

# **AN OVERVIEW OF THE STUDIES ON THE USE OF AUTHENTIC TEXTS IN LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS**

Serpil Sonmez  
serpilsonmez@yahoo.com  
College of Education  
Florida State University

## **ABSTRACT**

There has been an increasing amount of research on the use of authentic literary texts in language classrooms for the last ten years. It has been widely discussed that using authentic literary texts and encouraging students to join literary discussions enhance language development (Adair-Hauck & Cumo-Johanssen, 1997; Adair Hauck & Donato, 2002; Carter & McRae, 1996; Kramsch, 1993; Lafayette1993; West & Donato, 1995). However, little has understood and discovered about the use of literature in language classrooms. Therefore, a step by step review of the earlier research is presented here to address those gaps in research practices. The inquiry for the questions (1) What is the use of authentic literary texts in ESL/EFL and literature classrooms? (2) What is the role of text-based discussions in ESL/EFL classrooms? (3) What is the role of teacher in text-based discussions in ESL/EFL classrooms? reveals that there is a need for more empirical studies and detailed micro-analyses of literary discourse particularly in English language classrooms.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The dichotomy between literature and language classrooms has attracted the attention of the scholars for the last two decades. Although most of the scholars suggest new ways of studying literary texts in the classroom, the arguments are dual in nature. Some scholars discuss the inclusion of literary texts in the second/foreign language (ESL/EFL) curriculum while others argue that recent developments in second language acquisition should be incorporated into literature classrooms.

For a better understanding of the issues raised by these arguments, this paper investigates the use of literary texts and literary discussions and their pedagogical implications on language development in these classrooms. Thus, this paper seeks to address the following questions: (1) What is the use of authentic literary texts in ESL/EFL and literature classrooms? (2) What is the role of text-based discussions in ESL/EFL classrooms? (3) What is the role of teacher in text-based discussions in ESL/EFL classrooms?

The first part of this paper will review the perspectives on the use of literary texts both in the ESL/EFL and literature classrooms while the following section will address to the opportunities literary texts provide for classroom discussions. The role

of the teacher within text-based discussions will be analyzed further in the third section. Finally, conclusions and a general critique will be presented.

## USE OF AUTHENTIC LITERARY TEXTS IN THE CLASSROOM

Using authentic literary texts in the ESL/EFL classrooms has long been claimed to benefit language development of the learners. However, many of the scholars within the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) report that authentic texts used in the beginner and intermediate level language classrooms are usually journalistic readings and/or short realia items such as advertisements and TV guides but not authentic literary texts (Frantzen, 2002; Knutson, 1997; Shanahan, 1997; Shook, 1997). Although some scholars do not support the use of literary texts in language classrooms except the advanced level, Maxim (2002) investigated the use of authentic literary texts during the first semester of beginner-level German classrooms. He found that the students were able to read an authentic German romance novel during the 4<sup>th</sup> week of their exposure to the target language. He reported no significant differences in the standardized exam scores of the control group and the authentic reading group.

On the contrary, Lee (1986) claims that language learners are linguistically incapable of understanding literary texts until they reach the advanced level proficiency. As a response to Lee (1986), Frantzen (2002) suggested that studies in SLA “underscores the importance of incorporating reading skills development in beginning and intermediate level foreign language classrooms.” (p. 116). However, Bernhardt (2002) and Kramsch & Kramsch (2000) argue that SLA researchers are not the only ones to blame. Their concern is that authentic literary texts are not introduced to students unless they are in a postsecondary literature classroom. Earlier studies indicate that students in postsecondary literature classrooms hardly have advanced level language proficiency (Bernhardt, 1995, 2002). Investigating reading abilities of second language learners, Bernhardt (2002) provided evidence that grammar skills and linguistic ability accounts only for 30% of second language reading performance. These findings contradict with earlier claims that studying authentic literary texts requires advanced level language proficiency.

For Schultz (2002) the rise of communicative competence methodologies favoring oral language skills is another reason for the lack of interest in the use of literature in language classrooms. The interest in the communicative competence theory during the 1980s made literature and authentic literary texts disappear from language classrooms (Kramsch & Kramsch, 2000; Schultz, 2002). Although using authentic literary texts in beginner level ESL/EFL does not seem logical due to the relative complexity of the text when compared to the language proficiency level of the students, findings indicate that beginner level foreign language learners can also benefit from reading authentic literary texts and that authentic texts have an impact on developing learner’s communicative competence (Rice 1991; Shanahan, 1997).

Though very few, studies on second/foreign language classroom failed to show strong connections between the study of literary texts and language development (Donato & Brooks 2004), while some others reported how they

incorporated literary texts in the language classroom rather than presenting the scientific results of their approaches (Schultz, 1996). Facteau (1999) also presents empirical data about the connection between reading skills in L1 and the performance in L2. The studies on literature classroom followed a similar approach and discussed how literature should and should not be taught (Shook, 1997; Harper, 1996). The findings from the reading research in the first language were taken as facts for teaching literature classes in a second or foreign language.

At this point, a closer look at these two types of research reveals another distinction between the studies that support improvement of linguistic and cognitive skills in the literature classroom, and the ones that support using literary texts in the second/ foreign language classroom. Interestingly, many of the articles that support the use of literary texts in language classrooms are opinion articles. Therefore, very few papers provide empirical evidence for the assumptions made even though they have a solid background on certain theories of language (Shanahan, 1997; Shook, 1997; Kramersch, 1985).

The distinction between the theoretical origins of the studies in literature classrooms and ESL/EFL classrooms is probably one of the main reasons for the different research practices. The literature perspective originates in the research on first language such as the reader response theory and the schema theory while the scholars in the second language classroom perspective emphasize the sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1979, 1981; Bakhtin, 1981, 1986) and the opportunities that literature provides for classroom discourse. Although the varying perspectives within these two theories of reading in the first language received a lot of criticism, a brief overview of these theories is necessary to better understand the theoretical background of the studies that suggest the use of authentic literary texts in the second/foreign language classrooms.

### **Theoretical origins of literature classroom research**

A review of research done in the literature classrooms revealed that the reader-response theory of literary criticism (Fish, 1980; Iser, 1981) and the schema theory (Rumelhart, 1980) of psycholinguistics were highly influential in these studies.

#### **Schema theory**

According to the schema theory, readers construct meaning from a text with the help of their background knowledge. Therefore, comprehending a text is an interactive process between the reader's previously acquired knowledge (schemata) and the text. Studies in this perspective distinguish two different types of knowledge: The background knowledge of the rhetorical organizational structures of different types of texts (formal schemata) and the background knowledge of the content area of the text (content schemata). This perspective influences the teaching of the text as a finished product as it concentrates on providing culturally relevant information to the students and increasing comprehension by controlling vocabulary, structure and content of the text. However, schema theory is criticized by the scholars who recognized that there

needs to be more communicative, student and reader centered approaches to teaching. (Bernhardt 1991; Fecteau, 1999; Friedman, 1992; Kramsch, 1985; Swaffar, 2002).

### Reader response theory

The reader response theory rejects the notion that readers need to be given expository texts so that the vocabulary, structure, and the content of the text can be appropriated by the learners. Followers of this perspective claim that using these texts helps narrowing down numerous possible meanings for mental processing. The expository texts tend to limit readers' use of schemata and therefore, the reading text becomes a finished product. Iser (1981) proposed that reading an authentic literary text can "open up an increasing number of possibilities, so that the combination of schemata entails selective decisions on the part of the reader." (p. 184). Therefore, this theory gained more support from the scholars who suggest a more active role of the reader in the reading and meaning-making process.

### **Theoretical origins of the language classroom research**

The sociocultural theory in SLA is based on the Vygotsky's studies on human mind, learning, and development. Vygotsky argues that learning and development are not the same. For him, social factors are the major elements of human development whereas cognitive factors are considered to have lesser importance. Central to the development of the individual is the biological and cultural forces where the former is associated with lower level psychological processes while the latter is associated with higher level psychological processes. According to Vygotsky (1981), higher level mental functions such as rational thought and learning originate in social activities (p. 163). It is during these social activities that individuals internalize the patterns of social activities. Language plays a crucial role in this internalization process that it is considered to function as a mediating tool for development (Vygotsky, 1981, Wertsch, 1995).

Johnson (2004) suggests that Bakhtin's ideas could be implemented in the sociocultural theory as they are complementary to Vygotsky's ideas (p. 127). The central notion of Bakhtin's theory is that utterances produced by humans are dialogic in nature and that no single utterance belongs to an individual before it is appropriated (internalized) by the same individual. The utterances are produced are identified as Primary and/or secondary speech genres. Primary genres can be novels, dramas and all kinds of scientific research while secondary genres are the internalized versions of the primary genres.

Therefore, learning a language is associated with being exposed to a variety of speech genres, not learning lexical, syntactical and morphological functions of the language (Bakhtin, 1986, pp.78-79). Given the definition of the primary and secondary speech genres, the text in the written and discursive form is a speech genre and it has its origins in the social act. Magnan (2003) further explains that "text is the stimulus and map of language acquisition" where learners create their own understandings of a language through the text (p. 12). The sociocultural theoretical

perspective considers discourse as one of the key components of language learning and human development. Therefore, the following section will be a synthesis of the findings in earlier research on text-based classroom discourse.

## TEXT-BASED CLASSROOM DISCOURSE

A review of the research on the use of authentic texts in the language classroom and the incorporation of language and literature curriculums indicates that very few researchers (Donato & Brooks, 2004; Mantero, 2002; 2003) have been concerned with the mediational role of literary texts in language classrooms. On the contrary, majority of the studies investigated ways to incorporate the academic disciplines into a language and literature discipline. According to Burnett and Fonder-Solano (2002) the (dis) connections between these two fields are not more than imaginations and misconceptions of the scholars trained separately in those academic fields. For them, there are many commonalities between these two fields than differences.

However, Frantzen (2002) points out that, language classrooms have been investigated more than literature classrooms so that little is known about the language learning experiences of students in literature classrooms. Thinking that many students in the literature classrooms are either foreign or second language learners as well, several scholars (Byrnes, 1998; Byrnes & Kord, 2001; Donato & Brooks, 2004) suggested that finding a connection between language learning and literature teaching is essential for the students majoring in literature in a foreign/second language.

Although the students are not capable of uttering linguistically complex sentences at the lower proficiency levels, providing them opportunities to provide insights and personal opinions (even when it is in their L1) on a literary text may contribute to their language development through collaborative construction of meaning. Consequently, Miller (2003) reports that literary discussions shape students' thinking and higher order mental skills in an L1 reading classroom as it allows the students and the teacher interact and co-construct knowledge. Following a sociocultural perspective of reading instruction, Miller provides evidence that students develop specific habits of mind when teachers play a mediational role in literature discussions.

Donato and Brooks (2004) followed a phenomenological approach to text-based literary discourse. Surprisingly, their study revealed that the perceived experiences of the teacher and the actual classroom situation are the opposites. The teacher expressed her objectives as "describing, analyzing and personalizing" the literary texts. However, no significant evidence for students' descriptions or analyses of literary texts was found throughout the observations by the researchers. Another conflict was observed in students' perceptions of their experiences from the literature course. Researchers concluded from the students' expressions that the students' goal in studying literature is comprehension of a finished product rather than personalized understanding and collaborative construction of knowledge through discussions in the classroom. Donato & Brooks (2004) also note that the students were aware of the opportunities literature provided them to see the uses of language in different

contexts. However, they believed the only contribution of their studies in literature to their language development is expansion of their vocabulary.

Donato & Brooks (2004) also explored whether advanced level speaking skills could be monitored through literary discussions. Surprisingly, their results indicated the impact that interactional routine of classroom discourse has on the quantity and quality of student discourse. This interactional sequence is described as the IRE/IRF pattern which is found to be the dominant discourse genre in the language classrooms as well as in other subject classrooms at all grade levels. Their findings indicate that the initiation-response-evaluation/facilitation (IRE/F) pattern (Mehan, 1979) prevents learners from gaining floor during classroom interaction and from presenting their interpretations of the text. Donato and Brooks (2004) were surprised to find that teachers' strategic use of IRE/F pattern does not allow discussions to occur in a literature classroom because they have hypothesized that literary discussion would provide opportunities for advanced level speaking functions as described by the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines for Speaking.

## THE IMPACT OF THE TEACHER

Mehan (1979) pioneered the studies on classroom discourse. His findings are supported by later studies that majority of classroom interactions are constrained by unique interactional sequences called the Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) pattern. The initiation sequence poses a question or a problem statement for the students to respond. These questions could address to individual students, groups of students or class as a whole. The following sequence is students' response to teacher's initiation. Following the response, the evaluation sequence is the essential part of the classroom interaction since it is this sequence that makes classroom discourse different from everyday conversation (Mehan, 1979, pp. 52-54).

Mehan's (1979) interactional sequence is described as the triadic dialogue by Lemke (1990). According to him, triadic dialogue is "an activity structure whose greatest virtue is that it gives the teachers almost total control of the classroom dialogue and social interactions." (p. 168). Clearly stated, this description underlines the power status of the teacher in the classroom. Based on his studies in the science classroom, Lemke (1990) identified that the most common use of the triadic dialogue is to control the academic content and at what pace the lesson should move. Obviously, this type of dialogue favors teacher priorities rather than allowing students to raise concerns and/or provide insights.

Cazden (2001) also agrees with Mehan (1979) that the IRE sequence is the dominant pattern in classroom discourse at all grade levels and the question form is the most common initiation form (p. 29). Some researchers argue that the IRE pattern establishes the power relationship between the students and the teachers. The initiation response evaluation pattern sets the role of the teacher as the orchestrator of the classroom talk. The orchestrator has the power to decide who, what, when and why to initiate in the classroom interaction. Therefore, the students can only talk when invited by the teacher. However, the evaluation sequence gives the most power

to the teacher. The evaluator role gives the teacher to decide what knowledge is valuable and what knowledge is not.

Lemke's findings about the classroom discourse are supported by later studies in language classrooms. Nassaji and Wells (2000) investigated the interactional sequences in several language classroom episodes and found that triadic dialogue is the most common interaction pattern in the classrooms. Interestingly, they found that the triadic dialogue sequence is the dominant discourse genre even when the teacher's aim is to engage students in dialogic discourse. In addition to Mehan's (1979) and Lemke's (1990) descriptions of IRE sequence, Nassaji and Wells identified that the evaluation sequence could also be the "follow up" sequence where the teacher's aim is not to judge the student answers but to build on student responses. Surprisingly, this finding provides evidence that the third sequence in the follow-up form allows students to take floor and elaborate on their responses. It is also evident in their study that this sequence allows the teacher to engage in the co-construction of knowledge as a participant of the discourse. Nassaji and Wells (2000) also looked at the type of questions asked by the teacher during the initiation sequence and they found that negotiatory type of questions such as clarification questions, asking for alternative opinions, etc. triggered more follow ups, therefore, more student responses.

The discursive function of the follow-up genre is investigated in further detail by Cullen (2002). Cullen reported that the follow up/feedback form also has an evaluation role even when it is implicit in teacher's speech and this function is to confirm, disconfirm, or modify students' interlanguage rules.

A key concept in the sociocultural theory is mediation. According to Kozulin (2003), there are two agents of mediation, humans and symbols (p. 18). The human mediator in Vygotsky's sociocultural theory is that each psychological function appears twice in development, once in the form of actual interaction between people and the second time as the internalized form of this function. According to that, higher mental functions originate in the interpersonal plane that is external to the individual. Johnson (2004) describes that the interpersonal plane is transformed into the intrapersonal plane by the gradual, dynamic process of internalization through patterns of social activities. This transformation helps learners move from their zone of actual development to their zone of potential development with the help of a more capable peer in the form of scaffolding. This help from a more capable human is usually defined as scaffolding (Wood, Bruner and Ross, 1979). In order for scaffolding to be effective, the assistance from a more capable one needs to be gradual and contingent.

Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) investigated scaffolding and found that this type of assistance in the form of corrective feedback helps learners move through their zones of proximal developments. Furthermore, they developed a regulatory scale designed to detect the learners' microgenetic development within the zone of proximal development. According to this scale, microgenetic development is detected when the corrective feedback moved from the most explicit level (e.g. teacher provides the correct pattern) to the most implicit error (e.g. teacher asks learners to find their errors and correct them independently).

This definition of development reveals that teachers play the most crucial role in students' learning. The teacher's role in the language classroom is to provide corrective feedback to scaffold the students to activate their zones of proximal development and help them move towards the stages of their zones of proximal development. In this description, the teacher is not the evaluator. Instead, the teacher acts as a more capable adult who interacts with learners to scaffold their learning.

However, a closer look at the actual classrooms as evidenced by research mentioned earlier in this paper, reveal that the classroom interaction is dominated by the IRE/IRF pattern. This gives the teacher the ultimate power to teach what, how, and when s/he thinks the students need to learn. As discussed earlier in this paper, studies found that even the discursive form of the feedback/follow-up sequence can be a form of evaluation as it also allows teachers to talk more in the classroom rather than providing opportunities for students to express their ideas (Cullen, 2002).

Even though critical, some scholars in the sociocultural perspective argue that the IRE sequence may serve a purpose. However, they emphasize that instructors' reliance on this sequence may be because of teachers' limited expectations and views of the students (Mantero, 2002). According to Lemke (1985), the IRF sequence may serve as a balancing tool for thematic and interactional control in language classrooms so that the teacher can use whenever s/he feels a need to balance in order to achieve the goals of the program.

This kind of control over students is not favorable for most of the scholars following the sociocultural theoretical approach both in the fields of SLA and literary studies because it does not allow individual development and co-operative construction of knowledge. The Bakhtinian perspectives of the socioculturalist theory defines text as having multiple layers of meaning that suggests that there are no single and correct interpretations of a text. Therefore, teacher's role in the classroom is the role of a participant in the constructions and co-constructions of the text.

A similar concern is raised by Donato & Brooks (2004) that the relationship between literary discussions and teachers' orchestration of classroom discourse need to be investigated in more detail. There need to be models of really effective literary discussion rather than of teachers who are very monologic (Mantero, 2002) or who rely heavily on the IRE sequence (Donato & Brooks 2004). Once that is accomplished, we need to find out if participating in such discussions really does benefit SLA. One can never be sure whether it does, unless there is also a formal component to the lessons such that students are shown their errors and can correct them, are expected to use text-related vocabulary, and are pushed to use ever more complex sentence structures.

## CONCLUSION

This review suggests that studies in literature and language classrooms are at the beginning stages of realizing the potential of literary texts and text-based discussions. Surprisingly, so little research has been published on the literature classroom as an arena of study. Many of the articles available for review at the time this paper is written displays that scholars in these two disciplines are still arguing the

pros and cons of incorporating ESL/EFL and literature disciplines. One of the reasons to this might be the discrimination between these two disciplines in the academic institutions. However, this investigation reveals that it is only the second language acquisition paradigm where learning in literature classrooms is studied. This is interesting because majority of the universities in the United States have Modern, Asian and Middle Eastern Languages departments where students study the literatures of cultures that are different than their own. According to the SLA paradigm, these students are considered to be continuing language learners whereas studies in literature classrooms do not make such a definition.

Considering the gradual social shift in the language learning paradigm, another surprising finding is the need for more research on the use of literary texts and text-based discourses in the language classrooms. One of the reasons for this may be because studies in literature classrooms are still based on theories and research in the first language. Therefore, most of the studies on the use of literary texts in literature classrooms follow “literacy in reading” perspective which could hardly explain language learning and development of the bilingual learners in these classrooms. On the contrary, second language acquisition researchers are separated from the literature classrooms that they no longer consider those classrooms as research fields. Consequently, the studies reviewed in this paper revealed that literature classrooms are mostly out of sight for SLA researchers. There is also need for more English as a second language acquisition research as many of the studies are either in Spanish, French or German literature classes. Furthermore, the multicultural nature of those classes was often ignored.

The sociocultural perspective suggests that literary texts and discourses are essential for the individual and collective development of the students. Surprisingly, very little is said by the socioculturalists. A more detailed description of concepts and metaphors is necessary in these studies. Since the sociocultural theoretical framework is a relatively new trend in the field of SLA, I have the belief that studies in the literature classrooms will evolve in parallel to the research done in the acquisition of second/foreign languages. The more the process of second language learning and acquisition will be understood.

## REFERENCES

- Adair-Hauck, B. & Cumo-Johanssen, P. (1997). Meaning making through a whole language approach. In J. K. Philips (Ed.) *Collaborations: Meeting new goals, new realities*. (pp. 35-96). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.
- Adair-Hauck B. and Donato, R. (2002). The Pace model: A story based approach to meaning and form for standards-based language learning. *The French review*, 76, 265-275.
- Aljaafreh, A. & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zones of proximal development. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 465-483.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). The problem of speech genres. In C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Eds.) *Speech genres and other late essays: M. M. Bakhtin*. (pp. 66-102). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bernhardt, E. B. (2002). Research into the teaching of literature in a second language: What it says and how to communicate it to graduate students. In V. M. Scott and Tucker (Eds.) *SLA and the literature classroom: Fostering dialogues* (pp. 195-210).
- Bernhardt, E. (1991). *Reading development in a second language: Theoretical, research, and classroom perspectives*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Bernhardt, E. (1995). Teaching literature or teaching students? *ADFL Bulletin*, 26(2), 5-6.
- Bernhardt, E. (2002). Research into the teaching of literature in a second language: What it says and how to communicate it to graduate students. In Scott, M. V. & Tucker, H. (Eds.), *SLA and the literature classroom: Fostering dialogues* (pp. 195-210). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Burnett, J. & Fonder-Solano, L. (2002). Crossing boundaries between literature and pedagogy: Perspectives on a foreign language reading course. In Scott, M. V. & Tucker, H. (Eds.), *SLA and the literature classroom: Fostering dialogues* (pp. 75-106). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Byrnes, H. & Kord, S. (2001). Developing literacy and literary competence: Challenges for foreign language departments. In Scott, V. M. & Tucker, H. (Eds.), *SLA and the literature classroom* (pp. 35-74). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Byrnes, H. (1998). Constructing curricula in collegiate foreign language departments. In Byrnes, H. (Ed.), *Learning foreign and second languages: Perspectives in Research and scholarship* (pp. 262-295). New York: MLA.
- Carter, R. and McRae, J. (1996). *Language, Literature, & the learner: Creative classroom practice*. New York: Longman.
- Cazden, C., B. (2001). *Classroom Discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.
- Cullen, R. (2002). Supportive teacher talk: The importance of the "F" move. *ELT Journal*, 56, 117-127.
- Donato, R. & Brooks, F. B. (2004). Literary discussions and advanced speaking functions: Researching the (Dis) Connection. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(2), 183-199.
- Fecteau, M. L. (1999). First and second language reading comprehension of literary texts. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(4), 475-493.
- Fish, S. (1980). *Is there a text in this class?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Frantzen, D. (2002). Rethinking foreign literature: Towards an integration of literature and language at all levels. In Scott, M. V. & Tucker, H. (Eds.), *SLA and the literature classroom: Fostering dialogues* (pp. 109-130). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Friedman, E. H. (1992). Effective stylistics or the pleasure of the text: Foreign literature and the undergraduate. *ADFL Bulletin*, 3(3), 18-22.

- Harper, S. N. (1996). Strategies for teaching literature at the undergraduate level. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72(4), 402-408.
- Iser, W. (1981). *The act of reading*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins university Press.
- Johnson, M. J. (2004). *A philosophy of language acquisition*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kramersch, C. (1985). Literary texts in the classroom: A discourse. *The Modern Language Journal*, 69(4), 356-366.
- Kramersch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kramersch, C. & Kramersch, O. (2000). The avatars of literature in language study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(4), 553-573.
- Knutson, E.M. (1997). Teaching the whole texts: Literature and foreign language reading. *The French Review*, 67(1), 12-26.
- Kozulin, A. (2003). *Vygotsky's educational theory in context: Learning in doing*. U.K., New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lafayette, R. (1993). Subject-matter content: what every foreign language teacher needs to know. In G. Guntermann (Ed.) *Developing language teachers for a changing world* (pp. 124-158). Lincolnwood: IL: National Textbook Co.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, J. F. (1986). Findings and implications of L2 reading research. *Hispania*, 69, 181-187.
- Lemke, J. L. (1985). *Using language in the classroom*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Lemke, J. L. (1990). The language of classroom science. In Emihovich, C. (Ed.), *Locating learning across the curriculum*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Magnan, S. S. (2003). Rediscovering Text: Multiple Stories for Language Departments. *ADFL Bulletin*, 33(1), 9-15.
- Mantero, M. (2002). *Scaffolding revisited: Sociocultural pedagogy within the foreign language classroom*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No 459623).
- Mantero, M. (2003). Appropriating literature in Foreign language classrooms. *Academic Exchange, Summer*, 239-243.
- Maxim, H. H. (2002). A study into the feasibility and effects of reading extended authentic discourse in the beginning German language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86, 20-35.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Miller, S. M. (2003). How literature discussion shapes thinking: ZPDs for teaching/learning habits of the heart and mind. In Kozulin, A. (Ed.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in context: Learning in doing* (pp. 289-316). U.K., New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nassaji, H. and Wells, G. (2000). What's the use of triadic dialogue? An investigation of teacher-student interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, 376-406.
- Rice, D. B. (1991). Language proficiency and textual theory: How the train might meet. *ADFL Bulletin*, 22(3), 12-15.

- Rumelhart, D. E. (1980). Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. In Guthrie, J. T. (Ed.), *Comprehension and teaching research views* (pp. 3-26). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Schofer, P. (1984). Theoretical acrobatics: The student as author and teacher in introductory literature courses. *The French Review*, 57, 463-474.
- Schultz, J. M. (1996). The uses of poetry in the foreign language curriculum. *The French Review*, 69(6), 920-932.
- Schultz, J. M. (2002). The Gordian Knot: Language, literature, and critical thinking. In Scott, M. V. & Tucker, H. (Eds.), *SLA and the literature classroom: Fostering dialogues* (pp. 35-74). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Shanahan, D. (1997). Articulating the relationship between language, literature and culture: Toward a new agenda for foreign language teaching and research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(2), 164-174.
- Shook, D. J. (1997) Identifying an overcoming possible mismatches in the beginning reader-literary text interaction. *Hispania*, 80(2), 234-243.
- Shook, D. J. (1996). Foreign language literature and the beginning learner-reader. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(2), 201-216.
- Swaffar, J. (2002). Reading the patterns of literary works: Strategies and teaching techniques. In Scott, M. V. & Tucker, H. (Eds.), *SLA and the literature classroom: Fostering dialogues* (pp. 131-154). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1979). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1981). *The genesis of higher mental functions*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1995). The need for action in sociocultural research. In: James V. Wertsch, Pablo del Rio & Amelia Alvarez (eds.) *Sociocultural studies of mind* (pp. 56-74). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- West, M. and Donato, R. (1995). Stories and Stances: Cross-cultural encounters with African folk tales. *Foreign Language Annals*, 28, 392-405.