Redefining Literacy in a Foreign Language

Claire Kramsch
University of California, Berkeley

Thomas Nolden
Wellesley College

Culture and literature are making a comeback in language instruction. In Germany, teachers trained in "pragmatic-functional"/ communicative approaches are encouraged to adopt an intercultural approach with a hefty literary component;[1] in the United States, proficiency-oriented teachers are urged to enrich their lessons with cultural or even literary content. But what kind of content should this be? Should teachers inculcate in their students a stock of nationally shared bits of cultural information and the ability to quote from the classics? Or should they strive for a new type of literacy, centered more on the learner, based more on cross-cultural awareness and critical reflection?

As language teaching enters the twenty-first century, voices are making themselves heard for a redefinition of second language literacy[2] and in particular for a reassessment of the 20th century split between language study and literary/cultural studies.[3] The current interest in culture, common to both language and literary studies, offers an opportunity to reconsider the fundamental educational paradox that teachers have to face: the obligation to socialize their students into a given social order and the responsibility to make them develop their own particular voice by contesting that social order. The paradox between these two types of literacy in language study can be dealt with through a cross-cultural approach to teaching literary texts at the intermediate levels of language instruction.

We first discuss the limitations of current linguistic and literary theories as they have been applied to the teaching of foreign language texts. We then propose a conceptual framework that is better suited to take into account the unique (op)positional stance of the foreign cultural reader interacting with a foreign cultural text. In a third section we apply this framework to an analysis of concrete examples from classroom practice.

I. Limitations of Native Language Literacy Theories

The institutionalized dichotomy between literary studies and language training (the composita themselves are telling) is most often reflected in a curriculum that strictly separates literature courses from language courses, leaving the language instructor with a sentence-grammar syllabus aimed at providing the language skills necessary to enroll later on, if desired, in the "real thing": the literature course. Thus, the theoretical underpinnings of both endeavors have remained separate from one another—linguistic theories the concern of language teachers, literary theories the concern of literature scholars—neither bothering to examine whether these theories apply to the *foreign* reader of a *foreign* text.

Recent developments in second language reading theory[4] have made it clear that reading is not a passive skill of recognition, but an active bottom-up and top-down process: by matching the words on the page with the global meaning emerging from the text, and in turn by matching their global hypotheses with the individual words on the page, readers build for themselves structures of expectation called "schemata" that allow them to anticipate the meaning of words according to the context. These schemata, or mental representations, are triggered both by the ideational content and by the linguistic and discursive structures of the text. Researchers have repeatedly reminded language teachers that the meaning or the authenticity of a text is not in the text itself, but, rather, that it emerges from "negotiation" between the reader and the text. Reading is thus not a matter of discovering the meaning the author had hidden behind the words, but of discovering a match between what the text says and what the reader does. In other words, reading is a matter

O195-2

of "authenticating" a text.[5]

So much for the linguistic theory. But how does the teaching practice look like? Linguistic theories have had their impact on the teaching of informational texts. Students are now taught how to use strategies of information retrieval—skimming, scanning, intensive/extensive reading—and how to "read for meaning."[6] But the teaching of literary texts in the language classroom tends to repeat the traditional literature/language dichotomy mentioned earlier. Literary texts are hardly ever approached as stylistic processes of negotiated meaning between a foreign cultural text and its reader; they are still presented primarily as paradigms of grammatical usage or structural use, as exercises in information retrieval, or as (pre)texts for oral communication. Indeed instructors are hardly to blame when in the fictional world of textbooks Brecht's parable "Wenn die Haifische Menschen wären" becomes reduced to a pool of subjunctives because textbook authors make it fit into the corresponding grammatical unit. Despite recent research on learning strategies,[7] and the development of literacy skills,[8] teaching practice still does not give foreign readers the cognitive and linguistic ability to authenticate the texts they read.

Whereas the *language* classroom has yet to apply the new insights brought by second language acquisition research, the undergraduate *literature* classroom still has difficulty translating reader-centered literary research into a type of pedagogy that · would allow students to respond to creative texts by means other than analytical presentations, interpretive essays, or book reports. To be sure, reader response theory has emphasized that the act of reading is a creative and productive act, a challenge to make sense of a text's fundamental indeterminacy. The difference made by Rosenblatt between efferent reading, that focusses on the information gathered as a result of reading, and aesthetic reading, that orients the reader toward his/her personal reaction to the text during the act of reading itself,[9] captures the dialogic nature of reading and meaning-making. In recent years, post-structuralist and post-modernist literary theories have opened up the canon of interpretation to include such notions as intertextuality[10] or transtextuality,[11] that should leave space for multiple relationships between what Genette calls original texts (or "hypotexts") and their variants (or "hypertexts").

But, here again, theory and practice clash. A look at the textbooks used in foreign language literature courses is illustrative of the status quo: editions of literary texts provided for non-native readers leave the user with the impression that the language, e.g., of a contemporary German comedy, consists of vocabulary items only. Once the students have attained a sufficient linguistic proficiency, they are expected to "understand" the literary selections read in foreign literature classes as would native readers, or at least appropriately educated native readers. The ideal reading is that of a German or American literary critic versed in a particular school of reading. The native speaker norm of language classes has been replaced by the literary critical norm currently in vogue in academia.

Neither the reading strategies approach nor the attempt at placing the non-native reader in the position of the critic interpreting the literary text does justice to the non-native reader, the foreign text, or the act of reading. The problems of the practice are the deficiencies of the theory. Information-processing theories of reading have failed to account for the thorny problem of background knowledge necessary to read and understand foreign cultural texts. Reader response theory, modelled on the paradigm of national literatures read by native readers, did not look at the gaps in a literary text as culture-specific phenomena; nor did reception theory consider the status of the individual reader—it only took into account differences in the diachronic, historically determined point of view of reader communities to which the non-native reader does not belong.[12]

II. Foreign Language Literacy as Oppositional Practice

Rather than using theoretical models taken from native language literacy, we argue here that the literate activities of reading and writing in a foreign language should be considered a paradigmatic example for what social theorists and literary critics call *oppositional practice*.[13] For de Certeau, who coined the phrase, oppositional practice "consists of transforming imposed structures, languages, codes, rules, etc., in ways that serve individual or group purposes other than those 'intended'."[14] Oppositional practice is not resistance, dissidence or contestation. It just claims the right of the readers to position themselves at equal par with, i.e., in (op)position to, the text, by virtue of the very linguistic and conceptual power that the text has given them. By becoming aware of their oppositional stance, readers can enter into dialogue with the text and with other readers and eventually, through this

dialogue, experience "changes in desire" that potentially lead to social change. As Chambers remarks:

> Oppositional behavior does not *seek* change, although it may produce it, because it does not perceive the power it is opposing to be illegitimate (even though it is experienced as alienating). Rather than challenging the power that is in place, oppositional practices seek to solve an immediate problem [...] 15

That problem is of course at first a linguistic one. Learners wrestle with the new linguistic code, struggling to find an authorial voice in the utterances they speak or write. But the very fact that they are using a language that is not theirs to express a world that is or isn't of their choosing, opens up the opportunity to be "other in their own language and to be themselves in someone else's language."[16] Whether the learner repeats the phrases of the textbook or makes up his/her own, there is the potential for the creation of an oppositional space, where speakers and writers distance themselves from their own words and examine the context that prompted them to say these words this way rather than that way, or not to say them at all. This context includes, of course, the contraints imposed by multiple audiences and by the learners' limited grammatical and lexical resources. The oppositional stance we describe here does not seek to remove learners from their object of study, but, rather, "estranges [them] from taken-for-granted forms of talk or taken-for-granted contexts, in order to draw attention to them, [and] open them up for debate."[17] Oppositional practice creates what Chambers calls "room for maneuver";[18] it demarcates the space of a dialogic literacy that is not only the source of cognitive growth and understanding, but that can also elicit a "flood of aesthetic delight," to use Whorf's terms.

We argue that this dialogic literacy is fundamentally cross-cultural in nature. We apply here the term "cross-cultural" not to the traditional exchange of fixed ideas or material *products* between two historical communities on either side of national borders, but to the relational *process* of border crossing itself. Teaching cross-cultural literacy is not "teaching culture" in the usual sense of merely imparting a body of knowledge, although such a body of knowledge is a valuable starting point. It means facilitating the students' understanding of the essence of particularity and how this particularity is inscribed in the very language that people use. One way of getting them to develop their own and others' oppositional practices is by exploiting to the full the dialogic encounter between a literary text and its foreign cultural readers.

In order to illustrate such a pedagogical practice, we examine the writings of thirty low-intermediate college level students of German at UC Berkeley. We do so, not as teachers upholding standards of grammatical accuracy, but as candid readers who are intrigued by the intertextual relationship between a German text and the textual responses it may elicit from American readers. In the discussion of these writings, we illustrate and elucidate the discourse of oppositional reading, and show how students can be helped to identify the particular voice with which they as "authors" responded to the original.

III. Examples of Oppositional Practice

The prose narrative in this third-semester course was "Deutsche Kastanien" by Yüksel Pazarkaya, a story of discrimination against *Ausländer* in Germany.[19] Ender, a young boy born in Germany of Turkish parents, who considers German to be his native tongue, finds one day that Stefan, his favorite playmate, refuses to play with him in the schoolyard, with the excuse: "Du bist doch kein Deutscher." This incident brings back a similar incident a year before when German children refused to let Ender gather chestnuts for math class, also claiming: "Du bist Ausländer. Das sind deutsche Kastanien. Wenn du sie anfaßt, kannst du was erleben." Confused and distressed, Ender asks his parents: "Bin ich nun Deutscher oder Türke? Wer bin ich?" The mother doesn't dare tell him the truth. The father answers: "Du bist Türke, mein Sohn, aber du bist in Deutschland geboren" and comforts him with the promise that he will talk to Stefan. The assignment was: "Fassen Sie die Geschichte in 4–5 Sätzen zusammen".[20]

This story of discrimination in the schoolyard, written in simple German, is most likely a familiar one to American students and could be expected to be summarized in approximately the same way by all. Yet each student, despite his or her limited linguistic resources, recast the story within a unique discourse perspective.[21] In the following we identify three major ways in which the students transformed Pazarkaya's original hypotext into their own (hyper)texts: re-evaluation of the events, restructuring and re-weighting of the information, re-

O/95-4

location of the story's meaning.

1. Re-evaluating the events

The students' summaries fell into roughly four categories according to the type of evaluation they added to the factual rendition of events.

a. Implicit evaluation.

A first group of summaries molded itself closely to the original storyline, withholding any explicit personal evaluation of the events. One example of this type is:

> Es war einmal ein Kind hieß Ender. Ender war in Deutschland geboren, aber seine famillie kommt aus Türkei. Ender konnte gut Deutsch sprechen wie alle Kinder in seinem Schuhle. Ender glaubt, daß er ein Deutscher ist, weil er gut Deutsch sprechen konnte und in Deutschland gebiert. Ender hatte viele Deutsche Freunden, mit der er spielt sehr gern. Aber eines Tages ein Freund von Ender sagte: "Ender du bist kein Deutsch." Ender konnte nicht die Bemerkung verstehen, denn er fragte seinen Vater davon. Aber sein Vater hatte keine Lösung.

But even a seemingly descriptive report like this one contains some implicit authorial evaluation of the events. Phrases like "wie alle Kinder in seiner Schule" and "Ender hatte viele deutsche Freunde" are chosen so as to evaluate and emphasize Ender's normal social behavior and friendship patterns and make the rejection by his friend look all the more surprising.

b. Intradiegetic evaluation.

Several summaries made in their storyline explicit mention of the characters' motivations or feelings, either by quoting from the original ("[Die Eltern] kamen aus Türkei, um Geld zu verdienen"), by paraphrasing the original ("Ender war sehr traurig," "Er fühlt beleidigt," "An diese Frage sind die Eltern überrascht") or by supplying an explanation that was not in the text ("Der Sohn dachte, wenn man Deutsch spräche, wäre er deutsch").

c. Extradiegetic evaluation.

Many writers ended their summaries with an authorial evaluation of the theme of the story, for example:

> Seiner Vater kann die Fragen nicht gut antworten. Die Geschichte fragt die Frage, daß wenn ein "Ausländer" in Deutschland geboren ist, er

ist Beide ein Deutscher und ein Türker. Wie kann dieser Mann was etwas zu tun wissen? Er ist in die Mitte von zwei unfreundliche Seiten."

> Das war der ersten Mal, daß er vielleicht ein Auslander ist und daß vielen verschienden zwischen ihm und dem anderen Kinder sind.

> Die Jungen sagte,"Sie sind Deutsche Kastanien! Du bist kein Deutscher!" Aber, die Kastanien und Ender sind beide jetzt Deutch.

> Er wunshte zu kennen—wer bin ich? Dieses Problem kommt oft wenn mann ein Auslander ist. Es ist die Frage "Was ist der Untershied zwischen uns?" Aber gibt keinen Unterschied in Realität, außerdem das der superficiel ist. Die Kastanien sind ein Symbol. Es bedeutet das wir unsere untershieden machen.

These authors recast in their own terms what they perceived Ender's dilemma to be, in an attempt to bridge their world of experience and the world in which the story was written. We distinctly hear the authorial voices in each of their summaries: empathetic, understanding, outraged, philosophical.

d. Global interpretation.

A small group of summaries reflected their authors' decision to abandon a narrative report altogether and to synthesize, rather than summarize, the story. One example is given below:

> Das Problem für die Ausländer ist nicht nur ein Problem der Erwachsenen, sondern auch ein problem der Kinder. Die Kinder lernen von den Erwachsenen, daß die Ausländer anderes sind und spielen nicht mehr zusammen aber oft verstehen sie nichts warum es diesen Unterschied gibt.

Interestingly, this short synthesis makes explicit the unstated reason for the mother's silence in the central paragraph of the story: Not that she does not know the answer, but she doesn't know how to explain to her son why he should still be a foreigner, even though he was born in Germany and speaks German like a native speaker. Because it is only referred to indirectly, this reason was left out in many student summaries, as the examples below show:

> Er fragte seine Eltern, ob er ein Deutscher war. Seine Mutter antworte ihn nicht richtig weil sie nicht verstanden hat.

or

> Seine Mutter hat nicht verstanden, weil Ender in Deutschland geboren war, und Deutsch war seine Muttersprache.

Most student authors interpreted the text's statement about the mother: "Was sollte sie da sagen?" not as a sign of helplessness, but as a sign of puzzlement or ignorance, thus rewriting into the German hypotext their own American puzzlement at the current discrimination against foreigners in Germany.[22]

2. Re-structuring the Information

Besides adding their own evaluative voice to the original hypotext, the foreign readers more or less consciously restructured the sequence and the value of the facts presented. It is interesting to examine on the microlevel how the student writers used grammar and syntax to restructure the text's informational content so that it fitted their own understanding of the story. For example, while the original text starts with Stefan's devastating statement to Ender in the schoolyard ("Du bist doch kein Deutscher!", sagte Stefan zu Ender in der Pause auf dem Schulhof."), the students chose various "frames" to start off their summaries. Some kept close to the original:

> Enders Freund Stefan sagte ihm "Du bist kein Deutscher!"

Some chose a topic sentence that reflected what they perceived to be the main point of the story, e.g.,

> Ein Junge, der Ender hieß, hatte einen guten Freund, der Stefan hieß.

Others stated right away the political problem, e.g.,

> Ender ist Türkischer Jung, der in Deutschland wohnt.

Each of these beginnings represents a different restructuring of the information presented in the original text and sets up different expectations in the reader.

Restructuring is accompanied by a reweighting of the value given to the events. For example, in the original text, approximately one third of the text space is devoted to Ender's experience at school, one third to general background information about the family, and one third to the parents' reaction and Ender's questioning. This proportion is shifted in some summaries in favor of an emphasis either on Ender's problem, or on the parents' helplessness, or on the general political situation. The different values given by two student authors to "Ender's problem" vs. "Parents' helplessness" respectively are well illustrated in the two following summaries:

> 1. Es geht um einen Junge der Ender heißt und er ist ein Ausländer. Seine Familie kommt aus Türkei, aber war in Deutschland geboren. Eines Tages sagte sein bester Freund, daß er nicht mit Ender spielen wollte weil er kein Deutscher war. Ender wurde traurig und er merkte zum ersten Mal daß er anders war, wie die andere Kind. Seine Eltern waren *auch* traurig und sagten daß sie mit sein Freund sprechen werden, aber sie wußten *auch* nicht genau was sie machen sollten. (our emphases)

> 2. Enders Freund Stefan sagte ihm "Du bist kein Deutscher!" weil Ender Türke ist der in Deutschland geboren ist, und Ender wußte nicht, was er meinte. Er fragte seine Mutter "Was bin ich?" Seine Mutter wußte nicht, wie sie *diese Frage* antworten soll, und Ender stellte seinem Vater die Frage. Enders Vater sagte ihm daß es *eine sehr schwere Frage* ist. Der Vater sagte, daß er mit Stefan sprechen würde, und daß Stefan mit Ender wieder spielen würde. (our emphases)

In the first summary, four of the five sentences refer to Ender; the fifth sentence, even though referring to the parents, is subordinated to the main theme—"Ender's problem"—by its double use of "auch." In the second summary, four of the five sentences refer to the parents and the difficulty they have dealing with "die Frage." By devoting four fifths of his summary to the "schwere Frage" of national identity ("Wer bin ich?"), the second author is interestingly making the question itself, not the human characters, the main focus of his story.

3. Re-locating Meaning

By inserting their own valuation and evaluation of the original textual events into their hypertexts, and by refocussing the information structure in the very syntax they used, the student authors relocated the meaning of the story into a new discursive struc-

O195-6

ture. These relocations are all the more ingenious as the linguistic resources of these third semester authors are naturally limited. The two examples below show how the discourse ability of foreign writers can sometimes far exceed their linguistic abilities.

Example 1

> Diese Geschichte ist über einer jugend. Er heißt Ender. Und er hat eine Probleme weil, sein Freund ihm sagte daß er kein Deutscher ist. Und alles wo Ender geht, die Menschen sagt zu ihm daß, er kein Deutscher ist. Er ist ein Ausländer von Türkei.

Grammatical and punctuation errors notwithstanding, this short statement captures well in its rhythm and in its simple powerful structure the tragic human situation of foreigners in Germany. The core of the problem is well expressed in the parallelism of the two complex sentences starting with "Und...," the second echoing and amplifying the first. The first two short main clauses are picked up and transformed in the end by a single equally short main clause that says it all: "Er ist ein Ausländer von Türkei." Only linguistic limitations have prevented this author from making use of the full rhythm of his last two sentences to get his message across. A correct version would be: "Und überall, wo er hingeht, sagen die Menschen ihm, daß er kein Deutscher ist. Er ist ein Ausländer aus der Türkei." The cadence here reinforces the message the student author had intended to convey.

Example 2

> Es gibt ein Türke Kind, das Ender heißt, das in Deutschland wohnt. Er ist im Deutschland geboren, und er spricht Deutsch am besten. Er geht zu eine Deutsche Schule, und seine Freunden sind Deutsche. Aber, die Deutsche Kinder sind ihm böse und sie sagen das Ender keine Deutsche ist, weil seine Eltern Türke sind. Das wird schwerer, wenn er älter wird.

The word "deutsch" repeated seven times throughout this short six-line summary forms the core of a microstory which is framed by the two occurrences of the word "Türke," one at the beginning, one at the end. The text not only refers to but is also a metaphor for a Turkish boy whose

world is now German, but who lives at the periphery of that world.

One could argue that the repetition of the word "deutsch" in this short text is due to the typical awkwardness of a third-semester German student, and not to any sophisticated sense of discourse structure. And indeed, we refrain from making any judgments as to whether this and the other texts reflect their authors' conscious "intentions." However, the fact that any one of these sentences was composed from a set of available options and from decisions as to what to say and how to say it in so few words, makes it possible to read these texts as authors' texts in their own right and to assess their effect on the reader.

Each in their own way, the students' hypertexts defined themselves in opposition to the original hypotext—revaluing it, restructuring it, relocating the center of its meaning. To be sure, they sometimes were outright unfaithful to the original, as when students wrote: "Die Mutter wußte die Antwort nicht," because they had misread the relevant passage. Such misreadings are easy to rectify by returning to the wording of the original text. But the purpose of discussing with student authors the choices they made is not to teach them the one correct reading, but to make them understand that a summary is already an interpretation and a way of inserting oneself into someone else's story. And because one rewrites the other person's story within one's own social and cultural context, classroom discussion should strive to situate the authors' choices within their social and historical context as well as on the effect that discursive choices have on readers.

For example, students' texts seem to be influenced by other genres into which the students might have been schooled or socialized from their own cultural environment. To the authors of this paper, some of the summaries read like police reports, others like fairy tales, others like familiar American children's stories of the genre "My-best-friend-doesn't-want-to-play-with-me-any-more." But our reactions as readers are themselves determined by our cultural background and the written genres we ourselves have been schooled in.

What other texts are the student summaries echoing? For example, where do such phrases as "[Ender] hat eine Probleme..." come from? Not only did they seem to us to be a direct translation from the American common saying "he has a problem," but we suspected them to echo a tendency in American discourse practice to transform socie-

tal problems into local individual ones, that can be solved by local solutions. However, we cannot define for the students the locus of their oppositional stance; we can only offer them, through our own candid reading, the opportunity to discover the potential meanings of their own texts. It might not have been the intention of this particular author to convey the meanings we as readers imputed to the text, or the author might have just been replicating a meaning she found in the original text, (after all, Ender's father himself suggests solving the problem by talking to Stefan!). Yet the confrontation of the American student's phrase with a German reader's reaction can bring up for discussion the hidden social and historical forces behind seemingly anodine utterances.

In all these examples, the development of cross-cultural literacy entails making visible the myriad ways in which foreign readers enter into dialogue with a text when they do as simple an exercise as summarizing it. It requires also a conscious reflection with the students on the linguistic and cultural context of their own and of the original text.

Conclusion

Literacy practices in foreign language study have been dominated by two types of theory: information-processing theories of reading and reader response theory of literary criticism. Neither theory considers the oppositional position of the foreign cultural reader of the foreign cultural text. Oppositional reading practice should allow an expansion of reader response theory to a point beyond the paradigm of nationally circumscribed reception and co-production of meaning. Within this framework, the act of reading in a foreign language is the activity of shaping the contours of cultural gaps in meaning and relocating them if necessary. The exploration of the relationship between hypotext and hypertext that Genette calls "transtextuality" can be easily broadened to make foreign language learners aware of their room for maneuver.

However, in order for oppositional practice to be meaningful and ultimately transformative, it has to be validated as such by the teacher. Learners have to be addressed not as deficient monoglossic writers, but as potentially heteroglossic narrators. The texts they read and the texts they write have to be considered not only as instances of grammatical or lexical paradigms, not only as expressing the thoughts of their authors, but as *situated utter-*ances, directed by a particular writer to a particular reader about a particular topic. Only by positioning texts in their contexts of production and reception by individual authors/readers can the development of cross-cultural competence be enriched by a growth in aesthetic and critical consciousness that is the very essence of literacy.

Redefining literacy as a form of oppositional practice is simultaneously more modest and more ambitious than traditional forms of foreign language pedagogy. It does not require adherence to any particular literary theory since it opens up the literary text to a variety of readings rather than asking for one affirmative response; but it does require social commitment, for it implies that literacy in a foreign language is not an isolated individual achievement, but a social process of rewriting oneself through dialogue with another.[23] Ultimately, such a view of literacy is educationally sound because it makes learners conscious of the way their language, be it first or second, shapes the very reality they live in.

Notes

[1]Gerhard Neuner and Hans Hunfeld, *Methoden des fremdsprachlichen Deutschunterrichts: Eine Einführung* (München: Langenscheidt, 1993).

[2]See, for example, Claire Kramsch, "Socialization and Literacy in a Foreign Language: Learning Through Interaction," *Theory into Practice* (1987): 243–50; Vicki Galloway, "Toward a Cultural Reading of Authentic Texts," in *Languages for a Multicultural World in Transition*, ed. Heidi Byrnes (Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook, 1992) 87–122.

[3]For examples of such a redrawing of boundaries, see Paul Hopper, "Discourse Analysis: Grammar and Critical Theory in the 1980s," *Profession 88* (1988):18–24; Claire Kramsch, "Redrawing the Boundaries of Foreign Language Study," in *Language and Content. Discipline- and Content-Based Approaches to Language Study.* Ed. Merle Krueger and Frank Ryan (Lexington, MA: D.C.Heath, 1993) 203–17; Claire Kramsch, *Context and Culture in Language Teaching* (Oxford UP, 1993); Claire Kramsch and Sally McConnell-Ginet, "Conversational Epilogue," in *Text and Context: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Language Study* (Lexington, MA: D.C.Heath, 1992) 269–86; Janet K. Swaffar, Katherine M. Arens, and Heidi Byrnes, *Reading for Meaning: An Integrated Approach to Language Learning* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1991; Jeff Peck, "Toward a Cultural Hermeneutics of the 'Foreign' Language Classroom: Notes for a Critical and Political Pedagogy," *ADFL Bulletin* 23:3 (1992): 11–17.

[4]Second language reading research is represented by Marva A.Barnett, *More Than Meets the Eye: Foreign Language Reading. Theory and Practice* (Engle-

0195-8

wood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1989); Elizabeth B. Bernhardt, *Reading Development in a Second Language: Theoretical, Empirical, and Classroom Perspectives* (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1991); Patricia L. Carrell, Joanne Devine, and David E. Eskey, eds., *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988); Janet K. Swaffar, Katherine M. Arens, and Heidi Byrnes, *Reading for Meaning: An Integrated Approach to Language Learning* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1991).

[5]H. G. Widdowson, *Practical Stylistics* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992) 150.

[6]See J. Swaffar et al., 1991.

[7]For example, J. Michael O'Malley and Anna U. Chamot, *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990).

[8]For example, Janet K. Swaffar, "Constructing Tasks for Content Classes: The Case for Generative Iteration," in *Language and Content: Discipline- and Content-Based Approaches to Language Study*, ed. Merle Krueger and Frank Ryan (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1993) 181–200.

[9]Louise. Rosenblatt, *The Reader, the Text, the Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1978).

[10]The notion of intertextuality was first introduced by Julia Kristeva in an influential article entitled "Bakhtin, le mot, le dialogue et le roman," *Critique* 239 (1967): 438–65, translated as "Word, Dialogue, and Novel" in Toril Moi, *The Kristeva Reader* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986).

[11]Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré* (Paris: Seuil, 1982); see also, "Demotivation in 'Hérodias'," in *Flaubert and Postmodernism*, ed. Naomi Schor and Henry F. Majewski (Lincoln and London: U of Nebraska P, 1984) 192–201.

[12]Of course this problem is not peculiar to non-native readers. It is also encountered by native readers from a different time period, a different social background, a different level of education than the reader assumed by the text. The split between the teaching of language and the teaching of literature in academia serves among other things to reproduce a certain ability to read literary texts that is rarely taught directly, but rather, is assumed to have been acquired within the homes of the educated middle-class (see the analysis by Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron, *La reproduction: Eléments pour une théorie du système d'enseignement* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1970).

[13]Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1984); also, "On the Oppositional Practices of Everyday Life," in *Social Text* 3 (1980): 3–43.

[14]Ross Chambers, *Room for Maneuver: Reading (the) Oppositional (in) Narrative* (Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1991) 6.

[15]Ibid., p.9.

[16]Emily Schultz, *Dialogue at the Margins: Whorf, Bakhtin, and Linguistic Relativity* (Madison, WI: U of Wisconsin P, 1990). p.61.

[17]Ibid., p.62.

[18]Chambers, p.xi.

[19]This story is taken from Yuksel Pazarkaya, *Hei-

reprinted in the the second year textbook by Ronald W. Walker, Erwin Tschirner, Brigitte Nikolai, and Gerhard F. Strasser, *Assoziationen: Deutsch fur die Mittelstufe* (San Francisco: McGraw Hill, 1991) 201.

[20]This assignment was given in two different classes. In one class the assignment was phrased: "Fassen Sie die Geschichte in 4–5 Sätzen zusammen," in the other: "Bitte erzählen Sie die Geschichte in Ihren eigenen Worten (4–5 Sätze)." We found that the two different wordings did not yield significantly different results.

[21]The student texts reproduced below have not been corrected for grammatical accuracy. We are concerned here not with the morphological but with the discourse features of these texts.

[22]The difficulty that many American students had with the German concept "Ausländer" became visible in class discussion. The teacher had brainstormed students' expectations by asking first the question "Warum verlassen Menschen ihr Heimatland?" and "Welche Probleme erwarten sie im fremden Land?" This latter question had generated many answers: "Sie haben kein Geld, keine Wohnung, keine Familie, keine Freunde, sie können die Sprache nicht, sie finden keine Arbeit, haben keine Arbeitserlaubnis, keine Staatsbürgerschaft, es gibt viele Vorurteile, kulturelle Unterschiede." For American students, this was the familiar problem of immigrants to a new country. However, when the teacher tried to explore the concept "Ausländer," students did not seem to have a clear picture of who that might be, as the following excerpt shows:

T. Was assoziieren Sie mit dem Wort "Ausländer"?
Ss. (silence)
S1. anders?
T. ja, Menschen die anders sind, fremd sind (writes the two words on the BB)
T. In Amerika, wer ist Ausländer?
Ss. (long silence)
S1. In Deutschland Ausländer sind alle Leute, die nicht wie Deutsche aussieht.
S2. Hier in Amerika ... kann ... viel Aussehen haben. Hier viel ... Akzent ... schlechtes Englisch ... weniger Bildung
S3. kein Englisch auch!
S4. Gibt es *Ausländer* in Amerika?

Of course, it is not for the students' lack of experience with ethnic prejudice in the United States, but their experience is not automatically linked to whether a person is an American citizen or not. For American students, Ender is just a "second-generation Turk/German" with a social integration problem, but not a problem of national identity. A German reader, who does not consider his country to be an immigration country like the United States, would have had no difficulty understanding why Ender was concerned about his national identity and why that question was so difficult to answer.

[23]See Claire Kramsch and Linda von Hoene, "The Dialogic Emergence of Difference: Feminist Explorations in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching," in *Rethinking the Disciplines: Feminism in the Academy*, ed. Domna Stanton and Ann Stewart (Ann Arbor, MI, U of Michigan P, forthcoming).