MCCORMICK'S SOCIOCULTURAL MODEL OF TEACHING LITERATURE
AND THE ENGLISH LITERATURE 12
INTEGRATED RESOURCE PACKAGE

by

LAURA JUNE THOMSON

B.A.   The University of British Columbia, 1988

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULLFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
(Department of Language Education)

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of _Language Education_

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date _April 14/99_

Abstract

This study uses the principles of case study methods to test the validity of Kathleen McCormick's 1994 sociocultural model of teaching literature, which is outlined in *The Culture of Reading and the Teaching of Literature*. Through an analysis of the British Columbia English Literature 12 Integrated Resource Package curriculum document from the perspective of McCormick's model the study gives examples of how the curriculum document is and is not compatible with her model, how activities in the document might be adapted to correspond with McCormick's sociocultural approach and how this analysis reveals strengths and weaknesses of both the curriculum document and the model itself. The study reveals that while many of the rationale statements and prescribed learning outcomes could be adapted to accommodate McCormick's model, those relating to the influence of social and historical contexts of production of the text, the text as a site for multiple meanings and the centrality of student response are best represented. The principles of McCormick's model not represented are those relating to the context of a text's reception, the constructed nature of a reader's response and of the curriculum, and the naturalizing influence of ideology on a reader's response. The study also examines how McCormick's model might be applied to two texts in the curriculum. It goes on to suggest that the application of McCormick's model to this curriculum document has revealed the strengths of her model to

be the inclusion of the principles of a sociocultural approach to literature not found in the IR: those principles illustrated by her use of the concepts of reader and text having literary or general repertoires that do or do not match. These are

1. the context of a text's reception,
2. the constructed nature of the text, the reader's response and the curriculum, and
3. the naturalizing influence of ideology on a reader's response to the text.

The study recommends further examination of the practical application of McCormick's model and its principles to the literature classroom.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

> The model of reading set out here has grown out of
> a pedagogical imperative--the need to adapt
> developments in recent literary and cultural
> theory to the classroom. (McCormick, 1994, p. 90)

Kathleen McCormick's model of teaching literature outlined in *The Culture of Reading and the Teaching of English* (1994) draws from three perspectives on teaching literature which she labels as the objectivist approach (Cultural Heritage and New Critical approaches); the expressivist approach (Reader Response and Personal Growth Theory); and the Cultural Studies approach. McCormick argues that she attempts to preserve from each approach a focus on readers' strategies, a sense of individual readers actively reading texts, and an awareness of the larger social and historical circumstances affecting individual readers in her own sociocultural model of teaching literature.

This study uses McCormick's theoretical model of reading as a framework from which to analyze the British Columbia English Literature 12 Integrated Resource Package (IRP) for the purpose of addressing the following questions, which in turn contribute to the validation of McCormick's model:

1. What kinds of insights does a practical application of McCormick's model reveal about its strengths and weaknesses?

2. What kinds of insights about the IRP does applying McCormick's theoretical model to it reveal?

The primary significance of this study is that it provides an example of a practical application of McCormick's theory of teaching literature and thereby uses the IRP curriculum document to validate this theoretical model: to show its strengths and weakness.

Summary of the Literature Review

This study categorizes theories of teaching literature into three broad and possibly oversimplified categories: objectivist theory, expressivist theory, and cultural criticism, or poststructuralist theory. Objectivist theories, including theoretical orientations described as The Great Tradition (Leavis, 1952) and New Criticism (I.A. Richards, 1929), hold the view that singular, unchanging meaning resides solely in the text. (Corcoran, 1993; Moon, 1990; O'Neill, 1993) Expressivist theories are hailed as responsible for "democratizing the teaching of literature" (McCormick, 1994, p.35), as the "power relationship between reader, text and writer is shifted to privilege the reader" (O'Neill, 1993, p. 19). They stress cognitive strategies and the skills of the individual readers, and value the customs, beliefs, and present knowledge of individual students. According to Corcoran,(1994) the reader "lives through the experienced meaning that is for him the poem" (Rosenblatt, 1978, p. 40). Poststructuralist theorists criticize objectivist and expressivist theories of teaching literature because they do not acknowledge the social construction of subjectivity (or the readers' "supposedly" individual responses), or the social constructedness of the classroom situation (McCormick, 1994). Mellor and Patterson (1994) see the following assumptions

about texts and readers as crucial to Cultural Criticism or Poststructuralist theories of literature:

1. meaning is not fixed in or by the text,

2. texts are sites for the production of multiple meanings,

3. texts offer readers particular positions from which to read, and

4. its is possible for readers to produce multiple interpretations or readings. (p. 42)

McCormick (1994) states that, although rooted in Cultural Criticism, her sociocultural model of teaching literature attempts to bring together the best of each of these three approaches.

Methodology

This study, which follows the principles of case study design to examine how compatible the English Literature 12 IRP is with McCormick's model of teaching literature, makes the assumption that McCormick's model is an intelligent attempt to draw together the strengths of a variety of theoretical approaches to teaching literature. The study uses the following tenets of McCormick's model as a base from which to examine the IRP:

1. Reading is never just an individual, subjective experience. It is a cognitive activity that occurs within a social context.

2. A text is always "a site of struggle" : it may try to privilege a particular reading position as 'natural', but because readers are "subjects in their own histories" they may not produce that seemingly privileged reading.

3. An interactive model of reading (as McCormick describes her own) stresses that both readers and texts contribute to the reading process and that both texts and readers are themselves ideologically situated. (69)

With these in mind, the study examines statements from the IRP's "Introduction and Rationale statements"; Prescribed Learning Outcomes (PLO's); and Suggested Instructional Activities. These three parts of the IRP are analyzed to find examples of introductory statements, PLO's, or Suggested Instructional Activities which are compatible with the central ideas of McCormick's model.

The English Literature 12 Course

English Literature 12 is the flagship English literature course in the British Columbia school system. This senior-year elective course was expanded for the 1997/1998 school year from a chronological survey of the major figures in British literature from Anglo-Saxon times to World War I, to include later 20th century literature and works of English-speaking writers from Canada other Commonwealth countries, and the United States

The English Literature 12 IRP Document

The English Literature 12 course is comprised of one Core component, which is mandatory, and four optional modules, of which students must complete three. The Core studies module (25% of the

course's time allotment) is "a representative chronological survey of English language poetry and poetic drama from the medieval era to the present." (p. 3) It is divided into eight historical divisions:

> Classical / Medieval (Anglo-Saxon/ Middle Ages);
>
> Renaissance/Seventeenth Century;
>
> Englightenment;
>
> PreRomantic;
>
> Romantic;
>
> Victorian;
>
> Early Twentieth Century; and
>
> Late Twentieth Century.

The four optional modules for study are *drama, prose, poetry,* and *individual study,* in which students will "explore issues, themes, periods and genres relevant to the study of literature written in English from the medieval to the modern period." (p. 3) The choice of the particular texts and materials for study in the optional modules is left up to individual teachers; however, it is understood that the optional modules will cover material related to their foci from the eight historical divisions outlined in the core component of the course.

The Learning Outcomes for the curriculum are based on five curriculum organizers, which outline the guiding principles of the course: "Core Studies", "Reading and Thinking", "Written and Oral Expression", "Literary Concepts", "Personal Response". "The Core Studies" module addresses the Prescribed Learning Outcomes for the Core Studies curriculum organizer and the optional modules address

the learning outcomes for the other four curriculum organizers. These curriculum organizers are further divided into suborganizers listed in Appendix A.

Definition of Terms

New Criticism	approach to literature which "reifies the literary work as a self-contained artistic artifact." (Corcoran, 1994, p. 5)
Cultural Heritage	approach to literature which sees a teacher's obligation as transmitting literary culture to untutored students. (Corcoran, 1994)
Cultural Criticism	approach to literature which sees that responses to reading are not individual and idiosyncratic, but, in fact, are socially constructed. This social constructedness applies to responses, reading practices, text positioning and curricula. (Mellor and Patterson, 1994)
Reader Response	approach to literature which advocates that "no text is read independently of a reader's experience of other texts or of the common frame of knowledge lived through every day." (Trifonas, 1993, p. 387)
Personal Growth	model of English which emphasizes valuing the individual; relating learning to life; using personal language for learning; using language for real purposes and real audiences; encouraging wide reading and enjoyment of literature; and empowering the individual with responsibility and control over his or

her learning. (Mellor et al. in Thomson, 1992)

Objectivist	McCormick's (1994) category for literary theories which includes New Criticism, Cultural Heritage, and cognitive models of teaching literature.
Expressivist	McCormick's (1994) category for literary theories which includes Personal Growth, and Reader response theory.
Ideology	"Ideology is all those practices that most of a society's inhabitants take for granted as 'natural', or 'universal', as always true, even if (as we can show by comparing diverse cultures or different historical periods) they are not natural or universal, but rather are very specific to that culture. Ideology emerges in such ordinary, material practices of a society as marriage, family arrangements, religious beliefs, education, the value of the individual, political organization and in the very ordinary details of lifestyle. Ideology is always characterized by the acceptance of certain ways of living as natural, and the relative marginalization, rejection, even the incomprehensibility, of alternatives." (McCormick, 1994, p. 74)
Repertoire (a text's)	"a particular subset of discourses, combination of ideas, experiences, habits, norms, conventions, and assumptions, which the text draws on that allows it to be written and take the shape that it does."(McCormick, 1994, p. 70)

| Repertoire (a reader's) | "a set of culturally conditioned experiences, beliefs, and their knowledge and expertise." (McCormick, 1994, p. 79) |

Assumptions

Underlying this study are the following assumptions:

1. McCormick's model of teaching literature is an intelligent attempt to draw together the strengths of a variety of theoretical approaches to teaching literature, and

2. Senior English students would benefit from a greater understanding of the following issues surrounding the reading of literature:

a. that readers, texts, and readings of texts are social constructions

b. that a text, which is a site of struggle for meaning, may try to priviledge a particular reading position as natural, and

c. that both readers and texts contribute to the reading process and both texts and readers are ideologically situated.
[Beavis,1994; Mellor and Patterson, 1994; Morgan, 1994; Green and Morgan, 1991; Freebody, Gilbert, and Luke, 1991; Willinsky, 1990; Gilbert, 1987]

Study Outline

Chapter II of this study reviews other studies and examinations of aproaches to teaching literature, outlines McCormick's model, and examines the call for curricula and

methodology that incorporates some of the perspectives of postmodern or sociocultural approaches to teaching literature.

Chapter III of this study explains the principles of case study design used to examine the English Literature 12 IRP. Chapter IV details the study's findings and suggests two ways in which activities from the IRP might be adapted to accommodate McCormick's model, and Chapter V summarizes and attempts to draw conclusions from the study's findings, and makes suggestions for further practice and research.

CHAPTER II: THE LITERATURE REVIEW

Although "readers may believe that theories and concepts will deaden the spontaneity of their response to literary works" (Selden, 1985, p.26), more and more teachers of literature and researchers of teaching literature are recognizing that, as Kathleen McCormick (1994) writes,"we have no choice about whether to have theory in the classroom...theory is always there, in us and in our students" (McCormick, 1994, p.175). Theory about teaching literature is a way of looking at and understanding the text and the act of reading: it is a set of beliefs about what a text is and about what the process of reading is. Theory about reading dictates not only views of the text, but, and perhaps more significantly, "corresponding roles for the reader and the teacher" (Corcoran, 1994, p. 5). Our ideas about, or theory of, the act of reading, therefore, affect our approach to teaching reading and literature and ultimately our "results"--the consequences or effects of our reading and our teaching of reading. As a result, examining reading (or literary) theory is a central focus for research on the teaching of reading. This analysis will use the term "the teaching of literature," although McCormick (1994) uses teaching of literature interchangeably with teaching reading. She argues that although teaching reading is thought only to be done in primary grades, and then remedially after that, using the phrase "teaching literature" might exclude from her examination efferent texts, which she believes could be addressed by her model. In addition, most, if not all, theorists in the area of teaching literature are working under the tacit assumption that the students whom they

theorize about have all moved beyond the decoding stage in their reading development, whereas most practicing teachers recognize that this may not be so. I found only one article (Freebody, Gilbert, and Luke, 1991) in my reading, which, explicitly, although briefly, addresses the issue of "reading" or decoding in the teaching of literature. These authors recognize that their primary concerns are with the shaping of reading practices of those students who possess basic textual competence, but they also argue the position that reading, no matter how simply is a socially constructed activity: "all reading is built in the classroom" (p. 454).

Objectivist Theories of Teaching Literature

For the purpose of the literature review this study follows McCormick's classifications and categorizes theories of teaching literature into three broad, and possibly oversimplified, categories: Objectivist theory, Expressivist theory, and Cultural Criticism, or Poststructuralist theory.

In the realm of scholarly journals and research, if not in all classrooms, theoretical orientations described as The Great Tradition (Leavis, 1952) and New Criticism (I.A. Richards, 1929) are no longer popular with their assertions that "there is a meaning in the text put there by the author, which readers can be trained to uncover" (O'Neill 1993, p.19). Although these two orientations have been differentiated in terms of transmission and translation orientations to the text (Bogdan and Straw, 1990), Marnie O'Neill collapses them into a single category because of their view "that putative meaning resides in the text" (O'Neill, 1993, p. 19). New Criticism is seen as

championing the autonomy of literary texts, cutting them
free of the umblical cord which linked text with author
and establishing a set of critieria independent of changing
values and free of the untutored biases of specific readers.
(Moon, 1990, p. 8)

Both the orientations of the Great Tradition and New Criticism
encourage students to experience life through literature, to be
transported in time and space, and to feel as if "they were there":
teachers are "custodians and transmitters of literary culture" and
"certified explicators of the textual code" to students who are
culturally a "tabula rasa" (Corcoran, 1993, p. 4).

As well, based in this Objectivist model is what Kathleen
McCormick (1994) terms "the most influential development in
reading research and pedagogy...since the development in the 1960's
of the 'mind's new science' of cognitive psychology": the cognitive
model of reading (McCormick, p. 14). This model of reading
proposes that teachers should give readers enough background
knowledge so that they can use this "schemata" to decipher the
correct reading of the text. One weakness of this model is that it
does not allow for the possibility of readers bringing in background
knowledge that might support an alternative reading of the text.

Expressivist Theories of Teaching Literature

In contrast to this Objectivist theory of reading (and therefore
theory of the text, the reader and the teacher's role), in which power
resides in the text and with the author's intention, Expressivist

theories see this same background information, or schemata, not as a way to get to the correct reading, but as an opportunity to encourage students to develop their own authentic or alternate readings. Kathleen McCormick sees Expressivist theories as responsible for "democratizing the teaching of literature" (p. 35); O'Neill adds that the "power relationship between reader, text and writer is shifted to priviledge the reader" (O'Neill, p.19). These Expressivist theories are primarily associated with the personal growth model of teaching literature.

Mellor, O'Neill, and Patterson (Thomson, 1992) characterize personal growth theory as an amalgamation of Personal Growth and Reader Response theory. Using John Dixon's report of the Dartmouth Conference (1966) as a source, this personal growth model of English emphasized valuing the individual; relating learning to life; using personal language for learning; using language for real purposes and real audiences; encouraging wide reading and enjoyment of literature; and empowering the individual with responsibility and control over his or her learning (Mellor et al. in Thomson, 1992). Two dominant versions of Reader Response theory that are related to the Personal Growth model of English are the psychoanalytic and transactional theories. The psychoanalytic version (Holland, 1975 and Bleich, 1980) sees the text as a potential blueprint of the reader's identity theme, and reading of the text, therefore, results in personal idiosyncratic responses (Corcoran, 1994). The more predominant transactional version of reader response theory, based on the work of Louise Rosenblatt (1938, 1970), sees the text containing in itself a set of instructions for its

own realization. It stresses cognitive strategies and the skills of the individual readers, and values the customs, beliefs, and present knowledge of individual students (Corcoran, 1994): the reader "lives through the experienced meaning that is for him the poem" (Rosenblatt, 1978, p. 40). Peter Trifonas (1993) cites Eco (1979), Derrida (1974), and Rosenblatt, (1978) when stating that in reader response "no text is read independently of a reader's experience of other texts or of the common frame of knowledge lived through every day" (p. 387). In reference to Reader Response, Britton (1981) states that literature offers a vast extension of the range of possible human experiences available to the individual and that students find their own emotions and responses echoed in literature: the "genuine felt response" precedes the "expressed response" (Patterson, 1992, p. 135).

In contrast to Objectivist theories (New Criticism and Cultural Heritage) which see the text as the container of meaning, reading according to the perspective of Reader Response theory "is not the act of construing, but the act of constructing. Interpreters do not decode poems; they make them" (Fish, 1980, p. 327). As well, reading and writing for reader response theorists do not differ (Harker, 1990): "writing is not the communication of a message which starts from the author and proceeds to the reader: it is specifically the voice of reading itself: in the text, only the reader speaks" (Barthes, as cited in Mailloux, 1982, p. 40). In what serves as both a description and criticism of the limitations of Reader Response theory, John Harker (1990) writes that

a person becomes a reader by virtue of his [sic] activity in relationship to a text, which he organizes as a set of verbal symbols...and since this process is individual and private, the poem is removed from the text and takes on its existence within the conceptual space of the reader's mind. (p. 70)

In relation to Objectivist theories, the Personal Growth and Reader Response theories of literature significantly alter the way texts are taught, or more accurately, the way students respond to texts in classrooms. However, there are a number of criticisms of Expressivist theory. The Personal Growth model has been criticized for its connection to the Objectivist approaches (Cultural Heritage and New Critical approaches) to which it was intended as an alternative. For example, McCormick (1985) cites Flynn (1983) and Petersen (1982) as examples of reader-centered pedagogy that result in text-centered study much like that of the new critical approach. McCormick (1985) describes Flynn as using response strategies "to explore textual meaning...reifying the text and making the discovery of textual meaning the primary focus of her teaching" (p.156), and Petersen as regarding "response strategies as expressive preludes to the first draft of a more objective interpretative paper which will eventually illuminate not the reader or even the interaction of the reader and the text, but the text itself" (p. 156). Pam Gilbert (1987) states that "reader-oriented theories do not represent the radical shift necessary to shake free of the traditional expressive realist model of literature and its critical practices to produce new approaches to reading and writing in the classroom" (p. 243), and that what is needed is to read "in ways other than what seems

natural, universal, and self-evident in order to show that what may seem given is but a cultural construct" (p. 248).

Expressivist theories, according to McCormick (1994), were able to say what the text was not: objective; however, they were not able to say what the text was, other than a projection of the reader. [It is worth noting that Gilbert considers expressive realism to be the Cultural Heritage status of the text: Arnold's "the best that has been thought and said" (Corcoran, 1994, p. 5), whereas McCormick(1994) uses the term "Expressivist model" to label theories that "see reading primarily as an activity in which readers create their own 'personal' or 'subjective' meanings from the text as they read" (p. 30).] As well, Bull (1995) and Mellor and Patterson (1994), criticize reader response theory because it recognizes the reader's response as the only possible text related problem. Bull argues that when student difficulties arose in reader response theory, "these were interpreted as problems within the students themselves related to lack of comprehension or creativity, or an inability to meet the demands of a particular stage of reponse to a text" (p. 261).

The Cultural Criticism Theory of Teaching Literature

Much of the criticism of Personal Growth and Reader Response theory has come from Post-structuralist critics whose primary criticism is that these Expressivist models do not acknowledge the social construction of subjectivity (or the readers' "supposedly" individual responses), or the social constructedness of the classroom situation (McCormick, 1994).

Mellor and Patterson (1994) argue that many theorists see the following assumptions about texts and readers as delineating a boundary between Poststructuralist or 'Cultural Studies English' and earlier versions of English such as 'skills', 'Cultural Heritage', and 'Personal Growth':

1. meaning is not fixed in or by the text

2. texts are sites for the production of multiple meanings

3. texts offer readers particular positions from which to read

4. it is possible for readers to produce multiple interpretations or readings. (p. 42)

As well, Mellor and Patterson argue that these assumptions "indicate a theoretical advance" (p. 42) which offers benefits in terms of an "explicitly politicized form of English opposed to what are viewed as the 'elist' and 'naturalizing' tendencies of Heritage and Personal Growth respectively," (p. 42) and which frees texts and readers from the "constraints of the insistence of Skills and Heritage on 'the right answer' and from 'individualism' and 'universality' in the case of Growth model English" (p. 43).

The central position of the Cultural Studies or Cultural Criticism approach is that responses to reading are not individual and idiosyncratic, but, in fact, are socially constructed. This social constructedness applies to responses, reading practices, text positioning and curricula. Cultural criticism theorists believe that making meaning is not subjective or individual, but is shaped by sociocultural contexts (Corcoran, 1994); all other perspectives towards the text, the reading of the text, and the reader follow from

this belief: "reading is not a singular, private act, but an array of normative cultural practices" (Heap, 1991, p. 110).

In Cultural Criticism, the text is seen as a construction, not a reflection of reality that is true. Within all texts are assumptions about race, gender, and class, and through examining these assumptions the reader can uncover the "interested version of reality" promoted by each text (O'Neill, 1993). Fairclough (1989) also suggests that all literary texts "express distinct socio-cultural ideologies" (p. 39). In the same way that texts are constructed, so are the different readings of the text constructed as a result of foregrounding or privileging particular aspects of the text. This "positioning" occurs when texts "pragmatically constrain their interpretation and call into play particular reading positions" (Luke 1989, p. 61). Readers are positioned by the text and by sociocultural influences to marginalize or privilege particular meanings or readings. Cultural Criticism theorists see this positioning and the production of different readings as influenced by reading practices: primarily by how readers fill the gaps in the text and build meaning actively. Texts require for their understanding the use of "ideological patterns of action and belief" (Freebody, Gilbert and Luke, 1991, p. 455). Cultural Criticism theorists value making readers aware of their own reading practices so that they will be able to see what culturally and societally influenced perspectives they bring to the text in order to fill gaps or construct meaning. Cultural Criticism theorists also believe that in contrast to this, the Expressivist model encourages readers to fill gaps from life knowledge and therefore lock into readings that already fit with the status quo. Because of

this, Cultural Criticism theorists argue, the reader is forced to accept the reading positioning offferred by the text, rather than resisting or questioning that positioning (O'Neill, 1993).

According to O'Neill (1993) the possiblities of both accepting or resisting the text's positioning leads Cultural Criticism theorists to suggest that texts are therefore sites for conflicting or competing meanings rather than consensual responses. Cultural Criticism argues that the primary spontaneous response of reader response theory leads in two possible directions. The first is to accept every response because "that is what you think." The second, which Patterson (1992) calls "the tyranny of the Personal Growth model", is that the majority response modifies the minority response, and oppresses oppositional views. Patterson (1992) cites Britton (1970), and Dixon (1975) as examples of Reader Response searches for synthesizing, consensual and unifying readings. She suggests that not only does this search for consensus allow no room for dissenting voices or a plurality of perspective, but it also disallows any discussion of where these divergent or convergent readings come from, the values they support or affirm, and the grounds upon which any particular reading can be defended.

Cultural Criticism theorists, therefore, advocate teacher intervention in the reading process in order to heighten student awareness (metatextual awareness) of the ways texts instruct their readers to read. A variety of classroom activities that might result from a Cultural Criticism orientation are outlined in O'Neill (1993) and McCormick (1985). Prereading activities are used in culturally critical orientations to make visible to readers the assumptions they

bring to texts, and to make readers more aware of the text as only one possible construction. Using several texts based on similar situations and comparing readings of these texts also helps readers consider what attitudes and values are suppported in the different texts and readings of them. Examining the history of a text's critical reception allows readers to see the great variety of readings as a result of critics who are themselves readers conditioned by cultural assumptions.

Marnie O'Neill (1993) claims that the value of Cultural Criticism is that it has the potential to construct critical readers as opposed to simply responsive readers. As responsive readers are "prisoners of the text", critical readers "have the option to resist the text and to take up alternative, even oppositional reading positions," and can learn to see that "texts, rather than being regarded as the repositories of putative meanings or as offering universal statements about the human condition, can be perceived as culturally located artifacts" (O'Neill, 1993, p. 23).

Criticism of the Cultural Studies Model of Teaching Literature

Cultural Criticism addresses the issues of the social construction of text, reader, and, indeed, the classroom, and reflects a post-structuralist world view, which questions the belief in a single truth (logos) at the center of the text, and forces the reader "to acknowledge the text's plurality, incoherence, and arbitrariness" (Corcoran, 1994). However broadly it embraces the paradigm shift to Post-structuralism, Cultural Criticism, as well, has its limitations and critics. One criticism is of Cultural Criticism's apparent inability

to "conceptualize English teachers and students into the role of anything more than mere tools of social forces beyond their control" (Watson, 1995, p.6). Cultural criticism seems to emphasize social construction to such a degree that students may be led to believe that their personal capacities, responses, and beliefs are worthless and powerless. As well, according to Hunter (1994), in its classroom application Cultural Criticism has been criticized for being overly didactic and authoritarian and resulting in a transmission model of teaching in its attempt to encourage "resistant readers." Critics of Cultural Criticism, Doecke (1994) and Gutteridge (1992), wonder if there is room in the Cultural Studies approach to resist the positioning provided by the activities set up by the teacher: activities which themselves have been set up to reveal the text's own biases.

It is this final point upon which there is tremendous debate between the critics of Cultural Criticism (or Poststructuralist literary theory) and Post-structuralist theorists themselves. In the September 1994 volume of *English in Australia* (#109), devoted solely to the topic of Post-structuralist literary theory, Brenton Docke problematizes the freedom versus normativity debate and argues that the textual practice of a Postructuralist literature classroom is not very different from that of a New Criticism classroom in its attempt to indoctrinate particular responses in students. Along this same line of thinking, Hunter (1994) argues that English has functioned as "a moral induction into teacher approved norms" (p. 34). He suggests that students first learn that their untutored responses to literature are flawed or inadequate. Then they undergo a supervised "transformation through the introduction of norms

(they) are disposed to accept as coming from within" (p. 80). From this perspective Hunter (1994) sees the Poststructuralist classroom as potentially "a carefully crafted setting for the constant moral surveillance of apprentice citizens" (p. 82). This extreme characterization of a Poststructuralist approach to teaching literature does clarify one aspect of this debate. Robert Scholes' quotation refocusses attention on the issue at the heart of this debate: "Our job is not to 'produce' readings for our students but to give them the tools for the production of their own" (p. 24).

In an attempt to reconcile the opposing sides in this debate much has been written about how to include post-structural literary theory in the English classroom [Thomson, 1987, 1994; Freebody, Gilbert, and Luke, 1991; Morgan, 1994; Beavis, 1994; and Morgan and Green, 1991]. Morgan and Green (1991) describe a "third position beyond the binary of authoritarian transmission and the student-centered model" (p. 15). They call for

> a kind of balancing act, in teaching for learning...
> between engagement and estrangement: between
> being inside the fiction and being outside it, critically
> assessing it as social practice...Our aim is for our
> students to enter increasingly into the metapedagogic
> play of the classroom and so become co-authors in
> the construction of a changing and different curriculum".(p.
> 15)

McCormick's Sociocultural Model of Teaching Literature

In many ways Kathleen McCormick's (1994) model of literature study, which this study uses as a theoretical base from which to

examine the English Literature 12 curriculum, can be seen as an attempt to bring together the best of the student-centered model (reader response theory) and poststructuralist literary theory: a basis in the readers' own response and an awareness of the socially constructed text and reading. Her model flows in part from the four major points that McCormick believes post-structuralist literary theory can bring to reading theory:

> 1. readers are socially constructed, but are not without the ability to act,
>
> 2. readers are neither blank slates nor solely autonomous individuals,
>
> 3. readers are neither containers of meaning, nor are infinitely pliable, but are always "in use", and
>
> 4. texts are "produced under determinate conditions...and are reproduced under determinate conditions, not read 'faithfully' or solely from a personal perspective" (McCormick, 1994, p. 60).

In her book, *The Culture of Reading and the Teaching of English*, (1994) McCormick outlines a new sociocultural model of reading which clearly privileges the cultural studies (or cultural criticism) perspective, but also draws on "work in cognition that studies the particular strategies readers employ in various reading contexts" and preserves "the sense of individual readers actively reading texts" (McCormick, p. 68), which is a key aspect of expressivist theory. Behind the specifics of her model lie the beliefs that

1. reading is never just an individual, subjective experience. It is a cognitive activity that occurs within a social context.

2. a text is always "a site of struggle" : it may try to priviledge a particular reading position as 'natural', but because readers are "subjects in their own histories" they may not produce that seemingly priviledged reading.

3. an interactive model of reading (as McCormick describes her own) stresses that both readers and texts contribute to the reading process and that both texts and readers are themselves ideologically situated. (p. 69)

McCormick's model describes reading as an interface or matching of "repertoires." She acknowledges that the idea of matching repertoires has much in common with schema theory as both assume that

1. people take in and categorize information, beliefs, values, and ideas on the basis of their experiences, and

2. the way readers will read a text is determined, in large part, by how their particular systems of categorization and belief match those of the text. (p. 72)

McCormick begins her argument by defining what she means by society's general ideology, an idea she sees as underlying the entire act of reading:

Ideology is all those practices that most of a
society's inhabitants take for granted as 'natural',
or 'universal', as always true, even if (as we
can show by comparing diverse cultures or

> different historical periods) they are not
> natural or universal, but rather are very
> specific to that culture. Ideology emerges
> in such ordinary, material practices of a
> society as marriage, family arrangements,
> religious beliefs, education, the value of
> the individual, political organization and in
> the very ordinary details of lifestyle. Ideology
> is always characterized by the acceptance
> of certain ways of living as natural, and the
> relative marginalization, rejection, even
> the incomprehensibility, of alternatives.
>
> (McCormick, p. 74)

This ideology affects the reading and writing of all texts:

> Imagine ideology as a powerful force hovering
> over us as we write or read a text; as we read,
> it reminds us of what is correct, commonsensical
> or 'natural'. It tries, as it were, to guide both the
> writing and subsequent reading of a text into
> what it has defined as coherence. Ideology works
> to make some things appear more natural to write;
> it also works when we read to suggest what is
> natural, concealing struggles and repressions,
> forcing language into conveying predominantly
> those meanings reinforced by the dominant
> forces of our society. (McCormick, pp. 74-75)

This general ideology is a socially and culturally constructed force
which affects both reader and writer in the production of meaning.

As well, McCormick speaks of a literary ideology, related to
society's general ideology, but referring to "the particular
assumptions, beliefs, habits and practices that each society has in
relation to literature" (p. 75).

According to McCormick's model, a text's particular appropriation of ideology is called its *repertoire,* which is "a particular subset of discourses, combination of ideas, experiences, habits, norms, conventions, and assumptions, which the text draws on that allows it to be written and take the shape that it does" (p.70). McCormick is careful to point out that a text's or reader's repertoire is not an "objective list of features," but the text is always "in use," as texts themselves are, and is therefore subject to change as "the past is reconceptualized from changing determinate conditions of the present" (p. 71).

Both the text and the reader have literary and general repertoires that are drawn from the ideology of each. The perspectives of the text, attitudes about moral values, social practices, and political ideologies, make up the text's general repertoire. The reader's general repertoire is "a set of culturally conditioned experiences, beliefs, and their knowledge and expertise" (p. 79) on all matters. As well, the literary repertoire of the text is made up of "the literary conventions it follows and its formal strategies," (p. 81) such as literary form, character development, metre, plot, and point of view. Likewise, the literary repertoire of the reader consists of his or her understanding and "assumptions about what literature 'is' or 'should be' based on his or her previous reading experiences and the assumptions about reading (and literature) he or she has absorbed from the literary and general ideology of the culture" (p. 84).

Reading, from the perspective of this model, therefore occurs when the reader's repertoires intersect with the text's repertoires.

McCormick sees three possible results coming out of this "intersection of repertoires" (p. 80).

1. a matching of repertoires: The reader's expectations are fulfilled by the text's features, literary or general: all seems 'natural.'

2. a mismatching of repertoires: The reader's expectations are not fulfilled by reading a text. The reader may be unfamiliar with particular elements of the text (literary repertoire), or may not have sufficient information in his general repertoire to understand the ideology in the text. Because of this mismatching, or lack of, intersection, the reader is unable to interact in a meaningful way with the text.

3. a tension exists between the reader's and text's repertoires because the reader is sufficiently familiar with the text's repertoire but disagrees with or opposes the repertoire for various reasons (p. 87).

It is this tension between a reader's and a text's repertoires (point three above) that results from reading that McCormick sees as an opportunity for readers to take up informed positions of their own to defend alongside of, or against, the text. However, she sees this resulting only from readers becoming "increasingly conscious of the historical and social conditions in which texts have been produced and reproduced, and of the conditions that are working to produce them (the readers) as reading subjects" (p. 88). It is this final issue of the reader's understanding of the constructedness of response which McCormick sees as the most significant limitation of the Reader Response theory, and therefore the most significant

strength of Cultural Studies and her own sociocultural model of reading.

Freebody, Gilbert, and Luke (1991) advocate much of what McCormick's model attempts: "a reading pedagogy that interactively foregrounds for students the identification, analysis and contestation of the procedures and reading positions upon which texts call" (p. 450). McCormick's matching of repertoires has, as its central focus, "the dissonance between texts, ideologies, and discourses" (Freebody et al, p. 453), which Freebody, Gilbert, and Luke (1991) cite as a general strategy for a Poststructuralist pedagogy. As well, the origins of McCormick's model in student responses and students' understanding of the constructedness of their responses fit with Willinsky's (1990) call for "thoroughly Postmodern students of literacy" whose "lessons...push past the personal response to an understanding of how the text works the reader, the classroom and the world" (p. 179), while refuting critics of Postmodernist theory who see only "the essential incompatibility of reader response and postmodern deconstruction" (Gutteridge, 1992, p. 95).

As well, Mellor and Patterson's (1994) staging of the reading lesson consists of a four step procedure which is similar to, although less detailed than, McCormick's model:

1. the initial reading (which Mellor and Patterson call inadequate, and which McCormick might call "partial")

2. the problematizing of the student's initial reading by the teacher and the teaching of particular reading practices

3. the withdrawl of the teacher and

4. the production of the students' own readings. (pp. 50-51)

As the debate among advocates of objectivist, expressivist, and cultural studies literary theorists reveals the limitations of each approach, the strength of McCormick's model is, therefore, her attempt to address these criticisms by combining what is of value in each approach to teaching literature: the cognitive schema theory of objectivist models; the centrality of reader response from expressivist theory; and the awareness of the influence of social context, which comes from cultural studies.

This study's application of a theoretical model of teaching literature (McCormick's) to a curriculum document (the English Literature 12 IRP) is difficult to find in other studies. Much of the examination of Poststructuralist literary theory and its relation to teaching literature relates to the application of Poststructuralist theory in the literature classroom and not to the application of Poststructuralist theory to a curriculum document. With respect to the practical application of theory in the literature classroom, Calahan and Downing (1991), in *Practicing Theory in Introductory College Courses*, write

> Looking for sources on the subject of literary pedagogy
> one finds that anything like a comprehensive consideration
> of the specific classroom applications--especially at the
> introductory level--of contemporary literary theory has
> been slow in coming. (178)

Moran and Penfield suggest much the same in *Conversations: Contemporary Critical Theory and the Teaching of Literature* (1990):

> Further research on literary theory and pedagogy will
> have to continue to attend more closely to what specific

teachers do in specific classrooms within particular
instructional settings. (303)

Calahan and Downing (1991) cite *Conversations: Contemporary
Critical Theory and the Teaching of Literature* (1990) as one
exception to this absence of the examination of the application of
literary theory. The editors of this text state in its introduction that
it "fills a gap in teachers talking about what they do in their
literature classrooms" (p. 15). Although in this text there are eight or
nine articles in which teachers discuss poststructural approaches
they take to teaching literature, there is no discussion, other than in
general terms, of a definition of poststructuralist literary theory, or
of systematic approach by which poststructuralist literary theory's
use in the classroom or its application to curriculum is evaluated or
analyzed.

For example, Steven Lynn's article in this text, "A Passage in
Critical Theory", examines an excerpt from *Here at the New Yorker*
(1975) from five critical perspectives and comes to much the same
conclusion as did Eisner in his analysis of "A Study of Man" through
five different screens. Lynn concludes that "plurality is better than
unity" (p. 110). Joel Wingard's article in *Conversations* (1991),
"Delivery on the Promise of Liberal Education", argues in favour of
much the same kind of theoretical approach as does McCormick. He
calls his a "reader response/ cultural criticism" approach (p. 151)
whose result will "heighten your consciousness of your role in
making meaning of experience" (p. 161).

As well, there are three or four other articles advocating
poststructuralist approaches to literature teaching with various texts,

but there is no discussion of the system by which the theory is applied to the text (no curriculum documents are examined for theoretical influences); nor is there any detailed discussion of how poststructuralist literary theory affects student learning. Simply, the conclusion most researchers in this text come to is that poststructuralist theory is a valuable addition to the teaching of literature: a conclusion that supports McCormick's sociocultural approach to teaching literature. However, little has been examined with regards to analysis of the practical application of poststructuralist theory in the classroom or the application of poststructuralist theory to curriculum documents. This points to the need for two areas of further study which will be discussed in Chapter V of this study:

1. study of the application of poststructuralist literary theory to curriculum documents, and

2. the application of poststructuralist theoretical approaches to classroom practices.

Much of the debate about literary theory and its role in teaching literature that has been outlined in this chapter points in one general direction: poststructuralist or sociocultural approaches to teaching literature have valuable contributions to make to the teaching of literature. However, what is lacking is a systematic examination of how the key characteristics of this liteary theory can be applied to curriculum documents and ultimately classroom practice. McCormick's model begins to do this.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Although not easily categorized as clearly one kind of research design, this study most closely approximates the principles of a case study design methodology as it is an analysis of data that focuses on one phenomenon in order to understand it in-depth (Schumacher and McMillan, 1993). As this study uses McCormick's theoretical model of teaching literature to analyze the English Literature 12 IRP, in-depth knowledge about the model and the IRP are gained. The concentration of the case study design allows "researchers to discover what are the important questions to ask of a topic and what are the important topics in education to pursue empirically" (Schumacher and McMillan, 1993, p. 375).

According to Schumacher and McMillan (1993) one of the purposes of the case study design is to develop a concept or model. In this study it would be more accurate to suggest that an examination or analysis of a model (McCormick's) is its purpose. As well, this study follows another principle of the case study design: that of discovery-oriented or exploratory research. Schumacher and McMillan (1993) characterize this kind of inquiry as "an examination of a topic in which there has been little previous research in order to elaborate a concept or to lead to further inquiry" (p. 376). In this way, McCormick's sociocultural model answers a call from researchers [Beavis, 1994; Morgan, 1994; Mellor and Patterson, 1994; Gilbert, 1987] for approaches to teaching literature which embrace a post-structuralist perspective, and this study can be seen as an initial

examination of how this model might be applied to one particular curriculum document.

In two other areas this study follows the principles of the case study design: sampling and external validity. Purposeful sampling, "selecting information-rich cases for study in-depth" [Patton, 1990, p. 169, as cited in Schumacher and McMillan, 1993, p. 381], is often associated with the case study design when a researcher wants to understand something about cases without needing or wanting to generalize to all cases like it. This approach to sampling can best describe the selection of the English Literature 12 IRP as the document to analyze from the theoretical base of McCormick's model. Three techniques of purposeful sampling have also been used to select parts of the IRP for examination: extreme case sampling chooses the extreme example from a group, typical case sampling selects the typical characteristics of a group, and unique case sampling chooses the unusual or rare case (Schumacher and McMillan, 1993). Examples of these kinds of choices will be outlined later in this chapter when the methodology of this study is detailed.

With respect to generalizability and external validity, Schumacher and McMillan (1993) suggest that the primary aim of case study design is "not the generalization of results, but the extension of the understandings and detailed descriptions that enable others to understand similar situations and extend these understandings in subsequent research" (p. 354). The case study design principle of this extension of understanding suggests that the

practical application of the model would help to validate the model and show how it could be valuable.

According to Schumacher and McMillan (1993) two characteristics of a case study design which increase external validity are comparability ["the degree to which the research design is described so that the study can be used to extend findings" (p. 354)], and translatability ["that the theoretical framework and research strategies are understood by others" (p. 354)]. To this end what follows is a description of the methods employed in this study.

As applying all the specifics of McCormick's theoretical model (literary and general repertoires) to a curriculum document would have been too broad an approach, her model was narrowed to three general principles about reading and teaching literature. These were the three principles McCormick herself suggests are at the base of her model (p. 68) and examining these revealed that they were indeed ideas from which the details of her model emerged. The three tenets, also listed on page 8, are as follows:

1. Reading is never just an individual, subjective experience. It is a cognitive activity that occurs within a social context.

2. A text is always "a site of struggle" : it may try to privilege a particular reading position as 'natural', but because readers are "subjects in their own histories" they may not produce that seemingly priviledged reading.

3. An interactive model of reading (as McCormick describes her own) stresses that both readers and texts contribute to the reading process and that both texts and readers are themselves ideologically situated. (p. 69)

Parts of the IRP and what encompasses the English Literature 12 course were omitted. The assessment strategies, exam specifications and the exam itself concentrated on the evaluation of students' abilities to recall objective and factual material and therefore examining these sections for their compatibility with McCormick's model did not seem worthwhile. Because lists of resource materials would not have had the same influence from theoretical perspectives which were found in other parts of the curriculum they were not examined. The remainder of the IRP was divided into two sections:

1. Introductory Statements and Rationale, and

2. Learning Outcomes and Suggested Instructional Activities.

The next step was to read the subsections of these two sections: general categories, introductory statements, individual learning outcomes, and instructional strategies, and then to categorize statements as either:

1. compatible with McCormick's model,

2. neutral with respect to McCormick's model, or

3. antithetical to her model.

As well, subsections of these two IRP sections were categorized according to their compatibility with other theoretical perspectives on teaching literature (objectivist or expressivist approaches). Round figures (i.e., two-thirds, one half, 90%) are used throughout the study to give the reader a clearer, but not exact, perspective of the relationship between individual examples and other material in the IRP. Attempting to give exact percentages would detract from the

study's attempt to find theoretical perspectives compatible with McCormick's model.

As is outlined in Chapter IV of this study there were approximately one-third of the statements from the IRP which could be classified as

1. not clearly revealing an alliance with any particular theoretical perspective. For example: the learning outcome which suggests that students "demonstrate an increasing level of confidence in oral reading" (p. 46) was considered atheoretical enough to exclude from analysis.

2. revealing a possible alliance with a number of theoretical perspectives. For example: the learning outcome which states that students will "demonstrate an understanding of and evaluate the purpose and effectiveness of recurring images, motifs, and symbols" (p. 40) could be viewed from a New Critical direction through an examination of how a symbol reveals theme in a particular short story. It could as well be taken in a Reader Response direction if readers were to be asked to examine how effective a recurring motif is for them, or what effect did it have on their reading?

These two examples reveal part of the process undertaken to eliminate some of the statements from the IRP as not relevant for examination in this study. Those statements deemed relevant showed clear bias toward one and sometimes many theoretical perspectives. For example, a rationale statement that mentions "refining personal values" (p. 1) could be classified as compatible

with a personal growth perspective as well as McCormick's theoretical approach as it is rooted in the recognition that a reader's personal response is central to his making meaning from the text. As well, statements about "social and historical influences on literature" (p. 4) are those which could be seen as compatible with aspects of McCormick's model.

After this general categorization was completed, what Patton (1990), (cited in Schumacher and McMillan, 1993) calls "purposeful sampling" was employed to choose examples from the IRP which could reveal the most information about both the IRP and the theoretical model. For example, the learning outcome examined at the end of Chapter IV of this study, which addresses the rhetorical bias of an excerpt from *Pride and Prejudice*, is an example of unique sampling. It is the best example of an opportunity in the IRP to illustrate clearly McCormick's idea of the naturalizing force of society's ideology on a reader. Although no other parts of the IRP address this issue, this one example is out of the ordinary in its presentation and an opportunity to examine such an issue.

The case study principles of in-depth analysis of a single phenomenon apply generally to this study; however, most of the examples of case studies in the area of teaching literature or curriculum theory took a much different approach. [Cooley and Bickel, 1986; Schubert, 1986; Kimpston, 1985; and Martin, 1985] Most examined the implementation of curricula in the classroom or the implementation of a particular approach to teaching literature in the classroom.

One case study approach to curriculum implementation by Newell and Holt (1997) was typical of other examples found. It was a broadly based examination of how a particular English department implemented its curriculum. The study collected data from a variety of sources: formal (written) curriculum, teachers, administrators, student interviews, and observations of classes. Although the researchers did examine the written curriculum and came to the conclusion that it was treated by most teachers as a list of content material that needed to be covered, the primary focus of the study was the implementation of the curriculum. The researchers were concerned with the result--what was being taught--rather than how the curriculum guide influenced or did not influence what was being taught.

This same focus on curriculum use or curriculum interpretation in many curriculum studies was observed by Connelly and Clandinin (1990) in the "Curriculum Theory" section of *The Encyclopedia of Educational Research*. Connelly and Clandinin's classification of reserach methods in curriculum theory (Analytic/ Intentional/ Portrait/ Structural/ Societal) all refer to an examination of curriculum and curriculum theory in practice: studies "establishing relations between learner, teacher or milieu and the subject matter" (Schwab, 1978, p. 503 as cited in Connelly and Clandinin, 1990, p. 280). Eisner's analysis of "Man: A Course of Study" through the screen of five different orientations to curricula at the end of *Conflicting Conceptions of Curriculum* (1974) most closely approximated this study's isolation of and analysis of the theoretical perspective of an individual curriculum document. His example was

brief, detailed none of his method of analysis, and concluded that most curriculum documents will reveal a little of each of his five theoretical orientations to curriculum.

There are many other examples of curriculum studies which examined the implementation of curriculum or the products of the implementation of the curriculum. Much of the research in this area seemed to follow Schwab's (1978) statement that "work is incomplete until the relationships between empirical or theoretical findings and practice are established" (p. 520 as cited in Schumacher and McMillan, 1993, p. 287). Because of its focus on the theoretical compatibility of the IRP and McCormick's model, this study takes the first step toward a theoretical understanding of the IRP and the model. Clearly, according to Schwab, 1978, this study's relationship to practical applications needs to be examined with further research.

In conclusion, though not typical of many case study designs because it does not examine as its focus the implementation of curricula, this study does follow the general principles of the case study design with respect to its purpose of discovery-oriented research, its generalizability, and some of its techniques of sampling.

CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS

This chapter reports the findings of the analysis of four parts of the IRP from the perspective of McCormick's model and examines some of the methodological issues raised in the analysis of the IRP. The four parts of the IRP examined are the 1. "Introduction", 2. "Rationale Statements", 3. the issues of gender, race, and class in the IRP, 4. the "Prescribed Learning Outcomes and Suggested Instructional Activities" in the IRP, and two detailed examples of how McCormick's model might be applied to two texts in the IRP "Core Studies" module. The findings of the chapter concluded that although parts of the IRP are compatible with McCormick's model in the areas of the social and historical context of the production of a text, the focus of McCormick's model on the context of reception of a text or a reading of a text and the examination of the naturalizing influence of ideology in a text are not apparent in the perspective of the IRP document. As these findings reveal strengths and weaknesses in the IRP document, they also reveal strengths and weaknesses in McCormick's model. These will be discussed in Chapter Five of this study.

Analysis of the IRP's Introduction and Rationale Statements

Throughout the English Literature 12 IRP's Introduction and Rationale Statements there are references to attitudes toward reading that are based in both Objectivist and Expressivist models

with the Expressivist model dominating this section of the IRP. For example: the purpose of the course is to "examine and appreciate a rich literary heritage," (p. 1) (Cultural Heritage approach); students will have "aesthetic appreciation", do "close reading," refine their "critical judgement...and critical discernment with respect to literature," (p. 1) (New Critical approach); and teachers will provide an opportunity for literature to affect the "personal growth" of the student," (p.1) (Personal Growth theory). The perspectives that these examples reveal could be included as part of McCormick's model, but presented in isolation from contexts of production and reception, as they are in the IRP, these objectives are clearer examples of the perspectives emphasized by Objectivist and Expressivist models than of the theoretical approach advocated by McCormick.

However, two-thirds of the stated goals in the course IRP Rationale and Introduction statements suggest a general perspective toward reading and teaching literature which would not be excluded from McCormick's model. For example, the following is a sample of the twenty-five or so rationale statements in the areas which the IRP labels as Intellectual Development (#1-4, my numbering); Human and Social Development (#5-8, my numbering); and Career Development (#9, my numbering). These state that the English Literature course will offer students opportunities to

1. study significant works written in English
2. explore a broad range of literature
3. develop creative and critical thinking skills
4. appreciate the power of literature to express the
   human experience throughout cultural history

5. examine and appreciate the diversity and
   commonality of the human experience
6. recognize and appreciate enduring cultural values
7. develop a deeper respect for the range of voices
   within English Literature and English speaking
   societies
8. appreciate an evolving history and cultural tradition
9. develop skills of cultural literacy. (p. 1)

These objectives are almost three-quarters of the listed objectives of the English Literature 12 course which, although not the primary tenents of McCormick's theoretical perspective, could easily be said to be ones that her perspective might support. For example, rationale statement number four suggests that students will examine literature as it expresses the experience of writers throughout the history of English literature. McCormick's model characterizes such an approach as an example of the text's general repertoire:

> Every time we read a work that comes from the distant
> past or a different cultural formation, we encounter
> assumptions, beliefs, and perspectives that are different from
> our own. The perspective of the text, its attitudes about moral
> values, social practices, etc. make up its general repertoire.
> (McCormick, p. 76)

As well, McCormick's model would not be antithetical to rationale statement number one as her model might view it as an opportunity to examine how and why such "significant works" (p. 1) have been chosen as significant both to the period in which they were written

and to the present time in which they were chosen as texts for the course. McCormick's model of teaching literature would examine the literary and general ideologies of both time periods in order to explore ideas about good, or "significant", literature and the values of society reflected in these ideas about good literature.

However, this compatibility with McCormick's model could, as well, be said of other approaches to or models of teaching reading and literature, as many of the objectives listed above are sufficiently broad and inclusive in their theoretical influence. For example rationale statement number five (above) asks students "to examine and appreciate the diversity and commonality of the human experience" (p. 1). This statement might be supported both by a Cultural Heritage approach to literature (which would encourage students to analyze texts as primarily biographical illustrations of what human experience was at a particular time) and by a reader response approach to literature (which might encourage students to evaluate the experiences they encounter in their reading according to how well it does or does not fit with their own previous experience). These rationale statements are sufficiently broad to allow for a link with a variety of theoretical approaches to teaching literature, McCormick's model included.

More interesting than the above examples which support Objectivist and Expressivist perspectives are some of the examples of goals or objectives from the IRP's Rationale and Introduction statements which more closely approach some of the ideas integral to McCormick's reading model. In a number of places in the IRP (for example, pages 1, 2, 3, 6, 12,16,19, and 24), there is an emphasis on

the study of literature in relation to its social and historical context and the "extent to which literature both reflects and shapes culture" (p. 1). As well, it is stated that the course is one in which "literary texts are studied both as works of art for close reading and as reflections of social, political and historical forces" (p. 1). This final statement seems to be based in both the approach of New Criticism ("works of art for close reading"), and that of Cultural Criticism ("reflections of social, political and historical forces") (p. 1). Although the first part of this statement seems to be based in the approach of New Criticism ("works of art for close reading"), the second part ("reflections of social, political, and historical forces") is compatible with McCormick's model's emphasis on the role of the context of production in the making of textual meaning.

Although the historical context of a piece of literature is mentioned frequently in the IRP's introduction (pp. 1-3, and 5), "historical context is an integral part of the English Literature 12 course," (p. 3) it is used primarily to refer to the historical context of the production of the text. In very few places, is the historical context of the <u>reception</u> of the text explicitly referred to. This recognition of the importance of the dual influence of historical and social context on both the production (writing) and reception (reading) of a text is key to the interaction of reader and text repertoires of McCormick's model.

While the IRP Rationale and Introduction statements do address, and even emphasize, the importance of studying literary texts within their historical and social contexts, it is the context of production which is examined, and that of reception is lost as was

stated in the previous paragraph. "Literature texts are studied...as reflections of social, political and historical forces," (p. 2) suggests a recognition of how context influences the making of the text (production), but this IRP rationale statement does not suggest that the other element in the making of meaning (the reader's active construction of meaning in the reception of a text) is, as well, a reflection of these same social and cultural contexts or influences.

Although the context surrounding the reception or reading of the text seems to be lost as a focus, the reader's personal response, itself, is quite present in the IRP's Rationale and Introductory statements. Students are given opportunities to "engage with literature" (p. 7) and encouraged to "develop skills in formulating informed, personal responses to a wide range of literary texts" (p. 7). In relation to the emphasis that McCormick's model places on the influence of historical, social and cultural contexts on the production and reception of texts, the IRP does refer to students' "cultural literacy skills" (p. 3); their ability to "appreciate the power of literature to express the human experience throughout cultural history" (p. 1); and "an evolving historical and cultural tradition" (p. 1). The language used in these statements supports a perspective which sees culture as an influence which is important to understand as a force shaping attitudes. This is related to McCormick's idea that themes in literature which are sometimes called 'universal' need, instead, to be seen to be "historically situated rather than universal...and produced by historical and cultural variables" (p. 78). The IRP's reference to "cultural literacy skills" (p. 3) and "an evolving

cultural history" (p. 1) can be seen as beginning to address themes as culturally situated rather than as universal.

As these examples show, some of the above general objectives in the areas of intellectual, and human and social development, and some specific approaches to historical, cultural and social context can be connected to McCormick's sociocultural approach to teaching literature. However, approximately one-third of the Rationale and Introduction statements in this IRP can be construed as antithetical to McCormick's model: in particular with respect to the role of issues of gender, race, and class in the course. These examples I will detail in the following section.

Analysis of the Treatment of Issues of Gender, Race and Class in the English Literature 12 IRP

The IRP states that the goal of the course is to study "a broad range of literature written in English by men and women from various countries, regions and social classes" (p. 6). The range of opportunities for this kind of study in the Core texts is limited and opportunities to address issues of gender, ethnicity, and class seem to be, quite directly, segregated to the optional modules of the course. However, in McCormick's model, issues of gender, race and class are central to the ideology of a text and to the cultural and social constructedness of the text's production and the text's reception. An example of this kind of omission from the IRP is that there are only five of the twenty-eight core texts written by women: Elizabeth Barrett-Browning, Emily Bronte, Emily Dickinson, Margaret Atwood,

and Stevie Smith. This observation can be made of many curricula as the debate about the expansion of the canon of English literature is constant. Taxel (1989) writes that curriculum for American literature courses is "characterized by exclusion of particular world views and interests... and the domination of those texts that represent and naturalize the ways and beliefs of mainstream culture" (p. 436). Pam Gilbert's 1983 study of literature texts in Australian schools revealed "few contemporary women writers...included in reading lists" (p. 64).

In fact the influence of the make up of the core texts in the Literature 12 IRP was a topic of much discussion in the revision of this course as "it will help to shape Canadian society, defining what is worth studying and why" (Killian, 1992, p. 41). In a number of these debates in the BCELTA journal *Update*, the primary advocate for the expansion of the English Literature 12 canon and, in particular, women's place in it, was Avril Chalmers, a B.C. Literature 12 teacher. In response to calls to maintain the course curriculum as it was, Chalmers argued that the canon is socially constructed and that the current (pre 1997) Literature 12 course reading list was a "socially acceptable" construct, "the one which common sense has come to regard as big 'L' literature" (1995, p. 29). Chalmers suggests that the issue of the canon and its makeup is important because literature is not exempt from socializing forces of society on "appropriate attitudes and roles for men and women" (p. 27). Chalmers cites Elaine Showalter (1971) when she discusses "the invalidating" effects of a prolonged exposure to male vision presented as universal: "the masculine viewpoint is presented as normative and the female as divergent" (p. 13). Seeing curriculum texts as socially constructed; a

text's presence in the canon as having a normalizing effect; a self-conscious re-evaluation of the canon; and moves to make it more inclusive are all perspectives on teaching literature that are compatible with McCormick's model's approach to the socially constructed text, reader and reading. McCormick writes that a text is always a site of struggle and "it may try to privilege a particular reading position as 'natural', but because readers are 'subjects in their own histories' they may not produce that seemingly privileged reading" (p. 69). This initial kind of debate in advance of revising the English Literature 12 curriculum seemed to bode well for a curriculum which incorporated a sociocultural perspective on literature.

Further to this end, summary recommendations to the English Literature 12 curriculum Review Committee were for "a greater focus on the works of women written in a revised course--not as a token inclusion, but as an integral part of the study of literature from all periods," (p. 18) and that "learners be invited to explicitly consider the criteria, values and the assumptions that underlie the traditional definition of the canon of 'literary greats'." (10) These initial recommendations are interesting when seen in the light of the resulting canon represented by the texts in the Core module, and the learning outcomes and suggested activities which accompany the texts. In the IRP, learners are not invited to interrogate the make up of the curriculum, and the exclusion of a significant list of women writers from a variety of literary periods (Lady Jane Wroth, the Countess of Winchilsea, Mary Shelley, Elizabeth Gaskell, Ann Radcliffe, George Eliot, and Virginia Woolf, to name only a few) might

suggest that the inclusion of the five female poets whose works are represented is token.

As well, in the Literature 12 IRP Appendix on Cross-Curricular interests, there is a subsection on Gender Equity arguing for gender-equitable education which involves "the inclusion of the experiences, perceptions, and perspectives of girls and women, as well as boys and men, in all aspects of education," (p. c-8) and suggesting the designing of "lessons to explore many perspectives and to use different sources of information...to refer to female and male experts" (p. c-9). Although discussion about recommendations for and rationale statements within the revised Literature 12 IRP all point towards an expanded and inclusive canon and an opportunity for students and teachers self-consciously to examine the construction of that canon, which is compatible with McCormick's discussion of the influence of society's ideology on the construction of a text, the result is only five poems written by women poets and no suggestion in the Prescribed Learning Outcomes or the Suggested Instructional Activities that teachers and students begin to examine how and why these particular Core texts have been chosen. Leaving aside the lost opportunity to expand the canon, or to simply address the issue of the "construction" of the canon as represented in the curriculum, it is clear that the representation of a "range of voices" with respect to gender is not evident in the core reading list as was suggested above.

As well, this implied privilege of some voices and not others in the make up of the core readings is reinforced explicitly in other parts of the IRP as issues of gender, race and class are segregated to the optional modules:

> In the optional modules students explore
> issues, themes, periods and genres relevant
> to the study of literature written in English
> from the medieval to the modern period.
> Issues of gender, class and ethnicity are best
> addressed in the optional modules. (5)

The result of this kind of language seems to be the exclusion of these issues from the Core texts. This thereby reinforces their marginalization and their lack of importance: they are optional; it is not necessary to study them. This segregation of issues of gender, race, and class to the optional modules of the course raises an interesting issue from the perspective of McCormick's model. Her theoretical approach to teaching literature recognizes the naturalizing effect ideology has on the expectations readers have of texts (the literary and general repertoires of the reader and the text). McCormick's model acknowledges the fact that the very absence of these issues or absence of these voices in the overall curriculum or in individual curriculum texts is making an equally strong statement about these issues (O'Neill, 1993).

Whereas the IRP seems to ignore the danger of assuming that there is no possibility of studying issues of gender, race, and class if a text does not explicitly address them or if they appear "absent" in the text. For example, the absence of a female voice, or issues addressing women or gender in "Ulysses" or "Dulce et Decorum est" does not mean that the ideologies of these texts have nothing to say about gender and women. The absence of women in these two poems reveals much about the ideology of war, leadership, affairs of

state in the time periods in which each was written. So although these texts do not speak directly to the issues of gender, race and class, they still may provide valuable opportunities to discuss the absence of these issues in the text and what this absence suggests about the text's ideology. Thus, the marginalizing of the issues of gender, race, and class to the optional modules in the course results in lost opportunites for teachers and students to examine the positioning of the texts they are reading and the many, not initially apparent, but equally influential, ideological perspectives reflected in these texts. Another example of this can be seen when examining Sir Thomas Wyatt's sonnet "Whoso List to Hunt" which appears as a core text in the IRP. By explicitly relegating the issue of gender to the optional modules of the course, the IRP may have lost the opportunity to encourage students and teachers to discuss the ideology of the objectification of women which underlies Wyatt's extended metaphor in the poem: a metaphor which compares the romantic pursuit of a woman to the pursuit of a hunted animal. Clearly the IRP does not forbid the examination of gender issues in core texts; however, its explicit suggestion of their study in the optional modules of the course may influence some teachers to believe that these issues are not as strongly reflected in the core texts as they are in the optional modules. McCormick suggests that this kind of approach serves to reinforce rather than resist or question the naturalizing force of dominant ideology (only the explicitly addressed themes) on a text's or reader's repertoire because it allows the text and its explicit themes to position the

reader to accept, rather than question, the text's ideology and that ideology's naturalizing influence.

Thus far an examination of the IRP "Introduction and Rationale Statements" from the perspective of McCormick's model reveals

1. that many IRP Introduction and Rationale statements do not exclude McCormick's model. Her perspective can be incorporated in some places,

2. that one significant aspect of her model, the examination of the influence of the context of reception, is not addressed in the "Introduction and Rationale Statements" for the IRP, and

3. that the IRP does address the importance of examining the context of production of a text, but that the context of reception (the historical and social circumstances influencing the meaning a reader makes from the text) is not examined.

With respect to the practical application of her model to the IRP this chapter's examination of the IRP "Introduction and Rationale Statements" reveals as the model's strength its ability to characterize more fully the complexity of what influences readers when they make meaning from texts. This occurs particularly with respect to a reader's social and cultural surroundings (a reader's context of reception). By revealing what the IRP document leaves out, McCormick's model extends the understanding of reading literature beyond an examination of what an isolated text or what an isolated reader contributes to making meaning to a recognition of the influence social and historical contexts have on both the reader and the text.

Approach to the Analysis of Prescribed Learning Outcomes and Suggested Activities of the English Literature 12 IRP

The second and most important part of the English Literature 12 curriculum document includes the Prescribed Learning Outcomes (PLO), and their accompanying suggested instructional and assessment strategies. In this Curriculum section of the IRP for each of the five curriculum organizers and suborganizers (detailed at the beginning of this chapter) there are Prescribed Learning Outcomes (course objectives); Suggested Instructional Strategies (examples of classroom activities/assignments which would help to fulfill the course objectives); and recommended learning resources (examples of print, video and multimedia resources to accompany each learning outcome). Although, in some ways it is parts of this curriculum section that come closest of any of the sections of this document to the perspective advocated by McCormick's model, many of the same conclusions made, from the perspective of her model, about the Rationale and Introduction of this IRP can be made about the Prescribed Learning Outcomes and accompanying Suggested Instructional Strategies. To generalize, both sections of the IRP (the "Introduction and Rationale statements" and the "Prescribed Learning Outcomes" and the "Suggested Instructional Strategies") inlcude perspectives on teaching literature which could be seen as compatible with McCormick's model. However, the specific nature of the many Prescribed Learning Outcomes and Suggested Instructional

Strategies reveal a more specific alliance between the IRP and the model than many of the Introductory or Rationale statements. However, with respect to the social, historical and cultural contexts influencing readers making meaning (contexts of reception) and teachers and students studying literature (the constructedness of teacher and curriculum choices), McCormick's model has expectations which are left unfulfilled by the IRP.

Perhaps half of the learning outcomes in the course apply only generally to my analysis of the course from McCormick's perspective. For example, in the curriculum organizer Written and Oral Expression, one learning outcome states that students "will evaluate their own written, representational and oral expression" (p. 44). Although not completely devoid of a theoretical base (or bias), this learning outcome could be applied in such a way as to favour any of the approaches to teaching literature outlined in the introduction to this paper. Another example of this is the learning outcome that states that students will be expected to "demonstrate an understanding of and evaluate the purpose and effectiveness of recurring images, motifs, and symbols" (p. 40). This learning outcome initially appears to imply a New Critical bias, in that the use of the word "purpose" implies clear authorial intention, and this kind of isolated examination of parts of the text fits with the New Critical perspective that a text is made up of the sum of its parts and to understand the parts is to understand the whole. A New Critical approach to reading literature is more than likely the primary influence on this learning outcome and the suggested analysis of the parts of the text; alternatively, reading from the perspective of

McCormick's model, one might see "the effectiveness of recurring images, motifs and symbols" (p. 40) as an opportunity for students to examine their own reading of an image (or possible readings of an image) and to see how this reading might be different or unchanged from the reading constructed by the historical or social context at the time of the text's production. From the same learning outcome, two very different directions might be taken. The general nature of many of the learning outcomes in the IRP allows the opportunity to see them interpretated from a variety of theoretical perspectives.

Although many learning outcomes are written in such a general way that they can be appropriated by a number of theoretical approaches, the Suggested Instructional Strategies proposed in the IRP usually serve to narrow the focus of the learning outcome sufficiently enough to reveal a particular theoretical basis. For example, in regards to the learning outcome analyzing "recurring images, motifs, and symbols" examined in the previous paragraph, one suggested instructional strategy in the IRP is to "invite students to follow an image, motif, or symbol through one or several plays analyzing its use [by Shakespeare] in developing theme" (p. 40). This instructional strategy takes the learning outcome in a New Critical direction as it is implied that students are asked to interrogate the text in order to find the meaning in the text. As the nature of an instructional strategy serves to clarify the learning outcome, the Suggested Instructional Strategies that accompany many of the learning outcomes in this curriculum section are very helpful in clarifying the intention of/bias of the curriculum objectives (learning outcomes), as shown in the above example. For this reason I will

examine many learning outcomes and their accompanying instructional strategies in conjunction with each other.

While keeping in mind all of these examples of learning outcomes and instructional strategies as potential "sites of struggle" for meaning, this study examines a sample of learning outcomes and instructional strategies which can be categorized as either:

1. reflecting, if not McCormick's model itself, influences from a sociocultural perspective (in particular the issues of contradictory ideas within a text and the historical context of production and reception of a text), or

2. missing opportunities to utilize a sociocultural approach, such as the one advocated in McCormick's model.

Analysis of Prescribed Learning Outcomes and Suggested Instructional Activities

Before looking at particular learning outcomes and instructional strategies in relation to McCormick's model, this study will briefly acknowledge the influence of objectivist literary theory in this section of the IRP. Almost all of the learning outcomes and instructional strategies in the Core module of the course are based in the Cultural Heritage and New Critical approaches. In the tradition of the Cultural Heritage approach, the central learning outcome in the Core module states that students will "demonstrate an understanding of the following literary works and the contributions each has made to the heritage of English literature" (p. 20). As well, the New Critical belief in an objective text is implied in suggesting that students

analyze "key aspects of the text" and develop their "understanding of these key works of literature" (p. 13). Assessment strategies which are compatible with a New Critical approach suggest that teachers look for evidence of 1. analysis of text, 2. offering interpretations that are consistent with themes, and 3. supporting positions by providing evidence from the text (pp. 23 and 31). Underlying these practices is the view of the text holding a single, unchanging and objective meaning without and separate from any consideration of social context. (O'Neill, 1993)

It should be noted that the Cultural Heritage and New Critical approaches lend themselves quite easily to the Core section of the course, which is 25% of the course's time allotment (p. 4, IRP), and are therefore predominant in this section because of its focus on examinable content (this core module is the primary basis for the English Literature 12 government exam, which is worth 40% of the student's final grade) and on texts produced in "another time," but not thought to be "reproduced" each time they are read.

Although the Core module lends itself to an Objectivist model, many of the other modules include learning outcomes and instructional strategies which reflect Expressivist theory and which begin to incorporate sociocultural influences primarily in the areas of 1. the text as a site for a "multiplicity of ideas", 2. the historical context of a text's production, and 3. the context of a text's reception.

The idea of the text as a site for a "multiplicity of ideas" and a "struggle for meaning" is a central component of the theoretical base of McCormick's model. She sees this struggle for meaning amidst a vast array of, at times, contradictory meanings present in the text as

a result of the interaction between the reader's and the text's literary and/or general repertoires.

Two examples of these opportunities in the curriculum section of the IRP center around Grendel, that "Shepherd of evil, guardian of crime," (p. 18) who, "bearing god's hatred," "came, hoping to kill" (p. 17), but is eventually defeated by the hero Beowulf in the Anglo-Saxon epic of the same name. In the Reading and Thinking curriculum organizer, one prescribed learning outcome is to "demonstrate respect for divergent ideas and values expressed in the text" (p. 34). A traditional approach might be to examine how students show respect for the values and ideas of the text that diverge from their own. However, one intructional strategy takes this learning outcome in the direction that McCormick's model might take it, by suggesting that students write "get-well cards for Grendel" (p. 34) or write "Grendel's obituary" (p. 12). These kinds of activities would result in students' demonstrating respect for ideas and values in the text that diverge from the dominant perspective, ideology, or positioning presented in the text (i.e., that Grendel is completely evil), and begin to recognize that within a text there can be a "multiplicity" of sometimes contradictory meanings. However, these are two of only three or four examples in the IRP of learning outcomes which reveal the text as a site for a multiplicity of ideas.

.A somewhat similar approach is suggested in the IRP section Rhetorical Situation for any piece of literature. This activity suggests that "students role play a conversation between characters with diametrically opposed points of view" (p. 28). This, as well, might allow for an opportunity for students to explore positions or

readings of the text which work against, or resist, the predominant, naturalized ideology of the text's repertoire.

As noted above in the examination of the IRP's Rationale and Introduction, the influence of historical context on the text is a central tenet of the English Literature 12 course (IRP), and is, as well, one focus central to the ideas influencing McCormick's model of teaching literature. However, it should be noted that the objective of the IRP's explanation of the historical context of literature is to show how that literature reflects a particular time and place, whereas McCormick's objective in emphasizing the historical of a text's production is to see how that text (and author) was shaped or constructed by its (his or her) particular social and historical context. Approximately one-third of learning outcomes and instructional strategies refer to an examination of the text (or attitudes in the text) as a product, or a construction, of a particular social or historical context. In the Core module an instructional strategy suggests that students "debate whether Eliot would have written 'The Hollow Men' if he were alive today" (p. 24). This suggested activity would allow students not only to examine the influences of Eliot's own context (of production), but also those influences on their own contemporary context (of reception). As well, in Reading and Thinking (Historical Context) the students are encouraged to "become aware of the importance of time, place, and cultural background when studying literature" (p. 36) with suggested instructional strategies that ask them to "determine and cluster the relationships between characters and such elements as setting, values, and social classes" (p. 36). This is compatible with McCormick's model as these activities encourage

readers to probe how both the social and cultural context of the text's production has affected how relationships regarding setting, values, and social classes (i.e. , McCormick's term "ideology") appear in the text.

Another learning outcome in Reading and Thinking (Historical Context) expects students will "describe the relationships between the attitudes and values expressed in literature and their historical contexts" (p. 36). It follows with instructional strategies that ask students "to compare their own feasting traditions with those of other cultures" (p. 36) after recreating a banquet that might have taken place in a specific literary period. This would, hopefully, not end simply in a comparison of table manners, but move onto a discussion of the values (general ideology) reflected in the feasting traditions of the students, the literary period, and other cultures.

While there are places in the course's curriculum that begin to address the effect of social and historical contexts on the production of literary works, this influence is not always supported by accompanying instructional strategies. For example, in the curriculum organizer Reading and Thinking (Heritage Literature) it is expected students will demonstrate "the ability to evaluate works of enduring attitudes, values, and themes in literature" and "the ability to evaluate works of enduring literary reputation" (p. 30). Obviously some attitudes, values, and themes in literature clearly endure; however, instructional strategies that correspond do not give teachers sufficient direction to transform this objective into anything other than a search for theme and main idea. For example, "Divide the class into groups. Ask each group to research a poet and

present its findings in a seminar. Students may involve classmates in discussions of the poet's work" (p. 30) and "Ask pairs of students to role-play fictional characters discussing an idea central to the work" (p.30) are both examples of instructional strategies that lead teachers away from an examination of the social and historical influences surrounding a text's production.

Although recognizing the influence of social and historical context on the production of works of literature fits with the theoretical base of a sociocultural approach, McCormick's model, in fact, goes much further to recognize, equally, the influence of social and historical context on the reception of works of literature. The above examples focus solely on the impact of social and historical context on the production of literary texts. However, McCormick's model sees reading as an interaction between the general and literary repertoires of both the reader and the text. These repertoires are developing out of and are influenced by the ideology of text and reader:

> all those practices that most of society's inhabitants
> take for granted as 'natural', or 'universal', as always
> true, even if (as we can show by comparing diverse
> cultures or different historical periods) they are not
> natural or universal, but rather are very specific to that
> culture (McCormick, 74).

It is this influence of social and historical context on the reception of the text, McCormick's model's second half of context of production, which is almost completely lost in over 90% of the IRP. Below are the only three clear examples of attention to the context of

reception in the IRP. These examples first begin to look at student response, and then, more importantly and rarely, they begin to suggest, if not to promote explicitly, the examination of why students respond in such a way and how that response may be culturally constructed rather than personally idiosyncratic. These three examples begin to show the emergence of an opportunity to promote a sociocultural approach in the IRP.

The first example is an instructional strategy that suggests that "students generate a list of heroic traits and compare them to Beowulf" (p. 12). This is the beginning of an opportunity to examine how the reader's repertoire (with respect to heroism) interacts (matches or opposes) the text's repertoire (with respect to heroism), and to discuss how the ideology of the Twentieth century and that of the Anglo-Saxon period affect both reader and text.

Another instructional strategy invites students to "write responses to poems in which gender specific pronouns have been changed (i.e., Bronte's 'Song') and decide which they prefer and give reasons for their choices" (p. 34). The obligation for students to give reasons for their choices is, again, an opportunity for students to see how their general ideology (their attitudes toward male and female behavior, and that which they see as natural, or universal) affects their reading, meaning making, or struggle for making meaning in these particular literary works.

Finally, with regards to instructional strategies for the study of Pope's "The Rape of the Lock," two strategies, in particular, touch upon the issue of response to gender roles being shaped by or constructed by society's ideology. One activity asks students to

"write and role-play a mock trial for the 'violation' of Belinda in the poem. Then have them write a response that compares this trial to twentieth century issues" (p. 16). Possibly the issue of the victim's culpability in the crime maybe raised in this comparison as it is central to Twentieth century discussions of the issue of rape and it is quite clearly suggested in Pope's poem. This would provide a good opportunity for students to look at the interaction between the reader's ideology (Twentieth century attitudes toward rape and female culpability in rape) and the text's ideology (the Enlightenment period's perspective on the same issues) and the influence of each on the reading created, or the meaning made, by the reader.

In a similar vein, another activity suggested for the study of "The Rape of the Lock" invites students to write summaries of gender roles as they appear in the poem. Again, this kind of instructional strategy provides an opportunity for students to examine the expectations about male and female behaviour that they bring to the text and how what they find in the text fits or does not fit, or seem natural, in relation their own repertoires concerning this subject. To fulfill completely the potential of this activity, from the perspective of McCormick's model, students might also be encouraged to look for contradictions in the presentation of gender roles in the poem, in particular the complex and stereotypical characterization of Belinda herself, and ask the question: is there a struggle for a unified presentation of gender roles within the text itself?

As well as these examples, which seem to be influenced by some of the same principles guiding McCormick's model, there are examples of what McCormick might consider very obvious

opportunities to incorporate a sociocultural approach to reading literature into the course, which are simply lost. Many of these lost opportunities are rooted deeply in a perspective of reader response theory that is unconcerned with the influence of social and historical context on a reader's response to or reception of the text.

The clearest example of this is the "Personal Response: Respecting Interpretations" curriculum organizer on pages 56 and 57 of the IRP. The three learning outcomes in this section are that students will

1. demonstrate appreciation of texts within historical contexts,

2. demonstrate respect for differing personal responses to texts, and

3. demonstrate a willingness to be open-minded and to show respect for textual evidence when sharing interpretations of literature. (pp. 56-57)

These learning outcomes are based primarily in the theory of reader response that sees individual student response as solely personal and idiosyncratic. Patterson (1992) cites Arnold (1869) and Leavis (1943, 1952, 1969) when she suggests that "personal growth discourses appear to accept that the individual reader is the source and origin of his or her own meaning" (p. 134). A strong influence of the reader response theory is not antithetical to McCormick's model: her perspective centers on the interaction between what the reader and the text each bring to the activity of reading. However, her model looks beyond the seemingly "isolated" act of a single

reader interpreting a text by using his or her individual prior knowledge, biases, and experiences. It looks to the societal and cultural influences on the reader's repertoire and therefore on the resulting "reading" of the text. McCormick emphasizes the social construction of the reader, and therefore the reader's response, while many learning outcomes in the English Literature 12 IRP focus solely on the individual reader's response with no attention to its constructedness--an element that McCormick sees as essential to a complete understanding and examination of the act of reading.

For example, the three learning outcomes from the Personal Response curriculum organizer listed above are examples of an approach to reader response which is individual and isolated because the constructing social and cultural forces that McCormick sees surrounding the reader are not mentioned in these examples from the IRP. The first learning outcome suggests an awareness of the context of production of the text, but does not mention that these same kinds of historical, social and cultural influences might be affecting the meaning making that the reader is doing (the effect of the context of reception on the reader). The second learning outcome suggests, through omission, that it is important for students to respect different readings of texts, but not to understand why these differing readings have been constructed or what forces have shaped these different interpretations. The last of the three learning outcomes reinforces the importance of one-half of the process of making meaning (the construction of the text); however, it does not recognize how the reader's interpretation of text is involved creating the reading of the text. This third learning outcome, in many ways,

departs from a reader response approach to literature and returns to a New Critical or Objectivst approach which sees meaning as residing solely in the text. According to McCormick's model, rewriting these three learning outcomes to address the issue of the influence of context of reception on construction of meaning done by the reader might result in the following:

1. demonstrate an appreciation of the influence of social, historical, and cultural forces (contexts) on the production of the text by the author and on the reception(s) of the text by the reader(s),

2. demonstrate respect for and understanding of the constructedness of differing responses to (or readings of) particular texts, and

3. demonstrate a willingness to be open-minded and to show an understanding of the influences of both textual evidence and contextual evidence (the forces influencing the readers' construction of meaning of the text) when examining interpretations of literature.

The lack of inclusion of the context of reception of a text applies not only to learning outcomes, but also to instructional strategies which are based in reader response theory. There are strategies in the Written and Oral Expression and Personal Response Modules, but not in the Literary Concepts, Core, or Reading and Thinking Modules, which give students opportunities to express their own opinions of and responses to literary texts and ideas and values present in them. Some examples ask students:

1. to create a scene that does not exist in a play that has been studied (p. 46),

2. to write letters to, or stories or poems about characters they identify with (p. 54), and

3. to be given two poems, one of which is superior according to a set of teacher-determined criteria, and then to choose which poem is most effective and then develop their own list of criteria to assist in literary evaluation. (p. 54)

These suggested instructional activities give students opportunities to respond personally to their reading; however, none of these instructional strategies asks students to begin examining directly the possible origins and constructedness of their responses. An example of this kind of examination is to extend the third instructional activity listed above. This might be done by giving students an opportunity to discuss why they think they valued particular parts of poems, once they had articulated their own criteria for literary evaluation and possibly compared them to those of the teacher and of their classmates. Typical questions raised by students might be:

1. Where did I get the belief that a good poem must include/or be about _____?

2. How has my schooling and experience of poetry in school (teachers' and fellow students' attitudes toward poetry) shaped my ideas about good poetry and my attitudes towards poetry?

3. How has my experience, or lack of experience, with poetry outside of a school setting influenced what I think a "good" poem is?

4. How has my participation in this criteria-listing activity or my criteria list itself been affected by the knowledge that it is an assigned activity, and theat the teacher-authority has a criteria list her-or himself?

From the perspective of McCormick's model questions such as these might help students get beyond the initial stage of their individual response toward an understanding of how their responses and readings of texts are shaped by the social and cultural constructions around them: school and societal attitudes towards poetry, the subject English and the value of each.

In other parts of the curriculum document, students are asked to examine the origins of and contextual influences on the production of texts, but not the origins of and contextual influences on their own response to (or reading of) these same texts. An example of such an instructional strategy is an "invitaion to students to write about what they would die for" completed in conjunction with their study of Wilfred Owen's "Dulce et Decorum Est" (p. 24). What McCormick's model would add to this activity is a subsequent examination of how their responses to the question "what would you be willing to die for?" reveal their own values and attitudes towards what is important in life. This would result in not only an opportunity for students to explore their own value systems, but also, and perhaps more central to McCormick's perspective on reading, would provide an opportunity for the class to examine how its attitudes towards going to war, fighting, and sacrifice are influenced by its own society's attitudes towards these same issues. A comparison could then be made among their attitudes, late Twentieth century society's

attitudes, and the attitudes apparent in Wilfred Owen's poem, all the while keeping in mind the historical, political, and social forces influencing these attitudes. More than likely a discussion or examination of the effects of WWI and WWII, and possibly the Vietnam War, on attitudes toward war, conscription, sacrifice, and dying would result.

As these examples show, personal response is a key element in both the theoretical base of the IRP and of McCormick's model; however, ninety percent of the IRP's learning outcomes and instructional strategies which relate to personal response do not take the students' exploration of their responses beyond the initial individualism of the response to an understanding of how the influence of the context that surrounds the reader (the context of reception) shapes her or his response to and reading of literary texts in much the same way that a text itself is shaped by the social and cultural influences that surround and influence its author (the context of production).

There are, however, three or four student activities described in the IRP which could be transformed in order to help students understand the issues surrounding their own ideologies (both general and literary ideology). One example in the Core Studies organizer suggests having students keep "logs or journals as they reflect on learning strategies they use" (p. 15). Students are encouraged to answer questions which help them to reflect on what happens and what they are doing when they read: "What did you do that helped you to understand the more difficult parts of this section? What did you learn about your own reading and thinking?" (p. 15). In addition

to this, getting students to ask themselves additional questions would further help them to understand the perspectives and influences they bring with them to their reading. For example they could be asked questions to help them examine their literary repertoires:

1. What kind of reading experience did you expect when you were told that this text was (a poem, epic, romance, essay, etc.) ?

2. Was this text easy to read? Why? Why not?

3. What was most difficult about reading this text? Why do you think this particular aspect of the text made it difficult to read?

4. Is this a "good" piece of writing? why would you classify it this way?

5. What other kind of writing or which author's writing does reading this text remind you of?

These questions have been adapted from McCormick's guided response questions which appear in appendix B of this study.

These kinds of questions might begin to help students think about the attitudes and preconceptions, likes and dislikes, they bring with them to their reading. This approach encourages readers to be self-conscious of what McCormick calls their literary repertoire, whereas more traditional Reader Reponse questions encourage students to respond personally to their reading but not to examine socially constructed reasons for the responses they have to literature. For example, if a student responded to the above questions and

thereby became aware that his or her expectations of poetry were that a poem should be written in elevated language and a strict form, he or she then might have a better understanding of why he or she responded with distaste and confusion when reading a Jim Daniels' poem written in the free verse and in the voice of a laid off steelworker. From McCormick's perspective this would help readers be more aware of how these attitudes and biases were helping to shape their making of meaning while they read.

As well, students might use other questions to examine the influence of, what McCormick calls, their general repertoires on their responses to a particular reading. Asking these kinds of questions would result in a clearer metacognitive understanding of students' own reading practices and how these processes, or interacting repertoires, help to make the meaning of the text.

As well as the Personal Response organizer, there are other curriculum organizers, such as Reading and Thinking (Issues) and "Written and Oral Expression" (two out of the five curriculum organizers), which in the Rationale and Introduction to the IRP seem to fit with a sociocultural perspective on reading, but are translated into learning outcomes and instructional strategies which address not "the influence of gender, ethnicity, and class on literature," (my emphasis)--which the learning outcome states--but rather the presence of gender, ethnicity, and class in literature. The difference between influence and presence is key. "Influence" suggests a recognition of and encourages an examination of social, historical, and cultural contexts that affect the text's production, while "presence" simply encourages a "search and find" Objectivist approach to

examining how many times one of these issues is mentioned in the text. An example of this is the learning outcome which encourages students "to explore issues of racism in a variety of literary works..." (p. 28). This Objectivist approach to finding examples in the text looks at works of literature in isolation from their contexts of production and reception. In part, this returns to an issue mentioned earlier in this paper: that of the belief that unless issues of gender, ethnicity and class are directly addressed in a work of literature it is unlikely that readers would study these "absent" issues in the text. McCormick's model of teaching literature would suggest that a text can be influenced by an attitude toward gender or class which does not explicitly present itself in the text. For example, the fact that there is no mention of race or class issues with respect to the relationship between the mariner and his shipmate, or the mariner and the wedding guest, in "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner" does not suggest that attitudes in the Romantic Period towards these issues do not influence the text. Looking in this particular text for the "presence" of these ideas would result in a simple, but incomplete answer: no. However, looking for the "influence" of these ideas and attitudes would allow students to see the absence of these issues as one result of this particular construction of the text. As well, "influence" implies a relationship between the social and historical forces of the text's context and the text itself, whereas, "presence" seems to imply a self-contained existence of the ideas in the text: ideas which are isolated from social and cultural forces that, according to McCormick's sociocultural model, actually put them or constructed them in the text (pp. 70-72).

In summary, the Prescribed Learning Outcomes and Suggested Instructional Activities in the IRP have some focus on the social and historical context of the production of a text; the possibility of multiple meanings in a text; and the centrality of student response in some areas of the curriculum, which are all compatible with McCormick's sociocultural model of teaching literature. However, with respect to the issues of the reader's response to the text as constructed; the context(s) of reception of a text; and the constructed nature of the course curriculum, the IRP document either ignores these issues or diverges greatly from McCormick's perspective on these issues.

Adapting IRP Learning Outcomes and Suggested Activities to Accommodate McCormick's Model

Perhaps the most significant parts of the IRP, from the perspective of this study, are the many examples of learning outcomes and suggested instructional strategies which do not preclude McCormick's approach to teaching literature, and which could be adapted to include many of the ideas central to her approach. As the organization of the IRP is flexible--"it is expected that teachers will adapt, modify, combine and organize instructional strategies" (p. 8)--there are opportunities for teachers to adapt learning outcomes to fit a variety of theoretical approaches to teaching literature. However, despite this self-proclaimed flexibility, the learning outcomes and instructional strategies presented are influential as some teachers approaching this revised course may

follow examples given in the IRP, examples which, at times, do limit or restrict the approach the teacher may take. As a result, much of this flexibility may be lost or difficult to achieve.

We are then, according to McCormick's perspective, left with the need, as Catherine Beavis (1994) writes, for "curriculum and policy documents to build in scope for teachers to act on poststructuralist perspectives" (p. 40). Wendy Morgan (1991), as well, recognizes this absence. She writes that "while critics like Pam Gilbert tell us about the inadequacies of our current practice, we don't yet have an established methodology to help us make our future practice adequate" (p. 151).

In an attempt to explore what this future practice--one incorporating a sociocultural approach to literature--might look like, I have chosen to expand upon two examples or opportunities in the IRP which are worthwhile adaptations of the IRP activities according to McCormick's approach to teaching literature. In the first example I have used two contrasting texts to help students gain a greater awareness of what McCormick calls the naturalizing influence of society's ideology on the general and literary repertoires of readers (their expectations of texts) and on how these repertoires shape readers' responses to texts. In the second example, I have borrowed one of McCormick's own sugested instructional techniques. It is a strategy which gives readers practice examining the relationship between the context of reception of a text and the responses to or interpretations of that text in so that they are better able to begin seeing how the ideology that surrounds them (their own context of reception) shapes their responses to a text.

Contrasting Texts: *Pride and Prejudice*

The first example is a suggested instructional strategy in the Reading and Thinking (Rhetorical Situation) curriculum organizer. The learning outcome for this curriculum organizer states that students will "identify elements of rhetorical situation: voice, implied audience, setting, and time" and "demonstrate an understanding of and evaluate the effectiveness of rhetorical situation in text" (p. 38). The corresponding instructional strategies are various: an identification game in which players identify person speaking, voice, time, subject, tone and mood in response to passages which are read aloud; the viewing of videos which discuss the use of rhetorical elements; and students examining the development of images and symbols in the course's literary works and comparing them with the visual representation of similar ideas in other contexts.

Another instructional strategy is the one which is the most specific and most clearly carries out the objective of the stated learning outcome:

> Discuss with the class how specific rhetorical elements
> bias the reader to the female perspective in the
> proposal scene between Mr. Collins and Elizabeth
> Bennet. (38)

As well as addressing the corresponding learning outcome's goal of rhetorical understanding, the above instructional strategy raises an important issue from the perspective of McCormick's model. Of most significance is not solely the presence of a "bias toward the

female perspective" in a Core text. This instructional strategy is exceptional in that it singles out this one example of rhetorical bias for examination. Few suggested Instructional Strategies in this curriculum organizer or, in fact, the whole of the curriculum, address the issue of textual bias. Obviously, this is not because no other texts are biased: according to McCormick's model of teaching literature (and poststructuralist perspectives on teaching literature) all texts are influenced or constructed by the social and historical context in which they were created and therefore in some way reveal that influence or bias in the text. Then, if all texts are biased (they support or present a particular ideology), why have the creators of the IRP singled out Austen's text as the one focus for examination of rhetorical techniques which bias the reader toward the female perspective in this excerpt? Why are students never asked to question the textual positioning of other texts?

The answer to these questions is central to McCormick's idea of the role of ideology in reminding the reader of what is "natural" or "commonsensical." (p. 4) To restate, McCormick's model asks us to imagine

> ideology as a powerful force hovering over us as we
> write or read a text; as we read, it reminds us of what
> is correct, commonsensical, or 'natural.' It tries, as it
> were to guide both the writing and the subsequent
> readings of a text into what it has defined as coherence...
> it also works when we read to suggest what is natural,
> concealing struggles and repressions, forcing language
> into conveying predominantly these meanings reinforced
> by the dominant forces of our society. (pp. 74-75)

As a result, because of the influence of readers' ideologies on their construction of meaning, the tendency for readers is to look for and accept (or prefer at times) that reading, or ideology, which seems natural or commonsensical to them (McCormick, p. 74).

McCormick's use of the idea of matching repertoires will clarify this. The "interface" between a reader's repertoire (general or literary) and a text's repertoire (general or literary) may result in a matching of repertoires: the readers' expectations are fulfilled by the text and the readers see the text's repertoire fit with their own repertoire and what they see as natural and correct. Conversely a mismatching or tension between reader and text repertoire may result: readers' expectations are not fulfilled and they find the text or part of the text different from or at odds with their sense of what is natural. It is this last scenario which is compatible with an activity in the IRP which asks students to examine the rhetorical sitaution in the *Pride and Prejudice* scene in order to see how it is biased from the female perspective.

Because of the influence of ideology, McCormick argues that many readers see writing from the male perspective or bias as natural (what we expect to see or are used to seeing) as it is the most predominant bias in much of what we are used to reading. In the *Update* (1995, 37:3) debate about expanding the canon in the revised English Literature 12 curriculum, Avril Chalmers cites Elaine Showalter (1971) who describes this as "the effects of a prolonged exposure to male vision, presented as universal: the masculine viewpoint is presented as normative and the feminine as divergent" (p. 13). From McCormick's perspective, the female bias or

perspective apparent in Austen's novel might be, for many readers, a shift in perspective from what they are accustomed to. Because this perspective does not fit as easily into the readers' general or literary repertoires (or expectations) it is easier for readers to notice its difference, or be aware of its presence, and therefore feel the need to examine and question it.

The IRP's suggested activity, which asks readers to examine the female bias in the excerpt, leaves this issue of mismatching of repertoires unexposed by both reader and teacher; however, using McCormick's model to rework this suggested instructional activity would not only fulfill this particular curriculum learning outcome, but it would also give readers an opportunity to examine how their own repertoires, or experiences with and expectations of a text, construct their reading and response to the text.

One way to adapt this strategy's examination of the proposal scene in *Pride and Prejudice* is to incorporate the use of a constrasting text. In *Reading Positions and Practice*, Gilbert, Freebody, and Luke (1991) advocate "lessons which actively juxtapose more than a single text for comparison and analysis" in order to "generate dissonance between texts, ideologies and discourses" (p. 453). One possible text to contrast with *Pride and Prejudice* might be Elizabeth Gaskell's 1863 novel *Sylvia's Lovers*: a novel about the romantic life of a Yorkshire girl. Although *Sylvia's Lovers* is not on the Ministry of Education list of Core texts to be studied in this course, the English Literature 12 course has a core component of 25% and then encourages teachers of the course to "choose works written in English from British, Canadian,

Commonwealth, American, and other sources... that have influenced the development of English Literature" (IRP, p. 4). *Sylvia's Lovers* is a good choice for study in the Literature 12 course because it fits within this rationale in the IRP and it is

1. set in nineteenth century rural England (a situation not well represented in Core texts),

2. an example of the Nineteenth century Romance genre, and of particular interest for this study from the perspective of McCormick's model,

3. a novel which provides a representation of traditional male and female roles which could be an initial example of these roles from which to move onto a less explicit examination of this issue as it appears in Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*.

As compared to Austen's novel, *Sylvia's Lovers* is traditional in its presentation of appropriate roles for men and women; in contrast to the apparent "female bias" of *Pride and Prejudice, Sylvia's Lovers* might be said to be written without bias, or, more accurately, without a bias which is as clearly apparent, in so much as *Sylvia's Lovers* embraces rather than questions traditional roles for and expectations of behaviour for men and women in the late 1800's. This will be detailed with examples further on in this section. Because of this contrast, examination of these two texts might result in readers finding the female rhetorical bias of *Pride and Prejudice* more obvious and "unnatural" (according to McCormick's model) than the more expected and "natural" rhetorical bias (or textual positioning) in *Sylvia's Lovers*. In the language of McCormick's model, there would be a greater clash between the reader's general repertoire and

the general repertoire of *Pride and Prejudice* in the area of gender roles than there would be between the reader's general repertoire and the general repertoire of *Sylvia's Lovers: Sylvia's Lovers* would be seen as natural and expected and *Pride and Prejudice* as unnatural and unexpected and therefore the reader might more readily judge Austen's novel as "biased" and Gaskell's as not.

Having chosen Gaskell's texts for these reasons, the task is then to help students to gain an awareness of this positioning by the author and of how their responses to the bias or lack thereof in each text are shaped by the texts and their ideologies surrounding gender roles. McCormick's approach with this kind of reading situation is to give her undergraduate students a series of general guided-response questions in addition to more specific response statement assignments which focus on particular issues of interest to accompany each reading. Some of her general guided response questions are reprinted here, and the remainder appear in Appendix B:

1. What is the predominant effect of the text on you: Confusion, identification with characters, interest, anger, boredom, amusement, terror, etc. Expand as much as possible.

2. Why do you think the text had this effect? To answer this, you should bear in mind that both you and the text have been produced by the particular culture(s) of which you are a part. Therefore to answer this question you will need to examine some aspects of the following:

   a. the general repertoire of the text: its subject-matter, social norms, its historical setting, the values and behaviors it (or its characters) take for granted as

'normal'. Remember that the general repertoire also involves historical context in which the text was written (which may differ from the setting of the text) and those in which it has been interpreted throughout history. (p. 157)

The above approach does rely heavily on student response, and in her examination of Reader Response approaches to teaching literature, McCormick has suggested that much of Reader Response analysis is "incomplete as [it] stops short of exploring how readings are determined" and "results in simply associative, 'touchy-feely' reactions" which, rather than opening up students responses to a text, restricts them to what the students already know or think they know about how they feel. (156) However, McCormick suggests that these particular guided response statements are modified in such a way that they direct "students to place their 'subjective' response in broader cultural contexts" and "bring into the students' awareness both the knowledge of and the need for more demanding kinds of information, and hence make students stronger, more informed and self-conscious readers of the various signifying practices of our society" (pp. 156-157).

In this same regard, Jack Thomson (1994) sees the response journal allowing students to "write their reactions as they are reading a text and then go on to analyze the assumptions underlying those reactions" (p. 201). Thomson (1994) suggests that rather than having students ask questions such as "What is my personal interpretation of the text?" they should be encouraged to ask, "What is it that I am bringing to the text that causes me to respond as I

do?" "How am I influenced by language and my social and cultural discourses to respond as I do?" and "How is this text positioning me to read it?" (p. 198). Both Thomson's and McCormick's questions encourage readers to address the issues underlying McCormick's sociocultural model of reading; however, both approaches assume a capable and self-aware reader, who is experienced in this kind of analysis of a text.

In order to adapt the *Pride and Prejudice* activity in the English Literature12 IRP for a less experienced reader than Thomson and McCormick expect, I would use a much more structured and, in fact, teacher-led examination of these same issues in order to get English Literature 12 students to the stage of the relatively independent analysis suggested by McCormick's guided response activity. This structured examination might follow the staged reading lesson suggested by Mellor and Patterson (1994) previously mentioned in this paper:

1. the initial reading
2. the problematizing of the student's initial reading
3. the withdrawal of the teacher
4. the production of the student's own reading

Before the initial reading of particular chapters from *Pride and Prejudice* (Chapter XXXIV) and *Sylvia's Lovers* (Chapters VII, VIII, XII, and XV in particular---direct quotations to illustrate these points follow in the example of students' character notes), or readings of the whole of the texts, students might be told that they are going to read two novels or excerpts from two novels about relationships between men and women: one written in the

Eighteenth century and the other in the Victorian period. Students would be asked to use their knowledge of attitudes and mores of these periods in order to predict what they might expect regarding male and female attitudes and behavior in each text. McCormick would call this an example of a reader's general repertoire. As they read, students would use reading journals to make note of their general reactions and responses to the texts and their particular responses to questions such as:

1. which text did they prefer and why?

2. which text seemed more realistic or believable?

3. how did their responses fit with the expectations they had about male and female behaviours and attitudes in each text? After sharing their responses, and with an understanding of McCormick's idea of "matching or mismatched repertiores", the teacher would help students to draw conclusions about why they responded the way they did and see how the text was written to position or influence their reading. However, more than likely the further problematizing of the reading may be necessary for students to see these kinds of connections.

Another way to problematize these readings is to examine how the authors constructed the major characters in each text as the product of an ideological perspective rather than as a "naturally occurring human being" (McCormick, 1994, p. 85). A strategy for this, suggested by Thomson (1994), is to analyze the language used to describe, and therefore construct, each character.

The intention of this comparison of character presentation and student exploration of the genre is to reveal and have students understand how the representation of characters in *Pride and Prejudice* does not fit with the expectations that readers have of that particular genre (their literary and general repertoires) and how the representation of male and female roles in *Sylvia's Lovers* in many ways does fit with their general and literary repertoires. Notes students would take or quotations they would find describing the four central characters might be grouped as follows:

Female Character's Response to Male Suitor's Proposal

Pride and Prejudice's **Elizabeth**

When proposed to by Mr. Collins, Elizabeth

1. speaks her mind   "it is impossible for me to do
                                otherwise than decline them" (p.122).

2. is vehement in her   "You could not make me happy and
   refusal   I am convinced that I am the last
                                woman in the world who could
                                make you happy" (p. 123).

                                "You must give me leave to judge for
                                myself and pay me the compliment
                                of believing what I say" (p. 124).

                                "I would rather be paid the compliment
                                of being believed sincere" (p. 124).

3. appeals to her father   "his negative [response] could not be
                                mistaken for the affectation and
                                coquetry of an elegant female" (p. 125).

Sylvia's Lovers' **Sylvia**

When courted by Phillip, Sylvia

1. plays coy, makes excuses   Sylvia did not like learning and did not
   and never really speaks   want him for her teacher; so she
   her mind   answered in a dry little tone--
                             "It'll use a deal o' candle-light;
                             mother'll not like that" (p. 94).

                             "Writing cramps my hand so I can't
                             do any serving for a day after; and
                             feyther wans his shirts very bad" (p.
                             93) (another excuse she gives for not
                             being in his presence).

Description of the Male Suitor:

Pride and Prejudice's **Mr. Collins**

1. relies on conventional   "may run away with his feelings" (121)
   language of love which   but goes onto list his reasons for
   proves to be false   wanting to marry: a clergyman
                             needs to marry, make him happy,
                             advice of his patroness, obligation
                             to his relations.

2. believes her refusal   "young women who reject the addresses
   to be a fashionable   of the man whom they secretly mean
   convention   to accept" (p. 122).

                             "established custom of your sex to
                             reject the man on the first application"
                             (p. 123).

                             "your refusal of my address is merely
                             words of course" (p. 124).

Sylvia's Lovers' **Kinraid**

1. has this effect of Sylvia   "a great lump lies hot and slumbering on the fire"

"she moved about with pretty household briskness, attending to all her father's wants" (p. 116).

These examples reveal the traditional presentation of male and female roles in *Sylvia's Lovers* and the apparent "female bias" in the excerpt from *Pride and Prejudice* noted in the IRP which was detailed earlier in this section.

Another comparison between the relationships portrayed in these two texts is how Mr. Collins' characterization of a fashionable female (as shy, self-conscious, and artificial in her presentation of herself) in *Pride and Prejudice* is present in the behaviour of Sylvia in many of the scenes involving the two lovers in *Sylvia's Lovers* (pp. 93, 105, 106, 116, 173, 213, 214--also see examples above of Sylvia's behaviour toward Phillip's intentions and of how Kinraid's presence afffects Sylvia's behaviour). Sylvia's selfconsciousness and artificiality contrast with Elizabeth's confident sincerity.

Sylvia is described by the narrator as "half-blushing" and "half-laughing" (p. 213); "pretending to be busy" and "pretending as if impatient" (p. 213); "equivocating" (p. 214); "as if" she were doing things (p. 214); and "conscious of her pretense for him" (p. 215). Sylvia is shy and inhibited in the presence of Kinraid: "She might have gone on but that she caught Kinraid's eyes looking at her with kindly admiration. She stopped speaking..." (p. 100). Another would-be suitor asks himself "Why did Kinraid's eyes always seek

her while hers were averted, or downcast, and her cheeks all aflame?" (p. 173). Conventionally Sylvia is shown to be concerned about her appearance: "How well it was, thought the young girl, that she had doffed her bed-gown and linsey-woolsey petticoat" (p. 154). The examination of these characters and how each fits or does not fit with the reader's expectations (McCormick's matching or mismatching of liteary and general repertoires) provides readers with opportunities missing from the initial question about rhetorical bias in the IRP. This contrasting of texts allows readers to

1. study texts whose repertoires match their own (*Sylvia's Lovers*) and do not match their own (*Pride and Prejudice*), and

2. observe in their own reading how texts whose repertoires conflict with their own seem to have a biased view of the world.

After examining these constructions, students might begin by finding similarities and differences between the male and female characters: Mellor and Patterson (1992) encourage asking questions such as who is speaking/listening? who is active/passive?,who is powerful/less powerful? and who is rational/emotional? Other questions in this comparison of how characters are constructed are What values does each character support? How are these values supported by the author's presentation of this character? (or how is the reader positioned to read/accept/ value this character and the ideology he or she represents?) Ultimately the result of this kind of examination might be conclusions about *Pride and Prejudice*

(particularly Mr. Collins' proposal scene) as an unconventional and, in some ways, mock romantic satire of Eighteenth century attitudes towards marriage and relations between the sexes, and about *Sylvia's Lovers*, in contrast, as a conventional representation of courting and the appropriate roles in courting for men and women.

This discussion about how readers were positioned by both Gaskell and Austen to adopt a particular reading of these courting scenes might then encourage students to begin to reflect on their own responses to the texts and primarily to the issue of Gaskell's text as a "natural" text in which readers' and texts' general repertoires are less likely to clash than in an "unnatural" text like Austen's. With this awareness students might then return to their initial responses to the text in order to understand how both the text and their responses were constructed by the influence of ideology. As well, the initial IRP question about the female bias in the Austen text could be examined in light of the issue of the naturalizing tendency of the dominant, conventional presentation of male and female relationships. For example, after the comparison and contrast of these two texts, students might be asked to examine the relationship between a text which has a general or literary repertoire with which the reader's general or literary repertoire clashes and which the reader has a tendency to label as rhetorically biased. Finally, the comparison and contrast of these two texts might then illustrate how the mismatch of text and reader repertoires in *Pride and Prejudice* makes it easier to see bias here than in a text such as *Sylvia's Lovers* in which a match between reader and text repertoires is more likely.

The juxtaposition of these two texts and their positioning of readers surrounding the issue of gender through the use of structured reading responses, an analysis of character "construction", and an examination of reader and text general repertoires is one way to examine the naturalizing influence of a dominant or conventional reading and thereby apply McCormick's sociocultural model to a text in, and a learning outcome from, the English Literature 12 IRP.

Reviewing Contexts of Reception of a Text: *The Tempest*

One central focus of the English Literature 12 IRP is the examination of literary texts within their historical contexts of production: "appreciate the power of literature to express human experiences throughout cultural history" (IRP, p. 1). A number of learning outcomes and suggested instructional strategies in the IRP do focus on this "foregrounding of the historical/cultural/and socio-political sources and bases of particular texts" (Gilbert, Freebody, and Luke, 1991, p. 451). For example, "demonstrate an awareness of the influence of gender, ethnicity, and class on literature" (IRP, p. 28) and "demonstrate and awareness of cultural geography and historical background in the text" (IRP, p. 36). However, a key part of McCormick's model of teaching literature is the social and historical context(s) of the reception of a text as well as the context of production of the text. McCormick's sociocultural approach views the literary text as a site for the construction of meaning: an interaction between text, which has been constructed by its context of

production, and readers, who, as well, have been constructed by their contexts of reception. In her approach it follows that readers constructed by different social and historical contexts (contexts of reception) will create different readings of the same text. There are no opportunities, such as the one suggested by McCormick and outlined below, in the English Literature 12 IRP for readers to examine how readings are influenced by contexts of reception. However , one opportunity that comes close to this examination of the context of reception is when students are encouraged to debate "Be it resolved that Eliot would write 'The Hollow Men' if he were alive today" (IRP, p. 24). However, in a 1985 article McCormick suggests that such an opportunity might be afforded students by having them examine a variety of critical responses to one particular text, and how the readings of the text change from one context of reception to the other. McCormick's example has students read a review article by John Jump on the history of *Hamlet* criticism from the Seventeenth century to the 1960's. McCormick claims that one result of the use of this kind of approach is that her students were forced "to ask how the text was able to support so many interpretations without seeming incoherent or fragmented" (McCormick, p. 84).

McCormick's approach is helpful because, as it may be difficult for readers to reflect in a self-conscious way on how their immediate surroundings or context (which reveals itself in their literary and general repertoires) influences their own construction of meaning, they might find it easier to examine the reception of a particular text over a span of many years through changing political, social and

historical influences, and see how different contexts of reception influence how other readers have constructed different meanings of the same text. For example, to see how attitudes towards Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* have changed in North America before and after the second World War in correspondence with awareness of issues surrounding anti-semitism.

The follow section of this study outlines how this approach might be taken with a core text from the English Literature 12 IRP: Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. When looking at the reception of this text over a number of literary periods, the focus will be on the many different readings of the character Caliban, whose portrayal in this play is particularly suited to this approach as it is a contradictory portrayal of a character who is open to many different interpretations or readings. The contexts of reception that students might look at in this approach are some of the literary eras already covered in the Core component of the course. As students are expected to have social and historical background knowledge from these particular periods in order to understand the influence of the contexts of production on these texts, they could use this same information to examine how the contexts of reception helped to construct particular critical readings of the play, or Caliban's character more precisely.

Barker and Hulme (1985) argue that "in order to speak of the Shakespearean text as an historical utterance, it is necessary to read it with and within a series of *con-texts*" (p. 236). They go on to explain con-texts as signifying a "break from the inequality of the usual text/context relationship. Con-texts are themselves texts and

must be read with. They do not simply make up background" (p. 236). This concept of the readable "con-text" reinforces the integral influence of the context of reception, which is missed by the English Literature 12 IRP, but advocated by McCormick's model.

In accordance with McCormick's (1994) and Mellor and Patterson's (1994) emphasis of the centrality of the reader's response in any sociocultural approach to reading literature, the examination of the history of a text's reception should occur after students have themselves studied and responded in-depth to the text. For the purpose of this kind of study of *The Tempest* students might be encouraged to focus on their responses to the central characters in the play and particularly on the relationship between Prospero and Caliban. Caliban's character is such this activity alone would likely result in a complex and contradictory, and at times very confusing for students, set of responses to his character, and perhaps even an intial discussion of why we respond to his character the way we do. McCormick's suggestion to study the history of the reception of the text has the potential to clarify for students the idea of a multiplicity of meaning in a text and the influence of context of reception in the meaning a reader constructs from the text.

The source for most of the following material on the history of the reception of Caliban's character in *The Tempest* is *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History* written by Vaughan and Vaughan (1991). This text examines the context of production of *The Tempest* and reception of the text through a variety of periods and cultural influences. Not only does it examine commentary on *The Tempest*, but it also examines productions of the play and other texts based on

and influenced by the characters and ideas in the play. From the vast number of conclusions drawn by Vaughan and Vaughan about the historical reception of *The Tempest* and Caliban's character, I have simplified four dominant readings of Caliban's character for this approach: the Eighteenth century monster; the Nineteenth century Romantic hero; the Victorian anthropoid; and the Post-Colonial slave. Each is an example of how the dominant ideologies of their time influenced readers in their construction or reading of Caliban's character.

The Eighteenth Century Monster

According to Vaughan and Vaughan (1991) Eighteenth century interpretations of *The Tempest* reflect the neoclassical perspective on man as a rational animal who can and should control his baser instincts. Vaughn and Vaughan state that Caliban represents to the Restoration "gross immorality and rebellion against divinely ordered authority" (p. 94). They quote John Dryden who says the following about Shakespeare's "monster":

> he has all the discontents and malice of a witch,
> and of a devil, besides the convenient proportion
> of the deadly sins; gluttony, sloth, and lust are manifest;
> the dejectedness of a slave is likewise given him, and the
> ignorance of one bred up in a desert island. His person
> is monstrous, as he is the product of unnatural lust;
> and his language is as hobgoblin as his person; in all
> things he is distinguished from other mortals. (p. 94)

Another critic cited in Vaughan and Vaughan, John Holt, writes in 1749 that Caliban was "ignorant of language before Prospero's arrival, and that he also lacked the knowledge even of what was "healthful or hurtful" for him. When he learned language, it

> enabled him to sort and separate his ideas, and
> know his own Purposes, or those meanings he had
> received from Prospero. In sum Caliban is incurably
> ignoble. His vices control his actions. Language and
> culture could curb those vices, but cursed with
> innate depravity, the education can never have its
> full effect. (p. 97)

As well, Maurice Morgan (1777), as cited in Vaughan and Vaughan (1991), characterized Caliban as Ariel's complete opposite:

> Caliban is the passion itself, or rather a compound of malice
> servility, and lust, substantiated; and therefore best shown
> in contrast with the lightness of Ariel and the innocence
> of Miranda (p.99).

Vaughan and Vaughan see this binary opposition between body and spirit, evil and good, guilt and innocence fitting comfortably with the Eighteenth century strict moral beliefs. Of note is Vaughan and Vaughan's claim that many critical attitudes towards Caliban in the Restoration and the Eighteenth century were based on Dryden and William Davenant's (1670) adaptation of Shakespeare's text, *The Tempest: Or, The Enchanted Island*, in which Caliban is a "monster of the isle," "a pimp and grotesque," (p. 91) whose major business is to follow Trinculo slavishly and to gain favour with him by arranging a sexual encounter between Sycorax, his sister in

Dryden's version, and his new master. Vaughan and Vaughan also suggest that a 1838 Macready production of *The Tempest* in Shakespeare's original text finally breaks the influence of the Dryden version and makes room for a more sympathetic reading of his character. Vaughan and Vaughan cite the critic Patrick MacDonnell praising an actor's interpretation of Macready's Caliban:

> it [the performance] delineated "the rude and uncultivated savage, in a style, which arouses our sympathies..." For Macready, Caliban is "a creature in his nature possessing all the rude elements of the savage, yet maintaining in his mind, a strong resistance to that tyranny, which held him in the thralldom of slavery." (MacDonnell, p. 17, cited in Vaughan and Vaughan, p. 105)

In itself, Dryden's version of the play could be examined to see what an Eighteenth century context or reception emphasizes and what it excludes in its construction of meaning.

The Romantic Period's Caliban

Vaughan and Vaughan's survey of Nineteenth century Romantic readings of Caliban's character finds that they were influenced by "The American and French revolutions' rhetoric about the rights of individual man, Rousseau's speculations on man's natural nobility in an uncivilized state, and the romantic poets' appreciation of poetic imagination attuned to the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings" (p. 102). Writers and poets also began to look at the play's scenario from Caliban's perspective and "they

empathized with his desperate attempt to regain control of his island and his life" (p. 103). The Nineteenth century reading of Caliban became less moralistic and more sympathetic. Coleridge in his lecture on *The Tempest* writes:

> The character of Caliban is wonderfully conceived: his
> is a sort of creature of the earth partaking of the qualities
> of the brute and distinguished from them in two ways:
> 1. by having mere understanding without moral reason,
> 2. by not having the instincts which belong to mere
> animals. Still Caliban is a noble being: a man in the sense of
> the imagination, all the images he utters are drawn from
> nature, and all are highly poetical." (103)

According to Vaughan and Vaughan (1991), even more sympathetically, William Hazlitt, in an 1818 response to Coleridge's lecture, argues that it is Caliban, and not Prospero, who is the legitimate ruler of the island. Vaughan and Vaughan cite Jonathan Bate who praises Hazlitt for being "the first to read *The Tempest* in terms of imperialism" (p. 104). These examples of Nineteenth century readings, which see Caliban's perspective and value his poetic and imaginative power, are readings of his character, or receptions of the text, which are influenced by a period of tremendous political and social change as opposed to the social conservatism of the Eighteenth century. McCormick would see the comparison of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth century Caliban's as a good opportunity to examine how each context of reception for each centuries' critics helped to shape how they read the play. McCormick would also suggest that this examination of the effect of context of reception would then help readers to themselves be more aware of

how their own context of reception influences how they read this play and other works of literature.

The Victorian Caliban

As well, Vaughan and Vaughan detail the influence of the context of the Victorian period on the reading of Caliban's character: more specifically, the influence of Darwin's philosophical speculations about man's place in an evolving universe. Texts by Browning (1864), Wilson (1873), and Renan (1878) are among the many texts which Vaughan and Vaughan cite as displaying this influence.

The most explicit of these conclusions is made in Wilson's *Caliban: The Missing Link* (1973). Vaughan and Vaughan quote Wilson associating Caliban with a "theoretical intermediate being, between the true brute and man, which, if the new theory of descent from the crude animal organisms be true, was our predecessor and precursor in the inheritance of this world of humanity" (Wilson, 1973, p. 46, as cited in Vaughan and Vaughan, 1991, p. 110). Wilson relates Caliban's fishlike appearance "to Darwin's view that man evolved from some species of aquatic animal" (p. 51, as cited in Vaughan and Vaughan, 1991, p. 110) while contending that "the form of Caliban is, neverthelss, essentially human" and calling him "a novel anthropoid of a high type" (p. 52, as cited in Vaughan and Vaughan, 1991, p. 110).

Vaughan and Vaughan show that this evolutionary influence is also evident in a French drama: Ernest Renan's *Caliban: Suite de "La*

Tempete" (1896). Renan's play begins where *The Tempest* ends and, in part, details Caliban's transformation:

> little by little, thanks to language and reason, thy deformed
> features have become harmonized, thy web-fingers have
> separated themselves one from the other, and from a poisonous
> fish thou hast become a man. (p. 111)

Vaughan and Vaughan (1991) see this transformation as a result of proper language and thought as representative of the Nineteenth century belief in humanity's constant progress and ability to improve itself. Vaughand and Vaughan (1991) cite this Darwinian Caliban, who is educable and evolving physically, morally and intellectually [Wilson (1873), Cranch (1887), Browning (1864), and Wheeler (1907)], as emblematic of Victorian optimism that "this symbol of fallen humanity could be transcended, or left behind at the very least" (p. 113).

A Post-Colonial Caliban

The final, and from the perspective of Vaughan and Vaughan, most significant group of receptions or readings of Shakespeare's Caliban, as outlined in their text, is the post-colonial reading of Caliban's character. Vaughan and Vaughan begin with examples from Latin American literature and culture. Fernandez Retamar's *Caliban* (1971) embraces Caliban as

> our symbol...Prospero invaded the islands,
> killed our ancestors, enslaved Caliban, and taught
> him his language to make himself understood. What

else can Caliban do but use that same language--today
he has no other--to curse him, to which that the
'red plague' would fall on him: I know no other
metaphor more expressive of our cultural situation,
of our reality... What is out history, what is our culture,
if not the history and culture of Caliban? (p. 156)

Vaughan and Vaughan continue developing this reading of
Caliban as a Post-Colonial slave by quoting from a 1974 issue of the
Massachusetts Review, entitled "Caliban." This issue is devoted to
Latin American cultural expression and its purpose is described as

[Caliban is a symbol of] a struggle for liberation and cultural
authenticity whose roots must be traced back, from
Salvador Allende, Che Guevara, and Toussaint L'Ouverture,
to the original revolts of indigenous Indians and Black
slaves. (p. 157)

Vaughan and Vaughan conclude this section by suggesting that "if
Latin America could see in Prospero the embodiment of European
imperialism and could see in Caliban a symbol of themselves,
Africans were likely to make comparable identifications" (164) and
that "this new reading of *The Tempest* has now become a common
one throughout the colonial world" (158). Vaughan and Vaughan's
examples of these interpretaions from across the colonial world are
many.

This perfunctory survey of four readings of Caliban's character
is an important opportunity to begin to help students examine and
recognize what McCormick calls the context of reception of a text.
Students' own knowledge of these historical periods from their study
of them in the Core module of the course would allow students to

understand how the ideology of the reader, the social and historical contexts which surround various critics or readers, influences how he or she has constructed meaning in interaction with the ideology of the text. This exercise would also help make students more sensitive and self-conscious of the influences of their own context of reception on their general and literary ideologies in making meaning from Shakespeare's Caliban and ultimately other texts they read.

In conclusion to this chapter on the findings from the analysis of the IRP from the perspective of McCormick's model three points should be emphasized:

1. A variety of theoretical biases were found throughout the Introduction and Rationale Statements and in the PLO and Suggested Learning Activities sections of the IRP.

2. The IRP and McCormick's model both value the importance of Reader Response and the historical context of the production of a literary text. As well, there were some examples in the IRP of activities which provided opportunities for students to see the text as a site for conflicting ideas and meaning.

3. The strength of McCormick's model was revealed in her concepts of the context of reception of a text and the use of matching and mismatching text and reader repertoires to examine the naturalizing influence of ideology on both reader and text.

CHAPTER V: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Findings

In the Rationale and Introductory statement section of the IRP there are examples of perspectives on teaching literature that can be classified as both Objectivist and Expressivist. For example, suggesting students "do close reading" and "refine their critical judgments...and critical discernment with respect to literature" (p. 1) can be considered from an Objectivist approach. Having teachers provide students with opportunities for literature to affect their "personal growth" can be considered compatible with Personal Growth perspectives on literature.

There are as well a number of sufficiently broad and inclusive statements, which can be said to be compatible with McCormick's model as well as many other perspectives on teaching literature. For example, "examine and appreciate the diversity and commonality of human experience" (p. 1). McCormick's model values the diversity and at times contradictory nature of voices in literature (1994, p. 63) and the Objectivist approaches to teaching literature value literature as a representation of human experience for the reader to uncover (O'Neill, 1993, p. 19).

Some statements more closely approach the perspectives of McCormick's model in relation to the social and historical context of the production of a text. For example, the suggestion that "students will develop their understanding of the relationship between the

social thought and the literature of an era" (IRP, p. 28). As well, also compatible with McCormick's model is the IRP's focus on the importance of student response at the center of literature study. In the Introduction to the IRP document teachers are encouraged to give students opportunities to "engage with literature" and to "develop skills in formulating informed, personal responses to a wide range of literary texts" (p. 7). Although the IRP and McCormick's perspective are compatible with respect to their valuing of student response, McCormick's model, but not the IRP, extends student response to include an awareness of the social and historical context in which students make their responses (McCormick's context of reception). The IRP suggests that texts be studied as "reflections of social, political, and historical forces," (p. 2) (McCormick's context of production) but does not suggest that the reader's own making of meaning or response to the text is, as well, influenced or shaped by these same social and historical contexts (McCormick's context of reception).

The IRP perspective and that of McCormick's model on the examination of issues of gender, class and race in literary texts also diverge. The IRP marginalizes the examination of these issues to optional modules (p. 5) and does not promote the examination of these issues in texts from which they appear absent. As well, the IRP does not acknowledge that even the absence of the issues of gender, class and race in literary texts does, in fact, make a statement about these issues (O'Neill, 1993). Conversely, McCormick's model recognizes the naturalizing effect ideology has on the expectations that readers have of texts (their general and literary

repertoires) and emphasizes the importance of examining how literary texts position readers and how many ideological perspectives, although not initially apparent, are reflected in these literary texts.

As well, although the IRP document is not entirely compatible with McCormick's sociocultural approach to teaching literature, there are opportunities in the IRP and the course reading material to adapt teaching strategies and approaches in order to embrace more completely the specifics of her model of teaching literature, for example the reading of interpretations of Caliban's character in *The Tempest* and contrasting the naturalizing effects of ideology in *Pride and Prejudice* and *Sylvia's Lovers*.

Conclusions

The questions raised in Chapter I of this study ask about insights into the IRP and McCormick's model revealed through the application of her theoretical model to the IRP curriculum document. This section will examine insights revealed about the IRP and the theoretical model with respect to four issues:

1. theoretical bias in curriculum documents,
2. Reader Response theory,
3. McCormick's context of reception of literary texts, and
4. McCormick's matching of text and reader repertoires.

Using McCormick's model to analyze the IRP document suggests, much as Eisner (1974) found in his analysis of "Man: A

Course of Study", that the currculum document reveals some of each of the Objectivist, Expressivist, and Cultural Criticism perspectives on teaching literature.

As well, this study reveals that one of the strongest areas of compatibility between the IRP and McCormick's model is in the area of Reader Response. This is reinforced by Trifonas (1993) citing Eco (1979), Derrida (1974), and Rosenblatt (1978): "no text is read independently of a reader's experience of other texts or of the common frame of knowledge lived through every day" (p. 387). McCormick has a reader's response as essential to her model as she values "the sense of individual readers actively reading texts," (1994, p. 68) and believes that "both readers and texts contribute to the reading process" (p. 69). This focus on the importance of a reader's response in a sociocultural model is advocated by Wingard (1991), who calls his approach to teaching literature a "reader response/cultural criticism" (p. 151) approach which will "heighten your consciousness of your role in making meaning of experience" (p. 161). This combination of Reader Response and a Poststructural awareness of the constructedness of that Reader Response in her model also strengthens McCormick's position against critics of Poststructuralist literary theory who suggest that Poststructuralist literary theory is overly didactic and authoritarian and results in a transmission model of teaching in its attempt to encourage resistant readers (Hunter, 1994).

However, while both the IRP document and McCormick's model value the integrity of a reader's response, a key difference in this area is the IRP's position on Reader Response as a primarily

individual, but not social, act. There are few opportunities in the IRP document for students to explore the sources of and influences on their responses to literature. In contrast, McCormick extends the concept of a reader's initial response to include an examination and understanding of the social construction of response to literature-- her context of reception of the text. This examination of the context of reception of a text is supported in research which calls for Poststructuralist approaches to teaching literature. Heap (1991) suggests that "reading is not a singular, private act, but an array of normative cultural practices" (p. 110); Gilbert (1987) calls for "ways other than what seems natural, universal, and self-evident in order to show that what may seem given is but a cultural construct" (p. 248); and O'Neill (1993) suggests that texts and responses to texts can be seen as "culturally located artifacts" (p. 23). McCormick's model is, therefore, valuable as it encourages the exploration of the sources and influences of reader response (context of reception) whereas the IRP ignores this in its approach to teaching literature.

Another signficant discrepancy between the approaches of the IRP and McCormick's model is in the area of encouraging readers to become aware of textual and reader bias (or the positioning of reader and text). In this regard the IRP relegates issues of gender, class, and race to the optional modules of the course and thereby implies that these issues can be examined only in texts where gender, class, or race are explicitly addressed (or where the bias or positioning of the text is clearly evident). This weakness in the IRP is revealed through an examination of McCormick's emphasis on the naturalizing influence of society's ideology on a reader's repertoire: what the

reader expects from the ideology of the text (general repertoire) and from the literary and stylistic concerns of the text (literary repertoire). McCormick's conception of the matching or mismatching of the text and reader repertoires is a valuable tool with which readers can begin to explore how their reading of and response to a text is positioned or biased by what they expect (or are culturally conditioned to expect) as natural, conventional, and commonsensical (McCormick, 1994). Without the tool of the matching or mismatching of repertoires with which to understand how a text is biased or positions a reader, that reader is forced to accept the reading positioning offered by the text, rather that resisting or questioning that positioning (O'Neill, 1993). McCormick's matching of repertoires provides an opportunity for this kind of exploration which has been called for by advocates of Poststructuralist approaches to teaching literature: O'Neill (1993) suggests teacher interventions in the reading process in order to heighten student awareness (metatextual awareness) of the ways texts instruct their readers to read, and Freebody, Gilbert, and Luke (1991) advocate a "reading pedagogy that interactively foregrounds for students the identification, analysis and contestation of the procedures and reading positions upon which texts call" (p. 450).

In conclusion, the application of McCormick's model to the IRP document confirms Eisner's conclusions about multiple theoretical perspectives in one curriclum document. More significantly, the central position given the Reader Response perspective in both the IRP and McCormick's model reinforces it as a perspective key to both Expressivist and Sociocultural approaches to teaching literature. As

well, this analysis has revealed two strengths of McCormick's model. The first is her extension of the emphasis on Reader Response to include a more self-conscious awareness of the construction of that response and the social and historical forces shaping that response (McCormick's context of reception). The second is her model's concept of the matching and mismatching of repertoires which can be used as a tool to help readers foreground a text's positioning or bias, no matter how natural and/or commonsensical it may seem, so as to make readers aware of how texts influence or position their reading.

Implications

As biases from many perspectives on teaching literature were apparent in the IRP, educators writing curriculum might turn their attention toward writing more self-consciously about theoretical perspectives on teaching literature in order to make more transparent the role that various theoretical perspectives play in shaping curriculum. Theoretical perspectives on teaching literature need to be made explicit parts of curriculum documents, and topics in teacher inservicing, so that teachers can have a more conscious awareness of how rationale statements and instructional strategies priviledge particular ways of thinking about literature and approaches to teaching literature. Research implications in this area are vast: from a detailed codification and analysis of curriculum documents and their theoretical biases, to examinations of how explicit knowledge of theoretical approaches to teaching literature

for teachers and for students affects how literature is taught and what is learned about literature in the classroom.

Although this analysis of the IRP from the perspective of McCormick's model reveals Reader Response as a central and valuable component in Expressivist and Sociocultural perspectives on teaching literature, McCormick's approach to this issue points to the necessity of encouraging more awareness of the social construction of response. Curriculum developers must, again, be conscious of this when writing curriculum documents. Teachers need to be given instructional strategies which will allow them to encourage students to become aware of the social constructedness of response (the social and historical context of the reception of a text) rather than simply seeing response as personal and idiosyncratic. A good place to start might be with McCormick's example of examing the historical reception of a particular text over a period of time, such as was done at the end of Chapter IV of this study with Caliban's character in *The Tempest*. This kind of examination of the responses of others, in other times, to a text might then make it easier for students to begin to examine the reasons for their own responses to literature (the social and historical context and constructedness of their responses) as was illustrated at the end of Chapter IV in an examination of the constrasting texts of *Sylvia's Lovers* and *Pride and Prejudice*. Researchers might explore how it is that readers fill gaps in their reading: idiosyncratically or as a result of social construction? Studies using culturally specific groupings might be helpful in attempting to control and measure the cultural knowledge of and influences on any particular study group. As well researchers might

examine how knowledge of the concept of context of reception affects student responses as compared to the responses of a group untutored in a formal awareness of this same concept.

Another strength in McCormick's model was revealed through the absence in the IRP of any opportunity for readers to "resist" (O'Neill, 1993) or question the positioning of a text and the corresponding naturalizing influence of dominant ideology on a text and on the reader's reading of the text. McCormick's model provides one solution to this weakness with her concept of a matching or mismatching of reader and text repertoires. Researchers need to further evaluate the usefulness and the effect of using this tool in the classroom. Many questions need to be asked: What kind of a response or reader results from using this tool or helping readers to use this kind of a tool? How sophisticated a reader is needed in order for this tool of matching repertoires to be used and understood most effectively? How does using this tool change or shape readers' understanding of the text and understanding of how they read the text? Conclusions from this kind of research could then have important implications for both curriculum developers and teachers. McCormick's technique of exploring the relationship between reader and text repertoire might be written into a curriculum document and used as an instructional strategy which might support student reading throughout a course.

Although the focus of this study is the English Literature 12 course and therefore the study of literature by senior English students, from a broader perspective McCormick (1994) and Freebody, Gilbert and Luke (1991) suggest that social and historical

forces shape reading at all levels (including ESL and remedial reading). While McCormick's model does not preclude this kind of examination she does not explicitly address how the model might be adapted for ESL readers (grappling with the language) or readers from a variety of social and cultural backgrounds (not from homogeneous social and cultural influences). This is one weakness of her model in that it omits any discussion about how to adapt her theory to different kinds of readers. The exploration of how a sociocultural model, such as McCormick's, could be adapted to ESL readers is particularly important for researchers from large urban centers in Canada, such as Vancouver, where there is a large population of students from a variety of cultural backgrounds and whose first language is not English.

With respect to the replication of this study, I would suggest that there is little room for valuable further study. By no means has this study thoroughly answered all of the questions it has raised; however, it has revealed, as Eisner's 1974 analysis of "Man a Course of Study" had, that within written curricular documents there are possibly many opportunities to see a variety of theoretical influences. What would be more valuable than a replication of this study would be an examination of the application of the curriculum document from the perspective of McCormick's model or an Objectivist approach to see how these theoretical perspectives influence what is taught; how it is taught; and what students learn about literature, their own reading practices and the social and cultural influences on their reading and understanding of literature.

In general, the analysis of the English Literature 12 IRP from the perspective of McCormick's theoretical model reveals that many of the aspects of her perspective (particularly context of reception and the matching of reader and text repertoires) begin to provide a theoretical base for the practical introduction of aspects of Poststructuralist literary theory in the literature classroom.

References

Austen, J. (1813/1968). *Pride and Prejudice*. London: Collins Press.

Barthes, R. (1982). cited in Mailloux, S. *Interpretive Conventions: The reader in the study of American Fiction*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Beavis, C. (1994). On textbooks, reading and change. A response to Brenton Doecke: The Post-structuralist English classroom. *English in Australia,* 1994, *109*, 30-41.

Bleich, D. (1980) The identity of pedagogy in research in the study of response to literature. *College English, 42*(4), 350-66.

Bogdan, D., & Straw, S. (1990). *Beyond Communication: Reading Comprehension and Criticism*. Upper Montclair, N.J: Boynton/Cook, Heineman.

Britton, J. (1981). English Teaching: Retrospect and Prospect. *English in Education, 15*(2), 1-10.

Bull, G. (1995). Children's literature using text to construct reality. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 18*, 259-69.

Cahalan, J. M., & Downing, D. B. (1991). *Practicing Theory in Introductory College Courses*. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE.

Chalmers, A. (1995). Monumental Changes: Disarming the Literature 12 Canon. *Update,38*(1), 4-8.

Connelly, F. M., and Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Curriculm Theory. *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*. New York: Macmillan, 267-281.

Cooley, W. and Bickel, W. (1986) *Decision-Oriented Educational Research*. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.

Corcoran, B. (1994). Balancing Reader Response and Cultural Theory and Practice. In *Knowledge in the Making.* Corcoran, B., Hayhoe, M. & Pradl, G. eds. Portsmouth NH: Boynton/Cook, 1994, pp. 3-23.

Derrida, J. (1974). *Of Grammatology* (G.C. Spivak trans.) Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Dixon, J. (1975). *Growth Through English.* (second edition) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Doecke, B. (1994). The Post-structuralist English class. *English in Australia,* 1994,*109*, 6-28.

Eco, U. (1979). *The role of the reader: Explorations in the semiotics of texts.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Eisner, E.W., and Vallance, E. (eds.). (1974). *Conflicting Conceptions of Curriculum.* Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power.* London: Longman.

Fish, S. E. (1980). *Is there a text in this class?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Flynn, E. (1983). Composing Responses to literary texts. *College Composition and Communication, 39*(3) 342-48.

Freebody, P., Gilbert, P., & Luke, A. (1991). Reading Positions and Practices. *Curriculum and Inquiry,* 1991, *21*(4), 435-57.

Gaskell, E. (1863/1973). *Sylvia's Lovers.* USA: Viking Penguin.

Gilbert, P. (1983). Down Among the Women: girls as readers and writers. *English in Australia, 64,* 26-9.

Gilbert, P. (1987). The Deconstructivist Technique. in *Readers, Texts, Teachers.* Corcoran, B., & Evans, E. eds. New Jersey: Boynton/Cook, 243-250.

Graff, R. (1992). *Beyond the culture wars: How teaching the conflicts can revitalize American Education.* New York: Norton.

Green, B., & Morgan, W. (1991). After the Tempest: or, Literacy, Pedagogy and the Brave New World. Keynote address, Whole Language Umbrella Conference. Niagara, USA, 1991.

Gutteridge, D. (1992). A Three Stage Pedagogy in Response. *Ourschools/Ourselves, 4*(1), 90-110.

Harker, J.W. (1990). Reader Response and the Interpretation of Literature: Is there a teacher in the classroom? *Reflections on Canadian Literacy, 8* (2&3), 69-73.

Heap, J. (1991). A situated perspective on what counts for reading. in Luke, A. & Barker, C.D. eds. *Towards a critical sociology of reading pedagogy.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 103-40.

Holland, N. (1975). *Five Readers Reading.* New Haven, Yale University Press.

Hunter, R. (1994). *Rethinking the School: Subjectivity, bureaucracy, criticism.* St.Leonards, NSW: Allen &Unwin.

Jump, D. (1973). *Hamlet, Shakespeare: Selected Biographical guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Killian, C. (1992). Politics and English Literature. *Update, 34*(3), 41-46.

Kimpston, R.D. (1985). Curriculum Fidelity and the Implementation Tasks Employed by Teachers: A Research Study. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 17* (2), 185-195.

Leavis, F. (1952). *The Common Pursuit.* London: Chatto & Windus.

Luke, A. (1989). Open and closed texts: the semiotic/ideological analysis of textbook narratives. *Journal of Pragmatics, 13*, 53-80.

Macdonnell, P. (1840/1943). *An essay on the play The Tempest*. London: John Fellowes.

Martin, J. R. (1985) *Reclaiming a Conversation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

McCormick, K. (1985). Theory in the Reader: Bleich, Holland and Beyond. *College English, 47* (8), 836-45.

McCormick, K. (1994). *The Culture of Reading and the Teaching of Literature*. Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press.

Mellor, B., & Patterson, A. (1994). Producing Readings: Freedom vs. Normativity. *English in Australia, 109*, 42-56.

Mellor, B., O'Neill, M., & Patterson, A. (1992). Re-reading literature teaching. in Thomson, J. ed. *Reconstructing Literature Teaching: New Essays on the teaching of literature*. Sydney: Australian Association for the Teaching of English, 40-55.

Moran, C., & Penfield, E. (1990). *Conversations: Contemporary Critical Theory and the Teaching of Literature*. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE.

Morgan, W. (1994). Resistant Reading Within/Against post-structuralism. *English in Australia,109*, 6-28.

Moon, B. (1990). What is Post-structuralism? *English in Australia, 94*, 6-13.

Newell, G. E., and Holt, R. A. (1997). Autonomy and Obligation in the Teaching of Literature: Teachers' Classroom Curriculum and Department Consensus. *English Education, 29*, 18-37.

O'Neill, M. (1990). Molesting the text: Promoting resistant readings. in Hayhoe, M. & Parker, S. eds. *Reading and Response.* Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press, 84-93.

O'Neill, M. (1992). Rereading *Wuthering Heights.* in Evans, E. ed. Hull. *Young Readers, New Readings.* England: Hull University Press, 73-90.

O'Neill, M. (1993) Teaching Literature as Cultural Criticism. *English Quarterly, 25* (1), 19-25.

Patterson, A. (1992). Individualism in English: From personal growth to discursive construction. *English Education, 24*, 131-46.

Patton, G. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods (second edition).* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Petersen, B. (1982). Writing About Response: a unified model. *College English, 44,* 459-68.

Province of British Columbia, Ministry of Education. (1993). Literature 12 Curriculum: Report on Scholarly Review. *Update, 35* (3), 13-18.

Province of British Columbia, Ministry of Education. (1996). *English Literature 12 Integrated Resource Package.* Victoria, British Columbia: Ministry of Education.

Richards, I. A. (1929). *Practical Criticism: A study of literary judgement.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Rosenblatt, L. (1970). *Literature as Exploration.* London: Heineman Educational.

Rosenblatt, L. (1978). *The Reader, the Text, the Poem: the Transactional Theory of the Literary Work.* New York: Noble & Noble.

Scholes, R. (1985). *Textual Power: Literary Theory and the Teaching of English.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Schubert, W. T. (1986) *Curriculum Perspective, Paradigm, and Possibility.* New York: MacMillan.

Schumacher, S., and McMillan, J. H. (1993). *Research in Education: a Conceptual Introduction.* New York: Harper Collins.

Schwab, J. J. (1978). The practical: a language for curriculum. *School Review*, 1978, *81*, 500-522.

Selden, R. (1985). *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory.* Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press.

Showalter, E. (1971). Women and the literary curriculum. *College English, 32*, 855-62.

Thomson, J. (1987). *Understanding Teenagers Reading: Reading Processes and the Teaching of Reading.* Ryde: Metheun.

Thomson, J. (1994). Literary theory: why, what and how? In Watson, K. *English Teaching in Perspective: in the context of the 1990's.* Sydney: St. Clair Press.

Trifonas, P. (1992). Explorations in the semiotics of text: A method for the semiotic analysis of the picture book. Unpublished MA thesis, 1992, UBC, Vancouver.

Trifonas, P. (1993). Conceptions of Text and Textuality: critical perspectives on literary theory from structuralism to post-structuralism. *Interchange, 24*(4), 381-95.

Vaughan, A.T., and Vaughan, V.M. (1991). *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Watson, K. , & Sawyer, W. (1995). Models and Metaphors. IFTE Unpublished lecture, New York.

Willinsky, J. (1990). *The New Literacy: Redefining Reading and Writing in the Schools*. New York: Routledge.

<u>**Appendix A:**</u>

Suborganizers of the Five Curriculum Organizers from the English

Literature 12 Integrated Resource Package (pp. 6-7)

Core Studies

Students acquire knowledge and appreciation of a body of significant
works, representative of the heritage of English literature.

Suborganizers
-Classical/Medieval
-Renaissance/17th Century
-Enlightenment
-Pre-Romantic
-Romantic
-Victorian
-Early 20th Century
-Late 20th Century

Reading and Thinking

Students acquire knowledge and develop critical-reading skills
through understanding and intrepreting a broad range of literature
written in English by men and women form various countries,
regions, and social classes.

Suborganizers
-Issues
-Heritage Literature
-Critical Judgement
-Interpretation
-Historical Context
-Rhetorical Situation

-Imagery, Motif, and Symbolism

Written and Oral Expression

Students develop skills in oral and written expression in response to literature. As well, through engaging with literature, students enhance their abilities to critically listen, represent, and view.

Suborganizers
-Literary Analysis
-Self-Assessment
-Oral and Visual Performance

Literary Concepts

Students develop skills in using appropriate literary terms, devices, and techniques in oral and written response and analysis.

Suborganizers
-Genre
-Terms, Devices, and Techniques
-Form and Style

Personal Response

Students develop skills in formulatin nformed personal responses to a wide range of literary texts.

Suborganizers
-Appreciation and Enjoyment
-Respecting Interpretations

Appendix B:
McCormick's Guided Response Questions
(McCormick, 1994, p. 157)

1. What is the predominant effect of the text on you: Confusion, identification with characters, interest, anger, boredom, amusement, terror, etc. Expand as much as possible.

2. Why do you think the text had this effect? To answer this, you should bear in mind that both you and the text have been produced by the particular culture(s) of which you are a part. Therefore to answer this question you will need to examine some aspects of the following:

   a. *the general repertoire of the text* : its subject-matter, social norms, its historical setting, the values and behaviors it (or its characters) take for granted as 'normal'. Remember that the general repertoire also involves historical context in which the text was written (which may differ from the setting of the text) and those in which it has been interpreted throughout history.

   b. *the literary repertoire of the text* : language, structure, use of familiar/unfamiliar conventions, organization, character development, themes, gaps or blanks in the structure that the reader has to fill in, etc. Remember that the literary repertoire also involves the literary values and debates that were going on when the text was being written and the history of the text's interpretation within changing literary values and debates.

   c. *the general repertoire of the reader*: your values, beliefs, your prior knowledge (or lack of it) about the text's subject-matter and its setting, your expectations, likes and dislikes, your knowledge of everything you take

for granted as 'normal'. Remember that your general repertoire-- as a subset of the general ideology-- is likely to possess various conflicts which the text may tap into. Try to be aware of these.

d. *the literary repertoire of the reader*: your reading patterns, your knowledge/lack of knowledge about particular literary conventions and literary history, your preferences for particular uses of language, structure, organization, character development, themes, gaps, etc. Remember that your literary repertoire-- as a subset of the literary ideology--is likely to possess various conflicts which the text may tap into. Try to be aware of these.