Languages in/for Education
Langues dans/pour l'Education
Language Policy Division
Division des Politiques linguistiques

COUNCIL OF EUROPE CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE
Language Policy Division
Division des Politiques linguistiques

LANGUAGE AND SCHOOL SUBJECTS

LINGUISTIC DIMENSIONS OF KNOWLEDGE BUILDING IN SCHOOL CURRICULA

N° 3

Items for a description of linguistic competence in the language of schooling necessary for learning/teaching literature (end of compulsory education)

An approach with reference points

Irene Pieper

In consultation with

Laila AASE, Jean-Claude BEACCO, Marisa Cavalli, Michael FLEMING, Helmut Linneweber-Lammerskitten, Florentina SAMIHAIAN and Helmut Johannes VOLLMER

Language Policy Division
Directorate of Education and Languages, DGIV
Council of Europe, Strasbourg
www.coe.int/lang

LIST DOCUMENTS WHICH PROPOSE ELEMENTS FOR THE DESCRIPTION OF LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE FOR SPECIFIC SCHOOL SUBJECTS

1. *Items for a description of linguistic competence in the language of schooling necessary for learning/teaching history (end of obligatory education)*

   An approach with reference points - Jean-Claude Beacco

2. *Items for a description of linguistic competence in the language of schooling necessary for learning/teaching sciences (end of compulsory education)*

   An approach with reference points – Helmut Vollmer

3. *Items for a description of linguistic competence in the language of schooling necessary for learning/teaching literature (end of compulsory education)*

   An approach with reference points – Irene Pieper

4. *Language and school subjects. Linguistic dimensions of knowledge building in school curricula* – Jean-Claude Beacco, Daniel Coste, Piet-Hein van de Ven and Helmut Vollmer

© Council of Europe, August 2011

The opinions expressed in this work are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Council of Europe.

All correspondence concerning this publication or the reproduction or translation of all or part of the document should be addressed to the Director of Education and Languages of the Council of Europe (Language Policy Division) (F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex or decs-lang@coe.int).

The reproduction of extracts is authorised, except for commercial purposes, on condition that the source is quoted

Items for a description of linguistic competence in the language of schooling necessary for teaching and learning literature (end of compulsory education) - An approach with reference points

This text presents a procedure for creating a curriculum for the teaching of literature which explicitly takes into account the discursive and linguistic dimensions of this subject area. It proceeds through successive stages, for which there are corresponding inventories of references, from the level of educational goals in the teaching of literature to the identification of linguistic elements which it is particularly important to systematise in the classroom in order to manage the corresponding forms of discourse. This procedure – presented for discussion – has been devised to be independent of the specific language in question.

The texts in this part of the platform – on history, sciences and literature – all contribute to the identification of the linguistic dimensions of knowledge building in school curricula. They aim at offering assistance for coherent curriculum development and express shared values. For this reason, the texts provided follow a common pattern. Part 0.,1 and 1.1. are nearly identical in wording, other parts have been adapted to the theme of literature education (part 4, 5 and 6).[1]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 7

1. Educational Values 7

1.1 Educating social actors 8

1.2 Values and literature education 8

2. Social and private situations of communication where literature plays a role 10

2.1 Situations in society which involve literature communication 10

2.2 From situations in society to types of discourse 11

3. Subject-related knowledge and competences 13

3.1 Components of knowledge in literature 13

3.2 Textual demands 14

3.3 Components of literary competence 14

4. In-school communication situations relating to literature teaching and learning 16

4.1 Checklist of classroom activities in literature education (for subject teaching/learning in general) 16

4.2 From classroom situations to discursive forms 17

[1] Jean-Claude Beacco designed the first study on history from which the present study benefited to a large extent (Beacco 2009). It is also linked to discussions in the group of experts who worked on the language as subject, namely Laila Aase, Mike Fleming, Tina Samihaian (see Pieper (ed.) 2007; Aase et al. 2009) and besides to an ongoing exchange with Helmut Johannes Vollmer who did the study on sciences (Vollmer 2009). For a general approach to the "linguistic dimension of knowledge building in school curricula" see Beacco et al. 2010.

5. Specific linguistic and semiotic competences needed for literature education 18

5.1 Strategic competence 18

5.2 Discursive competence 19

5.3 Formal competence 20

5.3.1. Pragmatic and cognitive categories 20

5.3.2. Linguistic categories 21

5.3.3. Executing discursive competence: write a review 22

6. Thresholds 22

Introduction

This module proposes an approach for specifying the competences and knowledge relevant to communication in language and the mastery of the language(s) of schooling used as a vehicle for conveying this knowledge. This approach specifies the knowledge and competences so that they can be taught by a systematic, targeted method, integrated with the teaching of subject-related knowledge. In the following text is illustrated specifically with reference to the teaching of literature, a very significant subject in the European educational area which often forms part of language as a subject, but is also taught as a subject of its own.

The text presents

- an overall approach for the description and categorisation of literature education and the competences needed for successful learning/teaching
- open-ended reference points (in the form of inventories) which are to be completed by the users, according to the specifics of the respective educational system and the languages in which teaching is conducted.

The purpose of these reference points is to help users in:

- identifying the linguistic and cognitive activities present in the subject under consideration;
- specifying the forms of the language of teaching/learning which are especially helpful in mastering the varieties of discursive content attached to the subject and the forms of communication necessary for imparting and acquiring subject-related knowledge and skills.

The overall scheme of the approach is as follows:

(1) inventory and description of the educational values targeted by literature teaching practices;

(2) inventory and description of the social situations of communication involving literature in the learners' social environment;

(3) inventory and description of the expected literary knowledge (including attitudes);

(4) inventory and description of the existing in-school communication situations for the acquisition and construction of basic knowledge and procedures in literature.
The choices to be made among these possibilities lead to the definition of the purposes and objectives of education in literature within compulsory schooling.

Based on steps (1) to (4) it is then possible to create:

(5) inventories and descriptions of the specific linguistic, discursive and semiotic characteristics of relevance for the types of discourse involved in literature teaching and learning practices; these characteristics deserve to be taught in their own right in this subject area.

The text is part of a set of modules (including history, sciences and the mathematics) which propose a common procedure, relevant in theory and helpful for curriculum planning, whatever the language of instruction in question is, whether the learners' first language or a language acquired to a standard of proficiency of at least level B2, according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR).

1. Educational Values

All teaching pursues educational goals over and above the expertise and learning which are both its substance and its aspiration.

1.1 Educating social actors

The role of languages of education in schools is to structure and assist the education and training of social actors. The aims of this education and training are shared by the Member States of the Council of Europe as the basis for living in society in Europe.

Schooling is responsible for preparing future citizens and developing their potential by giving them the necessary tools for all aspects of life in society (personal relations, occupational activities, public and political activities, leisure activities, etc.) and by enabling them to understand the basic values of democratic life and make them part of their personal ethics.

The languages of Europe are therefore not only a "raw material" for building regional, ethnic and national cultural identities, but also a means of acquiring relevant knowledge in a number of different areas, of exchanging about this knowledge and how to make use of it as well as of experiencing otherness. Plurilingual education seeks to enhance the value of individual language repertoires and to organise life-long continuation and training to ensure that they develop appropriately. Literature as embedded in plurilingual education has a strong potential of moving beyond the actual: the explorative and creative dimension of language and literature point to the possibility of vision and change.

1.2 Values and literature education

The values connected to the teaching of literature extend from acknowledging the contribution of reading literature to personal development and identity formation and appreciating literary praxis as a form of participation in cultural life, to preserving and forming the cultural memory, national and transnational heritage(s). In recent years, recognizing diversity among literatures as a meaningful contribution to learning in heterogeneous societies and to intercultural understanding has become more relevant. Thus, the public aspect of literary education is underlined.

The issue of literary education has been addressed in particular by two recent recommendations of the Council of Europe: It is stressed that knowledge of language includes the knowledge of great works of literature and that literature education should form part of the curriculum "at all levels of the education system" (Recommendation 1833, Parliament Assembly of the Council of Europe, 2008). A move beyond national conceptions of literature education is aimed at in favour of a "transversal approach to Europe's heritage, highlighting the common link of respect for cultural diversity" and as a contribution to education in European citizenship (ibid.).

Besides, literature education forms part of a wider concept of cultural and intercultural education through the arts with a rich potential for personal development and mutual understanding. Self-expression *through* and experience *of* the arts is explicitly valued (cf. Recommendation 1884, Parliament Assembly of the Council of Europe, 2009).

It should be noted that the notion of literature has changed over time and nowadays does not only refer to highly valued, canonical and/or national literary texts (cf. Eagleton 2008). It may well include other media (multi-modal texts like films in particular), sometimes even pragmatic texts. This is reflected in many European curricula which often address learning with various media within the same domain as literature. Thus, literature education is open towards media education in a more general sense as well as towards reading education in a narrower sense (Pieper (ed.) (2007)). The conception of literature and the design of the domain or even subject in the curriculum naturally affect the goals assigned to its teaching. It is particularly noteworthy that goals in the field of literature education embrace personal and subjective areas such as the development of a positive attitude towards literature, based on experiences of emotional involvement, pleasure, creativity, intellectual stimulation and enrichment, as well as the public sphere: literary discourse incorporates a cultural, often

ethical and political dimension which is enacted in various social contexts including the classroom. In most cases, curricula in literature stress reception and communication about literature more than production. However, the concept of cultural education points to a creative dimension which includes the latter also.

Besides, in the field of compulsory schooling it is worth reflecting upon the relationship between an academic discourse on literature which is oriented towards a discipline – philology, literary studies, literary theory, cultural studies – and a less professional discourse which takes into account the various ways in which literature is part of life and society and is valued as such.

Within the history of literature education the teaching of literature and its context have shaped both praxis and knowledge. This process has been influenced by expectations and literary praxis of society in general and the academy.[2] It can be argued that it lead to a knowledge in its own right – which of course has changed in history.[3] The rather general goals laid out below are primarily concerned with the civic and social as well as personal goals. Objectives which are closer to the logic of the academic disciplines are especially valuable in higher education (upper secondary and beyond).

The principle goals assigned to the teaching of literature may include:[4]

- to enable students to read and appreciate literature as a rich cultural source for understanding and exploring human existence in history and in the present, a source which exceeds one's own living sphere and offers intercultural and transcultural insights and which contributes to the formation of cultural memory
- to enable students to conceive of literature (including theatre, film and other media) as one of the fundamental components in the construction of a Europe based on a common cultural heritage, enriched through diversity and cultures of the world
- to allow for in-depth-understanding of fundamental anthropological as well as ethical and political issues across cultures and thus play a vital role in the promotion of fundamental values such as mutual understanding (empathy), tolerance, human rights and democracy;
- to make a vital contribution to educating responsible and active citizens and fostering respect for all kinds of differences on a basis of understanding culture(s) and literature(s) as a vital dimension of social existence in Europe and beyond
- to allow the nurturing in learners of the intellectual ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate texts critically and responsibly, through dialogue and through open debate based on multiperspectivity;
- to support learners to recognise and understand different views and interpretations of one and the same text or issue and their relative legitimacy, especially by accepting multiperspectivity in literary discourse
- to allow for experiences of pleasure and deep engagement and the development of a

[2] Given the diversity of the academic disciplines concerned with literature and the potential of learning with literature at school, it has to be considered that the way from disciplinary knowledge – not a clear cut body in itself – to literary knowledge as an outcome of compulsory education is not straightforward (Kämper-van den Boogaart 2008).

[3] This point was made by Bernard Schneuwly in a keynote at the Symposion Deutschdidaktik in Bremen in September 2010: "Savoirs/Scire: Gegenstand und Perspektive der Didaktik. Bemerkungen aus der Sicht der französischen Sprach- und Literaturdidaktik. See Aeby-Daghé/Schneuwly 2011 (forthcoming).

[4] Some of the goals laid out for history might well be taken into account for literature as well, especially where literature is considered as a cultural source which is embedded in a historical context and at the same time an expression of history.

positive, appreciative attitude towards as well as knowledge of literature
- to allow for experiences of literature as a (lifelong) means of identity-formation and self-development
- to support learners to master a variety of genres in reception as well as production and in different media
- to support learners to explore language as a means of imaginative and artistic expression both in *reception* and *production*, e.g. via reading and literary praxis, via creative writing, reciting and composing poetry, enacting theatre performances.
[...]

2. Social and private situations of communication where literature plays a role

It is the obligation of education to entitle learners to enriching experiences with literature.[5] As mentioned above (1.2) the concept 'literature' has changed in history and nowadays does not only refer to a well-defined body of texts, e.g. in the sense of a canon, but may well include other media and texts which are not as highly valued. A wider notion of literature which takes into account its popular forms including those in other media the media makes room for the acknowledgement of more social situations of communication where literature plays a role. These are situations and activities in realms both private and public. In Western societies the concept of an intimate reading experience, even secluded from everyday life and seen as a merely private experience, has been strong since the rise of civic society. Accordingly, the CEFR links literature to private and personal[6] situations. Intimate and engaged encounters with literature are certainly important and appreciated by habitual readers. Still, literature was and is also part of public life. Learner-oriented thinking on literature-education might well benefit from a closer look at those forms of literary discourse which can be found outside the private realm or the academy. Among the social situations are also those situations where people choose literature as a means of expression, where they write, recite and perform.

2.1 Situations in society which involve literature communication

An inventory of the situations of social communication where literature is present is set out in the table below. Its basis is a broad notion of literature. Situations of literature communication in classrooms are dealt with in part 4.

Informal social settings: family, peers, friends reading together (e.g. parents and children), reading by oneself

Media reception in social settings:

communicating reading experiences, experiences with films etc; listening to lyrics; exchanging opinions on literature of different kinds, discussing prominent themes

playing with language (riddles, rhyme, jokes; lexical creativity [e. g. invent words]; register and style; dialect and standard, minority and majority language), singing lyrics

The general press and other media, including the web:

reviews of literature, commercials of publishing houses, interviews with writers, reports on festivals and prices, documentation of laudationes; television or radio programmes on literature, on cultures and sub-cultures; theatre productions on television etc., authors' blogs;

interactive formats: customer's review, recommendation, commentary

The specialist press, which includes literature magazines (general and specialist)

Places for the construction of collective memory: celebrations of "great authors/authoresses", exhibitions

[5] This is true for all learners and crucial especially for those who do not experience a regular and lively literary praxis at home and thus lack familiarity with literature

[6] See chapter 4, table 5.

Public encounters with literature: recitals / lectures by authors and other performers, libraries and book shops, book clubs, reading circles

Artistic productions: cinema, theatre, opera…

Places to write and perform, public or semi-public: Theatre workshops, drama groups, poetry slams, creative writing workshops, writing competitions…

[..]

There are of course also:

Private situations of reading literature individually.
To some extent these private situations can be considered social as well: they can for example be embedded in family life. On an abstract level they form part of the process of socialisation which is by definition a process in which the individual and the social merge; e.g. individuals engage in reading as part of their ongoing engagement with themselves, others and their social existence which affects identity formation.

The situations mentioned involve different forms of communication: oral, written and audiovisual reception, oral and written interaction, oral and written production. The list may be supplemented and used as a guide to the identification of language skills forming part of literature syllabi. The social activities involving literary knowledge can be described in terms of discourse types and linguistic capacities.
Besides, in the history of literature education goals and discourse genres have been developed which are situated more specifically in education and classroom contexts. These are dealt with in part 3. These educational goals and practices form a dynamic body in the history of institutional learning. Their link to situations outside the classroom varies and changes in time.

2.2 From situations in society to types of discourse

For situations of literature communication it is possible to develop descriptors from an analysis of the characteristics of the types of discourse employed in those situations.
One example is analysed in more detail. First the cognitive skills underlying the discourse are spelt out, followed by the linguistic and semiotic skills which cover the language-driven activities. The operations are differentiated here for heuristic reasons. Linguistic activities are certainly linked to cognitive skills.
On the level of production and interaction the linguistic and semiotic skills will be observable. They are of particular relevance in educational contexts as it is via articulation (and often via verbal articulation) that knowledge and understanding are assessed.

Producing a review of a book for a website[7]

The literature related cognitive skills include the ability to …

develop a thorough understanding of the book: e.g. decode, extract propositions, make inferences, make use of prior knowledge and relate to information given, realise intra-/intertextual correspondences, establish a coherent situational model of the text[8]
clarify one's personal interest in and the appeal of the book
identify relevant aspects of the story, plot or content, of style and genre and work out the

[7] The CEFR does not cover this genre, but provides scales for reports and essays which are partly applicable (4.4.1.2).
[8] Here, all aspects of the reading-process as reconstructed by research in the field of reading psychology are to be considered (Christmann 2010). Some operations are especially relevant for reading literature, such as the realisation of intra- and intertextual correspondences (Kämper-van den Boogaart/Pieper 2008).

relationship between aesthetic devices and effect
place the book in a broader context: author/ess, literary history, literary works which cover similar issues or/and have the same genre…
consult further sources if necessary (read existing reviews; study articles on contextual issues)
develop an interpretation of the text which draws conclusions as to meanings on the basis of the operations mentioned[9]
evaluate the book with respect to form and content
form an opinion
identify the possible audience of the review
Identify the genre-features of a review
decide on the relevant and attractive issues to be presented in the review

The last three items of this list have a preparatory/planning function for text-production which is focussed upon below:

Linguistic and semiotic skills[10] include the ability to

produce a text along the characteristics of the genre: provision of a catching introduction, presentation of the book (summarising relevant aspects of story, style and genre; sketching an interpretation), evaluation and contextualisation, possibly expression of subjective conceptions of the text
make use of a register and style which suits genre, addressees (audience) and place of publication: more academic for a professional journal, closer to everyday-language (BICS) for a bookseller's customers-platform
present arguments in a conceivable order, highlight important aspects
monitor the writing process, analyse the provisional product with regard to addressees, content, style
edit the provisional product

Note that the differences in addressees and place of publication will affect the genre characteristics applicable: a customer's review does not have to meet the expectation of contextualisation and interpretation which forms part of professional expectations towards reviews. But the articulation of subjective impressions might be expected to a greater extent.
However, the example should show the complexity of literary discourse which often combines reception, production and even interaction.
Linguistic skills to be mastered in this example are linked to mastering the writing process.
An interesting second example which focuses on oral production is: *taking part in an informal discussion on a recent film in the cinema*. This is a common discourse type in literary life, mainly involving oral, visual, possibly written reception and oral interaction.

Once the situations of literary communication in society have been characterised and the types of discourse they (primarily) involve have been identified and exemplified, it becomes

[9] The difference between developing a thorough understanding and an interpretation is not always clear-cut. It could be argued, for example, that intertextuality comes in only when interpretation is asked for as a second step. On the other hand, in the case of satire a situational model which misses out on this point would not be adequate to the text.
[10] By distinguishing between literature related cognitive skills and linguistic and semiotic skills priority is given to a distinction between cognitive operations never mind their linguistic representations and linguistic and semiotic representation. This does not mean, however, that the latter are performed without cognition.

possible to single out and focus on particular aspects of knowledge and linguistic features in the teaching and learning literature in school itself. The relationship between literary discourse and knowledge and competences within the educational frame of reference is, however, not one of mere correspondence. Some aspects will reflect the constitutive function of literary education.

3. Subject-related knowledge and competences

A certain command of literature is an educational goal in itself. Therefore, specifications of literary competences as well as of literary knowledge are called for.

3.1 Components of knowledge in literature

Despite the different approaches to and conceptions of literature and the related knowledge there are constituents which regularly form part of literary studies and literature education. A comparison of curricula concerning literature shows a certain consensus with regard to elements of knowledge (cf. Pieper (ed.) 2007). The following components are often considered as the core of knowledge:

- genres: epic, poetry, drama and further differentiations
- fiction and non-fiction
- literature, text, media
- author, narrator, character
- rhetorics and stylistics: e.g. image, symbol, metaphor; irony; syntactic figures
- literary history: continuity, change, break, epochs

Another element concerns what historically has been covered by the issue of the canon (cf. Fleming (2007) in: Pieper (ed.)):

- knowledge of a range of texts which are exemplary with regard to genre, epoch, style (national and world literature).

In addition, especially towards upper secondary and with regard to its propaedeutic function for university and academic study concepts which are closer to literary theory might be brought in:

- interpretation and polyvalence
- intertextuality, intermediality
- text, culture and interculturality.

With regard to the social situations pointed out in 2.1 knowledge connected to the perspective of cultural sociology and system theory should also be acknowledged:

- the literary field
- roles in the literary system: author, publisher, critic, other mediators.

It forms part of the logic and structure of academic literary discourses that the components mentioned can be conceptualised in different ways – depending on the standpoint taken. For example: from the perspective of cultural sociology the notion of interpretation can be developed in view of different actors (the literary critic, the local theatre…), from the perspective of hermeneutics the same notion can be developed in view of a dialogue between reader and text. Also literary history and epochs are dependent on questions like: Is literature conceived of as autonomous or is it seen in interdependence with its socio-political context?

The components can be considered as general categories and general knowledge comparable to what has been termed as such in the studies on history (Beacco 2009) and science (Vollmer 2009). Their specification involves processes of clarifying perspectives and

choices. In educational contexts this process will be directed by educational aims, conceptions of feasibility, teaching traditions and various social actors. This "transposition didactique" (Chevallard 1991) thus forms a bridge between the complexity and diversity within disciplines on the one hand and goals in the field of knowledge and competences in literature education on the other hand. It needs to be subject to responsible observation and research.

Empirical research on students' performances in literature shows that aspects of literary knowledge might well be reproduced without being made functional for an interpretation or that they are applied schematically and even hinder comprehension and interpretation (Winkler 2007; Köster 2003). Findings of this kind are especially relevant in compulsory schooling where literary knowledge is often linked to dealing with texts and media (cf. Pieper (ed.) 2007) while in upper secondary schooling it is also valued beyond its application in text-reception as part of the canonical knowledge in the field. Due to the obstacles mentioned declarative knowledge as a constituent of literature education in compulsory education needs special attention: How can elements of knowledge be conceptualised and taught in such a way that they are helpful for the achievement of the goals of literary education?

3.2 Textual demands

Given that literature education deals with reading texts of very different character and complexity and given that everyday situations involve a variety of texts it is necessary to assess textual demands. An awareness for these should guide curriculum decisions on text choice. Also, their analysis in view of learning should be part of planning procedures of teachers.[11] The following aspects concentrate on literature in the sense of written texts which are still more prominent in educational settings than other media. The list covers some major aspects.

Aspects of text-complexity in literature

Vocabulary: specific and unfamiliar/outdated or common and current
Syntax: length of sentences and complexity
Text length (in prose), density (in poetry)
Text genre: meeting or varying the familiar/the pattern
Arrangement of plot and storyline: action/suspense easy conceivable or not; several lines or straight forward arrangements; number of characters; chronology and its explicitness
Perspectives: clear and few, unclear and many
Aesthetic structures/tropes: indirectness, imagery (metaphor/symbolic language), irony
Layers of meaning
Demands on prior knowledge and interests

Taking into account the goals of literature education (1.2), the situations in society involving literature communication (2.1) and the subject knowledge (3.1) as well as textual demands (3.2) that might occur the corresponding literary competences need to be clarified.

3.3 Components of literary competence

Taking into account the traditional core of literature as well as the manifold forms of literary praxis, a broad notion of literary competence is called for. Reading competence is certainly relevant; also, the specific elements of literary discourse, its role in socialisation and praxis have to be considered.

[11] A system which assesses text-complexity in view of corresponding levels of expertise with learners is currently developed in the project LIFT-2: Literature Framework for Teachers in Secondary Education (EU-Comenius Program):
http://www.rug.nl/uocg/internationalisering/literatureframework/index (26/07/2011).

With regard to reading, students should be able to understand, use, reflect upon and engage with the text (cf. PISA 2009, 34). The aspects of reading which PISA distinguishes as "mental strategies, approaches or purposes that readers use to negotiate their way into, around and between texts" (ibid.) are all relevant to reading literature:

- "retrieving information
- forming a broad understanding
- developing an interpretation
- reflecting on and evaluating the content of a text
- reflecting on and evaluating the form of a text." (PISA 2009, 34)

It forms part of reading competence to arrange the reading process effectively via strategies. The strategies are linked to the reader's purposes and to phases of the process: prior reading, while reading (perhaps several times), after reading.
Knowledge of strategies will include strategies useful to activate prior knowledge and expectations, e.g. considering the title of the text, briefly surveying the text, asking questions etc.. This phase – "prior reading" – corresponds to "planning" as part of the strategic competence in the CEFR.

During and after reading, those strategies should be available which help to structure and to pinpoint the essential parts of the text (e.g. mark key words, formulate captions for passages) or which help to elaborate upon the text in order to integrate new knowledge (e.g. answer questions formulated in the beginning, compare preliminary results of the reading process to expectations), other strategies to secure knowledge or intensify it (summarise main points). This phase corresponds to "execution" as part of the strategic competence in the CEFR. Here, epistemic writing, writing which helps to develop thoughts and to gain new insights, can come in.

Special attention needs to be paid to generating a mental model and developing it further/revise it – if necessary in the course of reading. This can also be helpful for narratives where a scenery needs to be imagined. The construction of meaning and a cognitive and affective response to the literary text in particular is often highly dependent on imagination.

Specific to literature is the importance of a motivation to engage in literature that goes together with a certain form of expertise and that is founded in gratifying experiences. It often has a habitual dimension (Bourdieu) which makes it a demanding goal for teaching. In general, literary competence can be defined as the ability to master the rules of literary communication. This includes attitudes and motivation, e. g. the readiness to read a text several times and to accept the contract of conceiving a text as fictional (Kämper-van den Boogaart/Pieper 2008).

It is then possible to spell out further elements of receptive and productive competences such as:

- to trace the interplay of form and content
- to trace intratextual structures
- to trace intermedial and intercultural relations
- to process/interpret metaphoric and symbolic language
- to identify layers of meaning
- to write about/talk about a literary text and argue an interpretation
- to take part in literary conversations/discussions.

4. In-school communication situations relating to literature teaching and learning

In order to switch to the actual teaching, from the social forms of communication and from the objectives defined in terms of literary knowledge, these must be linked with the forms of communication that are used in literature teaching.

Linguistic interactions in class have the function of transmitting values and guiding the learners in the formation of their attitudes, transmitting knowledge and directly or indirectly preparing them to handle the situations described in section 2 above.
It is important to characterise these interactions, since the effectiveness of the teaching in question depends on how the learners accept and participate in it.

4.1 Checklist of classroom activities in literature education (for subject teaching/learning in general)

Literature teaching practices are structured according to a finite repertoire of teaching/learning activities. Such forms of teaching methodology vary according to educational traditions and the methodological choices made in the syllabi which order the teaching. It is possible to distinguish between five major groups of activities:

1) activation, acquisition, structuring and storing of literary knowledge and world knowledge
2) presenting and describing text/media, arranging text reception (including free reading times), responding to/elaborating upon text
3) negotiating and discussing meaning(s)
4) evaluation of/reflection on text, new knowledge (change of perceptions) and the ways by which it was gained
5) creative/expressive literary praxis.

The following activities can be regularly found in classrooms:

Presentation by the teacher (including information about authors, genres, contexts, general narration, comments, explanation of terms and concepts, etc.) using visual aids (OP, AuR and WP[12] note-taking) for learners);
Teacher-learner interaction about the presentation (OI);
Learner-learner interaction (group work/pair work)
Learners' text-reception/finding information
Learners' treating of (textbook) tasks
Agents summarise information/results of…/new knowledge
Teacher-learner interaction about reading impressions after reading a book (e.g. at home)
Learners read the textbook (WR);
Presentations by learners (OP) based on notes, PowerPoint, etc.;
Literary dialogue where interpretations are shared and discussed (OI), chaired by learners or the teacher;
Debates (adversarial/multiperspective, OI) organised by learners (on the basis of texts or notes: WP);
Finding information (WR and WP; note-taking);

[12] Coding of communication activities based on the CEFR: **R** = reception; **P** = production; **I** = interaction; **O** = oral; **W** = written; AuR = aural reception.

Analysis and summary of text files (WR and WP);
Reviews of books, television programmes (WP or OP);
Reaction to a film watched as a class (OI);
Reading texts by critics (WR);
Activities run as projects (linking different competences, for example, developing a guided tour to an author's house); individual and/or group research;
Production of personal or imaginative texts (WP);
Production of analytical/interpretative essays (WP), production of reviews (WP);
[...]

What usually might be produced in writing is likely to be produced in various medial formats nowadays, e. g. in the form of (hyper-)text to be presented on the web.

4.2 From classroom situations to discursive forms

These literature teaching activities can be described in terms of linguistic capacities and types of discourse. For situations of literature communication, it is in fact possible to develop descriptors from the characteristics of the discursive style used in that situation.

An example is the objective: *taking part in a literary dialogue/discussion on a novel in class*, in which the type of discourse relates to oral production. This involves:

Literature related cognitive skills such as the ability to:

Read the text in question prior to the event;
Identify relevant aspects of the literary text;
Clarify personal reactions and form an opinion on characters, plot, narrative style etc.;
Give and support one's own point of view, explaining it by referring to the text and one's interpretation;
Listen to contributions of others and react, possibly change/adapt his/her own opinion/interpretation
[...]

Linguistic and semiotic skills such as the ability to:

Express and describe reading experiences including what he/she likes/dislikes
Express an opinion and give reasons, explain it by referring to the text in question/possibly its context and by highlighting important points
Develop an argument by taking into account the standpoints of others
Ask questions to peers in case contributions are not clear to him/her
Formulate a standpoint by relating to the text and to contributions presented in the discussion
Offer alternative phrasings if he/she feels not understood/misunderstood
Explicitly deal with the pros and cons of opinions/arguments presented in class and draw conclusions
[...]

The example can be linked to descriptors of the CEFR which were originally developed for foreign languages and which would have to be modified: B1, B2 and C1 in "addressing audiences" could form a starting point (CEFR, p. 60). An adaptation should take into account that contributions in the format of a literary dialogue or discussion can and should also be shaped by imaginative, even personal response. Depending on the age and cognitive development of the learners, demands as to abstraction and structure need to be reconsidered. Also, engaging in the exchange with others is central to the format at stake: the argument needs to be developed on the spot.

Plurilingual education presupposes linkage of the classroom modes of communication to the social ones involving literature, so as to make transfers of proficiencies between them. At least some of the classroom modes of communication should enable learners to handle social situations of communication with literary content:

- *either directly through the classroom use of these social forms*
- *or indirectly, with the same proficiencies as those inherent in the social forms being developed through the classroom forms.*

5. Specific linguistic and semiotic competences needed for literature education

So far we have identified and partly described (by way of example/illustration)

- situations in society of literary communication (2.1.)
- and the corresponding types of discourse (2.2.)
- and the components of literary knowledge (3.1.)
- the ingredients of literary competence (3.2.)
- in-school situations of communication with literary discourse as goal/content (4.1. checklist)
- and the corresponding types of discourse in literature lessons in school (example(s) in 4.2.).

Based on these different steps (and their underlying principles) it is now possible to single out and generalise specific linguistic competences suited for literature teaching and learning, aimed at imparting knowledge and expertise as well as instilling social communication skills.

To describe these linguistic competences, we shall adopt a communication capability model arranged in four sets of components, the first three of which form what is strictly speaking linguistic communication competence (see Beacco 2009):
- strategic component/competence (see 5.1.)
- discursive component/competence, mastering types of discourse (5.2.)
- formal component/competence (5.3)
- intercultural competences, not peculiar to literature teaching, will be dealt with in another module.

5.1 Strategic competence

General communicative ability includes a psycho-cognitive component termed *strategic* that controls observable linguistic behaviour in order to generate, produce and understand texts: 'Strategies are a means the language user exploits to mobilise and balance his or her resources, to activate skills and procedures, in order to fulfil the demands of communication in context and successfully complete the task in question in the most comprehensive or most economical way feasible depending on his or her precise purpose.' (CEFR p. 57) The strategic competence is – apart from where the field of reading is concerned - in fact not subject specific and is presented in more detail in the study on teaching and learning history (see Beacco 2009, 13-15).

5.2 Discursive competence

Discursive competence with regard to literature education has three major dimensions: one refers to the textual genres which are treated in class, texts that are read, genres that form part of receptive activities. The second dimension, often less present and certainly less explicit in curricula, refers to the literary genres students produce themselves, e.g. when engaged in creative writing. The third dimension refers to specific genres of communication about literature outside and inside school. The concept *type of discourse* (or *discursive form*) is useful for all, as it has been used to denote the forms taken by communication as practiced in a given social situation and communication community. The types of discourse are specific discursive forms identified as such by a standard name and certain characteristics (physical location, type of participants, medium, etc.) of the situations where they occur: lecture, news item, observation, dispute, myth or prayer, etc. (see Beacco 2009 for a more extensive account on the concept).

One aim of plurilingual and intercultural education, hence of languages of teaching/learning, is to broaden learners' discourse repertoires (in some/all of the languages of their language repertoires) in relation to their initial experience/proficiency in types of discourse and to give them the opportunity for new experiences (through texts and documents including non-verbal forms of representation) of the diversity of disciplines, academic cultures and of otherness.

A specific aim of literature and language education is to provide occasions for reflecting on discourse types, their usage and dynamics.

Literature syllabi may also be specified according to discourse type:

- types seen as already entering into the learners' repertoires (novels/stories/poetry for children and young readers, various kinds of films (drama/comedy…), theatre etc.)
- types present in the learners' social environment (various books available at home, periodicals: general-interest press, …; websites, customers' reviews, professional reviews, interviews with authors/authoresses; literary praxis: lectures in the library, poetry slams)
- types to which a certain form of exposure is sought by literature teaching: historic genres, canonical literature, literary criticism, encyclopaedic entries in the specialised discourse of the academy etc..
- types which learners should master as form of their literary praxis within and outside the classroom: literary dialogue/discussion, essay, summary…

The choice of the discourse types which it is considered learners should experience depends on the general choices already described (values, social situations of communication, literary knowledge, etc.) and may be fine-tuned in the light of descriptors relating to:

- the nature of the instructional activities which are to draw upon these texts (WR, OI...)
- the expected degree of proficiency for each (see sections 3 and 4)
- the proximity or familiarity of the types compared to those already experienced by the learners
- the interest (or motivation) which these discourse types may arouse
- the linguistic complexity of the texts chosen (3.2).

A specific demand when developing discursive competence in literature education is to make students aware of shifts between BICS and CALP: in a first encounter with a literary text it might be accepted to use an informal register and an intimate personal response might well be appropriate. However, when learners are expected to write a summary or an essay they usually need to choose a language that allows for abstractness and distance. Also, dealing

with literature might well ask for choosing a language different from the language of the literary text treated (see 5.3.2).

5.3 Formal competence

5.3.1. Pragmatic and cognitive categories

The conventions of form recurring in types of discourse (i.e. the linguistic and structural deliveries of the texts) may thus be described by means of categories unconnected with the syntax of the sentence.

These may be categories like speech acts/language functions or, on a higher, more abstract level, *discourse functions*. These analytical categories applied to texts (and also or alternatively to the *cognitive processes*) are to be understood as the discursive representation of both the cognitive processes and their linguistic realisation (in the sense of enactment) brought into play for the development/exposition of knowledge.

These discourse functions mark cognitive operations *and* their verbal performance at the same time; they are at the interface between cognition and verbalisation, they include operators such as:

Analyse	*illustrate/exemplify*
argue	*infer*
assess	*interpret*
classify	*judge/evaluate/assess*
compare	*correlate/contrast/match*
describe/represent	*name*
deduce	*outline/sketch*
define	*prove*
distinguish	*recount/narrate*
enumerate	*report (on) a discourse*
explain	*summarise*
	specify [...][13]

To describe educational and pre-academic discourse in literature, pride of place may be given to cognitive/discursive operations/processes such as:

- *describe*
- *recount/narrate*
- *explain*
- *analyse*
- *interpret*, in particular by *matching* (textual clues and interpretations) *comparing* (texts with related or contrasting texts/genres)
- *argue*
- *evaluate*

[13] See the extended list in Vollmer et al. 2008 which was arrived from the analysis of modern science curricula (and other subjects) for grade level 9/10 in Germany. See also the set of Macro-functions derived from this analysis (Vollmer 2009).

- *summarise*
- [...]

For each of these operations it is possible to identify the linguistic resources needed for their enactment, with likely variation between discourse types. It may be assumed that "words" referring to cognitive operations have equivalents in all languages and that an attempt could be made to compile transposable inventories (for different languages and different subjects).

To compile such inventories of forms required to express the discursive operations occurring in given types of discourse, one ought to use the CEFR *Reference Level Descriptions* for specific languages[14]

5.3.2. Linguistic categories

Discourse types can be described by using speech acts and/or cognitive operations since a specific discursive form is a verbal object albeit distinct from utterance, text, speech act, type of text, etc. Their verbal conventions may be apprehended

- as relatively stable types of utterances, in the case of highly restrictive types, set phrases, etc..
- as the relatively stable or predictable general scheme or elements of their structure, which may be broken down into stabilised successions of speech acts or cognitive operations (for example, the series: represent, interpret, match...)
- as the preferential forms, in a given type, with which to deliver them. This conformity determines the appropriateness of the utterances (and not their accuracy or grammatical correctness), that is their compliance with common "rules" on the acceptable makeup of discourse types.

These conventions may be described on the basis of various general linguistic categories (= independent of individual languages), such as:

- forms of actualisation of the speaker (for example, in English: *I/me, we, one,* impersonal, passive, reflexive, etc.);
- forms of actualisation of the person addressed;
- presence/distribution and expected forms (in a given type) of assertive, appreciative, ethical and other formulations;
- presence/absence/distribution and forms of meta-discursive indications (statement of text plan, etc.);
- standard form of certain paragraphs;
- discursive tone (serious, humorous, personal touches, etc.).
- […]

All descriptive categories used when analysing a discourse may serve as the starting-point for descriptors of formal mastery, especially with respect to reception or production. It nonetheless has to be taken into account that:

- texts of the same discourse type comply **to varying degrees** with the (often unstated) model underlying it;
- discourse types themselves may be conventional to varying degrees either as a whole or in some of their constituent parts (for example, the beginnings of scientific articles may be quite conventional/predictable while those of newspaper articles are fairly unpredictable).

[14] Available, or being produced, for English, German, Spanish, French, Greek, Portuguese...

This specification of forms should be underpinned by the expected language skills in other subjects taught and in language as a subject (Beacco 2009, see the example “to state a plan”).

5.3.3. Executing discursive competence: write a review

To perform the task of writing a review learners execute the operations describe, recount, evaluate. The task can be classified as complex in that it combines demands in reading and writing and often less demanding linguistic activities (narrate/describe) with more complex ones (evaluate/argue):

to describe

- with regard to genre: relate to/distinguish from common genres, use more or less academic terminology
- with regard to context: author, year, translator, similar works, publisher
- addressees: young or adult readers, female or male, people with specific interests
- design
- protagonists
- prominent themes/motifs
- language

to recount

- choose aspects of the story: who? what? where? (taking into account the addressees)
- recount (parts of) the story, possibly leaving out the end
- use present tense

to evaluate

- articulate an opinion (different levels of differentiation; depending on purpose)
- argue with reference to the book, to discourse outside the book (other texts, criteria like genre, epoch, literary market)
- articulate subjective experience and explain/make it plausible
- possibly articulate a recommendation

It is obvious that writers/learners need a linguistic repertoire which can form the basis of their choice. Their choice will depend – among other things – on the appropriate register for the context. Also, they need expertise in mastering the writing process including its phases planning, executing and revising.

6. Thresholds

Users are invited to determine from the categories set out above which thresholds of knowledge/language skills as regards literature-related discourse types the students should possess, according to:

- expected proficiencies (OI, OP...)
- types of discourse to be mastered (for reception or production)
- cognitive operations or speech acts which they must be able to recognise or deliver
- forms for delivering the above, which they must know how to handle correctly and suitably.

Empirical analyses of correct applications of these forms in productions (examination papers, for example) by learners who have taken courses of this kind or in other types of discourse to which they are exposed (textbook) should make it possible to estimate whether the results are actually achieved, hence to judge realistically whether they are within the learners’ grasp.

Selected bibliography

Aeby-Daghé, Sandrine; Schneuwly, Bernard (2011): “De l’horrible danger de la lecture” (Voltaire). Empirische Untersuchung der didaktischen Transposition eines Textes von Voltaire. In: Pieper, Irene; Wieser, Dorothee (ed.s): Fachliches Wissen und literarisches Verstehen. Frankfurt: Lang (forthcoming).

Beacco, J.-C. (2009): *Items for a description of linguistic competence in the language of schooling necessary for learning/teaching history (end of obligatory education).* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Beacco, J.-C.; Coste, Daniel; van de Ven, Piet-Hein; Vollmer, Helmut (2010): *Language and school subjects. Linguistic dimensions of knowledge building in school curricula.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Chevallard, Yves (1991) : *La transposition didactique : du savoir savant au savoir enseigné*, La Pensée Sauvage, Grenoble : La Pensée Sauvage.

Christmann, Ursula (2010): Lesepsychologie. In: Kämper-van den Boogaart, Michael; Spinner, Kaspar H. (ed.s): Lese- und Literaturunterricht. Teil 1: Geschichte und Entwicklung. Konzeptionelle und empirische Grundlagen (Deutschunterricht in Theorie und Praxis / W. Ulrich [ed.]). Baltmannsweiler: Schneider. 148-200.

Council of Europe, Strasbourg (2001): Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment (CEFR). (Cambridge University Press).

Eagleton, Terry (2008): Literary theory. An introduction. Minnesota: Minnesota University Press.

Fleming, Mike (2007): The literary canon. Implications for the teaching of language as subject. In: Pieper, Irene (ed.); Laila Aase; Mike Fleming; Tina Samihaian: Text, literature and ‘Bildung’. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Fleming, Mike (2007): The use and mis-use of competence frameworks and statements with particular attention to describing achievement in literature. In: Towards a Common Framework of Reference for Languages of School Education? / Waldemar Martyniuk (Red.). Krakau: Universitas. 47-59.

Kämper-van den Boogaart, Michael (2008): Fachdidaktik und Wissenschaft. In: Deutsch Didaktik. Leitfaden für die Sekundarstufe I und II / M. Kämper-van den Boogaart (ed.). Berlin: Cornelsen Scriptor. 86-104.

Kämper-van den Boogaart, Michael; Pieper, Irene (2008): Literarisches Lesen. In: Didaktik Deutsch. Sonderheft: Beiträge zum 16. Symposion Deutschdidaktik „Kompetenzen im Deutschunterricht“ / M. Böhnisch (ed.). 46-65.

Köster, Juliane (2003): Die Profilierung einer Differenz. Aufgaben zum Textverstehen in Lern- und Leistungssituationen. In: Deutschunterricht 56/5. 19-25.

Pieper, Irene (ed.), Laila Aase, Mike Fleming, Tina Samihaian (2007): Text, literature and “Bildung”. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Pieper, Irene (2007): Reading literature: a major domain in German primary and secondary education under challenge. In: Towards a Common Framework of Reference for Languages of School Education? / Waldemar Martyniuk (Red.). Krakau: Universitas. Section 9; 362-376

OECD (2007). PISA 2006: Science Competencies for Tomorrow’s World. Results of the Third PISA study. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. http://www.oecd.org/document/2/0,3746,en_32252351_32236191_39718850_1_1_1_1,00.html

OECD (2009): PISA 2009 Assessment Framework. Key Competences in Reading, Mathematics and Science.

OECD (2010): PISA 2009 Results: Executive Summary. http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/34/60/46619703.pdf (26/07/2011).

Vollmer, Helmut Johannes (2009): *Items for a description of linguistic competence in the language of schooling necessary for learning/teaching science (end of obligatory education).* Strasbourg: Council of Europe

Vollmer, H. J. (2007a). Language and Communication in the Sciences: A Case Study on Germany. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. (http://www.coe.int/T/DG4/Linguistic/Prague_studies07_EN.asp#TopOfPage)

Vollmer, H. J. (ed.) (2007b). *Language and Communication in the Teaching and Learning of Science in Secondary Schools*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Vollmer, H. J. (2009). *Language(s) in Other Subjects*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe (b http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/LangEduc/BoxD2-OtherSub_en.asp#LangOthSubE).

Winkler, Iris (2007): Welches Wissen fördert das Verstehen literarischer Texte? Zur Frage der Modellierung literarischen Wissens für den Deutschunterricht. In: Didaktik Deutsch 22, 71-88.