L2 LEARNERS' BELIEFS REGARDING SHORT STORY ANALYSIS AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THEMSELVES AS READERS

Dr.Aynur Kesen
English Language Teaching Department
Çukurova University, Adana, Turkey

ABSTRACT

Reading literature is highly associated with the readers' engagement with the texts and their personal reactions to what they read. Individualized meanings, creation of responses and filling in the gaps facilitate both the comprehension and the reflection upon the text. In addition, the nature of reading literary text emphasizes the need to reflect on personal theories and be aware of the fact that reading literature means discovering not only the text but the self as well. The present study aims to investigate learners' beliefs about analysis of short stories. The goals of the study are (1) to discuss high priority construct of each participant and (2) to investigate whether participants whose high priority constructs showed patterns of change over time also display change in their perception of current self and ideal self. Third-grade learners at English Language Teaching Department, Faculty of Education, Çukurova University were the participants of the study.

Key words: Personal Construct Theory, Reader Response Theory

ÖZET

Edebi metinlerin okunması büyük oranda okuyucuların metinle olan etkileşimleri ve okuduklarına verdikleri kişisel tepkilerle bağlantılıdır. Bireysel yorumlar, verilen tepkiler ve metindeki boşlukların doldurulması metnin anlaşılmasını ve metinle ilgili yorumların yapılmasını kolaylaştırır. Buna ek olarak, edebi metinleri okumak, okuyucunun kişisel teorilerini yansıtmasını ve edebi metinleri okumanın sadece metni

değil okuyucunun kendisini keşfetmesi gerektiğinin farkına varmasını vurgular. Bu çalışmada ketılımcıların kısa öykü analizi hakkındaki görüşleri araştırılmaktadır. Çalışmanın amaçları (]) her katılımcının kısa öykü analizinde en önemli olarak nitelendirdiği görüşlerin belirlenmesi ve (2) bu görüşlerinde belirtilen zaman aralığında değişiklik olan katılımcıların kendileri ve ideallerindeki etkili okuyucuyla ilgili görüşlerin değişiklik gösterip göstermediğidir. Çalışmaya Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı 3. sınıf öğrencileri katılmıştır.

***Anahtar Kelimeler:** Kişisel Yapısalcı Yaklaşım, Okur Merkezli Yaklaşım*

INTRODUCTION

The textual features of a work, the reader's role, the author's power and the nature of the reading process have been defined in various ways depending on the approaches in literature. For example, in 1970s there was a shift from structure-oriented approaches to reader-oriented theories. The reader's role in literary experience was redefined: the reader was no longer considered a consumer but a producer of meanings. Reader Response Theory received much acclaim for its emphasis on the reader's active involvement in creating meanings and analysing literary texts. Reader was no longer considered a passive receiver of the message but a producer interpreting the text on the basis of his/her expectations, background, personality and so forth. However, when the nature of literary experience is analysed another important theory - Personal Construct Theory- seems not to have been given considerable amount of importance What needs to be done seems to integrate Reader Response Theory with Personal Construct Theory, which will provide ground for exploring how the reader as an individual goes through the process of reading literary works.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Personal Construct Theory

Personal Construct Theory is based on the philosophy of constructivism which assumes that knowledge is a constructed version of the world rather than a direct representation (Oades in Görgün, 1999: 25). Kelly (1995) claims that "each individual makes sense of his/her world on the basis of his/her own personal experiments, constructs and hypotheses that are confirmed or disconfirmed constantly. The relevance of this theory to nature of literary experience and Reader Response Theory mostly lies in what Kelly called his "fruitful metaphor". For him, people are scientists, too. They have constructions of their reality, like scientists have theories. They have anticipations or expectations like scientists have hypotheses. They engage in behaviours that test those expectations like scientists do experiments. They improve their understanding of reality on the basis of their experiences like scientists adjust their theories to fit the facts. In a similar way, literary experience in the realm of Reader Response Theory suggests that reader's responding to a text involves both the mind and the emotions of the reader. In addition, Henderson and Brown (2000) define a reader as "a hypothetical construct of norms and expectations that can be derived or projected from the work and may even be said to inhere in the work." In their opinion, since expectations may be violated or fulfilled, satisfied or frustrated and

since the process of reading involves memory, perception, and anticipation, the charting of reader response is extremely difficult and perpetually subject to construction and reconstruction, vision and revision just like an individual's construing the world: anticipating, forming hypotheses, testing, and reforming them.

In Kelly's Personal Construct Theory, individual construes the world on the basis of his/her repertoire of constructs - models, hypotheses, or representations made out of individual experiences. Expectations, anticipations, and experiences all account for the way a person construes the events. Just like the individual in Personal Construct Theory, the reader in regard to Reader Response Theory is engaged in a process in which s/he makes sense of the text through his/her experiences and expectations. In reading a literary work, reader brings to the work his/her biases, expectations, background, reading strategies/theories and this results in a rather personal meaning. The reader determines the shape, form, and content of a text in the light of the content of his/her repertoire of literary experience

Personal Theories

In addition to personal constructs (models, hypotheses, or representations about an individual's world), the focus on personal theories accounts for the high contribution of Kelly's Personal Construct Theory to Reader- Response Theory and the studies on literature (in this study short stories). Personal theories refer to "a person's set of beliefs, values, understandings and assumptions" (Tann in Görgün, 1999: 20). Then, in the realm of literature, personal theories refer to the reader's values, beliefs, strategies, and assumptions about a literary experience - particularly for a specific genre. What to focus on in reading the text, how to approach the characters, setting or other elements in the story, when or how to infer meanings all depend on the personal theories of the reader. However, "personal theories usually exist at an implicit level; therefore, it becomes difficult to unearth and examine them" (Tann in Görgün, 1999: 20). For this reason, the need for eliciting and articulating personal beliefs plays an important role in understanding individuals' behaviours better. In view of literature, eliciting and identifying learners' personal theories about literary experience, for instance, theories about a specific genre such as short story or novels may

help learners see what they consider crucial in reading, analysing, or responding to a literary text.

Repertory Grid Method

Repertory grid method, which was developed by Kelly on the basis of his Personal Construct Theory, is concerned with uncovering individuals' personal construct systems. Unlike monolithic and nomothetic approaches such as questionnaires and standardised tests, Repertory Grid Method allocates differences in individual viewpoints. In addition, it is particularly concerned with the personal perspective of the participants (Pope and Keen; Pope and Denicole in Sendan, 1995). In exploring personal constructs, Repertory Grid Method allows researcher to focus on "attitudes, thoughts, and feelings in personally valid way" (Görgün, 1999: 80). As opposed to interviews or questionnaires, this technique of eliciting personal constructs allows participants to make use of their own words without being influenced. Used increasingly in many fields, Repertory Grid Method seems to be a new tool in literary context. The changes in regard to literary studies require adoption of methods such as Repertory Grid as recent arguments imply that "any reading of a literary work is acceptable" (Eagleton, 1996). Actually, Repertory Grid has been used in some of the studies on literary response. In one of these studies, O'Hare (1981) used repertory grid technique to examine the effect on response of stylistic modifications to a range of poems. Furthermore, the use of repertory grid can be seen in Applebee's study (1976) in which he investigated children's responses to stories. In another study by Miall (1985), repertory grid was used to elicit responses to a poem. Miall's study sheds lights on how individual differs from each other in regard to their responses. In addition, it dwells on common responses of the participants. Readers' attitudes, beliefs, personal theories as well as the text itself affect their responses. Therefore, only by uncovering readers' personal constructs can researchers elaborate on how these personal construct systems govern their behaviours. By exploring readers' personal theories about literary experience (in this study short stories), we can map the boundary between individual and common features in readers' responses. Apart from exploring individual differences and common features in readers' responses, the use of repertory grid method also helps the researcher to see how each individual construes him/herself as well as the changes s/he undergoes.

METHODOLOGY
Participants
The participants for the present study consisted of 15 third-grade students (2 males and 13 females)

enrolled at the Faculty of Education, Çukurova University, Adana, Turkey Participants were all volunteers. The average age of participants was 22. Most of them were graduates of Anatolian high schools where the medium of instruction is English. In addition, the majority did not have literature courses during their high school education. However, before the study, all of the participants had the required course "Introduction to Literature" in the second grade. The participants had just started the course "Short Story Analysis" when the first repertory grids for the present study were administered.

Procedure

In order to achieve the aims for the present study, a descriptive design was adopted. Fifteen third-grade students, all of whom were volunteers, participated in the study. All of the participants took the course -YI 333 Short Story Analysis-. It was a required literature course given four hours per week. The researcher was the instructor of the course. The aim of the course -in the most general sense- was to help learners develop personal meanings, interpretations about the stories they read. Indeed, the course aimed at enabling students to become a producer rather than a consumer of meanings and interpretations, and evaluations by focusing on their own expectations, biases, hypotheses, or personal reading strategies. At the beginning of the semester each of the participants was introduced the grid. The participants were asked to write their own constructs regarding short story analysis by using their own words. As to do this, they were asked to think of an effective and an ineffective reader of short stories. Thinking of two different model readers, they were asked to write what an effective reader does in analyzing short stories in the left column of the grid. In addition, for each construct in the left column, they were to think of an opposite construct and write it in the right column of the grid. The participants were free to display as many constructs as they wished. The participants were required to use English while filling out the grids. The reason for having participants use English rather than their mother tongue - Turkish- was to eliminate the difficulty in regard to naming some terms such as setting, theme, point of view etc and to eliminate the potential problems concerning communicative validity of the translation and interpretation of their grids. On completing the list of constructs, the participants were asked to evaluate these two different model readers (effective and ineffective reader), their current selves, and ideal selves by using a five-point rating scale where " 1 " represented the closest fit to the emergent (similarity) pole, " 3 " the mid-point, and "5" the closest fit to the implicit (contrast) pole. After rating the constructs and elements, the participants chose five most important constructs among the ones they had displayed; then, they wrote them in the order of importance. The rationale behind this procedure was to find out each participant's most important (high priority) constructs. Finally, the participants were interviewed as to check the constructs and ratings as well as to clarify the points unclear for the researcher. This procedure enabled the researcher collaborate with the participants in interpreting their grid data.

During the 14 weeks' period, short stories chosen both by the teacher and the students were analyzed in the classroom As the aim was to create/offer an atmosphere in which students feel free to develop personal meanings, reflect both on the text and themselves, fulfill their roles as active participants in view of their personal beliefs, values, and expectations, the instructor's role was no more than leading the discussions in the class. Before each session, each participant as well as other students in the class was asked to read the story at home highlighting the points that were of interest for him/her. In other words, each student was required to jot down parts, write his/her own questions (the answers of which were known or were to be learnt/shared in the class) and comments. In each session, the analysis of the story was carried out on the basis of the questions and comments provided by the students. The instructor avoided interfering as much as possible. Each student was free to ask questions or elaborate on the comment of others. The reason for asking them to generate their own questions was to help them reflect on what they believe to be important. Above all, the rationale was to enable them to see themselves as active participants in the process of active reading. The instructor, to enhance the contribution of the students, appreciated each question or comment.

At the end of the semester, fifteen participants were administered the second grids. For this, each participant was given his/her previously completed grid without original ratings. They were told that they might add new constructs or delete/modify the constructs elicited before. Besides, the participants were asked to re-rate the elements and choose their five most important constructs in regard to effectiveness in short story analysis.

Data Collection

Data for the present study were collected at the beginning, during, and at the end of the semester. During the first data collection session, the participants filled out the first repertory grids in regard to short story analysis. In addition, participants were interviewed as to clarify the unclear points about the grids. During the semester the participants were involved in reading/analyzing short stories. At the end of the semester, the second grids were administered.

DATA ANALYSIS
The Content Analysis of the Repertory Grid Data

Repertory grid data were also subjected to content analysis. The analysis was carried out at three levels: the analysis of high priority constructs, the analysis of main construct categories, and the analysis of concrete observable constructs added to second grids of the participants.

The Analysis of High Priority Constructs

In the analysis of high priority constructs, each participant's five most important constructs (high priority constructs) at Time 1 were compared to those at Time 2 as to investigate whether any change occurred between Time 1 and Time 2 in regard to content of the constructs. In addition to discussing individual aspects, high priority constructs of all the participants both at Timel and Time 2 were categorized as constructs referring to elements/constituents of the short story and those referring to reading strategies. The categorization of high priority constructs and the frequencies obtained for each category enabled the researcher to elaborate on what participants regarded most important in short story analysis.

The Exchange Analysis

Repertory grid data obtained from participants at two different times were also subjected to Exchange Grid Analysis. The reason for adopting exchange grid analysis was to identify change in participants' personal theories between Time 1 and Time 2. The significance level for structural change was 80 (a commonly accepted significance level in repertory grid research). That is, constructs and elements falling below 80 were considered to be yielding significant change while those that agreed upon over this level were viewed as stable, indicating no structural change between Time 1 and Time 2. Table 1 displays the five most important constructs (high priority constructs) of each participant at Time 1 and Time 2.

Table 1. High priority constructs of the participants

PARTICIPANT	TIME 1	TIME 2	COM. C	R.C
AYSUN	1- concentration (C5) 2- avoiding the use of dictionary (CI) 3- connecting events and characters (C3) 4- reading the story twice(C 2) 5- reading extra stories (C4)	1- concentration (C5) 2- analyzing the title (C7) 3- taking notes (C6) 4- connecting characters and events(C8) 5- analyzing word choice (C9)	C5	C6
BURCU	1- analyzing the elements of the story separately (C4) 2- asking for teacher's help (C5) 3- avoiding the use of dictionary(Cl) 4- underlining (C3) 5- thinking about what happened in the story (C2)	1- avoiding the use of dictionary(Cl) 2- thinking about what happened in the story (C2) 3- analyzing the elements of the story separately (C4) 4- analyzing word choice (C7) 5- taking notes (C6)	C4	C3 C4 C6
DENİZ	1- imagining (C6) 2- taking notes (C2) 3- writing questions (C3) 4- using time well (C7) 5- reader's associating her/himself	1- imagining (C6) 2- taking notes (C2) 3- writing questions (C3) 4- using time well (C7) 5- reader's associating her/himself	C6 C2 C3 C8	C2 C6

		with the characters (C8)		with the characters (C8)			
DUYGU		1- concentration (CI) 2- reading the story twice (C4) 3- underlining (C2) 4- writing questions (C3) 5- paying attention to single words and sentences(C6)		1- concentration (CI) 2- underlining (C2) 3- reading the story twice (C4) 4- combining all the clues in the story (CIO) 5- paying attention to single words and sentences (C6)		C2 C6	C2 C3 C6 CIO
EBRU		1- taking notes (CI) **2-** underlining (C2) 3- reading the story twice (C3) 4- connecting the elements of the story (C4) 5- thinking about the time when the story was written (C7)		1- connecting the elements of the story (C4) **2-** underlining (C2) 3- reading the story twice (C3) 4- reading the story at different times (C6) 5- reader's associating her/himself with the characters in the story **(C5)**		C2 C4	C2
EMİNE		1- love for reading (CI) 2- reading the story twice (C2) 3- using colorful pens to divide the story into parts (C5) **4-** analyzing the theme (C3) 5- dividing the story into meaningful parts (C8)		1- love for reading (CI) 2- underlining (C4) 3- analyzing the setting (C6) 4- analyzing the theme (C3) 5- analyzing both denotative and connotative meanings of the words in the story (CIO)		C3	C4 C8
ESRA		1- predicting the rest of the story (C6) 2- connecting title and story (CI) 3- using title to predict the content of the story (C5) 4- reader's associating her/himself with the characters (C7) 5- dividing the story into parts (C4)		6- connecting title and the story (CI) **2-** thinking about different alternatives (C3) 3- reading the story at least twice **(C2)** 4- predicting the rest of the story (C6) 5- analyzing word choice (C8)		CI	C7
FEYZA		1- analyzing twists in the story (C6) 2- comparing characters (C4) 3- analyzing style and language (C7) 4- analyzing the tone (C5) 5- analyzing conflicts in the story(ClO)		1- marking the text (C2) 2- comparing characters (C4) 3- analyzing twists in the story (C6) 4- analyzing conflicts in the story (CIO) 5- combining all the clues (CI7)		C6 C4 CIO	C2 C6 C7 CIO C17
GÖKHAN		1- asking questions (C4) 2- considering supporting elements **(C5)** 3- marking the text (C6) 4- imagining (C8) 5- writing in a diary (C9)		1- asking questions (C4) 2- considering supporting elements **(C5)** 3- marking the text (C6) 4- imagining (C8) 5- writing in a diary (C9)		C4 C5 C6 C8	C4 C5 C6 C8
GÜLŞAH		1- connecting events and characters (C7) 2- comparing characters (C5) 3- looking up the meanings of words **(C2)** 4- underlining (C4)		6- underlining (C4) 7- comparing characters (C5) **8-** connecting events and characters *(CI)* 9- predicting the rest of the story (C3)		C4 C5 C7 C9	C4

	5- predicting the rest of the story (C3)	10- analyzing the theme (C9)		
HANDAN	1- taking notes (CI) 2- sharing reactions (C6) 3- ignoring unknown words (C4) 4- making use of own feelings (C5) 5- reading the story more than once (C2)	1- taking notes (CI) 2- making use of own feelings (C5) 3- reading the story without stopping (C3) 4- reading the story more than once (C2 5- ignoring unknown words (C4)	CI C5	CI C5
KAMİL	1- knowing how to read short stories (C5) 2- visualizing (C4) 3- love for reading (C8) 4- being able to recall story after reading (C6) 5- ignoring unknown words (C3)	1- love for reading (C8) 2- using time efficiently (CI) 3- knowing how to read short stories (C5) 4- marking (C9) 5- being able to recall story after reading (C6)		C4 C9
RUHŞAN	1- concentration (C6) 2- guessing the meanings of unknown words (C2) 3- filling in the gaps (C3) 4- dividing the story into parts (C8) 5- analyzing the main character (CI)	1- analyzing the main character (CI) 2- concentration (C6) 3- using background knowledge *(CI)* 4- filling in the gaps (C3) 5- guessing the meanings of unknown words (C2)	CI	CI
SEÇİL	1- concentration (CI) 2- connecting the elements of the story (C5) 3- analyzing the symbols (C4) 4- analyzing the theme (CIO) 5- marking (C2)	1- concentration (CI) 2- analyzing the title (C8) 3- marking (C2) 4- connecting the elements of the story (C5) 5- analyzing the symbols(C4)	C2 C4 C5	C2 C4 C8
SİBEL	1- willingness (CI) 2- having a positive attitude towards the lesson (C2) 3- avoiding the use of dictionary (C3) 4- analyzing the characters (C5) 5- underlining (C4)	1- willingness (CI) 2- avoiding the use of dictionary (C3) 3- reading the story twice (C7) 4- rereading the story after finding the meanings of the unknown words(C8) 5- reading until everything is clear (C9)	C4 C5	C4 C5

When we analyze the high priority constructs of the participants in Table 1, we see that their high priority constructs produced three main categories: constructs regarding the elements/constituents of the story, those referring to the general reading strategies and constructs referring to other factors apart from reading strategies and elements/constituents of the story. The first category consists of constructs regarding the constituents/elements of the story and related reading strategies such as analyzing the theme, comparing characters, and analyzing the setting.

General reading strategies such as underlining, reading the story twice, and ignoring unknown words form the second group of high priority constructs. That is, the high priority constructs in this category refer to strategies that can be utilized for reading both literary and non-literary texts. The last category consists of constructs regarding the attitudes of the participants regarding the lesson and short stories, concentration and time management (the constructs in the third category will be analyzed as "others". Table 2 displays the constructs regarding elements/constituents of the story and their frequencies both at Time 1 and Time

Table 2. The content and frequency of high priority constructs regarding elements/constituents of the story

HIGH PRIORITY CONSTRUCTS	f	Time1	Time2
ELEMENTS/CONSTITUENTS OF THE STORY			
1. Analyzing title	5	3	2
2. Analyzing setting	2	1	1
3. Analyzing theme	2	1	1
4. Analyzing main characters	3	2	1
5. Analyzing tone	1	1	
6. Analyzing style and language	4	1	3
7. Analyzing symbols	2	1	1
8. Comparing characters	4	2	2
9. Combining all the clues		1	2
10. Connecting elements of the story	4	2	2
11. Connecting events and characters	2	1	1
12. Connecting character and plot	1	1	
13. Dividing the story into parts	1	1	
14. Analyzing elements separately	1	1	
15. Analyzing single words and sentences	1	1	
16. Analyzing twists in the story	1	1	
17. Analyzing conflicts in the story	2	1	

The first main category of high priority constructs consists of seventeen constructs. When we look at the frequencies for these constructs in Table 2, we see that analyzing the title of the story has the highest frequency. Construing this as the most important factor in short story analysis, readers seem to emphasize the deterring role of being involved in the story by making use of title as to predict the rest of the story or to build a relationship between the title of the story and its content. Commenting on the title of the story seems important also because it creates expectations. In addition, it may act as an accelerator to begin reading the text. Analyzing the style and language, comparing characters and connecting elements of the story also have high frequencies as high priority constructs. The comparison of the frequencies for the analysis of the style and language at Time1 and Time2 yields a noteworthy result. We see that the frequency for this construct is higher at the end of the semester (Time 2). In other words, analyzing how the writer uses the language in creating his/her work seems to be more important for the participants in why this construct has a higher frequency at Time 2 might be due to the activities in which participants were encouraged to elaborate on the relationship between what is given and how it is given in the story. Greenall and Swan (1986)

imply the importance of understanding's writer's style as to develop a better understanding of the texts. In their opinion " an important part of the pleasure in reading is being able to appreciate why a writer chooses a certain word or expression and how s/he uses it". The frequencies for these three constructs (analyzing language/style, comparing characters, and analyzing theme) yield another noteworthy result. The frequencies for analyzing the theme and comparing characters decrease at Time 2 while the frequency for combining all the clues in the story becomes higher. Therefore, we might suggest that towards the end of the semester, participants seem to have associated reading the story as a whole and thus combining all the details more similarly with efficiency in short story analysis.

The constructs having the lowest frequency in this category are analyzing the tone, connecting events and characters, connecting character and plot, dividing the story into meaningful parts, analyzing elements of the story separately, analyzing single words and sentences. All these high priority constructs having the lowest frequency in the first category were rank ordered as most important constructs at Time 1. That is, at the end of the semester these constructs seem to lose importance. The reason for such a change may result from the students' interest in analyzing the style and the language of the story and thus feeling that they are being more productive.

Table 3 displays the constructs regarding the

reading strategies and their frequencies at Time 1
and Time 2.

Table 3. The content and frequency of high priority constructs regarding reading strategies

HIGH PRIORITY CONSTRUCTS	f	Time1	Time2
READING STRATEGIES			
1. Reading twice	10	5	5
2. Reading the story at different times	1		1
3. Rereading the story after finding the meanings of unknown words	1		1
4. Reading the story until everything is clear	1		1
5. Reading the story without stopping	1		1
6. Reading extra stories	1		1
7. Avoiding the use of dictionary	1	1	
8. Considering both denotative and connotative meanings of the words	1		1
9. Ignoring unknown words	3	2	1
10. Guessing the meanings of unknown words	2	1	1
11. Taking notes	7	3	4
12. Underlining	9	5	4
13. Writing questions	3	2	1
14. Using colorful pens to divide the story into parts	1	1	
15. Marking	5	2	3
16. Summarizing	2	1	1
17. Imagining	3	2	1
18. Reader's associating him/herself with the characters in the story	3	1	2
19. Predicting	4	2	2
20. Thinking about different alternatives	1		1
21. Using background knowledge	1	1	
22. Filling in the gaps	2	1	1
23. Recalling the story	2	1	1

When we analyze the results displayed in table 3, we see that the constructs in this category refer to general reading strategies utilized in the process of reading both literary and non-literary texts. It is assumed that the principles of reading non-literary texts are closely related to those of reading literary texts (Langer, 1991). High priority constructs of the participants also revealed a considerable number of constructs referring to general reading strategies. As in the previous category, the frequencies for the constructs in this group yield noteworthy result. The construct with the highest frequency is reading the story twice. The reason why this construct has the highest frequency of all the constructs in this category might be due to the assumption that during the first reading the reader gains an overall impression. It is the second reading that facilitates critical thinking and commenting on the story. The frequencies for this construct at Time1 and Time2 also yields that this construct (reading the story twice) has the same frequency at Time1 and Time2. That is, participants seem to construe the number of reading as an important factor both at the beginning and at the end of the semester. Underlining the text and taking notes which also have high frequencies imply another important issue. High frequencies for these two

constructs may suggest participants' being aware that highlighting the important/striking parts in the text facilitates the analysis of the story. For instance, taking notes or underlining the text may help the reader in summarizing the story, generating questions, or combining clues in the story. Constructs regarding word skills also seem noteworthy. Among these constructs, ignoring unknown words receives a higher frequency as compared to other constructs referring to use of word skills.

High priority constructs that were rank ordered only at Time 2 also yield important results. These constructs included in the category of reading strategies are reading the story twice, reading the story at different times, rereading the story after finding the meanings of unknown words, reading the story without stopping, reading extra stories, considering both connotative and denotative (literal) meanings of the words, and thinking about different alternatives. The strategies which refer to the number of reading might suggest that at the end of the semester participants have become aware of the nature of reading literary texts which emphasizes reader's developing different meanings in each reading. Since readers' expectations, interests or background knowledge may not be the same every time they read the text, producing different comments, creating different meanings or focusing on different aspects of the text in each reading seem to be likely. Table 4 displays the last category of constructs and their frequencies at both times.

Table 4 The content and frequency of high priority constructs regarding the category "others"

HIGH PRIORITY CONSTRUCTS	f	Ti mel f	Time2 f
OTHERS			
1. Concentration	8	4	4
2. Time management	3	1	2
3. Willingness	2	1	1
4. Love for reading	4	2	2
5. Positive attitude towards the lesson	1	1	
6. Knowledge about the techniques of short story analysis	1	1	
7. Asking for teacher's help	1	1	
8. Keeping a diary	2	1	1
9. Sharing reactions	1	1	

When we analyze the constructs displayed in Table 4, we see that the last category of constructs refer to concentration, time management, reader's attitude towards reading and the lesson, keeping a diary, sharing reactions and feelings with other readers. The construct which has the highest frequency in this category is concentration. That is, participants construe concentrating on the text as a very important factor which leads to efficiency in short story analysis. When we compare this construct with underlining and reading the story twice which have the highest frequencies in their own categories, we see that concentration (f: 8) seems to be as important as underlining (f: 9) and reading the story twice (f: 10). In addition, high priority constructs which appeared both at Time1 and Time 2 in this category reveal that using time well, willingness, love for reading and keeping a diary also play a determining role in analyzing short stories effectively.

Table 5. The changes in participants' construction of current self and ideal self between Time 1 and Time 2.

PARTICIPANT	Ideal self	Current self
AYSUN	100	85
BURCU	90	60*
DENİZ	87.5	65.6*
DUYGU	86.1	88.9
EBRU	96.4	82.1

EMINE	100	84.1
ESRA	100	78.1*
FEYZA	92.5	82.5
GÖKHAN	78.3*	70*
GULSAH	100	96.4
HANDAN	100	75*
KAMİL	92.5	75*
RUHSAN	100	78.1*
SECIL	100	79.5*
SİBEL	83.3	83.3

* significant change (below 80 cut-off point)

The analysis of the changes in participants' construction of current self and ideal self reveals that significant changes occurred in 8 of the 15

participants' construction of current self as the reader. Only two of the participants' construction of ideal self displayed significant change between Time 1 and Time 2. In addition, while 3 of the participants' grids displayed changes in regard to content, other 4 participants' Time 1 and Time 2 grids did not yield change regarding the content of the grids. That is, 3 of the participants whose

construction of current self or ideal self yielded significant change had a larger repertoire of constructs at the end of the semester while 4 of the participants had the same number of constructs. Therefore, we may suggest that having a larger repertoire of constructs may have a role in some of the participants' developing a better perception of themselves or ideal self at the end of the semester. As for the participants whose construction of current self and ideal self did not reveal significant change, we see that they perceive change in themselves as they claim to have developed themselves and their perspectives in analyzing both short stories and events in real life.

Table 6. Common high priority constructs and changes in ideal self and current self

PARTICIPANT	The num. of common high priority constructs	Change in ideal self	Change in current self
AYSUN	1	__	
BURCU	3	__	+
DENİZ	4		+
DUYGU	4	__	
EBRU	10		—
EMİNE	2	—	
ESRA	2		+
FEYZA	2	__	
GÖKHAN	4	+	+
GULSAH	4	__	
HANDAN	4		+
KAMİL	10		+
RUHSAN	4	__	+
SECIL	4		+
SİBEL	2		— -

When we analyze the results displayed in Table 6, we see that except two participants (Gokhan and Deniz), all the other participants' high priority constructs displayed change in regard to content. That is, out of fifteen, thirteen participants changed

some of their high priority constructs at the end of the semester (Time 2). We see that changes in the content of the participants' high priority constructs were minor because more than half of the participants changed only half of their high priority

constructs. Therefore, we can suggest that at the end of the semester, some of the participants' views on the most important characteristics of an effective reader displayed changes, yet the amount of change was little. As for the relationship between the changes in the content of high priority constructs and changes in participants' construction of ideal self and current self, we see that participants whose high priority constructs showed little change regarding content did not display changes in their construction of current self and ideal self. However, we also see that some participants such as Deniz and Gokhan displayed significant change in their construction of themselves although their high priority constructs remained the same at the end of the semester.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this study, we aimed to uncover learners' high priority constructs regarding short story analysis as well as their construction of themselves and ideal self as the reader and the changes that occurred between Time 1 and Time 2. In order to explore learners' theories, we adopted a naturalistic/interpretive approach based on Kelly's Personal Construct Theory. Repertory Grid Method helped us to make learners' theories explicit and to see the changes. The findings can be summarized as follows:

- High priority constructs display little change in regard to content
- The first three high priority constructs in regard to frequency are reading the story twice (f: 10), underlining the text (f: 9) and concentration (f: 8). All three constructs that have high frequencies refer to general reading strategies that can be utilized in the process of reading literary and non-literary texts. That is, our expectation regarding genre specific strategies such as analyzing theme, characters, or tone of the story seem not to have been confirmed. However, the tendency towards rank ordering these reading strategies as high priority constructs appears to be supporting the view that "the principles of reading in general are closely related to those utilized in reading literary works" (Bock, 1993; Langer, 1991).
- Learners' high priority constructs refer both to genre-specific procedures (e.g. analyzing character, setting, point of view and general reading strategies (e.g. underlining the text, reading the story twice, guessing the meanings of unknown words).
- In regard to high priority constructs under the category of elements/constituents of the story and related strategies, we might suggest that differences between Time1 and Time 2 imply an increased interest in analyzing the style and language in the story (which indicates a tendency towards stylistics: the relationship between what and how) and decrease in the analysis of distinct elements such as characters, theme and tone of the story.
- The frequencies of the constructs under the category of reading strategies imply the tendency towards marking, underlining and note taking as well as reading the story at different times, reading the text more than once, and using background knowledge. In addition, reading extra stories seems to be perceived as another high priority construct fostering efficiency in short story analysis. Constructs with higher frequencies such as taking notes, underlining, and marking the text also imply a reader-based approach in which the reader focuses more on personal questions, interpretations and reactions.
- The constructs in the category of "other" imply the importance of developing a positive attitude towards reading short stories. High frequencies for concentration and love for reading suggest that efficiency in short story analysis requires not only adopting reading strategies but also positive attitudes, love and willingness.
- Learners, whose high priority constructs display little change in regard to content, seem unlikely to change their construction of current self and ideal self.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The analysis of the data we obtained in this study and the findings reveal some implications for the literature course and the literature teacher. The implications for the literature teacher and how s/he plans the course can be summarized as follows. The literature teacher should

- make learners aware of their own theories about short story analysis
- help learners develop their own responses and judgments through reader- text transaction
- help learners develop an awareness of their own way of reading/analyzing the texts
- problems
- to help learners not only reflect on the stories but also on themselves as individuals

REFERENCES

Bock, S. (1993). Developing materials for the study of literature. *English Teaching Forum, 31(3)2.*

Corporaal, A. H. (1991). Repertory grid research into cognitions of prospective eprimary school teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education,7(4).*

Eagleton, T. (1996). Literary Theory: An Introduction. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. Goodman, J. (1984).Reflection and teacher education. *Interchange, l(3),9-6.*

Gorgun, A. (1999). The impact of pedagogical courses on student teachers' thinking. Unpublished M.A. dissertation. Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey.

Greenall, S.,Swan, M. (1986). Effective reading. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Gutbezahl, K. (1994) in Gorgun, A The impact of pedagogical courses on student teachers' thinking. Unpublished M.A. dissertation. Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey.

Henderson, G. E., Brown, C. (2000). Reader response criticism. Retrieved June 23, 2001, from www.xenox.org/essay/iitthryh.html.

Kelly, G. A. (1955). The psychology of personal

Miall, D. s. (1985). The Structure of Response: A Repertory Grid Study of a Poem," *Research in* Constructivist Approach. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Reading, *the Teaching of English.*

Korthagen, F. A. J. (1993).Two modes of reflection. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* York: w. w.Norton & co. Inc.

Langer, J.A. (1991). Literary Understanding and Literature Instruction. *{Report Series No. 2.11).* Albany, NY: National Research Center on Literature Teaching and Learning, constructs: A theory of personality. New

Sendan, F. C. (1995). Patterns of development in EFL student teachers' personal theories: A *9(3).*