

5 Assessing output and outcomes in L2 through perspective taking.

Marie J. Myers

Introduction

While seeking to position the assessment of student contribution within perspective taking we also draw on the importance of the internalized elements of teaching by these future teachers behind achieving this aim. The underlying theoretical framework draws valuable input from Immanuel Kant's concepts. Kantian tradition of thought prizes self-knowledge. Kant's problematizes the question of judgement as central to the development of modern hermeneutics. Judgement must depend upon the prior 'schematizing' capacity of the understanding which gives an initial coherence to experience before it can be subsumed into judgements. Our study benefits from our positioning on perspective taking according to Laing, Phillipson and Lee (1968) and also looking at Kant's distinction between judgements of particulars, based on a pre-existing general rule 'determinant judgements', and those based on trying to establish a rule in relation to the particular 'reflective judgement'. The question that remains is about articulating the different frameworks. On the one hand we are looking at levels of language development while at the same time on the other hand 'professionalization' has to be taken into account.

The above distinction made by Kant points to the hermeneutic circle, in which the parts of the text to be understood depend on the understanding of the whole, and vice-versa. We also understand that taking a certain distance is necessary for knowledge integration.

According to Kant a resistance of interpretation to any codification i.e. argumentative aspect in the form of rules is essential to the varying versions of modern hermeneutics. Kant believes that judgement is the capacity to subsume under rules. We also took into consideration his insight into the role of spontaneity of the subject in the constitution of a knowable world by assessing students' work in the form of reaction papers sent via emails so as to maintain a sense of spontaneity in a written form. One could argue that email correspondence is a hybrid mode of communication encompassing elements

characteristic of writing because there was time for reflection to purely free spontaneous occurrences more typical of oral interactions. Indeed taking space and time for reflection was of utmost importance here as the students had to first read the theoretical texts assigned. However the free flow of comments in the reaction papers were intended for clarifying ideas and not for assessment and would therefore place the output closer to spontaneous production notwithstanding the fact that prior reflection had to be taking place. Disciplinary, or subject matter and content learning (methodologies) as well as language learning are interwoven in this course where students were not communicating in their mother-tongue. A look at the different competencies sheds new light on professional learning.

This course was created for a training purpose so the first decision to be made was on accessibility of the language level and also on how content was organized. Language level has to be operationalized and treated by readers as to have them take in the content.

Grammar and vocabulary levels could of course be an issue for content users especially in a course taught in a second language. The reading assignments came from a French research text (Myers, 2004) and the students needed to be able to grasp the meaning expressed by the writer.

There is a dilemma for instructors of such courses. One must reach the audience and also be true to the content, respect the linguistic identity of the knowledge domain, in our case having to do with the second language learning, and teaching communicative identity.

In order to measure the above, i.e. that all the objectives set are reached, we seek to uncover if the students show a balance in their professional language use, by acknowledging that they were able to access the language level, and that they have the understanding necessary to be accountable for using it appropriately. Integrating both aspects requires a sociolinguistic as well as a stylistic perspective with in addition a psycholinguistic one (Lantolf, 2000; Downs, 1971).

This leads to mention the cultural perspective inherent in language use. Differentiating factors having to do mostly with 'what we say' and the 'way we say it' (Wertsch,1991; Wenger, 1998; Swaffar, 1998). Based on these parameters we used a complexity scale and a perspective-taking framework to better understand students' actual abilities.

Description of the research design

Participants

Students in the teacher education courses for this study were of mixed backgrounds. As secondary teachers in Ontario need two teachable subjects, some had majored in History, Science, Math, etc. with fewer university courses in French, usually only three and were only able to participate at the periphery (Gee, 1999). The participants all had an adequate level of French, some were French majors with French as their first teachable subject with fewer courses in a second subject. These students usually work later as teachers of the language as a second language or teachers of content delivered in the second language in French immersion schools. One advantage of students trained in another specialty besides French is to make them qualified as content teachers with a solid knowledge of their other subject, thus increasing their employment opportunities. This can also be a challenge as the different types of students are not necessarily the strongest speakers of the second language as they specialized more in their other teaching subject. Some of these students gain entry into the program based as much on their experience profile than their academic grades.

There are fluctuations between students' beliefs among those who feel they had sufficient preparation, those who feel very positive about the French "fact" in Canada, and on the other hand, those who don't. These representations inevitably infiltrate their views of second language didactics and the didactic discourse. The instructor is somewhat caught in the middle, juggling an understanding of the contexts the students come from, while trying to make them grasp and question the professional attributes and the content delivered that should lead them to become successful teachers in the second language.

Needless to say, the future teachers are expected to understand the theoretical context underlying the teaching of their subject as well as being critical and reflective.

It became obvious that we had to take into account the fact that the participants were of the Internet generation, with gaps or differing views on academic discourse and displayed different levels of ability in the negotiation of learning and of teaching styles.

Paper selection

All the papers were from a course with 26 students starting in September 2006 and 24 from a course starting in 2007. After the course, regular assigned course

reaction papers were chosen for analysis. Papers were from one to two pages in length. The selection was made based on the fact that these papers were anonymous, sent by e-mail and could not be traced to the author.

Method

Students were required to forward their e-mails on a weekly basis. We examined the e-mail reactions over five consecutive weeks each of the two years.

These reactions to theoretical texts were written in French, the language the students were training to teach. The objective of the study was twofold: one, to uncover the level of complexity at which these future teachers of French could function in the French Language, their L2 and uncover weaknesses in order to develop remedial strategies for future classes; and second to look at perspective-taking development in order to devise classroom activities to bring about the desired awareness in them. Examples are given and discussed by drawing clear-cut borderlines between the assessed reproductive declarative knowledge and the quality of its transfer and/or transformation. We further comment on the impact of L1 versus L2 use on educational outcomes and situate the discussion within parameters drawn out of Kant's writings.

Theoretical framework

We used two measures to look at the students' discourse: Durant and Ramaut's (2006) complexity scale and the perspective-taking framework.

First we looked for complexification in language use following items on the complexity scale. The level of difficulty the reading entailed could be classified as advanced. The reaction papers were not part of assignments to be graded rather only formative in nature and intended to be a way to verify what had not been understood and needed further clarification.

The scale was intended for setting-up tasks in a sequenced order of difficulty and was used in our situation for the analysis of results. We understand that this framework, intended for the measurement of processing ability for the receptive skill of reading will certainly represent a greater degree of difficulty where the measurement of language production is concerned, namely in our case through written e-mails. The authors think nevertheless that the complexity scale also works for production-based tasks.

It includes the following parameters: *the world, the task and the text*. These parameters are articulated along a continuum and divided into three levels going from simple to complex with an intermediate position. The parameters under the category *WORLD* are defined as regards *level of abstraction*, divided

into concrete here and now descriptions, there and then: in othertime/space descriptions and an abstract perspective; *degree of visual support* including much, limited, and none, in the case of more abstract functioning; *and linguistic context* comprised of the following descriptors, 1) high level of redundancy, low information density, 2) limited level of redundancy and 3) high density of information, low level of redundancy. The parameters under the heading *TASK*, defined as communicative and cognitive processing demands, include *level of processing* with divisions corresponding to descriptive, restructuring and evaluative, i.e. a comparison of different information sources and *modality* i.e. the way students are providing their answers or producing the outcome in terms of 1) non-verbal reaction and 2) limited or 3) verbal reaction at a descriptive level. Under the *TEXT* entry four parameters are included, namely *vocabulary* in terms of frequency of words respectively high, less so and infrequent, *syntax* with regards to short simple sentences, reasonably long sentences with juxtaposition and long embedded sentence; *text structure* as far as the structure is explicit and clear, somewhat explicit and clear or left implicit; and *text length*, i.e. short, reasonably long or long.

To assess what one understands and at what level understanding takes place requires locating the output on a perspective taking position. Perspective taking is directly tied to meaning-making. Laing et al. make a distinction between direct perspective, meta-perspective and meta-meta-perspective taking, with the latter two having to do with different degrees of personal detachment in communication.

Direct perspective is defined as a personal attitude to content perceived and in our case having to do with aspects dealing with teaching.

Meta-perspective would correspond to a positioning from foundational theories in their relation to applications. This is highly desirable on the part of future teachers. It provides a way to situate the other's attitude or understanding in relation to a given text.

Meta-meta-perspective corresponds to taking additional distance from words given, adding another level of questioning. This helps raise additional awareness. The stance taking at this point would correspond to what one thinks the other's idea is, of what one thinks about a question.

These positions in turn have an impact on one's contributions to the on-going interaction. The English translations for all of the examples given in French are provided in Appendix 1 along with the examples.

Results

As we feel that it is important to develop a critical stance in future teachers, we were surprised by the relative homogeneity of the findings in this area. The framework we used to analyze the contents of the emails uncovered a number of strongly imprinted characteristics. *Complexity scale*

The complexity scale treatment shows a continuum for each category from minus to plus, or simple to complex. The Duran & Ramaut complexity scale results were entered under the following overarching parameters described above: *the world, the task, and the text*. All in all these university students' utterances were all ranked by analysis to be at least at an average level of complexity.

In section 1, level of abstraction: we need to include a 'Rejection category', as was identified in the analysis. Concrete descriptions are found in 2 papers (11, 9), 'In other time/space' is found in paper 9 and an abstract perspective is adopted in all papers except for 1,14,15,16,31.

Under section 2, degree of visual support, there was only limited visual support included in four papers, in 21 (a chart), 37 (a column of sound symbols), 43, 44, (in both cases quotes from the text in 16 font were followed by short comments), with no visual support in the remaining 4 papers.

As regards section 3, linguistic context, a limited level of redundancy was found in papers 1, 14, 15, 16, 43 and 44. All other papers displayed high density of information.

For section 4, level of processing, the category 'No understanding' has to be added to the chart as was evidenced in our analysis. Under 'descriptive' there is the use of paraphrase, under 'restructuring' there is evidence of some summarizing and under 'evaluative' we noted that ideas were seldom confronted to other theoretical concepts but rather the contents of the texts were calibrated against one's experience.

In section 5: Under 'non-verbal reaction' we can count the few missing papers that were not sent in for a given week. 'Limited verbal reaction' was identified in nine papers. All the other 37 papers displayed a verbal reaction corresponding to the descriptive level of the chart.

At 'Text level' all categories were identified on some text or other but without student identity one cannot study a trend, except by looking at papers showing weaknesses in a number of categories.

Perspective taking (Please see Appendix 1).

In order to be able to assess a specific student's ability in perspective-taking we assigned a code to each participant. Differences in code set-up reflect the difference in participating year. The students had not been instructed to use different levels of perspective taking, rather it was hoped that the research would allow to identify the ease with which these second language specialists used the second language. Students' discourse was annotated according to the level of perspective taken in the second language.

What was most interesting in the results was that although the three different levels of perspective taking were not assigned, the students' reaction papers typically did take a perspective at all three levels. In a way it showed that the students engaged in understanding the text with its theoretical complexities and then reported on it using their own communicative possibilities. This reflected an affective transposition between registers and also a certain proof of their ability for extemporaneous language use as well as of their explicating abilities. Language use at Laing et al's third level of perspective taking appears to be more difficult in the context of a second language as indeed was mostly apparent through the frustrations of two students, one who chose to respond in her mother tongue (L1) and another one who usually switched to mother tongue use half way through the assignments, when too much effort required in L2 at the theoretical level seemed to cause overload.

It appears that one ought to be concerned by the meaning-making taking place by our students when faced with more theoretical contents. The results indicate the differing ways in which the majority of students in this teacher education specialization course in French, second language teaching, process the information from the readings in a text they had to prepare and react to, prior to their class meetings. It came as a surprise that the reactions to the readings and the instructor overall were positive because not only was it hoped that students in taking a strong critical stance would find areas to be questioned or improved upon, but also because the author, also the instructor, would have welcomed the feedback in order to provide amendments to better tune course readings and discussions to students' needs.

A rather even division in perspective taking was expected as, according to researchers, perspectives are more closely tied to the context to which to react, whereas in this study, perspective taking was instead more of an individual positioning, with, in general, people keeping within a given mode of perspective taking especially at the level of direct perspective taking. It is important to note however that the few students who engaged in meta-meta-perspective taking also engaged in the direct and meta-perspective taking modes.

Discussion

We do not know if the findings are indicative of the amount of attention given to the text by individual participants or lack thereof, however they were assigned the same specific reading before each class and had to send their reactions by email which would indicate that they complied with the assignment, especially given the fact that no two responses from participants were similar.

We also question the role the use of the second language played in the data. We question whether the results would have been similar had the reading assignments and the reactions been carried out in the participants' first language (L1) (Kern, 1994). Does facility in language use affect the level of perspective taking? Or is the level of perspective taking more connected to personal characteristics at a given time?

The first two levels of perspective taking, that is, Direct Perspective and Meta-Perspective, were observed most often, with spontaneous meta-meta-perspective taking only noted in the case of five of the 50 participants, namely MM, 2jes2, 3mko, DH and GN. It is interesting to see that all these participants also reacted at the other levels of perspective taking. However most of the other participants stayed within Direct Perspective.

This shows how crucial it is to bring more students to that level of critical reflection. Our students however already showed a good level of meta-perspective taking and we can only hope that with increased training in continuing education they might be able to enhance their positioning as regards perspective taking.

Another question that arises is whether the level of French second language (L2) reached by our students was high enough to permit them to spontaneously use the different levels of perspective taking they usually access when using their L1 (Kern). Perhaps their conversational skills are not adequate for the assimilation of the theoretical content they were expected to handle. So we may be able to say that the level of processing complexity reached in another language could be a determining factor in the level of perspective taking one is able to process.

There could be reason for concern relative to the ways of being of those students in our university courses who display limitations as regards perspective taking in communication.

Awareness raising around these concerns might have to be carried out. In teacher education courses, future teachers should be taught, for the purposes of

listening comprehension in the second language, to model the different levels so as to better comprehend people who spontaneously use these different levels, and also to enable them to help their students in that endeavour.

One could also assume that perhaps meta-meta perspective-taking does not correspond to the preferred style of most students who choose teaching, and also wonder what might become of the ones who spontaneously engaged in meta-meta-perspective taking. Would these stand out in the profession or not? A follow-up study around this question should prove very informative. Maybe some of these future teachers just did not feel that a meta-meta perspective needed to be taken.

The results of this study show that implicit aspects connected to our speaking behaviors in teaching/learning deserve the attention of researchers.

The most important finding centers around the fact that competence and performance could be competing in individual language productions where professional training is concerned. In this study participants had to display competence in the performance of their tasks of reacting critically to theoretical writings in the professional field in which they are specializing, using the language of specialization, not their first language (L1).

Competence in complexity of use in the second language was expected through the display of accurate levels of language use as well.

But this also entailed an understanding of how to assess the expected professional performance while using the other language. In that light, assessing performance would be seen as more important, even of people who could be less competent in language use but could be hiding this lack of competence as it appears in our participants who only engaged in writing at a level of direct perspective taking. Would it not be preferable to be able to fully engage in all levels of perspective taking while perhaps language use might appear less competent?

There are obvious limitations to this study. The findings are only relevant in the limited context of this research. Contextual limitations are due to the constraints imposed by the conditions due to the method used and the distinction between “low level” and “high level” communication (Hall, 1988), with the choice of an emic approach starting from individuals and looking at the meaning of their “actions” or their contributions to the interaction over an etic approach starting from scientific observations, although we tried to connect both.

Choosing to analyze the anonymous e-mails, although it enabled us to protect participants' anonymity, did not permit further questioning participants on their contributions to see if any probing would push them into another level of perspective taking. We were also unable to assess if the use of L2 was impeding them in their expression, as with preserved anonymity we could not connect the emails to the students in the classes.

Conclusion

Overall the question has to be addressed from the angle of who is seeing the relationship between reflector and reflected. Another aspect to retain in the forefront is the particular association for each participant between language and being.

There is certainly a need to further push assessment to evaluating accounts of meaning outcomes from accounts of semantic outputs as connected to words.

In conclusion we can say that evidence from this study supports Kant's concepts of education. The difference to be made originates from action- and knowledge-based theories of competencies that have been framed by his concepts of education. From this angle, the capability to apply declarative knowledge to new learning situations, is identified as professional procedural knowledge bearing on "reflexive judgementability". The transfers emerged as a result of formative processes and practical experiences in school settings during the teaching practice component of the course. The students' competencies were investigated from a diachronic and synchronic perspective, however we did not keep track of the dates at which the different collected outputs analyzed were produced. Rather we were looking for whether the different aspects investigated would be identifiable at all. In further studies progress over time or lack thereof should also be investigated.

Furthermore this study would have gained from an additional analysis using Grice's (1966) cooperative principle looking at information through the parameters of quantity, quality, relation and manner since Grice in his work echoes Kant.

In a sense professional expertise has been conflated with the theoretical underpinnings presented in the training course in some of our examples. This supports the notion that prior contextual understanding which cannot be derived from rule is necessary. This leads us to recommend a hermeneutic-dialectic and reconstructive methodology.

References

- Auerbach, Elsa Roberts (1992). *Making meaning, making change*. Washington, DC: Centre for Applied Linguistics.
- Downs, James F. (1971). *Cultures in Crisis*. Beverley Hills, CA: Glencoe Press.
- Duran, Goedele & Ramaut, Griet (2006). Tasks for absolute beginners and beyond: Developing and sequencing tasks at basic proficiency levels. In Kris Van den Branden (ed.) *Task-based Language Education*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 47-75.
- Gee, James Paul (1999). Semiotic social spaces and affinity spaces. In D. Barton and K. Tusting, *Beyond Communities of Practice*, pp.214-232, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, Paul. (1966). Logic and conversation. In Peter Cole and James Morgan (Eds.) *Syntax and Semantics*, vol 3: *Speech Acts* pp.41-58. New York: Academic Press.
- Hall, Edward Twitchell (1988). Context and meaning. In Larry A. Samovar & Richard E. Porter (Eds.) *Intercultural communication: A reader*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, pp. 44-54.
- Harré, Ron and Gillett, Grant (1994). *The discursive mind*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G.eert H. (1980). *Culture's Consequence: Intercultural differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.
- Johnson, Patricia (1982). Effects on reading comprehension of building background knowledge. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 503-516.
- Kern, Richard G. (1994). The role of mental translation in second language reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 441-461.
- Laing, Ronald David, Phillipson, Herbert and Lee, A.Russell (1966). *Interpersonal perception*. New York: Springer Publishing Co.
- Lantolf, James (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. In J.Lantolf (Ed.) *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp.1-26). Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Lave, Jean and Wenger, Etienne (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, James F. (1986). Background knowledge and L2 reading. *Modern Language Journal*, 70, 350-354.

- Levine, Martin and Haus, George (1985). The effect of background knowledge on the reading comprehension of second language learners. *Foreign Language Annals*, 18, 391-397.
- Long, Michael H. (2005). *Second Language Needs'Analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers, Marie J. (2004). *Modalités d'apprentissage d'une langue seconde*. Bruxelles : DeBoeck Université.
- Swaffar, Janet K. (1988). Readers, texts, and second languages : The interactive process. *Modern Language Journal*, 72, 123-149.
- Wenger, Etienne (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wertsch, James V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zitation

Marie J. Myers (2012). Assessing output and outcomes in L2 through perspective taking [17 Seiten]. In: Wilfried Hansmann, Una Dirks & Hendrik Baumbach (Hrsg.), *Professionalisierung und Diagnosekompetenz – Kompetenzentwicklung und -förderung im Lehramtsstudium*. (Kap. V. 5: Online-Schriftenreihe der Philipps-Universität Marburg: *Professionalisierung und Diagnosekompetenz*. URL: http://archiv.ub.uni-marburg.de/opus/schriftenreihen_ebene2.php?sr_id=30&la=de).

Appendix 1

Findings relative to direct perspective taking.

As stated above, it has to do with personal attitude towards the information given and in this case, aspects related to teaching like for instance personal feelings or a search for practical recipes.

Examples of interactions:

- JS Je ne comprends pas contexte et co-texte/ I don't understand context and co-text
- This is a direct question, a request for clarification.
- JC Le dictionnaire; Je pense que c'est nécessaire d'enseigner comment on utilise le dictionnaire/ To do with the dictionary ; I think it is necessary to teach how to use a dictionary.

- In this statement the student repeats words from the assigned text, with what appears an intention to further validate what was read.
- JS Est-ce qu'on devrait donner le texte écrit [correspondant à l'exercice d'écoute], avant, durant ou après qu'ils écoutent?/ Should the written support (corresponding to the listening comprehension text) be given before, during or after the listening sequence ?

This student is directly reacting to the text and asks for further clarification.

- JC “switching to English text because brain is shutting down”
- This is an expression of a student’s feelings of frustration, also note that only the mother tongue is used, not the language of instruction.
- AW Même si on enseigne comment se prendre en charge, les étudiants ne le feront probablement pas./ Even when one teaches students to take control of their learning, pupils will probably not do it.

This constitutes a personal reaction to a comment made in the text.

Comments on other students’ reactions:

3mko in the direct perspective taking mode, always repeats what was not understood but never tries to interpret meanings by posing more questions. Perhaps this is a learning strategy and an economic way to let the instructor know what to revisit in class. However there is also evidence that this student is able to take a meta-perspective and a meta-meta-perspective in different contexts.

9tlc4 answers in L1 only.

9nmo1 answers and asks direct questions in L1. This participant seems to only skim the text, yet shows an understanding of the problems.

6.2.2. Findings on meta-perspective taking.

As stated earlier this is connected with positioning oneself in relation to fundamental theories as regards their ties to practical applications and with determining the other’s attitude in front of a given text.

Examples of interactions:

- JA Si j’ai mal compris les définitions de contexte et co-texte (indique ce qui a été compris) pourriez-vous les revoir en classe et nous fournir quelques exemples aussi? Merci./ In case I did not understand context and co-text appropriately (saying what was understood) could you review them in class and also give us a few examples.

- This student steps back from the text, in a self evaluating mode and looks at contents in a more holistic way and, as well, shows concern for classmates who might be in the same situation.
- MM On dit de donner moins de contenu à traiter et d'approfondir. Comment peut-on faire cela quand le curriculum a un nombre d'attentes tellement grand./ It (The text) says to give less content to process and to dig deeper. How can that be done when there are already a great number of areas to be covered in the curriculum guidelines.
- This student is weighting her responsibilities against the prescribed administrative contents, in order to be able to judge what has to take precedence.
- LM Je trouve que c'est difficile d'analyser [un texte littéraire] quand la plupart du temps on ne sait pas vraiment ce que l'auteur voulait dire. (réaction sur un discours dans lequel il est question de l'enseignement de la littérature.)/ I find it really difficult to analyse a literary text when most of the time one does not know what the author wanted to convey. (this was said in reaction to a segment on teaching literature).

Here we observe a certain distance taken with a reflection on the need to also teach about authors' backgrounds as it is necessary to fully understand a literary excerpt; students in the teacher education program are often not familiar enough with the authors whose texts they are required to teach to their pupils.

- DH Pour lire un texte pour le comprendre il ne faut pas imposer un temps limite, alors pourquoi est-ce que l'on fait toujours des tests de compréhension de lecture [dans un temps donné]./ To read a text for reading comprehension, there should be no imposed time limit, then why are reading comprehension tests always timed?
- This student's thinking goes beyond the text, questioning a practice that does not make sense to her in teaching, as compared to the real situation in a classroom.
- GN Mais est-ce que les romans [de la collection] Harlequin sont vraiment représentatifs de nos mœurs? J'espère que non!/ Do 'Harlequin'romances really reflect our way of living? I hope not!

This comment shows a student's reaction to a recommendation for easy readers but also an emphasis on the implications it has on the teaching of culture, thus going beyond direct perspective taking.

Comments on productions:

In these remarks one notices a critical stance taken showing distance from the text, stemming mostly here from life and professional experiences. These examples show in a way how the course the students are taking influenced their critical thinking as many of the other comments also mostly take a meta-perspective in reaction to course contents.

6.2.3. Findings having to do with meta-meta perspective taking.

Meta-meta perspective taking is explained above as implying a further distanciation like keeping in mind during interaction what members of another group imagine about one's attitude to a given question.

Examples of interactions at this level:

- MM Quand vous décrivez une réalité métaphorique et la sociopragmatique est-ce que vous faites allusion à la notion que tout langage est métaphorique comme le disent les théoristes (de Saussure, Derrida)?/ When you describe a metaphorical reality and sociopragmatics are you implying that all language is metaphorical as some theorists say?

This student seeks answers in connection with researchers like Derrida and Saussure, placing the contents of the text she read in parallel to what she understood these other researchers to have said and in a way is weighting her own understanding through the interpretation she thinks the other authors would have in this case, or rather interpreting her readings through the lenses of these other authors' ways of seeing.

- 2jes2 «Tenir compte des différences sociales et contextuelles entre apprenants» (citation du texte), les profs peuvent-ils l'incorporer [dans leur façon d'enseigner] au secondaire ou seulement à l'université?

These comments show the student's interpretation of the text cited by seeking the instructor's reaction from her professional experience to the student's own questioning or opinion gleaned from professional experience at the secondary level only. One can identify an attempt at thinking what the other's reaction is to one's thinking.

- 3mko Je pense que les pidgins sont très importants parce que c'est le point de rencontre pour des cultures différentes. C'est une sorte de négociation./ I think that pidgins are very important as they represent the cross-over point for different cultures. It is a sort of negotiation.

Here the student takes a leap from what the text says in the linguistic explanation of pidgins looking at it through a cultural studies lens from her understanding of what was gleaned from previous studies and going beyond.

Although it is not quite clear what kind of negotiating is referred to, it is obvious that the student is trying to take on a meta-meta-perspective.

- DH J'utilise l'infinif plus souvent dans mes classes maintenant. Les étudiants au commencement le font aussi. Alors peut-être que je le fais parce qu'ils le font./I use infinitive verb forms more often in my classes now. My pupils do this at the beginning. So perhaps I do it because of their influence (they do it).

This student transposed the reaction from the reading to classroom experiences. In doing so, we find not only reactions as to observations of the pupils' ways of using the language, but also an indication of what the influence of the pupils' behaviours could have had on DH.

- GN Je pense qu'on doit être prudent en faisant des généralisations [en disant] qu'il y a «une» culture qui correspond à «une» langue. Il y en a plusieurs selon moi, une langue n'appartient pas strictement à un pays mais à tous les pays où on la parle./ I think one ought to be careful when making generalisations, when saying that there is «a culture» corresponding to “a language”. According to me a language does not strictly belong to a country but to the several countries in which it is spoken.

The cultural awareness evident in this comment points to advanced thinking way beyond what was implied by the comment in the text. Does this student have some familiarity with the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis or is the student thinking through a lens coloured by intercultural experiences? Given the distance taken from the text in this example, the perspective taking is situated beyond meta-perspective.

- 3mko Le contexte dans lequel on va enseigner le français n'est pas un contexte où l'étudiant doit apprendre la langue pour survivre, donc c'est [les formes erronées qu'on n'essaie pas d'améliorer] plus un refus d'apprendre la langue qu'une négociation entre les deux langues [la L1 et la L2]./The context in which we will teach French is not one in which pupils have to learn the language to survive; so it is more a refusal to learn the language (by not trying to improve on errors made) than a negotiation between two languages (L1, the first language and L2, the new language).

The student's comments indicate a reference to prior knowledge in linguistics and error correction and are filtered by 3mko's classroom experiences. In fact the student implies here how pupils' attitudes impact language learning, explicating what the thinking on pupils' attitudes is because of what local circumstances will do to 3mko and others' failure at being able to teach pupils correct forms of French. Here again, the reaction is situated beyond the level of

meta-perspective taking. The student refers to the far reaching implications on the outcomes of professional practice through what the pupils being taught display as an attitude to the subject matter and dismisses the linguistic explanation, perhaps as a justification for failure or as an anticipation of possibly less positive teaching results.

Comments on productions at this level:

Only the few students' contributions above are situated at this level of perspective-taking, that is five out of 54 participants. It is moreover interesting to note that it was always the same students who took this position. It was hoped that when the readings in the text required more advanced positioning in regards to some theoretical issues, a great number of the students would engage in meta-meta-perspective taking, perhaps even as a way of peeling the layers in order to get a better grasp of the intended meanings. This was not the case.