A Semiotic Approach to the Reading of Literary Texts in EFL Classes[*][**]

Yabancı Dil Sınıflarında Yazınsal Metinlerin Okunmasına Göstergebilimsel Bir Yaklaşım

Necat KUMRAL[1]

[1]*Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa University, Foreign Languages Department, English Language Teaching Program. necat.kumral@gop.edu.tr*

ABSTRACT

Semiotic reading is a process approach developed in three steps to the reading of literary texts in language classes. The consecutive steps are said to be (1) reading within the text for the sense, (2) reading upon the text for the value and (3) reading against the text for the critique. In order to collect the data needed for the study a vast reading of the literature in the field concerned has been done and in class application of the approach has been administered accordingly. A control group and an experimental group were formed of the 4th grade students of the Police Academy, who were all upper intermediate in their study of English as a foreign language. Since the participants were the cadets qualified enough to be officers ready to work in their field using English, they were all considered eligible, and therefore they were selected exclusively for the study. The data were analyzed and interpreted to come up with a sound conclusion to see to what extent the thesis statement of the study and the results reached overlapped. T-test was used and the results were displayed in tables indicating the frequency each item of both comprehension questions and interpretations questions received. When the answers both of the groups gave to the comprehension questions were compared, it was observed that there was a statistically significant difference between the groups. However, when the answers both of the groups gave to the interpretation questions were compared, it was realized that there was a highly significant

difference between the groups concerned. The differences that appeared indicated that the hypothesis of the thesis was correct and that semiotic reading approach was applicable to the reading of literary texts in EFL settings has been proven.

Keywords: *Semiotics, Semiotic reading, Sense, Value, Interpretation*

ÖZ

Göstergebilimsel okuma yabancı dil sınıflarında yazınsal (edebi) metinlerin okunması için geliştirilen üç aşamalı bir süreci içine alan yaklaşımdır. Birbiri ardına gelen aşamalar; (1) metin içinde kalarak anlamı elde etme, (2) metin üzerine çıkarak derin anlamı yakalama ve (3) eleştiri için metne karşı okuma şeklindedir. Çalışma için gerekli veriyi toplama amacıyla ilgili alanda çok geniş bir araştırma yapılmış ve yaklaşımın sınıf içi uygulaması, uygun bir şekilde yerine getirilmiştir. Katılımcılar, İngilizce düzeyleri orta üstü olan Polis Akademisi son sınıf öğrencileri arasından seçilerek kontrol ve deney grubu oluşturulmuştur. Katılımcılar, kendi alanlarında İngilizce kullanarak çalışmaya hazır memurlar olmak için nitelikli öğrencilerden, çalışma için özel olarak seçilmiş ve tamamı çalışmaya dâhil edilmiştir. Tezin iddia ettiği okuma aşamalarının örtüşme düzeyleri hakkında sağlıklı bir sonuca varabilmek için elde edilen veriler t-testi ile analiz edilmiş ve yorumlanmıştır. Sonuçlar hem anlama hem de yorum sorularının her birinin aldığı frekansı gösterecek şekilde tablolar hâlinde düzenlenmiştir. Her iki grubun anlama sorularına verdikleri cevaplar karşılaştırıldığında aralarında istatiksel olarak anlamlı bir farkın olduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Yine söz konusu grupların yorum sorularına verdikleri cevaplar karşılaştırıldığında, aralarında hayli yüksek oranda istatiksel olarak anlamlı bir farkın olduğu görülmüştür. Ortaya çıkan farklar tezin iddia ettiği varsayımı doğrulamış ve göstergebilimsel okuma yaklaşımının İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği ortamlarda yazınsal (edebi) metinlerin okunmasına uygun olduğu kanıtlanmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: *Göstergebilim, Göstergebilimsel okuma, Anlam, Tema, Yorum*

INTRODUCTION

Language is a code of communication formed of verbal signs that are used to communicate a particular idea in a given situation. This code is a langue existing as a virtual system in the mind of the speakers who use it the way they internalize it as their mother tongue in brain. Langue becomes an actual system known as speech when used as a code of communication in a setting (Peirce, 1986; Saussure, 1986; Clarke, 1987). Using language in a context requires the use of discourse markers that interlocutors adopt so as to communicate properly. Communication occurs when the speaker transmits a message and the listener receives it as clearly as possible. When the messages cannot be transmitted and received well, there occurs a communication breakdown somewhere along the process. Proper communication requires the interlocutors to develop both linguistic competence and communication competence since language as a system of verbal signs also requires mastery over pragmatic principles (Grundy, 1995; Levinson, 1983).

Semiotics as an interdisciplinary study of communication deals with this sort of proper exchange of information in a communication setting. Communication through any system of signs, not necessarily verbal signs, namely words, is what semiotics takes it as its province. In the study of a work of art literary competence comes into play as literary works are opaque, not crystal clear, as the sense reached through literal study is not enough to appreciate the work properly (Collie & Slater, 1987). The hidden meaning behind the words can only be reached by moving from the sense to the value, the theme of the work at hand. The reader is expected to move from the said to the unsaid so as to get an overall picture of what is communicated through the work. If that is not enough to appreciate the work, the reader moves beyond it and criticizes it to reconstruct a text with a new centre of values (Derrida, 1986).

Semiotic reading of literary texts is a holistic approach offering a three-step reading scheme moving from the sense to the value and then to the critique of the text

concerned (Scholes, 1982). The reader develops a semiotic reading skill by reading within the text for the sense, the literal meaning, reading upon the text for the value and reading against the text for the critique. The reader takes a semiotic trip when s/he reads the text for the sense, interprets it for the value and evaluates or criticizes it for the critique. As the approach moves from simple to complex considering all the domains of learning—cognitive, affective and psychomotor—its objectives are said to be in accordance with the taxonomy of educational objectives (Granhund, 1985).

Literature Review

Language and culture are related that it is not necessary to elaborate on the relationship as it is always obvious from a semiotic point of view (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952; Lado, 1961; Valdes, 1996). Language as a powerful code is used to hand down culture from one generation to another (Hartley, 1982). "Language," says Nasr (1983, p.1) "is an acquired vocal system for communicating meanings." Language is also this vocal system to express feelings and explain thoughts (Huttenlocher, 1978). As a code of communication, it is used to communicate across thoughts, and to Miller (1978, p.3) "communication occurs when events in one place at one time are closely related to events in another place or at another time" and that "any physical process that has the capacity to span space and time can be used as a communication system." Communication does not occur in a vacuum and requires at least two people to exchange thoughts and/or ideas at a particular time. Wardhaugh (1988, p.1) states "when two people communicate with each other in speech (or through a text) we can call the system of communication that they employ a code […] and in most cases that code we may want to call a language." Language is a then a code of communication formed of verbal signs that turn into signifiers (sound-image) referring to signifieds (content: idea). This signification or stand-for reprocess is called semiosis that occurs when people communicate using a particular language (Barthes, 1994; Eco, 1979; Hawkes, 1992). Sless (1986, p.5) states that semiotics is "the study of communication and understanding' and semiosis is the process by which communication and understanding occur." To Sless (1986, p.5) communication and understanding are so

much related that without understanding the message communication cannot occur as this process of understanding is "one of the most powerful and useful concepts in the history of intellectual activity."

Intellectual activity does not happen by itself as there should be a context in which communication and understanding occur (Blass, 1990; Brown & Yule, 1985; Cook, 1989; Salkie, 1995; Schiffren, 1994; Van Dijk, 1981; Yule, 1997)). The role of context is significant in that the interpretation of any literary text depends partly on the standards of textuality (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981). The seven standards are said to be *cohesion*, *coherence*, *intentionality*, *acceptability*, *informativity*, *situationality* and *intertextuality*. These seven standards are assumed to have been met because literary texts are composed of well-developed texture meeting them all. According to Miller (1978, p.12) it is not adequate for a literary text to be absolutely comprehensible since language is unable "to capture the more elusive aspect of human consciousness," because "socially shared conventions of language have little value" and "communication about private psychological experiences can only be carried out by analogy, by metaphor, by poetry." Therefore, in this study a poem was used as a literary text to foreground how the private psychological experience of the poet was handled.

Signs are all around and what we do is to use these to communicate across our thoughts by weaving signs meaningfully. According to Kim (1996, p.1) psychology, philosophy and semiotics share a common ground, and she explains the relationship by making an analogy saying "standing on the earth of psychology humans live under the sky of philosophy between which are the symbolic systems developed around signs." This analogy gives us the clue that we are already surrounded by signs constantly communicating something meaningful depending on the context of the situation. This context of situation becomes the artistic medium in which language is used to express feelings, thoughts, ideas, and the like. The artistic medium is what the learner is expected to develop in the process of time through the study of literature. Language cannot be separated from literature as it provides perfect examples of language use. In a

work of art, the auditory/temporal signs which are symbolic in nature turn into visual/spatial signs forming a texture of the literary work in question.

There is a strong relationship between semiotics and language teaching since semiotics as the interdisciplinary study of communication comprises the study of language both in EFL and ESL settings in which language is the medium of communication (Erton, 2006; Kumral, 2006; Sert, 2006; Şenel, 2007; Nabifar & Baghermousavi, 2015; Husain, Dj, & Musrifah, 2020). Language, however, is not adequate to help explain intricate human thoughts processes, where semiotics comes into play to present a wide point of view as it includes verbal, non-verbal and multimodal communication (Kurtul, 2013; Kumral, 2013). Literary studies in EFL classes contributes a lot to the understanding of intricate human thought processes, and semiotic approach to the reading of literary texts in language classes can easily wipe out the problem whenever it occurs in the process of communication.

METHODOLOGY

The aim of this experimental study is to show how the semiotic reading approach can be applied to the reading of literary texts in EFL classes. Robert Lee Frost's poem was selected for the sole purpose that the narrative of the poem was easy to follow and that the poem was rich in terms of literary devices and symbols, which required the reader to move from the sense to the value in order to fully appreciate the text at hand. Two groups were formed: a control group and an experimental group. The groups were formed of the participants who were of the same age and had almost the same background in terms of language study. They were all English-medium police college originating students except two female students who were also English-medium Anatolian High School graduates. They were all at upper intermediate level and competent learners judging by their performance as learners of English in a typical EFL setting. The variables like age, academic background and their level in English were all ignored to come up with statistically significant data based on their performance on the test concerned. While the control group was given the poem with comprehension and

interpretation questions to check their understanding of the text and to what extent they were able to interpret the text, the experimental group was provided with the necessary background information in order for them to comprehend and interpret the text properly. The latter group was also provided with the key to the symbols as they are necessary to understand and interpret the text fully. The data collected were displayed in tables and assessed by means of t-test to find the t-value to compare and contrast the results of the tests given to the groups. The comprehension and interpretation results found after the analysis of the data were said to be statistically significant. At the end of the study some conclusions were drawn: (1) semiotic reading is a comprehensive approach, (2) it is applicable to the reading of literary texts in EFL classes, and (3) it can be used as a critical reading approach.

The test to collect the data for analysis was based on the meticulous library research and composed of nine questions. Four of the questions were comprehension-oriented while the rest five were interpretation-oriented.

1. Do you think the narrator's mood changes in the poem? How do you get a sense of that change between the stanzas? Consider how the shifting of mood coincides with the divisions of the poem.

2. What do you find in the first stanza? Does he describe or explain what he sees in the morning? Is there anything peculiar to the natural event? What for example?

3. What makes the narrator start asking questions in the course of the poem? How do you think he feels when he poses questions? Does he know the answers or simply echo his thoughts in his inner world without any interest in the answers?

4. What sort of design does the poet speak of? How does he feel when he finds a design in such a small thing? Why?

5. What do assorted characters of death and blight refer to? What do these characters signify respectively?

6. What does satin cloth refer to? What does it signify? Which of the characters mentioned do you associate it with? Please explain briefly why you think so.

7. Why do you think the poet refers to the characters as the ingredients of a witch's broth? Would you call them in a different way? How?

8. What sort of analogies can you find in the poem? Give them in order if you find any. What do they signify respectively in relation to enigma of life?

9. What happens to them all in the end? Do you agree with the narrator on the fate of the characters involved in the story as a consequence of his intellectual reasoning as to the design he finds in a thing so small? Do you sense that there is any moral lesson usually found in fables that the poet intends to communicate across?

The first four were designed to check their understanding of the poem as they were all based on the sense of the text, whereas the rest of the questions were designed to see to what extent they were able to interpret the poem. The first group (control group) consisted of ten students two of whom were female participants. Although the second group (experimental group) consisted of ten participants, two of them did not take the test. They were the same age, therefore age variable was ignored. They were all upper intermediate level in their foreign language study. Group 1 was presented with the poem 'Design' written by R. L. Frost with both comprehension and interpretation questions. Group 2 was provided with the information and key points necessary for better comprehension and interpretation of the same poem. Both of the groups answered the same questions and time allocated for the answer was the same. Depending on the frequency each item received the tables based on their comprehension and interpretation were made accordingly considering the groups respectively. An evaluation scale was formed ranging from 100 to 0. Therefore, a correct answer received 100 points, whereas semi-correct, partly correct and incorrect received 50, 25 and 0 respectively. The scores were evaluated according to t-test used to test how significant the differences regarding both of comprehension and interpretation between the groups were. The difference is significant beyond .05 and 1 levels, which indicates that the difference can be

interpreted as reliable or true with acceptable confidence provided that the t-value is significant beyond .05. The findings provided the researcher with the data to conclude that the approach developed was practically applicable to the reading of literary texts in EFL settings.

The following computation was done through the formulas below and the t-test was used for the analysis of the data.

$X = Єx / n$ for mean score

$S = Є (x-x)^2 / n-1$ for standard deviation

$S_H = S/ n$ for standard error

$D = A—B$ for the difference between the mean scores.

$S_D = SA^2 + SB^2$ for the standard error of the difference between mean scores.

$t = D / S_D$ for t-value

The results of the difference in comprehension and interpretation between the groups in terms of t-value are as follows:

Control Group

Comprehension	Interpretation
$X=33$	$X=13,5$
$S= 8,563$	$S=11,247$
$n=10$	$n= 10$
$S_H=2,77$	$S_H= 3,556$

Experimental Group

Comprehension	Interpretation
$X=32,5$	$X=40,5$

S= 8,0178   S=9,4868

n=8   n= 8

S_H=2,835 $S_{H=}$ 3,354

t= 0,1275   t= 5, 52351

(statistically significant)   (statistically highly significant)

Ethical Issues

This research had been conducted as part of the Ph.D thesis completed by the author before 01.01.2020, when ethical approval was not a prerequisite at the time; therefore, it was not received from the authorities of the National Police Academy where the study was carried out.

FINDINGS

The results of the research indicated that there is statistically significant difference between the groups concerned in terms of comprehension level of the participants. When it comes to speaking of interpretation level of the participants, there is a statistically highly significant difference between the groups. The following tables were made according to the frequencies each item received respectively in line with the answers of groups to the comprehension questions, and the next two consecutive tables were made considering the frequencies each item received in accordance with the answers of the groups to interpretation questions.

Tablo 1. Answers of Control Group to Comprehension Questions

Score	100	50	25	0	
Questions	Correct	Semi-correct	Partly correct	Incorrect	Total
1	8	2			90
2	6	2		2	70
3	5	1	3	1	62.50
4	9			1	90

Q1 received eight correct answers and two semi-correct answers, which means that the participants got the question right and answered quite well. **Q2** received six correct answers, two semi-correct and two incorrect, which indicates that they understood the question well and their answers were on the whole all right but not fully explained well. **Q3** received five correct answers, one semi-correct, three partly correct and one incorrect answer, which means that they understood the question but their answers varied from correct to incorrect. They may not have quite formulated their answers to make all of them correct based on what they read. **Q4** received nine correct answers and only one incorrect answer, which comes to mean that they understood the question well and their answer were to the point.

Tablo 2. Answers of Experimental Group to the Comprehension Questions

Score	100	50	25	0	
Questions	Correct	Semi-correct	Partly correct	Incorrect	Total
1	7	1			93.75
2	4	3		1	71.80
3	5	1		2	68.75
4	7	1			93.75

Q1 received seven correct and one semi-correct answers, which means that the participants got the question right and answered quite well. **Q2** received four correct, three semi-correct and one incorrect answers, which indicates that they understood the question and their answers were on the whole all right but not fully explained well. **Q3** received five correct, one semi-correct and two incorrect answers, which means that they understood the question but their answers varied from correct to incorrect. They may not have quite formulated their answers to make all of them correct based on what they read. **Q4** received seven correct answers and only one partly correct answer, which means that they understood the question well and their answer were all right.

Tablo 3. Answers of Control Group to the Interpretation Questions

Score	100	50	25	0	
Questions	Correct	Semi-correct	Partly correct	Incorrect	Total
5	3	1	1	5	37.50
6	1	5		4	35
7	1		4	5	20
8		1		9	5
9	1	1		8	15

Q5 received three correct and one semi-correct, one partly correct and five incorrect answers, which means that the participants got the question right but not answered quite well. This is because interpretation questions were highly challenging and demanding more knowledge as opposed to comprehension questions. **Q6** received one correct, five semi-correct and four incorrect answers, which indicates that they may have got the question right, but their answers were not on the whole all right. This calls to mind that this question appeared to be more demanding than the previous one. **Q7** received one correct, four partly correct and five incorrect answers, which means that they understood the question but their answers varied from correct to incorrect. They may not have quite formulated their answers to make all of them correct based on what they were required to interpret. **Q8** received one semi-correct and nine incorrect answers, which means that they either misunderstood the question or they simply did not compose their ideas thoroughly. This result indicated that this question appeared to be the most demanding one among them all. **Q9** received one correct, one semi-correct and eight incorrect answers, which indicates that they may have understood the question but they may not have answered it the way they were required to.

Tablo 4. Answers of Experimental Group to Interpretation Questions

Score	100	50	25	0	
Questions	Correct	Semi-correct	Partly correct	Incorrect	Total
5	3	2		3	50
6	6	2			71
7	4		1	3	53
8	5	1		2	68.75
9	6	1		1	81.25

Q5 received three correct and two semi-correct and three incorrect answers, which means that the participants got the question right but not answered well. Group 2 answered more questions correctly due to the fact they were provided with the necessary information. **Q6** received six correct, and two semi-correct, which indicates that they got the question right, and their answers were to the point. This adds up to the point that this question appeared far less demanding than the previous one. **Q7** received four correct, one partly correct and three incorrect answers, which means that they understood the question but their answers were not the way they were expected to provide. Their interpretation was not to the point. **Q8** received five correct, one semi-correct and two incorrect answers, which means that they understood the question and they composed their ideas accordingly. **Q9** received six correct, one semi-correct and ne incorrect answer, which means that they understood the question and answered it the way they were required to.

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

The results of the research have shown that the approach is applicable to the reading of literary texts both in theory and in practice. Participants expressed genuine interest in taking the test and wondered what the results of the study were. As it is part of the thesis statement that they would have difficulty answering the interpretation questions as they were naturally more demanding than comprehension questions. Since comprehension was based on the literal meaning of the poem, it was expected to become easy on their part to answer them. However, some of them appeared to be more demanding since they were not able to answer them properly. Even if they were assumed to have reached the sense of the text as they were provided with the meaning of the new words through guided vocabulary check, they still had difficulty understanding the text fully. Group 2 was expected to perform much better while answering the comprehension questions, for they were also provided with the key words and metaphors used in the poem. Nevertheless, the answers to the questions checking their comprehension were not absolutely different as some of the items really became challenging on their part. The

real difference was expected to be in their answers to interpretation questions since Group 1 had no prior information unlike Group 2, and they were on their own to interpret the poem so as to answer the questions properly. Group 2 made a lot of difference in answering interpretation questions because they were given all the necessary information pertaining to the literary devices used in the poem. They were able to get the deeper meaning, value or the theme of the poem, as they were engaged in the signification process known as semiosis, which was indispensable part of their effort to interpret the poem. Both of the groups went through the same material which happened to be totally communicative, for it was composed of all the necessary components such as *setting the scene*, *about the author*, *guided vocabulary check*, *the text*, *understanding the poem* (comprehension questions) and *reading between the lines* (interpretation questions). They were not expected to move beyond the limitation of the study to criticize the poem as they were not literarily competent enough to create their own text around their values.

Both theory of semiotic reading and how to apply it to language study complete the picture needed for a thorough understanding of how it really works in practice. Any sort of communication either oral or written is a concern of semiotics since this interdisciplinary study takes any of them as its province. Language is a linguistic sign system and semiotics considers it as a verbal sign system. Words are signs that refer to any existent or nonexistent thing in the world as they can be concrete and abstract notions used in any act of communication. Semiotics deals with all these notions as they refer to any concepts stored in the mind of the speaker and the listener, which makes communication flow possible. Any word is a sound-image stored as content-idea between which there is no clear cut resemblance but rather arbitrariness. Discourse analysis of texts is a pragmatic approach to textual communication. Language used in a context requires pragmatic analysis as meaning can be derived taking context-features into consideration. From a semiotic point of view discourse analysis is essential part of the whole issue because meaning derived as sense can be reached by reading within the text, which is the referential meaning. Since there is this deep meaning lying in the

cultural background of any literary text, reaching sense in context is not enough in semiotic reading. Reading upon the text for the value is the second step, for the reader feels the need to interpret the text by engaging in intellectual activity requiring semiosis. If the reader intends to take one step further, s/he reads against the text for the critique by creating a new text around his/her values. In-class application of the approach indicated that the approach can be applicable to the reading scheme it proposes in EFL classes. It also indicates that the approach can be used as a critical reading approach in language classes.

There have been some developments in the field of reading literary texts in EFL classes from semiotic point of view since 2000 when the thesis was completed. While semiotics stands as a study of communication, some researchers have thought that there is a close relationship between language teaching and semiotics (Erton, 2006; Kumral, 2006; Sert, 2006; Şenel, 2007; Nabifar & Baghermousavi, 2015; Husain, Dj & Musrifah, 2020) as they share a common ground ranging from the study of semantics to the study of pragmatics (Kumral, 2013; Kurtul, 2013).

REFERENCES

Barthes, R. (1994). *Elements of semiology*. New York: Hill & Wang.

Beaugrande, R. & Dressler, W. U. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*. London: Longman.

Blass, R. (1990). *Relevance relations in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1985). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clarke, D.S. (1987). *Principles of semiotics*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Collie, J. & Slater, S. (1987). *Literature in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Hon Kong: Oxford University Press.

Derrida, J. (1986). Structure, sign and play. In H. Adams & L. Searle (Eds.), *Critical theory since 1965* (pp.79-136). Tallahassee: Florida State University Press.

De Saussure , F. (1986). Course in general linguistics. In H. Adams & L. Searle (Eds.), *Critical theory since 1965* (pp.645-656). Tallahassee: Florida State University Press.

Eco, U. (1979). *A theory of semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Erton, İ. (2006). Semiotic nature of language teaching methods in foreign language teaching and learning. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *2* (1), 73-86.

Granhund, N. (1985). *Stating objectives for classroom*. New York: MacMillan.

Grundy, P. (1995). *Doing pragmatics*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hartley, A. (1982). *Linguistics for language learners*. London: MacMillan Press Ltd.

Hawkes, T. (1992). *Structuralism and semiotics*. London: Routledge.

Husain, N., Dj, M., & Musrifah, M. (2020). Semiotic analysis to the cultural content in the EFL text book. *International Journal of Research on English Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 67-82. doi:10.30863/v1i2.1230

Huttenlocher, J. (1978). Language and thought. In G. Miller (Ed.), *Psychology and communication*. Washington D.C.: USIA.

Kim, K. L. (1996) *Caged in our own signs: A book about semiotics*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Kroeber A. L. & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). *Culture, a critical review of concepts of definitions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kumral, N. (2006). Incorporating semiotic communication into EFL reading classes. *Education and Science*, *31* (141), 21-31.

Kumral, N. (2013). Semiotic analysis of textual communication in Snow by Julia Alvarez. *Journal Language and Linguistic Studies*, *9*(2), 31-44. Retrieved from http://www.jlls.org/vol9no2/31-44.pdf.

Kurtul, K. (2013). *Cellat ve Ağlayan Yüz* adlı hikayenin göstergebilimsel açıdan incelenmesi. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *9*(1), 81-94. Retrieved from http://www.jlls.org/vol9no1/81-94.pdf.

Lado, R. (1961). *Linguistics across cultures*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, G. A. (1978). Psychology and communication. In G. Miller (Ed.), *Psychology and communication*. Washington D.C.: USIA.

Nabifar, N. & Baghermousavi, M. S. (2015). Social semiotics evaluation of *English One* by gender. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *2*(2), 74-86.

Nasr, R. T. (1983). *The essentials of linguistic science*. London: Longman.

Peirce, C. S. (1986). Letters to Lady Welby. In H. Adams & L. Searle (Eds.), *Critical theory since 1965* (pp.637-644). Tallahassee: Florida State University Press.

Salkie, R. (1995). *Text and discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.

Schiffren, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Scholes, R. (1982). *Semiotics and interpretation*. New York: Yale University Press.

Sert, O. (2006). Semiotic approach and its contributions to language learning and teaching. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, *32*, 106-114.

Sless, D. (1986). *In search of semiotics*. London: Croom Helm.

Şenel, M. (2007). The semiotic approach and language teaching and learning. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *3*(1), 117-132. Retrieved from http://www.jlls.org/vol3no1/117-132.

Van Dijk, T. (1981). *Studies in the pragmatics of discourse*. Paris: Mouton.

Valdes, J. M. (1996). *Culture bound*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wardhaugh, R. (1988). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Yule, G. (1997). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

ORCID

Necat KUMRAL https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2857-8424

GENİŞ ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı Göstergebilimsel Yaklaşım'ın, yazınsal metinlerin yabancı dil sınıflarında okunmasına nasıl uygulanabileceğini göstermektir. Yabancı dil sınıflarında öğrencilerin anlamdan temaya ulaşmaları gerektiğinden okuma, onların kolay bir şekilde yazınsal kapasitelerini geliştirmelerinde yardımcı olabilecek bir beceridir. Yabancı dil sınıflarında öğrencilerin bu yazınsal kapasiteyi geliştirmeleri beklenmektedir. Göstergebilim, parçalardan daha çok bütüne odaklandığından her hangi bir eleştirel yaklaşımdan çok daha geniş bir bakış açısı sunmaktadır. Dolayısıyla okuyucunun bu bakış açısını yakalaması için metnin temelinde var olan kültürel boyut hakkında yeterince bilgi sahibi olması gerekmektedir. Okuyucunun doğru bir yoruma ulaşabilmesi, anlamın retorik ve bağlamsal boyutlarını bilmesine bağlıdır çünkü söz konusu bilgilerin eksikliği onlar açısından sorunun temelini teşkil etmektedir. Dahası, bu eksiklik metnin neden ve nasıl meydana getirildiği hakkında bir sonuca ulaşılmasını da engellemektedir.

Yazınsal metinler dilbilimsel kapasite ve performans gerektirmektedir. Yazar tarafından istekle yapılmış göndermeler derin ve geniş bağlam oluşturduğunda okuyucu açısından güçlüğe neden olabilmektedir. Metnin tarihsel, sosyal ve geleneksel geri planına yapılan göndermelerle çok daha geniş bir kapsama sahip olması ve derin anlamın kültürel boyutta gizlenmesi nedeniyle okunan metnin ne olduğu konusunda bir karara varılması güçleşmektedir. Göstergebilim, okuyucunun kendi ekseni etrafında bir metin oluşturmasını sağlamaktadır. Okuyucuyu anlamada, yorumlamada ve metni eleştirmede bilgilendirerek söz konusu sorunu çözmede ona yardım eder.

Bu çalışmanın kapsamı Göstergebilimsel Okuma Kuramı ve onun yabancı dil ortamlarında yazınsal metinlerin okunmasına uygulanması ile sınırlı kalmaktadır. Önde gelen göstergebilimciler, dilbilimciler ve felsefeciler tarafından geliştirilen kuramlar bu çalışmanın odak noktasını teşkil etmektedir. Bu kuramlar, göstergebilimsel yaklaşımın eleştirel bir okuma yaklaşımı olduğunu göstermek için yapısalcı ve postyapısalcı akımlar adı altında gerektiği gibi ele alınacaktır. Yapısalcılar metnin gösterdiği anlamı (sense) ön plana çıkarırken post yapısalcılar metnin geri planında var olan derin anlama (value) vurgu yapmaktadır. Araştırmada metin olarak seçilen tür şiir olduğu için bu şiirin anlamına ve derin anlamına nasıl ulaşılabileceği ele alınmaktadır.

Geniş bir araştırma yapılmış ve yukarıda belirtildiği gibi, kuramsal çerçeve, yabancı dil sınıfında bir şiirin okunmasına uygulanarak pratik anlamda desteklenmiştir. Kontrol ve deney grupları oluşturulmuştur. Katılımcılar, yaşları yakın, aynı düzeyde dil becerisine sahip ve yabancı dil ağırlıklı Polis Koleji mezunu olan Polis Akademisi son sınıf öğrencilerinden (ikisi hariç) oluşmaktadır. Diğer iki öğrenci yine yabancı dil ağırlıklı Anadolu Lisesi mezunu Polis Akademisi son sınıf öğrencileridir. Katılımcıların dil düzeyleri orta üstü olup dil kullanımında beceri sahibi olan bireylerdir. Çalışmada, yaş, akademik geçmiş ve dil düzeyi gibi değişkenler gözardı edilmiş ve çalışma sonucunda istatiksel anlamda farklar gözlenmiştir.

Kontrol grubuna anlama ve yorum soruları verilmiş ve onların metni anlamaları ve yorumlamaları test edilmiştir. Deney grubuna, anlama ve yorumlamanın tam anlamıyla yapılabilmesi için şiirde geçen semboller ve gerekli olan ön bilgiler kontrol grubuna verilen sorularla birlikte verilmiştir. Her iki gruba verilen test sonuçlarını karşılaştırmak için toplanılan

veriler tablolar hâlinde gösterilmiş ve anlamlılığın gözlemlenebilmesi için t-testi ile değerlendirilmiştir. Anlam sonuçları, istatistiki yönden değerli olarak gözlemlenirken yorum sonuçları istatistiki yönden yüksek oranda değerli bulunmuştur.

Katılımcılar hem testle hem çalışmanın sonuçlarıyla ilgilenmişlerdir. Gönüllülük esasına dayalı bir çalışma olduğundan gösterilen ilgi sonuçlara da yansımıştır. Çalışmanın başında katılımcıların yorum sorularında zorlanacakları varsayılmış, çalışma esnasındaki bu zorluklar sonuçlarda gözlemlenmiştir. Anlam sorularının yanıtları en temel düzeyde şiiri anlama ile sağlandığından birkaç soru haricinde öğrencilerin zorlanmadıkları görülmüştür. Sözcük anlamlarıyla sağlanan anlam düzeyi, yönlendirilmiş sözcük seçimleriyle kolay hâle getirilmeye çalışılmıştır. Buna karşın anlama, bazı semboller nedeniyle yine de kolay olmamıştır. Deney grubuna sembollere dair bilgi verilmiş olmasına karşın anlama düzeyinde büyük bir farklılık gözlemlenmemiştir. Yorum sorularına verilen yanıtlarda deney grubunun daha başarılı olacağı varsayılmış ancak varılan sonuçlarda büyük bir fark gözlemlenmiştir. Katılımcıların yazınsal metinlere olan yetkinlikleri yeterli düzeyde olmadığından katılımcılardan metnin üzerine çıkarak eleştiri düzeyine ulaşmaları beklenmemiş ve çalışmanın sınırı bu şekilde belirlenmiştir. Çalışmada Göstergebilimsel okumanın (1) kapsamlı bir yaklaşım olduğu, (2) yabancı dil sınıflarında yazınsal metinlerin okunmasına uygulanabilir olduğu ve (3) eleştirel okuma yaklaşımı olarak da kullanılabilir olduğu sonuçlarına varılmıştır.