

PEDAGOGIC LITERARY NARRATION IN THEORY AND ACTION

JOHN GORDON*

**University of East Anglia*

Abstract

Shared reading is an international convention of literary study where students have powerful formative encounters with narratives, shaping attitudes to the novel form and to reading. While narratology theorises narration in texts and speech, we lack an empirical account of teachers' narrative work around study texts purposed to literary study goals. This article introduces the term *Pedagogic Literary Narration* (PLN) to conceptualise teachers' exposition around narrative prose and its relationship with students' talk. Methodology adapts Conversation Analysis to account for the introduction of quoted text to literary study interaction, embedding Bruner's explorations of narrative meaning and Bakhtin's concept of heteroglossia. Elaborating transcript data, discussion outlines the constituent practices of a distinctive pedagogy built around interplay of text and teacher narrations. PLN extends Rosenblatt's seminal conceptualisation of reading transactions according to aesthetic and efferent stances. Findings identify teachers' complex, highly efficient and specialised exposition where unique new narrations derive from dual purposes to a) present text narratives and b) orient to them for literary analysis. PLN gives literary study a theoretical framework to assert its specialist pedagogy and enrich students' encounters with narrative prose.

Keywords: reading literature, novels, narrative, conversation, Pedagogic Literary Narration

INTRODUCTION

Miss Morgan read well. Even the tougher boys were won over until they never played hookey for fear of missing an instalment, until they leaned forward gasping with interest. (Steinbeck, 1953, p. 48)

This article examines teachers' presentation of prose narratives in school literary study and begins to address the scarcity of education research attending to its pedagogy (Fraisie, 2012; van Schooten, 2005). It concerns sharing novels with students and how unique narratives are realised through reading aloud, abridgement and spoken framing cues. This interactive storying differs from silent and solitary reading of narrative: "reading of the page is reinforced by the teacher: the emphasis and tone of the teacher's voice bring out structures and implications which might otherwise require excavation" (Bolt & Gard, 1970, p. 36).

Though novels are part of literary study globally, national requirements tend to prescribe which texts to read rather than how to teach them (Fraisie, 2012). Even so, students' encounters with 'set' texts in school often take a conventionalised format where reading is completed together in lesson time through core activities of reading aloud, questioning and discussion. Though the variety and detail of shared reading practices are neglected in international surveys, the convention is acknowledged as an approach to literary study relative to the diverse curricula of Russia, China, France and Senegal (Fraisie, 2012), Canada (Dezutter et al., 2012), Norway (Popova, 2006) and Sweden (Norling, 2003). Shared reading may also emerge where there is no national curriculum, for example in the Netherlands (Janssen & Braaksmā, 2018), or where the impulse to adopt it overcomes limited access to books, as in Haiti, where photocopies become the common focal resource of a class (Alexis, 2012). The format is sometimes considered one of aesthetic reading (Rosenblatt, 1978), though its exact nature can be difficult to describe given its layering of purposes (in France deemed 'un feuilleté de finalités', Houdart-Merot, 2012, p. 69) and complex history of theoretical influences (van Schooten, 2005). In contemporary debate, the neo-conservative 'knowledge turn' prevailing in England, South Africa and New Zealand (Wrigley, 2018) highlights the ideological significance of how we characterise, frame and pedagogise reading. Curricula promoting cultural literacy (Hirsch, Trefil, & Kett, 1988) and Social Realist 'powerful knowledge' (Young, 2010) determinedly divide subject content and subject pedagogy, a schism that is deeply problematic when applied to literary study of novels.

'Powerful knowledge' means abstracted and decontextualized knowledge, yet the novel form is essentially an expression of situated knowledge. Successful realisation of original, unique worlds and ways of knowing constitutes the very literariness of literary fiction. Novels offer aesthetically-rendered epistemology and invite readers to orient to ontologies inherent in narrative voice. Centrality of voice in novels suggests their narratives are a form of 'voice discourse', dismissed by Social Realists for de-legitimising 'rational, epistemologically grounded knowledge forms and truth claims' (Moore and Muller, 1999, p. 189). The pedagogy of sharing novels shapes for

readers a distinctive ontology, situating students' dialogic relationships with narratives in communal space. Texts are voiced and heard, as well as decoded from the page. Interactive mediation realises the compelling momentum of episodic narratives, fostering students' emotional development through empathetic response to represented experiences and psychologies of characters and narrators (Harding, 1962; Meek & Watson, 2003; Spencer, 1982, p. 21; Spencer, Warlow, & Barton, 1977, p. 112). Such mediation realises reading Rosenblatt considered both 'aesthetic' and 'transactional', where readers 'to some extent create' texts even as they are guided by them (p. 119). Rosenblatt challenged the assumption that the 'author's reconstructed intention' (Rosenblatt, 1978, p. 113) is the only meaning of a text read aesthetically. She attributed such a view to Hirsch (1967), whose ideas now influence approaches to reading in England and Wales where the significance of pedagogy is diminished relative to content-oriented 'knowledge-rich' curricula (Gibb, 2015).

Shared reading of novels shapes a way of knowing through narration across two interdependent levels, narration-in-text and interactive narrative-in-performance. Teachers mediate readymade print narratives using their own vocal and paralinguistic resources, or distribute reading between students. These methods do more than enliven the story, they encourage students' involvement in story-for-its own sake (McConn, 2016) and concurrently aim at mitigating inauthentic close reading practices (Giovannelli and Mason, 2015) urged by examination criteria. Teachers guide students' attentiveness to specific aspects of narrative, to details or extracts they will later consider according to a prescribed task or in relation to development of a particular reading skill.

I call this storying practice by teachers *Pedagogic Literary Narration* (PLN). It is a pedagogy consistent with a materialist view of teaching and learning (Eagleton, 2016), regarding 'cognition as inseparable from bodily and social existence' and challenging 'attempts to relegate aesthetic or ethical dimensions of our engagement with the world to an inferior position' (Wrigley, 2016). It rejects the reductive understanding of pedagogy implicit in Social Realist thinking, and also rejects its separation of pedagogy and knowledge in determining policy or practice in literary study and teaching. Instead, *Pedagogic Literary Narration* recognises that literary education through the novel must be influenced by the distinctive epistemology of the novel form, taking account of how teachers invite their students to the singular world realised by any literary study text, exploiting the collective and dialogic format of shared reading.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This account of PLN arises from classroom data generating a new theory of narrative and associated analytic methods. It explains what even expert teachers modestly describe as 'just reading in class today', where narratology (Genette, 1980; Labov & Waletzky, 1967; Propp, Propp, & Wagner, 1968; Ricoeur, 1984; Todorov, 1977) is

embedded in literary study as a *pedagogic device* (Bernstein, 1996, p. 39), its terminology conventionalised in classroom discourse to describe features of texts. PLN additionally highlights *how* teachers introduce texts to classroom conversations and guide interaction around them, to shape students' experience of narratives and how they understand them.

Rosenblatt's influential work (1978) treats reading as a transaction between reader and text, where literary reading is an event inclining to what she terms an aesthetic stance. The value of literary texts 'resides in the reader's living through the transaction with the text' (p. 132), while the reader's primary goal is 'as full an aesthetic experience as possible' according to the 'capacities' they bring to the transaction. Individual readers achieve this as they 'evoke' the text, acting on its cues to construct 'the speaker, the author—the voice, the tone, the rhythms and reflections, the persona' (p. 19). Rosenblatt's term 'embryonic critic' (p. 138) is helpful for considering what happens additionally during literary study in schools, where students are nascent critics. They develop a self-aware aesthetic stance to literature through guided interaction during shared reading.

Though Rosenblatt feels 'the capacity to participate in verbally complex texts is not widely fostered' (p. 143) in formal education, she focusses her exploration of the reading transaction on the experience of individual readers. In shared reading, however, the evocation of text is collective. The teacher's challenge is to maintain a 'fresh personal evocation' for individuals while also inducting students as embryonic critics. Pedagogic evocation of texts mirrors the aesthetic reading transaction of individual readers, with a focus on 'living through' the text (p. 25). Ironically, the intensity of such reading—for Rosenblatt also 'burned through' (p. 27)—may be tempered in teaching as the text is evoked in public according to additional learning goals, which often include fostering an aesthetic stance. Rosenblatt attributes to individual reading 'an organising process' that tentatively structures elements and modifies understanding as new items come to attention. In school, the teacher's guided evocation of the text achieves some of this process and, by pedagogic design or tacitly through the nature of presentation, directs students' 'selective attention' (p. 167) whether to notice something of tone, voice or other feature. Literary teaching thus evokes the text and concurrently realises an aesthetic stance, which at times becomes heightened and self-aware in order to make the aesthetic stance evident for students. This manifests the paradigm for literary criticism Rosenblatt understands as a movement between 'intensely realised aesthetic transaction' and 'reflection on semantic or technical or other details', seeking their correlation. In literary classrooms, this effort to realise the aesthetic stance may be complicated further by non-aesthetic or 'efferent' aims (p. 24) where reading must often carry something away for the purposes of assessment: the aesthetic stance is layered with efferent purposes too.

This theoretical frame embeds the concepts of evocation and aesthetic reading transaction in its treatment of classroom interaction, adapting a version of Conver-

sation Analysis (hereafter CA; Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1978) first developed for interactive second-language learning (Seedhouse, 2004). It innovates by attending to the distinctive reading transaction of studying novels in school, and to the text's impact on conversation. Responding to Rosenblatt's view of reading and to Bruner's treatment of narrative as a mode of thought (1992), this approach treats the novel as a participant in conversation entering discussion through quotation or paraphrase. Bakhtin's theories of dialogism and heteroglossia (1986) are also relevant. While education research interested in dialogic classroom interaction and narrative dimensions of teaching and learning have applied these theories, it is surprising they have not been applied to literary study when Bakhtin attended to literary dialogism so closely. The resulting methodology is a variant of Narrative Analysis tailored to literary pedagogy. My approach extends the repertoire of narrative analysis and narrative inquiry methods used in English education, complementing recent studies of the pedagogic potential of oral narrative genres (Juzwik, 2008), subjective small stories (Juzwik & Ives, 2010), students' written narratives (Daiute & Lightfoot, 2004) and ideologically-resistant counter narratives (Kinloch, Burchad, & Penn, 2017). PLN concerns re-presentation of narratives already fixed in novels as objects of study, rather than the dynamic between narration and student identities addressed in other studies. It encompasses pedagogic actions of teachers to represent text and orient readers to it, whether in single turns of exposition or as they guide students' interaction with the novel and one another.

Adapting the resources of Conversation Analysis to literary study contexts

Conversation Analysis originated as an ethnomethodological perspective on conversation. Adaptation by Seedhouse (2004) for second-language (L2) classrooms examines pedagogy-through-interaction, deviating from CA's originally unmotivated approach and its scepticism for contextualising conversational data when details of participant and setting would not be collected. Seedhouse's tailored approach extends studies of institutional interaction (e.g. Drew & Heritage, 1992) where organised interaction is considered relative to institutional aims, and therefore differently from spontaneous everyday interaction: lesson-time interaction concerns the 'reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction' (p.163). Seedhouse asserts "pedagogy can never be translated directly into classroom interaction, because there is an intervening level of organisation", challenging tacit assumptions of an "unproblematic" (p. 178) relationship between the two. In this theoretical frame the intervening level constitutes the in-the-moment experience of the literary text where movement between the aesthetic and efferent stances outlined by Rosenblatt is guided by the teacher and realised through interaction.

Seedhouse sees "complex personality" (Gribbin, 1991, p. 118) in every classroom action. Any instance demonstrates the *complementarity* of institutional discourse by simultaneously displaying "both uniqueness and institutional commonality" (p. 209). The first element of his three-way view of contexts for interaction (p. 208) works at

the unique micro level where analyses focus on heterogeneity. Here conversations build from a pedagogical focus introduced by the teacher and are “inherently locally produced and transformable at any moment” (Drew & Heritage, 1992, p. 19). The second view works at the level of *classroom context*, recognisable in teaching as discipline-specific genres of classroom activity. These are categorisable combinations of pedagogical focus and organisation of interaction, such as guided reading (Read Write Think, 2017). The third view operates at macro level, that of *institutional context*. Here instances are representative of subject discourse (L2 learning for Seedhouse, literary study here), and analysis concentrates on homogeneity. Applying the model to literary study I reverse the model, beginning at the homogenous macro level.

A three-way view of context for literary study

View 1: institutional contexts for literary study interaction

Institutional context in L2 learning means an instance of discourse belonging to the L2 discipline (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 212). To join this category interaction must display three properties:

- i) language is both the vehicle and object of instruction;
- ii) pedagogy and interaction have a reflexive relationship; and
- iii) linguistic forms and patterns of interaction produced by learners are subject to evaluation by the teacher.

It is challenging to identify three properties common to the varied and contested activities comprising the many iterations of English as school discipline, but less so to characterise classroom literary study, for which I propose these properties:

- i) literary texts (one or more) are the object of instruction, oriented to as crafted aesthetic artefacts;
- ii) there is a reflexive relationship between pedagogy, interaction and text(s);
- iii) linguistic forms and patterns of interaction produced by learners around texts are subject to evaluation by the teacher, yielding insight to affective and/or cognitive aspects of learners’ reading processes.

The introduction of the study text to these L1 descriptions marks the distinctiveness of this *institutional context* from L2 properties proposed by Seedhouse.

View 2: Pedagogic Literary Narration as classroom context

The second element of the three-way view, *classroom context*, recognises sub-varieties of discourse within each institutional context. In L2 teaching, for example,

teacher modelling of grammar in use differs from translation and needs different interaction. Literary study comprises distinct discourses around activities such as reading aloud, applying critical terminology, warranting arguments or describing the contexts of texts' production. More obviously, presentation of and interactions around poetry (Gordon, 2010, 2012, 2018) differ from those organised for plays or novels. The text's length and time available to present it, the text's genre or the assessment framework may also shape interactions.

PLN represents one specific *classroom context* within the broader *institutional discourse* of literary study. Shared reading mediates texts in interaction differently from other contexts for reading in class such as silent individual reading, or reading directed by comprehension questions requiring written response. Furthermore, each teacher approaches each text, reads aloud and organises their students' reading differently, consistent with Rosenblatt's proposition that reading transactions are particular to the moment, the environment and the lives of the participating readers (1978, p. 20). While many students across classes, schools, regions and nations can experience reading, say, *Of Mice and Men*, they will have differing experiences of its narrative depending on how their teacher presents it and guides their 'selective attention' (p. 43). This may be especially true when students' meet the text for the first time, evoked for and with them through shared reading: this constitutes their foundational reading transaction for *Of Mice and Men*.

For students, PLN is a multidimensional narrative experience also organised in print (for example by typesetting and chapters) and time (by the teaching sequence). Some meaning potential is already favoured if not fixed, permeating the shared experience where the teacher may plan to encourage a more efferent stance around chapters where it is important to register information, 'so that it may later be assumed in the actual events of the novel' (p. 38), or elsewhere seek more immersive aesthetic reading in episodes of high drama or emotion. In PLN teachers' spoken presentations evoke the diegetic world of the stories in public and realise a unique narrative construction according to the balance of modes employed. Teachers' narrative-in-presentation manipulates print narratives as "instrument[s] of mind in the construction of reality" (Bruner, 1992, p. 6). Bruner distinguishes between this orientation to narrative and one with declared interest in how narrative is constructed, often an explicit focus of literary study and derived from classical narratology. Emphasis on narrative construction implies the existence of "a text or a text analogue through which somebody has been trying to express a meaning and from which somebody is trying to extract a meaning". He asserts instead that there is "no unique solution to the task of determining the meaning" of narratives, and could be summarising the challenge faced by teachers when he says "the best hope of hermeneutic analysis is to provide an intuitively convincing account of the meaning of the text as a whole in the light of the constituent parts that make it up". PLN's narrative presentation shapes students' learning around novels dually around two forms of knowledge. In PLN the hermeneutic property of narrative is marked in both "its con-

struction and in its comprehension" (Bruner, 1992, p. 6). With one strand of attention on the experience of story, shared novel reading in school activates our capacity to "process knowledge" in the "interpretive way" neglected by rationalist and empiricist traditions (Polkinghorne, 1995, p. 8). It entails "right reasoning" through close analysis and explanation (a rationalist orientation), isolating features of the text as 'atomic propositions' (an empiricist orientation), whether as isolated quotations, characters, episodes or themes. The duality reflects the possibility that understanding fiction "is in fact inseparable from the criticism (perhaps 'evaluation' is a better word) of what is understood" (Bolt & Gard, 1970, p. 24). Rosenblatt also noted this combination as the 'confusion of stance' in literary study (1978, p. 162). In Bruner's view neither tradition alone adequately explicates "how a narrative is either put together by a speaker or interpreted by a hearer". This article's view of contexts for interaction recognises their interplay at the *micro context* level of exposition, at the very moments when teachers introduce study texts to their students in speech as public reading transactions.

View 3: the micro context of Pedagogic Literary Narration in action

Whatever the institutional classroom context, micro level interaction is unique. Instances of PLN are utterly singular as reading transactions in Rosenblatt's sense. Describing the institutional context for literary study I proposed the salience of text-in-interaction (View 1), marking difference from the L2 model (Seedhouse, 2004): how texts' narratives enter classrooms in speech determine micro level interactions. They enter either as:

- instances of sustained reading aloud or direct quotation where the narrative of the study book is vocalised word for word,
- or
- as paraphrased narrations incorporating the speaker's own vocabulary, syntax, embellishment or abridgement.

The ways in which the text's narrative enters conversations are thus akin to direct or reported speech, as if the voice of the book participates in conversations with varying degrees of immediacy. This L1 micro level context adapts CA treating the study text as a participant in interaction, informed by Bakhtin's concepts of dialogism and heteroglossia (1986).

The literary form is essentially "heteroglot", a confluence of voices where "literary language is a complex, dynamic system of linguistic styles" (p. 65). The form of the novel is a complex (or secondary) speech genre, comprising and inter-animating the many simple (or primary) speech genres of everyday talk, what he called "unmediated speech communion" (p. 62). His discussion of 19th century novels elaborates this complexity around shifts in narrative perspective, overt in transfer of narration between characters, or tacit in barely perceptible variations of register and vocabulary in omniscient narratorial voices. In the literary study classroom the presentation

of narrative gains an additional layer, as the teacher or any speaker brings to narration the grain of their own voice (Barthes, 1977). Resources of intonation, volume and rhythm bring new affordances in sound and time. Even where the text enters the lesson quoted directly, as direct speech, it is something changed, a different narration.

The text presented in the lesson may be further transformed where speakers embed its words in other utterances, or in the structure of interaction. Bakhtin considered language to be “realized in the form of individual concrete utterances” marked as units “by a change of speaking subjects, that is, a change of speakers” (p. 71). Any vocal utterance introducing the study text as direct speech is dialogic, creating an interaction between the text’s words and the speaker’s own (if the quoted text is embedded in their own conversational turn), or between the text’s words and the speaker’s use of the additional presentational and mediating resources of speech. This is a new “dual expression” (p. 93) comprising both the text’s original expression and the new “utterance that encloses the speech”. This newly-composed utterance embodies “the change of speech subjects and their dialogic interactions”, a switch between speaker voice and text voice like the interplay of “rejoinders in dialogue” (p. 92). It is as though the speaker of the text’s words also converses with the text. As a *classroom context* (View 2) the practice of speaking texts aloud represents what Bakhtin called “an exceptionally important node of problems” (p. 63). It is a problem only available for examination in *micro contexts* (View 3), in unique instances such as the example of PLN derived from study of *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (Stevenson, 1886) presented here.

METHODS

Data collection: sources, settings and participants

Data derives from the research project *Literature’s Lasting Impression* comprising fieldwork in four UK schools (two primary/junior and two secondary/senior), public reading groups and university seminars. In all schools involved, teachers shared and discussed novels with their classes over a series of lessons. As the researcher I saw three to six hours of teaching in each school over four consecutive weeks, observing classes at least weekly across November and December 2016. Timetables afforded limited observation of consecutive lessons, though observation of complete sequences in any school was not possible while working with all schools concurrently. Transcripts from one secondary school are presented here, in which one senior class (students aged 14-15) studied *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*.

I made non-participant observations of shared reading in action in each setting (see Table 1). In schools I observed shared reading over several lessons, recognising study of novels in English typically extends across a sequence given the substantial nature of texts. In every school the study novel was in use prior to the research, selected by the teacher in relation to their respective curricula frameworks. I joined

teaching of each narrative *in medias res*, and the texts remained the same across the project. Data sources comprise audio records of lessons, transcripts, field notes and the study texts used by each class. During observations I had access to study text editions used in observed lessons, later consulted in desk analysis to confirm instances of spoken quotation of texts in audio and transcribed data. Always sitting at the periphery of classrooms and outside the desk space of students, I made audio recordings of each lesson using a handheld device with bi-directional microphone. Aiming to diminish teachers' and students' awareness of my presence I did not make video records where equipment or its use might be obtrusive. Written field notes logged features of the teaching space including desk and seating arrangements. Where names were not used in exchanges, anonymised seating plans (students identified by letter A, B, etc) aided a running record of speaker turns and interaction in each lesson. In later desk analysis of transcripts, I recorded time codes for each turn, synchronised with the audio recording to distinguish one speaker from another. Finally, I annotated selected audio data, first transcribed as plain text, using CA conventions (see Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998).

Methodology: adapting Conversation Analysis to Pedagogic Literary Narration

Adapting CA for education research reflects methodological debates around the status and conduct of CA where *talk-in-interaction* is the object (Drew & Heritage, 1992). CA has an ethnomethodological focus on how social action is organised and ordered through interaction (Psathas, 1995), characterised by the essential question "Why that, in that way, right now?" (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 16). It aims to uncover the *machinery* of interactions (Sacks, 1992, p. 169) by which participants achieve order. Crucially it is an emic approach concerned with participants' intersubjectivity in conversation and how they make sense of one another's conversational turns (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). A conversation-analytic mentality is construed more as "a way of seeing" than a "prescriptive set of instructions which analysts bring to bear on the data" (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 94). Typically, the primary data for CA are recordings of naturally occurring interaction. Transcripts make data available for analysis though they are "inevitably incomplete, selective renderings of the primary data" (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 15). CA assumes talk-in-interaction is systematic and methodic, with "order at all points" (Sacks, 1992); that contributions in conversation are shaped by their interactional context, but also that they renew that context in each conversational turn; and that all details may be relevant and none should be dismissed as disorderly or accidental (Heritage, 1984). Consequently, CA deploys a very detailed transcription system attentive not only to turns, pauses and sequence but also to variations in volume, emphasis, pitch and intonation. It orients to data "bottom-up", avoiding etic "prior theoretical assumptions" (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 15). Like Seedhouse, I qualify this approach given the expectation of contemporary education research to justify the sampling base with regard to institutional interactions, to understand the institutional goals (in this case, pedagogic aims) influencing them.

Data reduction and coding

This section describes data reduction and coding rationale relative to the three-way view of context for literary study. Seedhouse (2004, p. 87) asserts that where methods adopt or blend CA and Discourse Analysis approaches, classroom communication research in both L1 and L2 learning finds databases of between 5 and 10 lessons sufficient to draw conclusions. The examples Seedhouse shares necessarily compromise CA's focus on "case by case analysis" of isolated instances of interaction (Heritage, 1995, p. 406), bending CA's usual "unmotivated looking" (Psathas, 1992) to research questions intent on developing teaching and learning in an education and often subject-based *institutional context*. I reconcile the perspectives here by providing details of the full project database (Table 1), a coded lesson-by-lesson summary of data derived from the focal class (Table 2), coded representation of data focussed on teacher exposition across lessons (Table 3) and selections of transcript data informed by that coding.

Stage one

Coding for the lesson-by-lesson summary of data entails consideration of participant turns (students and teacher) as instances of interaction viewed in the *classroom context* of PLN. It identifies instances of the study text narrative *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* entering lesson conversations either directly (in spoken quotation, including read-aloud), or indirectly as paraphrased narrative during collective plenary phases of lessons. This sequence from lesson 2 initially demonstrates students frequently paraphrasing *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde's* narrative according to the teacher's request for a summary of Chapter 7, consistent with learning goals 'to know and understand what happens' framed by the teacher at the lesson's start:

- 1) Teacher: Okay, Helena, could you tell me something, in your summary tell me something, maybe how the chapter starts?
- 2) Helena: Mr Utterson and Mr Enfield were on their like normal walk.
- 3) Teacher: They were on their usual walk then, and where do they end up?
- 4) Helena: Outside Jekyll's laboratory door.
- 5) Teacher: Laboratory, okay. It's quite a difficult word to say, *laboratory*. Okay. It's a bit like *vocabulary*. Okay, and does it say why they end up outside his house?
- 6) Helena: I don't think so, no.
- 7) Teacher: It doesn't. Could you hazard a guess then? What we already know about the story, about the two characters, why they end up outside Jekyll's laboratory?
- 8) Helena: They might have been, like, thinking about it and then just ended up there.
- 9) Teacher: Yes, because, you know, they're very concerned about their friend

Jekyll. Maybe, you know, if it's consciously on their mind, it may be subconsciously then, the body is moving to that area then. Okay then, good. David, what happens after that?

- 10) David: They try to convince Jekyll to walk with them and get some fresh air.
- 11) Teacher: Right, so where is Jekyll then?
- 12) David: Jekyll is in his laboratory but like near the window.
- 13) Teacher: Right, he comes to the window. That's key isn't it? This idea. Remember yesterday we looked at windows and doors and what they could possibly symbolise. So, he comes to the window then and they try and persuade him to come outside, get some fresh air, enjoy the... is it, I can't remember now, Sunday? Does it say evening or...?
- 14) Steven: I think it's evening because it says "twilight".
- 15) Teacher: That's right. Good, "twilight". I thought it was evening. Lovely.

Though student paraphrasing of narrative dominates early turns (2,4,10,12), the teacher also paraphrases the narrative in turn 13. The teacher's apparent—perhaps deliberate?—doubt over the timing of an episode receives clarification from Steven who quotes the narrative directly [14] to warrant his impression that it takes place in the evening. Steven makes the act of quotation explicit using 'it says', though in repeating his one-word quotation the teacher does not [15].

The distinction between quoted and paraphrased entry of the narrative text to discussion demonstrated here can be represented by four coding categories also reflecting *who* introduces the narrative to discussion:

- TQ: Teacher-quoted narrative (as in turn 15)
- TP: Teacher-paraphrased narrative (as in turn 9)
- SQ: Student-quoted narrative (as in turn 14)
- SP: Student-paraphrased narrative (as in turn 2)

The coding process scrutinised transcripts representing all plenary phases in lessons where interaction was collective and where all participants encountered the evoked narrative simultaneously. Any turns demonstrating the functions were coded and tallied. The overview in Table 2 presents the tallies relative to the total number of plenary turns in the lesson and by participants. Peer-to-peer talk outside plenary phases, for example during paired discussion, is not represented here.

Stage two

Coding for teacher-exposition narrows the focus to the data generated in stage one, concentrating on turns coded *TQ: Teacher quoted narrative* in plain text transcripts. This new sample isolates instances where teachers unequivocally introduce the

'given' narrative of the study text to interaction through speech, in unique ways and at the level of *micro context*. Recognising teacher-turns vary in form where spoken quotation of texts occurred, stage two coding classifies them according to whether they contain single or multiple quotations, and based on their apparent and articulated function. *TQ: Teacher-quoted narrative* turns are coded thus:

- S: contains **single** quotation (quotation unbroken by words not in the text)
- M: contains **multiple** quotations (two or more)
- Q: contains a real **question** (excludes rhetorical questions)
- G: contains **gloss**/summary of study text e.g. of an episode or by definition of vocabulary
- A: introduces literary **analysis** using associated metalanguage (theme, narrator etc.) or by explicitly invoking an abstracted reader
- O: Turn **orients** students to the study text's pages either explicitly or by using quoted narrative as a prompt

This example of a teacher turn drawn from lesson 5 demonstrates the use of multiple quotations (M) embedded in exposition to serve several functions. It identifies details representing each code of Q, G and A noted in square brackets:

Page 42—he talks about—he says “imperious desire”, which is arrogant desire [G], okay “to carry my head high where a more than commonly grave countenance before the public hence it came about that I conceal my pleasures”. So this is all tied in with the theme of reputation then [A]. He’s concerned with the opinions of others and he hides his true desires and he feels guilty [G]. He feels guilty and stressed about it, okay [G]. He hid them [G]. “I was guilty of them.” “Profound duplicity of life.” He’s aware that he has these deeper urges okay [G]. Do you think that creates reader sympathy? [Q] Does anybody feel sympathy for him, you know he’s a gentleman but he has to maintain this air of respectability [Q]. He’s so focused on reputation [G]. Michael?

That Michael responds with ‘I do feel a bit sympathetic for him because he’s kind of restricted on what he can do’ confirms the questions are understood as real rather than rhetorical, also illustrating that the meaning of utterances does not reside in propositional expression alone, but also in their modality and interpretation by others. This hints at the challenge and arbitrariness of describing turn functions, and at the relevance of CA’s focus on interaction: application of the orientation code [O] required attention to surrounding turns to categorise some spoken quotations.

Analysis

CA transcription conventions capable of identifying performative and interactive dimensions of shared reading data are preferred here to annotations used in Narrative Analysis to analyse aural but less concerned with public interaction (Gee, 1985, 1986, 1991). CA annotation attends to aural characteristics of utterances as well as the organisation and overlap of turns. The process assists 'noticing' of features of speech and how utterances are understood by others. This approach adheres to interpretive principles of Narrative Analysis exploring how narrators "impose order on the flow of experience to make sense of actions and events in their lives" (Riessman, 1993, p. 2). It entails close attention to the manner of telling, how the narrative is "put together, the linguistic and cultural resources it draws on and how it persuades the listener of authenticity" (p. 2). Narrative Analysis also focusses on subjective experience constructed in the moment of telling. Here interest in pedagogy entails alertness to the narrative details teachers select for comment, how they present them and how students respond.

This adapted CA is applied to teachers' presentation of narratives in speech in selected instances of *teacher quoted narration* (TQ) coded in stage 2, first of teacher exposition in a single turn and then of narration-in-interaction across turns. The sophistication of PLN is particularly evident in teacher turns that comprise questioning, glossing and analysis around multiple quotations (see Table 3). These combine interpretive and empiricist impulses in single turns, recalling Bruner: they at once introduce, atomise and scrutinise the study text narrative. To see how that happens requires annotation representing the relationship between quoted narration and embedding utterance, treating the text as participant in interaction with the speaker. For this I apply Quotation in Talk and Exposition (QuoTE) analysis (Gordon, in press) which simultaneously attends to the novel as a heteroglot "hybrid construction" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 304) and to the additional voices mediating it in the class. Heteroglossia (p. 324) in novels "is another's speech in another's language, serving to express authorial intentions but in a refracted way. Such speech constitutes a special type of double-voiced discourse" (p. 305). Double-voiced narration in novels "expresses simultaneously two different intentions: the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author". Teachers bring another level of refraction, for instance where they dramatize direct speech or narrating voices. Transcripts represent the entry of text as the voice of the 'Page', its turns embedded in the voice of the last human speaker. The section sign (§) is also used to mark spoken quotations distinctly from written quotations, used once at the opening of a quotation and doubled to mark is close. QuoTE analysis exploits CA transcription's interests in turn-taking, sequence, modality and timing to examine PLN at the *micro context* level, recognising that teachers' pedagogic goals may shape their expressive use of these quotations and how interaction around them unfolds.

RESULTS

Pedagogic Literary Narration as a classroom context realised in teacher exposition

Stage one coding confirms PLN (comprising *teacher-quoted narration* and *teacher-paraphrased narration*) as a phenomenon of plenary teacher-turns, and its frequent adoption relative to some but not all pedagogic goals of literary study. Data indicates that PLN is used with varying frequency across lessons, for example 15% of teacher-turns in lesson 2 ($n = 5$) and 55% in lesson 6 ($n = 15$). PLN is used with variable intensity within lessons, for example most instances of TQ and TN in lesson 6 coalesce in the last few turns of a total 50 turns. This variation according to pedagogic goals confirms its status as one distinctive *classroom context* among many, with the teacher switching between it and other *classroom contexts* during teaching. Its status as a phenomenon of teacher-turns is suggested in its occurrence as a 34% proportion of all teacher-turns ($n = 77$ of 220 turns), more than one in three. The broader significance of the text's entry into talk during classroom literary study is suggested in its occurrence as a 48% proportion of *all* turns (i.e. of students and teachers, $n = 206$ of 432 turns). Though students similarly engage in both quoted narration and paraphrased narration (30% of all turns), instances are distributed across the student cohort. They use quoted narration in 19% of student turns ($n = 38$), less often than paraphrased narration which comprises 45% of all student turns ($n = 91$). The teacher, conversely, balances use of paraphrased narration with quoted narrative (17% of all teacher-turns for each). This suggests the importance of *teacher-quoted narration* as a pedagogic strategy, to bring the narration of the text into the interaction as an artefact for public encounter and attention. In using TQ teachers may also demonstrate to students how to embed text detail in broader original utterance, especially if students do not do so intuitively with comparable frequency as the data here suggests.

Towards Pedagogic Literary Narration as micro context: teacher-quoted narration

Stage 2 (Table 3) coding narrows attention to instances of *teacher-quoted narration* (TQ), identified at stage 1 as the distinctive means by which teachers introduce text narration to interaction in plenary discussion. Of a total 38 TQ instances, 26 contain single quotations and 12 contain multiple quotations. TQ commonly occurs with adjacent or embedding utterance within a turn. Only one turn comprises quoted narration alone. The additional utterance in each turn enacts one or more further functions: glossing, analysing the text, questioning students, repeating quoted narration by students or orienting their attention to the print text. Table 3 depicts TQ instances deploying multiple quotation where two or more of these functions co-occur ($n = 11$, all multi-quoting turns). Typically, these occur in lengthy teacher-turns that some forms of analysis characterise as overly-didactic (Nystrand, 2006). However, in ful-

filling multiple functions, these turns are pivotal pedagogic moments binding together several aspects of literary study. The text's narrative, gloss, analysis and prompts seeking students' responses coalesce, as if to sustain engagement with the text's narrative, aid comprehension and encourage critical distance concurrently as far as a single turn allows. Particular pedagogic skill is required to orient students to a critical perspective on the text through questioning [Q], gloss [G] and analysis [A]. These three functions co-occur in 5 of 11 multi-quoting turns, but in just 2 of 26 single-quoting turns.

The next section isolates transcript data matching example 4 listed in Table 3 (asterisked), one of five occurrences (highlighted) where teacher exposition manifests Bakhtin's heteroglot 'node of problems' in simultaneously managing multiple quotations and pedagogic purpose. It is followed by a transcript representing continuing interaction in the same lesson, demonstrating the relationship between teacher exposition and students' responses.

Pedagogic Literary Narration as micro context

Narrating, demonstrating and analysing suspense in teacher exposition

In the first turn drawn from lesson 6 in the data set, *teacher-quoted narrative* (TQ, turn 1b) is embedded in teacher's exposition (1) between gloss (1a) and analysis (1c) drawing on literary-narratological concepts of 'tension' and 'building up':

- 1a) Teacher: he's scared (.) okay; >he actually physically says< (0.2)
- 1b) Page: \$I'm afraid\$§
- 1c) Teacher: o:kay (.) erm (.) it's building up; (.) the fear: and the tension (.) okay (.)
- 1d) Page: \$ I can bear it no more: §§ (0.5)
- 1e) Teacher: erm, we don't know why Poole is scared (.)
he deliberately (0.2) erm(.) >evades the question< when he- when erm
when th- when the >lawyer Utterson< says
- 1f) Page: \$now my good man be expli:cit (.) what are you ↑afraid of?§§
- 1g) Teacher: okay (.) he's
- 1h) Page: \$ doggedly dis - disregarding the question§ (0.2)
- 1i) Teacher: he: is deliberately avoiding ↓answering that question (0.5) >it
builds up the suspense< yknow, the theme of mystery (0.1) okay? (.) so
as(0.2) as we come into that paragraph on pathetic; fallacy; we already ap-
preciate how the characters are feeling: (.) they are go- they are going to:
Jekyll's house now >to find out< (.) what (.) on earth is going on (.) >we don't
know< as a character we don't know (.) what is happening: okay (.) but we
do know that Jekyll's been >locking himself up again; < (.) okay (0.2) erm (.)
and we know that Poole is >very very< afraid: (0.4) alri:ght, so something
>is- isn't right something is wrong< (0.4) .hh and then the writer Stevenson
u::ses pathetic fallacy (.) to c- to build up:on that tension: (0.2) okay and

build upon: the suspense (.) so erm what is the wea:ther like?, anybody like to read out:?

As the teacher develops the exposition fragments of *teacher-quoted narrative* extend in length. By turn 1d she has presented two rejoinders drawn from text's diegetic world, each mediated with emphatic and patterned rhythm to dramatize the psychological state of Poole. These begin a vocalised demonstration of 'building up' continued in turn 1f, so that text narrative enters the teacher's utterance in successive fragments, first of two words, then six, and now eleven. The rhythm of the teacher's spontaneous comment across turns 1a, 1c and 1e echoes the rhythm of quoted text, binding interpretive and analytic orientations to the text sonically so that the empiricist proposition that tension builds is demonstrated in linked and affectively-intoned realisations of narrative tension. The craftedness of the text's narrative is emphasised too, in co-ordination of 'the fear' and 'the tension' where each abstract noun is emphasised.

Across this heteroglot turn at least three voices coincide: the teacher's voice as medium, the voice of the text present as teacher-quoted narration, and the voices of characters as direct speech within teacher-quoted narration. In turn 1e, the teacher's comment 'we don't know why Poole is scared' distances students as readers ('we') from the character and orients them to an analytic perspective *outside* the diegetic world of the novel. This enacts a *fourth* voice in the exposition, that of the abstracted literary reader alert to textual ellipsis, also suggested by the collective noun 'we' hinting at consensus reading. Emphasis of 'why' and 'scared' foregrounds this orientation, cueing students' 'selective attentiveness' (Rosenblatt, 1978, p. 106) to a text detail and its meaning-potential. Similarly, turn 1f's intonational marking of 'explicit' and 'afraid' dramatises the character's voice, performatively cueing students' attentiveness by emphasising the indeterminate source of Poole's anxiety. By voicing Utterson's imploring tone the teacher underlines the gap in students' knowledge, that 'we' the readers 'do not know why Poole is scared'. Overtly stated orientations to reading are augmented by performed orientations to text, typified where the position and intonation of the third quotation (turn 1f) corroborates the cumulative tension described and even echoed in the declarative '>it builds up the suspense< yknow, the theme of mystery' (turn 1i).

The turn efficiently evokes the narrative, inviting students' involvement. Embedding narration in other voices, the turn also prompts the self-aware distance of literary-critical aesthetic stance.

Orchestrating narration, review and analysis through talk

This exchange follows directly from the first, representing turn 2 onwards. The teacher turns continue embedding quoted narrative, also guiding student contribu-

tions in dialogic consolidation of narrative details across the interaction. The orientation-to-text demonstrated in the teacher's exposition (1) is mirrored in students' turns that take up the distanced, analytic perspective:

- 2) Andy: erm the weather in this section is bitter
- 3) Teacher: yeah
- 4) Andy: and very cold
- 5a) Teacher: yeah you've g- got
- 5b) Page: § it was a wild cold seasonable night of Mar:ch §§
- 5c) Teacher: okay: (.) erm, anybody want to:: expand on that? (1.0) erm, Abby?
- 6a) Abby: he also personifies the moon as
- 6b) Page: § lying on her back §§
- 7a) Teacher: oo good, personification of the moon then,
- 7b) Page: § lying on its back §§ (0.2)
- 7c) Teacher: erm (.) yes you'd get a mark for sp-spotting that in an exam ↓ if you had an extract (.) what effect is being ↑ created there? (2.0) by doing –
- 8) Abby: well it kind of almost represents the—(.) cos lying on your back is quite a bad thing generally, it's kind of –
- 9a) Teacher: well you could be >lying on your back< and sleeping, and that's ↑ a good thing (.) okay:: (0.2) erm,
- 9b) Page: § lying on her back as though the wind had tilted her §§ (2.0)
- 9c) Teacher: so you'd want to say
- 9d) Page: § lying on her back §§
- 9e) Teacher: and then you'd need to expand that quotation where it says
- 9f) Page: § as though the wind had tilted her §§ (4.0)
- 9g) Teacher: how could that be more negative, a more negative interpretation, John?
- 10) John: it's showing that the wind's quite strong:

Critical distance is evident Abby's turns where she first adopts an explicitly analytic perspective [6a] supported by quoted narrative [6b]. The teacher repeats Abby's point [7a] and quoted item [7b], an action that holds and marks these intangible, ephemeral utterances for the attention of the whole class in the public arena of plenary discussion—the aural equivalent of displaying an artefact. As these are spoken quotations, they are not marked by quotation marks, their status and significance instead marked by repetition positioning them as objects for attention. The teacher substitutes the pronoun 'her' for 'its' in the first repetition [7b], but by the second the text's original 'her' is reinstated [9b]. Repeating the phrase again [9b], the teacher elaborates with quotation including information to account for the 'lying' position of the moon, 'as though the wind had tilted her'. The additional details more fully narrativize the personification identified by the student, making the state of the moon more dynamic, part of a causal relationship. This sequence models selective attentiveness the teacher knows is required in writing for examination. Switching

between the voice of the text in one quoted fragment [9d], a didactic voice explaining how written comment might embed quotation [9e] and then a second quoted item (the elaborating details) [9f], the teacher offers an overt account of what she has already performed without declaration by providing the elaborated quotation. Across two turns each for student and teacher, the ‘lying’ fragment is repeated four times [6b, 7b, 9b, 9d] and adapted once [9a], marking it as salient for all participants. The complete teacher’s turn [9] is heteroglot in its layering of voices—that of the text [9b], respondee to the student’s acknowledgement of personification [9a], didactic voice [9c] and that of the text [9d] which through repetition also carries the student voice. In its entirety, turn 9 is a culmination of the exchange and how the novel enters it through speech, transforming it to model its adaptation for writing.

The instance of teacher-quoted narration [9b] introducing the ‘tilted’ state of the moon by the wind also sets up a new focus sustained by the teacher at 9f, anchored to the quotation ‘tilted’ and tying it through emphasis with three uses of the word ‘unnatural’:

- 11a) Teacher: right good yeah it’s the physical strength of the wind that can physically push over the moon okay it’s unnatural so (.) it’s been
- 11b) Page: § tilted §§
- 11c) Teacher: okay? (.) ↑mother nature is referred to as she isn’t it—she, mother, mother nature this - that’s why she’s been personified as female rather than male okay but yeah it’s the strength of the wi::nd okay it’s unnatural to ↑reflect (0.2) what? (.) what is unnatural about events (.) that we already know about the book, the ↑reader would already know, Abby?
- 12) Abby: Hyde?
- 13) Teacher: sorry?
- 14) Abby: Hyde.
- 15) Teacher: Hyde yeah, it’s supernatural isn’t it? the theme of of the supernatural. We know it’s not natural and the weather the environment the weather and the environment the natural elements are reflecting that okay.

The exchange bridges the immediate quote-level correlation of ‘tilted’ [11b] and ‘unnatural’ [11a, 11c] with the text-level theme of ‘the supernatural’ [15]. Abby’s tentative ‘Hyde?’ [12] affords this broadening focus, and demonstrates extremely efficient introduction of the text to discussion through invocation of a single character in a single word.

The action of Abby’s turn differs from the work of the teacher seen in these extracts. Abby’s contribution of ‘Hyde’ functions as a form of paraphrase, its economy doing everything necessary to convey her understanding of connections across the text. It is in contrast to the heteroglot utterances of the teacher [7, 9], which continue to embed direct quotation consistent with pedagogic intent to model analytic orientation to quotations. Teacher-quoted narration is a key component in teacher

turns distinct from students' inclination to paraphrase. It is essential to the pedagogic function of teacher turns, to guide collective attention during plenary discussion.

DISCUSSION

Theorising narratives and Narrative Analysis for literary pedagogy

Data presented illustrate the concurrent operation of two levels of text-evoking narration interdependent in pedagogic function, entering speech in exposition and through interaction as *Pedagogic Literary Narration*. The shared reading format focusses on narratives materially fixed in writing, texts embodying a narrative voice (or voices) constructed across the work. PLN exploits additional modalities (Kress and van Leeuwen, 2001) of vocalisation and guided interaction across time to evoke narratives in public reading transactions. The teacher's evocation of the novel in the classroom is an extra-narration, tied to the print text but creating something new and encompassing as "a key process... the elicitation of the pupils' stance towards, his amount of sympathy with characters and situations as the fiction progresses" (Bolt & Gard, 1970, p. 24). PLN also serves the broader aim of inducting students as embryonic critics. PLN introduces the voice of the teacher to the classroom manifestation of text, but also additional voices (for example, a literary-critical register) embedded in the teacher's own. The teacher's turns are heteroglot utterances of subtle pedagogic design. In the first transcript, exposition invites readers' dual stance consistent with Bruner's accounts of narrative experience, where 'construction' and 'comprehension' of narrative occur concurrently. For pedagogic purposes, teacher exposition cues interpretive orientation to the text's narrative while also demonstrating the close analysis of textual features as 'atomist propositions' associated with empiricist reading. This instance of PLN as micro context illustrates the intervening stage between pedagogy-as-lesson-plan and pedagogy-in-action (Seedhouse, 2004), where the teacher's exposition is responsive to the text and students in the moment of utterance.

Results demonstrate how teachers create new expository representations of printed narratives purposed to pedagogic goals, influencing subsequent interaction. Application of QuoTE analysis extends the repertoire of institutional CA methods and identifies distinctive forms of conversational interaction demonstrating order at all points enacted with shared understanding by participants. This approach responds to the distinctive salience of printed texts in classroom contexts for literary study, acknowledging their profound influence on microcontexts where texts enter individual speaker turns and interaction in the form of spoken quotation (TQ, SQ) and as paraphrased fragments of narrative (TP, SP). The transcripts and analyses arising from this approach make visible the in-the-moment craft of experienced teachers of literature. The data give analytic access beyond the teaching-as-design template invoked by Seedhouse, offering means to scrutinise unique facets of literature-teacher

exposition that directly impact students' experience of literary study texts in two ways. First, teacher turns *evoke* students' experience of narrative in shared reading, with especially pronounced impact if this is students' first encounter with the source narrative. Second, the evocation concurrently guides students' orientation to the narrative, alternately prompting different forms of selective attentiveness and hence engagement—now immersion in an episode of high drama, now analytic distance, or now anticipating a character's motives and actions. PLN combines the unfolding experience of reading a narrative together with analytic orientation to the shared text.

The duality of narration revealed by the adapted CA method confirms Bruner's view of narration as an act of mind (1992), a conceptualisation especially useful for explaining the interactive, telegraphic, provisional and exploratory experience of narrative texts common to classrooms and represented in these data. Shared novel reading in classrooms enacts reading as a very different process from reading in private and outside the institutional context. In the classroom, reading can be collective, participatory and guided by the teacher: it is externalised. As a consequence, the nature of being a reader of narratives shared in classroom space is ontologically distinct from being a reader in private. This follows from the modal interplay of PLN, where a source narrative is embedded in extra-narrative utterances and orchestrated across printed, aural, verbal, temporal and spatial modes.

PLN framed by teachers necessarily invites students to engage with texts consistent with pedagogic goals in an interactive format, and therefore students' engagement with information and knowledge embodied in texts here differs from their engagement during private reading. As well as orienting a distinct ontology of reading, PLN formulates a distinctive epistemology of reading. To varying ratios, it concurrently simulates the experience of reading narratives for their own sake (where reading purposes may be characterised by terms such as engagement, immersion, pleasure and enjoyment) while prompting analytic distance associated with evaluative, critical and efferent perspectives. If it is challenging for students to read in this dual state, it is equally challenging for teachers to hold the two in balance while maintaining the integrity of the source narrative as a unique and expressive work of art, so much more than a text book or common teaching resource.

The Bakhtinian lens informing this discussion highlights literary teachers' exposition as essentially heteroglot where their utterances comprise either spoken quotation drawn from the study text or paraphrased versions of its narrative. PLN provides students with a form of extra-narration, where teachers' utterances frame the source text in pursuit of pedagogic goals. Extra-narration can be achieved using differing resources, the simplest being unembedded spoken quotation where inflection of the turn and its position in interaction contribute to its meaning. These are dually heteroglot, eliding the text's narrative voice with that of the teacher, even before the greater heteroglot complexity attributed to the novel form by Bakhtin is taken into account. Teachers may utter these fragments with intent and deliberately high-

light that complexity, foregrounding the play of voices inherent in the source narrative. They direct intramental selective attentiveness (Rosenblatt, 1978), the cognitive and affective focussing of individual reading, through the verbal resources of talk which manipulate collective 'differentiated attentiveness' (Barnes et al., 1969). They may, for example, mark the distinction between two characters by varying intonation and volume of voices, or highlight shifts between third person narration and dialogue, where the printed text may do no more than signal these typographically. Further, teachers can layer metanarration with verbalised comment, embedding spoken quotations in longer expository utterances. In these instances, the heteroglot nature of PLN is more obvious, where spoken quotations are subject to overtly articulated evaluative comment, described using literary-critical jargon, or interrogated with questions both real and rhetorical. In paraphrase, the source narrative is selectively re-presented, the voice(s) of the text subsumed in the teacher's own. As with spoken quotation, teachers may also merge paraphrased narration and overtly propositional comment within the same turn. Teachers also animate these turns in interaction, guiding students' contributions tending to paraphrase and interweaving them with quoted narration. Where students do quote narratives directly, the teacher dwells on quotations and repeats them. Repetition assists the literary-analytic function of PLN, marking quoted material for critical orientation and isolating it from the flow of narrativisation. The pedagogic dimension is also evident in the deliberateness with which the teacher marks these with extended pauses and intonation, to a degree not mirrored by students.

Despite PLN's appealing flexibility, this theorisation and the research methods do have some limitations. PLN's empirical basis in transcripts analysed via adapted Conversation Analysis ensures it offers an interpretive framework grounded in actual instances of literary study, but its origin in micro level analysis of interaction means its capacity to account for the full breadth of pedagogic methods in use is hypothetical. Even as it represents the diversity of shared reading with narratives it can never exhaust the variety of approaches used. By insisting on the uniqueness of micro level interaction around texts, PLN has limited scope to suggest generalisable characteristics of literary teaching beyond the terms of institutional and classroom contexts identified earlier (Views 1 and 2). Its focus on the reflexive relationship between pedagogy, interaction and text will always require consideration of highly specific details (View 3). In this study, the database was small consistent with expectations in this field (Seedhouse, 2004) and was limited to instances of literature study in the United Kingdom. There was no opportunity to apply QuOTE analysis to reading activities varying according to differing cultural conventions of conversation in education, a multitude of micro contexts relevant to the overarching classroom context of PLN. Treatment of PLN here assumes teachers of literature induct students to aesthetic reading, and do so methodically, influenced by teaching traditions in the UK. The concept will need to adapt to encompass global micro contexts of literary study if it is to elucidate literary praxis and represent differing attitudes of care teachers enact for their students through pedagogy (van de Ven and Doecke, 2011, p. 219). As we have seen

across the article, the theoretical conceptions of reading and narratology informing participants' actions in PLN are contested and changing. Furthermore, developing a version of CA interested in pedagogy and teachers' intentions as much as interaction may challenge proponents of CA in its purer form.

In summary, the term *Pedagogic Literary Narration* names the subtle activity teachers of literature engage in when they read study texts with students and simultaneously guide their developing analytic orientation to narrative prose. It merges diverse and hitherto unamalgamated theoretical influences in a concise conceptualisation of literary teaching to inform pedagogic content knowledge for the discipline.

Pedagogic Literary Narration:

- a) assumes public interaction as a pre-condition;
- b) combines the unfolding experience of reading a narrative together with analytic orientation to the shared text;
- c) uses a range of verbal and paralinguistic resources to direct the reading of attention of students, consistent with taxonomies of pedagogic cueing. This function is often spontaneous and responsive according to pedagogic intuition. Though the general activity is repeated frequently by teachers, phrasing, intonation and abridgement are unlikely to be rehearsed precisely in advance of teaching;
- d) is telegraphic, operating across several units including single turns, short exchanges, phases of lessons, and entire lessons;
- e) is part of a dialogic chain, drawing together an existing source narrative, students who encounter it and their teacher in new interpretative narration. They are active in its public realisation as 'poetic event' (Rosenblatt, 1978): it is more than mere mediation between actors;
- f) is heteroglot in terms of its participating voices and in performative aspects where teachers voice the text, the narrator, characters and themselves as well as guiding oral contributions of students;
- g) is a form of extra-narrative, always evoking and elaborating an existing written prose narrative;
- h) has varying recourse to prior theories and conceptions of narrative that explicitly or tacitly inform teachers' spontaneous speech and presentational choices, and which may also be referenced in the extra-narrative presentation of the literary work.

Pedagogic Literary Narration should be understood as an organic dialogic phenomenon and as an activity proceeding relative to numerous theoretical influences that will change over time. It can accommodate emerging influences, especially as they arise from developing literary theory and from social science and education research of collective teaching and learning. It is not a fixed theoretical model, though it provides a concise and resilient articulation of activity instantly recognisable to teachers

of literature, with sufficient generalisability to withstand changes in curricula and assessment arrangements.

CONCLUSION

Pedagogic Literary Narration names for the first time teachers' unique narrative activity with literary study texts in talk, so deeply embedded and normalised within the conventions of literary education. PLN clearly conceptualises the duality of literary pedagogy using narrative texts, highlighting the constant interplay of each study text narrative with teachers' original extra-narration purposed to learning goals. Recognising PLN as a phenomenon of literary teaching is significant because it is the dominant pedagogic format through which students experience narrative prose texts in school. For some students, it complements their experience of literary narratives in other situations, such as private reading. There are other students with less opportunity or inclination to read independently for whom PLN may provide their only experience of literary narratives. PLN therefore has an immensely powerful influence, shaping young readers' conceptions of literary reading, the value they attribute to engaging with literary narratives, and their attitude to narratives presented in printed form relative to the myriad narrative media available to them. When applied to any individual literary study text, PLN always creates a new and unique narrative experience that embeds but is distinct from the source narrative.

Pedagogic Literary Narration extends Rosenblatt's seminal conceptualisation of reading transactions where individuals evoke texts and adopt varying stances as they read. PLN describes the specialist disciplinary mode of teacher exposition that evokes texts collectively, shaping the distinctive aesthetic orientation to narrative required of embryonic critics in literary study. Nearly three decades have passed since Bruner highlighted narrative's unique way of knowing and the limitations of literary theory for explaining its role in education. A theorised pedagogy of this sort and distinct from a theory of narrative is necessary to ensure the educational potential of novels is extended, and to guarantee that the many elements of narrative experienced in literary classrooms can be recognised, valued and enhanced over time. To date research, narrative theory and subject teaching have not been part of the same story, allowing counter-narratives to thrive. The heroic return of the knowledge curriculum in the UK is one of these tales, redacting skilled and subtle subject-based pedagogy from the discourse of inspiring teaching. Counter to the arguments made by Social Realists, literary knowledge content (the study text) and literary pedagogy (realising the text as classroom experience) prove inseparable: to sever them is to misconceive the epistemology of the novel form, and to overlook how teachers necessarily transform narratives for presentation in the public environment of any classroom. PLN provides coherent means to describe core teaching practices that from initial teacher education onwards are central to the apprenticeship, development and expertise of teachers of literature across languages and cul-

tures. *Pedagogic Literary Narration's* greatest significance is its unambiguous recognition that skilled literary pedagogy is always far more than 'just' reading in class. At its best it demonstrates for students a mode of reading for life, a mode of knowing stories that enriches their experience and their orientation to the world.

AUTHOR'S NOTE

The research project *Literature's Lasting Impression* was supported by British Academy grant MD150021.

REFERENCES

- Alexis, D. (2012). Entre deux langues et deux approches didactiques. *Revue internationale d'éducation de Sèvres*, 61, 71-80. <https://doi.org/10.4000/ries.2672>
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Barthes, R. (1977). *Image music text*. London: Fontana Press.
- Barnes, D., Britton, J., Rosen, H. & LATE. (1969). *Language, the learner and the school*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity*. London, UK: Taylor and Francis.
- Bolt, S. & Gard, R. (1970). *Teaching fiction in schools*. London, UK: Hutchinson.
- Bruner, J. S. (1992). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dezutter, O., Babin, J., Goulet, M., & Maisonneuve, L. (2012). La lecture des œuvres complètes en contexte scolaire au Québec. *Revue internationale d'éducation de Sèvres*, 61, 111-120. <https://doi.org/10.4000/ries.2690>
- Daiute, C., & Lightfoot, C. (2004). *Narrative analysis: Studying the development of individuals in society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412985246>
- Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge, UK: CUP.
- Eagleton, T. (2016). *Materialism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Fraisse, E. (2012). L'enseignement de la littérature : Un monde à explorer. *Revue internationale d'éducation de Sèvres*, 61, 35-45. <https://doi.org/10.4000/ries.2664>
- Gee, J.P. (1985). The narrativization of experience in the oral style. *Journal of Education*, 167(1), 9-35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002205748516700103>
- Gee, J. P. (1986). Units in the production of narrative discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 9(4), 391-422. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01638538609544650>
- Gee, J.P. (1991). A linguistic approach to narrative. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 1(1), 15-39. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jnlh.1.1.03ali>
- Genette, G. (1980). *Narrative discourse: an essay in method*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Gibb, N. (2015). How E. D. Hirsch came to shape UK government policy. In J. Simons & N. Porter (Eds.), *Knowledge and the curriculum* (pp. 12-20). London, UK: Policy Exchange.
- Giovanelli, M. & Mason, J. (2015). 'Well I don't feel that': schemas, worlds and authentic reading in the classroom. *English in Education*, 49(1), 41-55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eie.12052>
- Gordon, J. (2012). Echo, not quotation: what conversation analysis reveals about classroom responses to heard poetry. *Classroom Discourse*, 3(1), 83-103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2012.666023>
- Gordon, J. (2010). What is not said on hearing poetry in the classroom. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 9(3), 40-52.
- Gordon, J. (2018). Reading from nowhere: assessed literary response, Practical Criticism and situated cultural literacy. *English in Education*, 52(1), 20-35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/04250494.2018.1414408>
- Gordon, J. (in press). The turn of the page: spoken quotation in shared reading. *Classroom Discourse*.
- Gribbin, J. (1991). *In search of Schroedinger's cat: Quantum physics and reality*. London, UK: Black Swan.

- Harding, D. W. (1962). Psychological processes in the reading of fiction. *British Journal of Aesthetics* 2(2), 133-147. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjaesthetics/2.2.133>
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge, UK: CUP. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511665868.020>
- Heritage, J. (1995). Conversation analysis: Methodological aspects. In U.M. Quasthoff (Ed.), *Aspects of oral communication* (pp.391-418). Berlin: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110879032.391>
- Hirsch, E. D., Trefil, J., & Kett, J. F. (1988). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Hirsch, E.D. (1967). *Validity in interpretation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Houdart-Merot, V. (2012). Une histoire ancienne, de nouveaux défis. *Revue internationale d'éducation de Sèvres*, 61, 59-70. <https://doi.org/10.4000/ries.2670>
- Hutchby, I. & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Janssen, T. & Braaksma, M. (2018). Students responding to a short story: An explorative study of verbal and written responses. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 18, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2018.18.03.11>
- Juzwik, M. & Ives, D. (2010). Small stories as resources for performing teacher identity: Identity-in-interaction in an urban language arts classroom. *Narrative Inquiry*, 20(1), 37-61. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.20.1.03juz>
- Juzwik, M. (2008). Oral narrative genres as resources for classroom literature study: A contextualised case study of conversational narrative discussion, *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(4), 1111-1154. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831208321444>
- Kinloch, V., Burkhard, T., & Penn, C. (2017). When school is not enough: Understanding the lives and literacies of Black youth. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 52(1), 34-54.
- Kress, G. & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse*. London, UK: Arnold.
- Labov, W. & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. In J. Helm (Ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts* (pp.12-44). Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- McConn, M. (2016). An evaluation of extensive and intensive teaching of literature: One teacher's experiment in the 11th grade. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 51(2), 162-182.
- Meek, M. & Watson, V. (2003). *Coming of age in children's literature: Growth and maturity in the work of Phillippa Pearce, Cynthia Voigt and Jan Mark*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- Moore, R. & Muller, J. (1999). The discourse of 'voice' and the problem of knowledge and identity in the sociology of education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(2), 189-206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425699995407>
- Norling, T.F. (2003). *Aims and objectives in the teaching of English literature at upper secondary school*. Karlstad, Sweden: Karkstad University. (Masters thesis).
- Nystrand, M. (2006). Research on the role of classroom discourse as it affects reading comprehension, *Research in the Teaching of English*, 40(3), 392-412.
- Polkinghorne, D.E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 8(1), 5-23 <https://doi.org/10.1080/0951839950080103>
- Popova, M.E. (2010). *How English language literature is taught in the Norwegian upper secondary school*. Hedmark, Norway: Høgskolen I Hedmark. (Masters thesis).
- Propp, V. I. A., Propp, V. Y., & Wagner, L. A. (1968). *Morphology of the folktale*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Psathas, G. (1992). The study of extended sequences: The case of the garden lesson. In G. Watson, & R.M. Seiler (Eds.), *Text in context: Contributions to ethnomethodology* (pp. 99-122). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Read Write Think. (2017). *Using guided reading to develop student reading independence*. Retrieved from <http://www.readwritethink.org/>
- Ricœur, P. (1984). *Time and narrative* (translated by Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer). Vol.1. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0360966900038305>
- Riessman, C.K. (1993). *Narrative analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rosenblatt, L. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., & Jefferson, G. (1978). A simplest systematics for organization of turn-taking for conversation. In Schenkein, J. (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (2nd ed.) (pp. 7–55). New York, NY: Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412243>

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Spencer, M. M., Warlow, A., & Barton, G. (1977). *The cool web: The pattern of children's reading*. London, UK: Bodley Head.

Spencer, M. M. (1982). *Learning to read*. London, UK: Bodley Head.

Steinbeck, J. (1953). *The Pastures of Heaven*. London, UK: Ernest Benn Limited.

Stevenson, R. (1886). *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde and other stories*. London, UK: Penguin Books.

Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the self*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Todorov, T. (1977). *The poetics of prose*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

van Schooten, E. (2005). *Literary response and attitude toward reading fiction*. Groningen, The Netherlands: University of Groningen (Doctoral thesis).

Warner, L., Crolla, C., Goodwyn, A., Hyder, E., & Brian, R. (2016). Reading aloud in high schools: Students and teachers across the curriculum. *Educational Review*, 68(2), 222-238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2015.1067881>

van de Ven, P.H. & Doecke B. (2011). Literary Praxis: a concluding essay. In van de Ven, P.H. & B. Doecke (Eds.), *Literary Praxis: A conversational inquiry into the teaching of literature* (pp.219–225). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6091-586-4_14

Wrigley, T. (2018). 'Knowledge', curriculum and social justice. *The Curriculum Journal*, 29(1), 4-24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2017.1370381>

Young, M. (2010). Why educators must differentiate knowledge from experience. *Pacific-Asian Education: Journal of the Pacific Circle Consortium for Education*, 22(1), 9-20.

APPENDIX

Table 1: Literature’s Lasting Impression database

Setting	Age	Sessions recorded	Focal text	
Primary school	A	10-11	4	<i>The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas</i> , John Boyne
	B	10-11	3	<i>The Windsinger</i> , William Nicholson
Secondary school	A	14-15	6	<i>The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde</i> , Robert Louis Stevenson
	B	11-12	4	<i>The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas</i> , John Boyne <i>Coraline</i> , Neil Gaiman
University group	A	Undergraduate year 2 (mixed)	3	<i>Tom Jones</i> , Henry Fielding
	B	Undergraduate year 2 (mixed)	2	<i>Pond</i> , Claire Louise Bennett
Reading group	A	mixed	1	<i>Life after Life</i> , Kate Atkinson
	B	mixed	2	<i>Daddy Long-legs</i> , Jean Webster

Table 2: Focal class data, Secondary school A

Lesson	Pedagogic focus of lesson (articulated in transcripts)	Total turns			Quotation narration Teacher / Student			Paraphrased narration Teacher/Student			Pedagogic Literary Narration (Teacher)		Literary narration, including Student instances	
		All	Teacher	Student	Teacher TQ (% teacher turns)	Student SQ (% student turns)	Total TQ+SQ (% all turns)	Teacher TP (% teacher turns)	Student SP (% student turns)	Total TP+SP (% all turns)	Total teacher PLN TQ+TP (% all turns)	Total teacher PLN TQ+TP (% teacher turns)	Total student literary narration SQ+SP (% all turns)	Total literary narration TQ+TP+SQ +SP (% all turns)
1	Know how Dr Lanyon is described in Chapter 6; understand how writer uses themes and symbolism; write effective paragraph on Jekyll's state of mind.	79	42 (53)	37 (47)	15 (36)	16 (43)	31 (39)	0 (0)	7 (17)	7 (19)	15 (19)	15 (36)	23 (29)	38 (48)

PEDAGOGIC LITERARY NARRATION

2	Know and understand what happens in Chapter 7; write critical paragraph on how Jekyll is presented in this chapter.	58	34 (59)	24 (41)	1 (3)	2 (6)	3 (5)	4 (12)	8 (33)	12 (21)	5 (9)	5 (15)	10 (18)	15 (27)
3	Know what happens in Chapter 8; understand pathetic fallacy; retrieve relevant and accurate textual information.	99	49 (49)	50 (51)	10 (20)	16 (32)	26 (26)	7 (14)	10 (20)	17 (17)	17 (17)	17 (35)	26 (26)	43 (43)
4	Know what happens in Chapter 9; share responses to Chapter 8; write revision notes on how the writer builds tension.	113	58 (51)	55 (49)	4 (4)	2 (2)	6 (5)	17 (29)	44 (80)	61 (54)	21 (19)	21 (36)	48 (42)	69 (61)

5	Know Freud's theories of id, ego and superego; understand what happens in early Chapter 10; be able to link Hyde's actions with Freud's theories.	33	19 (58)	14 (42)	3 (15)	1 (7)	4 (12)	1 (5)	8 (57)	9 (27)	4 (12)	4 (21)	9 (27)	13 (39)
6	Read final chapter and understand what happens, focussed on Jekyll's feelings; practice writing critical paragraphs.	50	27 (54)	23 (46)	5 (19)	1 (4)	6 (12)	10 (37)	14 (61)	24 (48)	15 (30)	15 (55)	15 (30)	30 (60)
Totals across lesson sequence		43 2	229 (54)	203 (47)	38 (17)	38 (19)	76 (18)	39 (17)	91 (45)	130 (3)	77 (18)	77 (34)	131 (30)	206 (48)

Table 3: Teacher exposition, TQ multi-quotation turns

Example	Question/Q	Gloss/G	Analysis/A	Repeat/A	Orient/O
1	0	1	0	1	0
2	0	1	1	1	1
3	1	0	1	1	1
4*	1	1	1	0	0
5	1	1	1	1	0
6	1	0	1	0	0
7	1	1	1	0	0
8	1	1	0	0	0
9	1	1	1	0	0
10	1	1	1	0	0
11	0	1	1	0	0