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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the quality of intertextual learning that took place with adolescent students in one school when several different texts were introduced.

In this study an intertextual approach to learning is related to literacy in the curriculum. Definitions of text and intertextuality are presented and an argument is made that the latter is an important concept in locating literacy in the larger field of curriculum studies. Reading and writing across the curriculum are examined using the concept of "cognitive pluralism" (Eisner, 1992). Genre theory is discussed as it affects intertextual learning. This discussion leads the researcher to make a case for a multiple literacy curriculum that would develop a literate person, one who can mediate his or her world through multiple sign systems – not only verbal and written language forms. The data demonstrates that an intertextual approach or a multimodal one is grounded in cognitive pluralism, and current theories of reading and writing across the curriculum. Analysis of data showed that play, 'jouissance', and the essence of fun was crucial in learning. Intertextual learning provides the opportunity for both plaisir and jouissance as defined by Barthes (1975).

This study involved a planned comparison of the intertextual connections made by twelve grade eight students in a reading, writing, speaking, listening and viewing situations. Personal inventories, journal written responses, field observations, the videotaped discussions and open-ended interviews with the participants were used to discover the views, responses and reactions of twelve grade eight students and their teacher regarding intertextual learning.
To

Anna and Wasyl Kuryliw,

my mother and father
Acknowledgements

My deepest gratitude to the students I worked with who always made me feel I was teaching and studying something they valued. Many thanks to Gordon Wells for his insightful questions on genre and to Robert Morgan for introducing me to Roland Barthes and for very thoughtful comments. To David Booth, my ‘Giver’ whose words and work have inspired and influenced my education from the beginning. He has given me more than one opportunity to experience ‘jouissance’. Finally, words of appreciation for my husband, John Leeson whose patience, encouragement and support were the impetus for the completion of this work. And to Twink, my constant companion.
Table of Contents

Abstract .................................................................................................................. ii

PURPOSE AND RATIONALE OF STUDY ................................................. 1
Theoretical and Conceptual Framework ........................................................ 2
Reading and Media ......................................................................................... 5
Print and Image .............................................................................................. 7
Intertexts ......................................................................................................... 9
Curriculum ....................................................................................................... 11
Cognitive Pluralism ....................................................................................... 14
Genre Theory and Intertextuality ............................................................... 15
Multiple Ways of Knowing and Implications for Education ................... 16

REVIEW OF LITERATURE ..................................................................... 20
Towards A Definition of Text ........................................................................ 20
Drama as Text ............................................................................................... 23
Popular Culture as Text .............................................................................. 25
Text and the Reader ..................................................................................... 28
Response ....................................................................................................... 30
Reading and Writing and Response Theories ............................................. 31
Intertextuality ............................................................................................... 33
Dialogism ....................................................................................................... 36
Intertextuality and Schooling ..................................................................... 37
Intertextuality as a Process of Abduction ................................................... 39
Genre ............................................................................................................. 42
Genre and Intertextuality ............................................................................ 43
Reading, Voice and Intertextuality ............................................................. 47
School Practices ............................................................................................ 54
Reading and Writing Practice .................................................................... 54
Reading Practices/Reading Positions .......................................................... 56
Drama, Reading and Learning .................................................................... 57
Secondary Voices, Dialogism, and the Imagination .................................... 58
Memory and Intertextuality ........................................................................ 62
Dewey and Experience ............................................................................... 64
Inquiry Learning ............................................................................................ 67
Questioning .................................................................................................... 72

METHODOLOGY ..................................................................................... 78
Research Participants and Research Setting ............................................... 80
Gaining Access to the Field ......................................................................... 81
Data Gathering Procedures ......................................................................... 82
Setting the Stage ........................................................................................... 82
Cycles of Activity ......................................................................................... 85
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explorations</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Inventory Questions</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere Questions</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions For Author</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama Questions</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions in Interviews and Discussions</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abduction</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reflections</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Review of Findings</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Writing, Speaking and Viewing</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions and Connections</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for Practice</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stance</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Writing Practice</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dialogic Classroom</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience, Content and Pedagogy</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Teacher-Student Relations</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Learning</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Further Study</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REFERENCES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A: Letter And Consent Form</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B: Personal Inventory</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C: Synopsis Of Novel And Film</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D: Initial Interview Frame</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix E: Biographical Sketches Of Students</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix F: V#12's Final Product</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE

PURPOSE AND RATIONALE OF STUDY

Producing, maintaining, and reading texts are often called literacy acts (Mey, 1991 p. 84). In a broad sense, literacy is the ability to handle a text; that is, to process text. Traditionally, though, the term has been connected with education, the literate person is one who has been put through 'letters' and 'arts' and can participate in the cultural and social life of the community. Conversely, illiteracy means suffering social and cultural deprivation. Another meaning of the term refers to the process of becoming literate which connotes the process of "getting there, of making it in society".

Today, the point of getting an education for many students is centred on securing a steady, well-paying job. Supposedly, the better (read, longer) one's education, the better (read, more highly paid) the job. As Cook-Gumperz (1986, p. 41) expresses it, this "happens when 'schooled literacy' becomes a system of decontextualized knowledge validated through text performances." From being an aim in itself (the production and consumption of culture through the processing of texts), literacy becomes a due paid to society in order to gain access to its activities.

Because schools are immersed in print (mono literacy), the purpose of this study was to examine, in the context of one school, the potential of intertextual learning as a means of encouraging multiple literacies. Briefly, intertextuality is a central process of making meaning through connections between present and past texts constructed from a wide variety of life experiences. It can change to reflect the context from which it is appropriated and can reveal itself differently depending upon the conditions of its
appropriation. (A more detailed discussion of intertextuality follows). The study linked the
nature of students' written and oral responses to intertextual activities. The data reflects
the students' awareness of how they interacted with the various texts through their oral
and written responses.

Written responses, audiotaped interviews and videotaped group discussions were
collected and reactions to the 'textual' events were recorded. Information from these
sources helped the researcher to determine the level of ideation the texts produced and the
links (type and degree) to intertextual learning that occurred with the introduction of
different texts. Interviews were held with the classroom teacher to obtain information
relating to patterns found in the students' responses.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

Since people first began to read and write, literacy has been a problematic concept.
In the past, much of the concern about literacy stemmed from what people have assumed
were its consequences. Mey (1991) and others have identified at least three types of
consequences: cognitive, economic and social.

Researchers (e.g. Goody and Watt, 1988) propose a "Great Divide" theory, which
suggests that literacy affects the ways the members of a society think: literate thought is
conceptual; nonliterate thought, concrete. The assumption here is that literacy itself
confers certain general and wide-ranging cognitive skills that can be applied in different
areas.

Other researchers, however, have argued that the consequences of literacy, far
from being invariable or automatic, depend on social context. Kathleen Gough (as cited in
Kintgen, Kroll and Rose, 1988) demonstrates how literacy will be adapted to the society that uses it. It becomes what Scribner and Cole (1981) call a recurrent ‘practice’, a goal-directed sequence of activities using a particular technology and particular systems of knowledge. In their view literacy is:

a set of socially organized practices which make use of a symbol system and technology for producing and disseminating it. Literacy is not simply knowing how to read and write a particular script but applying this knowledge for specific purposes in specific contexts of use. The nature of these practices, including, of course, their technological aspects, will determine the kinds of skills (consequences) associated with literacy. (p. 236).

As Scribner and Cole (1981) demonstrate in detail in The Psychology of Literacy, the cognitive consequences of literacy are real but limited, and they do not constitute a revolution in thinking. Any discussion of literacy or illiteracy, then, must begin with some basic settling of terms. When we ask why Johnny can’t read, what do we expect him to read? Is he to read familiar material, or text he has never seen before? What do we expect him to get out of his reading? Is it enough if he merely reads the words aloud, or must he be able to answer questions based on the text? Must he be able to analyze the material and perhaps criticize it? Must he be able to justify his own views about the matter covered? The use of the term “literacy” is so broad that it must almost be defined for each occasion on which it is used. Just as a single definition of literacy is insufficient, so is its scrutiny from within the confines of a single academic discipline.

When the purposes of language in the classroom differ too radically from other purposes of language in students’ lives; when the academic community and the outside community are too far apart; when the compromise between the personal and the conventional is too difficult; then resistance to institutionalized learning and failure are the
likely results. Mey (1991) argues that: "The state of affairs in most of Western culture today is that access to society by way of literacy is controlled in such a way that the controller are in principle unable to spot and identify their controllers" (p. 87). In Michaels’ (1987) terms, both the "interactional" and the "institutional" forces that are at work in what he has called "the discoursal space of literacy instruction" remain implicit processes, such as in the classroom teaching of reading and writing. He calls for researchers to make observations and analysis that will "shed light both on the writing that gets done in a classroom and on the broader institutional goals and constraints, which influence teacher and student behaviour" (Michaels 1987, p. 322). These forces are operative at the covert level of control.

When the purposes of literacy in the classroom can be related to students' private lives and interests, education is much more successful. Paolo Freire (1970) has argued repeatedly that literacy instruction cannot exist in a vacuum, that it must be accompanied by "conscientization," a growing awareness of the literate person as a member of a particular social and political group.

Literacy is too often discussed as though it were a constant, easily measured phenomenon that could be completely comprehended in one 'correct' view. There is more than one perspective on, and there are various ways of investigating, this complicated and multidimensional topic. The answer to "Why Johnny can't read" is a great deal more complicated than it might originally appear.
Reading and Media

In today's world of information bombardment, literacy is often invoked as a battle cry against the forces of popular culture—especially the mediums of video, television and film—that are thought to deflect attention from the academic pursuits of a print book culture.

Print and television are two media that compete for children's time and attention. Popular sentiment assumes an inherent difficulty and significance in reading books and an inherent simplicity and insignificance in watching television. Print literacy is seen as an accomplishment bringing informational and general psychological benefits; televiewing is considered an amusement for immediate gratification (Klein 1988; Mander, 1978; Ontario Ministry of Education, 1989; Pimenoff, 1989; Postman, 1985). Schools are primarily print-oriented institutions. Outside school, the most influential and widely disseminated modes of communication are the electronic media—computers, television, radio, walkmen, telephones and videos.

Indications of the centrality of reading in current curricular thought can be seen in numerous public documents. For example, the Reading Framework for the 1992 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP Reading Consensus Project, 1992) opens with this passage:

Reading is the most important fundamental ability taught in the nation's school. It is vital to society and to the people within it. It is the door to knowledge and a capability that can liberate people both intellectually and personally. (p. 1)

Similar passages can be found in introductory chapters of textbooks, openings to journal articles, proposals for funding, teacher guides for basal readers and conference
announcements. We are now familiar with passages such as this, and fail to question the claims or to consider how this view of reading is placed within more encompassing accounts of learning, schooling, societal change and political power.

Essential to any reading, Rosenblatt (1989) says, is the reader’s adoption, consciously or unconsciously, of a stance. A stance, she says, reflects the reader’s purpose. The reading event must fall somewhere in a continuum, “determined by whether the reader adopts a predominantly aesthetic stance or a predominantly efferent stance” (p.158). The term efferent describes the kind of reading in which attention is centered mainly on what is to be carried away or retained after the reading event. In the aesthetic stance the reader adopts an attitude of readiness to focus attention on what is being lived through during the reading event. The sensations, images, feelings and ideas that remain are the record of the individual. This evocation, and not the text, she argues, is the object of the readers “response” and the interpretation both during and after the reading event.

But is reading “the door to knowledge”? What about writing? Where do we place dialogue, observation, experimentation, contemplation, mathematical exploration, or artistic expression? And is reading truly liberating? The claim that reading is the key to intellectual and personal liberation is debatable.

Morgan (1990) argues that there are two levels of reading. The first and more internal one he says, focuses on the way any technique of reading is rooted within a particular institutional and societal setting. What counts as reading always changes depending on the political and social considerations in accordance with the changing nature of institutional transactions and the governing social conduct of a period.

Morgan’s (1987) study provides a number of examples of how dominant conceptions of
school literary reading have altered over the past century. He argues that “reading systems are always multiple and contradictory: any official version of reading achieves its appearance of unity and stability by its location within an establishment” (p.328). He also (1990) states that most forms of reading and interpreting in which students engage are traditional ones — and students are encouraged to view it as a natural way of doing things. He has argued that by looking at the teaching of reading within schools, we can see it as a fluctuating and powerful technique of cultural production.

Whereas the privileged object within cultural life during the nineteenth century was the printed word, the dominant cultural form of the twentieth is indicated by the term “media.” As Fredric Jameson (as cited by Morgan, 1990) reminds us, this word brings together three “distinct signals: that of an artistic mode or specific form of aesthetic production; that of a specific technology…; [and] that, finally of a social institution” (1987, p.199). The need to conceptualize the media in this way has challenged us in turn to rethink language and the literary text within this threefold articulation: that is that any cultural object or practice is best understood by triangulating the relations and simultaneous pulls of aesthetic, material and institutional dimensions (p. 336).

Print and Image

Guardians of print-literacy have long valued imagination over image, what is recalled over what is seen. The integration of visual and verbal literacies, then, presents a potentially disruptive challenge to the hegemony of word over image — and openly suspicious (even hostile) characterizations of the visual should be seen in part as an anxious reaction to that challenge. As Behrendt puts it, “the print-literacy establishment has revealed itself to be surprisingly entrenched in what is ultimately both a reactionary and fundamentally elitist attitude to a new form of cultural literacy that is profoundly interdisciplinary in nature…” (as cited in Garrett-Petts, 1996 p.45-46).
After intensive research on reading, a number of teachers and researchers are beginning to question the limitations of a strict focus on reading. Despite the emphasis in recent reading research on comprehension strategies, a focus which can lead to highlighting reading as a set of skills rather than a tool for inquiry in all disciplines, some teachers and researchers are asking how to move from a skills model to literacy across the curriculum model.

Notions of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary learning have highlighted a pressing need to theorize and teach an integrated set of literacies. The multiplicity of communication channels and increasing cultural and linguistic diversity in the world today call for a much broader view of literacy than that portrayed by traditional language-based approaches. What needs to be emphasized is how teachers can equip students with means to negotiate the multiple linguistic and cultural differences in our society.

Literacy pedagogy has traditionally meant teaching and learning to read and write in page-bound, official, standard forms of the native language. "Literacy pedagogy, in other words, has been a carefully restricted project — restricted to formalized, monolingual, monocultural and rule-governed forms of language." (New London Group, 1996, p.2)

I will argue, as many others have, that literacy pedagogy must now take into account the growing diversity of text forms associated with information and multimedia technologies. The explanations must include understanding and skilled control of representational forms that are becoming increasingly significant in the overall communications environment, such as visual images and their relationship to the written word.
The notion of multiliteracies supplements traditional literacy pedagogy by addressing these two related aspects of textual multiplicity (control of representational form and this relationship to written form). What we might term "mere literacy" remains centered on language only, and usually on a singular national form of language at that. This is seen as a stable system based on rules. A pedagogy of multiliteracies focuses on modes of representation much broader than language alone.

There is an increasing multiplicity, an integration of significant modes of meaning-making, where the textual is also related to the visual, the audio, the spatial, the behavioral, and so on. New communications media are reshaping the way we use language. When technologies of meaning are changing so rapidly, there cannot be one set of standards or skills that constitute the ends of literacy learning. Therefore, perhaps to be literate, as Wells (1992) has proposed, "is to have the disposition to engage appropriately with texts of different types in order to empower action, thinking and feeling in the context of purposeful social activity" (p. 148).

**Intertexts**

Two key concepts help us describe multimodal meaning and the relationships of different designs of meaning: hybridity and intertextuality (Fairclough, 1992(a), 1992(b)).

The term "hybridize" highlights the mechanisms of creativity and of culture-as-process particularly notable in contemporary society. People create and innovate by hybridizing, that is, articulating in new ways, established practices, and conventions within and between different modes of meaning.
Prinz (1991) and Jones (1993) have linked this concept to the collage and
"documentary collate" impulses in recent fiction and poetry. Generally speaking, they say
the notion of collage has been imported into literary studies as an equivalent term for
"intertextuality": as a form of allusion, citation, or echoing. Intertextuality is more than
collage, but as noted before, the interaction of multiple discourses puts greater demands
on reader/viewer response and these demands may look more like challenges to those who
see themselves as defenders of print-literacy. However, but an exclusive definition of
"literacy" has less and less in common with lived experience, and is hard-pressed to
accommodate intertextual modes of reading. As Richard Johnson (1986) notes,

The isolation of a text for academic scrutiny is a very specific form of
reading. More commonly the texts are encountered promiscuously; they
pour in on us from all directions, diverse, coexistent media, and differently
paced flows. In everyday life, textual materials are complex, multiple
overlapping, coexistent, juxtaposed in a word "intertextual." (p. 67).

Intertextuality draws attention to the potentially complex way in which meanings
(such as linguistic meaning) are constituted through relations to other texts (real or
imaginary). Text types (discourses or genres, narratives and other modes of meaning,
(such as visual design, or a musical score) can be viewed historically in terms of the
intertextual bonds that comprise and transform them.

In this study of intertextual learning, written and oral responses to the different
types of learning, and the experience of different modes of communication were recorded
to see the levels of ideation, as well as the questioning and critical thinking produced by a
group of grade eight students. An interview was held with the classroom teacher and all
participants to obtain in-depth information relating to intertextual patterns found in written
work. An analysis of group discussions was used to explore the application of these patterns.

In this study I will relate an intertextual approach to learning to literacy in the curriculum. I will define text and intertextuality, and present an argument that the latter is an important concept in locating literacy in the larger field of curriculum studies. I will look at reading and writing across the curriculum and examine them using the concept of "cognitive pluralism" (Eisner, 1992). In addition, I will discuss genre theory as it affects intertextual learning. This discussion will lead me to make a case for a multiple literacy curriculum that would develop a literate person, one who can mediate his or her world through multiple sign systems—not only verbal and written language forms. I will demonstrate how a multimodal approach is grounded in cognitive pluralism and current theories of experiential and inquiry learning.

Curriculum

As mentioned earlier, intertextuality is a multifaceted notion that changes across time and context. For example, it can change to reflect the context from which it is appropriated and can reveal itself differently depending upon the conditions of its appropriation. This activity occurs at both a formal level (school texts) and informally via links with the texts of students' biographies, popular culture, and peer cultures, for example.

Bakhtin (1981) argues that the concepts of heteroglossia and dialogism are central to intertextuality. Heteroglossia is the simultaneity of dialogues, a way of conceiving the world as composed of a cascade of languages, each with its own distinct formal signs. It is
through social interaction that signs are created, and these signs become the basis for all
learning. Language in use is dialogic. Bakhtin sees dialogism as a fundamental principle of
language: a part of the very nature of communication, it is the enabling condition by which
we make meanings with words. Dialogism is a name not just for dualism but for necessary
multiplicity in human perception.

Therefore, “in order to see ourselves,” Bakhtin recognizes the struggle between a
sanctioned discourse and its dialogical opposite, what he calls internally persuasive
discourse, as an important struggle. One’s own voice is often at risk of being drowned out
by the voices of others, especially the voices of authority. The constant struggle over
whether to adhere to internal discourse or accept the voices of those in power often closes
the door to heteroglossia. Bakhtin argues that learning has its roots in a social dialectic.
Learning is “a response to signs with signs” that were created in interaction (Bakhtin,
1973, p.11). This notion of learning as a dialogic process has direct curricular
implications. It points to the need for students to engage continually in the exchange of
ideas, to be involved in dialogues of varying kinds in order to expand their notions of
literacy.

The basis for my conception of curriculum and where I link my concepts of literacy
to the development of the curriculum process follows Schwab’s four commonplaces:
teacher, learner, subject matter, and milieu (Schwab, 1973). These commonplaces are “the
components that come together to determine the nature of learning — the experiential
curriculum” (Goodland and Su, 1992, p. 332). The reason for treating these as the starting
point is that they can include virtually every aspect of what happens in educational
practice, as well as things that might not be considered, such as the environment. It is
important that they be considered interconnected with each other. Teachers are engaged in helping learning to occur, while learners are more engaged in the process of learning. Subject matter is what is being learned. This can include a myriad of educational resources, print, audio and visual tools such as the computer, television and film. Through these media and the processes involved in using these media countless other lessons are consciously or unconsciously being learned. Milieu, according to Schwab, has two categories. The first is the overall context that is consciously being taken into account and integrated into the curriculum by teachers and students. The second is the limitless categories of influences that affect the lives of both teachers and students and are not overtly integrated in curricula. I intend to indicate the importance of the connection of these two categories of milieu in intertextual learning.

Simon (as cited in Cherryholmes, 1988) argues that curriculum is a contest over what signs students can learn. He believes that instruction can be the literal and figurative mediation of those signs. Subject matter and the two categories of milieu define the range of the contested signs.

According to semiotic theory, we have created sign systems to express meaning and to mediate our world. Halliday states that our culture “is itself a semiotic system, a system of meanings or information that is encoded in the behaviour potential of the members” (1975, p. 36). The verbal potential (language system) of a culture is only one part of a culture’s more general semiotic system. Students usually experience a linear curriculum immersed in a print-oriented environment. Adolescents make connections readily when presented with screen images via television, film, or computer monitor. The struggle over signs is inevitable for students and teachers and the mediation of these signs
can be brought about in curriculum through the recognition of social, cognitive and communicational theories of reading and writing. It is important to recognize that Schwab’s experiential curriculum need not be linear (an idea to be discussed in the genre and multiple literacies sections) and to accept cognitive pluralism as a valid form for curriculum and literacy development.

Cognitive Pluralism

In relating intertextuality to curriculum studies, my ideas were shaped by the concept of cognitive pluralism. Cognitive pluralism provides a framework for the relationship between knowledge types and forms of intelligence. The cognitive pluralism idea is at least as old as Aristotle’s distinctions among three different forms of knowledge— theoretical, practical and productive. It has only been in the last two decades that a pluralistic conception of knowledge and intelligence have been advanced in the field of education. As a conception of knowledge, cognitive pluralism argues that “one of the human being’s distinctive features is the capacity to create and manipulate symbols” (Eisner, 1992, p. 317). These symbols are powerful cultural resources, played out as mathematics, music, literature, science, dance and visual arts.

Language is only one of the ways that the private, personal life of the individual is publicly manifested; the symbol systems mentioned previously establish the others. Although these symbol systems exist discretely in a math class or a music class, they are not often allowed to be used to demonstrate knowledge and understanding for example in an English or history class. There are several functions that symbol systems or forms of representation perform: (a) they stabilize ephemeral thoughts and feelings; (b) after
stabilization it is possible to reflect on and edit one's thinking; (c) transforming from private to public form makes communication possible; (d) the act of representation is also an opportunity for creative thinking; and (e) the form of representation used both constrains and makes possible particular types of meaning. Poetry allows one to represent meaning inexpressible in mathematics. Because the quest for meaning is part of human nature, the ability to represent or recover meaning in the various forms in which it can be experienced should be a primary aim of schooling. One could say that the symbol systems are a foundation in the construction of our personal worlds. Acknowledging cognitive pluralism allows a whole new array of possibilities to enter curriculum. The concept of literacy and educational equity would be expanded. Although the term 'literacy' typically refers to the ability to read, it can be extended to include the encoding or decoding of information in any of the form that humans use to convey meaning (Eisner, 1982).

Genre Theory and Intertextuality

Genre theory is based on useful similarities between different texts and symbols, and represents the meaning-making practices of a historical community, particularly its systems of intertextuality, which determines the multiple possible similarities that will matter. This emerging understanding of genre is grounded in the social action of groups (Miller, 1984) drawing on linguistic, compositional, literary and communicational theory (Bakhtin, 1981; Campbell & Jamieson, 1978; Lemke, 1988; Todorov, 1990).

Lemke (1992), in his definition of intertextuality, echoes Bakhtin's chief assumption that there is no figure without a background. Every utterance, every text, every occasion, is discourse, conveying its social meanings against the background of
other texts, and the discourse of other occasions. He acknowledges that intertextuality is an important characteristic of the way we use language in social communities. We can make meanings through the relations between two texts that cannot be made within any single text. Lemke believes it is important to understand the general principles by which our own community, at least, constructs relationships of meaning between texts. Which other texts do we consider relevant to the interpretation of this particular text, and why? What kinds of meanings are made by constructing these relationships between texts? And what kinds of meanings are not made because a community will not, or cannot, make such connections between two texts available to it? Lemke contends that we tend to connect texts that we see as being “on the same topic” or “about the same thing” and that we have both relatively explicit and implicit devices for signalling intertextual connections to readers. In school communities we must ask what kinds of relationships students construct between such texts and for what communicative or meaning-making purposes they do so.

Multiple Ways of Knowing and Implications for Education

Each learning activity should start with a immediate interest for students to engage in and that this activity use multiple sign systems interactively with more conventional forms of literacy. Instead of relying primarily on written narrative texts, we will need to be more concerned with helping students understand and analyze multiply coded genres and their interrelationships. Students should have experiences reading and writing within a wide variety of genres, with opportunities to approach the same subject from within various sign systems. Teachers need to identify and analyze the essential skills of multi-literacy and distinct genres.
The whole language movement taught some language educators how to create environments and experiences that supported children in thinking like readers and writers. Now we need to extend these insights beyond language to other sign systems. Specifically, we need to establish classroom settings that support children in thinking like artists, mathematicians, musicians, scientists, historians, and filmmakers.

Since all cases of literacy are multimodal, being literate means being able to create multimodal texts that are appropriate to the context in which the language learners find themselves. A multiple-ways-of-knowing curriculum builds on the learner taking a new perspective on knowing. It allows children whose dominant ways of knowing is something other than the linguistic mode a way to gain a voice and to discover their own identities. This kind of curriculum supports inquiry by appreciating diversity. Learners are supported in finding their own voices through any one of several ways of knowing. There are at least two views about student voices. The first group views voice as "individual expression" while the second group views voice as "participation." An alternative to these two views would perceive the self as something that is formed in conflict and co-operation with the array of discourse and interactions occurring within a classroom; in this view, the self would be dynamic, multiple, always changing. Developing voice would involve the appropriation of others language, it would involve risk and struggle. Although "knowledge gives the illusion of residing in books, people, and disciplines," in reality it is "a relationship that resides between and among people, disciplines and sign systems in particular times and contexts." (Harste, 1994, p.1223).

As Kress (1997), eloquently states:
The first aim of the new curriculum of representation and communication is the acceptance of a theory of meaning making in which individuals are the makers and not merely the users of systems of communication. The second aim is the development of the principle of design as the central category, and the essential aim for all who experience the curriculum. The third is the development of a productive disposition towards cultural difference. The fourth ... is that we need to rediscover and reinstate the different possibilities of engagement with the world, which are open to us. (p. 163)

Teaching strategies which facilitate the development of multiple literacies could enable deeper and more interconnected forms of learning. The curriculum experience in schools could become “real” and part of the students’ lives, instead of separate from what they consider real.

Although the search for connections across texts and lives is a natural part of learning, many students’ school experiences have led them to expect fragmentation in their learning. Traditional approaches to reading and writing instruction have often treated these processes as a single act of constructing, or of understanding a single individual passage. Integrated and intertextual learning needs to be encouraged, or at least understood. Making intertextual links drawn from popular culture and across the different types of semiosis, verbal and visual, sound and image, increases the possibility of a rich learning experience.

The purpose of this study is to illustrate what is involved in exploring intertextual learning from one particular theoretical framework: the interactive sociolinguistic and sociocultural framework. The study of the variety of language usage in social contexts can make a significant contribution to students’ academic and general welfare if judgements of their language are unshackled from right-wrong presuppositions and a dispassionate approach is taken to relating their language to the situations they must deal with in the
course of their lives. An understanding of code switching can be a valuable tool and can illuminate our understanding of students' behaviour in different language contexts. A failure to take into account individual and group differences in language usage, and pressures to maintain or avoid certain usage has hampered effective language instruction. The study will describe how this approach to schooling processes focusses on the interplay of linguistic, contextual and social presupposition which interact to create the conditions for classroom learning. In so doing, the intent is to make visible how this theoretical perspective might guide the exploration of literacy as it occurs in everyday life in classrooms, influences that can be learned, and the claims a researcher can make. This framework will become more obvious in discussions in Chapter three and four.

In this study, the concepts of experience, interaction, continuity, and problem solving are central to an understanding of inquiry and intertextuality. Accordingly, instead of suggesting that the world is a static presence that provides a context for all that happens during reading, this thesis will argue that these concepts are more plausibly seen as the dynamic means by which the processes of evocation and response, (in Rosenblatt's terms), take place.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature in this chapter will focus on several areas and will follow the theoretical framework of Chapter One. The initial strand will be on text, in particular on, and how reading (viewing), writing (representing), and speaking and listening (through drama and popular culture) in the classroom encompass one form of intertextual learning. The second strand will discuss school practices (experience, inquiry models, and genre theories) and how they can link up to explicit intertextual learning in the classroom.

Towards A Definition of Text

The theories of the French semiotician, Barthes, challenge traditional concepts of writing and of reading by undermining the concept that a piece of writing can manifest fixed and determinate meanings, or be a message from an ‘Author-God.’ Barthes draws a distinction between the concept of the work and of the text, and it is in this distinction that the significance of the concept of ‘text’ is made clear. Barthes uses the term ‘work’ to refer to the authored text – the text that is tied to its writer as ‘owner’ of the work. The work that is owned is normally the object of consumption, can be held, can be seen in bookshops, and found in catalogues. A move from work to text, however, represents a move away from the acceptance of the finished product, the consumable item, towards the acceptance of the process of writing, of textual study. Once the author is displaced from the centre of the work as guarantor of truth and pre-given meaning, the text can be spread out and the threads of its texture followed. The text then becomes a ‘network’ and reading thus becomes the production of writing, rather than the production of an authored work.
Such theories of writing and of the text diminish the distance between writing and reading and join them as signifying ‘practice.’ Barthes attempts to explain this practice by drawing metaphorically upon a concept of ‘playing.’ He offers a comparison between the processes of playing a text and playing a musical score. For instance, we can play a text as one plays a game—looking for a practice that directly duplicates it — but we can also play it as ‘co-author of the score.’ In this second way readers are engaged in what Barthes defines as “a practical collaboration” with the text. Reading and writing join hands, change places, and finally become distinguishable only as two names for the same activity.

When the narrator’s voice cannot be identified, even by using the device of the ‘limited point of view’ of different characters at different times through the novel, the text becomes, in Barthes words, “unreadable.” It becomes a “writerly,” a scriptable text.

This division between the readable and the unreadable text—the text of pleasure and the text of jouissance have been central to the analysis of patterns and readability in the novel. In the unreadable or ‘scriptable work’ the stance of the narrator cannot be determined. The text then becomes ‘writable’: a text of ‘jouissance.’ No one position has preference. By comparison, the readable text can be coded, ordered and interpreted (Barthes, 1981, p. 43) and can offer only pleasure. The pleasure is associated with familiarity and passive consumption, whereas the jouissance is linked with the unraveling of the text’s fabric and an almost erotic delight in the gaps and fissures of its textures (Barthes, 1981, p. 44).

A ‘text’ is henceforth no longer a finished body of writing, some content enclosed in a book or its margins, but a differential network, a fabric of traces referring endlessly to something other than itself, to other differential traces” (Derrida, 1977, p. 57).
Scholes (1985) argues that we must open the way between the literary or verbal text, and the social text in which we live. He identifies three aspects of textual study: reading, interpretation, and criticism. Each of these can be defined by the textual activity it engenders. In reading we produce text within text; in interpreting we produce text upon text, and in criticism we produce text responsibilities. He also states that teachers of literary text have two major responsibilities. One is to find ways for students to carry out these productive activities, and the other is to produce oral and written texts in all three of these modes of textualization: within, upon and against (p. 24). The teacher’s job is to show students the codes upon which all textual production depends, and to encourage their own textual practice. An interpretive text is always in a network of relations with other texts and institutional practices. “It is never a pure relation between a ‘primary’ text and a single ‘secondary’ text or commentary. Rather it is a statement in a dialogue” (p. 30). Scholes believes that by bringing the critical text inside the classroom we make a greater textual power available to students. “We make the object of study the whole intertextual system of relations that connects one text to others—a system that will finally include the students’ producing their own text” (p.31). (See Sumara’s (1995) idea of three vertical texts producing a fourth).

Wells (1992), suggests that what is important about a text is the observable and permanent linguistic representation of the meanings designed by its author. He also states that it is “heuristically worthwhile to extend the notion of text to any artifact that is constructed as a representation of the sense we make of our experience so that we may reflect upon and manipulate it” (p.147). Furthermore, he says that in the classroom there are many oral events during which close notice is given to the actual words spoken as well
as to the speaker’s meaning. He believes that is quite apt to extend the notion of text to include such oral events. (A discussion of speech genre follows). Short (1992) extends the linguistic definition of text to say, “A text is any chunk of meaning that has unity and can be shared with others” (p. 315). A song, a dance, a poem, an oral story, or pictures are all texts from which learners can draw connections as they construct their understanding of a text.

This broader definition of text sees intertextuality as a central process of making meaning through establishing connections between present and past texts constructed from a wide variety of life experiences. Short argues that intertextuality allows us to see learning as a process of making connections, of searching for patterns that connect to make sense of our world.

Text, thus, presupposes other texts and has a multiplicity of sources. “It is polyphonic and double-voiced; it is a multivocal field of play where texts are superimposed upon texts, upon still other texts” (Hartman 1992, p.297).

Drama as Text

Cecily O’Neill (1994) reminds us, as does Barthes and Derrida, that the word text, before it referred to a written or printed or manuscript text, meant a “weaving together.” In this sense, it is clear that there can be no performance without text, but while there is always a text, there may not always be a written script. It is useful to conceive of the text, whether written, improvised or transcribed, as the “weave” of the net or web: woven tightly or loosely and organizing the material of which it is made. It comes into being during the dramatic event.

The dramatic text has been usefully defined as “that which lends itself to a fiction, and is capable of being translated into a possible world” (p.19, 1994). O’Neill explains that process drama, by nature, is primarily defined by the absence of any prior literary document, finds its meaning and being only in action, and will generate a text made up of a
similar network of relationships to those produced in any other theatre event. This text will evoke a possible world, new or old, or possess the potential to be translated into an imaginable world. There is, in effect, a “latent” text in every improvised drama. In theory, it might be possible to record or transcribe this text, and like any conventional play script, it has the capacity to generate further dramatic events.

Although process drama may lack an obvious textual source, it will never arise in a vacuum. The dramatic world may be activated by a word, a gesture, a location, a story, an idea, an object or an image, as well as by a character or a play script. O’Neill (1995) describes these occasions for initiating dramatic actions as pre-text. It is the pre-text that will provide a firm base for the dramatic encounter of process drama.

“The ideal pre-text ‘rings up the curtain’ by framing the participants effectively and economically in a firm relationship to the potential action” (O’Neill, 1995, p. 21). It may hint at previous events and foreshadow future occurrences, so that the participants develop expectations about the dramatic action. The pre-text will also determine the first moments of the action, establishing location, atmosphere, roles and situations. Any significant dramatic event, whether scripted or improvised, will endure in the memory of those involved in the experience, and so will the encounter of process drama. The concept of text as memory may indicate ways in which actors in primitive and popular theatre passed on their improvised scenarios.

In the process drama world, participants are free to alter their status, adopt different roles and responsibilities, play with elements of reality, and explore alternative existences. When the drama world takes hold and acquires a life of its own, all of the participants will return from that world changed in some way, or at least are not quite the
same as when they began. The key to both the power and the purpose of process drama and theatre lies in the fact that they not only permit, but actually demand that we discover other versions of ourselves in the roles we play or watch other actors playing.

O’Neill (1995) argues that other art forms offer us new worlds, worlds in which we can feel but not act worlds for contemplation. In process drama, we go beyond that. We create the world and live, however briefly, by its laws. She believes that drama is an art form that “generates and embodies significant meanings and raises significant questions. Every dramatic act is an act of discovery and our acknowledgement of our humanity and community, first in the drama world and then in the real world” (p.151).

Popular Culture as Text

Morgan (1998) in discussing the teaching of media offers an interesting perspective on media as text. He sees teaching media as “dialogic in that it ‘co-ordinates and exposes’ divergent discourses about the media to each other, so that what might be gained is a “coming to know one’s own language as it is perceived by someone else language” (Bakhtin, 1981: 365, as cited in Morgan, p.121).

This perspective, Morgan believes, begins by recognizing the paradoxical and diverse practices of media use, rather than attempting to define them through the assigning of fixed textual meanings. This perspective recognizes that the variety of meanings we make from media change from one context to another because our discourse is by nature heteroglossic. Morgan, (1998) argues that in “the media-rich environments, the media themselves are active contributors to discursive hybridization, an essential aspect of the negotiation of subjectivity-in culture” (p. 121).
Buckingham and Sefton-Green (1994), in their study of popular culture, often encounter the view of young people as ‘dupes’ of popular media. Critics of all political persuasions have been known to advocate this view of young people as helpless victims of manipulation and as being very susceptible and naive. In this explanation, the text is seen to be all-powerful. The reader is powerless to step back or resist; ‘reading’ or making sense of media texts is regarded as a mechanical process in which meanings are imprinted on passive minds.

Such a view presumes that young people are powerless, have no control, and need to be educated on how to make decisions and evaluations because they are seen to be incapable of doing this for themselves. Buckingham (1994) and Morgan (1998) contest this view, not only because it is unproductive, but also because they believe it seriously misinterprets the nature of young people’s relationship with the media. Morgan (1998) argues for an approach, which goes outside of a theoretical analysis and the literary concentration on texts. Drawing on the work of Bakhtin, and on recent studies of the ethnography of media use, he argues for an approach that connects educational practice with the everyday routines of media use which go beyond the confines of the classroom. He states that, “Reproduced as speech acts, texts are unfinished responses within macro-social question and answer structures” (p. 126). Jameson suggests (as cited in Morgan, 1998) that:

once we pose the text as active reaction in a specific historical situation, it is no longer autonomous. And if the text is an answer, a solution, a reaction, it is a form of praxis, it can no longer be grasped passively; it must be seen as an active intervention in a concrete situation… (1987: 19).
Morgan (1998) argues for the promoting the study of student responses and conduct in their day to day lives in order to discover what most students already know:

that media in everyday life are experienced as processes of making and remaking rather than merely as ‘text’ for decipherment. Going beyond textualism and radical critique means shifting our attention to the *verbing* of media experiences instead of the *noun* of text, to active subjects in culture rather than inert meanings in texts.”(p.128)

The learning about media texts would explore in an open-ended fashion the popular cultural world of the every day life of students. Morgan believes that:

> It would examine such mundane interaction in order to discover what is vitally new and important about *these* media appropriations by *this* group in *these* specific social situations. It would focus on the innovations and micro-displacements accomplished by everyday uses, local discourse, and communal values — including of course the practices of the media classroom itself (1998, p. 128).

In a recent study, Buckingham and Sefton-Green raised some broad questions about how young people read and use popular cultural texts, how we might gain access to these processes, and how we might visualize them. Buckingham and Sefton-Green wanted to look not so much at the relation between the reader and the text as at the ways in which meanings and texts are socially communicated. Rather than concentrating on how young people read particular texts, they wanted to consider the social functions that those readings perform. Broadly speaking, they wanted to move away from a notion of reading as merely a matter of individual ‘response’ and to redefine it as part of a broader process of social distribution and use, which they call culture (see Morgan, 1987).

They see reading as an innately social process. The understanding of the text does not occur in isolation but is defined in and through social interaction, and particularly through talk. As John Fiske (1987) has argued, talk about popular media can be seen as
part of a broader 'oral culture'. Individual responses are part of meanings circulated within daily discussion thereby generating a powerful connection between 'social' and 'individual' readings — and perhaps making the separation of the two immaterial. How we talk about texts and how we use them in our every day lives rests on how we talk about them with others, and on the contexts in which we do so. Reading is thus inevitably a process of dialogue (Bakhtin, 1981).

Text and the Reader

Luke (1991) contends that there are three mutually related central concepts when talking about text. The first two concepts are: no text without context, and no context without social control. In particular, as regards reading and reading instruction, Heath's (1986, p. 22) observation that "reading is highly contextualized" can be extended to all texts produced and consumed in society, not just those taught and employed in one particular community. Luke's formula would entail a further proposition—"no text without social control." That is to say, society mediates the context in which the individual expresses or discovers him or herself: "Hence, in order to make sense of any text at all, one has to know the social context in which it was generated and in which it functions" (Luke 1991, p. 96). This means we are able to position the text, the teachers, and the students in relation to each other.

Buckingham and Sefton-Green (1994) say that to talk about media involves the constructing and negotiating of social relationships. Thus we are questioning the way in which students socialize themselves into group membership, and thereby construct their
own cultural identities. In defining their own tastes, individual readers also develop assumptions about how other people read. For example, Buckingham and Sefton-Green say that “by distinguishing between ‘fans’ and less committed readers, or between gender and ethnicity, they define themselves as readers in terms of what they are not as well as in terms of what they are” (1994, p.30). In the case of popular music, this may be particularly important. This process is likely to be complex and tentative, particularly when it comes to buying into ‘membership’ of other social groups. Buckingham and Sefton-Green argue that:


tastes and preferences are socially distributed, and they serve as markers of social distinction and positions — and thus of power relationship; yet the meanings of those distinction and positions — what it means to be black or white, male or female — are not simply given but are actively reconstructed and renegotiated through social interaction. It is through such processes that ‘reading’ becomes ‘culture’ (p. 30).

They do not believe that the media are regarded here as having powerful roles; on the contrary they provide heterogeneous ‘symbolic positions’ which young people may actively use in attempting to define and to oppose or embrace the various pleasures that can be constructed from texts. Thus, the number of subjective positions available to their readers is not limitless. The independence of readers is clearly circumscribed, although in ways that will vary for different readers in different contexts, and for different texts. Ultimately, however, this relationship between the power of the reader and the ‘power’ is not predictable or easily analyzed. Yet the basis of Buckingham and Green’s argument is that both are defined in relation to each other:

In accepting that the text is somewhat readable in the first place, we also inevitably agree to become its reader, and we do so at least partly in the terms that the text permits. In reading, and in talking about what we read, we are thus simultaneously defining our identities as readers (p. 30).
Response

Although Bakhtin (1981), a Soviet literary theorist and contemporary of Vygotsky, has only recently been included in discussions of reader response to literatures, his concept of dialogism illuminates an important aspect of reader stance. For Bakhtin, all utterances are dialogic-multivoiced, contradiction-ridden and tension-filled (p. 272) — pushed and pulled by the centripetal (unifying) and centrifugal (diversity in) forces of living language. Novelistic discourse is particularly polyvoiced, reflecting the strained co-existence of diverse social, historical, contextual, psychological, and developmental forces within language. According to Bakhtin, there are no neutral words or forms for each “taste of...the context in which it has lived its socially charged life,” each is populated by the intention of previous users (p. 292). As Bakhtin explains,

Language, for the individual consciousness, lies on the borderline between oneself and the other. The word in language is half someone else’s. It becomes one’s own only when the speaker populates it with his own intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intentions. Prior to this moment of appropriation, the word does not exist in a neutral and impersonal language. (It is not, after all, out of a dictionary that a speaker gets his words!) But rather it exists in other people’s intentions: it is from there that one must take the word and make it ones’ own (1981, pp. 293-294).

From this perspective, the reader’s stance toward text makes entry into the dialogic and tension-filled world of literary meaning-making possible. Having entered, the reader is then able to make a text his or her own, to imbue it with personal semantic and expressive intentions, to populate it with his or her own accent. According to Bakhtin, such acts of appropriation are essential elements of meaning-making. Without them, a text — or any other utterance — remains overpopulated with the intentions of others.
Despite the usefulness of the concept of appropriation in considerations of reader stance, Bakhtin's work cannot stand alone as a theory of reader response to literature. In considering the question of theoretical approaches to reader stance, then, it seems most productive to allow continuous dialogue among these theories so as to encourage interplay among them. Each plays a role in framing the construct of reader stance. The similarity lies in the common perception of language as a form of power.

Reading and Writing and Response Theories

A notion exists that meanings are located in texts, and that all that is needed is a reader of sufficient sensibility to unearth what the writer has purposely locked away. This notion, has been the dominant assumption for many years and has served as a base for personal growth and whole language approaches to English teaching. In this version of the activity of reading, unique responses result from individual differences in creativity and originality and reflect the reader's ability to come to grips with universal aspects of human existence and experience.

Although theorists of reader-oriented criticism disagree on many issues, they are united in one thing: their opposition to the belief that meaning resides completely and exclusively in the literary text. This opposition ranges from criticisms of the doctrine of textual autonomy to attacks on the idea of objectivity itself. The essential similarity between New Criticism and reader-response criticism is obscured by the great issue that seems to divide them: whether meaning is located in the text or in the reader. The location of meaning, however, is only an issue when one assumes that specification of meaning is
the aim of the critical act. Thus, although New Critics and reader-oriented critics do not locate meaning in the same place, both schools of thought assume that to specify meaning is criticism’s ultimate goal. “This assumption not only joins these polemically opposed movements, it binds them together in opposition to a long history of critical thought in which the specification of meaning is not a central concern” (Tompkins, 1992 p. 201).

Tompkins (1992) cites examples from Iser and Riffaterre, neither of whom renounces formalism entirely. “Both make statements such as “the reader’s enjoyment begins when he himself becomes productive” and the “semiotic process really takes place in the ‘reader’s mind’. Slatoff reduces the importance of the text even further: works of literature, he says “have scarcely any important qualities apart from those that take shape in our minds.” Psychoanalytically — oriented critics go further still, putting the reader in place of the text as the prime object of critical investigation. Holland writes, “the point is to recognize that stories...do not mean in and of themselves, people do, using stories as the occasion...for a certain theme, fantasy or transformation.” Bleich generalized the point to make it include all utterance: “The meanings of individual words, and of aggregates of words, depend altogether on those who read the words and tell the meanings to others.” Finally, reader-critics influenced by structuralism not only deny that literary texts have meaning in and of themselves, but also that those individual readers can create their own meanings. Thus, Culler writes, “the poem...has meaning only with respect to a system of conventions which the reader has assimilated” and Fish declares that, “the objectivity of the text is an illusion” there are no fixed texts but only interpretive strategies making them” (p.226).
Intertextuality

Text is always created from something else. It presupposes other texts and has a multiplicity of sources. “It is polyphonic and double voiced; it is a multivocal field of play where texts are superimposed upon texts, upon still other texts” (Hartman, 1992, p. 297). And on this field, textual resources, utterances, and designs are webbed and in turn spun into other texts.

Hartman asserts that texts exist as part of a complex dialogue rather than an isolated monologue. Reflecting Bakhtin’s theories of simultaneity, he sees texts as being networked with other texts — spatially and temporally — into a virtual metatext with a meaning that drifts according to the context of other texts in which it resides. There is no fixed, focal meaning. Intertextuality is a multi-faceted notion. It is not an idea that remains absolute and constant across time and context. It can morph and reflect the context in which it is most pertinent. It can reveal itself in different ways depending upon the conditions of its appropriation.

The term “intertextuality” was coined by Kristeva in the late 1960s in the context of her accounts for western audiences of the work of Bakhtin (as noted in Fairclough, 1992). Although the term is not Bakhtin’s, the development of an intertextual, or in his terms “translinguistic,” approach to the analysis of texts was a major theme of Bakhtin’s work. Bakhtin (1981) points to the relative neglect of the communicative functions of language within mainstream linguistics. For Bakhtin, all utterances, both spoken and written, are bound by a change of speaker and are oriented retrospectively and prospectively.
Fairclough (1992) notes Kristeva’s observation that intertextuality implies “the insertion of history (society) into a text and of this text into history” (p.270). Fairclough suggests that this inherent historicity of texts enable them to take on the major roles they have assumed in contemporary society at the leading edge of social and cultural change. “The rapid transformation and restructuring of textual tradition and orders of discourse is a striking contemporary phenomenon, which suggests that intertextuality ought to be a major focus in discourse analysis” (p. 270).

The following is a synopsis of Holquist’s (1991) interpretation of Bakhtin’s works. Utterance, dialogism and heteroglossia, as described below, are from a synthesis of Holquist’s study of Bakhtin’s ideas.

Utterance is the topic of analysis when language is conceived of as dialogue, the fundamental unit of inquiry for anyone studying communication as opposed to language alone. Bakhtin’s idea of the utterance, says Holquist, is active, one of performance. Utterance, as it is used in dialogism, does not involve much freedom of choice. It is dialogic in the degree to which every aspect of it is a give-and-take between the specific need of a particular speaker to communicate a precise meaning and the common requirements of language as a universal system. While there is some latitude for relative freedom in the utterance it is always achieved in the face of immediate controls of several kinds. A basic way in which the constraints on choice are evident lies in the fact that an utterance is never in itself original: an utterance is always an answer. It is always an answer to another utterance that precedes it, and is therefore always situated by, and in turn qualifies the prior utterance to a greater or lesser degree.
"An utterance then, is a border phenomenon" (Holquist, 1991, p. 61). He says this is because every utterance takes place between speakers and is therefore immersed in social factors. This means that the utterance is also skirting around what is said and what is not said, since, as a social event, the utterance is shaped by speakers who assume that the values of their particular community are shared and thus do not need to be verified. Utterance is a deed. It is active, productive; it attempts to resolve a situation, brings a situation to an evaluative conclusion, or extends action into the future.

Discourse, therefore, is not a reflection of a situation, it is a situation. Each time we talk, we literally enact values in our speech through the process of accepting our place and that of our listener in a culturally-specific social situation.

For Bakhtin, the position of the observer is fundamental. The observer is an active participant in the relation of simultaneity. Dialogue can be reduced to a minimum of three elements — an utterance, a reply, and a relation between the two. "It is the relation that is the most important of the three, for without it the other two would have no meaning. They would be isolated, and the most primary of Bakhtian a prioris which is that nothing is anything in itself" (Holquist, 1991, p. 38). The relation of every utterance to other utterances is dialogism. Any and all relations between two utterances are intertextual. Not only have words always been used and not only do they carry within themselves the traces of former use, but people themselves have been touched, at least in one of their former conditions, by other discourses.
Dialogism

Language in use is dialogic. "The word in living conversation is directly, blatantly, oriented toward a future answer word. It provokes an answer, anticipates it, and structures itself in the answer's direction" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 280).

Bakhtin invites us to see dialogism as a fundamental principle of language: dialogism is part of the very nature of communication, it is the enabling condition by which we make meanings with words.

The simultaneity of these dialogues is merely a particular instance of the larger polyphony of social and discursive forces, which Bakhtin calls "heteroglossia."

"Heteroglossia is a situation, the situation of a subject surrounded by the myriad responses he or she might make at any particular point, but any one of which must be framed in a specific discourse selected from the teeming thousands available" (Holquist, 1991, p. 69).

Heteroglossia is a way of seeing the world as made up of a cascade of languages, each having its own distinct formal signs. These signs, too, have their own values and are often taken for granted. Heteroglossia controls the operation of meaning in the kind of utterance we call a literary text. Dialogism is the name not just for a dualism, but also for a necessary multiplicity in human perception. Holquist maintains that there is a law of placement in dialogism. He says everything is perceived from a unique position in existence; the corollary of this is that the meaning of whatever is observed is shaped by the place from which it is perceived. Nothing can be perceived except against the perspective of something else; dialogism's governing assumption is that there is no figure without a ground. The mind is structured so that the world is always perceived according to this contrast. For Bakhtin there is no single meaning being striven for: "the world is a vast
congeries of contesting meanings, a heteroglossia so varied that no single term capable of
unifying its diversifying energies is possible” (as cited in Holquist, 1991, p. 24).

However, “in order to see ourselves, we must appropriate the vision of others. I
get my self from the others; it is only the others’ categories that will let me be an object
for my own perception. I see my self as I conceive others might see it. In order to forge a
self, I must do so from outside” (Holquist, 1991, p. 28).

Intertextuality and Schooling

Intertextuality is most commonly defined as the process of making connections
between current and past texts, of interpreting one text by means of previously composed
texts. This view focusses on the “ways in which the production and reception of a given
text depends upon the participants’ knowledge of other texts” (Beaugrande & Dressler,
1981, p.182, as cited in Short, 1992), and defines texts as meaningful configurations of
language intended to communicate.

Learners’ connections and stories are determined by their socio-political and
cultural histories as well as by the particular social context within which the connections
occur. Intertextuality is always socially constructed but varies by situation and by
individual as well. The knowledge that a learner brings to any experience is based in a
particular culture and history and so intertextuality can never be viewed simply as a
cognitive process. Each culture has its own definition of what constitutes a story, and
governs the circumstances and style of the telling. Each of these understandings is further
affected by divisions within society, such as class, gender and ethnicity. Not only does the
learner bring a particular sociocultural history to an experience, the experience takes place within a specific social environment.

Buckingham and Sefton-Green (1994) identify some of the parameters of what they have termed the social process of reading. They state that there appear to be three distinct but related aspects, which they call reading positions, reading profiles and reading histories. Each text makes available a range of reading positions, and closes off others. Each text invites the reader to read it in some ways but not others and demands, and thereby develops, particular kinds of competencies. In reading, and in sharing what they read, readers also define themselves. In semiotic terms, “this is a process that has both a synchronic and a diachronic dimension” (p. 30). Thus readers can be said to have reading profiles. As they read a broad selection of texts, they place a particular text by differentiating between other texts, defining it in terms of what it is and is not. This process also changes over time: readers have reading histories, and as their experience of text increases, so also the way that they locate the text changes. It is through these processes that young people develop their cultural capabilities as readers, while constructing identities for themselves as individual readers.

In reading often we encounter anomalies. Students most often bypass or ignore the anomalies and continue reading, or viewing. They do not stop and examine and/or play with text in which the anomaly is found. Play and its role in intertextuality can be called abduction.
Intertextuality as a Process of Abduction

Pierce (as cited in Short, 1992) argues that every instance of critical thinking begins with the observation of something that is surprising — an unexpected occurrence or anomaly. He believes, and I concur, that many students no longer expect exceptions, or have learned to ignore them, finding it safer to continue with their present beliefs or to give preference to the teacher’s beliefs. Once learners do recognize an anomaly, they search to find some point of view or connection that will explain the unusual occurrence. The process of noting something unexpected, searching for connections to create possible hypotheses, and evaluating whether or not to test out the hypotheses, Pierce calls abduction. He believes that this is the only process that can result in new knowledge. This cycle of critical thinking, with its focus on anomaly and abduction is crucial to an understanding of the social environments that encourage more complex intertextual connections. He says: “Intertextuality is a process that involves both disjunctions and connections that are set in motion when learners encounter anomalies through their interactions with other learners and texts” (as cited in Short, 1992, p. 317). He continues by stating that the connections allow learners to link ideas together, see new relationships, and bring unity to their understandings. The disjunctions, the ideas that do not fit, force learners to go back and reconsider evolving and past texts and so can lead to fundamental changes in thinking. Both the disjunctions and connections occur within particular social environments that can open up or close down dialogue and inquiry among learners.

The concept of intertextuality points to the productivity of texts, to how texts can transform prior texts and restructure existing conventions (genres, discourse) to generate new ones. But Fairclough (1992) says this productivity is not, in practice, available to
people as a boundless space for textual innovation and play. It is socially limited, constrained and conditional upon relations of power. The theory of intertextuality cannot itself account for these social limitations, and "so it needs to be combined with a theory of power relations and how they shape (and are shaped by) social structures and practices" (p. 270).

Hegemony theory, as presented by Fairclough, is a strong contender for understanding this shaping and combining power, and integrates well with intertextuality.

Not only can one chart the possibilities and limitations for intertextual process within particular hegemonies and states of hegemonic struggle, one can also conceptualize intertextual process and processes of contesting and restructuring orders of discourse as processes of hegemony struggling in the sphere of discourse which have effects upon as well as are affecting a hegemony struggle in the wider sense (p. 271).

And Foucault (1972) suggests that:

in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized, and redistributed according to a number of procedures, whose role is to avert its powers and to cope with chance events ... (p. 216).

In our society we are aware of, and know the rule of exclusion. The most obvious and familiar of these concerns are that which is taboo. We know that there are no independent stories. Formulae and ritualized texts are to be used in well-defined circumstances; things are said once and safeguarded because people suspect some hidden secret or wealth lies buried within. Foucault introduces the term "commentary," which he describes as discourse which is spoken and remains spoken indefinitely, beyond its formulation, and which remains to be spoken at some future time. In his view, there is no question of there being one category, fixed for all time, reserved for essential or creative discourse, and another category to merely restate, explain and comment. He believes that
the difference between “primary” text and “secondary” text can, on the one hand, permit us to create new discourse indefinitely and open an opportunity for endless repetition. On the other hand, whatever the procedure used, commentary’s only role is to say, finally, what has already been articulated. “It must — and the paradox is ever changing yet inescapable — say for the first time what has already been said, and repeat tirelessly what was, nevertheless, never said” (1972, p. 221). The drama of ritual, the masked repetition, suggests that in the end there is, perhaps, nothing other than what was there at the beginning: simple recitation. Foucault suggests that, “commentary gives us the opportunity to say something other than the text itself, but on condition that it is the text itself which is uttered, and in some way brought to a conclusion. The novelty lies no longer in what is said, but in its reappearance” (p. 221).

Foucault believes that ritual is an exchange and communication of specific forces at play within complex but restrictive systems. He suggests that it is probable that they cannot operate independently of these systems. He goes on to say that:

The most superficial and obvious of these restrictive systems is constituted by what we collectively refer to as ritual, ritual defines the qualification required of the speaker of who in dialogue, interrogation or recitation, should occupy which position and formulate which type of utterance; it lays down gestures to made behaviour, circumstances and the whole range of signs that must accompany discourse; finally, it lays down the supposed, or imposed significance of the words used, their effect upon those to whom they are addressed, the limitations of the constraining validity (p. 225).

The presence of institution power indicated by the powers of ritual, are very important theories that provide insight into the intertextual connections that the participants in this study made or did not make.
Genre

'Genre' is a term used in literacy pedagogy to connect the different forms that text takes with variations in social purpose. Texts are different because they do different things. So, literacy pedagogy has to be concerned, not just with the conventions of how texts work but also with the living social reality of texts-in-use. How a text works is determined by its function. The reasons for the textual differences can be located in the social purpose of each text (Kalantzis 1993, p. 7).

Genres are social processes. Texts are patterned in reasonably predictable ways according to patterns of social interaction in a particular culture. Social patterning and textual patterning meet as genres. Genres are textual interventions in society; society itself would be nothing without language and its anticipated patterns. Genres, moreover, give their users access to certain realms of social action and interaction, and to certain realms of social influence and power (Kress, 1989). Learning new genres gives one the linguistic potential to join new domains of social activity and social power.

A genre approach to literacy teaching involves being explicit about the way language works to make meaning. It means engaging students in the role of apprentice, with the teacher in the role of expert on language systems and functions. It demands an emphasis on content, on structure, and on sequence, in the steps that a learner goes through to become literate in a formal educational setting. For most genre theorists, genre is a category that describes the relation of the social purpose of text to language structure. It follows that in learning print literacy, (and other literacies) students need to analyze critically the different social purposes that guide patterns of regularity in language (or other semiotic tools)—the why and how of textual conventions (Kalantzis 1993, p. 1).
Language always happens as text, and as text, it inevitably occurs in a particular
generic form. That generic form arises out of the action of social subjects in particular
social situations. In Kress’ terms, a genre consists of being within a particular social
occasion that has a common structure and that functions within the context of larger
institutional and social processes.

Kress (1989) argues that the power relations between participants in an interaction
have a particular effect on the social meanings of the texts constructed within a given
genre. In a lesson — a genre in which the power variance is great — the interaction is more
closed, whereas in a conversation—a genre in which power status is reduced — interaction
is more open.

As genre theory evolves, however, it becomes obvious that more and more text is
generically problematic. To describe this:

we need to move beyond categorization of the generic, towards using
genre as an analytic tool for engaging with the multigeneric, intergeneric
and heteroglossic texts of society where differences of ethnicity and
subculture and style are increasingly significant elements of daily
interaction. (Littlefair 1996, p.16).

Genre and Intertextuality

Lemke (1992) describes three patterns of intertextuality. He calls them topical
content, thematic content and representational content (ideational metafunction). The
second, thematic content, is the attitude and orientational stance of a speaker toward
addressees and audiences, toward the thematic content, and toward other possible stances
in the discourse community (called the interpersonal metafunction). The third term,
representational content, comprises the resources for making whole text from mere word strings and seeks to account for both structure and texture (textual metafunction) (p.259).

Corresponding to the second general function, thematic content, there is indeed a pattern of intertextuality in a community based on linking texts that have "the same point of view" toward audience or content. And regarding the third, representational content, one has the common case of linking texts that have the same genre structure.

Lemke argues that when texts are the same in all three of these respects – talking about the same things, from the same point of view, in the same genre – we have the strongest basis for considering them potentially relevant for use in one another's interpretation, that is, as intertexts of one another. When they are similar in none of these respects, either we must look to some larger meaning pattern than text itself (for example, to a common social activity in which both texts may play a role), or we do not see the texts as relevant to one another except marginally.

Lemke postulates that the intertexts of a given text are all the other texts that we use to make sense of a specific text. Some of the other texts share the same thematic pattern of "propositional content" (co-thematic texts); others may have the same interpersonal or value-orientation points of view (co-orienting texts). Still others belong to another element in the same activity structure (co-actional texts), or have the same genre structure (co-generic texts). For example, a poem and a film, both about war, may be co-thematic.

Lemke argues that intertextual connections are a matter of degree as well as of kind and that it is only the pattern that counts as the content of the subject, not any particular text or its situation. Mastery of the pattern, the ability to "say it in your own
words”, means reproducing the pattern, not the text. Learning the pattern, like learning a genre, requires exposure to many differently worded instances of it. “The pattern is an intertextual formation, characteristic of a community; it is not predictable from knowledge” (1992, p. 259). We use language according to culturally learned themes and other patterns to construct a meaning-world. “Linguistic analysis, powerful as it is, can only provide at best a very incomplete account of any actual act of meaning-making, but it can guide us toward the general principles of semiotic intertextuality that we need” (p. 265).

Further to Lemke’s second principle of intertextuality, thematic content, Beach and Anson (1992) in their discussion on stance, concede that a reader can infer possible meanings from various texts. While doing this, the reader is applying his or her stance, or ideological orientation or perspective. In adopting a stance, a reader or writer infers those meanings consistent with his or her beliefs, attitudes or orientation.

This notion of stance is therefore consistent with social theories of intertextuality (Bloome et al, 1989). Participants in a conversation — oral or written — adopt certain stances that establish their social roles and relationships according to particular literacy events that have their own particular social histories. Group members are therefore socialized to adopt stances constituting membership in specific discourse communities. As part of their socialization, group members acquire stance by exposure to what Bennet and Wollacott (1987, as cited in Turner, 1988) describe as “textual shifters”. These “textual shifters” consist of a series of texts that represent a shared ideological stance. Bennet and Wollacott described these shifters in a study of the texts involved in the popularity of
James Bond books and movies in the late sixties. These stances represent cultural attitudes and group allegiance.

In Bakhtin's theory of dialogism, layers of multiple indeterminate meanings are inherent in discourse. Through their "active" or responsive understanding, readers and writers are open to this multiplicity of meanings. Similarly, Beach and Anson (1992) claim that "stance has to do with readers' and writers' openness or responsive understanding to the indeterminacies and ambivalences inherent in discourse and social relationships" (p. 339). Readers and writers, however, may adopt a stance in which they suppress the exploration of these multiple meanings. Or they may adopt a stance of "responsive understanding," in which they actively explore multiple meanings. By entertaining and articulating multiple, even conflicting meanings to others, students break out of "dualist," absolutist, modes of thinking and are able to entertain alternative perspectives. Students, as they assimilate the words and ideas of others, must struggle to sort out the jumble of images, values, words, and ideas being hurled at them in order to liberate themselves and formulate their own pathway and stance.

However, readers and writers stances, or their willingness to entertain multiple meanings, may be related to their roles in and relationship to a particular social or literacy event (Bloome & Baile, 1992, as cited in Beach and Anson, 1992). Group members may therefore become locked into rigid, routinized roles or procedures suppressing exploration of more vague and amorphous ideas. In the classroom, Beach and Anson observe that the I-R-E (initiate, respond, evaluate) "routine reifies status differences between teacher and student, allowing for little explicit dialogue exploration of indeterminate, ambivalent meanings associated with responsive understanding" (p. 339). In these monologic or
controlled literacy events, Beach and Anson conclude – as did Bakhtin, Fairclough, Foucault and others – that those in power attempt to confine the potential indeterminacies and ambiguities of meaning to those meanings consistent with their own institutional values.

For example, in schools this takes the form of suppressing some students' voices. In contrast, in a social context in which conventions and roles are fluid and open, and where responses are more aesthetic rather than efferent (Rosenblatt, 1988), participants may be more likely to adopt a stance in which they welcome multiple meanings or live through experiences associated with more social and fluid definitions of intertextuality.

All of this raises the question of what aspects of stance inherent in a fuller social context are more likely to foster exploration of a multiplicity of meanings.

Reading, Voice and Intertextuality

The question of voice has become a special marker of the success of both progressive and radical classrooms. A social theory of genre as explained by Kress needs to be attentive to the constantly shifting relations between the language in the spoken mode and its relations to shifts in power.

The immediate presence of an audience in speech makes it potentially interactional and spontaneous. Both speakers and listeners jointly construct a world of shared meanings, constantly modifying and elaborating according to the response of the moment. Turn-taking patterns shift according to the power relations between the speakers. In a conversation, for example, where the power relations may be relatively equitable, turn
taking may be subject to negotiation. In a typical classroom lesson, on the other hand, the interaction between teacher and students may be controlled to a greater extent by the teacher. The expectation of this consistent and ‘reliable’ narrative voice fails to acknowledge that the school voice, the student voice, and the teacher voice emerge from a substantially different ideological setting (Giroux, 1986). Even in the most liberal of humanist classrooms, the idea of allowing students their right to an ‘individual personal voice’ assumes a convergence with a voice learned from the teacher, or more cynically the opportunity to fake what it is one thinks the teacher wants. (Gilbert, 1989).

Voice is Bakhtin’s term for the speaking consciousness: the person acting — that is, speaking or writing — in a particular time and place to known or unknown others. “Voice and its utterances always express a point of view, always enact particular values. They also are social in still a third meaning; in taking account of the voices being addressed, whether in speech or in writing.” (1981, p.193) This dialogical quality of utterances Bakhtin calls ‘responsivity’ or ‘addressivity’.

While speech is structured, it is also emergent. There is an intrinsic tension between constraint and choice, between the given of tradition and the new of responsiveness of the moment. In Bakhtin’s (1986) words:

The generic forms in which we case our speech, of course, differ essentially from language forms. The latter are stable and compulsory (normative) for the speaker, while generic forms are much more flexible, plastic and free. The better our command of genres, the more freely we employ them...the more flexibly and precisely we reflect the unrepeatable situation of communication — in a word, the more perfectly we implement our free speech plan (p. 79-80).

Bakhtin (1986) acknowledges the existence of differential communicative competence without using the term.
Many people who have an excellent command of a language feel quite helpless in certain spheres of communication, precisely because they don’t have a practical command of the generic forms used in those spheres. This is not a matter of an impoverished vocabulary or style, taken abstractly. This is entirely a matter of the inability to command a repertoire of genres (Bakhtin, 1986, p.96). [for example, the genre of writing an academic thesis.]

Bakhtin asserts the intrinsic intertextuality of all utterances. We choose words according to their generic specification. Genres correspond to typical situations of speech communication, typical themes, and consequently also particular contacts between the meanings of words.

This typical (generic) expression can be regarded as the word’s ‘stylistic aura,’ but this aura belongs, not to the world of language as such, but to the genre in which the given word usually functions. It is an echo of the generic whole that resounds in that word.

Thus the expressiveness of individual words is not inherent in the words themselves as units of language, nor does it issue directly from the meaning of these words. It is either typical generic expression or it is an echo of another’s individual expression, which make the word, as it were, representative of another’s whole utterance from a particular evaluative position (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 97).

A speaker or writer must select among typical forms. Bakhtin (1981) suggests grounds for interpersonal conflict during discourse, because of the “auras” that accrue to those forms from awareness of their previous contextualized use:

Language is not a neutral medium that passes freely and easily into the private property of the speaker’s intention; it is populated-overpopulated with the intentions of others. Expropriating it, forcing it to submit to one’s own intentions and accents, is a difficult and complicated process (p. 294).

Bakhtin’s dialogism and heteroglossia point to the need for a set of reading practices which recognize the dialect within the divided self and which can hear the polyphony, or the multiple voice, which struggle for prominence in the text itself. The dialogic struggle begins at the level of the word itself.
By recognizing the multiple voices, the polyglossia of the text, readers are given
the dialogic possibility of creating "a counter discourse to the discourse of the utterer"
(Todorov 1984, p. 22) which will allow for the 'legitimization' of voices marginalized
through particular race, gender and class affiliations.

For Bakhtin (1981), the struggle between a sanctioned discourse and its dialogical
opposite, what he calls an internally persuasive discourse, is an important struggle. The
voices of others and of authority often threaten to drown out one's own voice. The
constant struggle over whether to adhere to internal discourse or accept the voice of those
in power often closes the door to heteroglossia.

Bakhtin's ideas are, perhaps, the root of intertextuality, but in the course of my
research other concepts that determine student's voice, or lack of it, have entered into the
discussion. One such important concept that intertextuality has incorporated deals with
power and ritual.

As Lemke (1992) has pointed out, social constraints on the potential meanings and
intertextual connections available and not available for learners are established by the
particular language and cultural systems operating in that learning environment and
classroom event. Bloome (1989), too, argues that intertextuality is located in the social
interactions between people, and that once a juxtaposition of texts has been proposed, "it
must be interactionally recognized, acknowledged, and have social significance" (p. 1).
Bloome reminds us that we cannot just examine the types of connections being made by
learners and the process of making those connections, but must also examine what
happens to those connections once they are put forth within the social community. What
connections are advanced by children and are not recognized or accepted by others? Who
has the power within a particular learning community to sanction intertextual connections? Bloome asks the same question as Fairclough and Foucault. What occurs when those in power do not sanction intertextual connections? The intertextual connections that are arrived at in a classroom reflect participant structures. The social relationships and participant structures within a classroom are thus an essential aspect of any study of intertextuality.

Often, children in school are not given the time to hypothesize, to talk themselves into understanding, to ‘think aloud.’ Barnes calls this groping towards meaning ‘exploratory talk.’ It is marked by frequent hesitation, rephrasing, false starts, and changes in direction. This type of exploratory talk is one means by which the assimilation and accommodation of new knowledge and old is carried out. Talking to learn must be part of every language interaction that is to have impact upon children.

Booth (1994) argues that talk can help children make sense “out loud” as they come to grips with new ideas and understanding. “It is a bridge that helps them explore relationships that arise between what they know and what they are coming to know. Language is the heart of the drama process and the means though which the drama is realized” (p.89). Drama may be the most appropriate means of providing the types of speaking/listening situations needed. It can facilitate a wide variety of language used in context that requires full participation within an affective/cognitive frame promoting types of talk important in encouraging deep-level thought processes, such as discussion, negotiation, clarification, explanation, persuasion and prediction.

Booth (1994) goes on to explain that because drama provides role situations different from those in regular classroom settings, children can begin to regulate the
action. This will markedly affect the language use of everyone in the classroom, including that of the teacher. "Modes, registers and qualities of language can be released more effectively through drama than in many other classroom situations. Both the children's confidence and competence in their language abilities are enriched and increased through the synthesis of language, feeling and thought" (p. 90).

Neil Mercer (1996) discusses the diverse field of research on talk, which does not provide an ordered set of findings that can easily be integrated. However, he does find that research supports the conclusion that talk between learners has been shown to be valuable for the construction of knowledge. Joint activity provides opportunities for practicing and developing ways of reasoning with language, and the same kinds of opportunities are unlikely to arise in teacher-led discussions. This conclusion he says, can be used to justify group work and other forms of collaborative activity in the classroom. But the research also shows that while encouraging talk between learners may help the development of understanding, not all kinds of talk and collaboration are of equal education value. Mercer argues, that:

First, it is talk in which partners present ideas as clearly and as explicitly as necessary for them to become shared and jointly evaluated. Second, it is talk in which partners reason together — problems are jointly analyzed, possible explanations are compared, and joint decisions are reached. From the observers, point of view, their reasoning is visible in the talk (1996, p. 363).

However, research examined by Mercer does not support the idea that talk and collaboration are inevitably useful, or that learners left to their own devices necessarily know how to make best use of their opportunities. A sociocultural perspective on classroom education supports the use of collaborative activity, but it also highlights the
need for an explanation including rules and standards for the activities students are expected to undertake as part of their learning. What is more, Mercer maintains, learners themselves need access to that rationale, one that they find convincing. "Justifying social or moral choices to friends, or even discussing the social norms of classroom life is not necessarily the same as using language as a social mode of thinking when making joint decisions, solving problems, or choosing between alternative explanations for observed physical events" (Mercer 1996, p. 374), as cited in Much & Schweder, 1978; Elbers, 1994).

Mercer (1996) argues there are good reasons to believe that students are often unclear or unaware of what they are expected to be doing and achieving when they are on task in education activities, and that teachers often provide little useful information about such things to children. One cannot assume that children already possess a good understanding and awareness of how best to go about "learning" together in the classroom. In concluding his arguments, Mercer states that there are communicative and intellectual dimensions to the organization of collaborative activities, which are important if the activities are intended to contribute to children's educational progress. Simply sitting them down with a shared task may provoke talk, but of what kind and quality? It may be, he suggests, that teachers — the organizers of collaborative activity — often do not have a clear notion of what kind of talk they are trying to encourage, and for what reasons.
School Practices

Reading and Writing Practice

Practice of reading skills might improve student performance on standardized tests but it does not improve overall reasoning ability. If children's reading instruction comes exclusively from a vocabulary controlled reader, photocopy sheets, and skill and drill work books, they are not likely to learn to respond critically to the larger issues presented in literature, history, science or the world at large.

An intertextual approach to learning focuses primarily on the relationship between reading and writing and on developing a new concept of literacy. The issues of reading and writing across the curriculum have been expressed throughout this century and remain a concern today. The theoretical focus on the interrelationships among context, purpose and cognition has pervaded the literacy literature since the mid-1970s. It has and added new dimensions of interest, leading to greater understanding of the way in which practical and comprehensive literacy activities across the curriculum support the development of higher levels of literacy.

The implications arising from an integrated view of reading and writing are significant. Accepting the challenge of these implications would involve new curricular research into the interaction of reading and writing on a daily basis in schoolwork, the contexts that support that development of literacy, and the implications for the shape of the curricula.

Two researchers offer suggestions as to how intertextual readings could be established in the classroom. Pressley, El-Dinary et al (1992) in their conclusion of their
study, argue that by targeting the teaching of comprehension strategies, all four of the factors that contribute most to student self-regulated cognition should be affected. They state that: (a) students should be offered a repertoire of diverse reading strategies, which they practice adapting for coordinated use with other strategies and background knowledge; (b) development of metacognition should be encouraged, especially understanding about the appropriate use of the strategies being taught; (c) important nonstrategic world knowledge should increase because the reading capabilities developed in the reading group permit students to construct important understandings from all the reading they do, both in the group and independently; (d) building student motivation to use strategies and nonstrategic world knowledge is a high priority in transaction strategies instruction (p.546)

Dennis Sumara (1995) has created the term “focal reading practice,” to describe a practice which encourages and demands an intertextual approach to reading. He states that focal reading practice is meant to remind the human subject of her or his cultural and historical position amid a current set of intertextual experiences. It is important that this intertextual reading and interpretation occur. In his own response to reading and teaching practices, he has found that a minimum of three vertical experiences are needed for the focal practice to be realized. His reading of a poem, his memory and re-interpretation of the photograph of his mother and her friends, and his past reading and interpretation of The English Patient, for example, became the location within which he created a new text. Three events, interpreted in relation to one another, produced a fourth. The fourth was then read in relation to the originating three, and to other events which occurred in his life alongside it.
Whenever there is a deliberate attempt to produce responses which show the co-emergence of the reader's personal identity, her or his involvement in collective identities and her or his lived experiences—which include literate practices such as reading and writing—a focal reading practice has been generated (Sumara, 1995 p. 24).

Reading Practices/Reading Positions

Being able to read must mean being able to resist the apparent coherence or unity a work offers, and being able to question the text. Such reading can best be accomplished if readers have at least a passing knowledge of the typical generic expectations of such texts, and the common reading practice, which will reproduce or ‘play’ the text. Experienced readers will, however, be able to play the text in others ways; to move beyond the expected reading position to one of critical resistance—to try other reading frames, perhaps those that are generated by the textuality of the classroom. Reading practices and reading positions can then become the focus of study in a classroom. Reading is no longer regarded as an innocent or neutral activity seeking the person behind the text. Reading involves a close study of intertextuality of the way language functions in meaningful practice. The removal of the ‘Author-God’ as the dominant classroom reading frame can be a liberating reading experience for many adolescents and many teachers. Gilbert (1989) believes that the move from voice to text in the classroom must rest on a broad theoretical base that acknowledges the constructed nature of discursive power systems. A base which accepts that reading is a set of learned and arbitrary cultural practices sanctioning certain meanings (See Morgan, 1990, Buckingham, 1994 et al.).
Drama, Reading and Learning

The connection between the learning areas of drama, and reading and listening is the world of meaning. Booth's (1994) beliefs about reading and drama seem to connect with Bakhtin's theory of dialogism when he states: "It is the idea of symbolization and its role in the discovery and communication of meaning that connects drama and reading. Both areas are concerned with interaction. In story drama, the children enter into a dialogue, modifying and exploring symbols by changing and challenging each other's contributions" (p. 118).

When reading, students enter at first into a dialogue with the author, then with other readers, and finally with themselves. Through discussion and analysis, they modify and develop their understanding of the author's meaning, as well as absorbing the diversity of meanings their classmates have taken from the text. In both cases, children are negotiating at the symbolic level.

Whether the situation in the drama is based upon an original story from literature, a speech, or a picture is of little significance. The drama must refine the facts to uncover unknown truths and universal concepts, not just retell events from memory.

Fundamental memories brought forth by the intensity of the reading or drama experience are tapped so that the resultant response is both personal and universal, and can be shared in the context of the literacy situation and the dramatic experience. "Then the literary code will be broken and the context made significant to the 'theory of the world' that each individual is in the process of creating as he or she is educated in the widest sense of the word" (Booth, 1994, p. 118).
Secondary Voices, Dialogism, and the Imagination

The dialogic in fiction is a medley of styles and languages, or in Bakhtin’s preferred term, voices. He says: “The novel as a whole is a phenomenon multiform in style and variform in speech and voice” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 26). He goes on to list the principal stylistic features — the quoted speech of characters, the relationship between characters’ discourses and the author’s relationship between all such discourses and others outside the text—that are referred to or suggested by means of what he calls “doubly-voiced speech.” By this term Bakhtin means the common experience in the novel of being addressed, not directly by the author, but indirectly through the represented discourse of persona or character, or in the voice of a recognizable literary style. The author is present, of course, in the sense that she or he has put all the elements of the novel together. But this very variety of discourses within the novel both prevents the imposition of a single authorial view of the world and leads to the creation of a multiplicity of secondary worlds as readers exercise their capacities for ‘responsive understanding’ during the reading. It is here that Bakhtin’s concept of dialogism help in rethinking the idea of the secondary world in more active terms. This endless variety expressed in a text is both the source of the reader’s pleasure in recreating his or her own fiction and of the novelist’s pleasure in the act of creation.

The dialogic imagination is described by Bakhtin in auditory terms. The virtual world the reader experiences during reading, in all its multisensory variety, is activated by the voices — stated, implied, imitated, and embedded in text. “Books are embalmed voices: the reader’s job is to disinter them and breathe life into them.” (Cox, 1992, as cited in Benton 1992, p. 32). In so doing, the reader begins the engaging process, and creates a
sense of living in a "secondary world which is both dialogic in origin and impetus, and experiences a sensuous phenomenon whose nature, coherence and point relate intimately to the primary world and intertextually to their secondary worlds created in the past and yet to come" (Benton, p. 32, 1992).

In Benton’s (1992) theory of the secondary world, the world is in the head of the reader, and the voices in the story sustain this world. In this notion of a world in the discussion of fiction, experience is the single most common idea. It appears in a variety of shapes, not least in recent developments represented under the title ‘reader-response criticism.’ Benton explains that during reading, when we are “lost in a book”, we inhabit a mental space that is biologically determined. In that space between the reader’s inner self and the words on the page, a “literary hologram” is created.

The secondary world is a transaction metaphor. When children read or listen to a story, they are creating personal images in their minds. Story is a basis of organizing our human experiences, a framework for learning. As Bakhtin would suggest, we search for our own stories in the stories of others. Booth (1994), speculates that drama may be one of the few language situations that opens up story possibilities, and allows spontaneous narrative to enter naturally into the flow of talk — every kind of story from personal experience to literary fictions.

Rosen (as cited in Booth, 1994) says that “stories-in-the-head” should be given their chance to be heard. In making meaning from the stories of others, children must go back and forth between the story they are reading or listening to, and the stories they know — their own personal narratives. They are, in a very real sense, building a personal story from their own experiences, attempting to make sense of the story in order to make
meaning in their lives. Until “the child can make his or her story from the fictional one, there is no story for that child. The process of story continues beyond the end as the seed of another story readies itself for germination” (Booth, 1994 p. 40).

Booth argues that drama is the act of crossing into the world of story. In sharing drama, we agree to live as if the story we are enacting were true. We imagine the story, engage with it, struggle with its unfamiliar concepts, associate our own experience with it and fill in its shape with our own particular interpretation. We process the key events, images, and themes of story by living them out in drama. The process holds true whether the stimulus for the drama is written story, an oral tale or a group’s narration. “Drama enables us to discover the heart of story through its images. The voice of the group resonates off the voice of the text to create the voice of the drama” (Booth, 1994, p. 40). This is appropriation, dialogism, heteroglossia, and use of intertexts as Bakhtin would conceptualize them.

In drama and in narrative, the context may be fictional but the responses are real. Although the child is in a make-believe situation in story and in drama, the real world continues to exist, and the learning for the child lies in the negotiation of meanings—symbolic and literal—taking place in both spheres.

Drama helps children wander in the story garden, reconstructing symbols, images, and narrative sequences through action. They re-examine, the story’s ideas, experimenting with them, learning “to play” with the narrative and then, in reflection, coming to an understanding of both the story’s possibilities and the art form used to create it (Booth, 1994, p.41). (cf. Barthes’ theory of jouissance).

Drama can help children see beyond literal meaning, even subconsciously, so that an understanding of the complexity and subtlety of meaning is applied to the story. The
children pause in a fictional present to linger on an image, or move forward, backward and sideways, in an attempt to make meaning happen. Time can be altered, ideas juxtaposed. If story is being used as the source of a drama, then the child brings to the text an ability to hypothesize, to identify with, and to clarify what is happening in the story, in the drama, and in his or her own life. The learning is integrated as he or she engages with the two art forms. When the child has translated a written symbol into experience, she or he can then re-examine the story in light of this new experience.

When children read or listen to a story, they are creating personal images in their minds and entering a secondary world. In drama, they help to build group images. How will they go about these tasks? Will they create a new story, connect to another story, or build on to the story by designing new circumstances or by finding analogies and patterns to other texts? How will they link this story to others, creating a repertoire of stories for future reference?

Story drama may even open up internal comprehension. It can use the pattern of one set of images to organize quite a different set. Therefore the images from one story can be used as images for related and yet different meanings in another context. Story drama opens the door to intertextual learning.

The story of The Giver led the students to make explicit intertextual connections especially when discussing and thinking of memories and the impact they have on people's lives. The following section talks about Bartlett's theory of remembering and how his concepts of remembering complement Bakhtin's notions of dialogism.
Memory and Intertextuality

In the first half of the 20th century, Bartlett posited a theory of the content of mind as schema, or networks of meaning, as reflected in his book *Remembering*, published in 1932.

Beals (1998) contends that Bakhtin’s writings on appropriation augment Bartlett’s notion of schema, and vice versa, in ways that aid our understanding of how children (and adults), in the course of dialogue with the world around them, construct their knowledge of themselves and their world. In her argument, Beals examines Bartlett’s notion of schema, as a depiction of the organization and development of the mind, through the lens of dialogue and appropriation found in Bakhtin’s work.

For Bartlett (1932), meaningful connections formed the basis of the notion of schema: “All the cognitive processes, from perceiving to thinking, are ways in which some fundamental ‘effort after meaning’ seeks expression. Speaking very broadly, such effort is simply the effort to connect something that is given with something other than itself” (p.177). He characterized schema as the network of past experiences in the mind, constantly rearranging and reconstructing itself. New experiences and perspectives confront old ones. The connections that Bartlett spoke of were active, dynamic arrangements of meaningful material. This material, the content of the mind, gains new meanings as these connections are formed.

Bartlett’s theory of schema grew out of his work on human memory. He used the term remembering, which maintains the sense of ongoing activity within real-life contexts. He placed the focus on the content and process of remembering, rather than on the mechanism of memory, and placed great emphasis on development on growing and
changing and rearranging. He stated that "schema refers to an active organization of past reactions, or of past experiences, which must always be supposed to be operating in any well-adapted organic response" (1932 p. 201). Words, the concepts underlying them, and their relations to other words and concepts constitute one kind of schema. Text structures represent another type of schema that Bartlett's works suggest. Bartlett's experiments indicated that participants were able to recall the basic outlines of a story over long periods of time.

Conventionalization was a central focus for Edwards and Middleton (1986) in attempting to understand the formation and transformation of collective memories. They believed that sharing memories for events is essentially interactive, coming in the form of conversational discourse. Conventionalization occurs as one remembers, "a fundamentally symbolic process both rooted in and constitutive of culture, forming and being formed by symbols and meanings transmitted in texts and pictures" (p.79). Their view gives Bartlett's treatment of culture new life. Bartlett tended to see culture as a single entity (e.g., there were Native peoples, British people, and people from Thailand), whereas Edwards and Middleton pointed to how culture forms, and is formed by, the symbols we use to think and interact in everyday contexts. They recognized that memories are not simple recalling of events, but come loaded with their own purposes and assumptions.

To Bakhtin, the human mind was thoroughly social. For him, mind was not bounded by one's own self, but was shared across the barriers of individual lives, situations and players, or one's imagination. But like Bartlett's conception of mind, the voices in heteroglossia are alive, growing, shifting. Both the individual and the world around him or her are dynamic participants in the process of development. For Bartlett,
the social group seemed to be simply a template overlaid on schema. For Bakhtin, however, heteroglossia was the foundation and frame for the construction of schema. It was not an add-on or an overlay; it was the beginning and pivotal point for the formation of schema. As previously discussed in this thesis, for Bakhtin, words and utterances were the stuff of the mind.

Dewey’s (1938) theories of experience and continuation and interaction are ideas that support Bakhtin's notions of the importance of dialogism to establish an intertextual chain and transformation.

Dewey and Experience

Dewey’s ideas are often converted into catch phrases that serve a variety of purposes according to the situation and the players involved. Dewey’s philosophy is often touted as the embodiment of progressive education. But Experience and Education (1938/1963) was actually written as a result of his concerns about the excesses of progressive education and detailed his view of what ideal schools, curriculum, and teaching should be about. The curriculum was to be problem-centered and the environment was to be so constructed so those children would be motivated to engage in inquiry learning. For Dewey, perhaps the most influential educator in North American history (Pinar, 1995), “Education, experience and life [were] inextricably intertwined” (Clandinin and Connelly, 1993). Dewey “took for granted the soundness of the principle that education, in order to accomplish its end both for the individual learner and for society, must be based upon experience – which is always the actual life experience of some individual” (Dewey, 1938, p.89).
In order to understand what Dewey meant by experience, it is necessary first to
turn to his use of the term “situation” (Dewey, 1938). Continuity and interaction are the
“longitudinal and later... aspects” (p. 44) of a “situation.” The principle of continuity rests
upon “the fact of habit” (p. 35) wherein every experience is seen to modify other
experiences, whether the students want it to or not. Continuity means the connectedness
of experiences in time as seen in the fact of habit. Experience is made up of two
components: objective conditions—physical and social environment; and internal
conditions, the ways in which experiences are taken up so as to create attitudes and
interests which lead to a deepening of a student’s ability to fully experience the
possibilities of each moment. The principle of interaction signifies the equal importance of
both the objective and internal conditions. Education, then, is seen as growth along the
axis of continuity, based upon experiences arising from the principle of interaction. To
create such an environment for inquiry, teachers need to understand both the content and
the student. A teacher working from Dewey’s educational philosophy has a harder job
than other educators do. The teacher must recognize the importance of the course
content, and the nature of the internal conditions of the child, which govern the ways in
which she or he experiences the lesson. The teacher must also recognize and work with
the objective conditions of physical and social environments, which influence the internal
conditions.

For Dewey, a complete educational experience amounts to the objective and
subjective having equal weight. The quality of a single experience is affected by all
previous experiences and has the potential to influence future experiences. The principles
of continuity and interaction make it possible for experience to bring about change and effect growth.

To understand educative experience in the Deweyan sense, it is necessary to pay close attention — first, to the needs, purposes, personality and intelligence brought by the students to the class, and second, to what is present in that class. The social relations and meaning within which a student encounters a book, a computer program, a film, an utterance or a glance by a teacher or fellow student were fundamental to Dewey’s conception of educational experiences — the kind of experience that could enhance participants’ lives.

The theory of experiential education has been developed out of research in several areas, including philosophy, psychology and sociology. The framework presented by Carver, (1996) draws on these disciplines, as well as on anthropology, cognitive science and education reform.

Interdisciplinary framework is needed because experiential education is an interdisciplinary field. We must be able to share and integrate what has been learned both in different setting and from the perspective of different traditions.

Carver states that:

Experiential education promotes the development of student agency, belonging, and competence by introducing resources and behaviors that allow for active learning, drawing on student experience, authenticity and connecting lessons to the future in a learning environment that usually values caring, compassion, responsibility, accountability individuality, creativity and critical thinking (1996, p. 11).

Quite simply, experiential education is education (the leading of students through a process of learning) that consciously applies students’ experiences by integrating them into
the curriculum. Experiential education is holistic in the sense that it addresses students in their entirety — as thinking, feeling, physical, emotional, spiritual, and social beings. Students are viewed as valuable resources for their own education and for the well being of the communities of which they are members. Carver (1996) finds four pedagogical principles that stand out as salient features of experiential education: authenticity, active learning, drawing on student experiences, and providing mechanisms for connecting experiences to future opportunities. Teachers facilitate processes by which students participate in the construction of knowledge. Students in experiential educational programs are treated as active participants in their own education.

In classrooms, life is the "enacted curriculum" (Eisner, 1985) rather than the stated one engaged in by students and teachers. The student's experience of the enacted curriculum is of primary importance because it is within such experience that learning about self and the world takes place. What is or is not learned and how such learning, relearning and unlearning are involved in the unfolding composition of students as persons, can be presumed to vary with the differing kind of educational experience that students have. Thus, for good pedagogy a clear understanding of the natures and conditions of student experiences would be fundamental to encourage intertextual learning through inquiry.

Inquiry Learning

An inquiry model of literacy assumes that knowledge is constructed through meaningful activity, which may include, but is not limited to, conventional literacy activities. In the inquiry model, textuality plays a less significant role than in other models.
Instead, the learner starts with knowledge or questions and branches out, for example, through observation, dialogue, reflection, mathematical construction, musical notation, video making and reading to construct new knowledge and new questions. This growing network of knowledge develops in ways that no one teacher or student can easily predict in advance.

Short, Harste and Burke (1996) have introduced the term “authoring cycle” as a curricular frame to an approach to curriculum as inquiry. There is an underlying process of inquiry in the authoring cycle, which starts from:

(a) building from the known, (b) taking the time to find questions for inquiry, (c) gaining new perspectives, (d) attending to difference, (e) sharing what is learned, (f) planning new inquiries, and (g) taking thoughtful new action (p. 52).

This process is shaped by Dewey’s ideas of the organic connection between education and personal experience.

Inquiry is more than problem solving. Problem solving suggests a right answer. Inquiry suggests alternative answers as we uncover the complexity of issues. Problems are not something to be avoided, but opportunities to inquire. The very act of teaching itself becomes a process of inquiry. Short, Harste & Burke (1996) argue that if the authoring cycle is to serve as framework for curriculum it must be anchored in the underlying process of inquiry. They identify three sources of knowledge that inquirers draw from: personal and social knowing through our life experiences, knowledge systems as structures of knowledge (history, biology); and alternative perspectives on word and sign systems (music, art) as alternative ways of making and creating meaning about the world. Knowledge systems and sign systems are not reduced to subject areas with a focus on
mastering specific facts and skills. Instead they are seen as perspectives, ways of thinking and stances one can take in the world.

The heart of inquiry is personal and social knowing. Learners bring the knowledge they have gained from their personal experiences of living in the world and being part of specific cultural groups and social contexts. Inquiry can only begin with what learners already know, perceive and feel.

Progress in inquiry is having new understandings and new questions to ask. The term "understands" highlights the fleeting nature of what we learn. We don't inquire to eliminate alternatives but to find more functional understandings—to create diversity, broaden our thinking and ask more complex questions (Short, & Burke, 1991). Children have to be part of creating the questions. Dewey (1938) states that teachers have a responsibility to establish classroom learning environments and selected experiences that have the most potential for raising anomalies and questions for specific groups of students. Teachers cannot, however, determine exactly what those anomalies will be; or else they become the problem posers. Problem-posing and inquiry questions should be determined by students. The authoring cycle is set in motion when students engage in individual projects that grow out of personal focus rather than a class focus.

Learners will not pursue the questions that really matter in their lives unless they are in an environment where their ideas and lives are valued, in short, a democracy. This view encompasses a new vision of literacy, schooling, curriculum, and teacher development. Curriculum as inquiry involves a community of learners in the process of collaboratively constructing knowledge as they continually seek understandings of personal and social significance from new perspectives for the purpose of creating a more
thoughtful world. Closely related to Short, Harste’s & Burke’s idea of the authoring cycle is Group Investigation as developed by Sharan and Sharan, 1992. This method is based on classroom instruction in which students work collaboratively in small groups to examine, experience, and understand their topic of study. Group Investigation (Sharan and Sharan, 1992) is designed to appeal to all facets of the student’s abilities and experience relevant to the process of learning, not just to the cognitive or social domains. It provides educators with an approach to the conduct of teaching and learning in schools that differs significantly from traditional instruction. To comprehend fully the goals and meaning of the Group Investigation method, it is important to examine the intellectual, pedagogical and psychological foundation upon which this method is based (p.1).

Group Investigation seeks to translate into classroom practices some of the main education goals and principles formulated by John Dewey. In the past few decades, many educators and psychologists have added their insights and contributions, to enlarge upon Dewey’s basic perspective. They provide us with a rich array of possible procedures for implementing Dewey’s ideas in today’s classrooms.

By following in Dewey’s footsteps, we can identify four essential components of school learning that typify this approach. These four components serve as criteria for knowing when we are implementing the Group Investigation method in keeping with its basic principles and goals, and, when we have merely made some surface changes in the conduct of classroom teaching and learning. Sharan and Sharan (1992) describe investigation, interaction, interpretation, and intrinsic motivation as primary indicators of the Group Investigation method, and say they are interrelated and occur simultaneously.
Each component refers to a different dimension or level of implementation of the Group Investigation method.

Investigation refers to the organization and procedures for directing the conduct of classroom learning as a process of inquiry. Interaction identifies the interpersonal, or social dimension of the learning process as it unfolds in the communication among members of small groups in the classroom. Interpretation occurs at both the interpersonal and the individual cognitive level. Intrinsic motivation refers to the nature of the students' emotional involvement in the topic they are studying, and to their pursuit of the knowledge they seek to acquire. The goal is to have students become personally interested in seeking information that they need in order to understand the topic under study. The simultaneous combination of all four components is a fundamental feature of the Group Investigation method (Sharan & Sharan, 1992, p.5)

A report prepared by Bertram and Davidson (1994) explores three models for the relation of literacy to larger curricula concerns: a Skills Model, an Instrumental Model, and an Inquiry Model. Their report suggests that after two decades of intense research on reading, a number of teachers and researchers are beginning to question the narrow focus on reading, which distorts the view of learning, and to ask whether a curriculum centred on reading restricts classroom activities. Because of these concerns, many educators have turned to literacy-across-the-curriculum approaches. The report explores in some depth the Inquiry Model's conception of the role of reading and writing within learning.

Bertram discovered that at the heart of the inquiry model lies a meaningful question. As the learner investigates an issue, she or he is simultaneously engaged in the discovery of information related to the particular topic area suggested by the question, and
equally important, engaged in the examination of various modes and form of discourse. The learner gets to formulate broad questions out of his or her own experience and reflect on the social implications of the new knowledge. Although similar in appearance to the Instrumental Model of literacy, the Inquiry Model is significantly different in that its starting point is an inquiry, not a text. The Inquiry Model, as a consequence, adopts a broader and more encompassing definition of experience than that found in the Instrumental Model, which focuses on narrower conceptualization of prior knowledge. It also places far more emphasis on consideration of the social implications of learning, where those working from integrative models might see such concerns as potential extensions of text-based experiences, rather than as vital elements of inquiry.

In teaching students how to ask questions and make inquirers that matter, we are often asking to them to think aloud, individually and collaboratively. The intervention of the teacher may be needed in order for this skill to become meaningful, and generate intertextual connections (See Mercer, 1996).

Questioning

Sharan and Sharan (1992) conducted a special study of how frequently students ask questions during classroom lessons. The study revealed that all students in a given classroom ask approximately two question per lesson, compared to between 40 or more questions asked by the teacher during the same period (p.11). Traditional instruction in schools is directed by what the teacher wants the students to know, and what the teacher has planned to present. It is not typically directed by what the students may or may not
know, understand, or wish to learn about a given topic. Since the flow of information, and even of questions, is primarily from the teacher to the students, the purpose of these questions is obviously not to seek a solution to a problem. Teachers ask questions of students, not to obtain an answer that is unknown, but to determine whether the students know the answer the teacher considers being the correct one.

The same finding about whom asks questions in typical classrooms was reported in the massive study by Goodlad. He writes that:

Students rarely turn things round by asking questions. Nor do teachers often give students a chance to romp with an open-ended question. The intellectual terrain is laid out by the teacher. The paths for walking through it are largely predetermined by the teacher (Goodlad, 1984, p. 109).

The Group Investigation Model, as proposed by Sharan and Sharan (1992), seeks to change this typical pattern of classroom principles and procedures and to redefine the teachers’ and students’ roles. Since teachers have more mature knowledge than their students, they should be answering questions, not asking most of them. Since the students are the people in the classroom who are there to study and learn, they should be asking the questions. Moreover, the people doing the studying should define the problem they are studying and determine the problems of knowledge that must be solved in order to study that topic in a way that makes sense.

In a review of intervention studies by Rosenshine and Meister (1996), students were taught to generate questions as a means of improving their comprehension. Overall, teaching students the cognitive strategy of generating questions about the material they had read resulted in gains in comprehension, as measured by tests given at the end of the intervention (Quantitative Research). The traditional skill-based instructional approach and
the reciprocal teaching approach yielded similar results. Question generation is important in fostering comprehension (Palinscar & Brown, 1984) and as a self-regulatory cognitive strategy. The act of composing questions focusses the student’s attention on content. Scardamalia and Bereiter (1985) and Garcia and Pearson (1990) suggest that question generation is one component of teaching students to carry out higher-level cognitive functions for themselves.

The first purpose of Rosenshine and Meister’s (1996) review was to attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of this cognitive strategy. Their second purpose was to use this research to help them learn how to teach cognitive strategies. Through this study, they hoped to identify and discuss instructional concepts that might be added to our vocabulary of instruction; concepts that might be useful for the teaching of other cognitive strategies.

Based on the results of their study, Rosenshine and Meister recommend that the skill of question generation be taught in the classroom. However, they recommend, at present, that only two procedural prompts be used; (a) signal words and (b) generic questions or question stems. The data also suggest that students at all skill levels would benefits from being taught these strategies.

Although procedural prompts have been useful in reading and other content areas, one must be aware that even well designed procedural prompts cannot replace the need for background knowledge on the topic being studied. Procedural prompts are most useful when the student has sufficient background knowledge to understand the concepts in the material. Procedural prompts and the use of scaffolds cannot overcome the limitations imposed by a student’s insufficient background knowledge.
Simpson (1996) discusses the importance of teachers developing questions based on understandings they wish to foster in their students. She thinks it is important for students, in turn, to develop their own questions based on a text they are reading. Simpson outlines the steps she took and presents some of the difficulties she encountered in her work with a colleague and her year 6/7 class in South Australia. She recalls that, at first, “in retrospect...the children’s written responses...were very short, monosyllabic where possible, and disappointing insofar as they did not appear to reflect any kind of consideration of the issues we were attempting to raise” (1996, p. 122). In the second stage of their work, in which the students were asked to construct their own questions, Simpson writes:

There were not many questions...that we could easily identify as being critical... that is, standing back from the story as it was presented to question how and why it had been constructed the way it was. We were somewhat puzzled and disappointed by this, but our initial concerns evaporated when the children came together to talk about their questions. What soon became apparent was that the kind of question did not matter. The children’s understandings were developed through the response, not the questions. Nearly every child’s questions provoked interested response from the other children and stimulated discussion that reflected the kinds of insights we were trying to encourage (p. 123).

When teaching children how to ask questions we are asking them to watch and listen, join in and appropriate what they observe, and to make meaningful connections in their minds, appropriating new material and making it a part of themselves.

In the following discussion on findings the word fun came up as one of the key memories that the students would take away with them. This led the researcher to investigate the concept of play and fun and found that it connected with the emerging
theory of jouissance, pleasure and experience that could be found in explicit intertextual learning.

Is having fun a positive educational outcome? What is fun? Can fun be connected to inquiry learning and/or to the production of explicit intertextual learning? We are aware that fun and the concept of fun is elusive.

Christina Bisson and John Luckner (1997) argue that from a universal point of view, fun is relative, situational, voluntary and natural. These universal characteristics appear simplistic at first, but when their pedagogical implications are considered it becomes clear that they are at the heart of the puzzle that is called fun. The problem Bisson and Luckner raise resides at a curriculum level. On one hand, they argue that fun is natural and contributes to the learning process. On the other hand, they admit that because of the variability, fun is difficult to predict and reproduce. Therefore, using fun in education becomes an uncertain science, where the end results of our actions cannot be easily anticipated. So why would we want our students to have fun? Solely because it is in their nature, or are there other reasons to use fun in our teaching?

What are the pedagogical benefits of fun? According to Bisson and Luckner intrinsic motivation is the most obvious pedagogical benefit associated with having fun. Carver contends that fun can have a positive effect on the learning process. By inviting intrinsic motivation, suspending one's social reality, reducing stress, and creating a state of relaxed alertness, fun can be seen as a powerful tool to enhance a motivating and safe learning environment. Roland Barthes, on the other hand, depicted fun as two separate notions.
In *The Pleasure of the Text* (1975) Roland Barthes presents his two-fold notion of pleasure as plaisir and jouissance. Plaisir depicts purposeful enjoyment and is capable of being expressed in language. It is more conventional and traditional than jouissance. Where plaisir is as specific pleasure, jouissance is more diverse; it is joy, ecstasy, unexpected. Jouissance is a profound, heightened form of pleasure involving a temporary loss of self. Fiske (1989) sees the roots of plaisir in the dominant ideology. “Where jouissance produces the pleasure of evading the social order, plaisir produces the pleasure of relating to it” (p. 54).

In school, fun is much like that described as plaisir; conservative, connected to curricular purposes, and usually organized and regulated by adults. The intent is either to provide a momentary release of tension or to induce the students to engage in the activities on the academic agenda. Pleasure, like jouissance, is produced by and for the children, in their own way and on their own terms. It exhausts itself in the present; the human interplay is all that matters. Where plaisir is an every day pleasure, jouissance is that of special moments (Grace & Tobin, 1998, p.54).

The hope is for the students to experience either one or the other. Jouissance obviously cannot occur everyday, in everyday situations, but attempts should be made so that special feeling of 'aha' can be experienced by the students at least intermittently in their school life.

In light of the research discussed concerning text intertextuality, experience, inquiry learning, genre and dialogic theories, it seems likely that qualitative research may add additional insight to support explicit intertextual learning. An analysis of intertextual connections made by students in response to various texts, through the techniques of participant observation, interviews, and discourse analysis seems to be in order.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The Common Curriculum (1994) stated that the development of literacy is a central aim in education. It claimed that to function effectively in today’s and tomorrow’s society, students must be literate not only in the traditional sense, but also in the wider sense that includes literacy in the various technological media used for communicating. The authors believed that since these forms of communication are increasingly used to find, organize, and communicate information, the traditional language skills — reading, writing, speaking, and listening — must be expanded to include print materials such as graphics and pictures as well as the non-print multi-media “texts” of television and film (Ontario Ministry of Education, p.37). Therefore, references to “text” in the outcomes listed for language included both print and non-print materials. Similarly, references to reading, writing, speaking, and listening included skills that are not usually associated with these activities: for example, reading included viewing; writing included various forms of representing; speaking included dramatizing; and listening included responding.

The 1994 Common Curriculum recognized that reading, writing, viewing, and presenting were interconnected and that the student’s progress in one area influences and is influenced by, development in the other areas. It also recognized that language, culture, and identity are closely linked and that students need opportunities to think critically about the social values and statuses assigned to different languages by various groups in our society, and to explore issues of bias and stereotyping related to language and culture.
The new provincial Language Curriculum (1997) takes a different approach to the learning of language. Its main emphasis is on achievement and expectations. A word search was done on the document and not once did the word literacy appear. Language is again relegated to skill development and the narrow and segregated understanding of language and literacy. The achievement levels for language focus on four categories of skills: reasoning skills, communication, organization skills, and skills related to the application of language conventions—spelling, grammar, punctuation, and style (Ontario Ministry of Education, p.5).

The present study supports the philosophy of the authors of the 1994 Curriculum. The data findings from this study are important and can be used to persuade educators that language learning is more than the acquisition of measurable skills. And, as quoted earlier from Michael’s (1987), we “need observation and analysis shedding light both on the writing that gets done in a classroom and on the broader institutional goals and constraints which influence teachers’ and students’ behaviour” (p.322).

This study involved a planned comparison of the intertextual connections made by twelve grade eight students in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and viewing situations. Personal inventories, journal-written responses, field observations, videotaped discussions, and open-ended interviews with the participants were all used to discover the views, responses and reactions of a grade eight class and their teacher regarding intertextual learning.
Research Participants and Research Setting

All research was conducted in an elementary school within a large board in Metropolitan Toronto. The school is located in the City of Toronto, in a middle-class neighbourhood that is culturally diverse. The school houses nearly four hundred elementary students from junior kindergarten to grade eight. There is also an early French Immersion department, which involves about 100 children. It is an old school, with an addition built on.

The grade eight classes were involved in an intensive rotary system and they interacted with four different teachers in one day. They were exposed to a variety of teaching styles and expectations.

Participant observations were made in the school library, which was the teaching room of the researcher. In the group were four girls and eight boys. The ages ranged from 13 to 14 years. The group reflected a heterogeneous range of abilities and cultural backgrounds. The study took place in the school library — a renovated space from two former classrooms. The researcher (teacher-librarian) attempted to make the space workable, inviting and attractive. The bulletin boards were filled with children's artwork that stemmed from a variety of activities in the library. The north wall was framed by windows and the south and east walls with bulletin boards and shelves arranged with student-made artifacts, and with books that reflected the research done by students in the school. The study group met at the southwest wall to carry out their work. They were seated around two adjoining tables while working in the study. At times they had access to the whole library and were able to work in pairs or groups, according to their needs and depending on the activity assigned. The library had six rectangular library tables and in the
east end of the library (the primary section) there was a rocking chair, along with some soft cushions, a round table and a primary bench and table. Often a group or pair would work in this less restrictive area.

**Gaining Access to the Field**

Permission to conduct the study was first obtained from the Director of Education of the large board in Metropolitan Toronto. Following this, initial school contacts were made with the principal of the school in which the study took place. The principal and the classroom teacher were contacted and provided with an outline of the proposed research and asked to participate in the study. All participants and their guardians were asked to sign an informed consent form, indicating that they were fully aware of the nature and extent of the participation in the study. All participants were assured of anonymity and confidentiality, in that what was written in the responses and said in the interviews would be used only for the purposes of the study (see Appendix A).

Interviews were conducted at times convenient for the participants. Students interviews were held during the regular language arts period in a seminar room where there was little chance of interruption. The scheduled period for language arts was one hour and a half, and that was also the length given for the interview with the students, although some were shorter than the given time. The one interview with the homeroom teacher took place after school hours, in the library, and was one hour in length.
Data Gathering Procedures

The focus of data collection and analysis was the writing generated by students in their journals, the interviews, the videotaped sessions of the discussions of the concepts of the novel and the students' own videotaping and final product. The participants were observed during the viewing, the drama session, discussion periods, and writing periods, and were interviewed in terms of their reaction to the study and the type of learning that occurred. The novel used as the springboard for the study was *The Giver* (1994). This powerful novel, winner of the 1994 Newbery medal, was chosen as likely to stimulate discussion about the concepts of utopia, repression, conformity, and the value of memories. The open-ended conclusion would lead to debate the main character, Jonas's ultimate fate. A synopsis of the story and film can be found in Appendix C.

Setting the Stage

Before the study began, the students were informed in very general terms about the study and told that their work would help the researcher to complete her thesis. The students met for one session prior to the study to introduce them to the nature of the study and to accustom them to the video and audio equipment that was used throughout the study. The Personal Inventories (see Appendix B) were handed out and were expected to be handed in the next time we met.

All the work for this study was to be completed in four weeks (or twenty sessions). The students met for 90-minute sessions during the four-week period in a private area of the library media centre. The study started May 17 and ended June 17.
In the first week, the novel was given to the students and the first 7 chapters (58 pages) assigned to be read at home.

The basic procedure while reading the novel was the same for each session. There would be a discussion of the chapters’ read (led by researcher), and then the students would respond to some questions posed by the researcher about the chapters. The discussions were videotaped and so was some of the writing in the journals. The researcher at this time made her field notes of the session and observed the writing of the journals. The procedures changed during the drama session, the film viewing, and videotaping sessions.

The drama session, with Professor David Booth, was on May 28. Most students had by then completed the reading of the book. Professor Booth was introduced to the students and led the class in the drama. The researcher observed.

The film *The Quest* was seen on June 3. The film was introduced without a synopsis or any reason given for viewing it. This is perhaps not typical, as usually a teacher would explain the reason for viewing the film. However, in this case I did not wish to contaminate findings with any ideas, suggestions, or biases of my own. There was no oral discussion after the film, again which may be unusual. The purpose of limiting the discussion was to elicit personal written responses. If an oral discussion was permitted or encouraged there would be a chance that the written responses might be influenced (Probst, 1988).

The scripts for the videotaping were chosen and written on June 4, and videotaping began June 6. On June 10, the idea of the final product was discussed, and participants began planning their final reflection of the study.
There was no dominant focus of data collection and analysis. Every attempt was made to integrate data received from written journals and personal inventories, dialogue with students, interviews with students, personal observations, analysis of the video tapes for body language and gestures, and the artwork often included in the students' work. The participants were observed during reading, viewing, dramatizing, writing, and speaking, and were interviewed in terms of their reactions to the multiple ways of learning that took place in the study.

To obtain additional data, the researcher videotaped each session using one stationary camera. The videotapes were coded to record the body language and gestures of the participants in relation to what they said or what was being said to them. The two complementary sources of information — the field notes and the videotaped transcriptions — were compared. Where differences occurred, the researcher referred to the videotapes and the annotated fieldnotes. Most of the differences between the records occurred when a student moved out of range of the camera. For those occasions the annotations in the fieldnotes made it clear what the student was doing. The students' interviews were transcribed and used to supplement the record of intertextual behaviours. At times, behaviours recorded in fieldnotes and observed on videotape were clarified by explanation during the interview. From the three sources, some behaviours for each student were tabulated. In this study, transcription involved making decisions about whether talk or participation structures (Erickson, 1982) would be represented; how perimeters between events and components within events would be name and depicted; what level of detail would be needed to represent sub-events; how the event would be represented in the flow of life in the classroom; and how verbal and nonverbal aspects of communication would be
represented. In other words, transcription was a process theoretically driven by both sociolinguistic and cognitive anthropological concepts.

For the purpose of this analysis, transcription involved a series of steps. The first step involved composing a blueprint of the overall organization of the one hour and a half, and identifying the parts of events across that time. The second step involved recording all talk and/or actions as they occurred within the fragment of classroom life selected for analysis. Step three involved exploration of the transcribed event to identify action and interaction patterns among participants.

Cycles of Activity

An exploration of how time was spent within and across days led to the identification of the notion of a “cycle of activity” (cf. Short and Harste 1996, authoring cycle). Green and Meyer (1988) conducted a study of a special summer school English class and discovered that “the term ‘event’ as well as the notion of ‘lesson’ was both problematic. When did an event begin and end? What was a lesson? How did the members of this group refer to what they were doing? The term cycle of activity was selected to capture the over time nature of classroom events” (p.150).

Their students did not refer to the events of classroom life in broad terms but rather often indicated the event by name as did the participants in this study. The twelve students from this study referred to the events as (e.g. journal writing, the drama lesson, video, film). Thus, there was no common classroom term to identify the boundary of events. Green and Meyer (1988) selected cycle of activity to describe the order of their
study since it indicated a complete series of actions about a single concept. To be part of a cycle of activity, Green and Meyer say:

events must be "tied" together by a common task or serve a common purpose. The "tied" nature of classroom events (sub-events) and the identification of cycles of activity led to a discovery that such cycles were part of larger cycles. Any activities that reflected themselves (the students) could only be understood when the entire cycle of activity was considered (p. 150).

The "tied" nature of the different cycles of activity described by Green and Meyer led this researcher, as it did for them, to the choosing of the notion of intertextuality to explain what was involved in "reading" in this grade eight class. One way to think about the relationship of this cycle to other cycles is to see each cycle as a social and academic text that participants must read, interpret, and contribute to, as the sub-events within a cycle are being reconstructed (Weade & Green, 1989). The text involves verbal, visual, and written aspects of communication and context. The participants construct it as they interact with each other.

Table 1

Chronology of Text Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK</th>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Print – Reading</td>
<td>The Giver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Drama – speaking and listening</td>
<td>Professor D. Booth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Film-viewing</td>
<td>The Quest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Video taping – representing</td>
<td>Self production</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations

The observations recorded were of a general nature. The notes were descriptive and reflective in nature. The descriptive aspect of the fieldnotes included a description of the participants' body language, concentration, interactions, the time that written responses took, and the physical setting at the time. Specifically, observations were made of students' stance relative to the viewing, reading, speaking, writing and creating.

The reflective part of the fieldnotes provided an opportunity for the observer to consider her own opinions and beliefs, and to reflect on the process of analysis while considering the method employed. Connecting data and speculating on emergent themes and patterns was important for future data analysis. Considering the methods involved helped to clarify and deal with methodological problems and deciding how to handle them (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). The reflective components of fieldnotes were designated as observer's comments and noted on the notes as “OC”. By the use of fieldnotes, the meaning and content of the observations could be captured more completely (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). What was observed is presented in as much descriptive detail as possible, rather than summarized or evaluated.

The researcher built a model of reading that demonstrated how a person could learn about self from learning about others through text and through discussing texts with others. Finally, the students were shown that in relation to their lives, the interpretation of text in this class was both personal and social as was the construction of personal text. For these participants, literacy involved the construction of an intertextual web within and
across the oral, written, and published texts, and the film and drama that were constructed and reconstructed in this study.

Data Analysis Procedures

The data collected included: (a) students’ personal inventories; (b) observational notes made during the “reading,” involvement with the “texts,” and the production of the responses; (c) the written responses in students’ journals to the activities as each text was presented to them; (d) the comments and gestures made during the videotaped sessions, (e) their stance to writing; (f) their stance to performance of videotaped sessions that the students produced; (g) the comments made during the interviews; and (h) their final “new” text.

Analysis in the Field

As previously noted, some data analysis was conducted during data collection. Specifically, the speculation and formation of ideas began during the observation of written and videotaped sessions and interview responses, and was indicated by marginal comments made on fieldnotes. In addition, the written responses and observation notes formed the basis for the generation of the initial set of questions that guided the interviews.
Personal Inventories

Personal inventories were read and categorized. Initial orientating frames to this data included:

(a) types of questions asked by students
(b) reading and viewing preferences of students
(c) time spent reading and viewing
(d) use of leisure time

Journal Responses

Student's journal responses were read and categorized based on:

(a) the types of questions asked
(b) length of responses
(c) evidence of intertextuality in responses
(d) evidence of metacognition in responses
(e) comparison of initial and concluding remarks

Analysis of Videotaped Discussions

The videotapes were analyzed for verbal interaction, as well as gesture and body language, based on:

(a) evidence of intertextual references in discussions
(b) who controlled the discussion
(c) kinds of inquiries posed by students
Analysis of Two-Minute Videotape Extracts by Students

The videotapes produced by the students were analyzed for evidence of intertextual learning as evidenced by:

(a) choice of selection  
(b) script  
(c) written and verbal response to experience.

Drama Sessions

The drama session with Professor David Booth was analyzed for verbal, body, and other intertextual symbols based on the student’s:

(a) problem-solving techniques  
(b) types of questions asked  
(c) responses, written and oral, to the experience.

Final Text

The student’s final product was analyzed for evidence of intertextual learning based on the student’s:

(a) choice of product  
(b) evidence of intertextual connections  
(c) verbal responses to the product.

Analysis After Data Collection

Data analysis involves the process of systematically sifting through, and analysis of, written samples, field observations, artwork and interview transcripts. With these forms
researchers search for regularities, patterns and topics in order to generate ideas to explain their interrelationships (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982).

In the constant comparative method, a design for multi-data sources, analysis begins early in the study and is nearly complete by the end of data collection. Throughout the course of this analysis an attempt was made to have the findings grounded by the theoretical views (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982) discussed in Chapter One and Chapter Two.

Topics and patterns were sorted and identified by specific words and phrases selected by the researcher as a means to categorize descriptive data so material that related to a specific topic could be separated from other data. These words and phrases became coding categories that represented units or pieces of data collected around the specific topic or issue. All data were indexed, using as many coding categories as possible, with information concerning how, from whom, when, and where the data were obtained.

Considering these points during data analysis ensured that the contexts within which the data were produced were available to help in understanding their significance within the setting in which they had occurred.

As a result of this sifting and re-sifting of data a series of questions resulted. These questions served as a framework for discussion of the research findings.

1. Did the written and verbal responses show that exploration and discovery took place while viewing and reading, speaking and listening?
2. Were intertextual connections being made? If so, in what mode was it happening most frequently?
3. What was the nature of the learning? Was it personal, comparative, or universal in nature?
4. Did the written response to one text show more complex writing and a higher level of learning?
5. Was preference of one medium important in the learning outcome?
Upon completion of data analysis all categories were examined to determine their interrelationship as they related to the focus of the research.

The cycle of activity described previously, along with the connected cycles including the larger cycle of activity that led to the creation of a final product by the students in this study, make up what Bloome et al have called intertextuality. The researcher consciously linked various smaller cycles to a larger cycle to aid the construction.

The texts created by this cycle were then linked to the published text being read in the class: *The Giver* (Lowry, 1994). The final product and the student’s videotapes were part of an intertextual web that involved life-to-text and text-to-life interpretation by the participants. The life-to-texts and texts-to-life-relationships were only one type of deliberately constructed relationship among texts that were available to participants. The researcher also constructed cycles of activity that focussed on interpreting drama, film, and videotaping. The texts with which researcher and students interacted, and the cycle of activity related to each are described in Table 1.

As indicated in Table 1, the participants read, wrote, spoke and listened in interaction with four different kinds of text. Each of these cycles of activities involved engaging with the text, as well as a series of sub-events related to interpretation of text. The structural pattern provided a means of recording the events of the study so that the conditions for participation and interpretation could be examined. An exploration of the intertextual references across cycles of activity showed that the researcher deliberately made text-to-text, text-to-life and life-to-text connections for herself and with the students. In addition, the researcher and students were developing a larger concept: “the
power of memories". The researcher built a model of reading that demonstrated how a person could learn about self from learning about others through multi-texts, and through discussing these texts with others. Finally, the students were shown that their lives can aid in interpretation of text, and that both personal and social meanings were important to the construction of personal text. For these participants, literacy involved the construction of an intertextual web within and across the oral, written published texts, film and drama (multi-modal texts) that were constructed and reconstructed in this study.

The Mechanics

Computer Assisted Program–Nudist

Using the computer program, Nudist, assisted the researcher in her coding. Using the computer forced the researcher to make coding explicit, and therefore led to formally comparable results and the accumulation of research findings. There is also, as Weber (1984) notes, “perfect code reliability in the application of rules for content coding” (p.128). Conrad and Reinhart (1984) also note the rigour interjected into an analysis based on computer-coded data, which makes all examples available to the researcher. This aspect of computer application may enhance the reliability of findings since all coded material is presented to the researcher simultaneously for analysis. In addition “it should be possible to easily locate deviant cases, which are often critical in an analysis” (p. 9).

One concern when using computers with qualitative data is the effect such technology might have on the process of analysis. Lyman (1984) points out that the writing and reading of fieldnotes is an intimate process that is often self-revelatory.
Introducing a computer into the process interjects a different medium and causes a
different relationship with one's data. This new relationship is more mechanical and
impersonal, perhaps blocking insight that might otherwise emerge. Some of the richness of
qualitative data may also be lost if one begins substituting technical language and
quantification for description and metaphor. Friedheim (1984, p. 95) also notes, the
"potentially serious cost of electrofiling" if the file management's system determines the
choice of topic or type of analysis. Finally, by having to determine a data filing system
early on, category construction and/or theory building may be brought to closure
prematurely.

Nudist is particularly well suited to grounded theory. It differs from many of the
code-and-retrieve packages in that it is able to assist in grounded theory building within
the complex layers of intertextual learning. It helps the grounded theory method user to
manage, explore and search the research texts, whether they be transcriptions, documents,
or audio-visual recordings: The Nudist program can do the following:

(a) Manage and explore ideas about the data
(b) Link ideas and construct theories about the data
(c) Generate reports (Richards and Richards, 1994)

The benefits of such computer-aided grounded theory research are many. First, the
emerging categories can be explored and cumulatively built up without losing any of these
links to the data. Second, memos about theory can be stored and linked to the data. Third,
the index can be flexible and have the ability to change rapidly to adapt to emerging
categories. Finally, the system supports the inclusion of all data in an infinitely flexible
system (Richards and Richards 1991, p. 274). The interpreting and thinking is still done by
the researcher. The computer software is not capable of making conceptual decisions. The
really hard work of deciding what is important data within the event is still firmly part of the critical research process.

Interviews

The interview method is acknowledged as lending itself to participant identification of important issues surrounding the topic or situation (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). The goal of interviewing is to allow the participants the opportunity to talk about things of interest to them and to discuss matters of importance to the researcher using their own concepts and terms. Learning the participants’ perspectives helps illustrate and explain the inner dynamics or processes occurring within situations and events (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). Therefore, the goal of the interviews was to have participants provide critical descriptions of what was naturally and characteristically occurring, from their points of view.

Questions were open-ended, allowing participants the opportunity to select and explore a range of responses, and the researcher to build on and extend those responses. In particular, the questions asked were designed to get participants to freely express their thoughts around particular topics, thoughts that developed from their perceptions of approaches to reading, film viewing, writing, dramatizing, and video-taping, and from the learning that took place while they were involved in these processes. These themes were selected for investigation because they related to the fundamental issues surrounding intertextual learning and the belief that classes are based on print; and the need to explore aspects of a multi-literacy classroom and activities.
Interviews with the students were conducted in three different formats. Ten were individual interviews, one was with a pair of students, and one interview was with four participants (these four had also individual interviews). These were done in order to see if there were any differences in the responses and in the type of interaction and intertextual scaffolding that might occur in a group, individual, or duo interview. There are limitations to a group interview, one being that a dominant member could take over the discussion. The researcher was aware of the possibility and tried to prevent it from happening by encouraging other members to speak. The approach to the interview was focussed but open-ended. As the researcher had worked with all of the participants, the atmosphere was comfortable and relaxed. The interviews took anywhere from 20 minutes to one hour.

An interview also focussed but open-ended, was held with the classroom teacher at his convenience. This interview dealt with his perceptions of learning through print, film, and writing, and how he saw integrated learning. The researcher was interested in seeing if there was any similarity between the responses of the students and the teacher’s.

Each interview was audiotaped with the permission of the participants. All participants agreed to the audiotaping of interviews. Although a tape recorder is not part of the natural setting and may affect the researcher-subject relationship, it was used to capture the participant’s perceptions as accurately as possible. The intent of the interview was to inform participants that everything offers a potential clue to unlocking a more comprehensive understanding of what is being studied (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). The tapes were reviewed and transcripts were made of each tape for use in data analysis.

The initial frame for interviews was based on an analysis of information collected from the students’ written samples and personal inventories, and of the observations noted
during the process of reading the "texts" and the response to them. After completion of this analysis questions were formulated for the initial interview. The initial interview frame is contained in Appendix D.

Video Taped Transcriptions

In videotaped transcriptions one basically asks, as Wells (1992) did: "So what's happening?" Since video transcript analysis is such a complex task, it must be emphasized that there can be no single, definitive answer. Nor is this simply a problem with the accuracy of the transcription. As Wells noted "the problem is one which is inherent in the nature of linguistic communication itself, of which the incompleteness and possible inaccuracy of any transcription is an inevitable outcome" (p. 40). The recorded text is subject to different interpretations by each person who engages with it, whether through video recording or through transcription. The comments offered here must therefore be taken as only one possibility, and as showing bias since they are one person's interpretation of the text.

Limitations to the Study

There are some limitations to this study. It was conducted with only one group of students who, while culturally mixed, were from an urban setting. A rural setting or inner city setting might provide different results. There was no gender balance in the group. Having four girls and eight boys respond to the texts may have yielded results quite
different from situations in which the gender ratio was reversed, or in which there was a more even balance of genders.

No matter how much we may generalize quantitatively about groups, reading, writing and televiewing are always carried out by individuals. This study was done in a particular educational, social, and cultural environment, but also as part of the ongoing lives of twelve individuals. Reading, writing and film viewing transactions are simultaneously individual and social activities. Another limitation was the time of the study. The end of a school year for grade eight students may not be the optimum time to ask for such responses. The students are eager to leave the juvenile setting of an elementary school, and are anticipating graduation.

One of the responses to the texts and the activities was in written form in a journal. While some students may be used to writing down their responses to print, the results of their writing in response to other kinds of texts may be affected by their lack of experience with this type of activity. However, it must also be noted that participants were asked for personal written responses, as opposed to being asked to answer basic comprehension questions about what they had seen or read.

The data were collected over four weeks. A longer time frame, especially the amount of time given to read the novel, might have yielded different results, and results might also be different if the study had been carried out in a more "natural" classroom setting.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS

The purpose of the study was to examine the evidence of explicit intertextual connections a group of grade eight students made while reading texts. Responses were examined by contrasting the nature of student's spoken, written, and visual texts. In the reporting of the data that follows, a number of conventions were adopted. These included:

a) For ease of understanding of the written response, the researcher, at times, corrected the spelling and grammar of the respondents. Care was taken not to alter the student's intent or style.

b) Written responses are represented by a student number (e.g., #3).

c) Interview and discussion data was presented with an initial and student number (e.g., (E5)).

d) “O” indicates researcher observer and “T” indicates teacher.

e) Within each category, the data are presented in temporal-sequential order and subsequently discussed in an integrated fashion.

Since observation occurred during all the events, they are presented in each section in an integrated manner. The principal categories and their properties are presented in Table 2.

Text and Intertextuality

A classroom whose members are concerned with textuality and intertextuality focusses on the way in which texts are constructed and readings are produced. In such a classroom the making of a text becomes important to the making of a written text, a spoken text, or a visual text. Text construction becomes the classroom focus and the myths of authorship and creative inspiration are more critically considered. (For authorship theory see Short and Harste, 1996, R. Barthes, 1975, and M. Foucault, 1972).

In keeping with the exploratory nature of this current research study, outcomes will be addressed by using a number of observations that emerged in the course of
reviewing interview transcripts, students’ writing after they had read the text, and film
viewing and transcripts of all the group interactions. The following questions guided the
observations:

1) What opportunities exist for students to learn about reading, writing and
themselves in the course of reading and responding to a series of events related
to themes in *The Giver*?
2) How do students, if they do, make cumulative reference across texts?
3) Given different opportunities to generate responses to literature, what do these
students reveal about themselves, their response to literature and their literacy
skills?

Guided by these questions a number of observations were made. Given the nature
of this work, observations using the group as the unit of analysis will be reported first,
followed by the cases of individual students, and comments made by the classroom
teacher.

Table 2

**Categories Emerging From Journals, Interviews, Group Discussions and Student
Inventory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>ASPECTS CONSIDERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday Life</td>
<td>a Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c Ritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d Abduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memories and</td>
<td>e Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>f Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g Ritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h Abduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society and</td>
<td>i Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>j Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k Ritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l Abduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertextual</td>
<td>m Kind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personal Response – Voice of the Adolescent

Smells Like a Head Book

Load Up on Books
And Bore Your Friends
It's Fun to Read
And to Pretend
She's really bored
And so am I
One More Chapter

Please No
Please No
Please No
Hello (repeat)

With the lights out
It's much harder
I'm so tired now
I'm still reading

Got To Finish
While I'm eatin
By this morning
Got no feelings

Eight Days
He's gotta mission
Near Possible

Gotta Finish
Fore it's too late
I understand now
Friends help me

We did acting
For Fun
With Mr. Booth
Not his son
He the Chosen
Only One
Now I gotta
Run

My Book
A movie
My play
In the library

Fun

Fun

FUN

Fun

Fun

Man lives

FUN
These lyrics, written by a grade eight student (#10) who participated in the study, capture the group’s contradictory feelings. Initially, group members were astounded that I would ask them to read a 150-page book in four nights. I had calculated that the students could read approximately 35 pages a night. Surely by the time they were in grade eight they could read this amount on a daily basis. In his journal, (#10) commented that “The classes were fun except when we had to read the book in three days. I’ve never done that.” In the third verse of the poem, this same student writes of being tired and having no feelings. In *The Giver*, members of the community in which Jonas resided had no feelings. Had the student assimilated this concept and included it in his response to reading the novel? Later in the study the students view the film, *The Quest*. The student juxtaposed himself with the marathon runner who was the hero of the film. In the film the hero received help from friends in order to understand his quest and, it appears, so did this student.

In the last verse (#10) refers to David Booth as the Chosen One. That was not the name of the character David Booth played. However, (#10) connects the role to Jesus and to the hero of the film, but drops the idea and does not pursue it although he had also made this connection in his journal when he stated that:

if he failed or didn’t proceed, their community would live in misery. The two boys also remind me of Jesus Christ. They were all born to save their people and they all completed their tasks. They all gave up something they loved in order to free their people.

He concludes by mentioning the texts that he ‘played’ with the book, the movie, and the play in the library. Did he perhaps experience ‘jouissance’?
Analysis of the participants’ written responses and interviewed responses revealed a number of characteristics of reflective language that would be expected in an adolescent reader and writer. Analysis of students’ responses have been categorized into three groups: response (fun) to study; response to reading and writing; and response to viewing, drama and videotaping. Aspects that will be addressed include: What appropriations, if any, took place in the responses? What connections were made between texts or genres? What evidence was there of abduction? What evidence of ritual and/or power (as defined by Foucault, 1972) was evident in the responses? What was the kind and degree of the intertextual learning and where did it occur most often?

School Experience

In the personal inventories that the students completed at the beginning of the study they were asked if they enjoyed school, and to give reasons that would explain their answer. Most of the respondents gave a qualified yes, accompanied by thoughts such as “What else would I do?” However, in terms of ritual, power, and appropriation, it might be useful to examine some of the responses. The discussion will be conducted in an integrated manner.

“It uses up my time,” says #2. “Without it I would be bored.” (#8) “It’s something to do”. (#3) “I can learn new stuff and spend time with my friends” (#7). (#10) seemed to be the only ambivalent one: “Yes/no/yes/yes; staying at home is too boring and all my friends at school make it all right.” (#1 and #5) like it “most of the time.” (#1) “doesn’t like it sometimes because the material is boring.” (#4) “likes school because it keeps me out of trouble during the day.” (#11) said, “yes because it’s educational. You need it.” and
#6's response was "Yes. The reason is that learning is such a great thing and I believe that life is meant for us to learn as much as possible for the next life." #12 said "yes, because school's like a job and when you work you feel proud of yourself because you're doing something for yourself."

Summary

Utterance takes place between speakers and is therefore immersed in social factors. What is being said often wraps around what is not being said. Written utterances of these students are obviously shaped by speakers (teachers, parents) who assume that the values of their particular community are shared and thus they do not need to be explicit. The students revealed their values through the process of accepting their place and that of their listener (the researcher) in a culturally specific social scenario. (The ritual and the masked repetition.) The asking of "Do you like school" is a ritual. The repetitions of symbols and words shown in the students' responses confirm Foucault's views on ritual and commentary. Saying yes, but perhaps meaning no. Not being able to freely express their inner voice; uncertain of what that voice is because of the competing voices. We witness the simple recitation of the words: "educational," "job," "learning for you" seen as an opportunity to say something other than the text itself, but on the conditions, laid down by the researcher, that it is the text itself which is uttered. Ritual defines the qualification required of the speaker who knows which stance to adopt, what to say, and the range of signs that must accompany discourse (learning, job, proud). Ritual also lays down the supposed or imposed significance of the words used, their effect on
those to whom they are addressed (researcher, teachers, parents), and the limitations of constraining validity (same shared ideological texts). The text is still over-populated with the intentions of others. There is an attempt to make the text their own, but how difficult it is!

Pleasure

I have introduced (#10’s) personal response to his experiences in the study as a way of introducing the group’s response to the study and to illustrate, through the inclusion of his poem, the kind and degree of intertextual learning that took place in the study. Without exception, all the students said they had “fun.” The following statements were taken from transcribed interviews or from the students’ journals.

O: If you were to describe the experience of the last few weeks what might it be?

(Al#1): Fun, different and interesting. It was fun because it wasn’t like anything else. I had fun reading the book. It was the fastest I ever read a book that long, and different because we don’t do anything like that in our class. ...I learned learning is easier when I’m having fun and there is less pressure.

(Con#6): Fun. Experiencing different ways of thinking. Looking at novels in a different perspective instead of just reading a novel. It’s different...and made you think in different ways.

This reinforces Kamiya’s (1993) notion that fun can allow learners to try new things without the fear of making a mistake. In a fun environment one can find the motivation to participate in novel experiences or undertake new challenges. As Levy (1978) notes, play can provide a “suspension of reality.” Through play one can lose the notion of social barriers. As a catalyst, the combination of fun and play can eliminate control factors intrinsic to our socialization.

(Mat#9): It was different, weird, crazy, and just out there. Really cool. Fun.
O: Were you learning something?

(Mat#9): Yes. But it wasn’t like the normal learning though. Because of discussion and that it was easier to be open and easier to learn things. This is a lot better.

O: This is a better way of learning things?

(Mat#9): Oh yeah. It was weird.

O: You sound surprised, actually.

(Mat#9): I am. School is usually boring. It’s just there. You go there every day. This would change it to have a couple of classes like this. It would be really fun. It’s more open and easier for kids to express themselves. Like for everyone. Not just for the brainers and keeners.

O: Describe the experience of the last three weeks.

(S#10): Fun. Besides all the reading and the writing there was a lot of drama which is always fun and anything is better than being upstairs.

(T#11): You see everything involves fun these days. People are saying they are having trouble getting kids to church, but it’s not fun, that’s the problem. My Mom ask why don’t I go to church really often and I say because there is nothing to do. You sit there and do nothing. You have to get the people involved, and same with class. There has to be an element of fun in there, something to make you look forward going to a certain subject. Like language arts. Oh yeah, we’re going to be acting today...things like that. Not just oh, reading books. Which is great ... right ... but you do reports, things like that ... it’s got to be fun.

O: Tell me, would your mom and dad be happy for this kind of learning experience for you?

(T#11): Yeah. Because they know in the past I’ve had trouble learning things ... like math tests and just tests. I have trouble remembering stuff. My mind goes blank.

(Con #6): The drama with Mr. Booth. Because it was fun and we don’t really get to do that sort of thing during school.

O: What did you learn from that experience?

(Con#6): That everyone has their own special way of doing things and you shouldn’t rush things, take your time, because eventually you will get your answer to solving a problem.

(V#12): I would describe it as fun. Because we read the book for fun, we understand it better.

O: Are you telling me that you don’t need all those comprehension questions?

(V#12): Yeah.

(V#12): Well, I learned that if you do it for fun you understand it better than if you had to do questions and all that stuff.

O: You learned something about learning.

(V#12): Yeah.

O: You know the first thing you told me was that you thought it was fun, but by golly you seemed to have been doing a lot of thinking. Thinking must be fun.
(S#10): Yeah.

Reflections from the Journals

(#7) I like this program. It was very fun and interesting. I really learned how to write opinions and thoughts down on paper. It was about the book *The Giver* but it didn’t just [have to] do with the book. We took ideas from the book and used it in our lives. When Mr. Booth came in we leaned how to get people to reveal what was inside of them by working together. When we videotaped we took a part in the book and played it out like we were a part of the book with feelings and thought. (#7)

This student’s response seems to support Carver’s (1996) contention that fun can have a positive effect on the learning process by inviting intrinsic motivation, suspending one’s social reality, reducing stress, and creating a state of relaxed alertness.

(#8): It was fun and exciting because I wasn’t shy or scared to talk in front of the class

Caine & Caine (1992) argue that one of our goals as educators is to challenge learners discreetly and naturally, so that new intellectual connections will occur. Fun generates this relaxed environment where learners feel safer to take risks, be creative, make mistakes and most importantly, keep trying.

Reading

Most of the respondents when asked how much they read and what kind of books they preferred to read, answered that they read about half an hour a day. One respondent said she read four hours a day. Asked what they did in their leisure time, only three participants admitted to reading in their leisure time. As Buckingham and Sefton-Green (1994) noted, reading profiles and histories could be determined by the responses in the
personal inventories and through interview and group discussions. Through audiotaped

group discussions the following group profile of four participants was examined.

Group discussion

O: The other thing that came from the inventories was that not a whole lot of reading was
being done here. I'm not surprised by it anymore. What is it that you guys do because you
don't read?

(T #11): I go out a lot.

(Al #1): Just doing things.

O: It seems that it's a matter of preference. I guess you would prefer to do other things
than reading. I'm trying to find out what it is that makes reading not pleasurable for you.
Why isn't it pleasurable?

(Ma # 8): Depends on the book you read. Some I can't even concentrate on. Like if I'm
reading a book just like a book the teacher gave me to read like Francis Rain or
something and every time I try to read it at home, well it's like the Leaf game is on and I'd
rather be watching because I know what going on in the game. I would rather put this
aside.

O: Because of the book...

(Ma#8): To me, I can't really read books. It's hard for me to concentrate on that one
thing. I think of other things while I'm reading. When I finished the book I just don't
know what happened.

(Con#6): Most of the schoolbooks I don't like.

O: So what do you suggest? Would it be more helpful if you're in grade seven or eight
for you to choose your own books.

All: Yeah.

(Al # 1): I would rather have a hard time reading a hard book. Something like Jurassic
Park. I would rather read that and screw up a lot more than reading an easy book and not
have fun reading.

It would appear that these four would rather do other things than read. School-
selected readings are suspect, and one's own preference for a particular genre might
encourage more leisure and playing with text as suggested by (Al#1). His remark also
suggests that school texts don't provide enough of a challenge to the students. One also
fears, however, that if teachers employ the novels, films or television shows that the students enjoy, they will resist them in the same way that they resist the texts imposed on them by teachers and institutions.

In further examining their reading experiences in school, the consensus was that students' reading experiences consisted of reading a few chapters of the novel and answering comprehension questions.

(Ar # 3): In the regular class we study the novel. Here we studied the whole outlook on various topics. The Memories or whatever...in Francis Rain we are just studying the novel and trying to figure out certain words and comprehension and vocabulary.

O: Which do you prefer?

(Ar #3): Down here I liked it better than up there reading Francis Rain. It was more interesting. Up there we just read the book and answered questions but down here we read the book and talked about it and then we had some fun.

However, in personal interviews, different reading histories and profiles emerged.

O: You read a lot?

(T#11): My favorite book was probably.... I've read a lot of good books. Have you read The Ghost Boy?

O: No.

(T #11) I love that book

O: Who's it by?

(T#11): I don't know. My mom brought it home and she says, "I read this book, it's great," and I said "OK" and at the end I say, "Mom, what's it all about?" and she says she didn't read it. It's about this boy and he's a spirit and he sort of goes back to see what's really going on. It's really neat. His father was insane or something. It was a good book I liked it.

O: What did you think of the reading activities? The best or the worst?

(S #10): The worst.

O: Do you like reading?

(S #10): When it's issues I like. I don't mind it. Like Sports Illustrated. Sure.

O: Did you find it difficult reading the book in three or four days?

(S#10): Yeah, because I had to give up watching TV.

O: It seems that you are a good reader and you understand what you read but you don't spend a lot of time reading. Any reason?
(V#12): I usually read during the summer because I don't like reading while school is going on because I sort of get the books mixed up.

What does this mean? Reading books at school is efferent and requires a different approach. Reading books for pleasure (fun) can't be mixed with the other? Why?

In the Personal Inventory the students were asked to name their favourite book, poem and author. Many could not name a favourite book or author. Those that were mentioned ranged from C.S. Lewis to R.L. Stine. Those who mentioned favourite poems stated that a poem that they had written themselves was their favourite. What was interesting to note was that favourite books or authors often paralleled closely the genre of their favourite television program. Student (#6) who acknowledged to liking C.S. Lewis, preferred watching fantasy television shows, while (#4) who professed to liking R.L. Stine liked movies dealing with horror. Only one student (#1) seemed to display an eclectic appreciation of texts. He stated that his favourite book was *Come, As You Are* (The story about the rock group “Nirvana,” and his favourite author was Farley Mowat. He did not name a favourite television show but gave *Wayne's World* as his favourite movie. A few participants read magazines and newspapers.

Summary

It would appear that, for many adolescents, pleasure reading differs from reading for school purposes. But pleasure for one was not pleasure for another. Some, it seemed, preferred to struggle with a text rather than not. The boys in particular were reluctant to admit to liking reading or to reading any fiction. For example, one student (#10) read many different kinds of literature, but he was not about to admit it in public. What we
think about texts and how we use them in our daily lives depends to a great extent on how we talk about them with others, and on the contexts in which we do so. The meaning of any reading is thus inevitably a process of dialogue. In defining their own tastes, individual readers also develop hypotheses about what other people read.

Buckingham and Sefton-Green (1994) argue that preferences are socially distributed and that they serve as markers of social distinction and position, and thus of power relations. However, the meanings of those distinctions and positions are not simply given but are actively reconstructed and renegotiated through social interaction. #10 in a one to one interview was able to tell me that he like reading and read a lot, but in the group discussion this attitude was not evident. It is through such processes that ‘reading’ becomes culture. According to Buckingham and Sefton-Green (1994) young people may actively use “symbolic position” (boys not liking to read fiction, or only reading a particular genre such as horror books) in seeking to define and to resist the various pleasures that can be constructed from texts. This pleasure is often associated with familiarity and passive consumption.

Initial Responses to Novel

When participants were asked for their initial response to the novel, many replied in ways that might appear negative.

(#2) The novel is quite odd because the setting and way of life are not familiar to me. The novel is a bit disturbing because the whole society is controlled by some sort of leader.
(#4): My first impression of the novel was that it was a bit confusing and I thought the novel was going to be boring.
(#5): My first impression of the novel was that the book is different from any other book I’ve read. I find it kind of hard to understand because of all the different groups.
(#7): I liked the first few chapters. It’s an interesting book so far. I like how it’s so different from our life and world.

(#12): The novel surprised me at first because I would have never thought that in grade 8 they would make us read a novel 100 per cent fictious [sic]. I like it a bit because it’s different and every chapter is unexpected (suspenseful). I like suspense. It’s very well planned.

(#1): It did not appeal to my interests of books. It was boring, crappy, a sleeper.

(#9): I find it weird and hard to understand.

(#11): This novel is much too complicated for my tiny head.

Students (#3) and (#10) thought that the novel was similar to *A Wrinkle in Time*. In the videotaped conversation about their initial impressions of the book the following conversation took place. Although not identifiable, female voices and opinions were absent. This was true of most of the group discussion. The girls barely took part in the discussion unless encouraged by the researcher.

In addition, the following discussion shows no disparity between the individual responses by these boys and their responses in the group discussion. However, if we examine the individual responses of the girls, we see that they were at least a bit more open to the novel and its possibilities. The boys remained true to their culture and denied liking the book or anything that could be considered similar. In examining their reading and viewing profiles, one sees that the books and television they enjoy tended to be of the action genre.

Q: First impressions of the book?

(A#1): It didn’t appeal to me. Because I don’t like books that you have to sit around and wait for something to happen. I like books where something happens right at the very beginning.

(S #10): It reminds me of *A Wrinkle in Time* and I hated that book. In *Wrinkle*, IT the brain controlled everyone in this certain town. It was too slow I thought this book would be the same except that it would put me to sleep faster.

(Con#6): I thought it was unusual at the beginning, then I read the back in order to really figure out what was going on.
(T#11): It's too complicated. There are so many things going around and it's just the same thing. I hated Wrinkle and I just don't enjoy this kind of book.

O: So much going on. For example?

(T#11): The amount of kids in the household. Where they come from. Nobody has his or her own children. It's like a gift almost. People take care of them until they are a certain age and they're released to certain families.

O: So?

(T#11): There are too many things going on. I mean, there are so many rules.

(Ar#3): It was OK. I've read better books.

O: Why are you judging the book on 50 pages?

(A #1): Because usually when we've read fifty pages we've read half the book.

(Mar #9): This book is really weird. It's almost like a parallel universe where they have all these rules that would be confusing to anyone of us...it's too complex. People go and you don't know what happens to them, and there are all these rules and unknowns. It's just unfair.

(T#11): There's not enough details to know what's going on.

Obviously this was not going to be a book read as passive consumption. The students are baffled. The content of the book holds anomalies and disjunctions. But is there a will and desire to push through the meaning of these mixed reactions? Will the students begin to explore the disjunction and search for new meanings? This is an unknown genre to most readers. Is this why they are experiencing so much difficulty? For example, student (T #11) says that there is too much going on, at the same time that he says the book lacks detail. The author is asking for him to help her out. Start the jouissance. Will he be able to co-author?

Writing

O: What about writing? What kind of writing have you been doing not just this year? The last couple of years, what kind of writing assignments have you been given in class?

(AI# 1): Composition.

O: Just to write stories?
(A# 1): Poems.
O: How do you feel about writing?
(A#1) I like writing.
O: Why do you like writing
(Al#1): I can express how I feel, I like writing music.
O: (to Ch 5) Do you like to write?
(Ch# 5): Sometimes.
O: Do you like to write in school?
(Ch# 5): No.
O: What is the problem with writing in school?
(Ch #5): Too many distractions.
O: So you need quiet and concentration. Are you given topics you can write about?
(Al#1) I only write when I want to write. I don’t like writing in school because topics never appeal to me.
O: What do you like to write about?
O: And sometimes those are so private that you don’t really want to write about it in school?
(Al#1): And I like to do it to music.
O: That can be your project. You can write a song for us with regard to all this.
(Al#1) I’m not going to put lyrics in it.
O: Oh, you need lyrics. Sorry.
(Al#1): Fine. But I won’t sing them.
O: (to Mar#9) How about you?
(Mar#9): Writing is good, but I can only do it when I feel like writing. Otherwise it’s really boring and I can’t write. I’m just blank. Especially when the teacher tells you to do it in the middle of a class and you’re just sitting there trying to think of something to write. And then they get mad at you.
(Al#1) It’s not our fault. If you’re brain dead, you’re brain dead.
O: (to Ma#8) How about writing? Is it any easier or better or more pleasurable than reading?
(Ma#8): Yeah.
O: Because...
(Ma#8): It’s easier to think about and understand because it’s your own.
(Con#6): I hate writing. Compared to reading I read a lot. I like reading
O: Which is harder to do read or write?
(Con #6): Write.
(#1; #8; #9): Read.

(When polled individually, the results seemed to be split between reading and writing).

(Con#6): I think writing because you have to figure it out, think of something to write.
(Al#1): No, you can write anything you want.
(Con#6): But if you have a topic.
(Al#1): No. I never write about a topic. I write about what’s in my head.
(Con#6): Sometimes the teacher makes you write about stuff you don’t want to.
(Al#1): Because I don’t write for other people I write for myself and I don’t write all the time.

In the interview with Ar#3 he explains some of the difficulties he has with writing.

O: You did a fair amount of writing, too. How do you feel about writing your thoughts down?
(Ar#3): In some ways it’s harder than just writing about a book because a book is more straightforward than your thoughts ‘cause that’s harder to comprehend than just a book.
O: I don’t quite follow.
(Ar#3): It’s easier to read a book and put what’s in the book down on paper than trying to think of something down from your thoughts because your thoughts are more confusing than the book.
O: So you have to sort out a lot of things first in your head. Have you had much experience in doing that?
(Ar#3): No, not really. It’s mostly we read the book and answer the questions.
O: Did you mind doing it this way?
(Ar#3): It was actually different and mostly fun. It was enjoyable.

The following are thoughts and impressions of the homeroom classroom teacher with regard to how he teaches reading and writing.

O: Do you teach writing skills?
T: Yeah. Definitely. I would say so.
O: What writing skills do you teach and what is your approach?
T: Basically I’ll get the kids to write on any topic and then what I’ll do, because kids are already using things that you may teach, so OK let’s take a look at this story and see what we like about it. What makes this a good story? So you look at setting, character development, plot and use of words and stressing different kind of words and themes. I’ll
usually go with what the kids have and from there I'll introduce things that haven't been touched on and I'll give them examples of stories. So I'll use stories that have a lot of dialogue, point of view, first and third, [person], and I always like to do setting, and the language and vocabulary that may not be familiar to them. So basically I throw it out to the kids and talk about what a theme is and they'll give me a whole list of things and we'll talk about what is important. I don't stress content as much. Whether he's wearing a blue pair or black pair of pants is irrelevant. So when I give them a test or something. I'll say pick a theme from the novel that you think is important and explain how the author develops it. A lot of the novels that I work with deal with maturity and development of kids, so we go into that a little bit.

O: How do you evaluate the writing?

T: That's a good question. I think when I first started teaching I would take the story, correct all the grammar and then I said the story is worth this and the grammar is really poor and then you give them a mark in between. So what I try to do now is try to give them a set of different marks. I'll give them a content mark, the quality of their work, the quality of writing itself. Then I'll give them a spelling, grammar and punctuation mark. I don't stress that as much anymore, but I think it's important that they are aware of areas that they can improve on, so each time I'll do the same thing and put a little number in brackets that indicates that they have gone up or down in some area. Basically the writing itself, have they expressed their thoughts clearly... with less importance on spelling and grammar. It depends on the kind of mistakes. Because in many cases the kid's programs are modified so you can't expect them to be perfect in spelling... and there is the careless errors of forgetting to cross the t's and dotting the i's so it depends on the different kinds of mistakes. And then I'll take those errors and set up my grammar lessons.

O: Have you looked at or examined The Language Standards from the Ministry?

T: Yeah. I have. I think they are good. The math one is good as well. It gives you good ideas. I think it's good for new teachers.

O: Has anyone improved in writing in your class from September to now? (May).

T: Oh yeah. I can think of a few kids.

O: How did you know? Where was the quality of improvement shown?

T: Just in general. The stories were longer, with more plot development, with more descriptive words. Generally the whole class' spelling and grammar and punctuation was better. That again comes with the expectation of the teacher. The teachers expect it and the kids say well in order to raise my mark I have to do this. A lot of improvement there. The writing is more sophisticated in terms of quality, it's more of a level that you can appreciate.

It is interesting to note that this teacher of 10 years experience considered the

*Language Standards* to be of use to new teachers but not experienced ones. Also it was
evident that he was not using the levels of language from the Standards to evaluate the writing of his own students.

Summary

Discourse synthesis, as Spivey (1996) defines it, is both comprehending and composing, as a writer uses cues from more than one text to construct meaning for the text being written. Even though the texts being read suggest possible methods of organizing, prioritizing and linking content, the writer must supply new connections and possibly create new organization patterns to integrate the content of the synthesis. Acts of discourse synthesis are social acts, performed in accordance with socially established convention in various discourse communities. Writers employ knowledge they have built through social experience, including their knowledge of discourse conventions and their sociocognitive knowledge of possible effects on readers. In performing such acts, they engage in a process of communication that involves other people.

From the above discussion, it would seem that these students are uncomfortable and unfamiliar with discourse synthesis. Writing is mechanical and perfunctory. They do not consider it a social act, and are not aware of how their writing could affect readers. Some prefer writing to reading, not only because it was easier, with the exception of (Al#1) who was able to organize, prioritize, and link his writing to his feelings or his music, thus creating new organizational patterns to integrate the content.

The teacher's comments confirm the nature of what these students had experienced this year and probably over the past few years of their schooling. The students
write for their teacher, for marks, and for very mechanistic purposes. The teacher believes
that he is teaching the children a specific genre of writing which appears to be limited to
fiction, and that he is successful in his endeavor. However, are they really learning to
organize, prioritize, and link contents? Are they learning any new genres?

Gilbert (1989) believes that the move from voice to text in the classroom must rest
on a broad theoretical base that acknowledges the constructed nature of discursive power
networks. The way in which such networks organize and systematize social and cultural
practice makes a base, which accepts that reading is a set of learned and arbitrary cultural
practices giving certain meanings priority. Gilbert believes that there must be an emphasis
on textuality rather than phonocentrism to demystify much of what is commonly identified
as writing practice, and make the craft of writing and the practice of reading more
accessible to students.

Viewing

The students’ attitudes toward viewing showed that whether their preference was
video or film, they wanted to be involved, wanted to interact. They saw very little
connection between filmviewing and televiewing in school and for their own pleasure.

O: Most of you don’t go out to see movies in big movie houses too often. (To Ch #5) Can
you tell me why? You’re the only one that does. Whom do you go out with when you go
out?
(Ch#5): With my friends.
O: You prefer seeing the movie rather than seeing the video at home? Because?
(Ch#5): You see it first hand before the video comes out. It’s a big screen.
O: So you see a difference between the big screen and little screen.
(Al#1): When you’re at the movie theatres you can’t really say anything because they’ll
kick you out. When you’re at home you can say ‘that’s cool’.... You can comment.
O: So you like the fact that you can interact at home with what you are seeing, but when
you are in public you really can’t.

(Ma#8) I like both the same because you get to see the movie firsthand like (#5) said—it’s
a big screen, louder probably. When you’re home you can lie down, you can get up when
ever you want to get up. You can do more at home. You can be more comfortable.

(Mar#9): It depends. I like to go to the theatre like once in a while, but sometimes it’s not
worth it because sometimes you go down there and you can’t really do anything in the
movie. If you want to go out and get some more popcorn then you’ll miss another five
minutes of the movie.

(Con#6): I like the little screen and the big screen: I like the big screen because of the way
it makes you feel like you’re inside the movie but I also hate the idea of going somewhere
waiting for the movie to start.

O: You don’t like the feeling of anticipation?

(Con#6): You get it at home.

(AI#1) That’s boring. Half the time they don’t have anything on the screen and you’re
sitting there for 10 minutes staring at nothing. Music.

(Con#6): Elevator music.

O: When your teachers have shown videos in school, what’s your reaction to it? How do
you find them?

(Val#12): Boring.

O: You find them boring.

(Con#6): Hard to watch because of the students...

O: Elaborate.

(Con#6): Because they talk, and the volume can’t get very loud, but in the movie theater
it’s pretty loud so if somebody does talk you can almost hear over it, but on the television
if someone is talking you are distracted.

O: What kind of movies would you like to see in school?

(Mar#9): Some realistic movies.

(AI#1): Something helpful.

(Mar#9): Like the ones you get from the Board are so boring. Like Sherlock Holmes, they
draw a picture for five minutes and you’re staring at this picture for five minutes.

(Ma#8) They should get more into... I know they’re acting in the old times, but still make
a bit in the nineties. All this old stuff and nobody knows what is going on.

(Mar#9): And they show us movies that have been around since the seventies; they
haven’t really updated them.

The following are the view and perceptions of the teacher with regard to viewing

and learning:
O: If students were shown a movie about John A. Macdonald and then read a book about John A; from which do you think the students would learn more from?

T: Whether they would learn more. I don’t know but they certainly would enjoy it more and probably get a lot more out of it. But again it depends on the quality of the movie. You can take a movie and then plug in the holes. So this is what it has shown but there is more than that ...so then you may provide some writing material or some reading material or your own material and say copy this off the board. This is what we have to plug in ...I think movies are a great teaching mechanism that we have to make more use of. The kids love TV; they watch TV; so if they are going to watch TV, let’s get them to watch quality programming. I’ve used it extensively this year. I think it’s got a place in education. I think it’s a matter of getting good stuff and going off from there. And teaching the kids that it’s not just watching television that there’s education involved. That it’s not just entertainment. Because a lot of kids, once they hear TV, get the popcorn.

O: So what do you do? Soon as you say movie or TV, the body language changes and maybe it’s good thing...approach seems more accepting. How do you go about making sure this is a teaching tool, this is a teaching moment not an entertainment moment?

T: You got to tell the kids point blank. This is what we are doing and you’ve got to give them something to focus on. You just don’t say we’re going to watch something...enjoy it. Get a pen and paper out. I want you to do this or I want you to note this or that kind of thing. Because other than that, it becomes entertainment. When they’ve got nothing to do. Because that’s what they are used to. If they have nothing to focus on, then it’s just like at home. I also have given them programs to watch at home. Programs that they watch – comedies like Steinfeld. OK. I want you to watch and tell me what the theme was in that particular program. You can take everyday programming. When you do that it gives them without telling them. They watch TV more critically and that’s the goal and that’s what I told the kids – I want them to watch TV critically. This is what I like, what I don’t like, and why. We have to teach them to be critical thinkers, generally, not just about television. I really enjoy using television and I think it’s really important that we use more of it.

Summary

Students are media savvy. The teacher used television frequently to teach, but to what avail? Students are bored and don’t find the programs useful. Perhaps it would be more effective if students were allowed to make their own connections, rather than of a steady stream of instructions as to what, and how, they should watch on television. The teacher didn’t know if they would learn more from a book or a movie, but he knew they would enjoy the film or television more. He suspected the value of the film because the
students' approach to televiewing or filmviewing was one of anticipation and pleasure.

(An aesthetic stance). He presumed that they would only be entertained and that learning could not take place simultaneously with entertainment. However, the students expressed dissatisfaction with the 'educational' movies shown and did not say that they enjoyed them. Was the enjoyment nullified because of the efferent approach the teacher took in presenting the media, or was the enjoyment absent because the students were not able to make connections? Obviously, both teachers and students mistrust film's ability to teach.

Speaking

Most students found speaking in this study enjoyable. The girls did not participate as much as the researcher would have liked. They needed prompting to express their views.

(Al#1): It’s more the kids that pressure you than the teachers. Here I was allowed to do my own stuff. I found it easier just to write stuff down and like everything. I like saying what I feel and writing sometimes sucks.

O: Did you find that you were writing things down differently than what you were saying?

(Al#1) Yeah. Because you don’t write how you speak. You can’t use any slang. You have to write proper grammar and that. You can’t write things like ‘eh’? Get bent or something.

O: Where do you think you learn more from: reading or from watching videos and movies? What did you learn the most from?

(Al #1): The book. That’s where my first impressions were from and everything else surrounded the book.

O: What did you learn from the book? Did you feel that you were learning stuff? To read? To write?

(Al#1): Yeah.

O: At a different level than you normally do? When I was asking you to write, personal responses to what we say or heard, what did you think about that? Is this an approach that you like? That you had to write down personal responses rather than discussing. In other words, I’m asking you which did you prefer, because we did both the discussion and the personal responses.
(Al#1): The writing. I like the writing because you can get more down on the paper then what comes out of your mouth and also there is more that you can say on the paper than during a discussion because there is only a certain amount of time that you have.

When asked if they should get more opportunity to write reflectively the girls stated:

(Me#7): Sometimes. But not really.  
O: Do you think it's something that should be done?  
(Me#7): Yeah.  
O: Why?  
(Ch#5): So everyone can write down their own opinion.  
O: Because during group discussions what happens sometimes?  
(Ch#5): Sometimes people say your answer or they kind of change the way you're thinking.  
(Me#7): Or sometimes people make fun of what you think.  
(T#11): I don't know ...it just happened through the book. The book made it happen.  
O: How so?  
(T#11): The book was weird and you wanted to talk about it and it was just something that you really couldn't hold back for long.  
O: Did you prefer writing your personal ideas or did you prefer talking about them?  
(T#11): Talking was better. It's easier to open up talking.  
O: Did you find that your opinions were different while you were talking than when you were writing?  
(T#11): When you are writing, I usually put something different, so it's not exactly the same thing.

The following are the teacher's views and perceptions about talk.

O: What is your approach to teaching language?
T: I try different approaches. Very much stressing the oral more than the written. I think that's important. Giving the kids a lot of time to work in groups. Giving them a chance to do some role-playing. I find that if their role playing they seem to get comfortable with one another grow in confidence and sometimes that can extend to written work.
O: Why do you think the oral is important?
T: Generally just to communicate with others. Most jobs involve good people skills. Any job really. So if you come across as a good speaker, a confident speaker, it will help you in your every day life and any kind of simple dealing – at a bank or calling a gas company.
Summary

The students seemed to be divided as to which mode they preferred to use when sharing their thoughts and feelings. However, it was evident that the freedom to speak openly was not present for everyone, and most obviously for the girls in the study. As Me (#7) and Chr (#5) pointed out, they often didn’t speak as one feared her opinions would be made fun of and the other feared she could be swayed from holding her ground in a discussion. The boys on the other hand seemed to have the opinion that talk was better and less constraining.

This data confirms Bakhtin’s idea of the utterance that it is one of performance. Utterance, as it is used in dialogism, does not involve completely free choice. While there is some room for relative freedom in the utterance, it is always achieved in the face of several constraints. An utterance skirts around what is said and what is not said. As a social event the utterance is shaped by speakers who assume that the values of their particular community (school) are shared and thus do not need to be spelled out in any way.

For Bakhtin, the struggle between a sanctioned discourse and its dialogical opposite, what he calls an internally persuasive discourse, is an important struggle. One’s own voice is often threatened to be drowned out by the voice of others and of authority. (E.g. Al#1’s comments on writing). The constant struggle of whether to adhere to internal discourse or accept the voice of those in authority often closes the door to heteroglossia. The statements by the students suggest some constraint and internal struggle. The teacher
is unaware of such a struggle and assumes that communicative skills are important only for social and economic reasons.

Videotaping

A piece of student work may be produced in a number of different ways, depending upon the reading frame adopted. The participants in this study were asked to choose a section of the book to videotape. The section was to be of some significance to them and was to fill no more than two minutes. They were to script the scene themselves. They chose their own partners, and there were two pairs that were boy-girl. The sequence of events was as follows: The pairs made a decision as to what scene to videotape; they began scripting and practicing; and then chose who would videotape their two minute segment. This was truly the most intertextual event of the study. Through discussion, reading, writing, listening and viewing many appropriations or connections with multitemtexts took place. The researcher observed an exciting learning experience. As there was so much activity going on which involved interaction with the researcher, the researcher found it difficult to record individual acts of intertextual learning.

O: And what did you think of the whole video experience?
(Me#7): Fun.
O: Besides fun. I know you had fun.
(Me#7): It was hard keeping your action in character. We would break out laughing or screwing up your lines.
O: What about making the videos? What did you think about that?
(S#10): That was actually a lot of fun, because you sort of wanted to say something, but then you had to shut up because...
O: What do you mean?
(S#10): Well, I found it hard to keep quiet while everyone was doing their stuff.
O: What did you want to say all the time?
(S#10): When Al (#1) was doing his "movie," his ending was so pathetic, I just wanted to
go show him or something.

O: It appears to me you just wanted to be involved in all the productions. What made it
difficult for you and Ma to concentrate? You did get it together.

(S#10): Ma kept on looking at "T" and he would start cracking up.

O: I sensed you were uncomfortable.

(S#10): It was a cheesy role.

O: I don't know what 'cheesy role' means.

(S#10): O.K. If this were a play or something I wouldn't want to be the Giver. I would
rather be someone else.

O: Are you glad that you did that scene?

(T#11): Yeah. I'm glad I worked with somebody different. I never worked with her
before. She's nice.

O: You usually worked with other guys.

(T#11): Yeah, usually.

O: Is it a problem working with girls your age because people think that you like them?

(T#11): It doesn't bug me, because my friends won't think that because they know I
don't, or it doesn't matter.

(Ca#4): It was fun. I don't get a chance to work with A[#1]l so it was different.

(Ma#8): I was working with [#10]. We were to choose a scene in the novel and dramatize
it. We chose the scene where Jonas gets his first memory from the Giver. It was fun and
funny.

Summary

When asked to reflect on their work, students had to make their knowledge of
media and videomaking explicit, and to question it. In a sense, Buckingham and Sefton-
Green (1994) see this exercise as forcing students to acknowledge consciously what they
already know 'unconsciously'. At the same time, it forces them to question both how they
know what they know, and where that knowledge comes from. Because this is a
collaborative activity — both in devising the images and in gauging of another's readings of
them—an interaction developed between a number of different 'language modes.' Here we
would include the visual language of photography, as well as talking and writing between
critical analysis and practical production. This researcher discovered, as did Grace and
Tobin (1998), that video production tended to blur the lines between work and play.
Grace and Tobin reflected on their students, and this researcher can only corroborate that
the same occurred with her students that:

> In their journals students wrote repeatedly about the fun of video
production, yet they often mentioned how much work was involved. Video
production seemed to represent a type of work that was fun and in which
the children located places to play. In their collaborative groups they read,
wrote, problem-solved and gained technical skills, yet they also found ways
to produce pleasure in exploring the boundaries between rules and
freedom. Such pleasure frequently moved beyond what we typically think
of as fun in school. The pleasure experienced in the video project existed in
and of the moment and had a life of its own. (p.54)

As described in Sharan and Sharan’s (1992) Group Investigation method, it was
evident that there was an interpersonal interaction or social dimension of the learning
process. Interpretation occurred at both the interpersonal and the individual cognitive
level. The students were intrinsically motivated. These experiences happened
simultaneously.

Drama

The researcher videotaped the drama sessions with David Booth. However, in
moving the equipment from its position where the group discussion was held, the sound
system was turned off. Consequently, transcripts from the drama session were not
available and the researcher had to rely on students’ responses and personal observations
of the session to analyze data. The researcher had the students watch the silent drama
session and videotaped their reactions to seeing themselves involved in the drama. All
participants but one had enjoyed and found it fun and exciting. Various responses to the experience will be discussed throughout this thesis. In this section the focus will be on the written and verbal responses to the drama experience and, in particular, the use of language. Evidence of appropriations and connections made in intertextual learning will be examined.

This process drama generated a text in action, appropriated the space in which it occurred, required the participants to project into a number of roles, and moved toward an unknown horizon of possibilities. It also provided the researcher with a fertile ground to examine students’ appropriations, the connections they made with other texts, their personal experiences, and links to intertextual learning.

In describing the role Booth played, students called him “decision-maker”, “ruler of the Country”, “important figurehead”, “the patient”, and “the leader”. Only one student seemed to connect ‘The Giver’ from the novel with the role that Booth played. What former reading, viewing, and listening had these students done that made them use these particular words to describe Booth’s role? Why did only one student make a connection between that role and the Giver?

In writing her response to drama (#5) wrote the following:

My role was to get people to say what they feel.....All eleven of us were phycaligests [psychologists] and we had to get to the root of the Givers (Mr. Booth’s) problems. After about one hour of everyone trying to get to the root of the problem we solved it. I think it was a fun experience. I’ve never done something like that before. Everyone stayed in role so well it was amazing. When [#4]... came up with the idea to hypnotize The Giver everything started to fall in place. There were three days and I found the third day most interesting because we found out why he was guilty.
This respondent considered her job to be solving a problem. The surprise for her was the fact that all her colleagues stayed in role throughout the hour. Student #5 was the only participant who retained a connection to the novel. She considered Booth’s problem to be one of guilt. She believed her role was to get people to say what they felt. Does she believe that people now don’t generally say what they feel?

Student (#7) wrote:

My role was a healer and I was famous for getting deep down inside and touching their inner feelings and make them come out with their thoughts and feelings. Twelve of us were gathered to help the ruler of the country. He came in confused and shallow. We first tried to talk to him calmly. On day one we tried to get to know him and his childhood. We didn’t get very far. So we tried to hypnotize him and we got farther than we were before. We found out he was a child who knew no other children and was chosen as the decision-maker for this city. The city could not make decisions for themselves. They were not capable. The decisions were too great. But Mr. Booth (the decision-maker) could not make any decision without clearing his mind. So we then found out that our job was to help him clear his mind.

Student (#7) considered herself to be healer. Some of the words she used such as, “deep down inside,” “confused and shallow,” “he was a child that knew no other children,” “the city could not, they were not capable” suggest appropriation from other texts that she has read or seen. She considered her job to be “to clear his mind.”

(#6): My role was a motivator... a very trustworthy psychiatrist. My role in the act was a psychotherapist that healed people through mental powers. I came from Lithiumania, a country far away... I specialized in shock therapy and lobotomies. Our patient was the great ruler of a country.

This participant considered himself to be a motivator, a “trustworthy” one with mental powers. He came from Lithiumania — did that appropriation come from lithium and mania? (The student had cultural roots in Lithuania.)

(#10): My role was a very trustworthy psychiatrist. Mr. Booth started the session by telling us we were the top “psychiatrists in the world.” First he
pretended that he was a reporter, and one by one he interviewed us asking us why we're chosen. Then we really started. We all sat in a semi-circle around him (the patient) and tried to help him. Whenever we asked him a question he would never give up a complete answer. My fellow students started to use the novel (the Giver) as the answer, but he changed it just so that we couldn't use the novel.

Student #4's Journal entry about the drama session identified Booth by name.

Day 1
On day 1, Mr. Booth (the patient, we'll call him John) was very confused and he felt anxiety. Dr. R. (#4) hypnotized him and slowly but surely were getting to him.

Day 2
Dr. R. hypnotized him once more and we kept asking questions.

Day 3
John didn't want to be hypnotized. He felt we were on the right track. When the session ended we helped him heal himself.

Student #10 was the "trustworthy" psychiatrist. In his description of the drama segment, he depicts the frustrating process of asking questions and receiving incomplete answers. The answers given by Booth, in role, prevented the students from using the information from the novel and they were forced to look elsewhere for their questions.

#10 and #4 were the only students who tried to give Booth a name. The names, however, I feel did not match the character Booth played. He was not just a John or a Bob. Did he really represent for these students Everyman and really not anyone special?

(#4): My role was a motivator. I motivate people if they feel sad or left out. I make them feel like they're wanted, loved and needed in this world. I picked this profession because I feel those people are very important in my life. Mr. Booth said we were going to do some drama. What he said was that we were all psychologists and we all have some special way of doing our job. The scene was we were helping a man that needed extreme help. We needed about twelve psychologists to help him with his problem. The character that Mr. Booth played had no name so we'll just call him Bob. Day 1 'Bob' is seated before us. The first question we asked was if he remembers what his childhood was like and he said he couldn't remember.
I think he could remember, it’s just that he doesn’t want to remember. We asked him more questions but his reply was constantly “I can’t remember.” So we moved on to hypnosis.

The language of these participants echoes social and cultural believes of psychologists. “I was to make them feel like they are wanted, loved and needed in this world. Student #4 was the only one who explained why she chose this role for herself and the only one who analyzed Bob’s lack of responsiveness. She does not recognize in her written description that he is a ruler of a country. Just sees him as a man that the 12 psychologists were helping. It was her suggestion to hypnotize Bob and use her bracelet. However she does use the word we, not I. She feels that helping the man is very much a group effort.

Drama Memories

The following are students’ responses to viewing the silent drama on videotape:

(Al#1): We didn’t get very far. We got more out of him the first day.
O: But the questions were different?
(S#10): We kept on going in circles.
(Ca#4): We kept on asking the same questions.
(S#10): (using Booth voice) I’m the Giver. Is there another Giver? NO. I’m the Giver.
O: So you really had to listen to what he was saying in order to find the right question to ask.
(Ca#4): He kept on going on and on about the same thing. We kept on badgering him [group discussion about badgering]
(Ca#4): But you can’t do that to him if we badger him. If I’m pressuring you to remember something and you can’t remember it, isn’t that going to make you say, forget it I want to leave? You’re making me do something that I can’t do.
(S#10): Maybe Mr. Booth – because there was a lot of thinking at the top of your head and saying it right away.
O: And you found that challenging?
(S#10): Yeah. You had to be careful about what you said or else he would go after you.
(#12): Probably because he was supposed to have been a leader of another community. Showed us it was very stressful making so many decisions even though they may be easy and even though he has to make them. Since everyone is going to agree with him, he still didn’t feel it was the right decision and he was a bit stubborn, though.

Summary

Booth (1994) believes that in process drama we agree to live as if the story we are enacting is true. We imagine the story, engage with it, struggle with its unfamiliar concepts, associate our own experience with it, and fill in its shape with our particular interpretation. The voice of the group resonates off the voice of the text to create the voice of the drama.

The students examined the story’s ideas, experimenting with them, learning to play with the narrative and see themselves in its reflection. The students paused in a fictional present, lingered on an image, and moved forward, backward and sideways in an attempt to make meaning happen. In doing so, intertextual learning occurs as students appropriate, connect, and made links with their personal experiences, with other texts, and with the world they live in.

O’Neill, (1995), states that when the drama world takes hold and acquires a life of its own, all of the participants will return from that world changed in some way, at least not quite the same as when they began. The key to both the power and the purpose of process drama and theatre lies in the fact that they demand that we discover other versions of ourselves in the roles we play or the roles we watch others play.

In this instance student #4 has been a marginalized voice up to her time in the study. Through her involvement, in role as a psychiatrist, who motivates people who are
“sad or feel left out”, she let others see her pain. She was instrumental in helping find a way, through hypnosis, to break Booth’s wall. Her colleagues saw a different side to this student. Prior to this experience she contributed very little to group discussions, and was considered to be weak member in the group. Her contribution to the drama brought her a new level of respect from her fellow group members.

In story drama the children enter in a dialogue, modifying and exploring symbols by changing and challenging each other’s contributions. Booth (1994) says the process of story “continues beyond the end as the seed of another story readies itself for germination.” (p. 40)

A drama event is a heteroglossic event. It is a situation with the potential for a myriad of responses that the participants might make at any particular point, and must be framed in a specific way selected from the many available. Participants, in their roles as psychiatrists, had many possible responses to the patient’s dilemma, but as psychiatrist their responses had to be framed in a specific way. The literary hologram described by Benton represents the evolving space between the reader’s inner self and the words on the page—especially when the event is dramatic in nature.

O: What did you think of the drama with Mr. Booth?
(S#10): Surprising. I didn’t think it would be like that. He’s actually a good actor. There’s a lot of improvising going on so you actually had to think. Again.

Memories and Communities

Memories could be painful or enjoyable
Memories should be kept with each other

(#6)
The following data examines reflections and discussions the students participated in that relate to memories. Appropriations, connections and links were made to other texts so the intertextual learning was deep and varied. A multiplicity of perceptions and opinions were evident.

O: Does anyone want to help him out here?Why do his dreams hurt?
(Con#6): Because they’re bad Memories.
(Al#1): So what?
(Con#6): Have you ever had bad Memories?
O: Bad Memories don’t cause pain?
(Con#6): You’ve never had bad Memories, have you?
(Al#1): Falling down the stairs is fun?
(Mar#9): Even if people have really bad dreams ...they don’t really like getting hurt unless they’re really psychos.
(Con#6): Let’s say you have ...or you’re thinking of someone being dismantled in front of you.
(Mar#9): That doesn’t hurt?
(Con#6): Sure it does.
(Mar#1): But it’s not physical pain?
O: Now you’re bringing up the question of what is pain. You know, when somebody really hurts your feelings.
(Al#1) It doesn’t cause you to limp.
O: But you not feel like somebody kicked you in the stomach?
(Al#1) That doesn’t explain it. Somebody says you’re stupid you don’t start limping.
O: You don’t physically limp, but you certainly walk around wounded. If people verbally abuse you, constantly, you don’t think you are walking around hurt and that you start taking it out on other people?
(Al#1): Yeah, but Jonas thinks like he’s going to get bruised from it or something or break his bones.
O: It may not break your bones but it surely breaks your spirit.
(Al#1): O.K. but it didn’t explain that.
O: Well that’s what we’re here to talk about.

This conversation began with an attempt to explain why Jonas’s dreams hurt. It traveled down various paths and intertextual connections before student (Al#1)
understood the connection between bad dreams and memories. Other students watched and listened, joining in, appropriating what they have observed, reshaping themselves and the world around them. These students sought to make meaningful connection in their minds—between bad dreams, memories, physical pain and emotional pain—appropriating new material and making it a part of themselves. These conceptions are laden with history; the collection of all the routines and novel experiences in which they have participated. These connections shift, expand, and reconnect, as students make sense of the routine and experiences of their daily lives.

Bartlett’s theory of schema is illuminated as we see a process interwoven with mental processes like perception, attention, and emotion. Edwards and Middleton’s (1990) theory of sharing memories of events is evident as we see this discussion of memory as essentially interactive, coming in the form of conversational discourse. The two researchers also recognize that memories are not a simple matter of recalling events, but come loaded with their own purposes and assumptions. Bakhtin’s theory assumes that coming to understand word meaning is a dynamic process of linking new meanings with old ones. Rather than simply receiving the word and its meaning, the person recognizes the connections of that word to other words and shifts his or her sense of the words accordingly, giving shape and shade to words. The picture of development here, then, is one of constant interaction between individuals and all of the words and utterances in the heteroglossic context around them. Speakers attempt to make themselves understood by recognizing their own conceptual horizon or schema around the word, and recognizing the conceptual horizon of the listeners, which differs from their own.
(#2): I received memories of what happened on Tuesday. The memories were of the kids taking on roles of different people who were supposed to be therapists. They had different talents, they healed with moral support or with a physical touch. The students worked with an advisor for Ms. Kuryliw. He played the part of some guy who they had to get all the memories out of him that they could. The students put him in hypnosis and asked him about the different parts of his life. For some reason these are the basic details I remember. I also remember the frustration the students had when they wanted answers the advisor didn’t have.

This is the synopsis that student #2 gave of the group’s memories of the drama session with Booth. As Bartlett would have expected, the student retold the story of the event quite accurately. He appropriated the roles of the students and stated that they healed with moral support or with a physical touch. He was able to capture the frustrations of the participants and thus recognized both the cognitive and emotional level of the event. He referred to Booth not as the drama teacher, ruler, or decision-maker, but as the researcher’s advisor. This says something about the student’s assumption regarding the real purpose of Booth’s real role in the case study.

The following extracts represent some generational memories of the participants. They were asked to write in their journals what memories they had of their generation, their parents, their grandparents and their great grandparents.

(#2): First generation — I remember school days. The stuff we did in school. I remember jk — grade 8.
Second generation (parents) — I remember the Gulf War, Vietnam, Korea, the OPSEU strike, and the first man on the moon.
Third generation (grandparents) — I remember WWII. I remember Communism, Fascism, Nazis. I remember Stalin, Mussolini, and Hitler.
Fourth generation — I remember Alfred Hitchcock, born in 1899. I remember the Great Depression. I remember the Titanic.

In the post interview with student #2 I asked him the following questions with regard to his memory chart:
O: Your initial memories are the schools, and then you are remembering the Vietnam War, World War I, and the Titanic. Where did you know the Titanic? Is this again from television and books?

(An#2): I just decided to take what I know from the time periods that were caused by those people from those generations. My generation, we’re still in school. Like the Gulf and Vietnam and all that that that’s how I got to those.

O: How do you think memories are connected to knowledge?

(Con #6): Well, when teachers teach you, they have to know that memory as well, so it’s like we are being the receivers and they are being the givers. They give us the knowledge, their memories to us not always, like sometimes they look at the book, but sometimes for helpful hints they use their own memories.

O: You’ve had many teachers in your life... you probably received different memories of the same thing. How do you know which is the true knowledge?

(Con #6): I really don’t know ... because it’s different opinions ... so there are different ways of doing something. It doesn’t have to be identical.

O: For example, the person who wrote the book, Lois Lowry, she wrote the Book – she picked certain memories for the Giver to give to Jonas. Why do you think she chose those memories?

(Con #6): Because he never had experienced it. And if anything ever happened he would at least have those memories.

O: Your fourth generation memory was the First World War... the memory you have of it came from where?

C: Came probably from textbooks.

O: Do you believe that’s a valid memory?

C: Yeah. But you can’t always trust what you read. The person who wrote it has their own opinion.

The memories of student (#1) exemplify the division that occurred in remembrance of things past. Most of the memories were personal and were provided by family members. Other memories came from the mass media.

1st Generation. I learned Ode to Joy on my guitar (my first song)
2nd Generation. She hated disco (Mom told me)
3rd Generation. Grandpa cut off his fingers in a lumber mill (Mom told me)
4th Generation. the Light Bulb (TV, Books)

The first generation of the other participants’ memories were obviously personal:

“When I was about two years old and I had grapes in my mouth for about two hours;” “playing with my sister;” “remember when my sister got
married" my scholarship that I was awarded"; "when I got my first pair of roller-blades", "I remember my sister walked when she was about two." "Last year I was caught stealing at Wonderland." And beginning of school, projects, tests.

Not surprisingly, some were more emotional than others. Two of the participants' personal memories surrounded basically school-related memories: none from the family or any that denoted any deep emotion. As Edward and Middleton (1986) argue, recalled events come loaded with their own purposes and assumptions. Did these two students think that was what I wanted them to remember given the setting?

The second-generation remembrances most often came from the mothers and included memories such as "She hated disco," "She was very good at sports," "my mom is really afraid of animals," "the stories my mom told me about her child life and how hard it was for her." #10, however, wrote that They told me of "their" life. He also wrote: "Everyone was taking drugs, smoking and having sex anytime". #11 and #12's second generation memories were E.T., Star Wars McDonalds, and Disco—memories supposedly supplied by their parents.

Student #10 said that his parents had told him about "their" life. Am I to presume that they had sex and took drugs all the time? I suspect that #10's information here came from the mass media and his perceptions of the 70s. #11 and #12's memories come from their perception of their parent's cultural life. In the former student's case, I know that his parents grew up outside Canada, so his memories reflect his perception of what his parents might remember of their childhood.

The third generation memories were, with two exceptions, related to World War II: "During World War II, if my grandmother was in the field and a plane flew overhead,
she had to duck so that she wouldn’t die.” “My grandfather told me about how when he was about 18 he fought in the war in Malta.” “How they never really went to school because of the war.”

For some, the remembrance of this war was a personal one, but for others the knowledge came from television or books. Whatever the source of these memories, this event was an important one. Later, the group discussed the Holocaust:

O: Memory and Holocaust. What am I talking about?
(Ar#3): World War II and the killing of all the Jews.
O: Jewish people and many other people don’t want people to forget about it. They want people to remember it.
(Con#6): So that we don’t make the same mistakes over and over again.
O: So what if our community starts to forget about the Holocaust, and people are beginning to forget that a Holocaust occurred only 50 years ago. You knew nothing about it.
(Con#6): Looks like it could happen again.
(T#11): The States will protect us.

Whereas the students were aware of World War II, the Holocaust was, generally speaking, unknown to them and they could not make any connection between, the idea of not forgetting that tragedy and their own memories of World War II.

Students #11 and #12 also mentioned the War in their remembrances, but also added “Leave it to Beaver, Old Yeller, Cars, Jetsons, and TV”. Their perception of time is jumbled, but they still feel that it is important to include movies and television shows of time past.

The fourth generation remembrances were mixed or non-existent. For most it was World War I but for student #5 it was: “They wore corsets and knickers. I learned that
from ‘Road to Avonlea’” For students #11 and #12 it was the “First World War, strictness everywhere and the First Olympics.”

Summary

Memories are obviously intertextual. (Bartlett, 1932; Bakhtin, 1981; Edwards and Middleton 1986). In the examples above, students appropriated material from many places—from conversation with parents, from texts, and from mass media. Society and culture are important sources of some kinds of mass media, as well as of some kinds of schemata as noted by Bartlett. Conventionalization occurred, and is seen to be rooted in and constitutive of culture, forming and being formed by symbols and meanings transmitted in text and pictures. The picture of development, then, is one of constant interaction between individuals and all of the words and utterances in the heteroglossia around them. Bartlett (1932) points out how important the interactions between people and texts are to the process of mind. Bakhtin (1981) provides a somewhat similar notion of mind as social, with the individual appropriating and responding to the heteroglossia of all the dialogue between people, their speech and their written text.

Case Study

The students were asked what their memories of the study would be and as was expected, there were many types of memories these students said they would retain.

(Al#1): Probably (#8) and (#10) laughing themselves silly during their video play. That was the part I liked and probably reading the book in three days.
O: Any unpleasant memories?
(Al#1): Reading the book in three nights. That sort of hurt.
(An#2): It’s going to be reading a book about a community with no feelings. People who are just controlled by certain groups and an Outside, like a Big Brother sort of thing, and this book is like a look into the future, what the future, may hold if we stay on the path we are on. I’ll remember what we did here. The video cameras and the play and the interviews and all the questions.

(Conv#6): The movie.

(Me#7): Mr. Booth and the separation of us.

(Ch#5): Mr. Booth.

(Mar#9): All the fun we had and the things we did. It’s too early to tell.

O: Do you have a memory that made you uncomfortable or felt unpleasant.

(Mar#9): Probably that thing with Mr. Booth if anything. It was too weird. It was weirder than the book.

(S#10): Probably the reading of the book in three days,

O: Why that one?

(S#10): Because I’ve never done it before.

(S#10): Maybe Mr. Booth. Because there was a lot of thinking at the top of your head and saying it right away.

O: And you found that challenging?

(S#10) Yeah. You had to be careful about what you said or else he would go after you.

(Ca#4): The movie and the drama. Good positive Memories and the writing.

One of the most significant conversations regarding memory was with student #11.

He noted that memories were an important issue that came up for him because of the book.

O: So how important are Memories to you?

(T#11): They are important because there are things that you get to Remember.

O: Why is it important to Remember?

(T#11): Because there were good time and bad times

O: So? Who cares?

(T#11): I care.

O: How is that going to change you as a person?

(T#11): Maybe if you made a mistake in the past and you Remember it, then you won’t do it again ... Because people are so busy in their everyday lives that you don’t even stop to think about things that were done in the past, unless it’s something big. Sometimes it’s little Memories that kind of brighten your day. Like a smell.
His most important memory he said would be:

(T#11): You. [The researcher]. No seriously, I have known you for so long and this just adds on to the experience and knowing you. Every time I think of Ms Kuryliw I will think of *The Giver*.

On student (Ar#3) produced a poem as one of his texts.

> When I first came down here I never really thought about Memories or dreams
> But now I know that they have Meaning
> Some could lead you on a mad quest or turn you into a healer
> A Memory might be the end of a war but could start another
> It could also Remember how to build a super machine
> A Memory could be a gift from someone a long time ago or something from your childhood
> Such as a funny word or something you did.
> But I don’t really know what a Memory is.
> I feel that it is just something that’s stuck in my head... or heart.

**Analysis of A Final Product**

Why does student #3 now think that memories and dreams have meaning? Is it because of the dialogism that occurred among participants? The notion of a mad quest and a healer might come from the novel or the drama session. He refers to his generational chart by talking about his own and his mother’s memories. The internal struggle continues with the connections, the links, and the anomalies. His ideas are multi-faceted but remain constant. His ideas are adaptable and reflect the context from which they have been appropriated. The resulting text transforms prior texts to generate a new one. He doesn’t yet want to commit himself to a set definition of memory; instead he allows the reader to use his uncertainty.
Summary

Students' appropriations, connections, and links to other texts and contents produced rich intertextual learning. There was evidence of some concession to ritual and power and constraint of voice. Bartlett's, and Bakhtin's theories were supported by the data examined.

Speech

In the following discussion about community and conformity, the intertextual nature of learning is evident as students express opinions appropriated from peers, parents, teachers and society. Speech genres, the constrained, and the unconstrained are evident.

It is also obvious that students are struggling to find their voice and struggling with the text, yet show evidence of intertextual learning through appropriations and connections with other texts and personal experiences. There is also some evidence of ritualistic response and constraint of voice.

O: Did this community have choices?
(T#11): No.
O: Jonas was able to make choices because he had Memories...he did make a choice. Did he make the right choice?
(T#11): Yes
O: In you opinion, because...
(T#11): If he's chosen then you just ...it's really...it's difficult to say because it's really up to him. If I was him I would have done it too, because you are helping out your people. So I think he made a good decision. The right choice.

[Does he really believe this, or think this is the right answer. Would society be demanding such a sacrifice?]

O: So much going on. For example?
(T#11): The amount of kids in household. Where they come from? Nobody has their own children. It’s like a gift almost. People take care of them until they are a certain age and then they’re released to certain families.

(S#10): If you look at the book. 180 pages of small print. It looks like a lot. She has so much detail that she’s not really saying anything.

O: She’s not saying anything?

(S#10): Like so much detail. Okay. Yet if you think about the book there really was a very short...

(T#11): Message.

O: Let him finish.

(T#11): I know what he is going to say.

(S#10): Not much has happened. It’s just over a year. To me not very much happened right then and there. Lots of detail.

O: What happened to Jonas in a year?

(S#10): From the year 11, he became the Receiver of Memories.

O: And then what happened to him as a person?

(#S10): He filled his character. He got to see a lot more and became aware of what was happening.

O: And that’s nothing?

(S#10): No, it’s something. But it’s just... I don’t have the right words.

Barthes (1981) noted that when the narrator’s voice cannot be identified, even using the device of the ‘limited point of view’ of different characters at different times throughout the novel, the text becomes, in Barthes’ words, “unreadable.” It becomes a ‘writerly’ text. As is evident from his poem, Fun, (St #10) is about to experience jouissance. He is trying to unravel the text’s fabric.

Cazden (1992) argues that many people who have an excellent command of a language often feel quite helpless in certain spheres of communication precisely because they don’t have a practical command of the generic form used in given spheres. Here it is not a matter of an impoverished vocabulary or style taken abstractly. (Certainly not, when
he is able to describe Jonas as “filling” his character.) This is entirely a matter of the inability to command a repertoire of genre (p. 96).

Bakhtin (1981) asserts the intrinsic intertextuality of all utterance. Words are chosen according to their generic specification, and genres correspond to typical situations of speech communication. Thus the expressiveness of individual words is not inherent in the words themselves as units of language, nor does it come directly from the meaning of these words. A word is sometimes either a typical generic expression, or it is an echo of another’s individual expression. Bakhtin suggests grounds for interpersonal conflict during the process of expression because of the “auras” that accumulate to those forms from awareness of their previous contextualized use. (S #10) seems to be going through some sort of conflict as he is aware of his knowledge of words, but is not sure whether to use them or not. What is holding him back? Could it be ritual or power? In the first videotaped discussion the students made the following comments.

O: How do you depend on your communities? Do you think of your classroom as a community?
Group: No – Yes.
(Al#1): For me, people sort of gather and they sort of discuss things and sort of bond and stuff. Our classroom is sort of like a community because we all come and discuss things. We don’t really like each other. Not all of us. But we do bond sometimes. I guess we’re like a community.
(Me#7): We’re not a community. Because there are groups that people hang out with and they won’t change. They will only stick to that one group and then they don’t like the other groups.
(Al#1): That’s not true.
(T#11): I think that the important thing is that if somebody needs something they may not be part of your group. I think there are people who will go out of their way to kind of help them out.
O: Is your class a community or a bunch of groups here there and everywhere?
(Al#1): That’s what a community is.
(V#12): It’s not a community. A community people live around here.... We all know each other. We don’t get to meet every person.

Group: [Much interaction here].

(Con#6): Maybe another reason is because there is a lack of respect for certain individuals in those groups.

Group: (Lots of interaction).

(Al#1): Because there are a lot of groups. Say we divided by music. Us three like rock and #4 and those three like dance. It doesn’t mean I’m not going to like [11] or [8] or [Ca4] because they’re not into my music. There are different kinds of music and people who hang out together because of certain things they do. Like what they do in their free time.

(T#11): Like I have a pool. You have a pool. No one else has a pool. Can’t join us kind of thing. Sometimes it depends on wealth sometimes it’s on what you wear, sometimes its music.

(Al#1): Most of the time it’s music.

The above discussion illuminates Hyme’s (1973) portrayal of a “community as an organization of diversity”. Each individual must shift among language varieties, a process which seems painless but also portrays images that are more of conflict than of coexistence as described by Bakhtin. We see individual voices, although born of another, or dynamically stimulated by another, liberating themselves from the authority of another’s discourse. This process is made more compelling by the fact that a variety of alien voices enter into the struggle for influence within an individual consciousness (just as they struggle with one another in surrounding social reality.)

Buckingham and Sefton-Green (1994) says that talking about popular media also serves the function involved in constructing and negotiating social relationships when we consider how individuals use and talk about what they read. In defending their own tastes, individual readers also develop hypotheses about how other people read.

O: Is there anyone in your class that depends on you for anything?

(An #2): Yes. Some people want help from me in schoolwork.

(Ma#8): Like if you are doing a project they might depend on you to bring some stuff.
(Ch#5): My cat depends on me...No one in the class.
(Mar #9): Your teachers do, they expect you to get your work done. They trust you and your friends to keep a secret.
(T#11): I depend on my friends for various things. It's hard to pinpoint.
(Ca #4): I depend on myself, me, and I because I don't need anyone else to give me anything else except support. Everyone in this class are backstabbers and they talk behind your back.
(Ar #3): Well, Andrew depends on my computer at home
(S#10): Because he uses you.

The immediate presence of an audience in speech makes it potentially interactional and spontaneous. Both speakers and listeners jointly construct a world of shared meaning, constantly modifying and elaborating according to the response of the moment. Turn taking patterns shift according to the power relations between the interlocutors. Speech patterns can only be created if participants are aware of, and contributing to the discussion.

Kress (1989) argues that the power relations between participants in an interaction have a particular effect on the social meanings of the texts constructed within a given genre. In a conversation—a genre in which power differentials are reduced—interaction is more open.

Bakhtin (1981) maintains that voice and its utterance always express a point of view, enacting particular values, and taking account of the voices being addressed, in speech or in writing. He believes that, “language is a heteroglot from top to bottom.” While speech is structured, it is also emergent. There is an intrinsic tension between constraint and choice, between the given of tradition and the newness of responsiveness of the moment (ritual and power). He asserts the intrinsic intertextuality of all utterance. We choose words according to their generic specification. Genres correspond to typical
situations, speech, communication, and themes, and consequently also to particular
connections between the meanings of words and actual concrete utterance under typical
circumstance. Speech is either a typical generic expression or it is an echo of another’s
individual expression, which makes the word as if it were a representative of another’s
whole utterance from a particular point of view.

In interviews conducted after the study, some students suggested their views of
their community seemed to have changed. The researcher observed a bond developing
among the participants and wanted to know if their view of community had changed since
their initial responses to their larger community of the whole classroom.

O: Did you feel that the 12 people who worked in this group built an inner community
within the community?
(An#2): Yes.
O: What made that happen?
(An#2): Well, us getting together and us working together on the assignments we had and
discussing what happened .the circumstances.
O: What did you learn from that? [Drama session].
(Me#7): We learned how to work together.
O: So the working together to get a response was a unique experience for you? Working
together to get to a common goal. What made it feel so good?
(Ch#5): That everyone was so patient.
O: Remember, I asked you if you felt like a community in your class and most of you said
no? Did you begin to feel like a community with the twelve people near the end?
(Me#7): After awhile it was kind of like close. We got used to the people.
O: And remember I said a community needed to depend on one another and I asked if
you depended on one another and most of you said no? Did you have to depend on
anybody here?
(Me#7): Yeah. Like for example like in our video, we had to depend on each other and
depending on people to photograph it and not to laugh.
O: So was this good?
(Me#7): Yeah. Feels good.
O: What bonded you together, you think?
(Mar#9): The fact that we were doing something different from the class and that we all had the same opinions. Not the same opinion…but everybody was themselves. More so.
O: What made that happen?
(Mar#9): In this class, you can be and do what you feel sort of, but listen to the teacher and that.
O: Did you think that you were learning something from other people?
(Mar#9): About their lives and their opinions and getting to know them deeper than before.
O: What made that happen?
(Mar#9): I don’t know…it just happened through the book. The book made it happen.
O: How so?
(Mar#9): The book was weird and you wanted to talk about it and it was just something that you really couldn’t hold back for long.

In the following excerpt from the videotaped conversation about the book, students make links with other texts they have read. Exploratory talk and negotiating of meaning began taking place, along with the beginning of questions about the content of the novel.

(Ch#5): The book is kind of weird. I don’t quite understand it.
O: What is it that you are not understanding?
(Ch#5): They are like robots or something.
(Con#6): Usually books have human figures and they’re always the same. Maniac McGee was a different person but it was an earth setting but this was totally different.
O: You don’t think this is an earth setting?
(S#10): Everything is the same to people who look outside. It’s just a big gray. You are going to be assigned to whatever.
O: You have been using the word complicated but their society seems quite simple.
(V#12): They are very organized. There are no wars. No one can break rules: peace rules.
O: Look what a peaceful society they have. Isn’t this a benefit from no one breaking rules and having rules?
(Ar#3): They have the fear of release if they break a rule.
Group: [Discussion of what Release means].
(S#10): I’m just wondering. Just say right now it was like the book, except without some of the set assignments. I wonder how the world would be, because everyone would be afraid to commit crimes.
(T#11): Like the Death Penalty.
(Mar#9): It's not really a peaceful society because everything is controlled; it's just takes peace too far.
(Con #6): You have no opinion or options or freedom. Everyone acts the same way at the same time.
(An # 2): It's like a computer game, basically, where the whole thing is all preset for you.
(Al #1): You really can't think in this community, because in the evening you have to tell them what are you thinking and there is no friction or anything.
O: But isn't this what we are all striving for? This peaceful kingdom where everyone loves everyone?
(Al # 1): No way!
(V #12): It's too strict.
O: Can't you see that this personal freedom leads to problems?
(S #10) It's almost like they are living in fear. Not like, oh my gosh someone is going to kill me, but they don't want to be released.
(Con # 6): What kind of life would you have if you don't have any opinion of your life? Somebody else controls your life.
(Al #1): They mentioned guards. Who are they? Are they part of the community?

Summary

Intertextual learning relating to issues arising from the novel was evident in the group discussions. Links were made to parallel universes, computer games, other novels and socio-cultural practices. Exploratory talk and search for words was evident as the students struggled with difficult concepts and generic modes not usually available to them in their classroom.

Explorations

In the course of the study the students could ask questions, either in writing or verbally. The researcher was disappointed to discover that the questions were ritualistic, unimaginative, and limited. The participants were asked to complete a questionnaire (a
personal inventory) before the study began. In the questionnaire they were asked to ask to pose some questions. The following is a synopsis of the kinds of questions the students asked at the beginning of the study.

Personal Inventory Questions

All participants were asked to complete a personal inventory before the study started. The inventory can be found in Appendix C.

"If you could ask one question on any topic, and get a complete answer, what would that question be?"

#1: The cure for cancer and AIDS
#2: What is the point of existing?
#3: How can we fix the ozone and clean up pollution?
#4: How was your childhood?
#5: Which came first – the chicken or the egg?
#6: How is the best way of getting back to heaven?
#7: When is the world going to be peaceful?
#8: Who was the first person besides Adam and Eve to come on Earth?
#9: What is the meaning of life?
#10: [had no question]
#11: Where do babies come from?
#12: Is there any way of making science easier to understand and how?

The questions showed, at least for the researcher, a ritualistic response to questions posed by someone in authority. Most were clichés and had nothing to do with the students personally. Only #12 asked a question that was personally puzzling. #10 did not even bother thinking of a question, had so many that he couldn’t choose one, or refused to play the game. Perhaps the finding was to be expected. There was no limiting framework, but that was deliberate as I was curious to see what response I would get to what is a frequently asked question of these students.
Elsewhere Questions

The participants were asked to describe Elsewhere. In Jonas's world, Elsewhere was a place that people were Released to for a variety of reasons. This question, too, was asked early on in the case study as a means of stimulating a questioning attitude about an unknown factor in the novel. The following written responses showed some connective thoughts.

(#2): Elsewhere seems to be a place outside of the community, a place where Jonas is feeling his Memories that he received. The place seems to allow him to become one with the Memories.

(#3): Elsewhere is a symbol used by the other to represent release. Elsewhere represents the death in release.

(#4): Elsewhere is a place where people go to get away from their every day world.

(#5): I think Elsewhere is another place. It's a peaceful place where you have a mind of your own. No one to control you and Memories are alive.

(#6): It is a place in the mind and in life where you go from problems.

(#7): Elsewhere is a good place where everything is different and where he can go with Gabe and be himself. Elsewhere is a symbol of individuality, hope and most of all love.

(#8): Elsewhere is a “place” A cottage where everyone is happy and together.

(#9): Elsewhere is a “Place.” that is “normal” to use with happy Times in a cabin or it could be life after death, with happiness. Elsewhere could be an actual place with an actual cabin and feeling and color or it could be death with happiness that has been sought through life.

(#10): Elsewhere is a memory relived by someone. It is sort of life of the past, but Jonas can't go back in Time. Its like Elsewhere is real life.

(#11): Elsewhere is death, or the past.

(#12): Elsewhere is actually the Memories that he was given thought of as reality.

The concepts expressed here are far deeper and more thoughtful than the questions posed in the Personal Inventory. The respondents had to think of what, where, and why
before responding to this question. In asking themselves these questions the answers show
far more detail, a different tenor and are less ritualistic in nature.

Questions For Author

When the students were asked to put questions to the author they reverted to type.
Although the questions were ritualistic and predictable, they were probably genuine. Some
students had no questions, but preferred to comment. Commenting is easier than asking
questions. In talking about commentary, Foucault (1972) states that commentary's role is
to say what has already been said. This ritual gives us the chance to say something other
than the text itself. Given Foucault's theory of commentary, the repetition of comments
and questions was expected. Please note that student #10 was consistent: he had no
question for the author.

(#2): I would like to know if the Novel continues in a sequel and why is it that Jonas is
going down the hill in the last few paragraphs.
(#3): I think the novel needs a sequel and that it would never be always the same because
we need differences.
(#4): I don't have any questions about the novel but I do have a comment to make. The
novel to me seems like another novel that I've read. Its called "A Wrinkle in Time".
(#5): I strongly disagree with the release of the old because old people are the same as
you and me and they have every right to live.
(#6): What happened at the end? Did they find the Elsewhere? The community should
have never went to the stage of sameness.
(#7): I like the book but I don't like how it ends. It doesn't finally end. It just says he felt
joy and love and maybe music. It should be settled.
(#8): Where did the author get this idea about this book?
(#9): How could you get an idea like that for a book? What is Elsewhere? Where is
elsewhere? How do you get to Elsewhere? Why wasn't Elsewhere better described as a
place or void in death? Where your greatest Memory takes over as your life after death?
(#11): The ending wasn't any good. She had a lot of good ideas but there was no climax. I
expected the ending to be good but no it sucked.
(#12): On the other side of the hill is their feelings and all that stuff. What is there now? What happens with the community? Are these her opinions of the future?

Clearly student (# 9) started thinking of questions about Elsewhere after he was asked to describe it. The most frequently asked question of Lois Lowry with regard to *The Giver* is whether she will ever write a sequel. It seems a sequel is demanded, as the readers are unhappy with an unsettled ending, the "writerly" script. She has stated adamantly that she has no plans to write a sequel. The possibility of jouissance is there: why not seize it?

Drama Questions

During the drama session the participants were given an opportunity, as part of the drama event, to ask questions in order to solve the "patient's" dilemma.

O: What kind of questions did you ask?
(Ma#8): About his (Booth in role) childhood, was he abused? Who he grew up with? Etc.
(Ar#3): Did he remember his parents?
(V#12): Since he didn’t remember we hypnotized him and got a lot out of him by hypnotizing him.
O: What did you use to hypnotize him.
(S#10): A pendulum.
(Ca# 4): My trusty bracelet.
(AI #1): He said he wasn’t allowed to meet the people, so we asked him if he was isolated at birth.
(Ar#3): I said… I told him he was jealous over the other person because he was a decision-maker too and then he started yelling at me.
O: What did he say?
(Ar#3): He started yelling I'm not jealous. But he really was so… I sort of worked through the wall that he had and then some other people asked him questions and finally [he] was able to cleanse himself.
O: How did you feel when all that was happening?
(Ar#3): Oh it was kind of scary, because all I said was “then you’re jealous” and then started yelling at me. I kind of jumped. He was just sitting there calm, and then next thing you know he’s yelling at me and breathing down my neck.

(Al#1): We didn’t get very far. We got more out of him the first day.

O: But the questions were different?

(S#10): We kept on going in circles

(Ca#4): We kept on asking the same questions.

S(#11) (using Booth voice) I’m the Giver. Is there another giver? NO. I’m the Giver O: so you really had to listen to what he was saying in order to find the right question to ask.

(Ca#4): He kept on going on and on about the same thing. We kept on badgering him.

O: Did anything surprise you in the last three weeks?

(Ar #3): [long pause] I don’t think so. Most of the stuff I already knew. I was just refreshing my Memory. I don’t know. I think with Mr. Booth, he surprised me the way he kept us going around in circles, because when most times when you play, like do acting, like that you go into a straight line and you go through the problem and you figure it out, but he kept on making us go through circles figuring it out and it was different. Because we kept on going in circles and circles and you couldn’t get out of the circle and then when we did we went into a different circle.

Drama can benefit students in a number of ways. It can facilitate a wide range of language used in a context that requires full participation within an affective/cognitive framework. It encourages deep-level thought processes, such as discussion, negotiation, clarification, explanation, persuasion and prediction. It provides role situations different from those in a regular classroom setting; children can begin to regulate the action. This, in turn, will affect the language use of everyone in the classroom, including the teacher.

“Modes, register and qualities of language can be released more effectively through drama than in any other classroom situation” (Booth, 1994, p.31). The children’s confidence and competence in their language abilities are both enriched and increased through the synthesis of language, feeling and thought. In the instance of this study drama brought out ritualistic questions. By pushing the students for deeper thought the questions became
more thoughtful and considered, and the students learned that thinking, questioning, and problem solving is not linear but intertextual.

Questions in Interviews and Discussions

The following excerpt illustrates the students' limited ability to find answers to their questions. Responses were ritualistic, and only with discussion, prompts and scaffolding by the researcher were the students able to move out of the ritualistic mode and see the possible intertextual quest for knowledge and answers.

O: Like Jonas, who was receiving memories and information, so are you. What questions would you like answered?
(Con#6): How is the fastest way to get to heaven the easiest way?
O: So where could you go to find the answer to that?
(Al #1): Die and then you’d know.
O: What did Jonas have to do to find some of his answers?
(Ma#8): There could be many places that you could go. You could go to the church. You could ask older people maybe they have different opinions and different Memories.
(Mar#9): Well, mine was what is the meaning of life so somewhere up there. [heaven]
O: You don’t think you might find it here? You don’t think you may find it in Tibet?
(Con#6): No, the only way would be if you saw a vision of Mary.
O: And she could give you the answer?
O: Where would you go to find the answer to your questions?
(Al #1): To the future.
O: Which came first, the chicken or the egg? Where would you find the answer to that question? Where would you go? Which community might you have to go to answer that question?
(Mar#9): Farming community.
(Al #1): The egg people. The egg farmers of Ontario.
O: Would you go to a book or would you go to a movie?
(Ma# 8): Book,
(Con#6): Neither.
(Al #1) A wise man or a wise woman.
O: You would go to a person.
[A discussion followed with book, person, and movie as suggested forms of information. Computers were never mentioned.]
(#6): There is no one on earth who knows the answer to that question.
O: You sure about that?
(Al#1): I would go into everybody’s head.

The discussion about heaven, the meaning of life, and which came first the chicken or the egg, produced ritualistic answers. The ‘heaven’ response conformed to Catholic ideology, a commentary that merely reiterated and expounded. The same was true for the response to the other two questions. The responses “the future” and “wise man or wise woman” reflect a formula, things are said once and conserved, because people suspect some hidden secret or wealth lies buried within. Learning how to ask questions and how to find answers is a pattern that is unknown to these students. With prompts and scaffolding by the researcher the students perhaps will model the same kind of questioning and permit themselves unconstrained sources for finding answers to their questions.

Student #8 who claims to read only 15 minutes a day would use a book to locate information. He says he can’t concentrate when reading, but still believes books hold knowledge.

Research Questions

At the end of the study the participants were asked about a research project they would like to do using the novel as a base. To find an idea for their project they could think of a question relating to the text that they would like answered. The following data shows the difficulty these students had in formulating questions, and establishing a course
or path that would lead them to the answers they sought. Most questions, although not
deep or well-thought out, were genuine. If given an opportunity to discuss these questions
with their colleagues, perhaps a better understanding of how to follow a path to discover
the answers might have been established. The talk is exploratory; participants are
searching for unfamiliar words.

O: How would you go about doing a research project?
(AI #1): Probably ask somebody who came from a communist country or something
O: What kind of questions would you ask them?
(AI #1): How it was run basically and then probably find out more about government and
probably record my information on tape instead of in writing.
O: Why?
(An #2): Yeah, I watch shows about all of them. [Wars, and Hitler]
O: Do you do any reading about them?
(An#2): No.
(Me #7): Does it have to be from the Giver?
O: What were you thinking of?
(Me#7): Childhood. Always wondered what children thought when they couldn’t talk.
O: Where would that come from in The Giver
(Me#7): Gabe.
O: Why was Gabe attracted by the cloud, etc.?
(Me #7): Because it was the first time he had ever seen it.
(Me#7): I would probably start with observing children and trying to understand them and
spending a lot of time with them. [not books, not movies, no talking, just observing].
[Please note, it was this student who remarked in her drama reflection that Booth (in his
role) “was a child who knew no other children.”]
(Ch#5): Memories. Memories of horror.
O: How would you go about that? How would you start a research project on Memories
and horror?
(Ch#5): I don’t know.

This student (Ch#5) likes to read books in the horror genre. She thought she might
want to do research on horror. When the researcher tired to get her to make a connection
between horror and memories she could not immediately make the connection. It is likely
that her idea of horror is based on material found in R. L. Stine books—the potential horror of unleashed memories did not match her notions of horror. This is an example of disjunction and the student’s inability to make sense of the anomaly.

O: How would you go about researching rights?
(S #10) I would probably read a little bit about Hitler and see what they thought about it.
O: They being…the people who lived at that time?
(S #10): Yeah. Even some of the holocaust victims..
O: And who else…right now?
(S#10): With all the wars in Bosnia right now, it’s like their rights should be in place. They should be able to walk down the street without being shot.
O: What other kind of rights are being – or who else’s?
(S#10): I know there is another country involved but I’m not sure.
This student can’t make connections to other forms of human right—rights based on race, gender, or equality.
O: How would you go about doing a research project on this?
(#T 11): That’s hard. It’s always hard to start something…but you have to think about it. Maybe reading the book again.
[A discussion about Release and how it was done in the novel].
O: It was with medication. A big needle.
(T #11): Injection.
O: So would you start looking into the forms of…Have you heard of Dr. Kevorkian?
(#11) Yeah. He kills people that…if you are really sick and want to die…
O: How does he do it?
(#11) Isn’t it with pills?
O: Not to the best of my knowledge. So, you want start going into Newspapers, etc. And that’s one method. There are other societies who do it in other ways.

The following student would like to research sameness, but doesn’t realize that the source of his information and analysis may be in front of him. Research topics for these students seem to have to be abstract and distant, not related to their own lives.

O: If you were going to B. A. which a lot of people are going to, they would all be wearing the same uniform. Why do you think schools institute the rule that kids wear uniforms? The same thing. That is sameness.
(Ar#3): Well, then you don’t have certain groups for styles.
O: So now you are beginning to explore why some groups or societies want sameness. You belong to scouts, don’t you? Is there sameness promoted by the scouts?
(Ar#3): Well, we wear the same uniforms. The epaulets go on their shoulders, they show rank. There is the patrol leader and the assistant patrol leader and the rest of the scouts, so it really is the same, because then we would all have the same epaulets. But in some ways it is.
O: Remember in The Giver the colour and buttons on the tunics changed? Isn’t that what happens with the scouts? Things change, you get a different colour uniform or a different epaulette
(Ar#3): That’s mostly with the youngest group. The beavers get a different colour tail. When you get into cubs, everybody has the same uniform. But in some ways people have to be different, because you don’t find anything new if people aren’t different.

Student (An# 2) wanted to do research on oppressive government. His family had lived under communist regime but he, too, failed to see that they would be a valuable source of information. He thought he could get better information from books and television documentaries. These two examples provide some evidence that students have learned to segregate their real world experiences, and as a consequence have acquired skills that have no function or use outside the classroom. As Bertram (1994) discovered, at the heart of the inquiry model lies a meaningful question. As the learner investigates an issue she or he is simultaneously engaged in the discovery of information related to the particular topic area suggested by the question and equally important, in the examination of various modes and forms of discourse. The student can formulate broad questioning of his or her own experience and reflect on the social implication of this new knowledge. The following are comments and observations made by the classroom teacher.

O: What about research skills? Do you see a research project stemming from a novel study?
T: I would think so...for example, if you’re dealing with a novel where there might be some places of interest or historical figures or something like that then you might be able
to research a particular place or time period in history. Pre-World War or during the Depression. I’m thinking of some novels that took place during the depression.

Q: Have you ever assigned a research project when doing a novel?

T: I think I did one a couple of years ago when we did... Underground to Canada – that one stands out right away.

Q: If you were assigning a research project, with a novel or otherwise, what kind of skills would you expect a grade eight kid to have?

T: If they were researching a novel? The need to know the background of the time period, no matter what they are researching. So if they are researching a character in WWII they have to know a little bit about what was going on in WW II as that takes you a little bit into the psyche, or a group of people like the fascists in Germany or something like that. So they would have know something about the time period. They should be able to... they have to know where to look and they have to know all the resources. For example, when they did history and geography projects. I told them to look beyond the library, so some went to travel agents and some went to consulates. So they have to be made aware of those things by the teacher because a lot of these kids are not going to know that may include just a list of places or phone numbers and addresses as a directory and that’s all time-consuming stuff and you don’t want kids to take two hours to find the Indian embassy. Basically all the skills of looking for information. Basically knowing where to go for the information and bringing it back.

Q: Once the kids have collected their information do you have any input on how to organize that information?

T: What I usually do is to get them to come back and I’ll give them one or two questions that they have to research [researcher’s emphasis] and then they have to bring back the information and [I] ask them to write a synopsis of what that particular information is and then I’ll go over it with them individually. Because often what you ask is not what you get. They may go off on two or [more] different tangents, so I think they have to be guided along because a lot of times you think once they get the information, they think it’s a matter of copying it out, so you get into paraphrasing and plagiarism and the importance of respecting other people’s work, you get into other kinds of issues. Some just go into the computer, press the print button, and get everything out of there, and then you notice two or three kids have the exact same information. So that is something we will have to deal with in the future ...computer stuff.

Summary

Asking questions is unfamiliar for these students, so as a consequence the intertextual nature of their learning is limited. Connections from one question to another are weak, and the texts students use for gathering information are traditional and limited.
Perhaps some of their inability to ask questions are embedded in pedagogical practice, given that teachers tend to ask questions which the students must answer. Statements made by the teacher in the above discussion indicate that this teacher is most comfortable when posing questions to the students and framing research work. Students are not allowed to go off on a tangent. It is interesting to note that the teacher believes the information and methods of acquiring information from the computer will be of concern to him in the future. It would seem, at least to the researcher that the future is now.

Bertram (1994) discovered that the inquiry model uses a broader and more encompassing definition of experience and places far more emphasis on consideration of the social implications of learning. However, if procedural prompts are used, as suggested by Rosenshine and Meister (1996) students can learn the pattern of this activity.

Abduction

Pierce (1995) argues that every instance of critical thinking begins with the observation of something that is surprising — an unexpected occurrence or anomaly. The process of noting something unexpected, searching for connections to create possible hypotheses, and evaluating whether or not to test out the hypotheses, Pierce calls abduction. He believes that it is the only process that can result in new knowledge.

Intertextuality is a process that involves both disjunctions and connections that are set in motion when learners encounter anomalies through their interactions with other learners and texts. The connections allow learners to link ideas together, see new relationships, and bring unity to their understandings. The disjunctions, the ideas that do
not fit, force learners to go back and reconsider evolving and past texts and so can lead to fundamental changes in their thinking.

The following are comments and observations made by the teacher with regard to critical thinking. I use the term critical thinking here to avoid any misunderstandings of the terms disjunctions and abduction. Although not interchangeable, exploring disjunctions certainly would involve critical thinking.

O: How do you assess critical thinking?

T: I basically assess it orally by observation, how they respond whether their answer is a critique or whether it’s just a simple thing – I liked it because he’s funny. I try to relate it to their own lives. Do you know anyone who is like that? There really is not too many ways. Trying [to get] kids to analyze, and taking something apart, and how and why we watch, how much society influences what we watch and we have to get into what society expects us to do and what we should do for ourselves.

O: Do you, or any other teacher you know, teach thinking skills directly? For example, you said that we have to teach them how to analyze and separate and categorize and evaluate. Do we have, or do you have, formal lessons? Today we are going to learn how to analyze.

T: I know there was a teacher I worked with last year and she was terrific. She was a librarian. She would do lessons on research, thinking skills, critiquing skills, and the kids didn’t know where she was coming from initially, but by the end of the year, I noticed even in my class they were answering. I’ve always said I like to see it as part of the curriculum myself, as a separate subject if we had to, but if not we should have more of...like in history. I used flowcharts a lot, it gives kids something to focus on it – doesn’t make it as overwhelming. Like read five pages and answer 12 questions. These kids are visual learners. I think it’s a lot easier for them. Indirectly a lot of us are doing that, but we need to start as early as grade one. Why are we lining up? As long as they are thinking and asking questions. I have always looked at the Socratic method. I’m always asking the questions. [researcher’s emphasis]. Make sure they are listening.

The following are samples of data that indicate experiences with abduction. This excerpt was used previously to illustrate the necessity of dialogue to achieve intertextual learning, and in particular in trying to explain the pain of memories. Being truly intertextual, it serves many purposes in analysis.
O: Does anyone want to help him out here? Why do his dreams hurt?
(Con#6): Because they’re bad Memories.
(AI#1): So what?
(Con#6): Have you ever had bad Memories?
O: Bad Memories don’t cause pain?
(Con#6): You’ve never had bad Memories, have you?
(AI#1): Falling down the stairs is fun?
(Mar#9): Even if people have really bad dreams...They don’t really like getting hurt unless they’re really psychos.
(Con#6): Let’s say you have ... or you’re thinking of someone being dismantled in front of you.
(Mar#9): That doesn’t hurt?
(Con#6): Sure it does
(AI#1): But it’s not physical pain?
O: Now you’re bringing up the question of what is pain. You know when somebody really hurts your feelings.
(AI#1): It doesn’t cause you to limp.
O: But do you not feel like somebody kicked you in the stomach.
(AI#1): That doesn’t explain it. Somebody says you’re stupid you don’t start limping.
O: You don’t physically limp, but you certainly walk around wounded. If people verbally abuse you, constantly, you don’t think you are walking around hurt and that you start taking it out on other people? (AI#1): Yeah, but Jonas thinks like he’s going to get bruised from it or something or break his bones.
O: It may not break your bones but it surely breaks your spirit.
(AI#1): O.K. but it didn’t explain that.

In this discussion about memories and pain some students make the connections, but not by (AI #1). Only after discussion, prompts and scaffolding by researcher and other students does he begin to link ideas, see new relationships between pain and memories, and bring unity to his understanding. He had to reconsider evolving and past texts, and that led to fundamental changes in his thinking about pain. These intertextual connections occurred within a particular social environment that allowed the dialogue and inquiry to open up among learners.
O: So you felt no pressure here?
(Al#1): A bit in the beginning. Having to read the book in three days.
O: What exactly did you learn?
(Al#1): Our lives are better that what they had. Communism isn’t right. People don’t have much say. Their lives are run for them.
O: Did anything surprise you?
(Al#1): Not really. The book ended unexpectedly. I thought he was going to go back to the town after. I didn’t understand the ending. He heard the music.
O: How do you think the book should have ended.
(Al#1): I probably would have added another fifty pages. He leaves and he worries the people for a little while and then they don’t care and he comes back after.
O: What happens when he comes back?
(Al #1) Because he learned a lot while he was gone?
O: What did he learn?

The information is in this students head, but he is having great difficulty connecting the learning that Jonas acquired with the learning that he himself as acquired about rules, memories, and freedom of will.

O: Did anything come as a surprise for you?
(An #2): Well, kind of... when you were talking about the newspaper article, the communities that are building walls around them. I had heard about it once at Gifted (class), but I really didn’t think about it with the book, and when you mentioned it, and in a way it made a connection, how it’s happening already, with people blocking out anybody else. ... 
O: Would it be a good idea to teach this way most of the time?
(An #2) I don’t know about most of the time, because kids are used to the other way, and this takes longer than normal learning. So this would be more of a program that kids should take.
O: Do you think that you learned more this way, than your usual way or different things?
(An # 2): Different. If we had done it like we usually do, I might have learned more about the story, like plot, climax, etc. and this is more about feelings.
O: Where do you think you learn more from? Your own personal feelings or cognitive the brain kind of thing.
(An # 2): My own feelings.
Now that this student has discovered this about himself, which I'm sure came as a surprise to him, what will he do with this information? Will he approach his future studies aesthetically, or continue to emphasize the cognitive and the efferent? Further examples of difficulties in making connections and following through with disjunctive meanings follow.

A question was asked about the purpose memory served in the Christian religion

(Con #6): Last Supper.
O: And what did He say?
[prompting to remember parts of the Mass]
(Con#6): Do this in Memory of me.
O: And do you know how many years it's been
C: Two thousand.

Despite prompting from the researcher, this participant, while he made the connection with Jesus, he couldn't make further significant connections to Christian textual links. The researcher was perplexed as it would be expected that these students, immersed in the Christian faith since birth, would see the significance of the ritual of the Last Supper and Holy Communion and the importance of this rite as an important memory in Christian belief.

It was clear that the connection of memories and of story telling was a difficult one for this student.

(Ch#5): Maybe she [Lois Lowry] would like to go into a community like that.
O: You think she wants to live in a community like that. Why would, she...a writer...were there any story tellers in this community?
(Ch# 5): No.
O: Why not? Why are there no writers or storytellers?
(Ch# 5): Because they are pretty much the same kind of people.
O: And what do story tellers and writers do?
(Me #7): They kind of in a way... they cut away at the truth. Everything is supposed to be straightforward.
O: There are all kinds of writers. Before there was print, before there were books, how did people know anything?

(Me#7): Through mouths.


(Me #7): People speaking. Gossip kind of thing.

O: Gossip, yeah. So when you are gossiping, what are you doing?

(Me #7): You are retelling a story.

O: That happened when...?

(Me# 7): In the past.

O: OK. Why are there no storytellers in this community? Do you remember that all the books were hidden from the community? Why?

(Me# 7): People’s attitudes might change.

O: What do books hold?

(Ch# 5): Memories.

O: And if people read books, they receive Memories. So why do you think Lois Lowry wrote this book?

(Me #7): To keep people learning, to show what would happen to communities without books.

O: And without Memory. That’s maybe what motivated her. She doesn’t want people to forget their past and she doesn’t want people to...for example, if you have seen a video, and Jonas did see a video of his father releasing the baby, how could that be or how could that Memory be altered? It’s a video—what can you do to video’s?

(Ch# 5): You can erase them.

(Me# 7): You can change them.

O: How could you have changed that video?

(Ch #5): Just play over it.

O: Can you do that a with a book?

(Me# 7): No. Well you could read over and change bits of it like secret codes and stuff.

The girls were having a difficult time making the connection between the absence of storytellers in the novel, the role of storytellers in a society, the absence of books in Jonas’s community, and the absence of memories. The connections were beginning to happen, but something obviously wasn’t fitting into their notion of memories and storytelling. There were many places this conversation could have gone, many connections
and links. Also possible was the discovery of many anomalies and disjunction, including 
the censorship of books, movies and television, or the technology of dubbing and editing.

These girls were not ready to make the leap.

O: Did anything surprise you in the last three weeks?

(Ar#3) (long pause) I don’t think so. Most of the stuff I already knew. I was just 
refreshing my Memory. I don’t know. I think with Mr. Booth. He surprised me the way he 
kept us going around in circles because when most times when you play... like do acting 
like that you go into a straight line and you go through the problem and you figure it out 
but he kept on making us go through circles figuring it out and it was different because we 
kept on going in circles and circles and you couldn’t get out of the circle and then when 
we did we went into a different circle. Made me think about things I’ve never thought 
about.

The realization that thinking and problem solving is not linear came as a surprise to 
this student. What will he do with this knowledge in the future? (V#12) also noted the 
different approaches and strategies needed to come to an understanding of a problem.

O: Why do you think he (Booth) played the stubborn part? Do you think there was a 
reason as to why he was so stubborn. What was he trying to do?

(V#12): Not really sure. Maybe really trying to make us think.

O: And did you really have to think?

(V#12): I did. We really tried hard to get it out of him.

O: What did you learn? That you needed to get information to get out of him

(V#12): You sort of had to ask him new ways so he wouldn’t think we were intruding 
with his community and that we were not asking him personal questions.

(Ar#3) may have recognized an anomaly: why is sameness in the scouts OK but 
not in Jonas’s community? Will he begin the process of searching out connections to 
create a possible hypothesis, evaluate and test out the hypothesis? This is the student who 
discovered the problem solving was not linear. Will he apply this process to this question?

O: Did Lois Lowry raise any questions for you about life?

(T#11): Not sure... that maybe there are some people like that out there. The Devil 
worshippers and people like that, that live in their own little World, its just like they are
programmed to do one thing, so they really don't have any feelings, like serial killers and people like that, so they don't care about any one else. They don't know how to because...

Q: Do you feel that the community in the book was that extreme? They weren't killing anyone were they?

(T#11): No. But they didn't know what they were doing...They didn't know better. They weren't being themselves. They were just being other people. They didn't get a chance to be themselves...because they always could ride a bike until certain age and had to see if they were chosen and things like that, and there is none of that in our community.

Q: Oh, really? Can you vote? You have to wait to be a certain age ...[conversation about rules and regulations ensues.]

In this sample we find the student making a connection to devil worshippers. The researcher, without thinking, limits the discussion by suggesting that perhaps Jonas's community was not as extreme as a community of Devil worshippers. But indeed, Jonas's community did kill people and did sacrifice human beings. The student was making a link that the researcher at that time wouldn't permit him to follow. He went on a different track but could not see the anomaly that indeed, in some respects, our community was very similar to Jonas's community. In the conversation that followed with the researcher about rules and regulations he began to go back and reconsider evolving and past texts, and began a fundamental change in his thinking.

Connections

According to Lemke's framework the researcher's study was co-thematic (memories), co-generic (narrative), and co-orientating (use of interpersonal or value-orientation points of view). In the following section discussions and written responses will be examined to see which texts the students considered to be relevant to the interpretation
of *The Giver.* What kinds of meanings were not made? Why did the students make connections of some kinds but not others, between some texts, but not others?

Stance has to do with reader's and writers openness or responsive understanding to indeterminacies and ambivalencies intrinsic in discourse. Readers may adopt a stance of responsive understanding in so far as they are actively exploring multiple meanings. By entertaining and articulating multiple, conflicting meanings, students break out of rigid modes of thinking to entertain alternative perspectives. They assimilate the words and idea of others, and struggle to sort out the jumble of images, values, words ideas unleashed by a culture. In the process they free themselves and formulate their own ideology.

Connections to other texts were most readily made when the film, *The Quest* was viewed. The following extract was taken from #2's journal.

The movie is connected to *The Giver* in many ways. The main character is Chosen for a painful task just like Jonas. Jonas had to receive Memories to help the community while that guy had to go to the gate to open it, so that his community would live longer lives. At the end of *The Giver,* Jonas is somewhere else than his community, a place no longer known about. The guy reaches a place as well that people no longer know about, and elsewhere. This movie also reminds me of gifted because we saw the movie at gifted. This movie is like the Olympics, because this guy had to run, swim in sand and throw a javelin. The guy also reminds me of Jesus because Jesus opened the gates of heaven with his death while the guy opened the gates, which let in the light of life. This movie is kind of set in the future where everything is somehow mixed up just like in *The Giver.* There is also a council, which makes all the decision that are known about, just like the Giver.

O: You had seen it once before so you knew about the strangeness. Did you know why I was showing it, and the connection to *The Giver*?

(An#2): Yes.

O: What was the connection?

(An #2): There were sacrifices made both by the person who went on the quest and Jonas, who made the sacrifice of becoming the receiver and taking on all the Memories all upon himself — a large job, which also this person in the quest did.
This student found Jesus and the Olympics relevant to his interpretation of this particular text. He said the movie reminded him of his Gifted class, but did not elaborate on the connection. Why not? He connected texts that he saw as being on the same topic. With those texts that shared the same genre structure, his connections were strong. Where the genre differed, as in the Olympics, the connections were not developed. The connection to the life of Jesus was a different genre, but familiar genre to the student, which enabled him to make strong connections to the text. This student watched many hours of science fiction on television. Why did he not connect the book to television shows or movies. Perhaps, he did, but chose not to write about it.

In the group discussion about The Giver and film The Quest, the following observations were made.

(Mar#9): It was different from the book but the same idea and the way it worked out.
O: Did it help you understand the book better?
(Mar #9): Yeah. Some of the concepts of the book
O: What concepts did it clarify?
(Mar #9): Different place and in different situations, people are the same. Change. The journey was the same. Purpose of journey was different and this one was for longer life and...

(Ar#3): They were all connected with dreams and Memories or making decision. The Giver had to help the elders make decisions and in the movie the boy had to make a decision how to play the games or do stuff during his journey towards the gateway.

(T#11): It had a lot to do with the book. It was shorter and less detailed, but you have to sort of connect it. There was a chosen one.
O: There was no talking. So how did you know what was going on?
(#11) You could tell there was a chosen one... and he had a mission to bring the light and that would have allowed them to live longer... so obviously they had made mistakes before, choosing people that couldn’t do it, but they made the right choice this Time and he did it
O: And The Giver?
(#11) They had also made mistakes.
O: So by watching the movie, did it help you to understand the book?
(#11) Yeah, it sort of wrapped it up... like it was faster... it was sort of... something to help you remember.

(AI#1): The movie was cool; it explained itself better than the book did.

(#3): I think it was pretty good. Some connections: the boy in the Giver had to free the Memories, but in the Quest the boy had to go and open up the gate, so the light could spread all over the people, so they could have a longer life. In the movie, the boy met an older man like the Giver and he helped him. He also met a lot of challenges on the way. Some monsters, and played a cool game with cubes and cones that disintegrated each other.

(#5): A baby was born and the baby was the chosen one. He had a blue line down his hand that meant he had a long life span. Jonas was also the chosen one from birth but he did not have the line down his hand. The chosen one went through two days of travelling. Jonas went through a lot more in the Quest the life span was 8 days: In the Giver it was much longer. The chosen one started his journey on the second day. Jonas started a lot later.

Opinions (#5 continues)
I thought the movie was the best school movie I have ever seen. Usually the movies here are dull and boring, but this movie kept me interested. The Giver was very much the same as the Quest. I think we should watch another movie just like that one. It was interesting.

[After seeing the movie a second time.]
I like watching the Quest more on the screen than on the TV because, when I was watching it on the screen, I felt a part of the movie as if I was there. It also sounded much better. It was also much easier to grasp on the screen. I understood the plot much better. I loved the suspense just before something happened.

(#6): It was a good film but I thought it went too quickly. I would have been better if it was in a slower pace, so you could comprehend everything. Things that are similar between the Giver and the Quest was the main character was given Memories knowledge. Jonas was sent to change the community for the better. The community did not know the knowledge in both. The people chose the “one” from birth. This reminded me of Jesus Christ. He was chosen to bring the light. Jesus came to fill us with knowledge and understanding, just as in the film. The challenges were challenges just like in life.

(#8): This movie reminds me of The Giver. There was chosen one and a receiver. The No Name boy (chosen one) and Jonas were both like Jesus. Jesus was also the chosen one. I thought the movie was confusing; there was a lot of different scene, which I felt lost.

(#10): This film was not a film I would rent. The baby born was the chosen one, just like Jonas. They both had important tasks. If either of them failed or didn’t proceed, their community would live in misery. The two boys also remind me of Jesus Christ. They were all born to save their people and they all completed their tasks. They all gave up something they loved in order to free their people.

(#11): This movie was connected to The Giver because there was a Giver and a receiver. In The Giver people are released when they’re old, and in The Quest, if the chosen one doesn’t complete his quest, which is to open the gate for the light to come through. Originally, they only have 8 days to live, but if the chosen one opened the gate they would
have a normal life span. The giver and the receiver reminded me of Jesus. They all had a mission, a quest. The book and the movie both remind of the book *A Wrinkle in Time*. They all have the same thing in common.

#12: This film was different than any film I’ve seen. It was like the book, because there was a chosen one, someone unique who has to accomplish something. It was different because their life span was only 8 days, while in the book they had regular lives. He was so to like Jesus because he had to help others, in this case, help their lives become fuller and longer lives. The chosen one was like the Giver, because he had a teacher; there were elders. It was really different at the end, because there was an ending; they finished the film and everyone was happy and their lives changed – in *The Giver* nothing was accomplished and nothing changed.

The students connected *The Giver* with the movie *The Quest* quite readily, and in this connection related the two to Jesus, Olympics, and the novel *A Wrinkle in Time*. No other novel, movie, television show, or person was mentioned. The connection to Jesus in this community could be understood, as they were all immersed in the Christian theology, many had read *A Wrinkle in Time* collectively as a class, but where were the other connections to popular culture, and to their own personal lives? Why were these not forthcoming? Perhaps part of the answer is to be found in the use of genres in classroom use, in pedagogical requirements, and reading response practices.

In the conversation below, (#12 describes her drawing that represents her learning throughout the study.

(V#12): The first three at the top is read the book, saw the film then we dramatized it. The middle part is three things that we learned or that I learned. How to read faster than before, when we read something for Fun, we understand it better, that everybody has different opinions on whatever they are reading, and the two sides, things that I liked. The fact that we read a book in three days and that we actually got to dramatize and got to see ourselves on TV. (V#12’s) Final Product.[See Appendix F]

The following are comments made by the teacher with regard to teaching co-
genically, or co-thematically.
O: Do you make attempts to integrate the curriculum?

T: Some of the novels you will integrate some science or history. I’m thinking of *Underground to Canada* as a good example to integrate history. A little bit more difficult with mathematics. Although you sometimes can touch on certain things. I touch on Geography. I don’t teach geography this year. But in the past I’ve done that. I’m thinking specifically grade 6 geography and the Canadian themes. You can do a little bit of that. Even religion and family life to a certain extent. Touching on moral issues and things like. So I would say…not extensively but it has to come naturally it has to progress and if it comes out of the class, sometimes.

O: You don’t plan for it. If it happens, you use it.

T: I don’t plan that much for it. I like things to be spontaneous. Sometimes kids will give you ideas and then you think, that will fall into what we’re talking about in history of religion, and you just go from there sometime. I’m very flexible; I just go with what the kids like and go from there.

O: What’s the first novel you started off with?

T: We started off with Maniac McGee.

O: You would not sit down and say these are some of the themes, and this is how I could integrate? You don’t plan for it?

T: I don’t do it that way. I may list the themes from that. If I see the kids are pushing towards something, I can take it one step further. Well, I don’t say these are the themes this is where it’s going to fit in and don’t cram it down their throats.

I asked a participant what was different about the learning experienced as compared to the regular class routine:

(An# 2): More of an emotional level than usual. Because usually it’s just on an academic level and all this comprehension stuff. It was more emotional.

O: What did you feel and what did you think kind of stuff. And did you like that approach?

(An #2) Yeah.

O: Why did you like it?

(An #2) It was a change. It allowed me to do more that I usually do in the classroom. I got to use the computer camera and the questions were just different.

O: But did you think you were learning?

(#An 2): Yeah.

O: What were you learning?

(An # 2): Learned how mistakes can be repeated, and emotions, people are very different. That the world would be very different without emotions and if it was only controlled by a few, which is already with world leaders but not to the extent as here. (the novel).
O: Did your teachers ever try to introduce something like a movie or short story, or poem that connected with the novel that you were reading. Do you ever remember that happening?
(#6): Never.

In conclusion I would like to end with a statement made by (#10) the composer of the Fun poem that started the analysis of this study. I feel his comments summarized not only his individual response to the cycle of activities but also reflected the groups.

O: Did any learning take place for you?
(S #10): Just thinking.
O: Just thinking. That's a lot isn't it?
(S #10): Yeah. The stupid book made me think.
O: What did it make you think about?
(S #10): It made me think about the book, because it is all screwed up, and then how it related to life now.
O: Did it relate to your life in any way?
(S #10): Not so much relate as compared to how life is compared to the book... Like we have all these colours and they have nothing and once Jonas found out about colour, he was all happy.
O: Was thinking hard?
(S #10): I've never read a book like that, it was really different for me and made me think.
O: What did you think of the drama with Mr. Booth?
(S #10): Surprising. I didn't think it would be like that. He's actually a good actor. There's a lot of improvising going on, so you actually had to think. Again.
O: You know the first thing you told me was that you thought it was Fun, but by golly you seemed to have been doing a lot of thinking. Thinking must be fun, S.
(S #10): Yeah.

There are many threads in these findings that support the idea of the value of intertextual learning in the classroom. The threads consisted of personal responses and questions to everyday life, institutions and society. The threads led to some answers to the initial questions of the study, and found that the weavings of the threads lead to creating a fabric and place the threads into a web of possibilities for multiple literacies.
Some of the possibilities will be discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

"You are ‘The Giver’.”
(A grade eight student)

Teachers are often asked by parents and others to identify the best way to teach reading and writing. All literacy-based programs “work” to some degree or another. Process writing programs tend to create different kinds of practice and texts than genre-based programs. There is no “best” way. Instead, teachers need to consider social and cultural issues. As Luke (1998) points out, it is about how and to what ends we can reshape students’ reading and writing practices with cultural texts—in communities facing new and old technologies, media and modes of expression, emergent hybrid cultures and institutions, and forms of cultural identities and life journeys which are unparalleled. “It is about the kinds of literate cultures students are likely to encounter, and how we would have them design and redesign those cultures and their texts (New London Group, 1997; Buckingham and Sefton-Green, 1996).” (Luke, 1998. p.306)

It is essential that we undertake a social analysis of the dynamic communities in which children live, including social institutions, workplaces, and mass cultures. It is in these communities that students will use conventional print literacy and new multiliteracies alike to access, construct, and respond to information, whether it be print, electronic, or personal. “They will use literacies to shape their values, ideologies and identities, and to design and redesign the practices of civic and community life”(Luke, p. 306).

This analysis of what was involved in literacy in one group of grade eight students raised questions about what was involved in reading. Is it reading when the text is not
present but is being discussed? Is it reading if the talk is related to the text in some way at a later time? Is it reading if life experiences are related to text interactions? (Cochran-Smith, 1984). In what ways are events in the classroom interrelated? What models of reading are being constructed in and through everyday interactions with and about text? What counts as or becomes a text in a classroom?

The exploration of the context in which teacher-student interactions were embedded also raised methodological questions for us. When does an event begin and end? What is the relationship between a particular segment of talk, the speech event in which it is embedded, and other events with the classroom? How are linkages made between oral, written, and published texts, as well as about the ‘life texts’ of students?

The questions raised in this study suggest a need to explore reading from a situated perspective—that the models of reading as only a “within the head” process are limiting our understanding of reading in its everyday forms. This study showed not only that reading was a socially accomplished event, but also that by participating in the events of reading in this classroom students were constructing a particular model of reading, or rather, interpreting text. Finally, the analysis of the interrelationship of events showed that to understand reading from an insider’s perspective researchers need to consider the sociocultural history of life in the social group.

Personal Reflections

My interest in intertextual learning stemmed from an earlier study I conducted in the area of print and film. During this study it became evident that students learn from a
variety of nonprint texts. More importantly, the learning was more meaningful if students were able to make connections among the texts.

This current study provided me the opportunity to examine the kind, degree and quality of intertextual learning. The students that volunteered for the study knew me as I had been the teacher-librarian in the school for four years, and the students were aware of my teaching style and expectations. This perhaps would explain the openness, frankness and honesty of the participants. The homeroom teacher interviewed, as may be obvious, is from an older school of instruction. Therefore, if the students seemed to lack the ability to ask questions, or make meaningful connections, it is not the “fault” of this particular teacher, but his precursors and myself as the conductor of this research as perhaps I was not guiding them in a way to ask relevant questions.

My role as participant-researcher proved to be problematic from time to time. I wanted to allow the discussion to follow its natural course, but at times felt compelled to intervene to control the discussion so that the discussions would benefit my research. The ethical and subjectivity dilemmas of the researcher became evident. I now see that guiding the discussion and interview is necessary in order for learning to occur, questions to be asked and connections to be made. Many times I felt I was rushing the students through the process because I needed to produce the “data.” In these instances I adopted my teacher role so that students would work more quickly.

In general, I was satisfied with the work, with the exception of the written responses. I was disappointed that the sound failed during the recording of the drama sessions, however, it did give me an opportunity to examine intertextuality when I asked the participants to remember their roles and their dialogue of the proceedings. I would like
to have introduced other texts to the study — e.g., a computer application, perhaps another form of print and visual text, (e.g. newspaper, non-fiction, photos, artwork) in order to see what other kinds of intertextual connection might be made, and also if it would produce a different quality of intertextual connections. Too, it might have changed the students own concluding text.

I worried that one or more students would drop out of the study, and wondered how this would change the dynamics of the study. Fortunately none did, and whereas one student did not read the entire book, she was still able to learn and make connections due to the dialogue and group interactions.

I am committed to the importance of intertextual learning and its importance in promoting multiple literacies in schools. After a two-year sabbatical from school culture, I am now in a position to view school learning from the inside again. To my consternation it seems that teachers have embraced the present government’s approach to the teaching of reading and writing where print is the only source of information, and where students can be evaluated by discrete measurement of reading and writing skills. I would hope that in some subversive way, by using film and popular culture with the mandated texts and outcomes they would still be able to meet the governments requirements. The concept of intertextual learning is perhaps intended for students on another planet, in another time. The challenge for me is to find like-minded colleagues and a fissure in the system that would allow for intertextuality and multiple literacies to flourish. I am convinced that the only way students will have the opportunity to learn intertextually, and have the chance to develop multiple literacies, is to have teachers-in-training learn of the joys and pleasures of
intertextual learning. Only then will students be properly equipped to make with the ability to make critical, creative, and life-affirming connections.

Brief Review of Findings

This study began with an initial question, to see if and how students learned intertextually, and what activities brought out deeper and more profound connections among texts. For example, did students make connections to their spiritual life, did the students make universal connections. This study showed that students went though a process of self-realization and demonstrated satisfaction with the learning that had occurred. They disclosed information about their reading, speaking, and writing preferences and practices. They were making intertextual connections throughout the study, but the most significant ones occurred in the drama, film, and videotaping events, and in the discussions that followed about memories and communities. The reading of the text and the written responses to the print text, The Giver, produced the least number of intertextual links. Here they were also making intertext connections but it was more readily seen in the drama, videotaping, and movie viewing, and in dialogues with their peers.

Reading and Writing, Speaking and Viewing

The data revealed that reading school texts, for these adolescent students was mainly not pleasurable. Their own choice of reading often was. Reading practices in school revealed a mechanistic and discrete reading of novels, with answering comprehension questions being the order of the day. Writing, too, was considered a chore.
Writing was described by the students and the teacher as "writing stories." There was no
discussion that involved the writing of history notes, science reports or movie reviews.
Only one student seemed to be able to break away and discover his own voice in the
writing process.

Most participants enjoyed speaking, but there was evidence of constraint and
struggle as they felt pressure either from their peers or their teachers. The intertextual
nature of learning was most evident in this mode of communication. Exploratory talk led
to connections and links to other texts and their own personal lives.

Students considered viewing films, on the big screen or on video, a pleasurable
activity. However, in school they rarely enjoyed the process. The teacher indicated that it
was important that viewing be seen as instructional and not entertaining, and this activity
even at times encroached into the students' private and personal pleasures when he asked
them to critique a television program they found enjoyable. The videotaping activity was a
pleasurable, interactive, and intertextual experience. Viewing the film, The Quest, and
participating in the videotaping events produced rich intertextual links; the latter and the
activities around it produced the greatest number of intertextual links and connections in
this study. The links were rich because the students were able to draw from a great many
"textual" experiences to make meaning of the film and the videotaping experience.

The drama experience illustrated the students' "back and forth" pattern of learning
as they made meaning from the experience. In this large-group activity appropriation was
evident in the student's speech; they made a series of connections and links as they tried to
resolve the problem of the "patient." The one-hour activity changed the students,
producing in them a deep and profound intertextual learning. The links were deep and
profound as connections that were made manifested the dislocation and ec-static notion of
jouissance as presented by Barthes. Students became aware that connections each one of
them made produced an even greater understanding of their own learning as the situation
presented by Booth began to unfold. Talk and activities dealing with memory and
community exposed a minefield of intertextual learning. What made it a threatening
experience for some students, and therefore a bountiful intertextual experience, were the
unexpected responses from the “patient” and the “psychiatrists”. All students had to make
connections quickly but carefully, as one never knew how the “patient” might respond.
The unexpected responses were able to dislocate the assumptions of the participants, and
the occasion of this story was used for a certain transformation of understanding. It was
demonstrated that there are no fixed texts but only interpretative strategies making them.
This intertextual experience affirms Iser’s and Riffaterre’s statements that the reader’s
enjoyment begins when he himself becomes productive, and the semiotic process really
takes place in the reader’s mind. Final texts illustrated an understanding of the issues
raised in *The Giver*, and all demonstrated an understanding of the connections among the
texts introduced, and an increased level of intertextual learning.

**Questions and Connections**

While the drama, film viewing, and videotaping events demonstrated an
understanding of relations that connects one text to another, asking questions and making
connections proved to be problematic for the students when it seemed to them that there
was no text to launch them into an investigative state. It was in this process that the
students showed considerable weakness in knowing how to make connections and ask
questions that might lead to new understandings. Often, when met with an anomaly, students would not pursue the disjunction and ask why. There were many reasons for this, but ritual and power structures in place in schools hinder the asking of vital questions and the making of connections. In school culture teachers are the ones that ask questions. Students are not sure if they are asking the right questions. If modelling their teachers questions of them, which often are strictly comprehension and content questions, it is little wonder that to pose questions and to follow it through different textual experiences seems disquieting and foreign. Intertextual learning, if it is to be considered an entry to encourage multiple literacies, must enter into the school literacy designs.

Implications for Practice

Michael Sullivan, a partner and employment advisor in Fifty Plus Communication Consultant states:

Most “Generation Xers” are techno-literate and process vast amounts of information simultaneously. They are much more comfortable with diversity than previous generations have been and see global issues easily. They are entrepreneurial and self-reliant and seek fun and meaning in their work. They are supreme skeptics and cynics and value authenticity and candor. Provide meaningful work and link what you do to improving humankind. Keep fun prevalent. Provide instruction and communication in multimedia. Talking heads, dull memos and handbooks don’t work with this group. Use charts, photos, graphics, colour, sound, tech-gadgets and interactive-computer -based training (Humphries, 1998, B 10).

The quote summarized the need and rationale for change in teaching practices.

This current study has certain implications for teaching practices and curriculum development. In the following, the importance of recognizing the stance and voice of the
adolescent in the classroom, reading and writing practice, popular culture, inquiry learning and student teacher relationships will be discussed in an intertextual curriculum.

Stance

This study served to illustrate the impact various teaching approaches can have on students’ responses to literature. Purves (1985) uses the term “shared or cultural significance” to refer to understandings that communities of readers may have about the works that are read. By “personal significance” he refers to individual understandings that a reader can have that are unique to him or her alone. It would seem that the efferent approaches used in the researcher’s study encouraged students to focus on the shared or cultural significance of the works to which they were responding. Students tended to hold back their personal opinions and to respond to the works by analyzing them according to their understanding of expected literary or artistic elements. The responses were also more detached from the works, resembling a formalistic approach to literature. The written responses were efferent, despite the fact that, although an aesthetic approach was encouraged, at no time was the impression given that personal opinions were to be discouraged, or that there was one correct answer. Still, most of the resultant responses held back most personal opinions and were expressed often in a conventional style, with an absence of personal referents. Elements of power, ritual and lack of some genre knowledge perhaps explained the holding back of personal references and opinions.

The aesthetic approaches used in this study encouraged an emphasis on what Purves identifies as personal significance. Students who were able to embrace this
approach focused on the secondary worlds that they created from the reading experience, and on reacting to that world. They were more likely to respond by illustrating how their literary and life experiences added to the meaningfulness of the story experience, or how they visualized the literary work itself. They were much less likely to analyze the text as an object, concentrating instead on giving personal reactions to the events that unfolded.

Readers should be given daily opportunities to experience literary works and to respond to them aesthetically, not just efferently, through their choice of activities, whether in one-to-one conversations with peers, in conferences with their teachers, in small interest groups, or in a literary community made up of the whole class. Writing can be another mode of response and can be both a private and a public means of responding. Art, drama, and even filmmaking, can also be means of responding to and extending literary experiences. As students respond aesthetically, teachers should guide them in the use of selective attention where the emotions, associations, and images that are evoked are continually used to deepen and enrich the overall story experience. An intertextual experience of jouissance.

An intertextual approach could be a movement away from literary critiques that resemble detached, impersonal, text-centered criticism. In this teaching scenario, the magic of literature — its value and the importance of its personal significance — are not lost. Consequently, teachers will ensure that students develop critical abilities (that is we make the object of study the whole intertextual system of relations that connects on text to others — a system that will finally include the student’s own product) at the same time that they involve students and excite them about literary works.
If students are to have literature and arts in their lives, they must make them their own. In order to do this, teachers need to relinquish some of the curriculum control. One way is to redefine, if not abandon, the canons of literacy as they are currently defined, and broaden the scope of the literary world to include all the types of works present in their lives, such as film and other modes of popular culture. Another is to expand opportunities for the personal response process in instruction. Teachers can ask more open questions initially; ask questions later in the process that enable and support the student’s reflections on the personal evocations of the work; build more choices into the literature program—choices about what to read and how to respond to that reading; give students more time to ponder and develop their responses; and finally give them the space and support they need to explore ideas, concepts, and their own personal visions.

All of this might entail a greater emphasis on discussion of individual evocations, perhaps in student-centered groups where they may feel freer to respond openly. Initially, students will feel the pressure at time to conform to the groups ideas, but as trust and confidence grows as this process is more often used in classrooms, they will feel freer to heed their own voice. If, as the transaction theory suggests, our goal should be to encourage the aesthetic response, then she or he must shift control of this process to students. Teachers would then find themselves responding primarily to students and their literary evocation, and they would centre subsequent learning experiences on these responses, rather than on implementing a text-driven-curriculum.
Partners

Students and teachers can share in both the learning experience and in the decision-making that surrounds this experience. If teachers are willing to risk listening to adolescent voices, they can come away from this experience recognizing that in all classrooms there are strong students' voices asking to be heard. An attempt must be made to acknowledge our students as collaborators in the learning cycle. They too have an agenda, various knowledge needs, and the desire to learn information that is relevant to their lives and to the theme under study. As a result, teacher and students can work together to create an environment that is conducive to learning for all its members.

To create such a classroom situation teachers first need to be aware that students can be responsible for their learning, and are quite willing and able to make reliable and honest curricular decisions. Teachers also need to share their control of the educational process and power in setting learning outcomes.

Smith and Johnston, (1993) conclude that when the issues of control and authority are discussed at the middle school level, it is usually administrators and teachers making decisions about content and method. Rarely are students part of this decision-making process. Yet, the middle school concept advocates the accommodation of adolescent learners. If teachers and administrators are to understand and work with adolescents perhaps we should begin listening to them and allow middle-school students a voice in curricular decision-making. At this stage of development adolescents need to feel that they are being heard. They desire a degree of ownership of the education process and product,
a place where they can be active participants. "They want the teacher to 'move over' and work more collaboratively with them in learning things that matter to them" (p.18).

Reading and Writing Practice

Strongly related to the issue of stance is that of reading instruction. Practice of skills might improve student performance on standardized tests but it does not improve overall reasoning ability. If children's reading instruction comes exclusively from a vocabulary-controlled reader, Xerox sheets, skill drills and work books, the students are not likely to learn to respond critically to the bigger issues presented in literature, history, science, or the world at large.

The findings presented suggest that the students in this study were concerned about retaining facts from print, and this function was felt by some of them to be the exclusive use of print. The homeroom teacher, too, felt that only by repetition and by the use of the concerted effort it took to read, would there be reward in the lives of his students.

In the written responses to the print stories, most students responded to the format and language of the stories. They could not move beyond the concrete, the obvious, and the immediate present. This approach to reading was evidenced, as well, by statements made by students during the interview. In the interview the student was asked where he learned more from—print or film.

We need print if you want to learn about fundamentals. If you want to learn lessons you go to the film. T (#10)
Arnowitz and Giroux's (1985) argument also shows students' tendency toward literal interpretation. They found that students of all social classes seemed unable to move beyond superficial examination of issues, and that students "boggle at the idea that the imagination or reason may be employed to yield knowledge. Abstraction becomes a major barrier to analysis because students seem enslaved to the concrete" (1985, p. 52).

Writing, as seen in this study, was not viewed as an expressive and intellectual process, but rather as a functional process necessary for communicating isolated facts. Students in this study were not required, in the normal course of their school life, to synthesize, analyze, or evaluate text information. Instead, it seemed that they were required to learn separate pieces of information in order to recognize or reproduce them. Finally, both reading and writing activities were highly dependent on teacher direction and evaluation.

Responding to text is valuable precisely because it requires analysis, synthesis and evaluation. It provides the opportunity for students to express original opinions and gives them the chance to evaluate, synthesize, and perhaps make connections to other texts. It is through written language that students perform much of their active learning (Graves, 1983). Students indicated in the interviews that they were usually not given the opportunity to communicate in this manner.

In one instance, one of the students declared that film was more real to her than print. Arnowitz and Giroux (1985) argue that "the spectacle appears as the real world in which they wake up and participate in the process of living and their own non-media life is the fiction" (p. 53). The higher level of ideation in film and the intertextual connections
made in film viewing and videotaping, and declarations in the interviews, would seem to confirm this opinion.

Therefore, if writing is to become part of the critical process, use of popular culture might be the first place to start, since the electronic medium is what students seem to experience as “life meaningful practices”.

Stance, voice, reading and writing all contributes to a dialogic classroom. How and to what degree it is achieved often depends on the pedagogical practices of the teacher.

The Dialogic Classroom

The notion of dialogism itself implies a bringing together of two of the most powerful strands of contemporary theory – narratology and reader response. Dialogism is a superordinate concept, which is concerned with both the language of the text and the response of the reader. The theorizing of this relationship must be fundamental to the idea of literary understanding.

The main implications for teachers are twofold. “The first is that the secondary world that each child makes when reading or listening to a story is the basic subject-matter of literature’s lessons” (Cox, in Benton, 1992, p. 45). The question is how to translate this awareness into classroom methodology. Teachers need to reappraise the relationship between reading and teaching literature. In particular, it is necessary to develop a methodology of literature teaching that is based upon informed concepts of reading and responding, rather than upon the conventional, and narrowly conceived comprehension.
Properly handled, literary understanding and critical evaluation develop as a result of reflective reading and responding; the 2Cs (criticism and comprehension) are part of the 2R/s and are stronger for being so. If they cease to be part of the whole reading/responding experience, then comprehension degenerates into inquisition, criticism into mechanical analysis and a gap opens up between the reader and the text that reduces the latter to fodder for just another sort of textbook exercise. Literature needs to be given back to readers. It is the job of our methodology to see that this happens (Corcoran, 1992 p. 68).

Giroux (1986) provides a final pedagogical agenda for the critical, reflective practitioner, by setting up a number of ways of viewing the text and therefore understanding the constructed stand of the reader. These assumptions involve:

Treating the text as a social construct that is produced out of a number of available discourses, locating the contradictions and gaps within an educational text and situating them historically in terms of the interest they sustain and legitimate; recognizing in the text its internal politics or style and how this opens up and constrains particular representations of the social world, understanding how the text actively works to silence certain voices, and finally, discovering how to produce possibilities from the text that provide new insights and critical readings regarding human understanding and social practices (p. 63).

In the study and analysis presented and discussed, this researcher has tried to show that literacy is not, as Wells stated: “a single, homogeneous competence, but that instead it involves being able to engage with texts of different types in modes appropriate to the different purposes people have in using them”(p. 172). He also argues that “To learn how to engage with texts in ways appropriate to the purposes they can serve, however, children need to see and hear enactment’s of those inner mental processes that are the essence of literate behaviour so that they can appropriate them and deploy them for themselves.” (p.172).
Buckingham and Sefton-Green (1996) argue that teaching and learning about popular culture, as in drama, needs to be seen as a "fundamentally dialectical and dialogical process." (p.163) This involves a continual shift between action and reflection, between language practice and language theory. The two researchers also state that it is in this process of communication and interpretation between different experiences and modes of language – talk, practical work, and writing – that the most significant learning occurs. The primary purpose of teaching about popular culture, then, is not to provide students with new knowledge but to encourage students to make clear their ideas and to express them concisely, and to question the knowledge that they already hold. In this respect (as in drama), reflection and self-evaluation are crucial aspects of the learning process.

Buckingham and Sefton-Green (1996) argue that:

In considering the reasons why one reads and writes in a given way and in comparing one's reading and writing with other peoples, it becomes possible to realize why things are the way they are, and how they might be different. Above all, however, this should be seen as an inherently social process, as something which takes place within, and is motivated by a particular set of social relationships – not merely between the teacher and the individual student but also within and beyond the wider community of the classroom and the school. (p. 163).

O'Neill (1995) and Booth (1994), in their discussion about learning through drama would concur with the ideas of Buckingham and Sefton-Green's views of learning about popular culture. These kinds of learning that we are looking for are likely to take place over a much longer period, and are inevitably very difficult to define and evaluate. Trying to recognize what one has learnt from a specific activity or experience is relatively easy when it comes to basic motor skills or to information retrieval. Ideational learning of the kind that we have been discussing here, however, is much more intangible. In this study I
was able to discover to some degree what students learned from and about popular culture, and about their experience with the drama event. I was able to do this because of the intensity of observation and data collection that was required in order to evaluate the learning. Even at that, what the long-term learning was will never be determined.

This study revealed how the text worked to silence certain voices, but it did, through discussion and reflection by the teacher and students, provide new insights regarding human understanding and social practices. The participants were given a chance to engage with texts of different types in modes appropriate to the different purposes people have in using them. Because of the participants involvement in learning about popular culture and drama they were involved in a dialectical and dialogical process. This involved a continual shift between action and reflection not only between the teacher and the individual student but also within the wider community of the classroom and the school.

Experience, Content and Pedagogy

The practices of defining curriculum and teaching development are often spoken of as separate entities, yet they are both parts of the whole educational experience. Posner (1988) emphasizes a view of curriculum as “events” (Posner), and Eisner (1985) as the “enacted”. They argue that the curriculum exists, not as a document, but as a set of enacted events, in which teachers and students jointly negotiate content and meaning. Similarly, pedagogy, as understood by Doyle (1986) and Schwab (1983), is both a conduit for content and a social context that has a fundamental curriculum effect.
The following discussion will support the idea of teacher as a gatekeeper who establishes an environment in which students' co-author lessons. This will bring to the forefront the idea that curriculum and teacher development is one, as content and pedagogy merge. One student commented in the study that he would remember me as "The Giver." Although the comparison was flattering, it is important to realize that the teacher was, and always has been the primary text in the classroom. The first reading, and negotiating of any meaning, starts with the teacher and how she or he frames lesson presentations. What will be remembered and absorbed from these memories depends on what and how s/he asks the class to interpret the experience of the curriculum presented as well as the students purposes and interests.

One seemingly obvious impact of curriculum teaching is in the area of planning and teacher knowledge. Teachers need to know a subject, as well as what Doyle (1992) calls 'pedagogical content knowledge.' "This is the capacity to transform the content knowledge he or she possesses into a form that is pedagogically powerful and yet adaptive to the variation in ability and background presented by the students" (p. 498).

Doyle (1992) notes that the character of a teacher's content orientation affects the potential for content representation in the classroom, which has consequences for student's achievement. The process of teaching can be seen, regardless of the teaching strategy. The ideological orientation of a particular teaching strategy or set of disciplinary procedures simply alters how this transmission process will be negotiated, and thus what aspects of the culture will be emphasized and reinforced.

The image of the gatekeeper for teachers suggests that "the crucial role the teacher plays in determining whether the dynamics of primary socialization will be a source of
empowerment or a limiting experience” (Bowers, 1990, p. 105). The gatekeeper role is complex and can have a profound influence on students’ development. What makes the teacher’s role as a gatekeeper especially unique is the range of the students’ cultural exposure that will be mediated by the teacher’s pattern of thinking and assumed beliefs, as well as by what the teacher has not thought about. “In effect, students encounter the teacher’s representation of the culture, including the selection of curriculum materials, interpretations that reflect the teacher’s own past socialization and biases that are reflected in the legitimization of student response” (Bowers, 1990 p. 106).

Lesson construction is a creative process in which teacher and students construct text through their action and interactions. A considerable amount of interpretive work is necessary for students and teachers to navigate classroom life and participate in lessons. Doyle (1992) calls teachers “authors” of curriculum events. He states that they are like authors except that they are present while their works are being read. Teachers can structure their text during enactment’s in classroom situations by guiding students through the text, and helping to shape student’s responses. Simultaneously, students can be involved in the authoring of curriculum events. “The authoring of curriculum events is, therefore, a dynamic process in which content is produced and transformed continuously” (p. 508). This view of authoring the curriculum compliments Barthes theories of the “death of the Author-God” and provides a way for the “writerly” curriculum.

In this study inquiry, researcher/teacher orientation was important. The study took place in a specific social environment (small group, in a school library). The transformation of content occurred in solving practical problem of authoring and enacting curriculum events together. Teacher/researcher jointly constructed the classroom setting,
different voices were encouraged to be heard and opportunities to affirm and tell and retell their personal narrative were provided.

The smallest unit of curriculum is therefore the inquiry itself. Inquiry is a whole process that cuts across and integrates personal and social knowing, knowledge systems signs, and an environment based on educating everyone. Inquiry was the curriculum in this study. Social and personal growth connected, but teacher remained the central curriculum maker with the voice of the institution slightly muted, and the voice of the students and community making a start in having the teacher "move over" in a venture in which the teacher is the central curriculum maker.

Curriculum and Teacher-Student Relations

Curriculum should be understood as a complex fabric of intertextual relations that are interwoven among five components — students, texts, teachers, objectives, and goals.

In this instance there was a teacher/researcher whose objective and goals were manifold. Besides wanting the students to have a valuable learning experience, she was also concerned about obtaining data for a thesis. The students volunteered for the study for various reasons, and therefore came with their own goals and objectives. The texts were pre-selected by the researcher/teacher because of her particular need to gather data. The students had little choice in selecting of texts. They were given some say in choosing their videotaped segment and the production of their concluding text. This suggests that it is not so much the study of any single component that is illuminating, rather it is the study of the relation between and among these components. This applies to the reading of
literature — it is not the text or the reader that must be examined but the relation between
the components.

Once curriculum is understood as a complex fabric of interrelations, it becomes
clear that the study of the reader-text-relation functions as what Iser (1993) would call a
process of ‘literary anthropology,’ where through the process of interpreting the text the
reader interprets her or himself. And because the literary text is always read in relation to
the world, it is impossible for readers to read texts and to interpret themselves (through
their relation to the text) without interpreting the world. This suggests that more attention
should be paid to the way in which responses contribute to, and are influenced by,
collective action within the school classroom.

Sumara (1996) described four steps in intertextual learning in the classroom. His
steps reflect this researcher’s experience during the course of the study and her
perceptions of how intertextual learning could be introduced to the classroom. The
following is a synopsis of his concept of the four main parts of an intertextual learning
experience.

Teachers cannot exclude their own evolving responses to the text from the
classroom communities. Because the teacher is necessarily involved in the ecology of
curricular experience she or he cannot stand outside the commonplace location. The
teacher does not manage the learning site, but rather becomes completely involved as an
interpreter in the site. Teaching literature, then, is really an act of interpretation where the
teacher works with the students to understand the ever-evolving complex set of relations
that includes literary readings (see Doyle 1992, Bowers 1990, Short, Harste & Burke,
1996).
Second, student response must not become just a site of interpretive activity, but should contribute to the continuous process of intertextual interpretation. Students must begin to understand that any response they have to a text is always linked to the texts and to contexts of reading. In addition, to providing opportunities for students to explore reading with one another, teachers must also be able to interpret with students the way in which shared reading, discussion, and interpretation of one text can lead to the creation of another.

Third, Sumara states that teachers need to encourage the rereading of literary texts. Students need to have time to work in small and large group discussions. Conversation with one another within the learning site, acknowledged by shared readings of various texts and experiences, seem to help students to better understand the way in which their response to the texts was influencing, and influenced by, their other readings, as well as by other personal experiences.

In this study the researcher believed it crucial for students to be able to continually find ways to participate in "intertextual making" throughout the process of working within and through focal practices. The books and journals commented on by the students become places for their collected thoughts and, most importantly, provide evidence of the way in which their thoughts evolve and change as they continue to read and reread a novel in relation to other texts and experiences. This sort of intertextual making helped readers to experience explicitly the co-authoring process that occurs during the act of reading (see Barthes and the 'writerly script'). By making markings in books (pictures, words, doodles, and cartoons) and having an opportunity to review and reinterpret these notations, readers become more aware of the faint boundaries that exist between published
texts and their lives. Furthermore, they began to experience, more deeply than usual, the way in which reading experiences serve as a source for memories of lived experiences. As in Barthes’ theory of jouissance, or playing with the text, or co-authoring of the score, showing a ‘practical collaboration’ with the text reflects Sumara’s and the researchers methodology for bringing intertextual reading into the classroom.

Inquiry Learning

In a concept-based curriculum, immersion in the concept is necessary to enable the student to generate questions, find answers, and generate more questions. Wells (in press), building on Vygotsky’s theory of learning and development, has proposed that by “conceptualizing the classrooms as a Community of Inquiry, we can see how collaborative group work, dialogic knowledge-building and inquiry-oriented curriculum are essential and interdependent components of a vision of education...” (p. 29).

In this study the approach was one of concept teaching instead of topic teaching. We could see teachers typically begin by sharing the concept with students through reading and discussion. After several days (or weeks) of learning about the concept in a broad sense, students would have the opportunity to further immerse themselves in it through reading, writing, listening, thinking and observing through the Internet, and various other materials. Students could also develop projects, videos, games, music, art, poetry, drama, simulations, models, or other ways to report their new learning.

During this exploration time students and their teachers would determine how research on the concept would be done, and generate rubrics or assessment checklists to measure student input and understanding. After exploration, students would choose an
area of interest and focus on questions relating to this area. In our study, the students were presented with a choice of area to explore. The analysis of response showed a variety of interests stemming from the concepts discussed, but also indicated a lack of knowledge in how to go about locating relevant information and making textual connections. A typical inquiry day might include student reading and writing, conferring with the teacher, discussion groups, research circles, and small group and whole group work. In our study we were limited by time, but the investigation included reading and writing, conferring with the teacher/researcher, discussion groups, and small and whole group work. An attempt was made for instruction to be integrated and student-centered.

Many teachers have used, and are currently using, an inquiry-based teaching-learning approach. Siegel (1995) suggests upping the ante. If learners are to become authentic inquirers into the tension between the ‘new and old,’ then learners must go beyond words. Through the work of Goodlad (1984), and our own data we know schools are overwhelmingly word-worlds. One reason schools and teachers are biased toward print is because society is. The remarks made by students in this study indicate the need to have language as the natural form of authentic, accountable expression and quickly convinces them that it is the only legitimate way of knowing. However, there are indeed multiple ways of knowing. Researchers such as Langar, Eisner, Harste and others indicate that we, as humans, like to claim language as our defining feature; it is our ability to create and use symbols of any kind that is human specific. Seigel (1995) makes the point that once a teacher acknowledges the shift from thinking and doing to using sign systems other than language, she or he has taken the ‘semiotic turn’. He also reminds us:
The technical language of semiotics is unfamiliar to most teachers, teacher educators and education researchers and may convey a sense of elitist jargon, thereby alienating the very people who need a language for justifying the place of the generating power that comes from juxtaposing different ways of knowing, not in an endless play of crossing and crisscrossing, but as a way to position students as knowledge makers and effective inquirers (p. 473).

Language is but one of many sign systems, all of which have degrees of unity, applicability and complexity. Manning and Cullum-Swan (1994) indicate:

Morse code, etiquette, mathematics, music and even highway signs are examples of semiotic systems. Sign systems can be loosely or tightly connected or articulated and the relation within them can be various, homological, analogical even metaphoric. Social semioticians see social life, group structure, beliefs, process and the contact of social relations as functional analogs to the units that structure language. By extension of this semiotic position, all human communication is a display of signs; something of a text to be ‘read’ (p. 466)

With a profusion of curricula surrounding us that must be ‘read’ and ‘responded to’, multiple sign systems can assist teachers. Curricula can be explored by placing several sign systems in opposition. (See Simons and “contest over signs” in Cherryholmes, 1992) Exploration of ambiguous experiences promotes intertextual teaching by compelling teachers and students alike to make connections across various texts and life experiences.

As Paul (1996) states “Crossing sign systems, the visual with the auditory, the auditory with the written, the oral with the visual, the written with the visual, and so on, there is an opening for learner to inquire into the metaphoric gaps between meaning-making signs systems. Teaching and learning must bring the signs of the times together” (p.82).

As Luke (1998) has pointed out “students already face and live in the complexities of New Times: a globalized economy; the emergence of new, hybrid forms of identities; and new technologies that are transforming traditional print ‘ways with words’ and
generating wholly new and unprecedented forms of expression.”(p.306). If teachers are to select and construct texts for study, they must analyze the New Times and how they influence our students needs. At the same time, teachers must be attentive to participants in these new cultures and media. Luke goes on to argue, “to say that we need to teach and learn language in ‘context’ then, requires a critical dialogue between teachers and students about how ‘context’ and its forms of power and knowledge continually change.”(p.306)

Literacy education is teacher’s work, and teachers are service-and-information-based workers engaged in complex intellectual work with knowledge, and with spoken, written and electronic texts. Luke (1997) further defines the work of teachers:

Our work as literacy educators is to be knowledgeable and flexible readers and writers—to set the social and cultural conditions for those textual practices that we have mastered to be produced and designed, critiqued and redesigned. Our work is itself a form of heteroglossia; in other words, we are in a way ventriloquists for the diverse cultures that we live in. We listen, and speak, read and write different voices, cultures and texts and we enable our students to do the same blending their community knowledge practices and voices to reframe and redesign these texts (p.309).

Popular culture and media are potent texts in student’s lives but it is my believe that teachers are the primary text — they are “The Givers”. To foster plurality in the classroom teachers must become more comfortable with ambiguity. Learning is about the power of language and symbols to generate sources of meaning. This can only be done in classrooms where there is space for playing with and sharing language rather than a place where individuals work in isolation.

Such a classroom would embrace a dialogic environment where there is room for a “living mix of varied and opposing voices.” Bakhtin’s notion of heteroglossia at work.
Language, in this view, is social and is constructed from a collection of voices that represent discourses from the everyday to the literary and academic. As Willinsky rightly points out, "It no longer makes sense for New Literacy programs to strive toward a literate community in the classroom while continuing to speak of literacy principally in terms of personal and individual self-realization (1990, p. 206).

A dialogic classroom resounds with multiple voices and perspectives. Here, language is portrayed by action "the passage of word, the caravan of thought, the flux of the imaginary, the slippage of the metaphor, the drift across the page (Chambers, 1994, p. 10). These images evoke a classroom rich in diverse talk, literature, writing, and activities where language lives in the dialogic interaction.

Recommendations for Further Study

Very little qualitative research has been done in the field of intertextual learning. In this vein, additional research is needed in two areas: the process of creating literary worlds, and then responding to those worlds. Such research could take the form of protocol analysis, and could investigate, in particular, the students' ability to direct selective attention as they read and respond aesthetically.

Research is also needed that looks at the effects of having students experience works aesthetically. This might best be done by drawing on a diversity of research perspectives, including case studies, and ethnographies. As this study illustrates, a variety of methodologies can be used to investigate responses. By synthesizing the findings from diverse research perspectives, a fuller picture of what occurs in the intertextual response process will develop. Through such continued investigations, a more complete
understanding of how students mature in their responses to literature across repeated response experiences can be gained. By adding to our understanding of the types of responses to literature, and the kind of teaching that develops complexity in the response process, we would hope teachers would be encouraged to incorporate deliberate intertextual practices to add to the richness of the worlds that students create as they open the pages of a book.

Conclusion

This study has established how an intertextual approach to literacy is grounded in the curriculum theories of reading and writing, and cognitive pluralism. An intertextual approach has significant effect on the curriculum since it affects approaches to reading and writing, interdisciplinary inquiry, and the construction of intertextual ties. This approach has both social and individual features because they are linked to genre theory and multiple literacies. The concept of intertextuality has clear curricular implications, illustrating as it does the limitations of a linear curriculum. We need to set up a web of experiences related to the concept under study so that students, as they create their understandings, can draw from the subject matter and from the two categories of milieu discussed earlier. As students in the study stated, and as Humphries (1998) reported in her article: “Keep fun prevalent. Provide meaningful work and link what you do to improving humankind.” Indeed fun can be experienced but on a deeper level, an experience of jouissance, the feeling of dis-location and real surprise is what we should be striving for and can be discovered in a dialogic and intertextual classroom. For Barthes, the text of pleasure that “comes from culture and does not break with it is liked to a comfortable practice of
reading,” but the text of jouissance is “the text that imposes a state of loss, the text that discomforts, that unsettles the reader’s historical, cultural psychological assumption...[and] bring to a crisis his [sic] relation with language” (p. 14, 1975).

Intertextuality is a complex concept in which the “contest over sign” is embedded in Schwab’s components of curriculum (teacher, learner, subject matter, and milieu) requiring multiple manifestations of curriculum learning materials and programs to feed the growth of multiple literacies. Pleasure and sometimes jouissance could actually result from time to time.
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Appendix A:

Letter And Consent Form

Dear Parent or Guardian:

My name is Oksana Kuryliw. I am a teacher at St. C____’s School, and am very interested in knowing how students learn and what methods of teaching produce a higher quality of thinking in adolescent learners.

This year for my doctoral thesis in Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, I am examining intertextual learning in a collaborative setting of a group of adolescent students.

All research will be collected through observations and analysis of the written response, and transcripts of audio and video taped interviews. There will be no use of names or of statements made to identify whose response was used. The data collected will be used only for the purpose of this research study.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your child’s program or class will not be changed in any significant way.

You may discontinue participation at any time.

If at any time you would like clarification or you have any questions please call me at 393-5218.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would please sign the attached consent form and return it to the school as soon as possible.

Yours truly,

Oksana Kuryliw
AUTHORIZED CONSENT FORM

I am fully aware of the nature and extent of my participation in this project as stated. I hereby agree to participate in this project. I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this consent statement.

(signature of participant or authorized representative)  (date)

(printed name of participant)

(signature of investigator)

Oksana Kuryliw
Appendix B:

Personal Inventory

ME

Name: _______________________________ Birthday: _______________________  

No. of Brothers: _____ Ages: ____________ No. of Sisters: _____ Ages: ____________  

1. How do you spend your spare time?  
   ________________________________________________________________________  
   ________________________________________________________________________  

2. What will you do during the summer vacation?  
   ________________________________________________________________________  
   ________________________________________________________________________  

3. Do you enjoy school? _______  
   Why/Why not?  
   ________________________________________________________________________  
   ________________________________________________________________________  
   ________________________________________________________________________  

4. (a) How much time per day do you spend reading? ____________________________  
    (b) Name your favourite book: ___________________________________________  
    (c) Name your favourite poem: ___________________________________________  

5. Which of the following do you read?
6. What game do you enjoy most? ________________________________

State a reason for this preference:

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

7. What is your favourite saying?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

8. (a) What sports do you appreciate?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

(b) What sports do you participate in?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

9. Do you enjoy traveling? _______

Why/Why not?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
10. Name some of the places you have visited:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

11. Assume that a person has unlimited resources. Suggest three places throughout the world, this person would visit:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

12. What place in the world would you like to visit most?

____________________________________________________________________

Give reasons for your choice:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

13 (a) How much time per day do you spend watching television? ______________________________

(b) What is your favourite television program? ______________________________

14. How often do you go to the movies? Once a week _____ 2-3 times a month _____ More often _____

15. How often do you see videos at home? Number of times: per week _____ or per month _____

16. Do you prefer watching a movie or video? _____

Why? _______________________________________________________________
17. Name your favorite movie or video: ________________________________

Why? ________________________________

18. Who is your favorite:

(a) author? ________________________________

(b) sports figure? ________________________________

(c) TV personality? ________________________________

(d) actor or actress? ________________________________

(e) politician? ________________________________

19. Why do you admire or respect these people?

_______________________________

_______________________________

_______________________________

20. Of what personal achievement or goal are you most proud?

_______________________________

_______________________________

_______________________________

21. If you could ask one question on any topic, and get a complete answer, what would that question be?

_______________________________

_______________________________

_______________________________
Appendix C:
Synopsis Of Novel And Film

The Giver
by Lois Lowry

In a utopian community where there are no choices—where everyone has his or her place in the world assigned according to gifts and interests—the time has come for 12-year old Jonas to become the new Receiver of Memory. He will be the one to bear the collective memories of a society that lives only in the present, where ‘Sameness’ is the rule. But Jonas soon recognizes the losses and discovers the lie that supports his community. He decides he will change his world—but he cannot predict how that change will come about, or what that change will mean for himself and the “new child” Gabriel whom he resolved to protect.

The Quest
by Ray Bradbury

A wonderful tale of a people who are born, grow, age and die in eight days. An infant is chosen to go to open the gates, which will bring light and life to his people. He makes the journey through a mystical and perilous land, aging rapidly, until he stands before the gates themselves, the last obstacle.
Appendix D:

Initial Interview Frame

1. If you were to describe the experience of the last few weeks what might it be?
2. What did you learn?
3. Do you like to read?
4. Where do you learn more from – reading or televiewing?
5. What did you learn from the book?
6. Did the movie or drama session help you understand the book?
7. What did you think of the drama session?
8. For a research project, what concept or idea would you choose to explore and/or investigate?
9. How would you go about doing your research project?
10. Explain your final product.
11. How did you feel making the video? What did you learn?
12. One year from now, you are going to have a memory or memories of this event. What are you going to remember?
Appendix E:

Biographical Sketches Of Students

The following biographical sketches are a synopsis of information about the 12 subjects, developed from multiple data sources. The data sources included student writing and student interviews on videotape and audiotape. The student writing consisted of the student's personal inventories, their journals, and their print and visual products. The names used in this paper are pseudonyms, which have gender and cultural similarity to the students in the study.

Allan (#1)

Allan is a talkative, imaginative, sociable Caucasian male who had been in the French Immersion program but dropped out after six years or seven years in the program. The regimen of learning a language in a rigorous traditional manner did not suit his learning style. Allan enjoys playing his guitar and reading and learning about music. He enjoys playing chess and reading mystery. He likes writing, but not when dictated to by classroom practice. Allan made many intertextual connections. The most significant one was of creating some music and lyrics that explained his learning in the study but also provided music for Jonas's community, as his had none. When asked what he learned from the book he said:

O: That the life I have and paying high taxes is much better than not having free will.
A: Normally, in your class when you are in a group situation, who do you hang out with?
A: S. and T. because they are up to my standards in French.
O: It depends on what they are like in French?
A: Yeah, well French is hard. Cause I don’t like reading with someone who is slower than me, because that’s just boring you have to explain what everything means. I'd rather read with Tiago or someone like him because they understand it. His research question would have concerned communism.

Anthony (#2)

Anthony is a thoughtful Caucasian male whose parents recently immigrated to Canadian from an Eastern European country. He is in the Gifted Program and is interested in violent and action-filled movies and video games. He claims to watch four hours of television a day. His information about Hitler, Stalin and Mussolini, former world figures he is very interested in has come from television and he expressed no interest in reading about them. He often spoke of the emotions that he experienced in the study. Anthony made some significant intertextual connections throughout the study, but often he missed out on the most obvious ones that might have connected to his own personal experiences.

O: Do you think that you learned more this way than your usual way or different things?
An: Different. If we had done it like we usually do I might have learned more about the story like plot, climax etc. and this is more about feelings.

O: Where do you think you learn more? Your own personal feelings or the cognitive, the brain kind of thing.

An: My own feelings.

Arthur (#3)

Arthur is a quiet, good-natured and reflective boy who is learning-disabled. Arthur was absolutely entranced with the drama event and astounded by his own pattern of thinking during the case study. He made the most deep and profound intertextual connection in his poem dealing with Memories. Arthur’s first question in his PIN (personal inventory) had to do with the ozone layer, but by the end of the case study his questions became more personal, more perplexing and more complicated.

O: Is there any issues you would like to explore further?

Ar: Sameness. I might want to explore that. Why would they have sameness but no colour? You could have sameness. But with colour would they need sameness?

O: Did anything surprise you in the last three weeks?

Ar: (long pause) I don’t think so. Most of the stuff I already knew. I was just refreshing my memory. I don’t know.

This is a most telling statement. Possibly all students already have the knowledge and memories of the universe stored in them like a seed. All they need is an opportunity to revive the memories and the seed of knowledge.

Cairn (#4)

Cairn is a girl of African-Canadian descent who often presented herself as being misunderstood and misjudged because of her race. The researcher often wondered if she was right. She was one participant that the researcher suspected did not finish reading the book. She did not participate often in discussion, but when she did she was insightful and forceful in presenting her views. She desperately wanted to be part of this group. But the researcher often felt she was not as comfortable with some of the conventions (genres) as her colleagues seemed to be. She was the only student who did not complete the assignment on generation memories. And the researcher noted that this was a personal knowledge question, not an answer from the novel question. What stopped her from doing the rest? Laziness? Not understanding the question? Not being willing to share personal information? Not feeling her memories were valid? Were the memories too painful?

Cairn had more to say about the drama event than any other part of the experience. She wrote about it most as well. She made many intertextual connections in her description of the event. Her learning transformed her and changed her perception of herself.
Ca: I depend on myself, me, and I because I don’t need anyone else to give me anything else except support. Everyone in this class are backstabbers and they talk behind your back.

This was her comment at the beginning of the study and the end of it her contribution in the drama event was validated by her fellow participants and the seed of transformation to a more self-confident learner had been planted.

Charmaine (#5)

Charmaine is a very quiet, but thoughtful girl who participated very little in the discussions. She had to be coaxed to participate in the group interview and encouraged to share her ideas with the researcher in the combined interview. In the group interview she was the only girl and, even when a question was asked directly of her she would answer briefly and allow one of the other (male) participants to interrupt and she would fade again into the background. The researcher called her the active listener. The same thing occurred when she was interviewed with Melissa. On the surface one could say that Charmaine was not engaged in the events of the study; she appeared to be a passive participant. But in her journal she revealed: “Everything we did was all connected, somehow, in some way.”

Connor (#6)

Connor is the only child of a pair of very devoted parents. He plays the violin very well, is intuitive and is considered to be an eccentric by his classmates. He is an avid reader. During the drama session, Connor asked brilliant and moving questions of “the Patient.” He asked, “Do you love? You are like God. How does that feel? Does the community honour you?”

O: The making of the video…. was it you or An who chose the scene that you did?
C: I chose it.
O: Why did you think that was a significant moment in the book?
C: Because it was part of the book that made you almost end the story yourself. The way you wanted to end it and it really made you think about it. It just wasn’t what happened in the book you had to write it. [Emphasis researcher’s]

Connor made connections easily, and his intertextual connections were varied, but the above statement capsulated Barthes notion of ‘jouissance’ and the ‘writerly script’. Connor’s comments personified his total learning experience in this session.

Melissa (#7)

Melissa is a thoughtful, perceptive girl. Of all the candidates, she was one who admitted to being a reader and liking it.

O: And what do storytellers and writers do?
Me: They kind of, in a way, they cut away at the truth. Everything is supposed to be straightforward.

In explaining her picture that described what she learned from the study she said: “It’s called the dream world…and this is a person.”

O: Any person?

Me: Any person. It looks like me...he/she is in total darkness, so, and he/she looks out and he still sees darkness and stuff, and he’s looking out and he’s dreaming. This is like a split window, but the window is a reflection of his dream. This is the reality and this is what he is dreaming of.

Melissa connected the texts used in the study to make deep and profound insights about her learning and the world at large. She stated that: “People express their opinions. And by listening to other people express their opinions you begin to understand better and people too.”

Melissa was one of the few people who recognized Elsewhere as a symbol and she also was one of two who chose to travel to uncharted locations if given the choice: the Moon and the Underwater world.

Me: Elsewhere is a good place where everything is different and where he [Jonas] can go with Gabe and be himself. Elsewhere is a symbol of individuality, hope and most of all love.

Marco (#8)

Marco is a fun-loving boy, intelligent, and considerate. He admits to not liking to read, and thinks it’s easier to write than read since at least you are working with your own thoughts. However, he also believes that filmviewing is where most learning can take place. He is a good artist and his visual product of what he had learned from the case study indicated that he understood the underlying themes of the study and how it connected to his life. He connected the loss of memory in the community with the loss of time by a drawing of an old-fashioned chime clock emanating from an individual’s head in a thought bubble.

In comparing his two statements about reading and filmviewing, one can observe in this participant the ability to learn in literacy other than print. It is apparent, too, that in filmviewing intertextual learning takes place more easily.

Mar: To me, I can’t really read books. It’s hard for me to concentrate on that one thing. I think of other things while I’m reading. When I finish the book, I just don’t know what happened.

Mar: Even if you start thinking about something else, you still know
what’s going on [when watching TV or a film] but in a book you’re missing something if you are thinking about something else.

Maartin (#9)

Maartin is a thoughtful, insightful person, an avid reader. He really appreciated the type of learning he experienced during the study.

Mar: This kind of work in the class would be really fun. It’s more open and easier for kids to express themselves. Like for everyone not just for the brainers and keeners.

O: Did you prefer writing your personal ideas or did you prefer talking about them?

Mar: Talking was better. It’s easier to open up talking.

Mar: All these activities about the book were about us, and revealed more of our lives to us so the book became more than a normal fictional book.

In his PIN Maartin expressed his enjoyment of playing Capture the Flag in the Dark. He wrote: This game provides me with the challenge of silence and extreme self-control over my opponents and all the twigs and dry leaves and litter scattered all over the forest floor. Maartin would like to have visited the centre of the earth, the deepest ocean trenches, and up to the ozone layer.

Stan: (#10)

Stan presented himself as an enigma to the researcher. He often professed verbally to being bored; his body language often suggested a tension in the class, but his responses indicated that he was quite involved in the learning and contributed quite a lot to the activities and discussions in the study. Stan’s lyrics opened up the discussion on the findings. Stan showed evidence of a great deal of metacognitive learning took place during the study.

St: Actually in The Quest he had to save his people but in The Giver I guess he was saving his people from all those memories. You couldn’t see it as much as you could in The Quest. You can actually see him going out and saving them. But The Giver, it is more like mentally saving the people.

O: You did read, you did write, you were speaking. In the last three weeks, do you think your language developed in any way?

St: Possibly. I’ve always had this level of language, but I never used it much. While we were talking I had to find new words to describe how I felt about the book and things. I had to struggle to find the language to describe. [Another case of refreshing the memory or making a planted seed blossom?]

Tom (#11)

Tom is mischievous, wise-cracking the comic of the group. He revealed a sensitive, thoughtful side to his personality as the case study proceeded. He and Valerie depicted for their videotaped session the event when Jonas first discovers his sexual
feelings. This was practiced and taped with no laughter and with great sensitivity by the actors and the audience the rest of the class. The researcher will always be grateful to Tom for pointing out to her that the teacher is always the primary text.

O: When Mr. Booth was doing his drama did it help you in understanding the book?

T: Yeah, because there were questions I hadn’t heard before and they were coming from different people and his answers were pretty good...so things you didn’t know before just, sort of, like making letters. You just put them together like a puzzle.

The memories because people are so busy in their everyday lives that you don’t even stop to think about things that were done in the past unless its something big. Sometimes its little memories that kind of brighten your day...like a smell.

T: I don’t know, sometimes you just don’t want to say things in front of other people, so it gets right to you, and only you get to read it [the journals] and you still know what we are thinking.

Valerie (#12)

Valerie is a very mature and considerate girl who brought calm and serenity to the group more than once. In discussing her role in the Booth session, she states: “You sort of had to ask him in new ways so he wouldn’t think we were intruding with his community and that we were not asking him personal questions.”

O: You and Tom were involved in a sensitive part of the book. How did you feel about doing that?

V: I felt comfortable because it was part of the book and we were just dramatizing it. It was just acting something out and sort made me...I had only pictured it when reading the book, but on doing it, it did come alive a bit more.

O: Would you say that teachers spend too much time when doing novel studies that they take too long for books to be read?

V: It’s OK at the beginning of the book, but once you get the hang of it ...but then the joy goes out of it.

To see what intertextual connections Valerie made during the study please examine her final product as seen in Appendix F.
Appendix F:

V#12's Final Product

THE GIVER

DAY 3

THE END