

Language and Psychoanalysis

ISSN 2049-324X

Volume 2, Issue 1, 2013



Editors

Laura A. Cariola, Lancaster University, UK

Andrew Wilson, Lancaster University, UK

Editorial Advisory Board

Prof. Michael Buchholz, International Psychoanalytic University Berlin, Germany

Prof. Adrienne Harris, New York University, USA

Prof. Dianne Hunter, Trinity College, USA

Prof. Horst Kächele, International Psychoanalytic University Berlin, Germany

Prof. Ian Parker, Discourse Unit, UK

Prof. Riccardo Steiner, British Psychoanalytic Society, UK

Prof. Carlo Strenger, Tel Aviv University, Israel

Prof. Ruth Wodak, Lancaster University, UK

Editorial Contact Address:

Department of Linguistics and English Language

Lancaster University

Lancaster LA1 4YT

United Kingdom

Fax: +44-1524-843085

E-mail: a.wilson@lancaster.ac.uk and l.cariola@lancaster.ac.uk

Scope

The journal of *Language and Psychoanalysis* is a fully peer reviewed online journal that publishes twice a year. It is the only interdisciplinary journal with a strong focus on the qualitative and quantitative analysis of language and psychoanalysis. The journal is also inclusive and not narrowly confined to the Freudian psychoanalytic theory.

We welcome a wide range of original contributions that further the understanding of the interaction between Linguistic Analysis and Theory & Psychoanalytic Theories and Techniques. Any relevant manuscripts with an emphasis on language and psychoanalysis will be considered, including papers on methodology, theory, philosophy, child development, psychopathology, psychotherapy, embodied cognition, cognitive science, applied dynamical system theory, consciousness studies, cross-cultural research, and case studies. The journal also publishes short research reports, book reviews, interviews, obituaries, and readers' comments.

Peer Review Policy

All manuscripts will be peer reviewed by the editors, a member of the editorial advisory board, or another qualified person appointed by the editors.

For Contributors

Manuscript:

- Authors need to confirm with a cover letter that the manuscript has not been published previously and is not being submitted currently to another journal.
- Manuscripts are only published in the English language.

Word limit:

- Submissions for main articles should be approximately 3.000-10.000 words in length and include an abstract of about 200 words and up to seven keywords.
- Short research reports, book reviews, and readers' comments should be approximately 500-2.500 words in length.
- Interviews and obituaries should not exceed 4.000 words in length.

Style:

- Manuscripts should be double-spaced, in Times 12-point font, and in .doc, .docx, or .rtf format.
- Manuscripts should follow the style conventions as outlined by the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, 6th edition.

Contents

Peter Schneider, PhD

<i>Language Usage and Social Action in the Psychoanalytic Encounter: Discourse Analysis of a Therapy Session Fragment</i>	4-19
---	------

Lubie Grujicic-Alatrisme, PhD

<i>Psychoanalytic Literary Criticism: Using Holland's DEFT Model as a Reader Response Tool in the Language Classroom</i>	20-49
--	-------

Michael Buchholz, PhD.

Book review – “ <i>The Handbook of Conversation Analysis</i> ” and “ <i>Emotion in Interaction</i> ”	50-55
---	-------

Language Usage and Social Action in the Psychoanalytic Encounter: Discourse Analysis of a Therapy Session Fragment

Peter Schneider¹
Brooklyn College
The City University of New York

Abstract

A fragment of a therapy session is discussed using some of the tools of discourse analysis in an effort to demonstrate how speech acts serve as vehicles for the negotiation of roles and the transmittal of emotional/relational messages in the therapeutic dyad. In particular, issues of power asymmetry, proper function of the therapist, patient autonomy, and emotional attachment are subtextually communicated about through types of speech acts such as propositional triggers and utterances that are ambiguous as to their illocutionary and perlocutionary forces. The analysis of the speech acts in the session provides a microscopic identification of the expression of macro-level theoretical phenomena such as transference and counter-transference.

Introduction

With the accelerating breakdown of the hegemony of classical Freudian thought in the psychoanalytic world over the past three to four decades, post-modernist relativism rapidly became a cliché in psychoanalytic circles. No school could any longer lay claim to a monopoly on truth. Indeed, the notion of truth itself was been rendered highly problematic. The anti-realist views of philosophers of science such as Kuhn (1970) penetrated the psychoanalytic world via the work of psycho-analytic writers such as Spence (1982). In the latter's discussion of "narrative truth", a correspondence theory of truth was abandoned in favour of a coherence view of personal narrative. Through the analytic process, the patient's initial narrative is, gradually replaced by a new, presumably more coherent or useful narrative negotiated with the therapist. However, as Gergen and Kaye (1991) pointed out, while this view may be a useful description of analytic practice, there are several problems with it as a description of or a prescription for the therapeutic process. This conceptualization still privileges the analyst's narrative account of the patient's experience over the patient's initial narrative account. The analyst still seems to have a pre-existing "truth", albeit in quotes, a privileged story that s/he imposes on the "material" the patient brings. In the work of many narrativists, the view of the therapist as possessing a special knowledge of souls has still not been superseded.

Moreover, while the question of truth has been relativized, the problem of truth has been preserved in a narrativist framework that still relies heavily on a notion of representation.

¹ Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Peter Schneider, Private Practice, Brooklyn, NY; Adjunct Associate Professor of Psychology, Brooklyn College/CUNY. E-mail: p.schneid@gmail.com

What analyst and analysand are said to be doing is constructing better stories, i.e., better pictures or representations of something "out there". To this conception, Gergen and Kaye posed a different view of therapy as enacting and creating meanings through dialogic acts. Psychoanalytic writers, such as Hoffman (1991), also went beyond relativism to the position of social constructionism. This view tries not to privilege the analyst's meanings but rather sees the meanings arrived at by both participants in the therapeutic dialogue as mutually and interactively constituted. Such a position must necessarily force a reconceptualization of the nature of the therapist's activity and expertise. If therapy is not simply the replacement of one narrative with another, what else is it? The trend of thinking in Hoffman's work, and in the work of non-psychoanalytic social constructionists such as Gergen, is to see the therapeutic situation as an arena of (potentially) creative dialogic enactments.

In what follows, I will attempt to address the question of the grammar and vocabulary of some of these enactments. Some very interesting prior work in this area is collected in Siegfried (1995). Most of the work in this volume is by non-explicitly psychoanalytic writers (one notable exception being M. Horowitz). A more recent collection of work on conversational analysis of psychotherapy edited by Peräkylä, Antaki, Vehviläinen and Leudar (2008), building on the pioneering work in this area by Labov and Fanshel (1977), analyses patient/therapist turn-taking sequences. Several of the authors in this book examine dialogic specimens of how therapists use linguistic strategies such as substituting single words or short phrases (i.e., Rae) or reformulations (i.e., Antaki) as a means of introducing new meanings or extending patients' meanings in what the therapist deems therapeutically/emotionally useful ways. Peräkylä in this same volume discusses intersubjectivity by means of analysing how patients signal various levels of agreement or disagreement with therapist's interpretations. Streeck (also in this 2008 collection) discusses enactment but principally from the non-verbal gestural side. Of course, much has been written about enactment from a psychoanalytic/relational point of view.

Tilly's (2006) sociological work on reason-giving for action is an interesting discussion of how reason-giving functions in the negotiation of roles and relationships, one very important subset of meanings. In the case example I give below, the therapist (myself) asks a series of questions. Questions on the face of it are seeking answers - reasons for action, explanations or accounts of motives, statements of rules of social behaviour, and so forth. In this sample of dialogue, role negotiation is a salient feature as is the attempt to make possibly implicit emotional meanings explicit.

As Hoffman has noted (1992), there are limits to the range of meanings that the members of the therapeutic dyad can co-produce. Neither participant just "decides" what to say, what move to make. Rather, in Hoffman's terms: "...among the limiting factors are the temperaments and resources of the participants as well as the analyst's and patient's unconscious interest in particular kinds of interaction and associated unconscious resistance to other forms (p. 294)".

To these considerations I would add that the means for co-producing meaning are also socio-culturally limited. This is to say that in all our conversations, including the therapeutic conversation, we are following rules not necessarily of our own devising. We are playing "language games" as Wittgenstein (1953) first pointed out, which are in turn embedded in social "games", practices, or, as Wittgenstein termed them, "forms of life". It is with these tools that we socially generate meaning. Therapist and patient are at times

agreeing and at other times disagreeing about what it is they are doing, and much of this shared or divergent understanding of what they are about is unformulated. This, I think, is necessarily so for two reasons. First, there is the high speed of the analytic exchange, which, in this respect, is no different from many other forms of social encounter. There is no way we could become conscious, in the moment, of all the language games we are playing. But, secondly, embedded as we are within these forms of life, it is difficult for us to be aware of them as such. There is always some "horizon" of experience as Merleau-Ponty termed it (1962), which is difficult if not impossible to transcend or even comprehend. In part, this is because the rules of social and linguistic practice by means of which we constitute our worlds lie right under our noses. Thus, we take no note of them, or, taking note, we view them as so general and obvious as to seem trivial. We always can, but do not usually ask ourselves how we know what a speaker means by what he or she says. This field of inquiry is part of the discipline of speech pragmatics, which includes the study of linguistic forms, of reference, presupposition, types of speech act, relation of utterance to linguistic and social/action context, rules of turn-taking in dialogic exchange, and so forth. Although the formalized study of speech pragmatics is a technical specialized field spanning aspects of linguistics, philosophy (Austin, 1962), psychology, and sociology; the intuitive, implicit use of the rules and practical procedures of speaking and of understanding what another is saying is something that as naive laypersons we do every day. We do not have to be students of speech pragmatics to function in everyday social life. However, I would suggest that, as therapists, we are enhanced in our functioning by the more detailed understanding of dialogic process that inquiry into speech pragmatics provides. Indeed, knowledge of or, better, sensitivity to the subtleties of dialogic process could be said to constitute an essential aspect of our expertise.

But also, as noted above, linguistic practice is embedded in, if partially constitutive of, social practice. The forms of social practice include but go beyond the linguistic. If we ask the question of how we know what a person is doing extra-linguistically (in the sense of social action) by saying something, then we are starting to tread on somewhat broader but shiftier ground. We are entering the field where we can begin to talk about the underlying rules of communicative aims, i.e., the grammar of motives and purposes, intentional, quasi-intentional, or so deeply embedded as to be not easily formulable. This field includes the area of psychodynamic theory which we, as therapists, make use of to varying extents and in a more or less systematic way. It also includes the common-sense psychological and sociological theories of motivation that we all, therapists and laypersons alike, make use of, however consciously or unconsciously, in daily life. As applied to therapy, we might call this the field of receptive/passive or interpretive therapeutic speech pragmatics, insofar as we, at any given point, make use of a more or less systematic theory of social action (of which the dynamic metapsychologies are a subset) to understand the (speech) actions of each member of the therapeutic dyad. Finally, there is the question of what we do with our understandings of what we and the other are saying/doing in the therapy setting, however we arrive at these understandings. These involve questions of therapeutic aim and technique or, if we narrow it to linguistic activity, active or productive therapeutic speech pragmatics. Thus, there are at least three distinguishable levels of language use that come into play in therapeutic practice. First, are the everyday rules of language that enable basic communication; then there are the higher order social and psychological inferences about meaning and intention (which includes affect); and, finally, there are our conceptions of what we do as therapists with the meanings developed in the analytic encounter.

It might seem intuitively evident that these three levels of language use and understanding are hierarchically ordered. That is to say, one might suppose that the common-sense pragmatics of the rules of discourse are the basis of everyday understanding upon which the more arcane psychodynamic type of understanding is founded and that the theory of technique flows out of, or is entailed by, this latter kind of understanding. However, I would argue that no such simple hierarchy of knowledge of language use obtains in the therapy situation. Rather, we often jump from one level to another without acknowledging it to ourselves. This is to say that not everything we say or do in psychoanalysis is motivated out of the concerns of psychoanalytic theory. Rather, much of what we say and do as therapists is directly conditioned by culturally received linguistic and social common sense.

Of course, sometimes our psychological theory (our subcultural "common sense") moves us to override the general common sense. Moreover, and more importantly, theoretical and common-sense understandings and action are not always conceivable as two distinct moments in the therapeutic encounter. Rather, what we do as speakers in our culture shapes our understanding of what we are doing as therapists. A parallel situation obtains for the patient. His/her understanding of what s/he is doing qua patient takes place against a background of implicit everyday social communicative action.

Also, and importantly, understandings of the situation do not arise in an interpersonal vacuum but are always created under the influence (including implicit and explicit demands and instructions) of the other. These understandings then constitute an interpersonal field of meanings beyond the individual's control, an "intertext" in Bakhtin's terminology (Todorov, 1984). The intertext is a constantly developing organic process and product. As the dialogic interchange unfolds over time new possibilities and choice points of meaning and action open up. These choice points are complexly contingent on many factors, among which our awareness of choices and possibilities is, I believe, primary. Our awareness of choices depends on a subtle textual and textural sensitivity to the communicative actions, i.e., the gestures, moves, meanings, language games, and social beliefs and expectations of ourselves and the other. In order to demonstrate some of these nuances and possibilities of language use and meaning in the therapy situation, I will turn to an actual example of therapeutic discourse and interaction.

Case study

A woman in her early 30's has been in therapy for seven years through many life vicissitudes including a series of conflicted and often self-destructive love relationships, a long period of dissatisfaction with her work and the launching of a new career path, and many battles in an ongoing struggle to separate herself from her family of origin. In the year preceding the session I am about to describe, she had come to be in a basically satisfying relationship with a man, had gotten started in graduate school and been able to distance herself more than previously from the troubling influence of her family. She came to the session, having spoken in recent weeks about heading towards termination. Toward the end of the session, the following exchange ensued.

1Patient (Pt.): (Sigh) Well...I know I have to leave (falling tone)...(Long pause in which the patient looks away and then at me.)

1Therapist (Th.): Ah, hmm...How do you know that?

2Pt.: (Looks slightly taken aback) I mean...I guess it's time for me to move on.

2Th.: What makes you guess? Is that something you can guess?

3Pt.: (puzzled, indulgent smile) What do you mean? (gently rising tone)

3Th.: It just doesn't seem like something you can know or guess about. It's something you decide.

4Pt.: Well, yeah... I can decide...that's all. (Long pause, bites lip) It's just hard to say goodbye. Like you know in the spring? After the last group I was talking to Ed downstairs? and I just couldn't say goodbye. It made everything seem so meaningless if I could just walk away from it. So I told myself, "Well, you don't have to". That's why I said I'd be in the group again.

4Th.: Even though you didn't really want to.

5Pt.: Right.

5Th.: And now?...about leaving individual?

6Pt.: Oh well, that's different. I suppose I could just go on forever...make it permanent (laughs).

6Th.: But you know you have to stop.

7Pt.: Oh Ok. (mock exasperation) you know what I mean.

7Th.: Yeh...But what? You can't say goodbye to me either?

8Pt.: Well, yeah, sort of. It trivializes the whole thing.

8Th.: (in a tone of sudden discovery) Ah...I wonder if you think it's trivial to me.

9Pt.: Right. Isn't that ridiculous? As if seven years were nothing?

9Th.: No no no (fast, compressed)...It's not just the time...It's like I'm not supposed to have, couldn't have any feelings towards you.

10Pt.: Yeahh (looks toward me and smiles) I know that's absurd (long silence) So I guess it's time to leave, huh?

10Th.: It's up to you. It's what you decide.

11Pt.: I know. I know. But, it's also...there are these things to work on...Like this crazy jealousy that Z (the man she is living with) and I have about our pasts. And that stuff last time about how I have so much to prove academically. God, I felt worse...Like uh oh I really have a long way to go. (long silence)

11Th.: What's up?

12Pt.: I'm thinking of how I'm tired of going over the same stuff.

12Th.: Whyzat?

13Pt.: Feels like I haven't made much progress.

13Th.: (pause) Weeeeeell, I don't know. If you think about all the stuff we've been through and where you're at in your life now...I don't know if you can really say that.

14Pt.: Yeah, (shrugs) But I always doubt it...You know how I always doubt everything. And then I'm afraid I'm not doing everything just right and my mother will say "I told you so" (laughs) Well...maybe I should stay a little while more...(long silence)

14Th.: (hesitant half-laugh) Are you asking me or telling me?

15Pt.: I don't know...both.

15Th.: (after another long pause) Well, look here, if you're asking me whether you're fixed, whether you graduate now with your BMH, I'll tell you what I've told you before. You've made a lot of progress, it's naive to think that there'll come some definitive point at which you're fixed, no more problems. I'm sure you could continue this work on your own; I think you'll be OK without therapy, but it's up to you. It's what you want to do...(pause) But, now, if you're asking me will I miss you? The answer is yes. But, I'm certainly not going to tell you what you should do, (tone of mock desperation), cause there ain't no should.

16Pt.: OK. (long pause)

16Th.: OK (long pause)

17Pt.: I'll see you next week.

17Th.: (nods) See you then.

In reviewing this and other segments of therapeutic dialogue, I have recurrently been struck by how complex the therapy interaction can be when considered at any relatively fine level of detail. One can analyze what is happening in terms of the theory of psychoanalytic technique (relative to certain standard notions of therapeutic aim), at the level of conscious, pre-conscious, or unconscious motive and affect of both actors (often summarized as transference and countertransference), at the level of social action considered from a sociological point of view (e.g., assertions of the speakers as to their respective statuses, roles, and competences in these roles) and at the level of discourse, linguistically considered (what are the speech acts involved and the sequencing rules for these that are being followed in the discourse). If you really get into it, there is too much to say. So for the sake of staying focused, I will try to anchor the discussion on some linguistic features of the dialogue.

First, the patient's initial "*I know that...*" locution functions, to use a term of speech pragmatic theory, as a presupposition or propositional trigger. "*I know that*" embeds the proposition "*I have to leave*", thus suggesting that the latter is a declarative proposition which could be true or false. But, this is already complex and contradictory because the sub-predicate "*have to*" is not, strictly speaking, declarative in its form. It is more like an imperative, a command given to oneself. To use a term first introduced by the philosopher, Austin (1962), its illocutionary force, i.e., what kind of speech act it is, is ambiguous. It trades on other uses of "*have to*" which seem closer to reports of states of affairs rather than expressions of mere want or obligation. So, perhaps, we might

understand the speaker to be saying that she feels she ought to leave. This would count as a statement with a truth value - either she does or does not feel she ought to leave. But this is our gloss on her text, and certainly not the only one warrantable by what she said. What seems evident, just from the form of her words themselves, leaving aside any higher order psychological theory, is that the speaker or rather the speech means more than she or it says. Thus, we are compelled to examine connotations of key words and how these connotations condition each other. Making no pretention at exhaustiveness, I will list a few senses of "*know*" that might apply here: "feel compelled to"; "resignedly accept (that)" (this is perhaps communicated by the preceding "sigh"); "believe that you think I should"; "hope that you think I should (or should not)"; "want to"; etc. Also, various combinations of these seem possible such as, "believe-that-you-think-I should-plus-I-don't-want-to"; or "hope-you-think-I-should-plus-I-want-to"; (or, alternatively, "plus-I-don't-want-to"). Any connotation or combination of connotations will carry a slightly different motivational force, capturing different issues in how the speaker feels about herself, about the therapist, what she wants the therapist to feel or desire in the situation, what she wants the therapist to believe she feels or desires in the situation, and so forth. The question of which reading is most accurate or useful will be conditioned by many things, including one's own theoretical predilections and the patient's own self-understanding, whether theoretically informed or not, as best as one can discern it. And, of course, one's choice of reading will partly condition one's response, and one's response as therapist will retroactively confer a particular meaning or set of meanings on the patient's initial utterance. Thus, interpretive pragmatics and productive pragmatics are inevitably intertwined. One cannot have an action orientation in a situation without some reading of the situation's significance, and, vice-versa, one cannot have any understanding of the situation outside of all possible action tendencies or intentions. In short, we are always choosing our meanings even as we, seemingly involuntarily, create them.

But, I want here to advance two simple claims. First, you don't need a very developed theory to tell that something of interest is going on in attending to the utterance that we have been discussing. You can tell that the words mean more than they say by paying a little attention to how they are being used and in what tone they are being said. The point of developing a sensitivity to, say, ambiguous illocutionary forces is not to be able to sit there and say, "Aha! An ambiguous illocutionary force!" Rather, it is to sharpen our linguistic and social alertness to the many possible meanings and action possibilities of the situation without a lot of theoretical prejudice about what these might be. For example, a knowledge of the different illocutionary forces of utterances in the therapeutic situation that are ostensibly functioning as questions (coming from either the patient or the therapist) can help us become more aware of the many dimensions of the processes we are engaged in with our patients (Schneider, 1991).

Second, sometimes a fairly content-less awareness of possible subtext based on linguistic sensitivity alone can enable the analyst to question or comment on the patient's utterance as a tool to get a therapeutic investigation and/or interaction going. In the above sample, the opening sigh tips us off to surplus meaning. It seems to say that the patient has been engaged in some internal struggle. Thus, apart from explicit meanings, verbal quirks in tone and grammatical form, departures from normal discourse rules, truncated utterances, etc. can be clues to important matters and prompts to therapeutic inquiry. Such commenting and questioning was what I tried at first in the above exchange. However, I quickly deviated from a close following of the patient's "text." When she said, "*I guess*

it's time for me to leave", I asked what made her guess, but I did not let her answer the question. Instead, I moved in with a pronouncement, *"It's something you decide"*. What might have been going on here was a counter-transference reaction. I believe I heard the patient saying that she did not feel "cured" but rather exhausted, out of meanings, and doubtful about whether further progress could be made in the therapy. Since this was damaging to my therapeutic self-esteem, I unconsciously diverted the exchange onto an existential point about taking responsibility for one's decisions. Valid as this may be, it may not have been the most important issue at that time. Thus, out of counter-transferential anxiety, I allowed one of my theoretical attitudes to intrude on the flow of meanings.

But, what one might ask was this counter-transference or theoretical position about? What was at stake here? The patient's reluctance to assume full responsibility for the decision to terminate is not merely an expression of anxiety or lack of autonomy on her part. It is also, and perhaps just as importantly, a construction of our respective roles and, more generally, our emotional significances to each other.

She is playing by the social rule of therapist as expert. In this case, my presumed expertise is to know when she is finished with therapy, i.e., "cured" or "cured enough". It is this kind of expertise that I want to disown. The reasons for this would require a long discussion best reserved for another place, but let it suffice here to say that they involve values that are in some broad sense political. However, there is no way for me to escape from all attributions of expertise nor is it at all clear from the exchange that I want to do so. In saying, *"It's up to you"*, I am also asserting an expertise, to wit, my professional opinion that it would be best (healthiest?) for her to feel she can take on this responsibility. There is no way for me to avoid propounding a rule about our respective roles and attendant jobs and obligations. By calling oneself a therapist and setting up as one to whom another can come for help, one is necessarily claiming some kind of expertise, just as the other, in coming for help, is attributing expertise. Once one has chosen this role and meaning, many other meanings may follow, some of which may be unwanted by one or both parties and can become a matter of conflict or negotiation.

I do not know how many colleagues share my particular discomfort with the role of therapist as expert judge of another's mental health. But, I would venture to guess that at some time or other everyone in the field has experienced some role attribution that they want to disclaim. An interesting situation often occurs when a meaning (such as a role attribution) gets generated that neither party seems to want. This is the result of social and linguistic rules operating partly out of the control of either participant. It may be the case that something like this phenomenon was operative in the situation under examination here. Perhaps the patient was asking for my opinion about her leaving or staying not as an "expert" but merely as someone who is in a position to know because he knows her well. However, given that she is paying for her sessions and has come to me as one who presumably has some special skills for helping her, any request she directs toward me will take on the overtone of a request for my exercising professional knowledge. Everything she does or I do falls within this "contract", as it were.

But, to return to the analysis of the dialogue, this part of the encounter ended at the point where the patient said *"yeah, so I can decide...that's all..."* and then paused. This pause constituted a choice point for the therapist to speak or not, but it was a strange choice point. Insofar as the patient ends her statement on a note of finality, it seems as if she

were saying that there is nothing to add. Perhaps she is saying, "OK, You shut me up". But, in so far as the long pause seems to indicate that she is ceding her turn to speak, it seems I am being invited to say something. Or, perhaps, I am being both invited and disinvited to say something here. Again, you do not need a lot of psychological theory to see that this is the case. It just requires some sensitivity to the normal nuances of turn-signalling in conversation.² I opted for saying nothing, in effect invoking a psychotherapeutic rule at this point, to wit, the therapist is allowed to remain silent even if "normal" socio-linguistic rules call for a response. I did this because the only thing I could think of to say looked to me like it could be received as having a presuppositional and prosecutory edge to it, i.e., something to the effect of asking her why she wanted to disown responsibility for her decision.³ This, I feared, might have destroyed any possibility for mutuality and collaborative investigation at this point. (By the way, I think that it is useful for us to think about the specific reasons for silence at any particular juncture rather than follow the blanket analytic rule.) As it happens, the patient had plenty to say on the subject of her difficulty in deciding whether to leave, which is what took up the next section of the dialogue. One might guess that she felt enough freedom or urgency about her own agenda, however conscious or unconscious, to proceed in spite of my previous intrusion. (It may be that my silence indicated to her some willingness on my part to let her concerns resume a center-stage position.) I use the word "agenda" advisedly here because I think it is a propos given the indirection of her remarks. She starts off with a topic statement about how hard it is to say goodbye, and then launches into a story about an analogous situation about saying "good-bye" to someone else, Ed, from the group (for which I was also the therapist). One theme seems clear from this story, although she never makes it completely explicit. That is, she has some kind of fond attachment to Ed and, by implication, to me that makes it difficult to separate. However, she does not draw out the analogy or the theme of attachment specifically. Instead, she leaves a space for this. I feel called upon to fill it, and I do with my series of questions about whether she finds it hard to say good-bye to me. Why do I do this here, i.e., say for her what she seems to find hard to say? There are a number of reasons, none of which were pre-calculated strategically on my part. Basically, her message that she has some fond attachment to me makes me feel good, and on some level, not completely consciously, I want to let her know that I know that. My acknowledging the feeling says that I like it and that I reciprocate it.

Her following statement "*It trivializes...*" takes up an aspect of this theme and has many possible meanings of which I selected one with my comment to the effect that perhaps she thinks our ending our sessions together is trivial to me. That statement advances a psychological hypothesis that is not arrived at strictly by attending to language. There is a linguistic cue, of course, in her previous statement. There is an ambiguity of reference in the phrase, "*It trivializes*". The "*it*" seems to refer to the disembodied act of saying good-

² The question of the rules of turn-taking in conversation has received some attention from socio- and psycholinguists. This work is summarized in Pea and Russell (1987).

³ Bruner (1986) has a particularly clear discussion of presupposition and presuppositional "triggers" in discourse. Here, the "why" in, for example, "*Why don't you want to take responsibility...?*" would be functioning as a presuppositional trigger, i.e., it would be presuming the truth of the proposition, "*You don't want to take responsibility...*"

bye, but it could also include reference to the speaker and/or to the listener.⁴ One might say that the "theory" or interpretation was a latent possibility available to the therapist and was triggered by the patient's saying "*It trivializes...*". Her form of words gave me an opportunity to move in with this particular meaning, and I did so by pinning down the referent of the "*it*" in her statement to me, i.e., "*you think (fear) it's trivial to me*". I made the choice to advance my hypothesis out of considerations again not completely explicit to myself at the time. Most therapeutic exchanges, like most social Interactions, take place at high speed. We do not have time to scan our assumptions and strategies. Just as an improvising musician does not have time to consult his built-in "knowledge", i.e., the principles of technique or harmony, so, most often, we do not act from spelled-out strategic considerations. Rather, armed with our technique and our array of implicit theories, we take what the situation seems to give us, just as the jazz soloist improvises at the moment based on what he hears in the voicings laid down by the accompanist. One dynamic formulation of what is happening here is that the patient is expressing a fear that the therapist will get the message that the patient is unaffected by the termination of therapy. Perhaps, he will be hurt and/or not understand his own importance to the patient.

However, perhaps she is also expressing a fear that the leave-taking is trivial to the therapist. Maybe, she is expressing a dim awareness of the possibility that the therapist will defensively trivialize the relationship in his own mind if he hears her minimizing its importance to her. Further, maybe anticipating that the relationship is less important to the listener (Ed or me) than it is to her, she defensively trivializes it in her own mind and then fears the interlocutor may hear her trivializing it and may become hurt, etc. and so forth. So, in making one aspect of all this explicit, namely her fear that the relationship is trivial to me, I am perhaps dealing in many other resonances, but primarily I am reassuring her that it is not trivial to me. Was I aware of all of this at the time? Yes and no. It was a spontaneous decision on my part, not calculated but not uncalculated. But, could it be said I was choosing a meaning? Clearly, I was. Was I also choosing all the corollary meanings even though I was not explicitly aware of them? I am inclined to say that I was. But how could this be? How can one choose what one does not know? As therapists, I would submit that we do just this; that, paradoxically, we are responsible for what we do not know and, therefore, we choose what in commonsense terms we cannot choose, because it is our job to know that meanings are complexly numerous if not endless. I might add here that her drawn out "*yeahh*" followed by a smile and the comment "*isn't that absurd?*" and the more familiar "*so, I guess it's time to leave, huh?*" all could be taken as saying "OK, I got what I wanted (needed). I mean something to you, I know it and own it and that means I'm cured". Note that the patient here is implicitly playing by the rules of psychoanalytic attachment theory, even more so than the therapist who keeps avoiding special rules, reasons, and psychoanalytic theories of mental health by insisting "*It's up to you*".

We might ask if there are any other rules or assumptions, outside of specifically psychodynamic formulations, that either or both players are following in this exchange that would enable one to generate any of the various nuances of meaning just mentioned. I believe one such is instantiated here, and it may well be a common "rule" of social interaction in an egalitarian culture such as ours. It runs somewhat as follows: A believes that B's evaluation of A's significance to B will have some strong relation to A's

⁴ For a good discussion of problems of reference see Georgia Green's (1989) book "Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding".

evaluation of B's significance to A. This is the sort of cultural given that I referred to previously as seemingly too trivial to bear mention, but does exert an important pull on our social activity. If we become aware of such a rule, we will thereby gain another small measure of awareness and consequent range of function as therapists. This rule is operative in the above segment, the patient acknowledges my interpretation as accurate "*I know that's absurd*", and in her smile indicates she has received my implicit communication that the relationship is not trivial to me. Her next statement is interesting in the light of this last exchange. I can discern at least two messages in it. In saying, "*So, I guess...*" she is making an implicit connection between the leave taking issue and the question of our significance to each other (most saliently at this point, perhaps, her significance to me). The connective "*so*" is the tip-off here. But what is the nature of the connection between the question of termination and our significance to each other?

One subtextual reading is that the patient realizes that with our mutual admission that we value each other, a key dynamic issue of hers is thereby resolved. She can accept that she is a somebody. But, this is to attribute a psychodynamic meaning to her that she may or may not have. Another way to read it is to hear her as saying that now that this issue of our mutual significance is cleared up, she wants to know from me if she is truly "*done*".

The first reading puts us on equal footing more or less. At least, it does not call attention to any role asymmetry. The second reading operates within a framework of client and expert. She is asking for my professional judgment as to whether she is ready to leave. My response, "*It's up to you. It's for you to decide*" was clearly to this second subtext. One might say that my response was counter-transferential in what it did and did not respond to. Uncomfortable for both ideological and characterological reasons with the role of the expert judge of another's mental health, I made a somewhat moralistic disclaimer. Perhaps "bad faith" would be a better term than moralistic because it contained an instruction to her not to see me as an "expert", but paradoxically, this instruction was delivered from an expert's point of view. That is, I was in effect saying that it was my professional judgment that it would be best for her not to look to me as the expert judge of her degree of mental health. But, perhaps, apart from the specific content around the question of expertise, I was also counter-transferentially unwilling to acknowledge my importance to the patient and hers to me as central to the therapy. Here, in choosing one meaning, I was not aware of the meaning(s) I was not choosing to respond to. But, despite this lack of awareness, I would maintain that I was making a choice.⁵

With her next statement "*But, it's also...there are so many things to work on still...*" it seems that she is trying to convince me or herself or both of the supposed necessity of continuing, which she has already pre-judged. In particular, her statement that she has a long way to go seems to invite comment, seems to be invoking a "soft" conversational turn-taking rule, one perhaps especially germane to the therapy situation. That is, if A (the patient) says something and is convinced that B (the therapist) has an opinion about it, A's long pause means that B is now obliged or challenged to confirm or disconfirm A's statement. But, at this point, I play naive by refusing to confirm or disconfirm her statement "*I have a long way to go*". Instead, I ask her about her internal state or what she's thinking, i.e., "*What's up?*". This is a violation of the above-said soft rule of normal

⁵ However problematic, philosophically, the concept of unconscious choice may be, it is central to any psychodynamic view of human functioning (see Fingarette, 1963).

conversation. The reasons for doing this are a matter of therapeutic principle or ideology. I do not want to take responsibility for her decision to stay or leave by positing some absolute standard of mental health (How far she has to go). In several sessions immediately preceding this, she had raised the question of termination, and each time I had remarked that it seemed to me that she had done a lot of work, but she could stay or leave as she wished. On several occasions when she had brought up outstanding problems, I confirmed for her that these were things she was still working on, and that we all have things that we are still working on.

On the evidence of the present session, it is hard to determine just what she heard in all this. Insofar as I agreed with her that there were things she was still working on, she might have heard me as suggesting that she ought to stay. Insofar as I am saying that we all are still working on things (presumably including me, that expert and paragon of mental health), she might have heard me giving her diploma. All of these meanings are close to the surface, as it were, of our exchanges. They can be easily inferred from the form of words that we have been using. A more theoretically derived dynamic understanding of her motivation is that as she becomes able to see more about herself and becomes more active in the work, she gets afraid of her own progress and the eventual separation from me that this seems to imply. She then has two responses to this conflict. One is to seal over and say everything is hunky-dory or as hunky-dory as it is going to get. The other response is to re-pathologize herself and re-submerge herself in the relationship with me. When I pulled the analytic move by my silent refusal to respond to her statement/question/challenge about her having a long way to go, I believe she got a little angry and compressed these two responses of hers. She said in reply to my question about what she was thinking that she was *"tired of going over the same stuff"*.

This seemingly simple statement was actually quite complex. The *"same stuff"* that she is referring to is indefinite in its reference. It could mean the topics of the last few sessions, or everything we have been talking about from the beginning. In calling it *"the same"*, the patient seems to be denying that the way she has been talking about it with me is deepening her understanding or helping her to change. Thus, *"the same"* has the force of an accusation or criticism of me. "You're not doing your job" she seems to be saying "You're not helping me go deeper." It also seems to be a self-attack, a claim that she is still as screwed-up as ever and not getting anywhere. This take on what she is saying here derives not so much from dynamic metapsychology (although theory makes its contribution) as it does from a speech pragmatic reading of likely emotional responses to my refusal of her elicitation, that is the invitation to comment on her previous statement of how far she has to go. Among the many things at issue here is what Labov and Fanshel (1977), in their book on therapeutic discourse, call role strain and challenges to role competence. My silence is an instruction, to wit: You're supposed to figure this out for yourself. Her challenge is: Oh, yeah? You're not helping me like you're supposed to.

But none of this exchange is stark or openly angry. It is mitigated by tone. She has a tone of self-investigation, self-report, simple statement of fact. My *"Whyzat"* response is slightly humorous, seemingly friendly and curious. We are both playing down the conflict, preserving our own and each other's "face." However, when she said it feels like she has not made much progress (seemingly taking responsibility for this herself but leaving the possible meaning that I have been negligent or incompetent), I became uncomfortable. I did not want it to be agreed upon between us that the therapy was running down and ending in a failure or only a very limited success. For one thing, I did

not think this was so; for another, my therapeutic self-esteem was offended; and I also had the feeling that she was fishing for me to say the opposite. And I did that with my "Weeeelll...I don't know..." statement, which, by the way, has a little trick at the end when I say "I don't know if you can really say that". This is a pseudo-dispassionate disavowal of my self-interest in her not thinking this (which, interestingly, I don't really think she thinks). By saying "I don't know if you can say that" instead of saying "I don't know if I would say that" I am construing her statement as not being all that I hear it to be, in particular an attempt to get me personally involved in the question of whether or not she has made progress.

Finally, one last feature of the text calls for some comment. At the end when she says "OK" and "See you next week", I was experiencing some tension. I was acutely aware, whether erroneously or not, that what I said in response to these remarks could be taken as tacit approval of her desire to stay and/or my wanting her to decide to stay in therapy. Thus, I took great care to restrict the scope of my remarks to next week only ("See you then"), and was especially careful to make my "OK", echoing her "OK", completely neutral in tone, almost satirically so, such that it could not be taken to mean "OK, I'm glad you're staying" or "OK, I agree with your decision to stay". It is, of course, not clear that her "OK" was saying this. (In fact, we ended the therapy by mutual agreement two months later at the time of my and her summer vacation.) Rather, her "OK" may have been a response to my speech about no shoulds, something to the effect of "OK, I'll stop trying to palm this decision off on you" or perhaps "OK, alright already, stop preaching" or maybe "OK, no hard feelings". Here the "OK" has an ambiguous reference. However, it seemed to me from the whole tenor of (the emotional/pragmatic/semantic drift of) the session, that she could just as easily be saying "Ok, you've convinced me to stay", which is an action and motive that I wanted to disavow. Certainly, her statement about her chronic self-doubt, and need for and despair of her mother's approval seemed to be saying that although she had made progress, there was still significant work to be done. However, I was leery of prejudicing the case about how she could best make further progress. To that end, I strove mightily, one might say, a little forcedly or clumsily, in my speech about graduation, and in my terse, one might say, tense, final utterances, to present a neutral attitude about her staying or terminating, which, by the way, to the best of my self-knowledge, I actually felt. So, why all the striving to demonstrate neutrality?

I think, as I started to indicate above, the striving or protesting too much was an attempt to counteract lines of semantic force which seemed to be set up by our whole exchange to that point, to wit, that we agree that she should stay. Here is the power of language and the discourse taking a hold of both participants and potentially building a false consensus, a case of intertextuality run amok, outside of the participants' control or intention. The remark about missing her was also an attempt to correct something that seemed like it might be suggested by the whole preceding exchange. Namely, that I am the doctor without memory or desire dispassionately revealing to her a pre-existing truth that she is not in control of. This is a position which I find personally dishonest and dangerous.

Having presented a fairly detailed analysis, although not nearly as detailed as it could have been, of aspects of linguistic style in the therapy situation and their relation to the formulation of dynamic hypotheses, I want to summarize some of the linguistic/dialogic principles at play. First, linguistic dialogical/discoursal cues are our early warning system for knowing when something of psychodynamic and relational significance is going on. For example, conversational openings as revealed through the rules of sequencing and

turn-taking bear a functional relationship of unspecified complexity to therapeutic openings, i.e., opportunities for intervention of various kinds. Simply to codify a set of criteria as to what constitutes an opening would be a whole research project, let alone the attempt to characterize the relationship of conversational to therapeutic openings.

Second, if we want to hear all the possibilities of what our patients and we ourselves are saying and doing we must pay attention to the force(s) of utterances, that is, what kind of speech act a given utterance is, be it a statement, question, command, plea, entreaty, warning, promise, etc., plus the huge category of ambiguous or, as the linguists say, moodless utterances. There is a problem of over-simplification in this because it may be the case that the utterance is not the proper unit of analysis for the purpose of understanding therapeutic dialogue. This is because one utterance may have many forces, or different segments of an utterance may have different forces. And besides the question of illocutionary force, i.e., what kind of speech act is involved, there is the question of perlocutionary force, that is, the (consciously or unconsciously) intended and/or probable effect of the act on the listener which may not follow the divisions of utterance, but may rather be divided up along segments of utterances, distributed across utterances or be complexly embedded or nested in utterances. We are often, I would say, necessarily, doing many things at once and/or cumulatively over time. The above sample emerges out of the background of a long therapy that dealt with this patient's attachment to a disapproving parent, her consequent tendency to get involved in relationships (principally with male lovers) in which she was the subordinate party and another consequent tendency of persistent self-doubt about her life choices and competence. From my side, in the segment in which she doubts her progress in therapy, I can see retrospectively that I was responding counter-transferentially to being set up as the disapproving, judging parent (lover?). This response goes beyond the immediate dialogic, linguistic aspects of the exchange. In the whole emotional context of the relationship the words function not merely as bearers of quasi-propositional meaning but as emotional gestures, as actions.

It is important to remind ourselves that we can never have complete control of the consequences or construals of our actions, linguistic and para-linguistic. Because of the many meanings available to participants in an exchange, and the many different social and linguistic rules that come into play, there is a resultant opacity to intention, a kind of dialogic "practico-inerte" to use Sartre's (1963) phrase. Whether or not this is more prevalent in the therapeutic encounter than in other situations, it behooves us as therapists to have a healthy respect for the extra-intentional (which, incidentally, I do not mean as coterminous with the "unconscious").

If we become aware of the contingency of meaning in the practico-inerte of interaction, that is to say, if we are cognizant of meaning's resistance to our control, then the activity of the therapist becomes the continuous attempt to enter the stream of meanings and the continuous effort to nudge the flow in one direction or another without necessarily having a grand plan or master interpretation. Respect for the "thingness" of meaning can help us see through the naiveté of the view of therapy as the linear application of higher order metapsychological theory (and technical postulates derived therefrom) to clinical "material." To see the limits to what we can control and definitively understand is to revision our concept of what therapeutic skill is all about.

References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fingarette, H. (1967). *Self-deception*. London, UK: Routledge, Kegan Paul.
- Gergen, K. J. & Kaye, J. (1992). Beyond narrative in negotiation of meaning. In S. McNamee and K. Gergen (Eds.), *Therapy as social construction* (pp. 166-185). London, UK: Sage.
- Green, G. M. (1989). *Pragmatics and natural language understanding*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hoffman, I. Z. (1991). Discussion: Toward a social constructivist view of the psychoanalytic situation. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, 1, 74-105.
- Hoffman, I. Z. (1992). Some practical implications of a social-constructivist view of the psychoanalytic situation. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, 2, 287-304.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Labov, W. & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *The phenomenology of perception* (C. Smith, Trans). London: Routledge.
- Pea, R. D. & Russell, R. L. (1987). Ethnography and the vicissitudes of talk in psychotherapy. In R. L. Russell (Ed.), *Language in psychotherapy* (pp. 303-338). New York, NY: Plenum.
- Peräkylä, A., Antaki, C. Vehviläinen, & Leudar, I. (Eds.) (2008). *Conversation analysis and psychotherapy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Sartre, J. P. (1963). *Search for a method* (H. Barnes, Trans.). New York, NY: A. Knopf.
- Schneider, P. (1991). The analyst's questions to the patient. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, 27, 552-573.
- Siegfried, J. (Ed.) (1995). *Therapeutic and everyday discourse as behavior change*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing
- Spence, D. (1982). *Narrative truth and historical truth*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Tilly, C. (2006). *Why, what happens when people give reasons...and why*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Todorov, T. (1984). *Mikhail Bakhtin: The dialogic imagination*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Psychoanalytic Literary Criticism: Using Holland's DEFT Model as a Reader Response Tool in the Language Classroom

Lubie Grujicic-Alatryste¹
City University of New York, College of Technology

Abstract

Language students tend to struggle with literature because they find psychological and socio-cultural implications embedded in literary texts difficult to understand and discuss (Kramsch, 1996). This paper suggests that psychoanalytic literary criticism may offer a reading framework that could mitigate the struggle and allow for a deeper level of personal and social exploration of literary works. The DEFT model (Defense, Expectations, Fantasy and Transformation), as one type of reader-response approach to reading that draws on the psychoanalytic framework, might make the reading of literature easier because of its potential to offer to students strategies for finding a point of entry into the text. According to DEFT, the inability to find a point of entry into a new reading may be one of the reasons for finding a literary piece difficult, for 'disliking' or outright rejecting it. This qualitative study shows how the DEFT approach, originally created for native speakers but thus far little researched in relationship to non-native speakers, can be used to facilitate the reading of literary works in a language course.

Introduction

Literature used to dominate language teaching in the first half of the twentieth century. With the development of a stronger focus on linguistics in language teaching, the role of literature was seriously challenged (e.g., Topping, 1968). Concerns were voiced that literary language could be difficult for all readers, but even more so for non-native speakers due to non-standard language use, colloquialisms and 'loose dialogue' (Topping, 1968). Thus, it was suggested that literature be used less frequently as a tool for teaching language.

Since then, the place of literature in language learning has been debated in both second and foreign language teaching (e.g., Carter & Burton, 1982; Carter & Long, 1991; Hill, 1986; Kramsch, 1996; Povey, 1967; Spack, 1985; Widdowson, 1983). More recently, though, useful pedagogical resources for teachers have been developed and used in English as foreign language teaching (e.g., Collie & Slater, 2002; Lazar, 2000).

The theoretical issues dominating the debate on the relationship between language learning and literature translated into research studies that generally focused on well established reading variables such as word recognition, vocabulary gains, language

¹ Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Lubie Grujicic-Alatryste. E-mail: lalatryste@citytech.cuny.edu

knowledge (grammar and syntax), text structure, reading strategies, motivation, recall, and comprehension (Grabe, 2004). Reader-response approaches to reading literature have not been prominent in second language research studies. While first language reading research boasts a number of studies examining the role of reader response methods (e.g., Sadoski et.al., 1988), and foreign language research (in USA contexts) examines reader response methods such as reading logs and journals (e.g., Redmann, 2005), second language reading research remains fairly silent on this topic. There may be a few reasons for this silence.

One reason is the current predominance of non-fictional prose as basis for multiple choice reading tests and a growing focus on assessment and discipline-based reading and writing in many academic English classes in the USA educational contexts. Second, some of the anxieties about literature persist. For example, Kramersch's (1996) finding that non-native readers tend to approach literary works with trepidation because they often find short stories or novels difficult to understand or discuss is still echoed by many today. Some teaching methodologies may also have contributed to the feeling of trepidation on the part of the learners. For example, discussing literary works in the classroom by calling on students to analyze the readings in a whole class format could be highly intimidating and anxiety-ridden. Also, the teacher's expectations for students to be able to 'instantly' upon reading a story explain complex psychological and socio-cultural issues raised in literary works, or connect them to their own realities, may be a cause for discomfort to some language learners (Kramersch, 1996).

Many of these views, though relevant, are somewhat overstated (Spack, 1985; Widdowson, 1983). Students struggle with literature in part because they are asked to explicate complex texts or to analyze them within more formalist traditions that place emphasis on the view that the core meaning is embedded in the text and needs to be 'found.' Such teaching approaches do not recognize the role of the reader as a meaning maker in this process. However, using reading approaches that recognize the reader as a central participant in interpreting the text and author may liberate both the learners and the classroom by facilitating the process of tapping into the text on a personal level first. So, perhaps the issue is not so much about literary language being too difficult and beyond the capacity of language learners to comprehend it, but rather about finding a reading approach that is most relevant to non-native speakers' reading needs.

Thus, what students need is support with both language and reading processes in order to be able to read, understand and enjoy literature in a second language. One way to help them is to offer "reading tools" or specific responding strategies in order to find a way to initially engage with a text and, during a multi-stage reading process, gain higher levels of both comprehension of the text and recognition of its personal, social and world relevance.

This qualitative study describes a reading tool called the DEFT (Defense, Expectations, Fantasy and Transformation), originally created by Norman Holland (1975), using psychoanalytic criticism as its principal framework. It views reading as an active process lived through during the relationship between a reader and a text (Rosenblatt, 1968). The questions this study set out to answer were: Can the DEFT be used with non-native speakers of English in the same way as with native speakers? Will the DEFT make finding a point of entry easier for non-native speakers? The research findings show that the DEFT model is a valuable tool for discovering a point of entry into the text and also

for maintaining a more intense reader engagement with the text. The reading tool discussed in this study allows for gradual development of textual and thematic understanding and personal interpretations utilizing multiple readings, written responses and discussions that are low risk and student centered. Low risk is particularly important for language learners as it brings learning anxieties down and allows for more language intake and processing, and generally more successful learning (Ellis, 1985).

This article presents two students' pathways to a higher level of comprehension of psychological and socio-cultural issues in two short stories by American authors: "Happy" by Joyce Carol Oates and "The Story of an Hour" by Kate Chopin. The two-month process involved multiple readings of the stories and recordings of responses in the reading logs (layering), with minimal 'intrusion' from the teacher, and no evaluative feedback. The teacher held class discussions and facilitated pair and group work by guiding students in the use of the DEFT model, but was doing so without direct teaching of the model.

Although this study applies a model of analysis that was originally created for native speakers of English to non-native speaker responses, its main focus is not second language acquisition (SLA) but the process of making meaning while reading and responding to literature. Vocabulary featured in the analysis as a starting point for DEFT elements, but language was not examined in terms of proficiency gains, vocabulary knowledge, or recall.

Theoretical overview

This study is framed within psychoanalytic reader response criticism for two main reasons: a) its emphasis on the central role of individual responses in the reading processes, and b) its concept of the need to find a point of entry into the text (Holland, 1975) – something all readers, particularly language learners, might need in order to more deeply engage with the text. Holland's research is broadly used as a base for the analysis of student responses. Thus, a brief overview of pertinent studies conducted by Holland is provided here, and relevant references are made to the theoretical works of Freud.

Holland started his work on literary criticism by experimenting with a number of psychoanalytic concepts and applying them to different readers' responses while reading literature (1975; 1985; 1990). His early works evidence a fundamental belief that reading is a deeply personal, emotional and psychological process during which the reader and the text interact to create meaning. As he contends, "It is impossible to subtract the subjective elements in a reading from the objective, for each helps create the other [through] each reader's characteristic psychological process" (1990, p. 40). This process allows for textual meaning to be created through weaving done by the author and the reader. In short, reading is, in many of its aspects, a psychological process – a view embraced in this study.

Psychoanalytic criticism in literature can be traced back to the works of Freud (Meisel, 1981). Literary criticism borrowed key elements from classical Freudian psychology in an attempt to gain insights into reading processes and the role of personal and individual – the psychological – in the interpretations of literary works. Both 'Id' and 'Ego' psychology play a role in reader response interpretations. Classical Freudian Id-psychology considers sexual instincts as the determining force in an individual's life. In

line with this concept, art, and by extension literature, is seen as the secret embodiment of its creator's unconscious desires (Wright, 1984, p. 37). According to Id-psychology, authors – when creating works of art – express their childhood experiences and innermost, secrete desires. Ego-psychology counters the idea that all art is a product of infantile desires. Rather, it claims that authors take infantile material and transform it into works that are publicly shareable and acceptable (Wright, 1984, p. 57). The conscious ego-instincts, concerned with self-preservation and the need to relate to others, are in conflict with the 'id' or the energies of the unconscious and the sexual instincts. Within ego-psychological criticism, a text is a shared, wish-fulfilling fantasy of both the reader and the author. In other words, in the area of literary criticism ego-psychology highlights the maintenance of identity through transformation of private fantasy that can be publicly shareable, whereas the Id-psychology privileges the maintenance of private fantasy and infantile desires, which are not publicly shareable.

It is the notion of private fantasy that Holland began to explore in the reading responses of his students. He realized that literary contexts have the potential to bring out a reader's fantasies and secret wishes precisely because such reading frameworks can make those fantasies and wishes more socially acceptable. Thus, the text becomes a place where the author and the reader collide around the core-fantasy shared by both. This is a major premise that allowed for building the DEFT model and later on applying it in teaching.

In his very early work "*The Dynamics of Literary Criticism*" (1968) Holland examined fantasy, wish-fulfilling and daydreaming phenomena. He created a dictionary of fantasy based on the stages of child development, as given in psychoanalysis: oral, anal, urethral, phallic, oedipal, latent, and genital. Holland began the analysis of a number of literary works by first listing vocabulary and literary expressions that could reflect each of the seven stages of child development. For example, words that relate to dirt or mess would be considered part of the 'anal' stage, food tasting or eating would be considered part of the 'oral' stage, whereas wetness would be considered urethral. Holland attempted to show that the world of adulthood is tightly connected with one's early childhood development, and that childhood fantasies tend to persist in adult works of art--and by extension in literature.

Fantasy and defense were the main tools in conducting an in-depth analysis of reader responses in his seminal work, "*Five Readers Reading*" (Holland, 1975). For his analysis, Holland adopted Freud's triad of character traits: parsimony, orderliness and obstinacy (Meisel, 1981). Using the short story "*A Rose for Emily*" by William Faulkner, Holland conducted exploratory interviews with five students in order to discover patterns in students' characters and personalities that could lead him to insights into the way the mind works while one is reading literature. Holland painstakingly examined vocabulary his five student readers used when referring to the story, plot, and characters' actions. He also recorded students' free associations and personal stories they brought into the discussion of the short story. His study emphasized the idea that reading literature and talking about literature is not about the 'right' responses to the teacher's questions, but rather how responding can help a student connect to the story, or to her/his inner and outer reality. It is this aspect of Holland's research that was of particular interest in the present study. The following ideas put forward by Holland (1975) are relevant here:

The stories do not mean in and of themselves. They do not fantasy, or defend, or adapt, or transform. People do these things, using stories as the occasion for a certain theme, fantasy, or transformation. The problem then becomes understanding, not the story in formal isolation, but the story in relation to somebody's mind. Not a mind hypothesized, hypostatized, assumed, positioned, or simply guessed at - but real minds in real people (p. 39).

Holland's extensive research resulted in the formation of the DEFT model, which stands for defense, expectations, fantasy and transformation. Within the model, the reading transaction is viewed as consisting of four fundamental steps: the reader's initial approach to the text (expectations), her/his being selective in what s/he takes in (mode of defense), her/his projection of wish-fulfillment (fantasy), and her/his translation of fantasies into themes (transformation). The idea of defense is borrowed from psychoanalysis to mean "the actions of ego which refuses to accept what it cannot tolerate" (Holland, 1975, p. 22). Defense, in this context, is directly related to the 'liking or disliking' of the text and the ability of the reader to either be 'absorbed' in the text (taken out of oneself and merged with the characters and the happenings in the story), or left "flat" by the same. The story's act of meaning is adaptive because "meaning transforms primitive fantasies toward social, moral, and intellectual themes" (Holland, 1968, p. 105). Defense, which is unconscious, is activated automatically when any kind of threat or danger appears in our lives. People try to modify their fears and fantasies according to their own perceptual matrices so that they can tolerate them and adapt to them. In Holland's words (1968), dream and fantasy are important elements in the reading process because, as he explains: "A literary work dreams a dream for us. It embodies and evokes in us a central fantasy; then it manages and controls that fantasy by devices that, were they in mind, we could call defenses, but being on a page, we call form" (p. 75).

The role of DEFT in the present study

Both defense and fantasy are considered core concepts in the present study. However, it should be noted that although this study applied Holland's DEFT model, it did not use the seven pre-set vocabulary stages from his original study of five readers reading a text. Instead, the responses were generated based on the readers' self-selecting attractive, interesting or otherwise important parts of the short stories they were reading.

Anecdotal evidence tells us that all readers tend to initially respond to literature by the level of liking it (or disliking it, as the case may be). Within the DEFT framework this translates into the idea that readers experience defense when faced with literary selections they 'dislike' because they actually cannot 'enter' the text and begin to read, understand and ultimately appreciate it. This problem of not being able to find a point of entry may even be more pertinent for non-native speakers or language learners. Language students have different proficiency and reading comprehension levels. They come from diverse socio-cultural backgrounds and bring specific life experiences and expectations to

classroom readings, so it follows that different students will make sense of what they read differently (Holland, 1990). Within the reader-response framework, multiple readers make the interpretation of the same text fluid, not fixed. Consequently, there are infinite interpretations of each text since each reader brings his/her unique character, personality, and expectations. Thus, reading is a highly personal act during which we, the readers, after having met all the characters ultimately meet ourselves, or as James Joyce pointed out and Holland (1975) adopted it and used it to depict this process so aptly: “We walk through ourselves meeting robbers, ghosts, giants, old men, young men, wives, widows, brothers-in-law. But, always meeting ourselves” (p. 113).

When we read, indeed we may meet all these characters in our mind and within our own life experiences and expectations. This idea rang true for the participants in the present study as they, during the reading and layering processes, at various times reported that there were ‘parts of them, their lives’ in the stories they were reading.

Method

Participants

The participants in the study were two Japanese female college graduates who were taking a high-intermediate language class at an educational institution in the North-East United States. For the purpose of this study, their names were changed to Aniko (twenty-seven years old) and Kimiko (thirty-five years old). They both used to work in Japan but were not working in the USA. They were both married without children. They had spent about four years in the United States at the time this project was conducted.

Materials

The two stories used to generate data and responses were “*Happy*” by Joyce Carol Oates and “*The Story of an Hour*” by Kate Chopin. Both stories were written by female writers and involved female characters: in “*Happy*” the main character is an adolescent girl, and in “*The Story of an Hour*” it is a married woman. Family and marriage are addressed to varying degrees in both. This aspect reflected the gender theme on the syllabus as well as the overarching concepts of family relationships, dependence and independence. The short story “*Happy*” is about a daughter who returns from college to spend Christmas vacation with her mother. At the airport, the daughter meets her new stepfather. As they begin the journey home, the girl’s emotional and psychological journey unfolds. The three characters in the story are nameless. In the second story “*The Story of an Hour*” Mrs. Mallard gets the news of her husband’s sudden death. She instantly experiences a great sense of liberation and joy only to find out that the news was due to a misunderstanding. Her husband appears at the doorstep and she herself dies of “joy that kills.”

Data collection and procedure

Since this study is ethnographic in nature, the data was both generated and collected by assigning reader response tasks to students. The specific method for generating data is called layering: students were asked to do multiple readings of each short story and record their responses each time. The data collection instrument was a ‘Reader-Response

Worksheet' here also called the reading log because the students compiled a number of such worksheets thus creating a log (see Appendix A for the generic form of the sheet/log). The worksheet contained two columns with instructions to students:

Words/Phrases:

“Record the words that you feel are important to you; or that you feel you want to react to”.

Why I chose The Words:

“Write down why you chose a particular word or a phrase; explain how it made you feel; or what you connected the word with (what kind of experiences did you connect that word to, from your own life)”.

The same steps of layering were repeated for both stories: the students would read the story in class or at home, do some initial responding and then share (in groups or pairs) general reactions such as liking or disliking the story. Then they would be given the worksheets to use at home while reading for the second time. They would return to class and discuss the story's themes and relevant cultural concepts. They would go home and read the story again and respond to it. The final stage asked the participants to reread their responses and comment on them. The teacher regularly read the logs and returned them to the students without making any comments in the logs themselves. However, she would address, indirectly, the DEFT components by probing for expectations or fantasies while observing pair work. This method is in line with an 'unobtrusive' observational model of applying reader-response in the classroom, also known as 'undirected' (e.g., Dias, 1995).

The study

In order to show the process of reading and to trace the responses in relationship to DEFT, each story will be presented in the following way: first the layering process will be described from the first to the fourth reading. Then, the data generated during layering will be analyzed. Since the elements of the DEFT were not all noticeable right away but rather they emerged throughout the process, the chronology of the reading and responding is important – it shows the reading transaction processes. Thus, this article is organized following chronological rather than thematic order.

Layering Processes for the First Story “Happy”

The students were given a handout called “Reader Response: A Guide for Students”(Appendix D) and asked to read the story for the first time in class. Some vocabulary work was done in class. The teacher asked general questions, such as “*Did you like the story?*” and “*Why or why not?*” or “*How did you feel about the girl?*” The participants' answers were also general, and somewhat unenthusiastic. The students thought the story was 'okay' and 'interesting'. Although the students were encouraged to freely express their reactions in a relaxed, friendly manner, they remained quiet in the classroom, a phenomenon documented in research (e.g., Kramsch, 1996). They limited their utterances to short responses such as, “*She was sad*” or “*The girl was uncomfortable*” but did not venture further. The responses appeared to indicate struggle, either because the students felt unable, or ill equipped, to go beyond flat statements in the

public space of the classroom. It could also be that these two participants did not feel an initial connection to the story. They showed no apparent liking of the story.

The perceived student reluctance (or inability) to comment and their apparent disliking of the story provided an opportunity to indirectly introduce the DEFT model as a tool for dealing with ‘fears’ of the ‘unknown’ that the theme of the story might have stirred up in the students. The teacher gave a handout to students with questions that refer to fear, expectations and fantasies (see Appendix E). The students read the story at home for the second time and recorded their responses to self-selected words. In order to initiate the discussion about fears, the teacher asked the students to read some of the words from the story that they recorded in the logs. The following expressions came up: “*the pancake makeup, in a husky voice, his sideburns grew razor sharp*”. The teacher explained the words in relationship to the story’s characters and their realities – those of the newly remarried mother and her new husband. After the vocabulary explanations, the students interacted more but their resistance was still noticeable. They were not engaged with the story on a personal level. Within the DEFT, this behaviour may indicate defenses, or an ego not accepting what it does not understand or cannot tolerate. Perhaps, the ‘sordidness’ of the main characters created discomfort and disliking in these two Japanese female students.

The third reading and layering generated more comments and perhaps the defenses began to come down. This stage of class work called for the sharing of log entries in pairs. The students didn’t have to talk to the teacher, but they did speak with their conversation partners. This approach appeared helpful because the students discovered that others experienced similar disliking of some aspects of the story (e.g., the sordidness of the new husband). Such realizations, facilitated by sheltered participation (i.e., pair and group work), are particularly valuable because class work is at a level of sharing not judging or criticizing one’s ability to respond to the story. The teacher walked around, took random notes but did not make comments or interfered in any way with the discussion.

The final layering of “*Happy*” brought more sharing when discussing the mother’s second marriage and the daughter-stepfather relationship. The process clearly helped by gradually increasing the levels of personal engagement and also finding a point of entry, initially absent on the part of both students.

Discussion of Layering Results for the First Story “Happy”

The layering process revealed a few insights into the elements of the DEFT. Of the two participants, Kimiko appeared more willing to explore the multiple meanings of the story “*Happy*”. She was older and also more comfortable discussing her feelings and talking about her childhood, thus showing an ability to transform her fears into the beginnings of an understanding of how the story related to her own life. The second student, Aniko, however, participated less in the discussions admitting that she disliked the story and was unable to identify with either the plot or the characters. She saw the story as ‘silly’ because the characters were doing ‘silly’ things (e.g., the mother drinking in front of her daughter). Any indirect attempt by the teacher to elicit responses to the story by trying to get Aniko to engage in discussing her own relationship with her mother met with strong resistance. Aniko maintained that her childhood was happy and her parents were such different people that she simply could not imagine a family like the one depicted in the story.

Within the DEFT model, Aniko's reactions can be interpreted as an expression of discomfort discussing what could be perceived, socially, or otherwise, as inappropriate behavior. Breaking social norms, such as a middle-aged woman (and a mother) having a sexually charged relationship with her new younger husband may have contributed to Aniko's defensive reactions. Kimiko also hinted that such a relationship was 'wrong,' particularly because it took the mother away from what should have been her first priority – her daughter. She wrote (Appendix B-1):

“It's inappropriate action that mother drink, with her lover at the bar and that show adults' world to their children”.

Interestingly, both Aniko and Kimiko commented on the hugs and body contact between the mother and the daughter. It was more than they had ever experienced growing up, they said. This particular point in the story incited a discussion about “body distance” in two cultures. They revered the closeness Americans exhibit when with their children or family members. Kimiko's log entries included comments on the word ‘hug’ by stating that the scene where the mother and the daughter hug was ‘impressive’ because of “*the difference of body language between Westerners and [the] Japanese*” (see Appendix B-1). The desire to experience closer family relationships may have contributed to this reaction. When viewed through DEFT, the layering process seems to have brought out some elements of fantasy in their responses.

Layering Processes for the Second Story “The Story of an Hour”

The layering steps for the first short story appeared to have helped the process of reading and responding to the second one. The students knew what to expect from the layering. In “The Story of an Hour,” the main protagonist, Mrs. Mallard, is mistakenly informed of the presumed death of her husband. She experiences a flood of liberating feelings and overwhelming joy. But, when her husband shows up at the door alive and well, she unexpectedly dies.

This time, the process of layering was slightly altered so the students had to do the first reading at home and record self-selected words and phrases in their logs. In class, the first discussion turned out to be lively: the students had a lot to say about this story. There were a lot of language points though that needed attention, so class time was spent on explaining the meaning of expressions such as “*in broken sentences*”, “*hastened to forestall*”, “*away off yonder*”, “*her fancy was running riot*”, and “*save with love*”. These phrases were either new vocabulary or confusing usage in the text. English language learners tend to feel more secure when they understand the vocabulary that they perceive as difficult, so time was spent on vocabulary explanations.

After the second round of reading and recording the reactions in their logs (at home), the second-class session focused on discussing the responses in pairs. The same steps were repeated for the third reading. After the fourth reading, a general discussion of gender themes ensued. The teacher took notes of the discussion, but did not add her reactions to it.

Discussion of Layering Results for the Second Story

The participants Aniko and Kimiko had different reactions to the story. Their entries revealed a fair number of personal notes. Aniko did not like Mrs. Mallard's reaction to her husband's death. Mrs. Mallard's marriage was, in Aniko's view, "*bad and unsuccessful*" (see Appendix C-3). Aniko's defenses seemed high probably preventing her from engaging with the text more fully. The progression towards finding a point of entry was slow for Aniko. Contrary to Aniko, Kimiko found the story interesting (see Appendix B-2). She thought about "*movement of emotion, how it came out...interesting expressions*". She was moved by the words "*subtle, elusive...words that could explain everything*". Kimiko understood Mrs. Mallard's emotions, she said, but she could not understand "*what her [Kimiko's] real emotion [was]*". She was confused. Slowly she connected her marital experience to that of Mrs. Mallard's. That was a liberating transformation for Kimiko.

Kimiko's Layering

The first round of Kimiko's responses dealt with the feeling of joy, of being overwhelmed with, and at the same time motionless from, the "*sudden powers of freedom*". She wrote (see Appendix B-2):

Even though her [Mrs. Mallard's] conscience was beyond common (generally accepted) sense, her character attracts me very much. I understand such kind of feeling [physical exhaustion that haunted her body] like condition of despair. It reminds [me] of similar experience and condition.

Kimiko found a connection with the character and an entry into the story. She appeared engrossed in the story and her involvement suggested, within Holland's framework (1975), an "absorbed type" of a reader. During the second reading, Kimoko recorded a list of adjectives, such as "*subtle, elusive, fearful, and tumultuous*". Kimiko also chose to quote "*repression, pulses, and blood*". She followed the process of awakening possibly because she found it relevant to her life. She further wrote (Appendix B-3):

"The most important thing is our feeling (not logical thinking) or repressed feeling".

Within the DEFT model, this could be interpreted as an expression of one's own fantasy of being emotionally liberated, expressing her feelings freely, not just with her husband or friends, but within her own culture. She also recorded her own search for something that she could not name (Appendix B-3):

"I feel that I am expecting and looking for something (but I don't know) into this story".

Kimiko might have expected to find answers to her own sense of repression, or a feeling of being torn between traditional Japanese spousal duty and personal ambition. Her own choices of words are – on some level – almost as strong as Chopin's (Appendix B-3):

“[I] was really excited by these vivid expression!” [Here relating to “her pulses beat fast and the...blood warmed and relaxed every inch of her body.]

Kimiko also traced the emergence of the ‘new’ Mrs. Mallard evidenced in the list she made: *“self-assertion, body and soul free, days that would be her own”*. Within the DEFT framework, her comments on the “feverish triumph” may have revealed fear, perhaps of her own exaltation or hidden desires to be free (Appendix B-4):

“I’m afraid of complete things (referring to ‘triumph’), perfect and unshakeable victory. In this situation, I always think about unexpected twisted ending”.

While working through her responses, Kimiko made sense of things based on her own life experience. Drawing such personal parallels clearly helped her with story interpretation and comprehension. With each round of reading, Kimiko made new discoveries and produced fuller responses. Particularly revealing is Kimiko’s third round of responses. She repeated some of the previously recorded phrases from the story, such as *“haunted her body, tumultuously, and pulses”*, and she made personal connections to them (Appendix B-5):

“This story reminds me of my own painful experience. In spite of these feelings, I can’t stop reading these stories. Maybe like Louise [Mrs. Mallard], my soul look for (wait for) something. But I’m not looking for my husband’s death”.

At one point, Kimiko resorted to Japanese and wrote in Japanese characters on the page for lack of the right word that would most closely define her feelings (Appendix B-5). Although she might have not had all the English she wanted in order to express her reactions, it seems that the lack of full language proficiency was not an obstacle in the layering process. The students utilized whatever English they had in order to work through the reading. The life of the story’s characters and the literary world took over language concerns. Each layer of responding seems to have taken Kimiko deeper into the text and closer to her own feelings and personal realizations.

Aniko’s Layering

It was apparent that Aniko went through different experiences while reading the story and her recordings showed different reactions. Aniko stated that she came to the text of *“The Story of an Hour”* with certain expectations. In her words, she was a married woman and therefore wanted to read the story from that point of view. She began responding by writing the following (Aniko’s original language is maintained):

“Mrs. Mallard is a married woman as well as me, so I thought (expected) that I would read this story from this point of view and I thought (expected) that I would somewhat identified with her. While going on reading, I felt bad because she was happy (I’m not sure if this word is appropriate or not) to be free although it was happened by her

husband death [...]I thought that the reason why she was happy is that her marriage had been unsuccessful. I defended myself? I would not be glad to be free in case of my husband's death because our marriage is successful".

Aniko implicitly disliked the idea that Mrs. Mallard's happiness stemmed from her husband's death. She labeled Mrs. Mallard's marriage as being unsuccessful and quickly compared it to her own – which was successful (see Appendix C-3 for the progression of entries and for additional comments and textual clues). It is interesting that Aniko realized that she might have been defending herself. She was trying to rationalize her responses. Within the DEFT framework, Aniko may have rejected the feelings that Mrs. Mallard expressed possibly because Aniko's ego could not tolerate the idea of being happy rather than crushed by one's husband's death. The rejection in this context could be a defense mechanism against her own vague thoughts that she, like many women, felt oppressed (to an extent) in her marriage. However, unlike Kimiko, Aniko did not choose to pursue this avenue of exploration, although she could have. The defense against possible self-realizations and discoveries about her condition may have been the strongest element in her reading process. The second reading produced a very short response. Aniko continued to explain her reading process (Appendix C-4):

"When I read the story for the second time I tried to find the difference between her and me. That's one reason I read the story considering the era and environment. Of course whenever I read any story background is very important".

Aniko's rational approach to the reading was evidenced in her statements that *"background is very important"* (i.e., the information about the author provided in class). She then further explained (Appendix C-4):

"She [Mrs. Mallard] was suppressed a lot as a woman in such kind of time. I'm not suppressed at all by anything".

An interesting feature of Aniko's log entry is her heightened sense of self. She worked through the text by making comparisons between what she thought was driving Mrs. Mallard's actions and her own actions. During the third reading, Aniko commented again on her reading approach (Appendix C-4):

"I read carefully about her emotional progress".

The first sentence in her log written for the third round of reading appears to qualify her approach to responding method again. Under a subheading "Storm of Grief" Aniko listed the words from the text: *"paralyzed, physical exhaustion, suspension of intelligent taught"* (Appendix C-4) as examples of Mrs. Mallard's grief, but perhaps also as her own paralysis and suspension. Then, she traced the transition from grief – *"striving to beat back, relaxed, exalted"* – to joy. In her explanation (given in a boxed-off paragraph), Aniko tried to come up with alternative reasons for Mrs. Mallard's still unacceptable happy feelings (Appendix C-5):

“I still try to think the possibility that she made herself think that in order to protect herself, weaken the sorrow”.

In her later re-reading of the entries, Aniko called this process an elixir. After three readings of the story, Aniko was still stubbornly trying to come up with excuses for the way Mrs. Mallard was feeling. Within Holland’s character theme, obstinacy would be the dominant trait. Aniko couldn’t let go of the feelings created by the initial contact with the story and her responses to it: the initial strong rejection of the overarching premise of a wife feeling joyous upon hearing the news of her husband’s death.

During the fourth reading, Aniko focused on Mrs. Mallard’s and her husband’s feelings for each other. She wrote that for the first time during this final reading, she noticed that Mr. Mallard loved his wife (Appendix C-5). Aniko showed partial understanding of Mrs. Mallard’s feelings, and though still rejecting them, she slightly sympathized with her (Appendix C-5):

“Still, I don’t want to accept that. But can imagine her feeling (not completely). I was afraid that I might start thinking if I’m inhibited and suppressed or not”.

On the final page of the log she unexpectedly opened up and admitted (Appendix C-6) her fears:

“I have avoided to read these kind of story about marriage life because whenever I read these kind of story, I become nervous”.

It is this truth that perhaps freed Aniko’s responses. She realized that most of the time, she was avoiding such topics instead of dealing with them. The multi-reading model appears to have assisted the process of finding a point of entry. Though it took four readings in order to reach that level, it is certainly an important point for teaching as it illustrates the process that can help the students to achieve fuller reading experiences. Clearly, not all classes can set aside this amount of time to work on facilitating the process of finding a point of entry into the text, but this analysis shows a useful way of encouraging the journey towards self-realizations.

Additional findings

In order to gauge the results of the complex process of layering that the two participants completed for both short stories, additional elements were considered such as: scope of responses, amount of detail, any noticeable change in attitude towards the characters, levels of personal associations, and spatial/topographical aspects such as special notes on the page, the use of boxes for words or sentences, underlining, capitalization of certain words and any additional comments done during the last stage of layering. The discussion below takes all of these elements together based on the DEFT model.

Kimiko’s answers grew in scope and depth from the first responses to “*Happy*” to the final entry to the second story and they more closely followed the worksheet format. In layering to “*The Story of an Hour*”, she grappled with social and moral aspects of the

story in relation to her own life. Aniko, however, had a very different approach to log writing and responding. The first thing that stands out in her entries is the organizational style of the responses. Her first response was really a neat vocabulary list. She began by reflecting on the progression of her understanding of the story and the language used (Appendix C-3). From the start, Aniko tended to be more practical and rational in her approach. She took time to check each new word and to labor over the meaning of some syntactically entangled sentences. Her self-awareness as a language learner was also high as she wrote (Appendix C-3):

“Moreover as a second language learner, I tend to emphasize understanding the meaning of word and sentence rather than the theme”.

Aniko started her responses with pragmatism, possibly because she struggled to find a point of entry. Her defense was to use what she knew: the method of listing vocabulary, writing the words down, checking them for meaning and systematically working through each paragraph, as if doing a language exercise for homework.

In terms of the volume of responses, the second story yielded more copious log entries. Kimiko filled three pages with the phrases from the original text (see Appendix B-2 to B-5), in comparison to only one page she filled in response to *“Happy”* (Appendix B-1). The making of meaning seems to have been created through Kimiko’s associations to her own life experiences and, in that, it lends support to Holland’s suppositions about the point of entry. She connected her own feelings with the ones Mrs. Mallard experienced. Kimiko’s defenses could have been down, as she seemed to be no stranger to the feelings of despair or unconscious searching for fulfillment. Kimiko said that she had such times when *“[she] didn’t feel anything, couldn’t think and didn’t know why [she] was crying”* (see Appendix B-1).

When considering Aniko’s responses within the DEFT model, it appears that she revealed her fears as an afterthought, or in addition to her primary response of rejecting, disagreeing or disliking. Her defenses seemed to have slightly come down in the last layering process in the form of a postscript (P.S.), disclosing her suspicion about women’s position in the society “because of [her] experience” (Appendix C-6). Although she used the afterthought format of the post scriptum, she spoke more openly in it about her true reactions to Mrs. Mallard’s social conditioning. In some ways, the P.S. was a hiding place that allowed these comments to appear as being less important, or to be overlooked. But in fact, they may have been important feelings. Aniko added the P.S. during her final review of her entries.

Finally, the log entries could be read as a long narrative because each student reader, in a way, ‘storied’ her own story by “creating her experience of the literary work from her own lifestyle” (Holland, 1975, p. 63). Aniko stubbornly defended her beliefs about marriage but she reached at least a level of sympathizing with the character, though not accepting what she disliked. Kimiko enjoyed the experience and shared her own life stories. Within the two-month process, both students seemed to have grown more comfortable with their responses. Their explorations went beyond the surface to reflect personal and general life experiences.

Conclusion

The appeal of the DEFT model lies in its considerable potential to be a self-sufficient reading tool. The study in this article has shown that the texts were engaged at a very personal level, perhaps because it may be a natural point of entry for most people – to tap into what they already have: their own life experience and move from there to more abstract ideas. Critics could argue that this very aspect of the reader-response approach may bring diametrically opposite outcomes. Some students may feel intimidated by being asked to share those very private feelings – albeit in their logs only, and therefore their defenses may be an impediment to successful reading experiences. However, the use of the DEFT model allows for gradual adaptation. The teacher and the students can work through the reading stages at different points in time and the re-readings can help build students' confidence and ease.

Although this is a case study detailing the reading experiences of only two student readers, some conclusions could be made – though cautiously, pending larger studies and replications of this one. The students seem to have made a number of gains from their participation. By employing the reader-response model, the students, as evidenced in their logs, arrived at new insights about themselves, the social context around them, and the story itself. As a result, they may be able to use their experience with this approach to other literary texts in the future and grow intellectually, emotionally and socially (Vinz, 1999). These generally positive reading experiences could influence the amount and quality of future engagements with literature.

Finally, the log entries might have helped their language and vocabulary development. Despite some textual challenges, difficult vocabulary and expressions less frequently heard in daily English, these second-language learners showed that they could read and work with short stories as native speakers can. The model can be used for both populations-- native and non-native speakers of English. Future classroom methodologies can be adapted to more closely meet the needs of language learners, such as building into the layering process more initial work on language and vocabulary. Although not the focus of this particular study, it is recommended that future studies consider the relationship between the DEFT model and SLA.

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank Professor Ruth Vinz of Columbia University (Teachers College) for introducing Reader Response Criticism and Holland's work to me. She opened new avenues of literary exploration in my classrooms and changed my view of reading, text and the role of the reader. Special thanks go to my students for their participation in this study.

References

- Carter, R. & Burton, D. (1982). *Literary text and language study*. London, UK: Edward Arnold.
- Carter, R. & Long, M. (1991). *Teaching literature*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Chopin, K. "The Story of an Hour". <http://www.KateChopin.org/the-story-of-an-hour>
- Collie, J. & Slater, S. (2002). *Literature in the language classroom*. Cambridge: UK: CUP.
- Dias, P. (1995). *Reading and responding to poetry: Patterns in the process*. Portsmouth, NH: Boyton/Cook.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: OUP.
- Grabe, W. (2004). Research on teaching reading. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 44-69.
- Hill, J. (1986). *Using literature in language teaching*. London, UK: Macmillan.
- Holland, N. N. (1968). *The dynamics of literary response*. New York: OUP.
- Holland, N. N. (1975). *5 readers reading*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Holland, N. N. (1980). Unity. Identity. Text. Self. In J. Tompkins (Ed.), *Reader-response criticism* (pp. 118-134). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.
- Holland, N. N. (1985). Reading readers reading. In C. R. Cooper (Ed.), *Researching response to literature and the teaching of literature: Points of departure* (pp. 3-12). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Holland, N. N. (1986). Re-covering 'The Purloined Letter': Reading as a personal transaction. In R. C. Davis (Ed.), *Contemporary literary criticism* (pp. 363-376). NY: Longman.
- Holland, N. N. (1990). *Holland's guide to psychoanalytic psychology and literature-and-psychology*. New York, NY: OUP.
- Holland, N. N. (1993). A portrait as rebellion. In R.B. Kreshner (Ed.), *A portrait of an artist as a young man: Case studies in literary criticism* (pp. 279-294). New York, NY: Bedford Books.
- Kramsch, C. (1996). Literary texts in the classroom: A discourse. In L. A. Jacobus (Ed.), *Teaching literature* (pp. 121-136). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lazar, G. (2000). *Literature and language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: CUP.
- Meisel, P. (1981). Freud: A collection of critical essays. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Oates, J. C. (1986). "Happy." In *Raven's wing*. New York, NY: E. P. Dutton.
- Povey, J. F. (1967). Literature in TESOL programs: The Language and the culture. *TESOL Quarterly*, 1(2), 40-46.
- Redmann, J. (2005). An interactive reading journal for all levels of foreign language curricula. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(4), 484-493.
- Rosenblatt, L. (1968). *Literature as exploration*. New York, NY: Noble.
- Sadoski, M., et al. (1988). Imagination in story response: Relationships between imagery, affect, and structural importance. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23(3), 320-336.
- Spack, R. (1985). Literature, reading, writing and ESL: Bridging the gaps. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(4), 703-725.
- Topping, D.M. (1968). Linguistics or literature: An approach to language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 2(2), 95-100.
- Vinz, R. (1999). "Horrorscapes". In *Forming adolescent identity and desire*. Manuscript.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1983). Talking shop: On literature and ELT. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 37(1), 30-35.
- Wright, E. (1984). *Psychoanalytic criticism: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: Methuen.

Appendix A

Appendix A: Worksheet (Log)

READER-RESPONSE WORKSHEET

WORDS/PHRASES

Record the words that you feel are important to you; or that you feel you react to

WHY I CHOSE THEM

Tell me why you chose a particular word; Explain how it made you feel; or what you connected it with (the kind of experiences from your life)

Appendix B-1

Appendix B-1

HAPPY

Title: tiny, small happiness in the difficult situation.
(before reading) soft light in the darkness

- (kind of)
- ① The girl might part from her mother with a bad feeling.
 - Even if ^{the} time has passed to melt this feeling, she still has complex feeling and she can't accept her.
 - hug: impressive scene ^{some} for me. (difference of body language between Westerns and Japan (??))
 - The girl keeps distance from her mother.
 - She feels her mother getting old. At the same time, she recognizes her mother as a woman.
 - ② Mother's new husband: right person.
Mother: she looks happy without reason.
 - ③ The girl: she suppresses her feeling — but not indifferent (she hopes Mother's happiness)
Mother = emotional / childish — ^{she} can't see her around.
 - ④ The girl recognizes ^{gap} distance between children and adults listening to people's conversation. ^{adobe}
(It's inappropriate ^{action} that mother drink with her lover at the bar and that show adults' world to their children.)
 - ⑤ Girl's mother is unilateral (she never try to find her daughters' ^{true} voice)
 - Mother's new husband "Your mother is a high class lady."
"There's nobody in the world precious to me as that lady."
→ Author tells us that everything (including "happiness") is a relative world. (↔ absolute)
Happiness is different depends on people. in the

Appendix B-2

Appendix B-2

<u>Second Reading</u>	
- she did not hear the story as many women have heard the same, with a paralyzed to accept its significance.	Even though her conscious is ^{was} beyond common (generally accepted) sense, her character is ^{very} attracts me very much.
- She wept at once, with sudden, wild abandon in her sister's arms.	I
- Into this she sank, pressed down by a physical exhaustion that haunted her body and seemed to reach into her soul.	I understand such kind of feeling. (like the ^{kind of} condition of despair)
- new spring life - delicious spring rain was in the air - patches of blue sky	dim expectation of hope.
- She sat with her head thrown back upon the cushion of the chair, quite motionless, except when a sob came up into her throat and shook her, as a child who had cried itself to sleep continues to sob in its dreams.	It reminds me of similar experience and condition. (I didn't feel anything, I didn't could ^{couldn't} think and I didn't know why I was crying. In this condition, our <u>body</u> knows how to <u>reset</u> our soul.

Appendix B-3

Appendix B-3

<p>- she was young, with a fair, calm face, whose lines bespoke repression and even a certain strength....</p>	<p>She has a strong will naturally?</p>
<p>- A kind intention or a craft intention made the act seem so less a crime</p>	<p>Even if she did not know what it was, she ^(five sense?) her sense organ feels many things.</p>
<p>there was something coming to her and she was waiting for it fearfully. - she did not know.</p>	<p>vague feeling^{is} gradually expanding toward recognition of ego?</p>
<p>- It was too <u>subtle</u> and <u>elusive</u> to name but she felt it</p>	<p>This process ^{of} awakening of feeling is interesting for me. We can ^{easily} talk about independence women's rights, ^{and} independence using ^{tons of} concrete words and expressions. But (I think)</p>
<p>- creeping out of the sky, reaching toward her through the sounds, the scents, the color that filled the air.</p>	<p>most important thing is our feeling passion (not logical things) ^{or} repressed feeling. It produces passion and becomes our activator to the hope.</p>
<p>- with her <u>brown</u> nose and fell <u>tumultuously</u>.</p>	<p>I feel that I'm expecting and looking for something (but I don't know) into this story.</p>
<p>- her pulses beat fast and the coursing blood warmed and relaxed <u>every</u> <u>inches</u> of her body.</p>	<p>^{was} I, really excited by these vivid expression!</p>

Appendix B-4

Appendix B-4

<p>They would be so powerful with beauty here in that blind persistence with men and women believe they have a right to impose a private will upon a fellow-creature.</p>	<p>I really feel authors' hatred ⁽¹⁷⁾ against "existing common sense" kind of "security" between man and women especially disregard (indifference) of private will.</p>
<p>And yet she loved him - sometimes often she had not.</p> <p>the unsolved mystery</p> <p>self assertion which she suddenly recognized as the strongest impulse of her being!</p>	<p>Maybe she her marriage life was not happy. But in my mind, sometimes she love and hatred feeling sit back to back especially in marriage life ... Even if "she" it were "And yet she loved him sometimes she didn't."</p>
<p>Body and soul free!</p> <p>she was drinking in a very <u>drift</u> of life through that opens windows through</p> <p>all sorts of days that would be her own</p>	<p>Her change of feelings ^{were} condensed in only one hour.</p> <p>It is interesting.</p>
<p>It was only yesterday she had thought with a shudder that life might be long.</p> <p>There was a feverish triumph in her eyes</p> <p>an amazingly like a goddess of Victory.</p>	<p>I'm afraid "complete things" and "so perfect" and "unshakable victory." In this situation, I always think about "unexpected twist" ending.</p>
<p>heart disease <u>of</u> joy that kills</p>	<p>This expression really attracted me: In one sentence, English can express kind of unexpected twist. I want to know how to translate this phrase into Japanese.</p>

Appendix B-5

Appendix B-5

<3rd reading>	<Why I chose them>
- There was a dull stare in her eyes, whose gaze was fixed away off yonder -	On my 3rd reading, I found that I ^{was} always imaging 3 scenes when I was reading this story.
- physical exhaustion that <u>haunted</u> her body	(1) Louise's eyes remind me of M ^{rs} Bovary's eyes. (When I first read it, I was single and it was not impressive story at that time...) Now their feelings attract me. Maybe I'm married woman...
- how her bosom rose and fell tumultuously. - She was striving to beat it back with her will - as her two white slender hands would have been	(2) When I read this story, I feel kind of pain. It's so hard to analyze my feeling. This feeling is quite similar when I read Beauvoir's "The second sex". She expresses women's problems directly. But author's ^{women's} messages are different from Chopin. There is They have something common messages.
- her pulses beat fast - coursing blood warmed and relaxed every inch of her body	(3) This story reminds me my own painful experience (especially my 1st year of marriage life) I really hate Japanese (?) way of thinking of marriage customs. Usually women are trying to be invisible (dull?) to these problems. I can't translate in English. but it is not in English "Women become women after they framed in a frame." ^{women's} this phrase seem real to me when I read this story.
- There would be no one to live for her during those coming years: she would live for herself. powerful / bending / right impose intention self assertion strongest impulse her being	In spite of these feelings, I can't stop reading these stories. maybe like Louise, my soul look for (wait for) something. (but I'm not waiting for my husband's death.)
- Body and Soul free!	I'm strongly attracted by her vivid expression under such situation. (Chopin) ^{rising} and attracted by process of sense of organ in independence. 2. ... it is dead
- heart disease of joy that kills	

Appendix C-1

Appendix C-1

- storm of grief After the storm, it's always clear day.
- Open window She opened her mind? (heart)
- a comfortable roomy chair She is free from suppression
- new spring life her new life without husband
- suspension of intelligent thought She had been restrained by intelligent thought, so when she lost it, her real mind came out (intelligent thought is commonsense of society)
- She was waiting for it, fearfully. She was afraid of accepting the idea.
- coursing blood warmed and relaxed every inch of her body. → her heart trouble was owing to her suppression? She seemed to get better from the heart problem.

Appendix C-2

Appendix C-2

monstrous joy →
trivial

Her soul had not been living
~~in the past~~ so far.

Now she realized that
caring the conscience of society
virtue (generalization) are trivial.

blind persistence

She can't stand that people don't
doubt just tolerate (copy)
custom, society and the
value of man and woman.

frank - stoned, composedly

going back to reality of
daily life

Her heart problem came back.

Appendix C-3

Appendix C-3

Four elements

The development (progress) of my understanding is very slow because I took three times reading to understand the meaning of sentences and words. Moreover, as a second language reader I tend to emphasize understanding the meaning of word and sentence rather than the ~~theme~~ theme.

* the First time

- Mrs Mallard is a married woman as well as me, so I thought that I would read this story from this point of view and I thought that I would somewhat identified with her.



- While going on reading, I felt bad because she was happy (I'm not sure if this word is appropriate or not) to be free although it happened by her husband death.



I thought that the reason why she was happy is that her marriage had been unsuccessful.

3/26

Now I'm thinking

I feel like that.



I defended myself?

"I would not be glad to be free in case of my husband's death because my marriage is successful."

Appendix C-4

Appendix C-4

★ For the 2nd time

I guess

When I read the story for the second time
I tried to find the difference between her and me.
That's one reason I read the story considering
the era and environment. Of course ~~it~~
whenever I read any story background is
very important.



She was suppressed a lot as a woman
in such kind of time.



I'm not suppressed at all by ~~anything~~
(~~defending myself~~)

★ For the 3rd time

I read carefully about ~~the~~ her emotional progress.

Storm of grief



- paralyzed
- physical exhaustion that haunted her body and soul
- suspension of intelligent thought



She saw the town's daily scene which ~~was~~
full of vitality

Appendix C-5

Appendix C-5

↓
Something came to her and she was waiting for it fearfully
↓
She was striving to beat it back
↓
accept it
relaxed
exalted
↓
Joy

X I still try to think the possibility that she made ~~herself~~ think like that in order to ^{have had to} protect herself; weaken the sorrow
R elixir

* For the 4th time

At the first meeting, I learned that her husband had loved her.

↳ Now, I have to correct my subjective impression.

fear | Still, I don't want to accept that, but I can imagine her feeling (not completely) I was afraid that I might start thinking if I'm inhibited and suppressed or not.

Appendix C-6

Appendix C-6

Actually, I have avoided to read these kind of story, about marriage life because whenever I read these kind of story, I become nervous.

I had left this problem unsolved and I will do so again.

ps I feel like that the progress she accepted her idea is somewhat of similar to mine. I'm suspicious that ~~she~~ ~~she had~~ ~~inhibited~~ ~~herself~~ ~~also~~

Not only her husband ~~and~~ (society) but also herself inhibited her.
↳ because of my experience

↑

She had tried to conform to the society
She had forced herself
Taking advantage of her husband's death
She accepted herself.

Appendix D

Appendix D

Reader Response: A Guide for Students

Story Title: _____
Story Author: _____

Recording Words and Phrases

In this column, note down the words that draw your attention, that you find different, powerful, strange, beautiful, horrible, personal, relevant to your life.

How to find such words?

As you are reading the story, record the words that draw your attention because they are new to you, or they are long, or they are strong-sounding such as 'razor-sharp'¹— you know that a razor is a sharp instrument so having such a word in the text may have a special meaning.

How to Express Your Feelings?

You can try to connect to your feelings by asking: How do I feel about this character? Do I care? Do I feel sad about their life? Do I dislike them? If so why? Do I feel anger, ambivalence? These questions should help you express your reactions to the story.

List some of your feelings here, as you are reading the story for the first time in class.

What do you think are the main themes in this story?

What do you think, personally, about the theme: how is it relevant to you? How does it relate to YOU, YOUR life?

HELP WITH THE READING LOG TASK

As you are reading the short story at home, for each paragraph record in your log the following:

- The most important happening or action
- The most interesting characters or thoughts
- What images you developed as you were reading

Appendix E

Appendix E

Second Round of Reading and Layering: A Guide for Students

Here are some helpful tips you should consider while reading the short story for the second time in earnest at home. Remember that we touched on most of the elements of the reader-response in class.

1. Write down what you think the title means. Did it affect your expectations of the content of the story? As we said in class, when we start to read a story, we usually have some sense of what we may expect, or what we think would happen in the story. Sometimes, the expectations are very pronounced if we heard recommendations from friends, or we read the review of the story. But most of the time, we don't know much about the story. Still, with the first paragraph, we start building expectations. As we read on, we may make predictions about the characters and events in the story.
2. As you read each paragraph, please write down your reactions to the ideas, images, descriptions of people and places. Try to record any thoughts that come to your mind.
3. Once you have completed the log, re-read the entries. Consider what you wrote within your own cultural background. Can you connect the story to your cultural experiences? Can you see any of your personal fantasies in the story? Did the story encourage you to fantasize about your own life?

Book review

The Handbook of Conversation Analysis. Jack Sidnell, & Tanya Stivers (Eds.). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013, xvi + 844 pages, £120.00 (hardcover), ISBN 978-1-4443-3208-7.

Emotion in Interaction. Anssi Peräkylä, & Marja-Leena Sorjonen (Eds.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2012, 326 pages, £45.00 (hardcover), ISBN13: 978-0-19-973073-5.

Reviewed by Michael B. Buchholz¹
International Psychoanalytic University (IPU), Berlin/Germany

Reviewing Conversation Analysis (CA) “at the Century’s Turn”, Emanuel A. Schegloff predicted the “further development of our understanding of the organization of talk and other conduct in interaction itself” and to “register the particularities of its realization” (Schegloff 1999, p. 142). John Heritage (1999), additionally, foresaw a future where qualitative and quantitative approaches will “shift from basic CA to ‘applied’ analysis and back again” (p. 73). Both predictions can be viewed as fulfilled when one opens the two books under discussion here. These enormously rich volumes cannot be reviewed in their entirety, I have to select certain contributions of relevance for researchers in psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. But I will try to give an impression of the books as a whole.

“*The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*”, edited by well-known researchers in the field, is divided into five parts. The first part studies “Social Interaction from a CA Perspective”, its contributors lay the groundwork by presenting the historical and academic origins of CA, debate the special kind of “naturalistic”, not researcher-driven, data collection that is so characteristic of the field, discuss the methodology of transcription and present basic CA methods of analyzing data. Any reader will feel knowledgeably instructed, even if one knows the field. There is much to learn by these excellent summaries.

The second part on “Fundamental Structures of Conversation” is on another kind of basics, those of the theoretical type, such as turn construction (units), transition relevant places, sequence organization and preference, repair and overall structural organization. Just from reading the table of contents one can learn what a huge field of knowledge, theory and data, has been collected here and what a consistent body of terminology, secured in naturalistic data, has been able to be established in recent years.

The third part, “Key Topics in CA” demonstrates the networking of CA research activity. Many people in cognitive science work on such topics as embodiment, on gaze and emotion or affiliation – but nowadays most people connect these topics with

¹ Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Prof. Michael Buchholz. E-mail: buchholz.mmb@t-online.de

neurobiology or brain science. With the help of naturalistic data, things here sometimes look different than in the lab. McCabe et al. (2006) looked at the theory of “theory-of-mind” using CA in naturalistic settings with schizophrenic patients and found these patients to indeed have a theory-of-mind, but to use it differently. This is an important correction to what is commonly assumed in similar work in brain and cognitive science. Many corrections of that kind can be found in the articles of Part III in the “*Handbook*”. Cognitive researchers see emotions as something produced in a person’s brain. Ruusuvoori, however, shows “how people observably orient to an underlying affective structure in conversation” (p. 336). By observing and co-constructing emotion as an interactional resource and by attributing meaning to what is observed participants might be considered the most sensitive scanners for each other’s emotion. This is an important fact when psychotherapists of every kind begin to explore what they mean and do by using the word “empathy”. Ruusuvoori has much to tell about this that might interest readers of counseling professions, too.

Person reference, prosody, grammar and storytelling are names for research areas where modern technologies of analyzing talk come to be applied. Gareth Walker finds audiographic measurement to play an important role in analyzing turn-constructive units. His conclusions on transcription conventions need to be debated seriously. Participants react to these subtleties (which is something that can definitely be shown) and this must have, the author concludes, consequences for the transcription system introduced by Gail Jefferson following the mandate to put down in the transcription “what you hear”. Obviously, there is much more to be heard – if it is made viewable by audiographic technology. This overview of what happens in detail while we are talking is instructive for the question of what “clinical facts” are (Tuckett 1993, Tuckett 2012). There is much more in the psychoanalytic consulting room than what we can discuss when we have case presentations based on memory protocols only.

Jenny Mandelbaum makes a contribution on “story telling” and includes “embodiment” by summarizing CA research on recipient responses – through the body movement of listeners. She is led to the conclusion “that the particular practices used to tell stories in institutional settings contribute to the constitution of the setting as an institutional one” (p. 506) – obviously, there is something like a circularity between the institution and the kind of practices observed in telling stories: who might dare say that this is not important for psychoanalytic settings?

The impression of deep relevance for psychoanalysis is furthered in part IV, dedicated to “Key Contexts of Study in CA: Populations and Settings”. Medical communication or analyses of conversation in the court- or classroom are “classical” topics in CA research. But there is more. Mardi Kidwell summarizes CA research on “interaction among children”. She presents data from a corpus of more than 500 hours of natural interaction, videotaped and transcribed with children of about two years and a half – about their altruistic helping behavior. How these behaviors are composed and where in a sequence of actions they are positioned is described in detail. Pictures from the videos illustrate what is observed and described. Children move from onlooker to helper. In the day care settings adults are seen by the children as those whose first obligation it is to soothe, console and comfort a crying child, but “as a matter pertaining to the culture at large, it seems that even children this young search for someone to help...” (p. 531).

Another contribution by Anssi Peräkylä leads the analyst even closer to the consulting room. “Talking is indeed the key activity in all psychotherapies” (p. 551), this author begins with, and one wonders why this inescapable insight is so rarely taken as a stimulus for more research on psychoanalytic conversation. Anna O. had termed psychoanalysis a “talking cure”, Freud echoed that not more happens in psychoanalysis than an “exchange of words”. The analysis of conversation in the consulting room(s) should become an object of heightened interest in psychoanalytic process research. Peräkylä studies psychoanalytic talk. This talk is marked by “an endemic orientation in the therapist, and usually in the patient, to examine the patient’s talk beyond its intended meaning” (p. 552). How this “beyond” is handled in conversation might be a topic of interest. It seems to be a common conviction, shared by both participants; and Peräkylä shows how this conviction is “translated” in conversational practice: by formulations, interpretations and responses, using epistemic markers and perspective markers: “Thus, in delivering an interpretation while speaking about the patient’s mind and circumstance, the therapist still uses his or her own ‘voice’ in full strength” (p. 558). Peräkylä’s data are transcriptions of psychoanalytic sessions which cannot be reproduced here. Patients respond to interpretations with elaborations and show their (dis-)agreement. This is a crucial difference to hearing a medical diagnosis; here patients usually remain silent. “Resistance” and “affiliation” are further topics of CA analysis Peräkylä presents. He concludes that psychotherapy might be a practice “far less uniform than the medical consultation is”. This is as important as his next hint that CA should turn to clinically relevant issues. The more general point is the methodologically difficult description and definition of “deviant” conversations. Antaki and Wilkinson contribute to this with a summary of relevant research of conversation of “atypical populations”. At any rate, there is a growing hunch and evidence that there are links between cognition, conversation and culture and that the different strands of research can be brought to fruitful conversations.

Part V sees “CA across the Disciplines”. CA has roots in sociology and in linguistics, its rich influences touch psychology and anthropology and “standard” communication research. All these lines, seen from CA as the core methodological endeavor, are covered with important contributions by authors specialized in these areas. If psychoanalysis and CA could find a balanced way of cooperation, the one could enrich the other with deep insights that might form a balanced counterweight to the momentary psychoanalytic interest in neurosciences only. Psychoanalysts might remember how social our discipline, how culturally determined psychoanalysis, how linguistic and conversational our everyday tool – talk - is.

The same impression is furthermore strengthened when one turns to the book “*Emotion in Interaction*“, edited by Peräkylä and Sorjonen. Emotion – this is what most psychotherapists of whichever orientation think to be “their” genuine field. But, in academia there is no sole proprietor of anything. “Emotions” belong to the opera and its enthusiasts, to the scholars of literature, to family members, to the spin doctors of political communication and, of course, to scientists of different proveniences. And to psychoanalysts, of course. If one wants to know in what special way emotion is treated in psychoanalysis, one has to study how emotion is treated in other fields of knowledge. Otherwise, you cannot compare. Within CA approaches there are a lot of perspectives.

Marjorie Goodwin, Asta Cekaite and Charles Goodwin cover “emotional stance” using as an example how emotions are conveyed in refusals as a special kind of social action.

Although all authors refer to “basic emotions” and their expressions, still at the same time all authors also find that emotion per se is a kind of abstraction that cannot be found in the empirical world; emotions belong to particular social actions such as refusals, requests (as Wootton shows in a transcription of interaction with a very young child), directives, story-telling (contributions by Maynard and Freese) and complaints (Couper-Kuhlen). Emotions are constitutive parts of how actions are performed and perceived. Modern societies have implanted a lot of institutional mechanisms of emotion regulation and emotion control, of which psychotherapy (Voutilainen) is a part as well as health visiting (Heritage and Lindström). As in the “*Handbook*”, the question of how to transcribe emotion utterances becomes an entire subject of study. Markku Haakana uses a re-transcription by Gail Jefferson to show how it has become possible to transcribe the entire features of “fake” laughter. Alexa Hepburn and Jonathan Potter approach the same methodological issue in their contribution on “Crying and Crying Responses”.

So, emotions are not only “basic”, produced with evolutionary progress. They are not only perceived and interpreted and attributed by listeners, participants, viewers and bystanders. They also have action tendencies and cognitive aspects without which we would not be able to appraise many actions and human “objects”. Wootton analyzed the expectations of a child between two and three years who produced strong emotions when the parents did not fulfil the child’s expectations – which had been met just a second before. Appraisals and their breaks are prone to producing emotions - this conclusion must be drawn. Emotions do not only come bottom-up from the depths (of the brain), sometimes they come top-down. CA methodology will have to have a debate on how to include cognition. This includes unconscious cognitions, too. “To a large extent processes related to emotions are automated and nonconscious” (p. 282), psychoanalyst and conversation analyst Peräkylä summarizes in his very knowledgeable epilogue.

Emotions are a multifaceted object of interest. They should not be considered as producers of interaction. It might be more correct to reverse the order of causation: social interaction is the medium with the power to evoke and regulate human emotions. This, of course, is the topic where so much of psychoanalytic research can come in – on borderline patients, on the early developments of patients with psychotraumatic stress disorders, on neglected children, on the cognitive abilities of autistic children. And the net can be cast even further to include mirror neuron research, to the body as an important actor in conversational scenarios, research on the difference between inner experience and outer, social expression.

One thing remains to be mentioned. In a contribution to the “*Handbook*” John Heritage writes about epistemics that drive sequences. Meant here is not only the wish to know, it is the wish to balance knowledge so that participants in a local interaction share a common level of situated relevance. Those who ask who Peter is in a story told, are informed by the teller of the story: “he’s my brother-in-law” and the balance of knowledge is repaired. One can assume that there lies a lot of potential to analyze how emotions are produced in this conception: if this need for sharing knowledge, for the balance of influence and participation is hurt, emotion is produced. This happens in child rearing, in political discourse, in social practices in every second in the world. The link between emotion, cognition and conversational practices, thus, can be seen as a common orientation of research for the future in cooperation between psychoanalysis and CA. Our societies as a whole will profit from this.

Both books present in an excellent manner the state of the art, in CA in general and in CA-emotion research. They harbour the power for a mutual fruitful exchange with psychoanalytic knowledge and clinical experience. Psychoanalysis will have to adapt to the standards of data generation and presentation as usually practiced in CA. Transcripts, not protocols, are state of the art in data presentation and this should be acceptable by a profession that is urged to present its empirical approach. Empirical research is more than statistics and questionnaires, it is conversation that psychoanalysts engage in every day. Here we have a method that is taken seriously worldwide to analyze this talk in interaction in a precise and insightful way. And in many details this method comes close to clinical experience.

On the other hand, psychoanalysts might seriously contribute to the meanings of some kinds of exchanges presented in the details of such data. A very tricky matter in the future will be whether the general CA-premise of “order in every point” (Garfinkel 1967) is valid at every point? How can borderline-talk be made orderly? If it can, there must be meaning in it, detectable according to clinical convictions only if conversation analysts come to include an (auto-)biographical dimension as a useable methodological tool. The category of meaning-making through conversation can be expanded with psychoanalytic expertise. These books should enrich a stimulating debate between those two so important fields.

References

- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Heritage, J. (1999). Conversation analysis at century's end: Practices of talk-in-interaction, their distributions, and their outcomes. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 32, 69–76.
- McCabe, R., Leudar, I., Healey, P. G. T (2006). What do you think I think? Theory of Mind and schizophrenia. *Proceedings of XXVII Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, 1443–1448.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1999). What next?: Language and social Interaction study at the Century's Turn. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 32, 141–148.
- Tuckett, D. (1993). Some thoughts on the presentation and discussion of the clinical material of psychoanalysis. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 74, 1175–1189.
- Tuckett, D. (2012). Some reflections on psychoanalytic technique: In need of core concepts or an archaic Ritual? *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 32, 87–108.