

READING POETRY IN NON-DIRECTIVE SETTINGS

by

M. Alayne Sullivan

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
McGill University, Montréal,
October, 1990

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are a number of collaborators without whose scholarship, fine example, and support this thesis could not have been completed

First of all, I want to thank Patrick Dias for his patience, guidance and, most of all, his generosity. He has shared his ideas and research and been 'there' whenever needed, whatever strengths there may be in this piece of work have been influenced by him. Helen Amorizzi has been extremely supportive and offered many useful suggestions that have helped me tremendously throughout the writing phase of this project. Bob Bracewell and Mike Bristol have also spent time reviewing my work and their comments have been very helpful.

I am very grateful to Dianna Kinnach, and the principal and staff of Les Moynes D'Iberville School. Dianna made the pilot study a pleasure; she helped to make the data collection process and small-group work flow smoothly, and was an enthusiastic supporter of the entire project from the outset. Shelley Corrin was most cooperative and genuinely interested as well; she and her students were a terrific help and great fun to collaborate with during the latter stages of the study. Thanks as well to the many teachers at that school who walked quietly and helped in many small ways while the students were recording their interpretations of poetry.

I want to thank Jim Harris at the Educational Media Centre of McGill University who generously provided technical support, and the tutors at the Computer Lab at McGill who offered assistance whenever necessary. I am grateful, as well, to John Gradwell who arranged a grant from McGill University to pay raters to code protocols and cover the costs of cassette tapes. I also very much want to thank Bill Badger and the staff at St. George's School for kindly allowing me the use of their laser printing services. Thanks as well to Sharron Wall who meticulously proofread the final manuscript and offered invaluable suggestions, Mary Maguire who provided useful feedback on earlier drafts of the thesis, Collette St. Pierre who translated the abstract with such care, and Louise Murphy who has helped in so many ways.

Thank you Fran and Karen and Bruce, for providing untold support in so many ways over the past five years. And Carolyn Gibson - your friendship, wisdom and ongoing support are truly a gift.

I want to thank my family for their phone calls, letters, visits and ever-constant faith; thank you Judy, Ann Marie, Maureen, Sheila, Dad, and especially Mom - your prayers have been sustaining!

This research has been supported by a grant from F. C. A. R. (Fonds pour la Formation de Chercheurs et l'aide a la Recherche); without such financial support I could never have undertaken such work. I extend my sincere thanks for this opportunity.

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the reading processes used by nine sixteen-year-old, adolescent reluctant readers as they read and interpret poetry. The study also considers how these reading processes are affected by the students' participation in a one-month study of reading and independently discussing poetry in small groups. Each student's responding-aloud interpretation of poetry gathered before the study (pre-test protocol) is compared with his or her responding-aloud interpretation of poetry gathered after the study (post-test protocol). This is done by analyzing each protocol according to a reading scale which identifies five key-reading processes each of which is qualitatively differentiated across five categories. This reading scale, designed by the researcher, is based on the analysis of over one hundred and twenty responding-aloud protocols of adolescent reluctant readers.

Six of the nine readers refine the processes through which they read and interpret poetry. The most likely cause of this improvement is their having been involved in independent small-group discussion of poetry. The analysis of students' pre-test and post-test protocols reveal the (differing) extents to which each of them use the five key-reading processes.

RESUME

Cette recherche se veut une investigation des processus de lecture utilisés chez neuf adolescent(e)s agé(e)s de seize ans, peu réceptifs à la lecture, alors qu'ils (elles) lisaient et interprétaient de la poésie. Cette étude fait aussi état des effets qu'ont eu sur ces processus de lecture, la participation des étudiant(e)s à une étude sur la lecture d'une durée d'un mois, et de petits groupes indépendant de discussion sur la poésie. Les impressions et réactions orales de chaque étudiant(e) enregistrées avant l'étude (protocole pré-épreuve) sont comparées avec ses impressions et réactions orales enregistrées après l'étude (protocole post-épreuve). Ceci est réalisé en analysant chaque protocole d'après une échelle de lecture identifiant cinq processus clés de lecture, chacun d'eux différencié quantitativement sur cinq catégories. Cette échelle de lecture, conçue par la chercheuse, est basée sur l'analyse de plus de cent vingt protocoles d'enregistrement d'impressions et de réactions orales d'adolescentes peu réceptifs à la lecture.

Les résultats suggèrent que grâce aux petits groupes indépendants de discussion sur la poésie, six des neuf lecteurs (lectrices) ont acquis une nouvelle maîtrise des processus qu'ils (elles) empruntaient pour la lecture et l'interprétation de poésie. L'analyse des protocoles pré-épreuve et post-épreuve de ces étudiant(e)s révèle des degrés (différents) d'utilisation de chacun(e) d'eux (elles) des cinq processus clés de lectures.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iv
RESUME	V
INTRODUCTION	ix

Chapter	page
1. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	1
Reading Theory and Research	1
Reading Processes	1
Early Research in Reading	1
Schema Theory	2
Reading as Language and Thinking	4
Metacognition and Reading	6
Information Processing Models of Reading	7
Interactive Models of Reading	9
Teaching the Reading Process	10
Contexts for Teaching Reading	10
Teaching Comprehension Strategies	12
Evaluating the Reading Process	15
Group-Administered Reading Assessment	15
Process Oriented Assessment	16
Think-Aloud Protocols in Assessment	17
Reader-Response Theory and Research	18
The Literary-Reading Process	18
Relationship Between Reading and <i>Literary</i> Reading ..	18
Reader-Response and Literary Critical Theory	21
Interactive Theory of Literary Reading	21
Transactional Theory of Literary Reading	22
Psychoanalytic View of Literary Reading	23
Subjective View of Literary Reading	24
Interpretive Communities and Literary Reading	25

Chapter	page
1. ... cont'd	
Reader-Response Research (cont'd)	27
Teaching the Literary-Reading Process	31
Contexts for Teaching Literature	31
Small-Group Instruction	32
Evaluating the Literary-Reading Process	35
Need for Evaluating the <i>Process</i>	35
Responding-Aloud Protocols as Evaluation Tools	36
2. DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AND METHODOLOGY	38
Students	38
Materials	40
Procedures	41
Pre-test and Post-test Responding-Aloud Interpretations . . .	41
Small-Group Discussion	43
The Development of the Reading Scale	46
The Reading Scale	51 & 52
3. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	53
Five Sample Protocols	53
Vera	55
Barbara	77
Brenda	85
Nesbitt	95
Bob	104

Chapter	page
3. ... cont'd	
Analysis of Pre-test and Post-test Responding-Aloud Protocols . .	111
Barbara	111
Nesbitt	118
Trish	126
Donald	137
Rick	142
Sarah	163
Eric	175
Nat	187
Robin	196
4. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	206
Conclusions	206
Processes of Reluctant Adolescent Readers Reading Poetry	206
Effects of Independent Small-Group Discussion	207
Demonstrating Change in the Poetry-Reading Process	213
Implications	215
Teaching Implications	215
Research Implications	215
Limitations	216
Number of Students Participating	216
Design Limitations	217
Statistical Validity Limitations	217
Contributions to Research and Theory	217
How Readers Synthesize - Effect on Aesthetic Engagement	217
How Readers Expand and Clarify Interpretations	219
How Adolescents Use Key Reading Processes	220
How Reading is a Transaction	221
BIBLIOGRAPHY	223
APPENDIX A	237
APPENDIX B	239

INTRODUCTION

Curiosity about the nature of the reading process has taken researchers and theorists along various paths in their attempts to investigate it. E. B. Huey once said that:

to completely analyze what we do when we read would be the acme of a psychologist's dream for it would be to describe very many of the most intricate workings of the human mind as well as to unravel the tangled story of the most remarkable specific performance that civilization has learned in all its history (1908, p. 8)

Obviously, it is beyond the scope of any one piece of research to unravel such a 'tangled story'. But by looking at one particular group of readers and situating their reading 'performances' in the context of some of the research and theory that focuses on the reading process, some light may be shed on one small piece of that story. Specifically, this dissertation examines the reading processes of sixteen year-old reluctant readers as they interpret poetry.

This inquiry about the poetry-reading processes of adolescents is related to a broad body of literature. Both reading and literary theorists and researchers investigate the nature of the reading process and do so from a varying range of perspectives. They have constructed various models and theories of the reading process, raised considerations about teaching the reading process, and explored issues about evaluating the reading process. The three questions directing this study rest in the context of such work. These three questions are:

1. What are the processes through which sixteen year-old reluctant readers read and interpret poetry?
2. As a result of independently discussing (selected) poems in small groups (of three students each), over a one-month period, will such adolescents refine the processes by which they read and interpret poetry?
3. How can change in the processes by which these adolescents read and interpret poetry be demonstrated?

The first research question rests in the context of reading research and theory about the general nature of the reading process and about reading literary text in particular. One researcher's work has actually focused on the reading processes by which adolescents read poetry (Dias, 1979, 1987). Dias has identified four reading patterns and various reading processes used by adolescents as they read poetry. He has demonstrated that when adolescents respond, in writing, to poetry after they have been involved in his small-group procedure for independent discussion of poetry, these responses have been scored (blindly and independently) higher than written responses completed by a control group taught according to a large-group teacher-directed format. Such findings have been replicated by Bryant (1984), Engbrecht (1986), and Straw (1989). The research conducted for this dissertation differs from such previous research in that it compares each student's responding-aloud interpretation of poetry gathered **before** small-group discussion with his or her responding-aloud interpretation gathered **after** small-group discussion.

This study contributes to the work that has been done in reading and reader-response research by identifying five key-reading processes (classified according to fifteen subprocesses) used by reluctant adolescent readers when reading poetry. Previous work has focused on written responses to literature, (Richards, 1929; Purves and Rippere, 1968) and/or protocol studies quite often done by college level literature students (Holland, 1975, Kintgen, 1983). The work presented in this thesis identifies reading processes (and subprocesses) of adolescents *as* they read by tape-recording their verbal interpretations of (two) poems, transcribing these interpretations and identifying reading processes as inferred through the analysis of over one hundred and twenty such interpretations. In addition, these reading processes are qualitatively differentiated according to five varying degrees to which the five key-reading processes and their subprocesses are used. The manner in which each student uses the reading processes is demonstrated through an analysis of each student's pre-test and post-test protocol according to five categories of reading which are set forth in a reading scale. Thus, in addition to complementing the work previously done in reader-response research, this study demonstrates *how* reading processes are used through an analysis of each of the protocols and how the reading processes of each student change after their participation in small-group, independent discussion of poetry.

Chapter One

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This literature review is comprised of two sections. The first section pertains to **reading theory and research**. Research and theory about the nature of the reading process, teaching the reading process, and evaluating the reading process are presented. The second section contains a review of **reader-response theory and research**. In this section of the review, research and theory are presented about the *literary*-reading process, teaching the literary-reading process and, evaluating the literary-reading process. The material presented in each of these sections does not exclusively pertain to one section or the other and will be related to appropriate sections of the literature review where relevant.

Reading Theory and Research

Reading Processes

Early Research in Reading. At the beginning of the twentieth century E. B. Huey (1908) described the reading process as 'the most remarkable specific performance' of civilization. He said that if we could describe the reading process or come close to understanding it, we would be involving ourselves in the 'most intricate workings of the human mind'. Other researchers and theorists, also from the early part of this century, attempted to investigate the nature of the reader's engagement with text. Thorndike (1917) asked readers to respond to questions after reading a series of paragraphs. He concluded, particularly from their incorrect answers, that their difficulties resulted from 'thinking errors'; they did not place appropriate importance on critical ideas in the text or they did not fully consider the concepts presented through the text. From this work Thorndike concluded that reading is a highly active organizational and analytic thinking process.

E. N. Henderson's (1903) work also focused closely on the nature of the reading/thinking process. He asked several hundred students, ranging in age from first graders to university students, to read short narrative and expository passages. He then asked them to recall what they had read by writing down everything they could remember about the text. In examining

these 'written recalls' and comparing them with the text they had read, Henderson determined that students reorganized, simplified, and actually modified the information when they wrote about these text(s). In their written accounts, for example, students reproduced information in a different order and different organization from the text. Certain details from the text were not included in the written recall. Henderson found, as well, that the concepts presented in texts were modified to be more consistent with the readers' experiences. Furthermore, each time the students were asked to write another recall about the same text, the students reorganized, simplified, and modified textual concepts to be more and more consistent with their own experiences. Henderson thus concluded that the students' prior experiences exerted a strong influence on the manner in which the texts were interpreted.

Like Henderson, Bartlett (1932) also found that when students read and wrote recalls of a text, they reorganized, simplified, and modified the concepts presented in texts. Bartlett concluded that students (in this case university students) appropriated the concepts of the text within conceptual configurations or 'schemata' of their own particular experience(s). Bartlett proposed that the reading process is, in fact, a perceptual process. He says:

The immediate data are at once fitted to, or matched with, a perceptual pattern which appears to be pre-existent so far as the particular perceptual act is concerned. This pre-formed setting, scheme, or pattern is utilized in a completely unreflecting, unanalytical and unwitting manner. Because it is utilized, the immediate perceptual data have meaning, can be dealt with, and are assimilated (p 44)

Thus, according to Henderson and Bartlett, the reading process is largely a perceptual one whereby concepts symbolized in text are interpreted or assimilated according to pre-existing 'schemes' of each reader's experiences.

Schema Theory. The early work in reading research by Bartlett and Henderson is a precursor to a wide and more recent body of work which studies the reading process in light of 'schema theory'. Anderson and Pearson (1984) submit that, "to say that one has comprehended a text is to say that she has found a 'mental home' for the information in the text, or else that she has modified an existing mental home in order to accommodate that

new information" (p. 255). The 'mental homes' are referred to as 'schemata'. During the reading process, concepts presented in text(s) are 'slotted' within readers' schemata. In comprehending a text, then, the reader unwittingly, or unreflectingly (to use Bartlett's term) assimilates concepts of text(s) within 'mental homes' or 'schemata'.

Anderson and Pearson say that "one of the key processes in a schema-theoretic account of cognitive processing is inferencing" (1984, p. 269). The text does not have explicit instructions about the 'schema' readers should activate as they assimilate the concepts presented in the text. Anderson and Pearson say:

A reader may fill a particular slot in a schema by assigning default values in the absence of any specifically substantiating information in the text. It should be stressed that filling slots by default is not a rare event. Rather, it is a routine aspect of the ongoing process of comprehension. Writers rely on the fact that there is a considerable amount of knowledge that they share with their audience. It is this process of filling slots by default that most people think of when they are told that an inference has been made (p. 269).

Thus when the reader makes an inference, she is making a decision about how the concepts presented in the text are to be assimilated, according to her 'schemata'. Each new reading experience alters the reader's conceptual framework (or schemata) and she will then, as Bartlett says, unwittingly bring this framework to bear on each new reading experience. There exists then a reciprocal relationship between reader and text, the text is inferred according to the reader's schemata and thereby alters it at the same time.

Anderson (1977) says that, "the meaning of a text arises in an interaction between the characteristics of the message and the reader's existing knowledge and analysis of content" (p. 72) and that, "depending on the reader's goals, task, or perspective, he or she may override the conventions a linguistic community ordinarily uses to structure a text. When the schema changes, then, so will the importance of text elements" (p. 74). The reciprocal relationship between readers' schemata and the manner in which concepts of texts are inferred depends on the reader's active involvement with the text. As Thorndike (1917) put it, "the mind is assailed by every word in the paragraph. It must select, repress, soften, emphasize, correlate and organize,

all under the influence of the right mental set or purpose or demand".
Dillon says:

Whether one describes this process as one of finding schemata that best fit over texts in terms of accounting for specific details (as Rumelhart does) or as using schemata (frames) to guide a bottom-to-top synthesizing/generalizing process (as van Dijk does), all agree that this process is essential to, and may even be identified with comprehension itself and applies to all texts (1980, p 165).

The reading process is widely viewed in light of this schema-theoretic view, whereby readers 'unanalytically' infer concepts symbolized in text in the context of particular schemata or 'frames' organized according to their own particular experiences (Ausubel 1978, Anderson, 1984; Harste and Burke, 1980; Bisanz and Voss, 1981). Rumelhart (1980) actually calls schemata the 'building blocks of cognition'.

In *Reader Meets Author-Bridging the Gap* (1982), Judith Langer and Trika Smith-Burke present a collection of papers on the reading process. In one of them, Langer refers to the work of Ausubel (1968) in discussing the process through which readers comprehend text. She says that as readers interact with text they are, "relating the elements in the text with the generic characterizations in their own schematic structure" (p. 151). All of the work in this collection underscores the active role that the reader must take in order to make inferences and assimilate concepts of texts.

Reading as an Active Language and Thinking Process Frank Smith's (1971) earlier work presents the reading process as fundamentally a perceptual one. He refers to specific perceptual processes that readers undertake in order to actively extract meaning from text. He says:

The perceptual process involves components of prediction, identification, and interpretation as well as the subjective experience of "seeing" or "hearing" or "feeling" that is the final stage of the process. Prediction is obviously involved because of the way events can confirm our expectations. Perception involves identification because we do more than just discriminate one object or event from another - we recognize that they are familiar, and can identify them. From this identification, we are able to make assumptions that are not given in the events themselves.

All of this - the prediction, the identification, and the interpretation - is part of the final percept (Smith, 1971, p. 71).

Smith regards reading as a communicative and perceptual process - an interaction between 'the transmitter and receiver of a message'. And, similar to previously discussed views of the reading process, he says that the reader extracts meaning "on the basis of the visual information (the surface structure of language) and all the deep structure of language and knowledge of the world at large that is contained within his brain" (p. 69). Reading is thus likened to a perceptual process, a communicative and language process, that depends on the reader's active engagement with the concepts presented in the text.

In a more recent publication, Smith (1985) speaks of reading as a process of "getting your questions answered" (p. 96). We may read for information, to confirm predictions, to be entertained, or for any variety of purposes, the key to each reading encounter is that readers are constantly asking questions that are almost invariably implicit. Smith says:

Not only are we generally unaware of our questions as we read, we are also not often aware that we are getting answers, or of how we find these answers in the distinctive features of print. The answers in each case lie in the distinctive features of the print on the page. What we are unaware of is not the process of selecting and evaluating these answers, but the consequences of the process, the decisions made by the brain. We are aware of letters, or words, or general meaning, depending on what we are looking for (p. 114).

In this more recent view, the reading process is less a function of a book or author 'transmitting' a message and more one predominantly motivated by readers' demands, curiosities and preoccupations.

Kenneth Goodman (1967) views reading as a psycholinguistic process - as a complex interplay between the reader and the concepts presented in the text. Goodman refutes the view that reading involves a step-by-step perception and identification of printed symbols. He, consistent with other theorists and researchers referred to earlier, regards reading as a language and thinking process. He says:

Reading is a selective process. It involves partial use of minimal language cues selected from perceptual input on the basis of the reader's expectation. As this partial information is processed, tentative decisions are made to be confirmed, rejected or refined as reading progresses. More simply stated, reading is a psycholinguistic guessing game. It involves an interaction between thought and language (Goodman, 1967, pp 127 & 128).

According to this psycholinguistic view of the reading process, the reader brings the sum total of her experiences, language and thought development to bear on each interaction with text. Goodman says, "this self-evident fact needs to be stated because what appears to be intuitive is actually the result of knowledge so well learned" (1967, p. 130). Readers scan a page, focus on print and pick up graphic cues, " . . . guided by constraints set up through prior choices, language constraints, cognitive styles and strategies" (p. 134). Forming a perceptual image based on these cues, the reader searches her memory for syntactic, semantic and phonological cues. She makes guesses based on these cues, checks graphic cues and tests her decision about meaning according to graphic and semantic acceptability. She may then either start the whole process over again or accept the choice she has made and continue, assimilating the concepts she has inferred from the text with her own prior knowledge and background.

Metacognition and Reading. Some theorists and researchers claim that readers must have a conscious understanding of what they are doing as they attempt to read and comprehend text (Baker and Brown, 1984). That is, the reader must be aware of what she does and how she thinks about what she is doing as she reads, and she must be able to regulate her reading process in order to comprehend what she reads. Such an awareness, or consciousness of one's thinking, is termed metacognition. The ability to regulate the process through which the text is comprehended is referred to as 'comprehension-monitoring activity'. Baker and Brown comment on such reading processes:

These theories view comprehension as an active process of hypothesis testing or schema building. Readers make hypotheses about the most plausible interpretation of the text as they are reading, and test these hypotheses against the available information. As more information is acquired, hypotheses can be further refined or modified. If a reasonable

set of hypotheses cannot be found, comprehension suffers (p. 355).

Reading theorists suggest that without some level of metacognitive awareness, reading comprehension suffers. Successful readers use 'debugging' strategies when they realize that the mental set or schema according to which they are processing the text becomes inconsistent with the concepts represented in the text. In disambiguating and clarifying comprehension failure, such readers may slow down their reading process and deliberately attempt to identify and resolve their difficulties. Baker and Brown comment that, "most theories of reading acknowledge the crucial role of comprehension-monitoring activities. Experts agree that such activities are essential for adequate understanding of text" (p. 358, 1984). Readers have varying degrees of metacognitive awareness depending on their reading experience, general background experience, and familiarity with the type of text they are reading.

Information Processing Models of the Reading Process. The general theories of the reading process that have just been presented are complemented by another equally broad body of work that is centered around building 'models' of the reading process. Massaro says:

Building and testing models of reading processes advances our understanding of what the reader does while reading. We seek to know not only the nature of reading behavior, but, more importantly, the internal mental machinery guiding the observable behaviors (1984, p. 111).

In designing such models of the reading process, researchers and theorists attempt to set forth a series of cognitive activities or stages that readers typically follow when reading. Some researchers have criticized models of the reading process that are designed as a result of controlled, laboratory reading situations where students are asked to read very simplified texts, thus allowing the researcher to identify one or two narrow components of a complex process (Neisser, 1967). Dillon (1980) says, "we must avoid the fundamental error of supposing that study of memory for interpretively simple texts can characterize some basic level of processing which applies with some elaboration to interpretively complex and open literary texts as

well" (p. 178). Many such models of the reading process are termed 'information processing models'; they describe a series of steps or cognitive stages that readers follow when reading. It is just such models that Kenneth Goodman attempted to disqualify in his psycholinguistic view of the reading process

Information processing models make the reading process seem somewhat analogous to the assembly-line production process that takes place in car factories. The car is assembled piece-by-piece, passing through one stage of construction after the other until the final product is complete. In a similar manner, the reader completes one discrete process after the other according to information processing or 'linear' models of the reading process. For example, Gough's (1972) model proposes that readers go through five steps or stages in order to construct meaning. The first step is iconic representation, where the visual input or 'print' persists for a brief time on the retina. Then, according to the model, readers identify letters in the words on a page. After that, comes the 'mapping problem' where readers match the print with the lexicon or 'mental dictionary of words contained in the human head'. During the fourth stage, lexical search, readers process the strings of words into sentences. Then, during the fifth stage of this model, words are stored in primary memory, which according to Gough, is like a storehouse which contains phonological, syntactic, and semantic information. In this linear, step-by-step fashion the reading process proceeds. The model does not account for cognitive processes that take place simultaneously.

The LaBerge and Samuels (1977) model also contains five steps. The reader must complete each 'step' in order to comprehend meaning, as is the case in the Gough model. Both of these models, and all other information processing models, have stages each of which pass their 'production' to the next higher stage in the model. Another example of such a model is that of Hillocks and Ludlow (1984). Their taxonomy is based on seven stages, or seven 'skills'. In order to proceed through the stages, or skills of this model the reader must respond to particular questions. In this taxonomy, literal comprehension is the basis of the first three skills of the model, and inferential comprehension the basis of the next four skills. Hillocks and Ludlow say:

The model is based on two assumptions: first, that answers to questions represent skill types and, second that a question must be classified as a skill type in conjunction with the text from which it is derived. The model is divided into two major levels: literal questions (those whose answers appear directly in the text) and inferential questions (those whose answers are cued in the text but are not stated within) (p. 18).

The Hillocks and Ludlow model, like all of the information-processing models referred to, explain reading as a fixed set of cognitive steps that follow one after the other in a tidy sequence. According to such models, the reader is unable to perform skills at later stages in the model without first passing through or completing the first stages.

Interactive Models of the Reading Process. Interactive models of the reading process are described as being more sophisticated than the information-processing or 'linear' models because they account for simultaneous processing of syntactic, semantic, lexical, and orthographic information. Like the information processing models, the interactive ones also account for the reading process by depicting it as a series of stages but, according to Stanovich (1980), any stage in such a model may 'communicate' with and compensate for a weakness in any other of the levels within the model. Rather than being physically set up as a string of linear boxes, as the information-processing models are, the interactive models represent the reading process as a series of boxes that are arranged around a 'message center'. Input from the text can thus be processed simultaneously in these interactive models (Carpenter and Just, 1981; Kintsch and van Dijk, 1978; Lesgold and Perfetti, 1981).

Interactive models of the reading process are described as being able to account for simultaneous, complex interweaving of subprocesses. Carpenter and Just (1981) say:

In this view of processing stages, several stages can be executed contemporaneously, in the sense that firings of productions of two or more stages may be interleaved. Consequently, data and control can be transferred back and forth among different stages, somewhat similar to computer programs organized into co-routines (p. 183).

All of the models of the reading process, whether information-processing, or interactive, depict the reading process as a discrete series of stages or skills.

Even the interactive models, though they allow for simultaneous processing, reduce the reading process to a finite set of 'routines' whereby 'data' can be transferred between stages as though it is a physical entity. By representing the reading process as a series of boxes, all of the models discussed here present the reading process as a set of clearly defined compartments or skill levels

Asking about the nature of the reading process is to inquire about the nature of thought and language. Whether presented as an interactive or information-processing, linear model, or according to psycholinguistic, schema-theoretic, perceptual, or communicative principles, the reading process is regarded as complex, intricate and multi-faceted. Teaching this process is equally so

Teaching the Reading Process

Contexts for Teaching the Reading Process. The context(s) in which reading is taught are considered to be as much a part of the reading process as are the language, thinking and perceptual processes that are said to comprise it. Whether reading is taught as a series of skills to individual students or as a language and thinking process, considerations about the situations in which that teaching takes place are considered critical. Such a focus on these contexts has become a major area of inquiry within the field of reading research and theory. Bloom and Green say:

From this perspective, reading is viewed not only as a cognitive process, but also as a social and linguistic process. As a social process, reading is used to establish, structure, and maintain social relationships between and among people. As a linguistic process, reading is used to communicate intentions and meanings, not only between an author and reader, but also between people involved in a reading event (1984, p 395).

Reading is viewed as a cultural phenomenon that takes place within the broad context of society. The sociolinguist examines the reading process, not simply as an isolated act, but as one inextricably bound to the situation in which it occurs. Again Bloom and Green comment:

A primary assumption is that reading is a cognitive process embedded

in social and linguistic contexts. By describing the nature of the social and linguistic contexts of reading, processes influencing the nature of reading as a cognitive process are revealed (1984, p. 409)

Thus, *how* one teaches reading is a question not only of understanding the complexity of the process, but also very much one of designing a situation whereby it is *appropriately* 'embedded' in an appropriate social and linguistic context.

However much sociolinguists stress the importance of context, some researchers feel that teachers do not sufficiently consider the nature of the context(s) they create. Barnes (1971b) insists that teachers often create classroom contexts where pupils sit passively listening to the teacher or answering questions posed by the teacher. He says:

If teachers genuinely want to develop in their pupils critical habits of mind, or ingenuity in setting up new possibilities, they must put their pupils into situations which demand critical activity, or encourage freedom in generating hypotheses. To put it bluntly, too many children spend too much time vaguely listening and regurgitating: throughout the curriculum, they should be required to use language for playing with stories or ideas, for exploring things and people, and sometimes for organizing thought and feeling explicitly (p. 246)

Barnes refers to the work of Halliday (1973) who writes that language is a tool for categorizing, ordering and representing the world. Based on this view, Barnes urges teachers to design classroom contexts that push students toward asking questions instead of answering them, and using language with each other to sort through conceptual difficulties, and thus begin to direct and control their own learning.

Courtney Cazden (1988) also writes about classroom contexts; she particularly stresses the importance of peer interaction. Cazden bases much of what she says on the work of Vygotsky; to him social interaction is the basis of cognition. The development of logic in the child is a direct function of his socialized speech. According to Vygotsky (1962), intellectual growth depends on the facility and mastery the child has in using language. He says:

Concept formation makes use of such processes as association, attention, imagery, inference, and determining tendencies but they are insufficient without the use of the sign or word as the means by which

we direct our mental operations. The use of the word is the mechanism - the cause of the radical change in the intellectual process occurring on the threshold of adolescence. Learning to direct one's own mental processes with the aid of words or signs is an integral part of the process of concept formation (Vygotsky, 1962, p. 57)

Cazden emphasizes the importance of peer discussion in the classroom, and that by talking with peers and adults in the context of various learning situations students 'can do in cooperation today what they can do alone tomorrow', as Vygotsky (1962) states. In *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning* (1988), Cazden cites Perret-Clermont in support of her argument "cognitive conflict brings about the disequilibrium which makes cognitive elaboration necessary, and in this way cognitive conflict confers a special role on the social factor as one among other factors leading to mental growth" (in Cazden, 1988, p. 126). These thoughts about the importance of promoting active use of language in classrooms point directly to the value of peer-group interaction as a method through which the reading process might be effectively taught. Peer-group discussion of reading material is a perfect example of an activity that promotes 'cognitive conflict' and freedom for critical thinking activity - freedom to 'use the sign or the word as the means by which we direct our mental operations', and thus refine the reading process. These theories about the social contexts of learning and the role of language in promoting such cognitive growth are discussed by many researchers and theorists (Britton, 1970; Moffett, 1968; Halliday, 1973; Doughty, Pearce and Thornton 1972; Piaget, 1932; Tchudi, 1986).

Teaching Comprehension Strategies. In an article that reviews a broad range of instructional practices for teaching reading, Tierney and Cunningham (1984) speak less of the contexts in which such teaching takes place and more about specific methods of instruction. They discuss, for example, prereading activities, guided 'reader-text interactions', and post-reading activities. Each is designed to facilitate the reader's understanding of what is read. Tierney and Cunningham also refer to discussion activities designed to promote comprehension of text before, during and after reading. They say:

Comprehension strategies can be defined as those cognitive activities which good readers engage in to foster comprehension. Specifically, comprehension strategies might include: engaging background

knowledge, goal setting, identifying task demands, allocating information, evaluating content, self-appraisal, self-correction, predicting, self questioning and so on (1984, p. 630).

Most, if not all, of the activities described by Tierney and Cunningham involve teacher direction of students' engagement with text. Tierney and Cunningham describe specific activities and/or discussions that are directed by the teacher. Activities are designed, for example, to facilitate pre-reading skills such as establishing a purpose for which to read, or anticipating the content of the text. Or, the teacher might engage the students in a discussion about the knowledge related to concepts in the text. Other activities are designed to promote metacognitive skills such as self-appraisal, self-correction, and self-questioning *as* the student reads the text, and considers the concepts represented in the text *after* reading the text. Examples of such teaching activities are discussed by Anderson and Armbruster, 1984, Nist and Simpson, 1987, Montague and Tanner, 1987; Lorch and Lorch and Morgan, 1987; Brown and Smiley, 1974; Anderson, 1980; Rosenshine, 1980, Jenkins and Peny, 1980)

In an article stressing the value and effectiveness of directly teaching comprehension strategies, Pearson (1985) cites many examples of studies that, according to him, have successfully done so. He reviews studies that have taught students to more successfully answer inferential questions, make inferences as they read, and see the relationship(s) between questions and answers. Pearson also points particularly to a study by Palinscar and Brown (1984) who taught a group of seventh-grade poor readers a reciprocal teaching strategy that resulted in significant improvements in the students' comprehension scores. Twenty four students were involved in the Palinscar and Brown study; they were organized into four groups of six students each. One of the four groups were taught to practice the specific comprehension techniques comprising this reciprocal teaching strategy through small-group discussion within their group of six students. That is, this small group was taught to ask and answer questions, listen to summaries, as well as learn to summarize, make predictions, and ask for clarifications; they did so over a period of twenty teaching sessions while working on passages at a seventh-grade level of difficulty (though their reading was at the fourth-grade level)

In reviewing both the Pearson and Palinscar and Brown articles, Carver (1987) points out that the increases in reading ability described by Pearson, and Palinscar and Brown occur not so much as a result of the effectiveness of the various means by which comprehension skills were taught but as a consequence of three basic principles of reading comprehension. Carver points out, for example, that we can increase students' comprehension of passages by using easier passages, by allowing them to spend more time reading a passage, and by allowing them to practice the reading-related task we are seeking to improve. With these considerations in mind, Carver concludes that:

The evidence presented to support the case for teachers spending more time teaching reading comprehension skills is frail at best. Too often the Easiness Principle and the Reading Time Principle are not accounted for in research, and there is no solid evidence that gains due to the Practice Principle will transfer to reading ability in general. The most dramatic evidence for teaching comprehension skills was presented by Palinscar and Brown (1984), but few researchers would accept the finding that seventh graders reading at the fourth-grade level can be given 10 hours of reciprocal teaching and then become equal in reading ability to average seventh graders. Instead the Palinscar and Brown results are more reasonably interpreted as indicating that certain strategies, such as spending more time studying and reading, will result in a higher accuracy of comprehension especially when the materials presented are at the frustration level (p. 125).

Carver's clearly expressed doubts about the effectiveness of teaching comprehension skills echo a sense of uneasiness that is expressed by Tierney and Cunningham (1984). And, along similar lines, Rosenthal (1987) too, after attempting to replicate the findings reported by Palinscar and Brown (1984), concludes that constraints such as the suitability of the technique to the materials, students' familiarity and acceptance of small-group discussion, and grouping practices may prove a barrier to the ready implementation of such a discussion strategy.

There is a great contrast between teaching comprehension strategies and the previously described, student-directed, peer discussions advocated by Cazden and others, just as there was a considerable difference between psycholinguistic theories of reading, and linear or interactive models of the

reading process. The reading process (whether literary and/or non-literary reading) may be both conceived of and taught as a linear series of skills or as a complex language/thinking process. It seems that when the reading process is conceived as a socio-psycholinguistic process, it is also taught as such; classroom contexts are designed to encourage active discussions of the ideas symbolized in texts. Where reading is defined as a series of skills, or discrete stages in a process, it is taught as such; teachers instruct students in the use of specific pre-reading and/or post-reading comprehension 'strategies' such as those described above. Tierney and Cunningham address this point. They say:

We are uneasy with the linear and mechanical approach to presenting reading to students. However the brain functions, the experience of reading has all the components of art and experience. To date our comprehension instruction has tended to emphasize the systematic, sequential, and piecemeal at the expense of the aesthetic, experiential, vicarious, and the wonder of reading (1984, p. 634).

How one teaches the reading process is consonant with how it is defined. And, for that matter, how one evaluates the process depends equally on the view one has of it

Evaluating the Reading Process

Group-administered reading assessment. In reviewing the history of reading assessment, Johnston (1984), reports that the reading process was, and still often is, typically assessed using group-administered tests. Such tests, according to Johnston, contain short passages written specifically for such tests; the passages are quite short, and based on highly contrived concepts and experiences. Thus, students are not likely to be able to relate to such reading material. Furthermore, these tests contain a series of questions based on literal recall of details in these passages, word identification, and knowledge of, for example, vowel and consonant clusters; they do not assess the psycholinguistic processes used as students interpret the passages

Group-administered, silent-reading tests are marked according to norm and criterion-referenced standards. That is, students receive a numerical score relative to other students of the same age and grade level (norm-referenced

criterion), and/or a score relative to an absolute criterion (criterion-referenced) Johnston has this to say about group-administered reading evaluations:

The dynamic interactive nature of the reading process does not lend itself well to specification in terms of discrete objectives with simple criteria. Such specification has tended to decontextualize and trivialize the process. When advantages are being toted, the examples given are always of discrete skills such as identifying 80% of a list of 100 one-syllable words (p. 100)

Criterion-referenced measurement tends to result in a view of reading as separate subskills that must be assessed independently. The information provided by such assessment will ensure that teaching will follow the same model (1984, p. 101)

Norm and criterion-referenced assessment dominated, and in many ways, still dominates reading assessment.

Process Oriented Assessment. Goodman's (1970, 1985) Reading Miscue Inventory is one of the first assessment procedures designed to assess the reading process. The underlying assumption used in designing this instrument is that the pattern of oral reading demonstrated by students is a reflection of their thinking - that 'miscues' made when students read aloud are not errors, as such, but indications of the thinking process they followed in attempting to comprehend concepts symbolized in text. Goodman suggests that inserting words or phrases into a text as it is read, or leaving out words and/or phrases are 'miscues' that provide information about how readers are processing the ideas of text(s).

It has not been until recent years that researchers and theorists have begun to more carefully examine methods used to assess the reading process. *The Reading Teacher* recently devoted an entire issue to the state of reading assessment. In that issue, Valencia and Pearson say "reading assessment has not kept pace with advances in reading theory, research or practice" (1987, p. 726), and that "the tests used to monitor the abilities of individual students and to make policy decisions have remained remarkably impervious to advances in reading research" (1987, p. 727). Valencia and Pearson comment that reading is widely considered a psycholinguistic process involving the

ability to assimilate concepts, and synthesize information symbolized in texts, to make inferences and monitor these processes to a certain extent. Yet reading assessment tests evaluate literal comprehension and subskills

In a recent article, Johnston (1986) discusses a Vygotskian perspective on reading assessment. This perspective emphasizes that assessment should evaluate the underlying language and thinking processes which comprise it and not isolated skills. He says:

Vygotsky's quest for information about processes and their development was more oriented toward informal assessment procedures than formal ones. He stressed the importance of structuring situations to provide maximum opportunity for the learner to engage in diverse activities that could be observed in naturalistic situations, not just rigidly controlled (p. 84)

Consistent with this view, Joan Tough (1976) suggests that by unobtrusively tape-recording students as they engage in various activities and then examining transcribed 'protocols' of their oral language, one can make a very detailed appraisal of their thinking processes. She writes that "in making an appraisal of the child's use of language, it is the content of the child's talk, the kind of information with which he deals, and the manner in which he deals with it that is important" (1976, p. 86). She proposes sophisticated techniques through which the protocol of the student's use of oral language may be examined to determine the range of thinking used. Tough suggests, for example, that such protocols may be examined to determine the extent to which students use language to direct their own thoughts and actions and those of others, to collaborate with others, to report on experiences, use logical reasoning, make predictions, identify with people and various situations, and to be imaginative.

The Use of Think-aloud Protocols in Reading Assessment By tape-recording students' verbal, or 'think-aloud' interpretations of text(s), transcribing those interpretations, and examining them, one can gain tremendous insight into the nature of the reading/thinking process. Think-aloud interpretations of text(s) have actually been used increasingly as a valid means of assessing reading processes; by examining the written record or 'protocol' of such verbal interpretations, researchers can make inferences about the strategies a reader

uses to interpret text(s). Henk (1987) says, "think-aloud analyses might generate data that is not revealed in answering questions Although some psychologists view self-report data as suspect, it is gaining increasing acceptance as a means to 'mirror the processes of the mind' " (p. 867). And Brown and Lytle (1988) say, "used flexibly, protocols can provide a framework for assessment . " (p. 96). Ericsson and Simon (1980), in fact, established that verbal data, such as that provided through think-aloud interpretation(s) of text, are a valid data source. Afflerbach and Johnston (1984) report that "the increasing use of verbal reports as a data source in reading research reflects increased attention to the cognitive processes involved in reading" (p. 320). Kavale and Schreiner (1979) used protocols to investigate the reading strategies used by average and above-average readers. The one (not inconsiderable) caveat that must be kept in mind in considering the use of protocols as a means to evaluate the reading process is that it is time-consuming. It involves a great deal of investment in time to gather the think-aloud interpretations, transcribe them, and analyze them. Thus, though Henk refers to think-aloud protocols as a method by which the reading process might be assessed, he does not point to these rather considerable drawbacks. Such drawbacks are not a deterrent for researchers who have more time than classroom teachers to make use of protocols in assessing the reading process. In fact, most assessments of the reading process that rely on protocol analysis originate in research settings. Protocol analysis is not only a detailed and descriptive means through which the reading process may be assessed, it is also methodologically consistent with the (recent) demand for 'tests' that actually do assess reading as a complex psycholinguistic process.

Reader-Response Theory and Research

The Literary-Reading Process

The Relationship Between the Reading and Literary-Reading Process. Both reading theorists and literary reading theorists are interested in the nature of the reading process though they discuss it differently. In a recent publication, Straw (1990) says, "both fields have shared some basic assumptions about the nature of the act of reading, comprehension, and interpretation" (p. 49).

Carey, in fact, (1985) discusses the similarity that exists between the two. He says:

The possibility exists that literary theorists and reading researchers are unconscious colleagues; unconscious, at least, of each other's interests, goals, and assumptions. Many of the fundamental concerns of literary theory are identical to those of reading theory because most of what passes for literary theory is at base a discussion of the relationship between reader and text, and an amplification of the answer to the question of where meaning resides (p. 17).

Further, Carey comments that, "one might think that two disciplines with such an obviously common interest might have sought each other out long ago" (p. 18). Similar points are made by Harker (1987).

Hunt (1990) comments that reading theorists and literary-reading theorists have traditionally been reluctant to acknowledge each other and/or are unaware of each other's aims and methods. Literary theorists, he says, are wary of making generalizations about the reading process as a result of narrow and artificial reading situations and that, "as reading researchers become increasingly concerned with the reader's construction of the situation and the task, they will realize that they need to study readers engaging in tasks for their own purposes with naturally occurring, whole texts" (p. 104). Indeed, the two fields have grown separately and, as Hunt points out, the gaps between reading and literary theory are "more difficult to bridge than it might seem that they ought to be" (p. 91). It seems that the two disciplines come most closely together with the advent of the reader-response emphasis in literary theory and the increasingly acknowledged psycholinguistic view of the reading process in reading theory. Both positions hold that the reading process is mediated by the interests, background, and context(s) of the reader and both focus on what readers do as they are engaged with text(s).

In recognizing the relationship between reading and literary theory, Louise Rosenblatt (1981), on the other hand, decries the influence that the *reading* theorists' and researchers' models and theories have had on the way the *literary-reading* process is defined. She says:

The generalization still holds - that the cognitive, or non-aesthetic, model prevails. Even those theorists who limit their interest to literary works of art tend to accept, either implicitly or explicitly, the non-aesthetic

as the basic; the poetic or 'literary' elements are in various ways presented as added on to the 'literal' base. Hence, in all quarters, non-aesthetic models of reading prevail, with unfortunate results for literary theory, criticism and education (1981, p. 17).

Rosenblatt disagrees with the view that the literary-reading process may be explained simply by accounting for cognitive processes. She holds that the reading process is as much (or even more) a function of aesthetic involvement on the part of the reader as it is a cognitive activity. Reading theorists and researchers, as Tierney and Cunningham have acknowledged, have "tended to emphasize the systematic, sequential, and piecemeal at the expense of the aesthetic, experiential, vicarious and the wonder of reading" (1984, p. 634). Reader-response literary theorists and researchers tend to study primarily the literary-reading process; they are more likely to regard the reading process from both a cognitive *and* aesthetic point of view. When reading theorists study the *non-literary* reading process they are less likely to consider affect or the aesthetic involvement of the reader. These differences keep reader-response theorists and researchers apart from reading theorists and researchers despite the fact that they are, as Carey and others say, both interested in the relationship between reader and text

Dias (1990) comments that reading research occurs in contrived reading situations, that generalizations about the literary-reading process are derived from non-literary reading, and that reading researchers and theorists are often preoccupied with instructional applications of reading research - that is, teaching comprehension strategies. Thus, along with Rosenblatt, he is cautious about the relationship between reading theorists and reader-response literary theorists. In fact, Dias refers directly to Rosenblatt in stressing that the literary-reading process involves an attitude of responsiveness and an aesthetic involvement on the part of the reader. Reading theorists, he suggests, are often anxious to bypass the affective and proceed straight to the cognitive with a heavy emphasis on teaching comprehension strategies. Both Dias and Rosenblatt would agree with a recent statement by James Moffett (1990):

If literature existed only to be comprehended, we could regard "response to literature" as merely a subclass of "reading comprehension", since literature is only one kind of reading matter.

But literature exists not only to be understood but to be undergone.
 So actually for literature the case is the reverse: reading
 comprehension is a subclass of response to literature. Meaning
 is only part of the story (p. 302).

Despite the many similarities pointed to between reading theorists and researchers and literary theorists and researchers, the two disciplines remain independent perhaps largely due to their differing emphases on affect and comprehension. This point holds even given Mathewson's (1985) comprehensive model of affect in the reading process. Athey (1985) too acknowledges that even though some models "... draw attention to the significance of affect, ... beyond appearing as a "box" in the figure depicting the model, affective factors receive little elaboration or explication" (p. 527).

Reader-Response and Literary Critical Theory. Reader-response criticism is a relatively new discipline within literary theory. It has evolved in opposition to the New Critics and Structuralists who have primarily analyzed the structure(s) of texts (Eagleton, 1983; Frye, 1957). Reader-response critics are interested in studying the nature of the reader's involvement with (literary) texts. Steven Mailloux (1982) comments on the interest that reader-response critics have in the literary-reading process:

American literary theory has seen an explosion of interest in readers and reading. There is talk of implied readers, informed readers, fictive readers, ideal readers, mock readers, super-readers, literents, narratees, interpretive communities, and assorted reading audiences. The term 'reader-response criticism' has been used to describe a multiplicity of approaches that focus on the reading process: affective, phenomenological, subjective, transactive, transactional, structural, deconstructive, rhetorical, psychological, speech-act, and other criticism have been indiscriminately lumped together under the label 'reader-response' (p. 19).

Various reader-response theories of the reading process are reviewed in the following pages.

An Interactive Theory of the Literary-Reading Process. Wolfgang Iser (1978) refers to the reading process as an interaction between a reader and a text. In some ways, his view of the reading process appears to resemble the

transactional view of Rosenblatt's. He says, for example, that "as text and reader merge into a single situation, the division between subject and object no longer applies, and it therefore follows that meaning is no longer an object to be defined, but it is an effect to be experienced" (pp. 9 & 10). Though he says that the division between subject (presumably the reader) and object (presumably the text) no longer applies, many of his points actually point to a division between the reader (subject) and the text (object) by highlighting the role exerted by the text. He says that the text allows "a spectrum of actualizations" (p. 24), that the text "brings about a standpoint from which the reader will be able to view things" (p. 35), and that "the reader's role is to occupy shifting vantage points that are geared to a *prestructured activity* " (p. 35, emphasis added). Iser, in fact, refers to "perspectives represented in the text" (p. 36) and says that the text "denotes the role of the reader" (p. 38). Though Iser begins by emphasizing that meaning is not an object to be defined but an effect to be experienced, his position stresses the role of the text in the process through which the reader achieves this effect. Thus, in viewing reading as a process of 'consistency building', or, as he puts it, filling in 'gaps' in the text, Iser's position actually emphasizes the division between subject and object - reader and text.

A Transactional Theory of the Literary-Reading Process. In *The Reader, The Text, The Poem*, Louise Rosenblatt (1978) defines the reading process as a 'transaction'. She says:

In the basic paradigm for literary criticism, the movement is from an intensely realized aesthetic transaction with a text to reflection on semantic or technical or other details in order to return to, and correlate them with that particularly personally apprehended aesthetic reading (p. 162).

During aesthetic reading, Rosenblatt says, "the reader's primary purpose is fulfilled during the reading event, as he fixes his experience on the actual experience he is living through" (p. 28). She contrasts such 'aesthetic reading' with 'efferent reading' which she defines as reading to seek "the information, the concepts, the guides to action, that will be left when the reading is over" (p. 28). Rosenblatt suggests that during an aesthetic transaction, the reader

must read not only for literal comprehension, but must also evoke the experiences symbolized in the text. She says:

During the literary experience, concentration on the words of the text is perhaps even more keen than in efferent reading. The reader must pay attention to all that these words, and no others, these words moreover, in a particular sequence summon up for him (1978, p. 29).

In this transactional view of the reading process, reader and text, as separate entities, disappear. They compenetrates through the reader's transaction with the text.

Rosenblatt (1985) contrasts her 'transactional' view of the reading process with what reading theorists have termed an 'interactive' process. She says:

The 'interactive-processing model' which is said .. to share "common ground" with my transactional theory basically retains the old mechanistic view of separate personal "top" and textual "bottom" elements acting on one another. No matter how much one might build elements labelled top-down or bottom-up into a machine, the result would still be a machine, and not an organism (p. 100).

In the transactional view of the reading process, the text cannot be analyzed without reference to the reader's interpretation of it, nor can the reading process of the reader be considered without reference to the text. The transactional view of the reading process conjoins text and reader.

A Psychoanalytic View of the Literary-Reading Process. Norman Holland (1968; 1975) describes literary reading as a process through which readers project subconscious feelings as they read. In *The Dynamics of Literary Response*, he implies that the text controls the extent to which such projections occur. He says, for example, that "literature transforms our primitive wishes and fears into significance and coherence" (p. 30) and that in literature "we find a dictionary of fantasies - some guidelines as to what we are likely to find in literary works" (p. 60). These statements suggest that it is the text that dictates how our primitive wishes will be transformed and that the text has guidelines directing the reading process. He says, in fact, that the text *presents* the reader "with fantasies and defences like those in his own

mind" (p. 62) Implied, therefore, is that reading is controlled, not so much by the interpretive processes of the reader, but by the 'guidelines' in the text.

In *5 Readers Reading*, (1975) Holland insists that "it is readers who provide the unity" (p. 14), and that "a reader, as he synthesizes and recreates a piece of literature transforms his own fantasies into the social, moral, and intellectual meanings he finds by "interpreting" the work" (p. 17). Thus, in Holland's view, literary reading is a process through which readers project their subconscious defences, expectations, fears and transformations. This position is further explained in an article by Holland (in Cooper, 1985) where he explains that readers bring "identity themes" to each act of literary reading. He says, "The identity - DEFT - feedback model then gives us familiar questions to ask. What expectations do people bring to texts? With what fantasies do they endow the text? With what transformations do they give their reading more than transitory significance?" (pp. 16 & 17).

A Subjective View of the Literary-Reading Process. David Bleich (1978) views the literary-reading process as a subjective one; he suggests that readers respond to literature with affective responses and associations. In Bleich's words, "there are two basic components which contribute to any individual's emotional response to anything - affect and association" (p. 11) According to him, the affective response "demonstrates the multiplicity of directions in which even a single, though important, affect may be elaborated, and, in an important sense "explained" by the different sorts of analogies brought to bear" (p. 38). The associative response is described by Bleich as "the most complex but the most useful form of expressing feelings about literature. It reveals perception, affect, association, relationships, and finally a patterned presentation of all of these" (p. 48). Clearly, in this view of literary reading the process is tied to the emotional responses of the reader.

In an article about reader-response views of the literary-reading process, Alcorn (1987) comments that many reader-response positions authorize subjective readings of text without sufficiently considering the concepts that are actually symbolized in the text. He says:

The conceptual failure in many reader-response theories lies in their propensity to see all subjective "distortions" in perception as equal in degree and effect. This failure is the consequence of another larger

failure to grasp important distinctions in subjective processes. Texts are not blank screens reflecting the projections of a reader; textual signifiers do things to projections. Readers who fail to encounter the signifiers of a text fail to encounter the text (p. 142)

The material signifier offers itself as a criterion for accountability in textual response; readings that fail to encounter the actual signifiers of a text are failures in reading (p. 143)

It is interesting to note that Alcorn groups many reader-response theories of reading under what would seem a general subjectivist banner. But, the reader-response views of reading that have been presented contradict Alcorn's characterization. Rosenblatt's transactional view of reading, for example, holds that the text, along with the reader are both necessary elements in the process. Whether reading efferently or aesthetically, a reader must "pay attention to all that . . . words in a particular sequence summon up for him" (1978, p. 29). Iser (1978), in fact, has accorded Alcorn's 'material signifiers' of text a lead role in the reading process. In saying that the text "denotes the role of the reader" (p. 38) and that there are "perspectives represented in the text" (p. 36) Iser's interactive view of the reading process certainly does not ignore the role of the text as a 'criterion of accountability in textual response'. Summaries of reader-response theory such as Mailloux's (1982), and volumes edited by Tompkins (1980), Suleiman and Crossman (1980), and Cooper (1985) describe a range of theoretical views, such as some of those just referred to, and others, that are not all strictly subjectivist. Alcorn perhaps has not taken all these reader-response positions into consideration in making the remarks just quoted. He refers to "narcissistic or errant forces of subjectivity" (p. 139) without considering the range of reader-response views of the reading process.

Interpretive Communities and the Literary-Reading Process. Stanley Fish (1980) argues that reading is a process of constructing an interpretation of a text on the basis of shared conventions and "shared ways of seeing" (p. 332). Fish illustrates this view by recounting an anecdote about a student waving his arm in class; all of the other students in the class interpret the gesture to mean that the student wishes to speak. Fish says:

The source of our interpretive unanimity was a structure of

interests and understood goals, a structure whose categories so filled our individual consciousness that they were rendered as one, immediately investing phenomena with the significance they *must* have, given the already-in-place assumptions about what someone could possibly be intending (by word or gesture) in a classroom (p. 333)

Fish's anecdote is intended to underscore his point that meaning and/or interpretation of a text is a function of the context in which it is read. Further, that context is defined not only by the persons immediately present but by their background and the assumptions they bring to that context. Just as the students' interpretation of their classmate's gesture, in the example just mentioned, was guided by shared assumptions so is the interpretation of a text a function of shared purposes and goals according to Fish. He says

Communication occurs within situations and that to be in a situation is already to be in possession of (or to be possessed by) a structure of assumptions, of practices understood to be relevant in relation to purposes and goals that are already in place; and it is within the assumption of these purposes and goals that any utterance is *immediately* heard (p. 318).

Fish's point is that the interpretation of a text is a function of shared interpretive strategies; he says, "if the self is conceived .. as a social construct whose operations are delimited by the systems of intelligibility that inform it, then the meanings it confers on texts are not its own but have their source in the interpretive community of which it is a function" (p. 335). Fish thus concludes that there is no distinction between readers and texts; both seem to evaporate - to become absorbed by the shared social contexts and assumptions out of which they both arose. The boundaries between reader and text are removed because they are subsumed by relativism, shared contexts and a shared structure of assumptions.

Where many reading theorists would arrest the reading process so as to separately account for specific skills (Gough, 1972; for example and others previously mentioned) that might comprise it, Fish suggests that readers and texts are so interrelated that both exist only in relation to shared conventions. Reader and text are bound by these shared conventions and shared contexts. Where Iser has referred to the reading process as gap-filling, thus valorizing

the role of the text and simultaneously regarding it as an entity that can be analyzed apart from a reader's interpretation, Fish says that readers create texts through virtue of shared backgrounds and assumptions and in relation to the context(s) in which texts are read, and that texts, therefore, cannot be considered apart from readers

Robert Scholes (1985) comments on Fish's theory of the reading process. He refers to the various elements of Fish's position: readers, texts, and interpretive communities, suggesting that to account for the reading process by saying that it is a function of the way that shared conventions bring such elements together is far too sweeping an account, Scholes says.

First, he has asserted that readers make texts; then he has shifted his position to say, quite specifically, that meanings are produced by neither reader nor text, but by interpretive communities. But he has never made clear what an interpretive community is, how its constituency might be determined, or what could be the source of its awesome power. In practice, he sometimes means simply those who share linguistic and cultural information: that is, all those who would understand a certain speech in a certain situation as a request to open a window (p. 153).

... the notion of an interpretive community is a process that is too monolithic to represent adequately the agonies of choice that confront actual interpreters, who often have at their disposal more codes than they can use (p. 162).

In saying that the reading process is comprised by the shared conventions of interpretive communities, Fish presents reading as a function of a collective process rather than a personal or individual one.

Reader-Response Research. I. A. Richards (1929) once said "It is sometimes convenient to regard a poem as a mental prism, capable of separating the mingled stream of its readers into a number of distinguishable types" (p. 53). Richards is generally regarded as the pioneer of reader-response research. By asking college students to read and write responses to poems, and analyzing those responses, Richards categorized the 'mingled stream' of responses by identifying a series of pitfalls, or difficulties in interpretation. This was the first study to have ever considered the role that the reader takes in making sense of text. Richards' work was designed, though, not so much as a theory

or general account of the literary-reading process, but to identify interpretive errors college students make when they read poetry. Nonetheless, this study turned attention, for the first time, toward a consideration of the processes by which readers interpreted a literary text

It was not until the nineteen-sixties, when Alan Purves, with Victoria Rippere, presented *Elements of Writing About a Literary Work*, (1968) that research interest in the literary reading process was renewed. Purves and Rippere analyzed thirteen and seventeen-year olds' written responses to short stories and identified four general interpretive patterns of response. The students' responses were classified as engagement-involvement, perception, interpretation or evaluation, these general responses were then subdivided into various sub-categories. In his preface to this book, James Squire cautions that written responses to literature should not be considered synonymous with the actual literary-reading process itself. He says:

The elements of writing about literature are not necessarily identical with the elements of response. Reactions secured through written protocols may reflect more what students have been taught to think and feel about literature, rather than what they actually think and feel (p. v)

These comments raise a very important point about research conducted in an effort to investigate the reader-response process. The reading process takes place as readers read, not as they write about reading. Writing about reading does not capture the actual reading process itself. Thus, whether or not Purves, Rippere and Richards are actually studying the reading process is a point worth considering. A similar consideration might be made about the many research projects that have used the Purves-Rippere analysis categories (Morris, 1976; Applebee, 1976; Beach, 1973; Cooper and Odell, 1976)

Purves claimed to be working toward a system that would 'go farther' than the work of Squire (1964) who identified seven response patterns among twenty-seven boys and twenty-five girls aged between fourteen and sixteen years. They read and responded to four short stories. Squire reports that "the investigator divided each of the four short stories into six carefully predetermined divisions" (p. 15). The students met individually with the researcher to read and orally respond to each of the stories. Squire tape-

recorded these verbal responses, later transcribed them and inferred his seven response patterns from these 'protocols' He says:

By recording the verbal responses of individuals immediately after reading each of the five segments, as well as at the end of reading the complete story, evidence was obtained to suggest the development of responses of readers during the total process of reading a literary selection (p 16).

Squire's seven interpretive categories are identified as literary judgement, interpretation, narration, association, self-involvement, prescriptive judgement and, lastly, miscellaneous responses Unlike the work of Purves and Rippere, Squire's research was designed to capture the response process as it took place. Squire says, "Verbal transcripts - spoken reproductions of ideas, feelings, and reactions - seem to be closer to the internal psychological event of responding than do the written reports of earlier students" (p 29) Though Squire's work is much more closely focused on the response process as it occurs, he has also introduced a constraint on the reading process by dividing the stories into five segments. In so doing, he may be dictating that the students interpret the story not as a whole 'ut one segment at a time

Research by Kintgen (1983) and Kintgen and Holland (1984) was, like Squire's, designed to capture and analyze the reading process as it occurred Kintgen attempted to do so by tape-recording college students' interpretations of sonnets, transcribing these interpretations, and then analyzing the protocols. In describing his method of gathering protocols, Kintgen refers to the problem-solving, think-aloud protocols that were used by Newell and Simon (1972) to investigate mathematical problem solving Kintgen says

The aim of protocol analysis is precisely to reveal these natural but unnoticed activities, to provide a record of the temporal flow of mental activity that would be impossible for the reader to construct for himself because the self-monitoring required would interfere drastically with that normal mental activity Verbalization also interferes but since so much of understanding a poem requires verbal manipulation, that interference is not likely to be great (p 167)

Unlike Squire, Kintgen did not divide his texts into sections, thus the students were making decisions themselves (however tacitly) about how to

approach, analyze and synthesize the various elements of the poem. Kintgen and Holland (1983), and Holland (1975) also used think-aloud procedures and protocol analysis to investigate the literary-reading processes of readers

In more recent research, Dias (1979, 1987) has researched the processes by which adolescents read and respond to poetry. He too uses think-aloud and protocol analysis procedures to do so (1985, 1986). Dias has identified four patterns of reading and responding among the adolescents he studied: problem solvers, allegorizers, thematizers and paraphrasers. Dias says:

In describing these patterns to teachers and explaining their interrelationships, I have sometimes found it useful to describe the search for meaning in poetry as a procedure a prospector for gold might use. Both paraphrasers and allegorizers map the territory - paraphrasers with little sense of what lies beneath the surface and the allegorizers reading the topography for a fairly general picture of the underground ore formations. Thematizers are miners who act on hunches to dig in various places in the hope of finding a rich vein. Problem solvers are both surveyors and miners; they scan and they probe, are not anxious to close, and know there is more (1987, p. 68).

Dias describes various interpretive 'elements' in each of these four patterns of response, presenting them in the context of Louise Rosenblatt's work. She says, "we have to think of them not as separate entities, but as aspects of phases of a dynamic process, in which all elements take on their character as part of the organically-interrelated situation" (1978, pp. 100 & 101). Dias' (tape-recorded) interview techniques are designed to be as non-directive as possible so that the transcribed protocol of each student's interpretation is reflective of an independent, student-directed reading process, and that it therefore reflects the students' thoughts and decisions about how to read and interpret poetry.

The body of research and theory on the literary-reading process stands in an interesting position in regard to reading theory and research. Reading theorists have described the reading process according to cognitive, psycholinguistic and perceptual theories and models. Though they have not, as Rosenblatt suggests, emphasized affect or 'aesthetic' reading, they have investigated various language, thinking and communicative processes considered to be synonymous with reading. Reader-response theorists, while often considering 'aesthetic' or 'subjectivist' and even subconscious reading

processes have sometimes approached the reading process from a text-centered point of view as a result, perhaps, of the New Critical and Structuralist influence. Thus, the difference between the reading and reader-response positions rests both with the manner in which they conceive the reading process, and the degree of influence the text is accorded in determining the process.

Teaching the Literary-Reading Process

Contexts for Teaching Literature. Many of the points made about the importance of context, in the section on teaching the reading process, apply equally to teaching the literary-reading process. In *Understanding Teenagers' Reading* (1987), Jack Thomson says:

Contemporary reader-response literary criticism tells us that literature should be conceived of as an activity and experience rather than as an object of study; and reading and responding to literature should be conceived of as processes of making and sharing meanings, as ways of exploring and understanding what it means to live, as well as ways of understanding one's own and author's meaning-making processes (p 13).

He suggests:

more small-group discussion to replace much of the tediousness of summary writing and written comprehension (p. 25);

offering students a greater range of activities to engage in in response to literature, both of written and more performance-oriented kinds. There are many exciting ways of exploring literature imaginatively, ways which are more effective in helping students explore texts more deeply and enjoyably without resort to the arid, routine summaries and comprehension exercises they so bitterly resent (p 25).

These comments along with Cazden's (1988) and Rosenblatt's (1984) reinforce the view that literary reading may be best learned in classroom contexts that encourage peer interaction and aesthetic engagement with literature. These views are upheld by a variety of writers in *English Teachers At Work* (Tchudi, 1986).

Small-Group Instruction. Dias (1979, 1985) introduced a method of small-group, independent discussion of poetry which emphasizes reading as aesthetic engagement within a social context that promotes active exploration of texts. He says:

Students involved in such small-group discussion sessions gradually appear to assume responsibility for making sense of the poem and are therefore less likely to be directed by teacher expectations of how they must talk about a poem or by any notions that there are certain approved ways of making sense of poetry. The small-group discussion transcripts showed a gradual development of autonomous behavior among the students involved: a confidence in their own response, the emergence of individual strategies, a tolerance of ambiguity, a tentativeness about meaning, and a willingness to change their minds (1985, p. 109).

As a result of their involvement in such small-group discussions, the adolescents who participated made significant gains in their ability to read and understand poetry. By comparing these students' written interpretations of poetry with interpretations written by a control group (taught according to a large-group teacher-directed format), Dias determined that the students made considerable gains in their ability to interpret poetry.

Dias' findings have been confirmed in a study conducted by Bryant (1984). Two grade twelve classes participated in the study; the control group was a class of twenty-one students and the experimental group a class of seventeen students. Both groups worked with the same poems. Bryant says that in the control group "the teacher adhered to the constraints of 'frontal teaching' (lecture, large-group discussion and traditional writing assignments)" (p. 84). The experimental group was organized into small groups where they independently (without teacher direction) discussed one poem during each seventy-five minute period of instruction according to the small-group discussion procedure introduced by Dias. **Before** this study actually began, all of the students read and wrote reactions to the same poem. In these written accounts they described how the language and form of the poem influenced their response to and interpretation of the poem. These written reactions were compared with written interpretations that were completed by all of the students **after** their eleven periods of instruction.

An analysis of the pre and post written responses to poetry collected in the Bryant study revealed that the experimental group attained an adjusted mean of 6.43 whereas the score for the control group was 4.74. An English professor and a high school teacher blindly assigned General Impression Marking on a scale from 1 to 5 to each of the written interpretations thus providing the data through which such a generalization was made. This replication of Dias' work supports the claim that student-directed, small-group discussion of poetry leads to an increased ability to read and understand it.

The impact that independent student-initiated small-group discussion has on the literary-reading process is discussed at length by researchers and theorists. Mike Torbe (1974) says:

It is a shared, supportive discussion which returns us to a pre-Romantic notion of a sharing community who work together, rather than the inspired isolate, trusting in his talents to set him apart. These students had to find ways of both coping with their responses, and learning to value them, to be secure and confident in their shared opinions, instead of diffident and vulnerable as they had often been before. It was through the tentativeness and hesitant early formulation of what was only instinctively felt, in talk and in writing, that they worked through to the confidence of opinion and evaluation (p. 34).

These thoughts are variously expressed and endorsed by Mills (1974), Barnes, Churley and Thompson (1971), Brubacher and Payne (1985), Dixon (1973) Hayhoe (1984), Golden (1986).

Pat D'Arcy (1973) reports on a wide range of work that upholds the value of tentativeness and student initiated formulation of responses to literary reading. D'Arcy refers to D. W. Harding who says "First encounters in the classroom should deliberately hold back formulation, should back away from everything that isn't tentative and partial" (p. 21). D'Arcy herself says "candidates should be encouraged to indicate their response to the book examined, but too often this leads directly to the reproduction of secondhand opinions given to candidates by a teacher" (p. 21). These writers stress the importance of giving students the chance to formulate their own concerns and questions about literature.

In a seminal article about reader-response and the teaching of literature, Trevor Gambell (1986) says:

Rationales for literature teaching can be characterized as one of two types, text-centered and reader-centered. A text-centered rationale takes a subject approach, is discipline oriented, academic, and focuses on cognitive processes of the student. A reader-centered rationale takes an experience approach, is response centered, humanistic, child-centered, and focuses on actualization and social reconstruction. Another way of stating the dichotomy of rationales is that a dilemma exists between the demand for a "correct" reading of a text and the Berkeleyan notion that the literary text exists only through the mind of the reader, but that one cannot know the text (p. 120).

These comments point to the general dichotomy that has existed in literary criticism: that between the New Critical and Structuralist focus on the text and the reader-response focus on the reading processes through which the literary text is realized by readers. The text-centered rationale, say Dias and Hayhoe (1988):

dictates a classroom procedure which operates primarily through a process of inductive questioning by the teacher and a corresponding developing sense of the poem by the pupils. The teacher is in charge of the meaning that evolves, and the text, rather than the reader's generally unverifiable impressions and intuitions, must be adduced in support of the meaning that is 'unlocked' through the teacher's questioning (p. 7).

Dias and Hayhoe remark that "pupils are most likely to go on a genuine quest with a poem when they are responsible for that quest, with their wise adult of a teacher an ally, recessive and supportive in manner and in tone" (p. 81). Similar views about the value of a 'reader-centered', 'humanistic' and 'social reconstruction' approach to the teaching of literature, to use Gambell's terms, are expressed by Hunt (1982), Newkirk (1984), and Chase and Hynd (1987).

Just as the section on the teaching of reading concluded that one's conception of the reading process dictated the manner in which it would be taught, so does this section on the teaching of the literary-reading process conclude; that is, if the literary-reading process is conceived as a text-centered process, it is taught as such, quite often with the teacher directing the process and acting, as Dias and Hayhoe put it, as the arbiter of meaning. On the other hand, if the literary-reading process is viewed largely in light of readers' responses and a consideration of the contexts where literature is read, then it

is taught in a manner that allows for a spectrum of 'transactions' (to use Rosenblatt's term) such as small-group discussion confers.

Evaluating The Literary-Reading Process

The Need for Evaluating the Process. Many of the points raised about evaluating the *reading* process are relevant to an evaluation of the literary-reading process; that is, reading, language and thinking processes should be the focus of inquiry in evaluating reading regardless of whether such reading involves strictly efferent reading comprehension or aesthetic literary engagement. In saying that "The dynamic interactive nature of the reading process does not lend itself well to specification in terms of discrete objectives with simple criteria" (Johnston, 1984, p. 100), and that teachers and researchers should "structure situations to provide maximum opportunity for the learner to engage in diverse activities that could be observed in naturalistic situations" (Johnston, 1985, p. 84, cited earlier), Johnston is also speaking about an evaluation of *literary* reading.

In *Assessment and Learning in English* (Ed. C. L. Reynolds, 1984), there is a collection of papers about the need for process-oriented assessment of the literary-reading process. The writers are concerned about the large-scale assessment of reading (as well as writing) in Britain and Canada. And in another publication about assessment, Hayhoe (1985a) says, "inquiry into the nature of response seems to me the priority for our talents and energies; we have much to learn there if the dilemma is to be debated and coped with in ways which value the complex event so neatly labelled with the phrase, 'reading fiction' " (p. 32). There is a concern that the means by which the literary-reading process is evaluated be faithful to the complexity of and primarily aesthetic nature of that process. Again, Hayhoe says, " . . . if we accept that experience of literature is at least partly holistic, affective and not to be pinned down, we face serious challenges when we decide to go ahead with assessing and when we decide upon our assessment devices" (1985b, p. 32).

Some suggest that the literary-reading process may be best evaluated in the context of classroom activities. Dixon (1987) suggests that students be given the chance to spontaneously talk about literature with each other and that teachers simultaneously guide and evaluate such activities. He says, "It is such work that will offer the clearest testimony to the quality of students'

responses to their reading" (p. 764). Dixon also acknowledges that there is no general theory or framework against which we might trace the development of individual students. He says, "It is the absence of such a theory ... that makes it easier to keep up the pretence that there exists some unitary procedure in the brain called 'reading' that can be 'measured' on some sort of curious scale" (1987, p. 762). Dixon, like Rosenblatt, stresses that, "Literary texts invite us to construct an imaginary world ... to build the images and people of this world in our minds" (1987, pp. 763 & 764) and that the means by which such an 'event' is evaluated must be dictated by this premise. Similar views are also expressed by D'Arcy (1973).

Using Responding-Aloud Protocols as Evaluation Tools. Throughout the review of the literature on evaluating reading and researching the literary-response process reference was made to the use of responding-aloud protocols (Ericsson and Simon, 1984; Henk, 1987; Dias, 1985; and Kintgen and Holland, 1984) as a means by which reading and language processes can be evaluated. It has also been acknowledged that such a technique requires considerable time, dedication, and patience on the part of the researcher. But it is worthwhile to again comment that protocol transcription and analysis may be one of the most theoretically sound and honest ways to actually 'mirror the processes of the mind' as Ericsson and Simon (1980) put it. Though the act of verbalizing may interfere to some extent with the mind's engagement with the reading process, as Cooper and Holzman (1983) point out, it is also true to say that such verbalization serves to reflect the language and thinking processes used by readers to interpret what they read. It is also held that the act of verbalizing one's thoughts may serve to clarify and elaborate thought (Vygotsky, 1962). Thus, responding-aloud protocols seem to be one of the best means through which the literary-reading process may be evaluated in that they offer a picture of the mind's engagement with text as that engagement happens.

Summary

The range of work that has been reviewed here is bound by one central concept - the reading process. Various attempts to define, teach and evaluate this process have been presented. Central to all of this work is the view that how this process is taught or evaluated depends on how it is defined. The three research questions guiding this thesis are based on the work that has been done in an effort to define the reading process, teach the reading process and evaluate the reading process.

Chapter Two

DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the students who participated in the study and the materials used. It also details the procedures by which the pre-test and post-test think-aloud interpretations of poetry were gathered and the procedures used throughout the small-group discussion phase of the study. It further explains the procedures that were followed to design the analytic reading scale used to measure change in the processes through which the adolescents read and interpreted poetry.

There were three major 'timeframes' involved in the completion of this study. They are briefly presented here to help readers follow the series of explanations included in this chapter:

1. May of 1987 - First drafts of reading scale completed based on the analysis of eighteen responding-aloud protocols gathered in research by Dias (ongoing).
2. April and May of 1988 (five weeks) - Pilot Study
3. October and November of 1988 (five weeks) - Formal Study.

Though the students involved in both the pilot and formal study were reluctant readers, the description of '**students**' (below) applies specifically to those who participated in the formal study. The details about **materials** and **procedures** apply to both the pilot and formal study.

Students

Nine 16 & 17 year-old grade ten students took part in this study. These students were selected to participate because most of them were reluctant readers. They were selected in order to determine whether or not a small-group, non teacher-directed approach to reading poetry might engage them and lead to a refinement in their reading processes. Some of the students had repeated one or more grades, some had maintained low grades in previous school years and others did not enjoy English and made no effort in it according to their teacher. All of the nine students were registered in this particular grade ten class because it was a non-academic or 'general' English class.

One of the nine students had received consistently high marks in English (between 75 and 85%) for the past three years that she had attended this particular school. Nonetheless, she was enrolled in this 'general' class because she would otherwise have had to study History and Math totally in French in which she was quite weak. She was fond of English, had always done well in it and, according to her teacher, was a willing and able participant in class discussions.

Five of the nine students had received marks in English varying within a median range of 60 to 75% for the past three years. These students were described by their teacher as capable yet uninterested in English and lacking interest and/or aptitude.

Three of the students had received consistently low marks in English (generally between below-50 and 60%). Their teacher described these students as lacking in interest, aptitude and cooperation throughout their study of English.

These nine students are listed below. The names of the students are fictitious; the letter H, M, or L after each of their names indicates whether the students were first generally grouped in the 'high', 'medium' or 'low' ability groups. The students are presented in the list below in the order in which their pre-test and post-test protocols are analyzed in chapter three:

Barbara N. (H)
Nesbitt A. (L)
Trish G. (L)
Donald M. (L)
Rick C. (M)
Sarah M. (M)
Eric B. (M)
Nat Y. (M)
Robin K. (M)

There were originally twelve students involved in the study but one of them was absent throughout the time that the post-test think-aloud interpretations were gathered, and two others completed think-aloud

interpretations on defective tapes. Thus only nine of the original twelve students completed pre-test *and* post-test think-aloud interpretations.

Materials

The materials used in this study were a collection of poems. Two particular poems were used for the pre-test, and post-test, individual responding-aloud interpretations (these poems are included in Appendix A). One poem was used for each of the thirteen days (distributed over a one-month period) of independent, small-group discussion (a list of these poems is presented in Appendix B, in the order in which the poems were presented over the thirteen days of the study).

The two poems interpreted by the students in their individual, pre-test and post-test responding-aloud interpretations were matched, as closely as possible, in terms of difficulty. Though the poem "Birds" by Judith Wright, is longer than "Cyclops" by Margaret Atwood, the two poems appear to be of similar metaphorical intensity and of equal difficulty to interpret. Before the study began, twelve English Education students read the two poems and indicated briefly, in writing, if they found the two poems of equal difficulty to interpret, or if they found one more difficult than the other, and if so to explain why. Nine of the twelve students found the poems to be of equal difficulty, one indicated "Birds" was more difficult, two indicated that "Cyclops" was more difficult.

The poems used for the small-group discussion were selected because it was felt they would be of interest to the students and be challenging, yet not daunting to read and interpret. Following Dias' (1987) example, poems were chosen that would (likely) immediately intrigue the students. I wanted the poems to make the students curious, and inspire and interest them enough so that they would be compelled to turn to their small-group members to sort out interpretive difficulties.

Procedures

There are three sets of procedures explained in the following pages. They are the procedures used to: (1) collect **pre-test and post-test responding-aloud interpretations**, used as the data by which the research questions directing this study were answered; (2) co-ordinate the **small-group discussion**, (3) develop the **reading scale** according to which the research questions were answered

Pre-test and Post-test Responding-Aloud Interpretations. The data featured in this study are 9 sets of think-aloud interpretations of two particular poems. Each 'set' is comprised of one **pre-test think-aloud interpretation** and one **post-test think-aloud interpretation**. To answer the second research question in particular (that is, the question that asks if these nine adolescents will refine the processes through which they read and interpret poetry as a result of discussing poetry with each other in small groups), each student's pre-test interpretation was compared with his or her post-test interpretation according to a reading scale designed and applied by the researcher

To collect the pre-test and post-test data I met with each of the nine students individually just before the one-month treatment phase of the study began and just after it ended. During each of these meetings, or 'interviews', I explained that I was conducting a research study. I said that I wanted to find out more about how high school students understood poetry, and that I was interested in seeing how they responded to and interpreted it. After that brief, general explanation, the following instructions were explained to each of the students:

'I'll give you a copy of this poem. I'm interested to see what you do when you read it, how you make sense of it and what you do to understand it. I'll read the poem out loud and afterwards perhaps you can give me your initial impressions, reactions, thoughts, and even feelings about it. Then when you read through it yourself, just think out loud as you interpret it. Say everything that you read and think out loud until you reach what you feel is a satisfactory understanding of this poem. If there are particular words that you don't know and want me to define for you I can do that. Remember, you can read the poem as many times as you need to until you feel satisfied with your understanding of it. Just remember to say everything that you read and think out loud. All of your thoughts about the poem are important, so try and remember to say everything out loud.'

After asking if the reader understood, the poem was read aloud while the reader followed along on his or her copy of the poem. The only response(s) made during the subsequent think-aloud interpretation(s) were reminders to say everything out loud, and brief comments acknowledging what the student said. This is quite an important point. Because the purpose of the interview(s) was to have a record of each student's independent reading and response process, it was critical that they not be directed or even subtly prompted toward the use of particular reading strategies. If it became obvious during any of the interviews that a student was unsure of how to begin or how to proceed, it was suggested that s/he might begin by reading and interpreting the poem a phrase, line, or stanza at a time in whatever fashion s/he was most comfortable. If it seemed that a student's interpretation was based primarily on an impression of the poem gained through listening to it read aloud once, it was suggested that s/he might want to 'now' read the poem him or herself and interpret the poem as s/he proceeded through it. The students almost immediately grasped the point of the think-aloud procedure and proceeded without difficulty.

The above directions and procedures were followed for the pre-test and post-test data collection. Each of the interviews was tape-recorded and later transcribed verbatim from the tape. The resulting 'protocol' is an exact record of what each student said. Even the length of time the student(s) paused is recorded in the protocols (in seconds).

The order of presentation of each of the pre- and post-test poems was varied to control for the possibility that some students might appear to have become 'better readers' simply because the post-test poem was considered easier than the pre-test poem (even though this possibility was minimized by asking university students to read and comment on the difficulty factor before the study began). Three students were pre-tested using the poem "Cyclops", and post-tested using the poem, "Birds". Six students were pre-tested using the poem "Birds", and post-tested using the poem, "Cyclops". It was mentioned earlier that the original group contained twelve students and that two students interpreted poems on defective tapes. Those two students completed pre-test think-aloud interpretations using the poem "Cyclops", and post-test think-aloud interpretations using the poem "Birds". Because their post-test tapes were not usable, and because another student from this group (missing throughout the time of post-testing) was also pre-tested using the

poem "Cyclops", the total resulting sets of data are not balanced in terms of presentation order. Were it not for these unforeseen difficulties, there would actually have been six pre-test interpretations completed using the poem "Cyclops", and six pre-test interpretations completed using the poem "Birds" with post-test interpretations completed using the alternate poem

The following outline indicates the pre-test and post-test poems used with each student in the order in which they are analyzed in chapter four:

<u>Student</u>	<u>Pre-test Poem</u>	<u>Post-test Poem</u>
Barbara N.	Birds	Cyclops
Nesbitt A.	Cyclops	Birds
Trish G.	Cyclops	Birds
Donald M.	Birds	Cyclops
Rick C.	Birds	Cyclops
Sarah M.	Cyclops	Birds
Eric B.	Birds	Cyclops
Nat Y.	Birds	Cyclops
Robin K.	Birds	Cyclops

Small-Group Discussion. The students met for small-group discussion thirteen times, during their regular classroom English period(s) of fifty minutes each. These thirteen meetings took place over a one month period.

The (original) twelve students were organized into 4 heterogeneous groups of 3 students each. That is, before the actual small-group discussion phase of this study began, each small group was deliberately organized to comprise students of varying ability in English, according to both their academic records and their general interest in and attitude toward English. We (the regular classroom teacher and researcher) attempted to form groups of students who had worked well together in the past and who complemented one another in terms of verbal style. That is, if one student was considered reticent or uncomfortable about group discussion, he or she was organized to work with two other students with whom s/he was known to be comfortable. Or, if a student was considered domineering in group discussions, we placed that student with others known by their teacher to

hold their own in such situations. With such considerations in mind, we arranged the 12 students into 4 groups.

I co-ordinated the small-group discussion of the original twelve students who participated in this phase of the study. The procedures that were followed on each day of the thirteen days of the study are explained below. This small-group discussion procedure was developed by Dias (1979, 1987) as a means of helping students become autonomous readers of poetry.

The procedures followed in each of the thirteen meetings are explained below:

- copies of the poem were distributed to each of the students;
- the poem was read aloud by the researcher while the students followed along on their copies;
- the students were then given the opportunity to raise questions about words in the poem with which they were unfamiliar; only the literal definition of such words was provided thus leaving the students with the responsibility of inferring the metaphorical and/or connotative relevance of such words and phrases to the meaning of the poem,
- the poem was read aloud a second time by one of the students;
- the students were then given a second opportunity to raise questions about unfamiliar words and/or phrases. It was explained that the students had twenty minutes to independently discuss the poem with their group members after which a spokesperson for each group would report his or her group's interpretation, interpretive difficulties, differences of opinion and/or questions the group had about the poem (each student reported his or her group's interpretation about four times, given that there were three people in each group and the groups met thirteen times). These preliminary procedures usually lasted ten minutes;
- within each group, the poem was read aloud once by one of the students,
- it was suggested that each member of the group(s) should immediately offer his or her initial impressions, feelings, thoughts about and/or general reactions to the poem. This encouraged the students to identify with the poem in some way, to establish some point which they might then pursue with other group members, and also prompted them immediately to verbalize, and thus begin to talk about the poem without having to feel that they had to be sure about their reactions. Such

immediate responses encouraged the students to freely express whatever uncertainty, questions, feelings and/or concerns they had about the poem. These initial responses also often served as springboards from which the small-group discussions began;

- the role of the researcher over the next twenty minutes was to encourage continued discussion of the poem. The students were reminded (especially over the first few days) that by rereading, they would find new questions to ask each other, new details that may or may not support an interpretation they were working toward, and other possible interpretations for different stanzas. If a group was having obvious difficulty I encouraged them to reread and interpret the poem again a line or two or stanza at a time, and to ask each other particular questions about words, phrases or stanzas. Such general monitoring and prompting was necessary for only the first few days. Once the students learned that I would not tell them 'the meaning' of any part of any poem, they began to depend increasingly on each other;
- a general announcement was made when there were five minutes left for small-group discussion(s). The students were reminded to bring their discussion to a conclusion and discouraged from taking notes either during their small-group discussion phase or when preparing for their 'group reports'. Such 'notetaking' could concretize their thoughts and thus prevent further discussion and reformulation of ideas. Some worry was expressed on the first few days of the study that they would forget what they 'were supposed to say'. When reassured though that other group members could assist by reminding the 'reporter' of the group's thoughts, this fear was alleviated,
- the 'reporter' from each group related his or her group's conclusions, difficulties and questions about the poem. Students from other groups were encouraged to ask questions and/or offer alternative interpretations but to wait until each reporter had presented his or her group's interpretation;
- the researcher's role during these 'small-group reports' was basically to facilitate the order of each group's presentation and to encourage members from each group to add points perhaps overlooked or forgotten by their reporter. Again, I was following guidelines

developed by Dias (1979, 1987) for successful small-group discussion of poetry;

- after the small-group reports were presented, the floor was opened for questions and discussion on the part of all of the students. After the first few days of the study, the students were eager to raise points differing from those made by other groups, and to ask each other questions about particular details of group presentations;

- I also asked questions of the group at large. These questions were always of an open and interpretive nature. For example, questions were asked about how the details in the poem contributed to their interpretation, how one stanza related to the next or how the details of the poem contributed to a poem's mood, tone and style. The large-group discussion and reporting phase of each class usually lasted twenty minutes,

- the students wrote in journals each evening about the poem they had discussed that day. They were encouraged to read through the poem again and, just as they had done in their group discussions that day, interpret the poem a line or two at a time, or free-write about the poem. The criteria were that they should write at least a page. I responded to the journals by posing questions and making comments related to the points they had made.

These procedures were followed on each of the thirteen days of the study. Immediately following the thirteenth day of the study, I met with each of the students individually again, at which time the post-test think-aloud interpretations were gathered following exactly the procedures used to gather the pre-test think-aloud interpretations.

The Development of the Reading Scale. Approximately a year prior to the time that this research study was conducted a reading scale was developed by the researcher based on an analysis of eighteen responding-aloud protocols gathered through The International Response to Poetry Project (Dias, ongoing research). This five-point analytic scale plays an important part in this research study in that the three research questions directing this study are addressed by this reading scale. The reading scale applies in seeking to (a) identify the reading processes by which sixteen-year-old reluctant readers read and interpret poetry; (b) decide whether or not such readers refined the

processes by which they read poetry by discussing it with each other in small groups (by applying the scale to the pre-test and post-test protocols) and; (c) demonstrate any change in their reading processes. This section of the chapter explains how the scale was developed and how the three research questions directing this study are addressed by this reading scale

Seven months prior to the formal study being reported here, a pilot study was conducted in which twelve students participated; this pilot study contributed to the development of the reading scale. The study was conducted to also test the data collection procedures, determine the suitability of the various poems that were chosen for pre-test and post-test think-aloud interpretations and small-group discussion(s). The students who participated in the pilot study were also sixteen and seventeen year-old reluctant readers; they were also enrolled in a non-academic grade ten class. All of the procedures that have been previously described were followed during this pilot study.

Each of the twelve readers involved in the pilot study completed two pre-test and two-post think-aloud interpretations that were tape-recorded and later transcribed. One pre-test interpretation was completed using a poem, the other with a short non-literary (expository) article. The post-test interpretations were also completed using a poem and a short non-literary article. Thus, altogether forty-eight think-aloud interpretations were gathered during this pilot study

After transcribing and analyzing the forty-eight responding-aloud interpretations gathered in the pilot study, the reading scale was refined by the researcher. Four graduate students of Education independently and blindly scored (that is not knowing whether they were marking a pre-test or post-test protocol) each of the forty-eight pre-test and post-test protocols. There was 55% agreement between each of the pairs of markers when scoring the protocols independently and blindly; after discussion each pair reached 75% agreement. Even with discussion, they could not agree on scores for 25% of the protocols. Based on lengthy discussions about interpretive difficulties these readers had in applying the reading scale, it was continuously revised over the next several months.

Seven months after the pilot study was conducted the formal study began. Eighteen students participated in the formal study; they completed a pre-test and post-test think-aloud interpretation of a poem *and* a pre-test and post-test

interpretation of a short non-literary article. Thus, seventy-two protocols were collected from these eighteen students. Altogether, a total of one hundred and twenty think-aloud interpretations (48 from the pilot study and 72 from the formal study) were transcribed and analyzed. All of the poetry protocols that were gathered during the formal study were completed using either "Birds" or "Cyclops". The poems used for the pilot-test think-aloud interpretations were completed using a variety of poems.

The reading scale was further refined to reflect the analysis of the seventy-two protocols gathered during the formal study. It was then used by a doctoral student in Communications and a graduate with a Master's Degree in Communications to blindly and independently score these seventy-two protocols. These readers reached 73% agreement as a result of blindly and independently scoring the protocols. After discussing the protocols on which they had originally disagreed, they reached 96% agreement. Again, as a result of many hours of discussion, the reading scale was revised and completely restructured. Thus, to this point the scale had been used by six different people to analyze one-hundred and twenty protocols with an increasing percentage of agreement between pairs of raters.

The eighteen (9 pre-test and 9 post-test) responding-aloud protocols gathered from the nine students who participated in small-group discussion were analyzed and scored by the researcher according to the reading strategies set forth in the scale. Though these protocols were among the seventy two from the formal study that were scored by the individuals from the department of Communications (at McGill University) the reading scale had changed and evolved to quite an extent, both as a result of feedback from these two people and in consultation with my doctoral committee. Thus the many changes made to the scale as a result of working with the six different people (and the two final readers in particular) that applied it to the one hundred and twenty protocols made it necessary for me to reinterpret these eighteen protocols, in particular, according to the final version of this reading scale. Also, the detailed analysis of these protocols in chapter four demonstrates how each of the strategies outlined in the scale specifically accounts for the reading processes in these eighteen protocols.

The relevance of the analytic reading scale to this study is central; it is used as the critical means through which the three research questions directing the study are answered. The reading scale, for example, identifies the processes by

which these sixteen-year-old reluctant readers read poetry. It is also used to compare the pre-test and post-test think-aloud protocols of the nine students who participated in small-group discussion of poetry. And, thirdly, any change in the processes by which these adolescents read and interpret poetry is demonstrated according to the reading scale.

The final version of this reading scale is two pages long; it identifies five key reading *processes* and distinguishes among five *categories* of reading. The key reading processes are **synthesizing, reading and responding, expanding and clarifying, supporting inferences,** and **reacting critically**. The process of **reading and responding** includes four 'subprocesses'; they are paraphrasing, referring to personal experiences, aligning experiences with details of text and, explaining reactions. In a similar manner, the process of **expanding and clarifying** an interpretation includes 'subprocesses'; there are seven of them. These seven subprocesses are: questioning details of text, rereading, (degrees of) interpreting text coherently, expressing uncertainty, describing thinking, expressing ideas with clarity and delaying closure. And, the process of **supporting inferences** includes two 'subprocesses'; these subprocesses are describing logic used and aligning inferences with details in the text. The five 'key reading processes' are underlined and in boldfaced print and appear in the extreme left-hand column of the two pages of the reading scale (see pages 51 and 52).

The five *categories* of reading distinguish the varying extent(s) to which the readers use the five key reading processes and 'subprocesses'. A category 5 reader, for example, **synthesizes** by assimilating details of text within a consistent frame, whereas a category 4 reader synthesizes by assimilating *most* details of text within a coherent frame. Category 3, 2 and 1 readers do not **synthesize** according to the way this reading process is defined in the scale. A reader's protocol is scored according to one of the five categories of reading set forth in the scale. If, for example, a reader's protocol is accurately described by most of the statements that appear in column 4, that is the score awarded. In order for a protocol to receive a score of 5 or 4 (the higher spectrum of the scale) the reader must have **synthesized**; that is, she must have formed a comprehensive interpretation of the text by assimilating the words, phrases and segments of text within a coherent frame. The statements in columns 3, 2 and 1 describe readers who do not **synthesize**.

It may be noted that in order to successfully use the scale to score a reader's protocol some experience is necessary. In order to know, for example, whether the statements in category/column 5 or those in category/column 3 most accurately describe the reading processes in a particular protocol, the person using the scale to score a protocol must have read many protocols. After someone becomes familiar with a range of protocols, he or she can use the reading scale to comfortably assign a score of 5, 4, or 3. The second key reading process, for example, is **reading and responding**; the first of the subprocesses characterizing reading and responding is paraphrasing. The reader will note that a category 5 reader **reads and responds** by, 'paraphrasing *all* segments of text, that a category 4 reader does so by 'paraphrasing *most* segments of text' and that a category 3 reader, 'paraphrases *some* segments of text'. Thus, after becoming familiar with a range of protocols and applying this reading scale several times a scorer can come to distinguish between what is meant by such qualifying terms as 'all', 'most', and 'some'. With these explanatory remarks in mind, the reading scale is presented on the following two pages.

These
readers:

5

4

3

2

1

Synthesize*

by:

(see next
page)

assimilating
details of
text within a
coherent
frame

assimilating
most details
of text within
a coherent
frame

do not
synthesize

do not
synthesize

do not
synthesize

**Read and
Respond** by:

paraphrasing
all segments
of text

paraphrasing
most
segments of
text

paraphrasing
some
segments of
text

paraphrasing
text
unclearly
and/or
inaccurately

stating the
topic of text

describing a
range of
relevant
background
experiences

describing
some
relevant
background
experiences

describing
sometimes
relevant
background
experiences

referring
vaguely to
(irrelevant)
background
experiences

restating
some lines of
text

aligning
experiences
with many
relevant
details of
text

aligning
experiences
with some
relevant de-
tails of text

aligning
some
experiences
with some
relevant
details of
text

aligning
experiences
with text to
limited and
inconsistent
extent

making a
brief
generaliza-
tion after
reading text
once

explaining
reactions in
great details

explaining
some
reactions in
appropriate
detail

explaining
reactions in
inappropriate
detail

explaining
reactions in
almost no
detail

reacting
almost not at
all

**Expand and
Clarify** by:

questioning
many details
of text

questioning
some details
of text

questioning
some details
of text

questioning
few details
of text

not
questioning
details of
text

rereading

rereading
sometimes

rereading
infrequently

rereading
seldom

not
rereading

working
through one
interpretation
thoroughly
OR working
through
many
interpreta-
tions

working
through one
interpretation
& sometimes
making a
varying
interpretation

making
random and
sometimes
incoherent
interpreta-
tions

making an
interpretation
that is often
incoherent

not
attempting to
interpret text

...cont'd
**Expand
and Clarify**
by:

5	4	3	2	1
expressing uncertainty and attempting to resolve it	expressing uncertainty and sometimes attempting to resolve it	expressing uncertainty and seldom attempting to resolve it	expressing uncertainty seldom without attempting to resolve it	making no attempt to expand and clarify understanding
describing thinking explicitly	describing thinking sometimes	describing thinking infrequently	describing thinking to a very limited and unclear extent	not describing thinking
expressing themselves with clarity	expressing themselves with reasonable clarity	expressing themselves somewhat unclearly	expressing themselves unclearly	not attempting to express themselves clearly
delaying closure to a great extent	delaying closure somewhat	delaying closure to a limited extent	reaching closure somewhat easily	reaching closure almost immediately

**Support
Inferences**
by:

using clear and explicit logic	using clear and sometimes explicit logic	using confused logic sometimes	using confused logic frequently	not supporting inferences
aligning inferences with appropriate details in text	aligning most inferences with appropriate details in text	aligning inferences confusedly to sometimes inappropriate details in text	aligning inferences with frequently inappropriate details in text	not aligning inferences with details in text

**React
Critically**
by:

commenting on concepts, style, structure, and/or tone of text	commenting sometimes on concepts, style, structure, and/or tone of text	commenting rarely on concepts, style, structure and/or tone of text	not reacting critically	not reacting critically
---	---	---	-------------------------	-------------------------

*The word **synthesize** refers to the process by which readers form comprehensive interpretations of text by bringing the words, phrases, and segments of text together to bear coherently on those interpretations.

Chapter Three

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This chapter contains two major sections. The first section (from pages 55 to 107) contains **five sample protocols**. Each of the sample protocols is representative of one of the five categories of reading in the analytic reading scale (presented in the previous chapter). The second section of the chapter (pages 111 to 205) contains a detailed **analysis of the nine pre-test and nine post-test responding-aloud protocols** of the students who participated in small-group discussion of poetry. Each pre-test and post-test protocol is analyzed, compared and scored according to the reading processes set forth in the reading scale.

Five Sample Protocols

Five sample protocols are presented at the beginning of this chapter to clearly demonstrate that the five *categories* of reading outlined in the reading scale can be distinguished according to the differing extents that the readers use the five key reading *processes* and subprocesses. The five protocols appear, in full, in the left-hand column of each of the pages that follow. There is a detailed analysis of the reading processes used by each reader in the right-hand column of each page.

All of the five sample responding-aloud protocols were gathered from students who participated in the formal study (i.e. not the pilot study) and each is in response to the poem "Cyclops". The protocols presented in this first section of the chapter are chosen as the samples because each clearly represents one of the five categories of reading; each protocol exemplifies the reading processes set forth in *one* of the columns describing the five categories of reading. The category 5 protocol, along with its analysis, is presented first, followed in order by samples of category 4, 3, 2, and 1 categories of reading.

The most elaborate, sophisticated and reflective of the protocols (category 5 then 4) are presented first, followed by the progressively less detailed and less engaged protocols so that the reader may gain an appreciation of the full range of the reading and response processes *used*. By reading the most engaged protocols (category 5 and 4) and their analysis before reading the least engaged of the protocols, the reader will be acquainted with the full range of the

processes outlined in the scale. Thus, the reader will see how these processes *are* evident rather than first being presented with an analysis of how they are *not* (as is particularly the case with category 2 and 1 protocols).

It is important to point out, as well, that the numerical values outlined in the scale are being affixed to one example of *reading* and not to a reader or readers. These protocols are examples of how readers responded to poetry on only two separate occasions. A reader whose poetry protocol was scored as a 1 may, when reading science fiction, fantasy or a newspaper report, respond with a protocol scored at the 4 or 5 level.

The category 5, 3, and 1 protocols are not from among the nine students who participated in the small-group discussion of poetry and whose pre- and post-test protocols form the core data of this study. The sample 4 and 2 protocols are from two of the nine students who did participate in small-group discussion.

Before these five sample protocols are presented, it should be emphasized that the complex process of reading poetry is not being reduced to a number. It is not possible to actually say that the process(es) by which adolescents read poetry can even be fully captured in the reading scale that has been presented. The five numbers are mere codes for the reading processes identified in this study. And though all of the various category 3 protocols, for example, are similar in critical ways, none of them are ever identical. The numbers are descriptive and qualitative and are used to signal general boundaries between one category of reading and the next.

What now follows on the next several pages are the five sample protocols and their analysis. In the left-hand column of each page, the letter "R" is used to indicate the researcher's comments and the first initial of each student's (fictitious) name used to indicate his or her responding-aloud interpretation. In the analysis of each of the sample protocols (in the right-hand column of each page), the key reading processes are highlighted, and terminology used in these written analyses deliberately coincides with the respective terms used to present each of the key reading processes and subprocesses presented in each category/column of the reading scale.

5: Vera T.: Cyclops

3 R: I'll give you a copy of this
4 poem I'm interested in seeing
5 what you do when you read it,
6 how you make sense of it, what
7 you do to understand it Alright?

9
10 V: OK
11
12 R. So I'll read the poem out loud
13 and then afterwards you can give
14 me your initial impressions,
15 reactions, thoughts, perhaps
16 feelings about it And when you
17 read through yourself, just think
18 out loud when you interpret it.
19 Say everything that you think
20 out loud until you reach what
21 you feel is a satisfactory
22 understanding of this poem

24
25 V. OK
26
27 R. You may decide that there are
28 words you want to ask about.
29 You can see.
30
31 The poem Cyclops is read aloud
32 to the student
33
34 V You know when they said -
35 even the title when I thought
36 Cyclops - it's some - it's gonna be
37 about um monsters - well it is
38 but just the title itself I was
39 thinking about Cyclops - the
40 Cyclops
41
42 R Um Hmmm
43
44 V But when you read it, Cyclops
45 is more like the flashlight

The responding-aloud procedure
is explained (lines 3 to 29)

After the poem is read, Vera states initial impressions, reactions and thoughts (lines 34 to 45) She refers to the title and comments about how it makes her think of 'the Cyclops' (lines 34 to 40) thus aligning her general experiences (or background knowledge) with the title of the poem She then immediately *infers* an association between the flashlight and the Cyclops

1 R: Ah ha
 2
 3 V: The flashlight is the Cyclops
 4 because there's only one eye.
 5
 6 R Um Hmmm
 7
 8 V: And the flashlight is your eye
 9 because you can't see in the dark
 10 and that's the only way you can
 11 see is through the flashlight
 12
 13 R Um Hmmm Um Hmmm.
 14 Alright
 15
 16 V: It says -You going along the
 17 path, mosquito doped, with no
 18 moon, the flashlight a single
 19 orange eye- See even there it
 20 says the flashlight a single orange
 21 eye It's telling you that that's
 22 the Cyclops
 23
 24 R Um Hmmm
 25
 26 V Your eye and ah also because
 27 in the end you say that you are
 28 the hugest monster to the
 29 animals and to the to the
 30 creatures where you're walking
 31 you are an animal because you
 32 know everything is dark and
 33 then you see this huge light out
 34 of nowhere
 35
 36 R Right
 37
 38 V And this big monster walking
 39 with this big light and so they
 40 think you're a monster because
 41 of the fact that - I mean when it's
 42 light, it's light When it's dark -

She uses clear logic and explains her **inference** about the connection between the title of the poem and the flashlight (lines 3 to 11) At line 16, Vera begins to **read and respond** to the poem and further substantiates the **inference** that 'the flashlight is the Cyclops' (line 3) and 'the flashlight is your eye' (line 8) in saying, 'See even there it says It's telling you that that's the Cyclops (lines 19 to 22) Vera then brings more details of the poem to bear on her **inference** that the flashlight is the single orange eye *and* the Cyclops (lines 26 to 34). In explaining herself as she does in these lines Vera is also establishing a frame within which she may assimilate various details of the poem

Having clearly stated that the flashlight is the Cyclops (line 3), that, 'the flashlight is your eye' (line 8) and that the single orange eye is the Cyclops (lines 21 & 22), she then begins to explain how these details are associated with the 'monster' She says, 'so they think you're a monster because of the fact that when it's dark - you know this thing with the big light' (lines 39 to line 2 next page). Her **inferences** are aligned with appropriate details in the poem and she is explaining them logically and clearly

1 you know how this thing with
 2 the big light -
 3
 4 R: Um Hmmm
 5
 6 V. OK? And he goes mosquito
 7 doped I suppose that you've
 8 been mosquito bitten to death?
 9 Just about And then it says -the
 10 flashlight a single orange eye
 11 unable to see what is beyond the
 12 capsule of your dim sight, what
 13 shape- wha what your dim sight
 14 It's saying like because the
 15 flashlight - it's not - it's not as -
 16 when you close one eye you
 17 don't see this this side, you only
 18 see a certain range
 19
 20 R: Hmmm
 21
 22 V. And that's what the flashlight
 23 is doing because you don't have
 24 the - for the flashlight your
 25 range is not as big if you had an
 26 eye
 27
 28 R: Um Hmmm
 29
 30 V: But it's - you can see around
 31 but that's about it.
 32
 33 R: Hmmm
 34
 35 V. So in a - the capsule of your
 36 dim sight - you don't see much
 37 because it's dark and your
 38 flashlight is not that big
 39
 40 R Um Hmmm
 41
 42 V: So it's just maybe a hand
 43 flashlight so you don't see much

Vera **infers** that 'mosquito doped' means you've been mosquito bitten to death 'I suppose that, 'you've been mosquito bitten to death?' (lines 7 & 8)

She reads from the poem (lines 9 to 13) and then works toward an understanding of these lines of the poem She aligns an aspect of her experience with the phrase, 'capsule of your dim sight' by comparing the range of the flashlight to the limited range one has when seeing with one eye shut (lines 16 to 43)

In **reading and responding** as she does in these lines, Vera is aligning her experience with a relevant detail in the text, **clarifying and expanding** her interpretation by explaining herself with clarity and logically justifying her **inference** about the meaning of the phrase, 'capsule of your dim sight'

She works thoroughly at her interpretation of this phrase and concludes, 'So it's just maybe a hand flashlight so you don't see much' (lines 42 & 43)

1 R Hmmm
 2
 3 V But what you do see you're
 4 like "Awww paronoid"
 5 (pronounced with exaggerated
 6 expression)
 7
 8 R Hmmm
 9
 10 V OK -What shape contracts to a
 11 heart with terror- What you're
 12 thinking is because the flashlight
 13 - in the dark - in the way the dark
 14 is scary itself
 15
 16 R Hmmm
 17
 18 V But when you have the
 19 flashlight it makes you feel better
 20 but um you always wanna wiggle
 21 it around so you see everything
 22 And then it says -what shape
 23 contracts to a heart with terror-
 24 means you um - like you're
 25 walking and if you see a shay - a
 26 dark shape, your heart will just
 27 contract with with fright 'cause
 28 you don't know what it is So
 29 and it goes -bumps among the
 30 leaves- If you - maybe if you see a
 31 shape or you hear a noise, you'll
 32 get scared right away because you
 33 don't know what it is
 34
 35 R Um Hmmm
 36
 37 V (5 second pause) -What makes
 38 a bristling noise like a fur
 39 throat?- And - like because of
 40 the fact that ya don't know what
 41 these things are - maybe if it was
 42 in the - during the day and you

Vera reads and begins to respond to another line from the poem (lines 10 to 14) She appears to **infer** that it is the heart of the person walking with the flashlight that is contracting with terror for she says, 'the dark is scary itself but when you have the flashlight it makes you feel better' (lines 14 to 19)

She **infers** that, 'what shape contracts to a heart with terror' means that the heart of the person walking, 'will just contract with fright because you don't know what it is' (lines 26 to 28). She does not interpret these lines to mean, as suggested by the syntax and punctuation of the second and third stanzas of the poem, that the *animals* see a shape and that *their* heart contracts with terror because they don't know what the person is

Vera **expands and clarifies** her interpretation of what she reads by working thoroughly at her particular interpretation of these lines and aligning her **inferences** with appropriate details in the poem. She reads from the text (lines 37 to 39) yet her subsequent interpretation relates more to her reading of the phrase 'what shape contracts to a heart with terror' than to the phrase, 'What makes a bristling noise like a fur throat' She says, for example, 'ya don't know what these things are - maybe if it was during the day it wouldn't be so bad' (line 40 to line 1 next page)

1 saw it it wouldn't be so bad
 2 because . I don't know having
 3 the dark makes things -
 4 everything unknown but if it
 5 was during the day and you saw a
 6 shape and you heard noises it
 7 wouldn't scare you

8

9 R. Um Hmmm

10

11 V: But because of the - just
 12 because of that dark - the dark it
 13 just scares you

14

15 R Um Hmmm

16

17 V OK -Is it true you do not wish
 18 to hurt them?- That I have no
 19 idea why it has to do with the
 20 poem for now OK -Is it true you
 21 have no fear? Take off your
 22 shoes then -Let you sah - your
 23 eyes go bare Swim in their
 24 darkness as in a river- Because if
 25 you have no fear you don't need
 26 the flashlight to guide you You
 27 can just walk You don't need
 28 your shoes because when you - in
 29 a way when you're wearing your
 30 shoes you don't want to step on
 31 anything It's not because you
 32 don't wanna kill anything It's
 33 just because you don't wanna
 34 feel anything under your feet

35

36 R Um Hmmm

37

38 V And so you're afraid to -
 39 you're afraid to touch them -
 40 because you're afraid to um to
 41 be like them - to go around um
 42 seeing like them because you

In lines 1 through 13, Vera continues to explain her understanding of the phrase, 'contracts to a heart with terror'

She reads from the text (lines 17 & 18) and expresses uncertainty, as she puts it, 'for now' (line 20) (She returns to this line and makes an inference about it later in her reading)

She reads from the poem (lines 20 to 24) then **infers** both what the lines mean and how the details relate to her interpretation to this point She says, 'because if you have no fear you don't need the flashlight to guide you You can just walk You don't need your shoes when you're wearing your shoes you don't wanna step on anything you don't wanna feel anything under your feet and so you're afraid to touch them afraid to be like them to go around seeing like them (lines 24 to 42) Vera fully explains this elaborate **inference** about the lines from the fifth stanza of the poem

1 want your flashlight there so in
 2 case something comes you
 3 wanna see it and flash it on them
 4 and scare them away Oh! OK -
 5 Is it true you do not wish to hurt
 6 them? Maybe for them because
 7 it's dark they expect everything
 8 to be dark
 9
 10 R Who s they?
 11
 12 V The animals -
 13
 14 R Ah ha
 15
 16 V And the insects and the bugs
 17 outside
 18
 19 R Ah ha
 20
 21 V OK And - because the
 22 flashlight is scaring them because
 23 of the bright light because like
 24 when you close your eyes and
 25 suddenly you just - or like it's
 26 dark and you suddenly go in a
 27 room that's all lit It's - it hurts
 28 your eyes So in a way you could
 29 - the flashlight could be hurting
 30 their eyes also So -is it true
 31 that you- so I guess - OK And
 32 then ah -do not disguise yourself
 33 in armor- The armor is the light
 34 because they're afraid - they're
 35 afraid to go to the light
 36
 37 R Hmmm
 38
 39 V Yeah OK Mmmm -They
 40 watch you from hiding- is
 41 because - because of the light
 42 They're - they know something
 43 is

Vera's use of detail in explaining her **inferences** about the fifth stanza is clear and logically aligned with relevant details in the poem; she continues to explain her understanding of this stanza to line 4

She reads from the poem (lines 5 & 6) and **infers** that the flashlight is hurting and scaring the animals and insects (lines 6 to 23) She also **responds** to this line by aligning her experience of going into a dark room where lights suddenly come on with the **inference** that the light from the flashlight could be hurting the animals' eyes And, in consistently explaining her **inferences** with words such as 'so' and 'because', she explicitly reveals her logic and **expands and clarifies** her interpretation

She reads 'do not disguise yourself in armour' (lines 32 & 33) and **infers** that the armour is the light which is a disguise, 'because they're afraid to go to the light' (lines 34 & 35) She expresses herself with logic and clarity She reads, 'they watch you from hiding' (lines 39 & 40) and **infers** that 'they're hiding because of the light'

1 there and they're afraid so they
 2 hide
 3
 4 R. Hmmm
 5
 6 V It's not only because like
 7 maybe during the day it's free of
 8 smell that they hide from
 9
 10 R Um Hmmm
 11
 12 V But because of the fact that it's
 13 dark and the light shows It's
 14 like in the middle of nowhere
 15 They have this bright light
 16 From everywhere they'll all see
 17 you All the animals and all the
 18 bugs and everything will see you
 19 and they'll run away from you
 20 because it just - it's as if you're in
 21 a room all dark and you see this
 22 glowing spirit You know It's
 23 the only thing that shows that's
 24 bright, that stands out So - and if
 25 you don't know what it is, you're
 26 gonna keep away from it And if
 27 it's moving toward you you
 28 wanna get away from it They -
 29 you are a chemical smell The
 30 chemical smell I'm not sure
 31 Maybe it's because humans wear
 32 clothes and because clothes are
 33 all sin synthetically made
 34
 35 R Hmmm
 36
 37 V Sin - whatever
 38
 39 R Hmmm
 40
 41 V And like everything we make
 42 is not is not ah from nature but
 43 rather like ah chemicals and all

Vera continues to explain her understanding of the line, 'they watch you from hiding', she brings an aspect of her background knowledge to bear on the detailed set of **inferences** she articulates about it She explains that 'they are hiding 'because of the fact that it's dark and the light shows all the animals will run away it's as if you're in a room all dark and you see this glowing spirit' (lines 12 to 22)

She aligns her personal knowledge about 'spirits' with her **inference** that, 'all the animals and all the bugs and everything will see you and they'll run away from you'

Vera reads, 'you are a chemical smell' (line 29) then tentatively **infers** that the smell may result from synthetic clothes She explains that the chemical smell may refer to clothes that are synthetically made (line 33), like chemicals (line 43)

1 that stuff OK. -A cold fire- ..
 2 cold fire it's because a fire gives
 3 off light and it gives off heat but
 4 the flashlight gives off light and
 5 it gives off no heat so that's what
 6 they could mean by a cold fire.
 7
 8 R Um Hmmm
 9
 10 V. -You are giant and
 11 indefinable- Well maybe to
 12 them you're big because of the
 13 fact you have a flashlight. They
 14 they don't know any animals in
 15 nature who who have this big
 16 light all the time at night - even
 17 at night.
 18
 19 R. Hmmm
 20
 21 V. OK. -In their monstrous
 22 night thick with possible claws
 23 where danger is not knowing- ...
 24 OK Since it's all dark they don't
 25 know - because to them like um
 26 most animals have some kind of
 27 defence or protection or . . or
 28 something like that you know so
 29 so they go maybe - they don't
 30 know if you have claws. They
 31 don't know but you might
 32 because of the fact of your big eye
 33 that's scaring them away you
 34 know And they don't know
 35 they don't know the danger
 36 because it says where danger is
 37 not knowing You don't know -
 38 you have a feeling there's danger
 39 but you're so tense you don't
 40 know where the danger's coming
 41 from and you know there's
 42 danger or you think there's
 43 danger but

Vera explains her understanding of the two-word phrase 'cold fire'; she does so with clear and explicit logic (lines 1 to 6)

She reads from the poem (lines 10 & 11) and again explains her *tentative* (as suggested by the word *maybe* in line 11) *inference* that you are 'giant and indefinable .. because of the fact that you have a flashlight They don't know any animals ... who have this big light all the time at night' (lines 10 to 16)

She reads from the poem (lines 21 to 23) and explains her interpretation by referring to the dark (line 24), claws (line 30), the 'big eye that's scaring them' (lines 32 & 33), and 'the danger' that's 'not knowing' (lines 36 & 37) Vera brings these details to bear on her understanding of the phrase, 'their monstrous night'. She *infers* both that 'your big eye' is scaring them (lines 32 & 33) and that the person walking has 'a feeling there's danger' (line 38). She thus logically *infers* that the phrase, 'where danger is not knowing' applies both to the person walking *and* the animals

1 you don't know where it's
 2 coming from . And it says -you
 3 are the hugest monster- To them
 4 you're the hugest monster To -
 5 for you the monsters are the little
 6 animals that's gonna bite you
 7 (brief inaudible phrase) But for
 8 them you are the hugest monster
 9 because of the light It's alien in
 10 in the night for - like if you go
 11 in a forest You turn on - you
 12 don't have the flashlight with
 13 you You'll realize it's all dark
 14 except for maybe little fireflies or
 15 something

16
 17 R Hmmm

18
 19 V But then if you take out your
 20 flashlight, it's this big light out of
 21 nowhere coming To them that's
 22 how you're a monster because
 23 you don't go around - like maybe
 24 - or like in the daytime you don't
 25 see someone wearing a mask and
 26 ah - it's totally out of out of sync
 27 with the whole thing so that's
 28 how you can be a monster to
 29 them

30
 31 R Hmmm

32
 33 V 'Cause you're different and
 34 you're yeah - you're different

35
 36 R Um Hmmm

37
 38 V By - why does it have
 39 Canadian in brackets (Referring
 40 to the parenthesized word
 41 behind Margaret Atwood's name
 42 at the bottom of the page)

Vera reads, 'you are the hugest monster' and **infers** that it is from the point of view of the animals that the 'you' is the hugest monster, 'because of the light' (lines 3 to 9) She explains that the light is 'alien' (line 9) and that 'it's this big light out of nowhere coming' (lines 20 & 21) and that 'it's totally out of sync with the whole thing so that's how you can be a monster to them' (lines 26 to 29)

She has previously aligned the flashlight with the 'single orange eye', the 'cold fire' and the title of the poem Having **inferred** such a framework from these details, she now clearly assimilates many of the details from the rest of the poem within it She says, 'so that's how you can be a monster to them 'cause you're different' (lines 27 to 33), thus concluding her first reading of the poem and expressing a **synthesis** of the various elements of the poem

Having now interpreted the poem in detail and assimilated the various details within a coherent frame, she questions the reference to the poet perhaps expecting that detail to be meaningful to her interpretation (lines 38 & 39)

1 R Just to indicate that she's a
 2 Canadian writer
 3
 4 V OK So - also in a way that's
 5 how Cyclops is like whenever
 6 whenever you watch a movie on
 7 Cyclops or something He's this
 8 big creature with this huge eye
 9 and he's walking around and
 10 he's stepping on everything and
 11 then everybody runs away
 12 because he's screaming He's
 13 making loud noises And he's
 14 destroying everything In a way
 15 when you walk when you
 16 walk in the forest or something
 17 you're destroying - whatever
 18 you're stepping on you're
 19 destroying
 20
 21 R Um Hmmm
 22
 23 V OK So in a way - and when
 24 Cyclops is out he's destroying
 25 also when he's walking So in a
 26 way he's like that and and
 27 but they don't realize they're
 28 they're hiding from you 'cause
 29 they think you're a monster but
 30 they don't realize you're afraid
 31
 32 R Hmmm
 33
 34 V And it's as if - like my brother
 35 always tells me, a spider is more
 36 afraid of you than you are of it
 37
 38 R Um hmmm
 39
 40 V I don't believe him but - Oh I
 41 know it's true but I mean jeez,
 42 who cares?

Vera responds to the poem's title by aligning background knowledge about Cyclops; she says 'he's this big creature with this huge eye' (lines 7 & 8)

She then draws a comparison between the person in the poem and the Cyclops (lines 7 to 19) referring to details about Cyclops and then the person in the poem. She says Cyclops is 'walking' (line 9), 'stepping on everything' (line 10), 'making loud noises' (line 13), 'destroying everything' (line 14) and (in lines 14 to 19) says 'in a way when you walk in the forest you're destroying - whatever you're stepping on you're destroying'. In lines 23 to 25, she then says 'and when Cyclops is out walking he's destroying also when he's walking'. Her association between the Cyclops and the person walking is detailed.

Vera suggests that, just as spiders are more afraid of you than you are of them, so are the animals more afraid of you (Cyclops) than you are of them. In saying this, she points to the perspectives of the 'you' and the animals. She thus **reads and responds** by describing and aligning a range of relevant experiences with the details in the poem.

1 R: Yeah
 2
 3 V: OK And ah but they - you
 4 always think 'Oh I'm afraid - I'm
 5 afraid of them' You don't
 6 realize they're afraid of you
 7 more
 8
 9 R: Hmmm
 10
 11 V. Because of your light
 12
 13 R Hmmm
 14
 15 V. So you sit there and you go
 16 'Oh no I shouldn't be in the dark
 17 I better get home soon' or
 18 something But they're prob'ly
 19 going, 'Oh no A monster's out
 20 to kill us' You are the you are
 21 the one that doesn't belong there
 22
 23 R Hmmm
 24
 25 V You might - like if you if you
 26 were - if you didn't have your
 27 flashlight - if you were like um
 28 back to basics like um Oh I
 29 forgot what they're called The
 30 those those native people in
 31 Australia The
 32
 33 R Ah Aborigines?
 34
 35 V Yeah Like that
 36
 37 R Yeah
 38
 39 V So if you belong in nature
 40 because I mean - you don't you
 41 don't see them at night ah
 42 Maybe they might carry lights but
 43 like torches But I suppose that
 44 that might be normal but to

The animals, Vera says, are
 'afraid of you more' because of
 your light' (lines 6 & 11) In lines
 15 to 21, Vera continues to
 explain her understanding of the
 two different perspectives from
 which she **infers** the poem to be
 written She resolves these two
 perspectives by saying, 'you are
 the one that doesn't belong
 there' (lines 20 & 21)

Vera **reads and responds** to this
 poem to elaborate extent, she
 supports her **inferences** by
 describing detailed scenarios that
 she then aligns with relevant
 details in the poem She **expands**
and clarifies her understanding
 by probing and questioning the
 details in the text, she is working
 through her second reading of
 the poem and doing so
 thoroughly Whatever
 uncertainty she expresses she
 resolves She describes her
 thinking explicitly, expresses
 herself with clarity and is
 delaying closure to a great extent

Vera draws on another aspect of
 her background knowledge and
 carefully explains its relevance to
 her understanding of the poem
 She says 'if you belong in nature'
 (line 39) like 'those native people
 in Australia' (lines 30 & 31),
 'maybe they might carry lights
 but like torches (lines 42 & 43)
 Vera thus contrasts the 'you' in
 the poem with the Aboriginal
 people who are natural and not
 something manmade as she
 says in line 5, next page

1 see a flashlight You know, that
 2 would be different because you
 3 don't have if you go in the
 4 forest you don't see things that
 5 are manmade You don't see um
 6 - you don't see flashlights. You
 7 use what you get from nature so
 8 maybe that in a way is what they
 9 mean by chem chemical You
 10 can in a way say chemical is not
 11 part of really - is not really a part
 12 of nature

13
 14 R Hmmm

15
 16 V: It's - you break - because
 17 chemicals come from breaking
 18 down ah stuff, right -

19
 20 R: Um Hmmm Um Hmmm

21
 22 V OK So you could be - so that
 23 could be like um - because it's en
 24 - it's chemi - Anyways, because
 25 when the - when you're walking
 26 down a path and have a
 27 flashlight and you're wearing
 28 shoes and and all that, you're
 29 not you're not actually part of
 30 nature anymore You're more
 31 like this . this monster from out
 32 of nowhere coming into your
 33 land Like maybe a Godzilla He
 34 didn't - he wasn't - he wasn't
 35 human He wa - he didn't even
 36 he he had scales His walking
 37 is like a - dinosaur's The
 38 dinosaur was here Dinosaur
 39 doesn't belong in this time
 40 period Or this - he might belong
 41 in this area, you never know but
 42 it doesn't belong in this time
 43 period so you can say in a way
 44 that it

Vera continues to explain her **inference** as to why the 'you' in the poem is the hugest monster and why it has a chemical smell (lines 1 to 12)

Vera expressed uncertainty about the phrase, 'chemical smell' earlier in her protocol She now refers to the flashlight and that phrase explaining that, 'chemical is not part really of nature' (lines 11 & 12) and, 'chemicals come from breaking down ah stuff' (lines 17 & 18) and, 'when you're walking down a path and have a flashlight and you're wearing shoes you're not actually part of nature any more' (lines 25 to 30) Her initial premise that chemicals are not part of nature is aligned with details in the text which, she explains, are also not part of nature. She thus justifies her interpretation of the phrase, 'chemical smell' by relating it to elements of the poem that are, similarly, 'not actually part of nature' (lines 29 & 30).

Having thus **inferred** the significance of 'chemical smell' Vera begins to relate the 'you' in the poem with this, 'monster from out of nowhere coming into your land' (31 to 33) Again, she is **reading and responding** by describing a range of experiences and aligning them with relevant details in the poem Her **inferences** are also clear and logically aligned with elements of the poem

1 doesn't belong here So when
 2 you go in a - in a forest or
 3 something with a flashlight
 4 flashing everywhere, you don't
 5 belong in there because of the fact
 6 that you're not part of - you're
 7 not really - the things you have
 8 and the way you are is not part of
 9 nature
 10
 11 R. Um Hmmm
 12
 13 V: Like a human being might be
 14 part of nature but it's the way
 15 you are that doesn't belong in
 16 nature
 17
 18 R: Um Hmmm
 19
 20 V: So for them you're a monster
 21 because you're not . you you
 22 don't belong . Like maybe
 23 Godzilla wasn't a monster but he
 24 didn't belong so people made
 25 him out to be monsters or King
 26 Kong or something, right?
 27
 28 R. Um Hmmm
 29
 30 V: So that's the way where
 31 you can really say you're a
 32 monster (7 second pause) Also,
 33 it's not only like talking about
 34 the night and walking in the
 35 street but like anywhere. Like
 36 life in general I suppose maybe
 37 OK like when you always hiding
 38 yourself you're - you want -
 39 when you're hiding yourself
 40 behind - or (6 second pause) I
 41 don't know I take that back
 42
 43 R OK

Having explained (on the previous page) how Godzilla had scales, walked like a dinosaur which 'doesn't belong in this time period and 'doesn't belong here' (line 1 opposite), Vera now **infers** that the 'you' is similarly not part of nature. She says, 'so when you go in a forest the things you have and the way you are is not part of nature' (lines 1 to 9). She further explains, 'it's the way you are that doesn't belong in nature. You're a monster because you don't belong so that's the way where you can really say you're a monster' (lines 14 to 32).

Her background knowledge about Godzilla and the dinosaur is brought directly to bear on the concluding line of the poem. Her **reading and response** is thus aligned with many relevant details in the poem. She draws an explicit link between these scenarios and lines from the poem. She thus **synthesizes** the details of the poem, *as well as* relevant details of her own experience.

In lines 33 through 42, Vera begins to **infer** a second level of interpretation saying that the poem could be, not only talking about the night and walking in the street but like anywhere when you're hiding yourself (lines 34 to 39).

1 V OK
 2
 3 R. Alright
 4
 5 V Because some of it is like -
 6 where it says -danger is no
 7 knowing- you can never know
 8 when there's danger coming
 9 Like life is full of - it - you can't
 10 really say life is full of danger.
 11 But it's more like life is full of
 12 surprises so in a way that's how
 13 danger is Danger's not gonna go
 14 ah - it's gonna go 'I'm coming
 15 I'm coming I'm coming' Ya
 16 know It just pops out of
 17 nowhere Ah - or somehow you
 18 expect it But not to the point of
 19 you really think it's gonna come
 20 but it just giving you clues and it
 21 might be coming So in a - that
 22 could be in a way how life is
 23 because you know there's
 24 there's always - you get little
 25 surprises and scare - you get
 26 scared and (5 second pause) Ah
 27 and they go -do not disguise
 28 yourself in armor- Like a lot of
 29 people - to like if you go -
 30 because they say like ah - like
 31 they go to survive in the
 32 business world ah you have to be
 33 hard and all that See in a way -
 34 to - it's almost as if saying you
 35 have - to survive in this world
 36 you have to be mean And you
 37 have to protect yourself in in that
 38 way - saying do not disguise
 39 yourself in armor In that way
 40 you can see it as life You ca - you
 41 go around through life ah
 42 pretending to be something else
 43 that you're not 'cause if you
 44 actually act the way

Vera begins to assimilate details from the poem according to her **inference** that the poem could be about 'life' She does so in **reading**, 'danger is not knowing' (lines 6 & 7) and **responding** that, 'you can never know when there's danger coming' (lines 7 & 8) She interprets some details from the poem as though they are meant to represent general truths about life. She talks about 'danger', for example, (lines 8, 10, 13) and 'surprises' (line 12) then **infers**, 'that could be in a way how life is because you get little surprises' (lines 22 to 25)

Again, she has aligned this general experience directly with a line from the poem She then reads (lines 27 & 28) and **infers**, 'it's almost as if saying you have - to survive in this world you have to be mean And you have to protect yourself in that way' (lines 34 to 38)

She continues to **respond** by explaining the relevance of her general experience to the poem's representation of a general truth about 'life' (lines 39 to 44)

She suggests that you can't 'go around through life pretending to be something else that you're not 'cause if you actually act the way you do you'll be crushed by everyone else' (lines 40 to line 2, next page)

1 you do you'll be crushed by
 2 everyone else and that's why
 3 you can think like - because look.
 4 If you didn't - you would have to
 5 have a reason to dress yourself in
 6 - to protect yourself So that in a
 7 way - like that's how he was
 8 tryin' ta be when he was doing
 9 that with the flashlight He
 10 didn't - he was trying to protect
 11 himself from the dark and from
 12 animals that might creep up and
 13 he's gonna flash the light in their
 14 face or something So, in a way
 15 that's how life is You you can
 16 carry something to - you're
 17 always on the defensive side
 18 You you think you're - you think
 19 I have to always be on the
 20 defensive side but sometimes
 21 you realize that that ah be being
 22 on the defensive side you're also
 23 on the offensive So - that's in
 24 a way how See? You get my
 25 idea

26
 27 R. I think so

28
 29 V: But not the whole poem is
 30 like on life Your certain parts
 31 you can . kind of .. changing

32
 33 R Sure I think I see what you
 34 mean

35
 36 S OK And it goes -unable to see
 37 what is beyond the capsule of
 38 your dim sight- That could be
 39 meaning that people are not
 40 always so broad minded Most
 41 people are kinda narrow minded
 42 and 'I don't care what you say
 43 I still think this and this and
 44 this'

Vera explains the relationship between the line, 'do not disguise yourself in armor' and the flashlight She says, 'he was trying to protect himself from the dark and from animals that might creep up' (lines 10 to 12), thus further explaining her interpretation according to various specific details from the poem Vera says that life is like flashing a 'light in their face or something' (lines 13 & 14) She then says that carrying the light is representative of being on the defensive (lines 15 to 25) She again aligns this inference with a detail from the poem when she says quite explicitly, 'You think, "I have to always be on the defensive side" but sometimes you realize that ah being on the defensive you're also on the offensive' (lines 18 to 23)

She reads, 'unable to see what is beyond the capsule of your dim sight' (lines 36 to 38) and **infers**, 'that could be meaning that people are not always so broadminded (lines 38 to 40)

In saying what she does over these past few pages of her protocol, Vera is working toward a second **synthesis** of the elements of the poem having already assimilated the details of the poem as she explained why 'you' was the hugest monster

1 R: Sure
 2
 3 V: Like that. . And then because
 4 of the fact that you're so narrow
 5 minded, you don't see you
 6 don't see what's out of range and
 7 what might be coming or 'cause
 8 it says -what shape contracts to a
 9 heart with terror- and all that
 10 You know and by being by being
 11 so narrow minded you can hurt
 12 yourself and others by - because
 13 you don't want to well for the
 14 flashlight you can't really - 'OK
 15 I'm gonna make the light bigger'
 16 you know but when you're
 17 considering yourself you can say -
 18 you can - you don't realize you're
 19 being narrow minded but you
 20 are You're prob'ly think 'Oh
 21 I'm stubborn' But to be stubborn
 22 also is in a way to be narrow
 23 minded
 24
 25 R: Um Hmmm
 26
 27 S: Because you won't listen to
 28 anybody else's opinion and you
 29 just don't give a .. darn.
 30
 31 R: Sure
 32
 33 V: OK Like - so that in a w. y is
 34 like the flashlight You - when
 35 you have one view - one point of
 36 view that's always looking
 37 straight -
 38
 39 R: Hmmm
 40
 41 V: You're you're not gonna turn
 42 left You're not gonna look right
 43 You're going down there You're

Vera reads from the poem (lines 8 & 9) and **infers** that the details in this line represent what one might not see, 'what's out of range and what might be coming' (lines 6 & 7)

She is working toward an interpretation of the lines: 'unable to see what is beyond the capsule of your dim sight' and 'what shape contracts to a heart with terror' She **infers** that the flashlight's beam symbolizes the narrow-mindedness and stubbornness of the person walking. She explains, 'because you won't listen to anybody else's opinion and you just don't give a darn' (lines 27 to 29). Then she explicitly says, 'Like . . that in a way is like the flashlight You - when you have one view - one point of view that's always looking straight' (lines 33 to 37)

In this segment of her interpretation (lines 3 through 43), Vera seems less assured than when she was **reading and responding** line-by-line, throughout her first reading of the poem She reveals that her somewhat general and abstract interpretation about 'life' is more sketchy and perhaps less solidly connected with the poem when she says 'I don't know if this has anything to do with it' (lines 4 & 5, next page)

1 not gonna - if somebody says left
 2 you're you're gonna turn right.
 3 If somebody says right you're
 4 gonna turn left. I don't know if
 5 it has anything to do with it but
 6 so OK You're going along
 7 the path mosquito doped That
 8 means you've been - Oh and
 9 then it says with no moon OK
 10 that's why it also different
 11 because there's no moon.

12
 13 R: Right

14
 15 V: There's no - because at night
 16 you have the moon and it's
 17 shining So I I don't suppose
 18 that's that's scary but when
 19 there's no moon, everything is
 20 just dark except for the stars but -
 21 and then - so in a way that's
 22 that's why it's scarier when
 23 there's no moon unless there's
 24 a full moon but one of the two
 25 - when there's no moon and
 26 when there's a full moon (5
 27 second pause) I like the way
 28 where she just left -you are the
 29 hugest monster- at the bottom
 30 Like alone?

31
 32 R: Hmmm

33
 34 V: It's like - it's not saying - it's
 35 as if you're - it's a statement ..
 36 Like um - you don't - because it's
 37 telling you how you're afraid,
 38 how you're afraid, how you're
 39 afraid and then and then in the
 40 bottom it just says you are the
 41 hugest - it's getting you to the
 42 point where they're telling you
 43 that you're the hugest monster

Vera reads the poem from the beginning again, commenting on the fact that there's no moon (lines 9, 11, 19, 23, 25) She is attempting to **infer** further significance from some details in the poem

Vera begins to move from the **inference** that the poem represents 'life' to a **critical** awareness of the style, structure and tone of the poem Vera says that the last line of the poem is 'a statement' (line 35) and the poem is, 'getting you to the point where they're telling you that you're the hugest monster but you don't realize it' (lines 41 to line 1 next page) Vera then comments, And she's not preparing you for the fact that it's saying you are the hugest monster' (lines 9 to 11, next page) She suggests that the poet puts the reader in a position that is similar to the position of the person in the poem Both the reader and the 'you' in the poem are in a place where they face certain surprises, where they are not prepared to be (lines 34 this page to line 17 next page)

In concluding, 'you feel uncomfortable, it's because you're just out of your area' (lines 15 to 17 next page) she is commenting on the structural and stylistic details of the text and thus **reacting critically**.

1 but you don't realize it because it
 2 says -in their monstrous night
 3 thick with possible claws where
 4 danger is not knowing- it's as if
 5 saying um you know all around
 6 it's still - it s - it's as if it's foggy -
 7 all around it's foggy and and you
 8 don't really see what's going on
 9 And she's not preparing you for
 10 the fact that it's saying you are
 11 the hugest monster It's like -
 12 because in a place where you
 13 think you don't belong you
 14 don't And it's not because you
 15 know because you feel
 16 uncomfortable, it's because
 17 you're just out of your area

18
 19 R Hmmm

20
 21 V And to these an - you're not -
 22 to these animals you're not really
 23 an animal but some some
 24 creature with this big light and
 25 funny smelling clothes and who
 26 doesn't smell like the woods

27
 28 R Hmmm

29
 30 V You know? Because every -
 31 like every animal has a smell.

32
 33 R Hmmm

34
 35 V Every animal has a smell but
 36 you don't have a smell You
 37 come - it's as if you smell like
 38 you know when when people
 39 use their soap and they smell like
 40 soap and they smell like like
 41 perfume and they smell like that
 42 See in a way that's how you are a
 43 chemical smell

Vera further **expands and clarifies** her interpretation by rereading 'in their monstrous night thick with possible claws where danger is not knowing' (lines 2 to 4) and **infers**, 'you're not really an animal but some creature with this big light and funny smelling clothes and who doesn't smell like the woods' (lines 22 to 26) In stating this, she again depends on the significance she has already established for the lines, 'the flashlight a single orange eye' and 'you are a chemical smell'

She is thus continuing to **expand and clarify** her interpretation by further questioning the significance of these lines of the poem She is rereading, working through various interpretations of the poem, describing her thinking explicitly, expressing herself with clarity and delaying closure

She again **infers** that the person in the poem is the hugest monster because he is a creature with a big light and funny smelling clothes which smell 'like soap' (lines 39 & 40) and 'like perfume' (line 41) Having explained her understanding of how the poem's last line comes unexpectedly, she is now **inferring** the connection between the 'chemical smell' and the last line of the poem

1 R: Hmmm
 2
 3 V: Because like if you go
 4 hunting in the woods animals
 5 will not come near you because -
 6 if you just went and took a
 7 shower - let's go hunting Dad
 8 You go out hunting Animals
 9 won't come near you because
 10 they can smell you Not not the
 11 human smell but this weird
 12 smell OK so they won't come
 13 So you have to stay in the forest
 14 for about three days until you
 15 smell like the forest Then you
 16 know that's when you can get
 17 animals It's not (inaudible
 18 phrase) That's how -
 19 like also you know when you
 20 when you just lay a trap for
 21 an animal, animals don't come
 22 near They can smell Well like
 23 a baby bird - if you pick up a baby
 24 bird it - the parents will reject it
 25 because it - they can smell
 26 human - a human
 27
 28 R: Hmmm
 29
 30 V: So that's how in a way - but if
 31 you leave the baby on its own
 32 eventually it regains its own
 33 smell
 34
 35 R: Hmmm
 36
 37 V: So that's why it's more like a
 38 chemical smell because you you
 39 don't smell uh - OK if maybe
 40 animals - they don't smell like -
 41 animals maybe foxes - for
 42 animals - foxes smell like this,
 43 lions smell like that But if a
 44 human came in they'd go - like

Vera is **reading and responding**
 by again relating a personal
 experience with details in the
 poem: 'like if you go hunting in
 the woods animals will not come
 near you because they can
 smell you Not the human
 smell but this weird smell' (lines
 3 to 12)

Vera is either particularly
 intrigued by the 'chemical smell'
 or not altogether satisfied with
 her understanding of this
 element of the poem (this is the
 phrase in the poem about which
 she expressed uncertainty as she
 first read and responded to it).
 She aligns her background
 knowledge about hunting with
 'the chemical smell' in some
 detail (lines 3 through 33)

And, again, she aligns this aspect
 of her experience with details in
 the poem, saying, 'When you
 just lay a trap for an animal,
 animals don't come near They
 can smell the parents will
 reject it because they can smell
 human' (lines 20 to 26)

She is again **reading and**
responding by aligning these
 details of her experience with the
 'chemical smell', she concludes,
 'So that's why it's more like a
 chemical smell' (line 37 to line
 14 next page)

1 humans don't have one
 2 distinctive smell But it's more
 3 like - they smell - she smells like
 4 her soap, that person smells like
 5 that soap
 6
 7 R Hmmm
 8
 9 V: So it's all chemical So that in
 10 a way is how it's a chemical
 11 smell . And well yeah because it
 12 it doesn't - see it says here like
 13 the poem is going along telling
 14 you how you're scared and then
 15 it's saying um .. don't .. you
 16 know - try to be like one of them
 17 Turn off your flashlight Try not
 18 to - or you think you're scared
 19 and you know? No it says -is it
 20 true you have no fear- Then take
 21 off your shoes Try to prove - it's
 22 as if she's daring you to um ..
 23 sheeos be - she daring you to ... to
 24 turn off the flashlight and go
 25 walk as an animal
 26
 27 R. Um Hmmm
 28
 29 V: Well not to that point but
 30 walk like them and then and
 31 then she says -they watch you
 32 from hiding. You are a chemical
 33 smell, a cold fire You are giant
 34 and indefinable- OK. That
 35 might get you to the part where it
 36 says you are the hugest monster
 37 but they - but she makes it in
 38 such a way that she doesn't say
 39 right off the bat you are the
 40 hugest monster. She goes -in
 41 their monstrous night where
 42 danger is not knowing- and stuff,
 43 you are the hugest monster
 44 because in -

Vera continues to explain her understanding of a 'chemical smell' She says, 'So it's all chemical So that in a way is how it's a chemical smell' (lines 9 to 11)

Vera then **reacts critically** by summarizing the narrative progression of the poem She says, 'here like the poem is going along telling you how you're scared and then it's saying .. it's as if she's daring you .. turn off the flashlight .. and then she says they watch you from hiding .. That might get you to the part where it says .. ' (lines 12 to 36). In referring to these details, she notes the tone or feeling conveyed by the poem Vera comments on the critical elements of the poem that create the effect she sees in the last line of the poem: 'That might get you to the point where it says you are the hugest monster but they - but she makes it in such a way that she doesn't say right off the bat you are .. ' (lines 34 to 39).

She again then repeats her understanding of the last line of the poem, saying 'you are the hugest monster because in - when it says where danger is not knowing, in a way you're the unknown' (lines 43 to line 3, next page).

1 when it says where danger is not
2 knowing, in a way you're the
3 unknown

4

5 R Um Hmmm

6

7 V That's why you're the hugest
8 monster Because they know -
9 they know all the other animals
10 but you you have this thing
11 coming out with this light
12 flashing out of it and and smells
13 like soap I mean you you'd
14 think it was a monster

15

16 R Hmmm

17

18 V: Because it doesn't belong
19 here It doesn't smell like an
20 animal so that's how you are the
21 hugest monster

22

23 R. Um Hmmm

24

25 V That could - that could be
26 saying that they're saying - that
27 could go good with the saying
28 ah they're more afraid of you
29 than you are of it

30

31 R: Yes Um Hmmm

32

33 V Because here you're saying
34 you know you're afraid That's
35 why you have the flashlight But
36 then to them you're the hugest
37 monster But to them - for you
38 they're they're just animals and
39 they scare you right?

40

41 R: Um Hmmm

Vera explains, 'It doesn't smell like a monster so that's how you are the hugest monster' (lines 19 to 21)

At this point in her interpretation Vera is repeating and rephrasing many statements made throughout her interpretation and thus **expanding and clarifying** her interpretation by delaying closure

She again refers to a point she made earlier in her interpretation, in commenting again on the last line of the poem, she says, 'that could go good with the saying they're more afraid of you than you are of it' (lines 25 to 29)

She comments again on the parallel fears that she perceives in the poem saying, 'you're saying you're afraid That's why you have the flashlight But then to them you're the hugest monster for you they're just animals and they scare you right?

But for them you're like "they're out to kill me" ' (lines 33 to line 3 on next page) Vera is delaying closure by repeating some previous statements about the animals' fear of the flashlight as well as the person's fear of the animals (lines 33 to 49)

- 1 V But for them you're like
 2 (sharp intake of breath) 'they're
 3 out to kill me', you know?
 4
 5 R Hmmm
 6
 7 V So that's how it's - it's more -
 8 they're more afraid of you than
 9 you are of them
 10
 11 R Hmmm
 12
 13 V (6 second pause) OK
 14
 15 R OK?
 16
 17 V OK
 18
 19 R OK Super

Vera's final summary comment, 'they're more afraid of you than you are of it' (lines 8 & 9) is expressed in the well established context of her many previous interpretive statements about the fear the animals have the for the 'Cyclops with the flashlight who has a chemical smell, who is afraid to walk without shoes and who is the hugest monster'

Vera has **synthesized** by assimilating the details of the poem within a coherent frame - that 'you' are the Cyclops carrying a flashlight that is scaring the animals. The various **inferences** stated have been aligned within this frame, and logically and clearly aligned with details in the poem. She has **expanded and clarified** her interpretation repeatedly throughout her reading and response. In **reading and responding** she has brought a range of relevant experiences to bear on her interpretation of various details in the text and she has **reacted critically** by commenting on the manner in which the poet brings the poem to its concluding statement.

Her think-aloud interpretation thus characterizes in all these ways the reading processes of a category 5 reader according to the criteria set forth in the reading scale.

4: Barbara N.: Cyclops

3 R: I'll give you a copy of this
4 poem and I'm interested in
5 seeing how high school students
6 understand what they read How
7 they make sense of it you know?

8

9 B Yeah

10

11 R: So I'll read this out loud and
12 afterwards you can give me your
13 reactions to it, impressions,
14 feelings, thoughts and so on
15 Then can you read it through
16 yourself and just say out loud
17 everything you're reading and
18 thinking?

19

20 B OK

21

22 R. Yeah? And um you can read
23 it through as many times as you
24 want to

25

26 B Um Hmmm

27

28 R And if there's words you
29 wanna ask about, you can do
30 that

31

32 The poem Cyclops is read aloud
33 to the student

34

35 B OK um ou're -going along
36 the path mosquito doped with no
37 moon, the flashlight a single
38 orange eye- So I guess the
39 flashlight's sorta the Cyclops and
40 ah it's night and you're just
41 walking along unable to see what
42 is beyond the capsule of your dim
43 sight so you can't see beyond

The responding-aloud procedure
is explained (lines 3 to 24)

Barbara begins to **read and respond** to the poem immediately after it is read aloud.

After reading the first few lines of the poem (lines 35 to 38), she associates the flashlight with the Cyclops, the title of the poem **inferring**, 'I guess the flashlight's sorta the Cyclops' (lines 38 & 39) She **infers**, 'It's night' (line 40) and you can't see beyond the - you can only see what the flashlight sees (lines 43 to line 2, next page) She is **reading and responding** to the poem by paraphrasing the first stanza and making **inferences** aligned with appropriate details in that stanza

1 the - You can only see what the
 2 flashlight sees
 3
 4 R Um Hmmm
 5
 6 B -what shape contracts to a
 7 heart with terror, bumps among
 8 the leaves, what makes a
 9 bristling noise like a fur throat-
 10 Well it's - you're walking
 11 through the woods or something
 12 like that and then you see all
 13 these shapes and they scare you
 14 sorta like horror movies
 15
 16 R Um Hmmm
 17
 18 B And you're always afraid
 19 somethings gonna leap out into
 20 and then the noise of the
 21 leaves and everything It's like a
 22 horror and it's just scary and
 23 windy and a whole bunch of
 24 stuff
 25
 26 R Um Hmmm
 27
 28 B And -Is it true you do not wish
 29 to hurt them? Is is true you have
 30 no fear?- Well I guess . it's
 31 it's like you're going through the
 32 thing right and like -
 33
 34 R You're?
 35 B Yeah well us - we're walking
 36 through and then you always
 37 pretend you're brave or
 38 something and you're not scared
 39 of anything and if it'll leap out
 40 you'll try to - you won't - you
 41 don't wanna do anything to it or
 42 something 'cause it might just be
 43 an animal but in reality if it does

Barbara's **inference** that 'you can only see what the flashlight sees' (lines 1 & 2) is not as explicitly supported or explained as Vera's but it is aligned with appropriate details in the poem. Barbara reads, makes an inference, and continues reading. She reads verbatim from poem (lines 6 to 9) and **infers** that 'you're walking through the woods or something like that' (lines 10 to 12).

Perhaps because she seems to hurriedly read and interpret, she doesn't realize that the phrase 'unable to see' (line 4 of poem) qualifies 'what shape contracts', 'bumps among the leaves' and 'what makes a bristling noise'. She **infers** that, 'you see all these shapes and they scare you sorta like horror movies' (lines 12 to 14). Many readers in this study have similarly interpreted this 2nd and 3rd stanza.

It may be that Barbara **infers**, 'you're always afraid' (line 18) and, 'It's like a horror and it's just scary' (lines 21 & 22) because of the word 'terror' in the 3rd stanza and because her own experience would support her **inference**, but she doesn't explain it this way herself or elaborate on her explanation. She is **reading and responding** by bringing her experiences of 'walking through the woods' and 'windy nights' to bear on her interpretation of the first two stanzas of the poem.

1 jump you will be terrified and
 2 you just want it to die and go
 3 away so I guess you do sorta
 4 wanta hurt them and you really
 5 are scared

6

7 R Hmmm

8

9 B And ah -Take off your shoes
 10 then let your eyes go bare Swim
 11 in their darkness as in a river Do
 12 not disguise yourself in armor-
 13 Um I guess this is like well if
 14 you're not scared you know just
 15 go off and ah just go and don't
 16 use the flashlight and just not see
 17 anything

18

19 R Um Hmmm

20

21 B And -do not disguise yourself
 22 in armor- Um I don't know
 23 armor um armor ah I
 24 don't know Do not disguise
 25 yourself in armor You can't tell
 26 me who who's watching you,
 27 right? You can't tell me
 28 anything right?

29

30 R Um no.

31

32 B Um

33

34 R. But remember You can read
 35 it as many times as you want and
 36 see what comes of it through
 37 each reading if you wanna do it
 38 that way It's up to you

39

40 B Um

41

42 R You know what armor is,
 43 right? The literal definition?

She has read from the text (lines 28 to 30, prev. page) and **infers**, 'you always pretend you're brave and you're not scared of anything' (lines 36 to 39, prev. page) 'but in reality if it does jump you will be terrified so I guess you do sorta wanta hurt them then and you really are scared' (line 43 prev. page to line 5 this page) and is thus **reading and responding** by further aligning her experiences with details from the fourth and fifth stanzas

She reads from the fifth stanza (lines 9 to 12, this page) and immediately **infers**, 'I guess this is like if you're not scared just go and don't use the flashlight' (lines 13 to 16)

Unlike Vera, she does not elaborate on her interpretation, does not go into detail. Where a category 5 protocol is elaborate, detailed and explicit, the category 4's is not quite so. Barbara's **inferences**, though, are aligned with appropriate details in the poem and logical given the details in the poem

As she rereads one phrase from the text (lines 21 & 22), she struggles somewhat with an interpretation of it and attempts to **expand and clarify** her interpretation by asking, 'who's watching' (line 26)

1 B Yeah I know Yeah
 2
 3 R OK
 4
 5 B So I guess OK -do not disguise
 6 yourself in armor- Um don't
 7 don't um take off - well sort
 8 of goes like - don't sort of protect
 9 yourself
 10
 11 R Ah ha
 12
 13 B From from from the .. from
 14 something
 15
 16 R OK
 17
 18 B From the, you know, just go
 19 bare
 20
 21 R. Right
 22
 23 B Um -You are a chemical
 24 smell, a cold fire, you are giant
 25 and indefinable- well that means
 26 well they see you but you can't
 27 see them I mean you stand out
 28 and you're different And you're
 29 a cold fire - it's nothing like that.
 30 Can't be a cold fire You're the
 31 you're the giant, you're just,
 32 you're the different one You're
 33 you're the thing that stands out
 34
 35 R Hmmm
 36
 37 B -In their monstrous night
 38 thick with possible claws where
 39 danger is not knowing- well I
 40 mean in the night all the
 41 animals look like monsters and
 42 and there's danger everywhere
 43 and you can't see it and they just

Barbara continues to work at an interpretation of the phrase, 'do not disguise yourself in armor'. She **infers** that it means, don't sort of protect yourself from the something (lines 8 to 14). She reads verbatim (lines 23 to 25) and **infers**, they can see you but you can't see them' (lines 26 & 27). She refers briefly to 'cold fire' (lines 29 to 33), she **responds** to this phrase by aligning her experience of fire with the phrase, she says, 'Can't be a cold fire' (line 30). Barbara then elaborates on the phrase, 'giant and indefinable'; she says, 'you're the giant, you're the different one You're the thing that stands out' (lines 30 to 33).

Where the category 5 protocol has **inferences** and **responses** that are explained in detail, the category 4 reader's protocol contains **inferences** and **responses** that are not as thoroughly so. The category 4 interpretation is not **expanded and clarified** to the extent that the category 5 interpretation is.

Barbara reads from the text again (lines 37 to 39) and **infers** that, 'in the night all the animals look like monsters (lines 40 & 41) and 'there's danger everywhere' (line 42). She is **reading and responding** here by aligning her own experiences with details in the poem.

1 just might come and come after
 2 you
 3
 4 R: *They* might?
 5
 6 B. Yeah
 7
 8 R. Who's the 'they'?
 9
 10 B. Um the animals
 11
 12 R. OK
 13
 14 B: And you're the hugest
 15 monster. That means but in fact
 16 I guess you're the - well that
 17 means you're the worst of them
 18 all maybe. Or you're the biggest
 19 or you scared them. And they
 20 don't scare you
 21
 22 R: Alright
 23
 24 B: Cyclops. I don't know how
 25 the title goes with the poem.
 26
 27 R: No?
 28
 29 B: Except for maybe the
 30 flashlight but then after that the
 31 flashlight is just mentioned in
 32 the first stanza.
 33
 34 R: Right
 35
 36 B: Not the others.
 37
 38 R: Right.
 39
 40 B: and .. and . and .. (7
 41 second pause) um ... like a fur
 42 throat. That means it's sorta like

Barbara **infers** (cont'd from previous page, line 40) that, 'they just might come after you' (lines 1 & 2) meaning the animals (lines 8 & 10). She reads from the poem (lines 14 & 15) and **infers**, 'in fact you're the worst of them all maybe. Or you're the biggest or you scared them. And they don't scare you' (lines 15 to 20). Her **inferences** are logical and aligned with relevant details in the poem but she does not elaborate.

She comments on the title of the poem, saying, 'I don't know how the title goes with the poem except for maybe the flashlight but then after that the flashlight is just mentioned in the first stanza' (lines 24 to 32). She has commented on the poem's title once before at the beginning of her protocol and linked it with the flashlight (lines 38 & 39, page one). She doesn't **expand** and **clarify** this aspect of her interpretation by further questioning it or aligning other details in the poem with the (suggested) **inference** that Cyclops may have something to do with the flashlight.

She **reads**, 'fur throat' (lines 41 & 42) and **responds** by paraphrasing, or establishing the literal meaning of the terms (lines 42 to line 2 next page).

1 a harsh, sort of rough, right? Or
 2 soft - no Never mind.
 3
 4 B No no no
 5
 6 R No?
 7
 8 B . ah (6 second pause) Cyclops
 9 (10 second pause) Um (18 second
 10 pause) I have no idea OK.
 11 Cyclops Maybe it's because she's
 12 saying something about how
 13 humans think the animals are
 14 the bad guys and but in fact it's
 15 you who's the bad guy. And
 16 Cyclops is meaning - with one
 17 eye you only see one thing. And
 18 (13 second pause) humans are
 19 just monsters We're the worst.
 20 (14 second pause) -And is it true
 21 you do not wish to hurt them?-
 22 But in fact humans do hurt
 23 animals
 24
 25 R Hmmm
 26
 27 B. We always say we wanta save
 28 them and everything and not
 29 hurt them but we always end up
 30 hurting them
 31
 32 R Hmmm
 33
 34 B And we're not supposed -
 35 we're supposed to not be afraid of
 36 them And we're supposed to
 37 know they're all peaceful and
 38 everything, they won't hurt you
 39 but you always go and ya always
 40 hurt them because you're the
 41 one that's scared and if if you
 42 hurt them they can't hurt you
 43 and your fear goes away

Barbara indicates uncertainty about the phrase, 'fur throat' (line 2) then again comments on the relevance of the poem's title to the ideas in the poem thus attempting to **expand and clarify** this aspect of her interpretation

She pauses frequently (lines 8, 9, 18, 20) as she attempts to formulate both her understanding of the significance of the poem's title and her general **synthesis** of the poem's message She **infers**, 'Cyclops Cyclops Maybe it's about how humans think the animals are the bad guys but in fact it's you who's the bad guy. And Cyclops is meaning with one eye you only see one thing' (lines 11 to 17) She concludes, 'humans are just monsters We're the worst' (lines 18 & 19) and 'in fact humans do hurt animals' (lines 22 & 23). Barbara is **synthesizing** here by assimilating the details of the poem with the frame that, 'Cyclops is the bad guy' and the 'you' in the poem is one of the humans who do hurt animals' (lines 8 to 23)

She is also **reading and responding** by aligning her experience of humans' relationship(s) to animals with details in the poem (lines 27 to 43). She comments that, 'we always say we wanna save them . and we're supposed to not be afraid of them And we're supposed to know they're all peaceful they won't hurt you' (lines 27 to 38)

1 R: Um Hmmm
 2
 3 B: (10 second pause) -Take off
 4 your shoes then- .. I don't
 5 understand why they have so
 6 much about going bare and
 7 well the armor must mean
 8 something and (7 second
 9 pause) and (8 second pause)
 10 Maybe let your eyes go bare just .
 11 it's forget about seeing or forget
 12 about um .. just like animals and
 13 just - and don't hide yourself and
 14 ah - that doesn't make sense
 15
 16 R: Hmmm
 17
 18 B: . um (22 second pause) I
 19 don't know
 20
 21 R: What are you thinking about?
 22 I mean like, what is it you're
 23 working at?
 24
 25 B: Nothing. I'm just looking up
 26 and down - just . nothing (11
 27 second pause) Ah
 28
 29 R: You can read through as
 30 many times as you want. It's up
 31 to you I know. I've been reading
 32 through but I don't see
 33 anything R OK
 34
 35 B. (30 second pause) I don't see
 36 anything
 37
 38 R OK. You don't wanna say
 39 anything else more about it?
 40
 41 B No

In expressing her overall understanding or **synthesis** of the elements in the poem, as she has on the previous page, (lines 8 through 43), Barbara is assimilating the various **inferences** she has made throughout her interpretation and is **expanding and clarifying** her interpretation *as* she **synthesizes** by expressing herself with reasonable clarity. From lines 27 to 43, on the previous page, she has **read and responded** by tacitly bringing her 'frames' of personal experience to bear on the **inferences** she has made

She reads from the poem (lines 3 & 4), expresses confusion (lines 4 to 6), then **infers**, 'the armor must mean something' (lines 7 & 8) She concludes that 'take off your shoes then, let your eyes go bare' means, 'forget about seeing just like animals and don't hide yourself' (lines 11 to 14) She doesn't pursue this interpretation in any detail saying 'that doesn't make sense' (lines 14 & 15)

This category 4 protocol is an example of how the five key reading processes and respective subprocesses are used. This protocol exemplifies all of the category 4 statements, it differs from the category 5 protocol in terms of the *extent* to which the reading processes are used

1 R: OK

Barbara appears to be attempting to **expand and clarify** her interpretation by rereading and delaying closure to a certain extent (as evidenced by her pauses on previous page, lines 19, 27 & 28, and 36) and her comment that, 'I'm just looking up and down ... I don't see anything' (lines 25 & 26, and 35 & 36, previous page).

Having **synthesized** b y assimilating most details of the poem within a coherent frame, poem, *and read and responded* by relating it with her experience(s), she makes no other attempt to interpret the poem.

She has expressed herself with reasonable clarity delayed closure until she has at least touched on most elements of the poem, and she has generally aligned her background experience with the details of the poem.

3: Brenda B.: Cyclops

3 R: I'll give you this poem and
4 what I'll do is I'll read the poem
5 out loud alright -

6

7 B: OK

8

9 R: And you can you can follow
10 along and then afterwards you
11 can just give me your initial
12 reactions to it, your feelings
13 about it and so on - your
14 thoughts .

15

16 B: Yeah

17

18 R: And if there are any words
19 you want to ask me about you
20 can do that ... and then perhaps
21 you can read through it yourself
22 as many times as you need to and
23 ah tell me everything you're
24 thinking as you're reading
25 through the poem yourself. OK?

26

27 B: (nods yes)

28

29 R: Alright

30

31 The poem Cyclops is read aloud
32 to the student

33

34 B OK Sounds pretty
35 horrible - after awhile I thought
36 it was an animal

37

38 R Um Hmmm

39

40 B. Then it jumped to a person
41 then it jumped I don't know
42 where

The responding-aloud procedure
is explained (lines 3 to 25)

After the poem is read aloud,
Brenda immediately begins to
respond by attempting to
establish the identity of the 'you'
in the poem. She says, 'Sounds
pretty horrible - after awhile I
thought it was an animal' (lines
34 to 36). Then she says, 'Then it
jumped to a person then it
jumped I don't know where'
(lines 40 to 42)

... lines 3 to 5 on the next page,
she says, 'Just kept jumping to
somebody. I'm just trying to
figure out who it was', thus
indicating that she is aware of
what it is she is attempting to do
as she reflects briefly on the
poem

1 R: Yeah?
 2
 3 B: Just kept jumping to
 4 somebody I'm just trying to
 5 figure out who it was
 6
 7 R: Ah ha
 8
 9 B (13 second pause)
 10
 11 R: Maybe you could actually just
 12 read parts out loud as you're
 13 thinking through and that way
 14 I'll know what you're thinking.
 15
 16 B: Well when they said um
 17 like at the top part -you going
 18 through the path mosquito
 19 doped with no moon and the
 20 flashlight a single orange eye
 21 unable to see what beyond the
 22 capsule of your dim sight-
 23
 24 R: Hmmm
 25
 26 B: I was going OK maybe it's not
 27 an animal 'cause animals I don't
 28 know - rabbits have pink eyes so I
 29 guess animals can have orange
 30 eyes
 31
 32 R: Um Hmmm
 33
 34 B and ah then it goes -what
 35 shape contracts to a heart with
 36 terror, bumps among the leaves,
 37 what makes the bristle noise like
 38 a fur throat, is it you do not
 39 wish to hurt them? Is it true you
 40 don't you do not wish to hurt
 41 them?- and then I was going
 42 OK it's an animal, then I go

She pauses (line 9), is reminded to read and think out loud (lines 11 to 14) She begins to do so (lines 16 to 22) and then, rather than interpreting what she has just read, she responds by again attempting to *inter* the identity of the 'you' in the poem

She says, I was going OK maybe it's not an animal 'cause (lines 26 & 27), reads from the poem (lines 34 to 41), and again says, 'and then I was going OK it's an animal and then I go' (lines 41 & 42) It's as though she is not actually *responding* to what she has read, but because I have suggested she 'read parts out loud' (line 12), she is doing so She has said (lines 4 & 5) 'I'm just trying to figure out who it was' and 'maybe it's not an animal' (lines 26 & 27), and then 'it's an animal' (line 42) thus attempting to *expand and clarify* her interpretation on this point She really doesn't align these comments with what she has read

She is *responding* by aligning an element of background experience in concluding that 'rabbits have pink eyes so I guess animals can have orange eyes' (lines 28 to 30) She may be following through on her (announced) attempt 'to figure out who it was' (line 5) but her interpretation is somewhat random and incoherent to this point

1 maybe it's a person who doesn't
 2 want to hurt the animals
 3
 4 R Hmmm
 5
 6 B: Or maybe a chemical or
 7 something
 8
 9 R. Um Hmmm
 10
 11 B And then it goes -Is it true you
 12 have no fear? Take off your
 13 shoes then and let your eyes go
 14 bare swim in their darkness as
 15 in the river You do not disguise
 16 yourself in armor- I thought it
 17 was ah one of those ah you know
 18 those people dressed in armor
 19 suits?
 20
 21 R. Oh yeah
 22
 23 B. Back you remember? They
 24 lived in castles.
 25
 26 R. Right
 27
 28 B. We'll I thought they were
 29 them.
 30
 31 R. OK
 32
 33 B. The ah the ah the the guards
 34 the guards in armor suits.
 35
 36 R Yeah
 37
 38 B. um -They watch you from
 39 hiding ah you are a chemical
 40 smell a cold fire, you are giant
 41 and infinable unde fin able in
 42 th their monstrous night thick
 43 with possible claws where danger

Having announced that she is trying to figure out who is in the poem, she now **infers** that 'maybe it's a person Or maybe it's a chemical' (lines 1 & 6)

She reads from the poem again (lines 11 to 16) and then states another **inference** about who is in the poem saying, 'I thought it was one of those . people dressed in armor suits' (lines 16 to 19). Brenda is **reading and responding** by aligning details of her experiences with elements in the poem that may help her identify the person in the poem. For example, she reads, 'do not disguise yourself in armor' (lines 15 & 16) and is reminded of what she knows about 'knights'. On the basis of this, she **infers** that the 'somebody' in the poem might be 'those people dressed in armor suits' (lines 18 & 19) who 'lived in castles the guards in armour suits' (lines 24, and 33 & 34). She is attempting to **expand and clarify** her interpretation but is doing so by making random statements and expressing herself somewhat unclearly. Her **inferences** are aligned confusedly with sometimes inappropriate details in the poem.

The statements she has made so far are not supported by clear reference to the poem. And Brenda is not so much *interpreting* the poem but **responding** to various details from each segment of it in her preoccupation with identifying the 'you' in the poem. She reads verbatim from the poem (lines 38 to line 2 on the next page)

1 is not is not knowing you are a
 2 hugest monster-
 3
 4 R: Um Hmmm
 5
 6 B: So then I thought OK it's a
 7 monster
 8
 9 R: Hmmm
 10
 11 B: Like you know going through
 12 it you get all different ah
 13 opportunities to figure out what
 14 it is.
 15
 16 R: Yeah Sure
 17
 18 B: Ya still don't know what it is
 19 except that it's a huge monster
 20
 21 R: Yeah
 22
 23 B: But you know, you think of
 24 different types of things going
 25 through?
 26
 27 R: Yeah
 28
 29 B: Even going through it I was
 30 going OK its that - No it's that.
 31
 32 R: Hmmm
 33
 34 B: So .
 35
 36 R: See if you can work out then
 37 as you read through it You can
 38 take as long as you need and you
 39 can read it as many times as you
 40 want See what sorts of things
 41 you think about then as you put
 42 it together you know?

Again, Brenda states another **inference** about who the poem is about She says, 'So then I thought OK it's a monster' (lines 6 & 7) It is as though by reading through the poem and making a string of comments about who the poem might be about, as she just has, Brenda is merely reminding herself about the series of guesses she made as she *listened* to the poem being read

She says, 'Like you know going through it you get all different ah opportunities to figure out what it is' (lines 11 to 14) She says, 'Ya still don't know what it is except that it's a huge monster but you think of different types of things going through' (lines 18 to 25) She is quite aware that she is attempting to find out 'who' the poem is about She says, 'Even though going through it I was going OK - No it's that' (lines 29 & 30)

Thus, Brenda is attempting to **expand and clarify** her interpretation by questioning or relying on details of the poem that may lead her toward an **inference** as to the identity of the 'you'

1 B. Well it looks like um ... I
 2 don't know what it is
 3
 4 R. Um Hmmm
 5
 6 B. Queer monster that has
 7 orange eyes and his sight's
 8 not too good I think
 9
 10 R. Alright
 11
 12 B. um and he shows up in
 13 darkness He likes scaring people
 14 and it says he don't he
 15 doesn't want to - well that person
 16 doesn't want to hurt the animals
 17 or something I don't know
 18 what they're trying ta - hurt the
 19 ah people or what
 20
 21 R. Um Hmmm
 22
 23 B. and he disguise himself in
 24 an armor so it's prob'ly a person
 25 or a monster you know.
 26
 27 R. Um Hmmm
 28
 29 B. and it smells like
 30 chemicals so it might be a
 31 biologist
 32
 33 R. Ah ha
 34
 35 B. Or a chemist
 36
 37 R. Um Hmmm
 38
 39 B. Actually .
 40
 41 R. Alright
 42
 43 B. I just thought about it.

Brenda makes a series of **inferences** on this page about the characteristics of the 'you'. These comments are not clearly aligned with details in the poem

She says, 'Queer monster that has orange eyes and his sight's not too good I think' (lines 6 to 8). She doesn't pause to wonder at all what the 'orange eye' might represent or signify, she **infers** that 'his sight's not too good' from the stanza which reads 'unable to see what is beyond the capsule of your dim sight'. She doesn't align these statements with details in the poem, she **infers**, for example, 'He likes scaring people and that person doesn't want to hurt the animals or something' (lines 15 to 17) but does not align these statements with appropriate details in the poem. That she may be confused about how her statements are upheld by the details in the poem is revealed when she says, 'I don't know what they're tryin' ta - hurt the ah people or what' (lines 17 to 19). She **infers**, and he disguise himself in an armor so it's prob'ly a person or a monster you know it might be biologist or a chemist' (lines 23 to 35).

Because she is confused about the identity of the 'you', she cannot assimilate the details of the poem within a coherent frame, that is, she is not able to **synthesize**

1 R: OK
 2
 3 B: ... And it goes around at night
 4 .. and has claws ... so I don't
 5 know. Maybe it's half chemist
 6 and...
 7
 8 R: Hmmm
 9
 10 B: So that's what I think
 11
 12 R: OK. Well take your -
 13
 14 B: Could be a chemist or be an
 15 animal
 16
 17 R: Alright.
 18
 19 B: Could be a person.
 20
 21 R: Yeah.
 22
 23 B: That's about it (student
 24 continues to look at poem).
 25
 26 R: Alright well take your time
 27 then and have a look at it and see
 28 if you can . see more and more
 29 as you go through it each time.
 30
 31 B: ...
 32
 33 R: You can just - if you read it
 34 then I'll know - know where you
 35 are and what you're thinking.
 36
 37 B: . . (12 second pause) Scares
 38 everybody.
 39
 40 R: Hmmm
 41
 42 B: (17 second pause)

Having referred to the 'you' in the poem as a biologist, chemist, 'monster with orange eyes', and a 'person or a monster' on the previous page, she now infers 'it has claws' (line 4) and maybe 'it's half chemist' (line 5). Then she **infers**, 'Could be a chemist or be an animal' (lines 14 & 15). Then, in line 19, she **infers**, 'Could be a person'.

Brenda is attempting to **expand and clarify** her interpretation but is doing so by making random and sometimes incoherent statements without having carefully *read* the poem. She has not resolved the uncertainty she expresses about the identity of the 'you' by eliminating any of the possible conclusions she has mentioned. Thus she is still unable to **synthesize** by assimilating the details of the poem within a coherent frame.

At line 23, she says, 'That's about it' indicating she has reached closure. Because Brenda has read the poem so quickly and responded primarily on the basis of *hearing* the poem read aloud I point out that she may want to '... have a look at it and see if you can see more' (lines 26 to 29). She pauses, repeats a brief comment about the 'you' scaring everybody (lines 37 & 38).

1 R: What else are you reading
 2 there?
 3
 4 B: (11 second pause) That people
 5 are watching him or watching
 6 whatever it is
 7
 8 R: Ah ha
 9
 10 B: Who are watching it.
 11
 12 R: OK. What's making you
 13 think that? What are you
 14 reading to say that?
 15
 16 B: They are watching him from
 17 hiding
 18
 19 R: Ah ha
 20
 21 B: So everybody's scared of him
 22 .. And it's big Humungous
 23 and likes crawling in the
 24 darkness.
 25
 26 R: Ah ha
 27
 28 B: It likes danger I guess.
 29
 30 R: Um Hmmm
 31
 32 B: So that's about it.
 33
 34 R OK
 35
 36 B: But it's like somebody turned
 37 round and asked him a question
 38 You know -Is it true you do not
 39 wish to hurt them?- Like
 40 somebody turned around and
 41 said - you know looked at him
 42 right in the face and said -Is it

She says 'people are watching him or watching whatever it is' (lines 5 & 6). Her personal pronoun references are rather vague. It's difficult to know what she's referring to, for example, when she says 'Who are watching it' (line 10). She **infers**, 'So everybody's scared of him' (line 21), which might imply that this phrase concludes a line of reasoning she has developed. But she has used this causal connective loosely, it does not conclusively resolve a coherent line of reasoning. Brenda **infers**, 'It's big and likes crawling in the darkness' (lines 22 to 24) and, 'It likes danger I guess' (line 28). But, again, these **inferences** are confusedly aligned with details in the poem. To say that the 'you' 'is big' and 'likes danger and crawling in the darkness' is not necessarily contradicted, as such, by details from the poem. Thus, Brenda's **inferences** may not be illogical but she has not aligned these statements with appropriate details in the poem. Again she says, 'That's about it' (line 32) indicating she has finished reading. She has not yet expressed a coherent interpretation of the poem. She **reacts critically** by commenting on the tone of the poem in lines 36 to line 2, next page but this is another example of a random statement that is not assimilated with an overall understanding of the poem.

1 true that you do not wish to hurt
 2 them?-
 3
 4 R Yeah?
 5
 6 B. So that's what - you know it
 7 sounds like somebody looked at
 8 him in the face and asked him a
 9 question
 10
 11 R. Ah ha OK Do you want to
 12 say anything more about that?
 13
 14 B. That's about all
 15
 16 R. OK
 17
 18 B: (5 second pause)
 19
 20 R: Do you think you've ... pretty
 21 well gotten what the poem
 22 means?
 23
 24 B. Yeah It's about a monster
 25
 26 R: Ah ha
 27
 28 B That I don't know why but
 29 this guy sees himself as a person
 30
 31 R. Alright Alright
 32
 33 B. So - and has orange eyes and it
 34 appears in dark places
 35
 36 R Ah ah
 37
 38 B He likes dark places.
 39
 40 R Ah ha
 41
 42 B And um he scares
 43 everybody and everybody hides

Brenda infers, 'Like somebody looked at him right in the face and said, 'It is true you do not wish to hurt them' (line 41 previous page to line 2 this page) When she's asked if she wants 'to say anything more about that?' (lines 11 & 12), she concludes, 'That's about all' (line 14), indicating once again that she has reached closure. When asked, 'Do you think you've pretty well gotten what the poem means?' (lines 20 to 22), Brenda responds, 'It's about a monster' (line 24). Maintaining a pattern she has established early in her protocol, Brenda speaks about a 'monster' (line 24), and says, 'I don't know why but this guy sees himself as a person' (lines 28 & 29), and, she says it, 'Has orange eyes and it appears in dark places' (lines 33 & 34). She comes to the conclusion of her responding-aloud interpretation by attempting to once again identify the 'you' and its characteristics (lines 33, 34 & 38). She again does so without aligning these **inferences** with details in the poem, or assimilating such statements within a coherent frame. Brenda has used the key reading process of **expanding and clarifying** by primarily making random and sometimes incoherent interpretations, expressing uncertainty which she attempts to resolve in a haphazard manner, expressing herself somewhat unclearly and delaying closure to a limited extent.

1 when they see him coming or
 2 something and they watch him
 3 while he's coming.
 4
 5 R: Ah ha
 6
 7 B: They're all watching him
 8 from their hiding places. He has
 9 claws and he smells like a
 10 chemist
 11
 12 R: Yeah.
 13
 14 B: That's about it. That's that's
 15 what I think he is.
 16
 17 R: OK
 18
 19 B: . . . For some reason. I don't
 20 know why but that's what I think
 21 he is.
 22
 23 R: Is there any reason in the
 24 poem that makes you think that?
 25
 26 B: Well the way they describe it -
 27 it all looks like orange eyes and
 28 all this.
 29
 30 R: Yeah.
 31
 32 B: Well just the way they start
 33 describing everything. That's
 34 how I think it is.
 35
 36 R: OK Anything else you want
 37 to say about that?
 38
 39 B: . . . Uh not really - (inaudible
 40 word or two) .. Do you know
 41 what it is?
 42
 43 R: Well everybody says -
 44 everybody interprets it very

Here again, Brenda's use of a personal pronoun is confusing. She says, 'They're all watching him from their hiding places' (lines 7 & 8). It's difficult to know to whom or what she is referring in using the word 'they're'. 'That's what I think he is' (lines 14 & 15), she infers; she has primarily focused on identifying the 'who' in the poem. She says, 'I don't know why but that's what I think he is' (lines 19 to 21). This suggests her awareness of her uncertainty and that she does not know how to resolve it or perhaps even that she might take the time to do so.

When asked, 'Is there any reason in the poem that makes you think that?' (lines 23 & 24), she says, 'Well the way they describe it - it all looks like orange eyes and all this' (lines 26 to 28) and, 'Well just the way they start describing everything' (lines 32 & 33). Brenda views the poem primarily as a description of something (see lines 26, 32 & 33). She hasn't referred at all to the statements in stanzas 5 & 6.

Even though she has noted the tone implied by the two questions in the middle of the poem: 'Is it true you do not wish to hurt them?' and, 'Is it true you have no fear?', she does not comment about the succeeding statements that are so inextricably bound to these two questions in the poem.

- 1 very differently you know. Like
 2 some people say similar things to
 3 what you're saying and other
 4 things as well and everything is
 5 valid in a sense you know? It's a
 6 way that that ah - whatever you
 7 think about the poem or
 8 whatever you do -
 9
 10 B: Yeah everybody has different
 11
 12 R: Everybody has different yeah
 13 so whatever you - whatever
 14 you're thinking is as valid as as
 15 anybody else. It's a - it's a way of
 16 understanding that you that you
 17 have and so that's valid
 18 Perfectly valid
 19
 20 B: Yeah
 21
 22 R: OK?
 23
 24 B: OK.
- 25 On the previous page (lines 39 &
 26 40), Brenda reveals her
 27 preoccupation with the 'you' in
 28 the poem when she asks 'Do you
 29 know what it is?' My response is
 30 intended to indicate that I am
 31 primarily interested in her
 32 reading process and not in *what*
 33 she has said
 34
 35 Unlike the category 4 & 5
 36 protocols, this category 3 protocol
 37 exemplifies a reader who does
 38 **not synthesize**, Brenda is not able
 39 to assimilate the details of the
 40 poem within a coherent frame
 41 She **reads and responds** by
 42 aligning the details in the poem
 43 with elements of her experience
 44 but not always relevantly As
 45 frequently mentioned, she has
 46 attempted to **expand and clarify**
 47 her interpretation but her
 48 attempts are characterized by
 49 randomness and lack of clarity
 50 Her **inferences** are sometimes
 51 confused and, though she has
 52 made a sincere attempt to
 53 understand 'who' the poem is
 54 about, she has aligned such
 55 statements with sometimes
 56 inappropriate details in the
 57 poem This example of a category
 58 3 protocol has very little
 59 evidence of **critical reaction**

2: Nesbitt A.: Cyclops

3 R Let me give you let me give
 4 you this poem . And what
 5 we'll do is I'll read the poem out
 6 loud for you OK? And you can
 7 just sort of follow along on your
 8 copy and then afterwards you can
 9 give me your reactions to it -
 10 your feelings, ideas about it If
 11 you want to ask me about any
 12 words you're not sure of you can
 13 do that And then maybe you
 14 can just read through the poem
 15 yourself afterwards and as you
 16 read through it think out loud
 17 you know - just sort of tell me
 18 everything you think about
 19 And you can read it through as
 20 many times as you need to reach
 21 an understanding about it
 22
 23 N: OK
 24
 25 R Yeah?
 26
 27 The poem Cyclops is read aloud
 28 to the student.
 29
 30 N: (11 second pause after poem
 31 is read) They're saying that ah
 32 Cyclops is even more scared
 33 than ah than the people and
 34 he's always watching them
 35
 36 R: OK
 37
 38 N. and if you're not scared of
 39 him face him.
 40
 41 R: Yeah
 42
 43 N: Instead of all running away

The responding-aloud procedure is explained to Nesbitt (lines 3 to 21).

Nesbitt responds by stating an **inference** about the overall point or message of the poem For example, he says, 'Cyclops is even more scared than the people' (lines 32 & 33) He seems to be referring to the 'creatures people' as the people in the poem

Having said 'Cyclops is even more scared than the people' (lines 32 & 33), he next contradicts himself by saying 'if you're not scared of him face him' (lines 38 & 39) On the one hand Cyclops is scared, then next, the implication is that 'you're' (seemingly the 'you' in the poem) scared, otherwise the 'you' would face him

1 R: Alright
 2
 3 N: (27 second pause)
 4
 5 R: Tell me everything you're
 6 reading and thinking now as
 7 you're looking at that poem
 8
 9 N: He thinks that you're a
 10 chemical smell
 11
 12 R: Alright
 13
 14 N: The way that you think he's a
 15 . that he smells
 16
 17 R: Alright
 18
 19 N: (28 second pause)
 20
 21 R: Tell me everything you're
 22 thinking you know as you're
 23 looking at it. Everything you're
 24 reading and thinking - just say it
 25 out loud
 26
 27 N: . I think that ah Cyclops is
 28 creeping in through the bushes
 29 that his heart is beating
 30 (inaudible word)
 31
 32 R: Um Hmmm
 33
 34 N: And he's really scared of him
 35 .
 36
 37 R: When you say he's really
 38 scared of him - who do you
 39 mean?
 40
 41 N: The man who's in this is
 42 scared of Cyclops

On the previous page Nesbitt says, 'face him' instead of all running away' (lines 39 to 43). The **inference** that, 'you're scared of him and running away' (lines 38 & 43, prev page) is not aligned with any details in the poem.

He pauses (line 3, this page), and after prompting, (lines 5 to 7), **infers**, 'He thinks you're a chemical smell'- supposedly referring to the Cyclops (lines 9 & 10). It's difficult to know to whom he is referring in saying 'you're' (line 9), or if he is restating a line from the 7th stanza of the poem. His statement in lines 14 & 15 is equally difficult to follow.

He pauses (line 19), is prompted (lines 21 to 25) and then in lines 27 to 30, seems to begin a new train of thought not related to his comments about the chemical smell. Having **inferred**, 'I think Cyclops is creeping in through the bushes that his heart is beating' (lines 27 to 29), Nesbitt then says, 'And he's really scared of him' (line 34).

Aside from the vagueness of his personal pronoun references, about which I question him, (lines 37 to 39), Nesbitt appears to be responding to the text in a line by line fashion, making one statement after the next without knowing how to approach the reading and response process.

1 R OK
 2
 3 N (6 second pause) The man
 4 who's scared of his height really.
 5
 6 R Ah ha
 7
 8 N Cyclops is ah in a way
 9 scared of the human
 10
 11 R Um Hmmm
 12
 13 N (12 second pause) Some
 14 people say they have no fear but
 15 when fear confronts them
 16 they're really scared if you
 17 have no fear do not disguise
 18 yourself - go go to em (10
 19 second pause) To Cyclops you
 20 are a giant and (whispers)
 21 indefinable
 22
 23 R Um Hmmm
 24
 25 N He's even he's even scared of
 26 you (6 second pause) No matter
 27 how he looks or how big he is .
 28 you are the biggest monster
 29
 30 R Um Hmmm
 31
 32 N You could fight back or .
 33 (11 second pause) You have to
 34 have faith in yourself
 35
 36 R Alright
 37
 38 N (7 second pause)
 39
 40 R Remember you can read
 41 through as many times as you
 42 want to Just say everything out
 43 loud that you're thinking.

Having **inferred** that, 'the man is scared of Cyclops' (lines 41 & 42, prev page), Nesbitt now says 'the man who's scared of his height really' (lines 3 & 4, this page) He may be **responding** here by relying on an aspect of his background knowledge about Cyclops in referring to his height, but this **inference** is not aligned with any details in the text He continues by stating that, 'Cyclops is scared of the human' (lines 8 & 9), having previously said, 'the man who's in this is scared of Cyclops' (lines 41 & 42 prev page) He is struggling to **infer** the point of view from which the poem is written

In lines 13 to 16 he is **responding** by referring to his personal knowledge of fear but aligning this experience with the poem to a very limited extent He says, 'to Cyclops you are a giant and indefinable' (lines 19 to 21), and, 'no matter how he looks or how big he is, you are the hugest monster' (lines 25 to 27), thus perhaps resolving that it is the Cyclops that is fearful, though not reconciling his previous points of view about the man and the Cyclops

It's not clear who Nesbitt means in referring to 'you' (lines 25 to 28) It's also difficult to know what he means or why he says what he does in lines 32 to 34.

1 N: (18 second pause) The man is
 2 saying ah is it true that ... or a
 3 man's asking another man.
 4
 5 R: Um Hmmm
 6
 7 N: Is it true that you not ... you
 8 you do not wish to hurt Cyclops.
 9
 10 R: Um Hmmm
 11
 12 N: Hunt him down or (20
 13 second pause) he could also creep
 14 up on you without letting you
 15 know . (42 second pause)
 16
 17 R: What are you reading and
 18 thinking there as you're looking
 19 at it now?
 20
 21 N: (7 second pause) It's in the
 22 forest
 23
 24 R: Alright
 25
 26 N: The setting's in the forest.
 27
 28 R: Ah ha
 29
 30 N: (5 second pause) It's a warm
 31 night.
 32
 33 R: Ah ha
 34
 35 N: ...
 36
 37 R: Why do you say that?
 38
 39 N: Not it's not a warm night.
 40
 41 R: Hmmm?
 42
 43 N: It's a cold night.

Nesbitt struggles, without as clearly an expressed purpose as Brenda, to settle on a perspective from which the poem is written. In lines 1 to 8, he *infers*, 'The man is saying ... or a man's asking another man ... is it true you do not wish to hurt Cyclops?' That the poem would, in fact, seem to be asking, if it's true you (Cyclops) do not wish to hurt the animals, and thus not support Nesbitt's interpretation is a minor point. Nesbitt does not support his *inferences* by aligning them with specific details in the poem.

He responds to the line from the poem that reads, 'Is it true you do not wish to hurt them?' He says 'Is it true that you do not wish to hurt Cyclops?' (lines 7 & 8), thus implying that the 'them' referred to in the poem (fourth stanza) is 'Cyclops'.

Nesbitt has previously stated, 'Is it true you do not wish to hurt Cyclops? ... hunt him down' (lines 7 to 12); but this stance changes when Nesbitt next *infers* that Cyclops, 'could creep up on you ...' (lines 13 & 14). It is difficult to follow the line of reasoning from one statement to the next.

Nesbitt moves from one line to the next with a great deal of confusion and uncertainty. His *inferences* are characterized by confused logic and are aligned with frequently inappropriate details in the poem.

1 R: Yeah? OK.
 2
 3 N: (7 second pause)
 4
 5 R: Is there anything there that's
 6 making you think that?
 7
 8 N: Ah cold fire.
 9
 10 R: OK
 11
 12 N: Maybe he's sitting around
 13 sitting next to the fire 'cause he's
 14 cold
 15
 16 R: Alright
 17
 18 N: (20 second pause) He's
 19 wondering what shape Cyclops
 20 look like ah
 21
 22 R: Alright
 23
 24 N: .. or how he looks like.
 25
 26 R: OK. What are you reading
 27 that makes you say that?
 28
 29 N (in audible brief phrase)
 30
 31 R: Ah ah OK
 32
 33 N (9 second pause)
 34
 35 R: Just say out loud everything
 36 you read and think, OK?
 37
 38 N: (8 second pause) He's ...
 39 maybe he's bitten by a lot of
 40 mosquitos
 41
 42 R: OK

He does not support his inferences (lines 21 & 22, 26, 30 & 31, previous page) Having said, 'it's a warm night' (lines 30 & 31 prev page), he then says, 'It's a cold night (line 43, prev page) When asked what might make him think that (lines 5 & 6, this page), he refers to the two word phrase, 'cold fire' (line 8), though not explaining how this phrase leads him to his conclusion

Comments about hunting down Cyclops, or having him creep up on you, the setting of the poem, and that the Cyclops might be 'sitting next to the fire 'cause he's cold' (lines 12 to 14), are rather disconnected and/or illogically related. Nesbitt infers, 'He's wondering what shape Cyclops look like' (lines 18 to 20) '.. or how he looks like' (line 24), which may be prompted by his reading the lines, 'you are giant and indefinable', and 'what shape contracts to a heart with terror' But when asked (lines 26 & 27), he mumbles something that cannot be discerned (line 29)

It is as though Nesbitt is uncertain how to proceed, but he struggles to continue Though he is ill at ease and proceeds from one statement to the next without being able to assimilate the details within a coherent frame, he does not immediately reach closure.

1 N: (6 second pause) He doesn't
 2 want a flashlight to see 'cause the
 3 moon is not (inaudible word)
 4 enough
 5
 6 R: OK
 7
 8 N: (12 second pause) He's
 9 unable to see what ah what is
 10 coming or . what's moving in
 11 the bushes
 12
 13 R Um Hmmm
 14
 15 N (29 second pause) He's
 16 dreaming about ah . . what
 17 would happen
 18
 19 R. OK Where do you see that?
 20
 21 N. (student points to a section of
 22 poem)
 23
 24 R OK What is it you're reading
 25 there that makes you think that?
 26
 27 N. He's sleeping and he's
 28 thinking about the - his claws.
 29
 30 R: Ah ha. OK
 31
 32 N: (35 second pause) He's
 33 wondering to himself what
 34 makes the bristling noise
 35
 36 R. Ah
 37
 38 N. It's hard to (inaudible word)
 39 his fear.
 40
 41 R: Um Hmmm

It is as though Nesbitt reacts to isolated words from the text (in this case the word 'flashlight' and 'moon' in lines 1 to 4) without yet being able to **synthesize** the various words and phrases Nesbitt **infers**, 'He doesn't want a flashlight to see 'cause the moon is not --- enough' (lines 1 to 4) Though one word in this phrase was indiscernible on the tape, the syntax of his phrasing after the word ' 'cause', would not uphold the statement preceding it The omitted word would likely be either, 'bright' or 'dark', neither of which would make his statement logical

Nesbitt **infers**, He's unable to see what . is coming or what's moving in the bushes' (lines 8 to 11, this page), and is presumably reading the 2nd and 3rd stanzas though he does not refer to the text. Then he says, 'He's dreaming about what would happen' (lines 15 to 17), and though he points (quite uncertainly) to a section of the poem, he does not clarify what he means, or align this statement clearly with details from the poem

Where the category 3, 4, & 5 protocols are characterized by how each uses the key reading processes and subprocesses, (the exception being that the category 3 reader does not use the process of synthesis), the category 2 protocol is often characterized by the extent to which the processes are not used or used weakly

1 N: (15 second pause) And what
 2 does 'indefinable' mean?
 3
 4 R: 'Indefinable' is ah something
 5 you can't quite understand or
 6 something you can't quite see the
 7 shape of
 8
 9 N: (10 second pause) I think
 10 Cyclops is a giant that - how big
 11 he is how (inaudible word) he is
 12
 13 R: Um Hmmm
 14
 15 N: He has no idea (brief
 16 inaudible phrase)
 17
 18 R: Alright
 19
 20 N (55 second pause)
 21
 22 R: Say everything out loud that
 23 you're reading and thinking.
 24
 25 N (11 second pause) In their
 26 monstrous night they walk and
 27 hunt ah food or..
 28
 29 R. Um Hmmm
 30
 31 N. To them you are the
 32 monster
 33
 34 R: OK. Can you say a little bit
 35 more what you mean by that?
 36
 37 N: Um .. (student laughs rather
 38 helplessly) (13 second pause)
 39 B'cause Cyclops is scared of you
 40 so (6 second pause) In a way
 41 he's scared of you - you're a
 42 human and you have a chemical
 43 smell

Having **inferred**, 'He's dreaming' (lines 15 & 16, prev page), and 'He's sleeping' (line 27, prev page), he then **infers**, 'He's wondering to himself what makes the bristling noise' (lines 32 to 34), thus speaking about at least two irreconcilable states of mind

He questions a detail about the text (lines 1 & 2, this page), but having heard the answer (lines 4 to 7), he is not able to readily assimilate details of the answer with his understanding of the Cyclops (see lines 9 to 15)

From lines 9 to 15, Nesbitt expresses himself with uncertainty. He pauses for almost a minute (line 20), and, after prompting, makes another statement containing vague personal pronoun references. He seems to be reacting to the line in the text that reads 'In their monstrous night thick with possible claws', when he says, 'In their monstrous night they walk and hunt for food' (lines 25 to 27). Nesbitt is not certain of the referent for 'they'. This is evident in lines 31 to 43. He says, (almost **synthesizing** the various details in the poem), 'To them you are the monster' (lines 31 & 32). But when questioned a bit about that (lines 34 & 35), he responds, 'Cyclops is scared of you - you're a human' (lines 39 to 43).

1 R: OK
 2
 3 N: ... but to him ah ... you are
 4 the hugest monster. 'Cause you
 5 ah like to hunt . (13 second
 6 pause) They watch you
 7 wherever you go
 8
 9 R: OK
 10
 11 N. (19 second pause) You are
 12 unable to imagine ... what wh
 13 what he could do.
 14
 15 R: Um Hmmm
 16
 17 N If he captures you ..
 18
 19 R: OK
 20
 21 N. (17 second pause) The
 22 flashlight .. being ah the light of
 23 a flashlight being one single eye
 24 .
 25
 26 R: Um Hmmm
 27
 28 N: . guiding you through the
 29 forest.
 30
 31 R: Alright
 32
 33 N: (9 second pause) I don't
 34 know. I've run out of things to
 35 say.
 36
 37 R: OK. Super, that's great.
 38 That's good.

It is as though Nesbitt has been working with a kind of three-pronged point of reference that includes the Cyclops, the man and the 'them' (see line 31 prev page) He has not clearly distinguished among these three, or even clearly and consistently seen the identity shared by the Cyclops and the 'he' or the 'man' to whom he has often referred. Thus when he says here, ' to him . you are the hugest monster 'Cause you like to hunt. They watch you wherever you go', (lines 3 to 7), there is neither a clear person or thing pointed to with any of these nouns or pronouns, nor is there a clear sense of understanding established about how these three ('him', 'you' and 'they') persons or things cohere to underscore a theme of the poem. Nesbitt does not have a sense of the dual perspectives of fear that the poet is expressing. For he has said, almost at the beginning of his interpretation, 'Cyclops is even more scared than ah than the people' (lines 32 & 33, on first page of this protocol) He has also referred to fear on the previous page, in line 39. But in then **inferring**, 'The flashlight being ah the light of a flashlight

being one single eye' (lines 21 to 23. prev. page), he resumes his pattern of jumping to a point unrelated to the previously expressed one. Even in stating those lines (21 to 23, prev page) it may well be that he is restating more or less verbatim the second and third lines of the poem, rather than actually **inferring** the relationships between the flashlight, the eye and the Cyclops.

In general, then, Nesbitt's protocol is characterized by lack of **synthesis**. His **reading and response** process is characterized by unclear paraphrasing, and vague and often irrelevant referral to personal experiences. Also the category 2 protocol does not exemplify clear efforts to **expand and clarify** an interpretation; protocols in this category have few examples of rereading. Uncertainty may be expressed but seldom resolved and, as was evident in this example, thinking is unclearly expressed and closure reached relatively easily. **Inferences** are often illogical and not clearly aligned with appropriate details in the poem. There is no evidence of **critical reaction**.

1: Bob Y.: Cyclops

3 R: Let me give you a copy of this
 4 poem. I'm just interested to see
 5 how you understand it - I'm
 6 interested just to find out how
 7 you're understanding it you
 8 know, as you're making sense of
 9 it. So I'll read it through first OK
 10 -
 11
 12 B: OK
 13
 14 R: And you can follow along and
 15 perhaps afterwards you can give
 16 me your initial impressions of it,
 17 your reactions, feelings,
 18 thoughts. And then as you read
 19 through yourself, can you be sure
 20 to say out loud everything you're
 21 reading and thinking?
 22
 23 B: OK
 24
 25 R: You can read it as many times
 26 as you feel it's necessary to reach
 27 a satisfactory understanding of it.
 28 OK?
 29
 30 B: OK.
 31
 32 R: And you may decide that
 33 there are words that you wanna
 34 ask me about that you're not
 35 certain of.
 36
 37 The poem Cyclops is read aloud
 38 to the student.
 39
 40 B: (15 second pause after poem is
 41 read) The part where he goes ... it
 42 says -you are chemical smell- ...
 43 that probably means

The responding-aloud procedure is explained (lines 3 to 35). After the poem is read aloud Bob responds by commenting about one line from the poem. 'you are a chemical smell' and with that one clue he *infers* that the monster (referred to in the last line of the poem) is pollution (lines 41 to line 2 next page)

1 that the monster that he's talkin'
 2 about is pollution.
 3
 4 R: Um Hmmm
 5
 6 B: And ah it's like ... it could be
 7 ah ... an animal that's the victim
 8 of the pollution that's talkin' to
 9 ah ... tryin' ta tryin' ta ah talk to
 10 pollution itself.
 11
 12 R: Um Hmmm
 13
 14 B: Wants to know why it would
 15 ah - wants to ah ruin everything
 16 (11 second pause). Like it tells ya
 17 know to - just to look and see
 18 what he's done ... pollution's
 19 done to the - to the earth.
 20
 21 R: Um Hmmm
 22
 23 B: ... That there's pollution
 24 everywhere. ... What's
 25 indefinable mean?
 26
 27 R: Not quite ab - you can't quite
 28 explain it. You can't quite
 29 understand it. You can't quite
 30 grasp it.
 31
 32 B: ... He can't understand why -
 33 why any - what anything like
 34 anything would wanna do that to
 35 the earth ya know. It was nice
 36 the way it is before the pollution.
 37 That's about it.
 38
 39 R: OK. Do you wanna just read
 40 through then and tell me out
 41 loud as you're - what you're
 42 thinking as you look at each part
 43 of it

Here, in lines 6 to 10, Bob attempts to **infer** the identify of the 'you'. He says, 'it could be ... an animal that's the victim of the pollution that's talkin' ...' (lines 6 to 8) He **infers** that the animal is, 'tryin' ta ... talk to pollution itself' (lines 9 & 10).

Having decided that it's an animal that's talking, he next **infers** that it, 'Wants to know why it would ... ruin everything' (lines 14 & 15). He responds by making a brief generalization about pollution in suggesting that it will 'ruin everything' (line 15) Bob **infers** this on the basis of some details from the poem after hearing it read aloud once. He does not explain what he means in saying, 'like it tells ya ... just look and see what ... pollution's done to the earth' (lines 16 to 19) or that, 'there's pollution everywhere' (lines 23 & 24). He asks what 'indefinable' means (lines 24 & 25), then assimilates the details of my response (lines 27 to 30), with his notion about pollution: 'He can't understand why ... anything would wanna do that' (lines 32 to 34).

Having made these few comments, Bob indicates that he has reached closure, though he hasn't yet read the poem; he says, 'That's about it' (line 37). I suggest that he read the poem (lines 39 to line 2, next page).

1 then? That's your initial
 2 reaction I guess, huh?
 3
 4 B: Yeah
 5
 6 R: OK
 7
 8 B: -mosquito doped- .. there's
 9 mosquitos because of all the
 10 garbage there
 11
 12 R: Um Hmmm
 13
 14 B: The full moon, the
 15 flashlight I guess tha - with no
 16 moon, I guess that means ah ...
 17 like ya know smoke from ya
 18 know chemicals clouds or
 19 something blocking out the ... the
 20 the moon
 21
 22 R: Um Hmmm
 23
 24 B: (8 second pause) That's about
 25 it - that's about all I can get from
 26 it.
 27
 28 R: OK? You know you're free to
 29 read it as many times as you
 30 want to
 31
 32 B: Um Hmmm That's probably
 33 all I can get out of it.
 34
 35 R: Alright
 36

He reads the phrase 'mosquito doped', and briefly aligns one word of that phrase with his pollution theme saying, 'there's mosquitos because of all the garbage there' (lines 8 to 10). But in saying this, he comments only on the one detail that, according to his background knowledge about insects perhaps, can be associated with pollution. Bob refers to one or two elements from the poem after listening to it and scanning it once briefly, and, perhaps relying on a tacit notion that poetry contains metaphors that can represent any concept, he rather quickly decides that this poem is about pollution. He chooses one detail from the poem (mosquitos) that he associates with pollution. Pollution can be garbage and mosquitos can often be found near garbage. Then, of two details that he mentions (the moon, and a flashlight - lines 14 & 15) after reading a small section of the poem, he associates one of them with his notion about pollution saying, 'with no moon, I guess that means smoke from ... chemical clouds or something blocking out the moon' (lines 15 to 19). He does not attempt to differentiate the 'chemical clouds' (line 18) from the garbage, both of which he has classified as pollution. He then announces, 'That's about it - that's all I can get from it' (lines 24 to 26).

Thus Bob has not **synthesized**. He **reads and responds** by stating a topic about which he thinks the text centers, refers to three or four details in the text and bases his interpretation on what would seem general background knowledge about pollution

Bob does not **expand and clarify** his interpretation by rereading, and reaches closure almost immediately. His **inferences** are not supported to any extent nor clearly aligned with details in the poem. He does not **react critically**. Where category 5, 4, 3, and even 2 protocols exemplify *attempts* to engage the text, category 1 protocols do not. Bob's protocol is a clear example of this category of reading according to almost all the statements listed in that column of the reading scale.

Vera's, Barbara's, Brenda's, Nesbitt's and Bob's protocols are representative of the extent(s) to which the key reading processes are used in the 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 categories of reading. The reading processes in category/column 1 apply to Bob. According to the way synthesis is defined in the reading scale, Bob does not **synthesize**. Though he does formulate a *statement* about what the poem is about (pollution), he does not form a comprehensive interpretation of the poem by assimilating the various words, phrases and segments of the poem within a coherent frame.

Bob **reads and responds** to the poem by stating a topic (pollution). He then reads and restates some lines from the text only after being prompted to do so. After barely reading the text once (in fact, after only hearing it read aloud once) he expresses a generalization that the poem is about pollution. He does not explain any of his reactions to the text, in fact, his reactions are few.

Bob makes no attempt to **expand and clarify** his interpretation. He does not ask any questions about the text (aside from asking about the word 'undefinable'); he reads few lines of the text even after being prompted to do so. He does not reread and makes little effort to interpret the text. Bob makes no attempt at all to clarify and/or expand his understanding being content to comment that the poem is about pollution and saying, 'that's about all' after only listening to the text read aloud once. The one statement about the category 1 pattern of reading that does not as clearly apply to Bob as the other statements in that category is the one about 'clarity of expression'. Certainly, he clearly states that the poem is about 'pollution' but, because he makes so little effort to integrate elements of the poem with his conclusion about it, it is difficult to know if he *can* express himself clearly at all. He would have had to have made much more of an attempt to *interpret* the poem rather than reach closure immediately, as he did, to demonstrate an ability to express himself with any degree of clarity.

Though Bob referred to the 'chemical smell' in deciding that the poem was about pollution, this general **inference** about the poem is not supported. For a reader to support an inference that was as all encompassing as the one Bob made about pollution, he would have had to bring various words, phrases and segments of the text - that is, the details of the text - to bear on such an inference.

There was no evidence of **critical reaction** to the poem. Bob made no critical statements at all about any stylistic or structural elements of the text.

The reading processes outlined in each of the five categories of the reading scale account for Vera's (category 5), Barbara's (category 4), Brenda's (category 3) and Nesbitt's (category 2) interpretation of "Cyclops" just as they have for Bob's (category 1) interpretation. Although it was tempting to underline (or otherwise highlight) the reading *subprocesses* as well as processes in each of these sample protocols thus allowing readers (of this manuscript) to easily relate them to the statements set forth in each category/column of the reading scale, it was difficult as well as theoretically questionable to do so. This difficulty stems from two factors. First of all, the reader will note that all of the statements in the reading scale are generalizations that apply to not one particular reader but many readers. Thus, for example, category 3 readers (according to the reading scale) **read and respond** by 'paraphrasing some segments of text', 'describing sometimes relevant personal experiences', 'aligning some experiences with some relevant details of text' and, 'explaining reactions in inappropriate detail'. Because these statements are generalizations, they are not intended to specifically describe isolated instances of *one* reader's use of such processes. The second reason that reading subprocesses are not separately highlighted in the sample protocols is that such a finite identification would imply that any individual 'act' of reading poetry is reducible to separate skills. To reiterate a point made earlier, the reading scale exists as a whole to account for key reading processes and signal general boundaries that distinguish the varying extents to which readers use these processes. An analysis of the processes used in responding-aloud protocols of poetry thus does not lend itself to an item-by-item analysis.

The five key reading processes that are listed in the far left-hand column of the reading scale are recursively related. That is, in **synthesizing**, for example, a reader is also **reading and responding** to the text, **expanding and clarifying her interpretation**, **supporting inferences** AND **reacting critically**. The fact that five key reading processes have been separately identified and highlighted in the reading scale does not mean that these reading/thinking processes occur in isolation from one another. In fact, the extent to which a reader uses any *one* of the five key reading processes is *generally* commensurate with and indicative of the extent to which she uses any of the other key reading strategies. Vera, for example, used all of the five key reading strategies to a very thorough extent. Nesbitt, on the other hand, used

the key reading strategies in a limited and inconsistent manner, as was demonstrated in the analysis of his "Cyclops" protocol.

The five sample protocols were presented to provide an example of each of the five categories of reading *and* to show the extent to which the key reading processes and subprocesses are differently used in *each* of these sample protocols. Just as the comments in category 1 of the reading scale apply to Bob, so do the comments in each of the five categories/columns of the scale apply to Brenda, Nesbitt, Barbara and Vera.

Analysis of Pre-test and Post-test Responding-aloud Protocols

What follows in the upcoming section of this chapter is an analysis and discussion of the pre-test and post-test responding-aloud protocols of students who participated in small-group discussion of poetry. This analysis and discussion is done in three steps. There is first a **pre-test protocol analysis**, then a **post-test protocol analysis**, then a **comparison of pre-test and post-test protocols**. Each of the protocols is analyzed, scored and compared according to one of the five categories in the reading scale just as the five sample protocols were. In the analyses, I account for the readers' processing by quoting detailed excerpts from the protocols and referring to page and line numbers of each reader's pre-test and post-test protocol. The eighteen protocols amount to one hundred and thirty seven pages of text.

Student: Barbara N

Pre-test poem: Birds

Post-test poem: Cyclops

Pre-test Protocol Analysis. Barbara's pre-test reading pattern is that of a category 4 reader.

The responding-aloud procedure is explained (page one, lines 3 to 11). Barbara immediately comments that the poem is 'pretty hard' (page one, line 15), that she doesn't read poems (page one, line 19) and again, that the poem is 'kind of hard' (page one, line 26). She also states three tentative initial reactions to the poem. She says for example, 'it's not about a bird is it?' (page one, line 31), then asks, 'Is there a human in this? I don't know' (page, one, line 35), then says, 'I think it symbolizes something' (page one, lines 39 & 40). Her comment that, 'I don't think I really understand this' (page one, line 44), is representative of her general stance or attitude toward this poem, for many of her comments throughout her pre-test protocol express similar uncertainty.

Barbara begins to **read and respond** to the poem saying, 'the bird is perfect to him' (page two, line 3) though she doesn't yet confirm who she means by 'him' in that line. She refers to elements of her background experience saying, 'it sort of reminds me of a movie ... it's ... a boy ... and he's not happy

in Paris or something Fight all the time . . . and he finds birds sort of take him away from all this' (page two, lines 7 to 17) Barbara then generally aligns this element of her experience with the poem saying, 'Well this is like a lot of other poems you read . . . it's - there's always - OK the poet, he's unhappy or he he really - he thinks birds are an animal or something is very beautiful like perfect and he wishes he was one and . . . ' (page two, lines 18 to 21) She then again refers to her teacher saying, 'It's usually easier with the teacher . . . she usually explains everything' (page two, lines 21 to 26) Barbara begins to briefly paraphrase the poem; she says, 'it talks about birds a lot, describes them really well . . . ' (page two, lines 28 & 29) She **infers**, 'it can't be a bird' (page two, lines 30 & 31) and supports this by referring to the third paragraph saying, 'and the third paragraph where they talk - I think a bit of himself' (page two, lines 29 & 30). In this section of her protocol Barbara is beginning to decide if the poem is, in fact, about birds or humans though she does not say so explicitly After pausing for 26 seconds, she concludes, 'I don't know' (page two, line 35) I then prompt her to read the poem (lines 37 to 42) So far then, she has expressed a great deal of uncertainty and basic insecurity about her ability to read and make sense of poetry

Barbara again comments, 'I don't like poems much . . . they're hard to understand . . . I don't care for them that much' (page three, lines 6 & 7) She begins to **read and respond** to the poem by paraphrasing the first line of the text; she says, 'The first line says the bird's perfect' (page three, line 17) She begins to **expand and clarify her interpretation** by asking, 'What's a kestrel?' (page three, line 25) then again expresses her disinterest in reading the poem saying, 'The poem bores me a bit . . . the second line has nothing' (page three, lines 29 & 30). Barbara then begins to **read and respond** to the poem again; she briefly paraphrases the first stanza of the poem: 'It's saying - that for the first paragraph it basically says that a bird is a bird and it's nothing else but a bird' (page three, lines 34 & 35). She then again comments that, 'I'm not really good at this' (page three, lines 35 & 36)

Barbara makes an **inference** and, in doing so supports it by referring to what appears to be the first line of the second stanza; she says, 'Well, what I read about that is right for the bird to do . . . well . . . he's saying the bird can never be wrong' (page four, lines 3 & 4) She then proceeds to **read and respond** to the second line of the second stanza: 'Cruel kestrel dividing in his hunger the sky . . . my English teacher would be pretty good at that' (page four,

lines 4 to 6) She reads from the text again, 'Thrush in the trembling dew beginning to sing' (page four, line 10) and comments, 'I don't really understand that All I'm thinking about it it'd be perfect for English class and the teacher would be ah very helpful in understanding this' (page four, lines 11 to 16). Barbara then **reads and responds** by briefly paraphrasing the second stanza, she says, 'Well second paragraph says like birds are well their behavior is - it could seem sort um well cruel or mean or - the second paragraph gives me the feeling of sort of a bit evil and fighting and and ah the last line of the second paragraph says that you know this is how birds are - is what is needed for them to do Don't think them cruel or anything' (page four, 18 to 23). In **inferring** that birds are 'cruel or mean', Barbara is clearly referring to details in the text and in **reacting critically** she refers to the feeling of 'evil and fighting'. Barbara reads, 'I am torn and beleaguered by my own people' (page four, lines 23 & 24) then turns with a puzzled expression obviously referring to the word 'beleaguered'. She is thus **expanding and clarifying** her interpretation by asking about that word which I define as, 'to be worn out by, oppressed by, tired out by (page four, line 26). She then applies her understanding of this definition to her interpretation of the third stanza of the poem. She says, for example, 'Well the third paragraph is where I get the impression that he's not happy 'cause he's torn and he's tired of some people. Well if he's human he's prob'ly tired of the human race .. and maybe he's so sick of them because they're so cruel to birds or maybe ..' (page four, lines 28 to 31). She **infers** that the 'he' in the poem is tired of, 'some people' and, 'tired of the human race'; she **supports this inference** by saying, 'because they're so cruel to birds' (page four, line 31). She then reads 'The blood that feeds my heart is the blood they gave me' (page four, line 32). Barbara then **infers**, 'he's ah he's like them Well they're in him - they're part of the same group' (page four, lines 33 & 34). She reads again, 'My heart is the house where they gather and fight for dominion' (page four, lines 34 & 35) and **infers** that, 'the fighting really hurts him' (page four, line 36). She continues reading from the third stanza of the text: 'All different, all with a wish and a will to save me' (page four, line 37). She then **responds to what she has read** by aligning a personal experience with the text, saying, 'well it reminds me - I was thinking of a movie called ... ah Bird I think - no There's this movie with these two guys and one guys becoming obsessed with birds and he goes crazy' (page four, lines 38 to 40). Throughout this segment of her

protocol Barbara is **expanding and clarifying** her interpretation by questioning some details in the text, working her way through her interpretation, expressing herself with reasonable clarity and delaying closure

Barbara **responds** to what she has just read by aligning details in the poem with the movie she has seen saying, '... maybe this guy's crazy too and all those different people ... like a psychiatrist and the nurse and his family - they're not - they wanna save him, wanna help him get better and to turn him into a normal human being (page five, lines 3 to 6) She reads the first line of the last verse. 'I! I could leave their battleground for the forest of a bird' (page five, lines 10 & 11) and **infers** that what she has just read means, 'he'd rather be with the birds or like a bird rather than a human and in society at town ... he's just not happy with his life' (page five, lines 11 to 13) She then silently reads (there is a sixteen second pause, page five, line 12) and **infers** that, 'he wants to forget the past, and the present and the future' (page five, line 17) Barbara expresses uncertainty saying that, 'This third line doesn't - I don't make much sense' (page five, lines 18 & 19) She then attempts to resolve her uncertainty **inferring** that, 'I think he's confused and he wants to - he thinks the birds' life is pretty simple ...' (page five, lines 19 & 20). Barbara then expresses a very general overall **synthesis** of the poem pointing out the contrast between humans and birds. She says, 'as a human you think of ah you have to reminisce about the past and you worry about the present and then you worry about the future but birds lives one day at a time and it ... lives a simple life and ... he just wants his life to be as simple as a bird and concentrate on ... his emotions into being simple ... He just wants to be simple ... He doesn't want ah to have all the complications everywhere Feelings and emotions, things like that' (page five, lines 20 to 27) She says, 'So my impression of it is sort of like Birdy ... just reminds me alot of Birdy ... It's just a boy who's happy and he just becomes caught up in his perfect vision of the bird and the simplicity of a bird and so ... that's about it' (page five, lines 31 to 37) In referring again to the movie "Birdy", Barbara aligns this element of her background experience with the poem. Though Barbara has **read and responded** more thoroughly to the last two stanzas by paraphrasing these segments of the text, describing some relevant background experiences, aligning experiences with some relevant details of the text and explaining some reactions in appropriate detail, the general **synthesis** she has expressed

encompasses the points she has made about the first and second stanzas as well.

Barbara makes a brief general statement about the poem: 'The first paragraph is describing the bird, the second too - he's sort of describing himself and what he wants' (page six, lines 3 to 5). She is thus **expanding and clarifying** her interpretation to a certain extent by rereading and delaying closure somewhat. For the next several lines of her protocol she comments that her attention span wanders when she reads poetry (page six, line 9), that, 'It's pretty basic. It's an ordinary subject. I read things like this before and ah . it's kind of tiring' (page six, lines 27 & 28), and that poems are, 'just sort of too deep' (page six, line 36). Barbara comments that, 'I'm just sort of thinking of the movie and not really what this is saying' (page six, lines 45 & 46). Despite what she has just said though, it doesn't appear that the general **synthesis** she has expressed or many of the comments she *has* made about the poem apply solely to the movie to which she has referred.

The comments Barbara makes in the rest of her interpretation suggest she is aware of the general pattern of thought she follows in reading poetry. She says, for example, 'for me I don't really have to understand a poem to its little bitty words when I read a poem you know I like it, it sounds nice. If it ah it gives a meaning it says something but in not where you have to slave over for such a long time and it's just that the meaning is a bit easier ah to understand and you don't need an English teacher to help you' (page seven, lines 9 to 33).

Post-test Protocol Analysis. The post-test analysis of Barbara's interpretation of Cyclops was presented as a sample category 4 reading protocol (pages 77 to 84). Therefore, a comparison of the pre-test and post-test protocol is now presented.

Comparison of pre-test and post-test protocols. One of the most striking differences between Barbara's pre-test and post-test interpretations is that in her post-test protocol there is no expression of disaffection for poetry, dependence on the teacher, or lack of confidence in her ability to read and make sense of poetry. Such statements form a fair proportion of what she says during her pre-test interpretation.

In the post-test interpretation Barbara immediately begins to **read and respond** by paraphrasing the text, make **inferences** and **expand and clarify her interpretation**. In her pre-test interpretation, it isn't until page three of the protocol that she actually begins to read and interpret the poem. More than that, in the post-test she reads the poem line by line, thus staying much closer to the text than in the pre-test interpretation. In the pre-test interpretation, Barbara does not actually read and respond to the lines of the first and second stanza; rather, she makes a generalization about the first stanza after scanning it (see page three of the pre-test protocol, lines 34 & 35, these references are to page and line numbers in the original protocols, not those in the sample protocols presented in the first section of this chapter)

The **synthesis** Barbara makes in her post-test interpretation assimilates many more relevant details of the poem than does her **synthesis** of the pre-test poem. Because she **reads and responds** to the post-test poem much more consistently and closely in her post-test interpretation, the **synthesis** she makes more *fully* assimilates all of the details of the text. Though Barbara reaches a generally coherent **synthesis** of the pre-test poem ("Birds"), her synthesis of the post-test poem ("Cyclops") results from a much more detailed, line by line **reading and response** to *more* of the words, phrases and segments of the poem. Clearly, this is not the only difference between the two responding-aloud protocols but it certainly is one big difference between them.

Because Barbara reads the post-test poem ("Cyclops") in much more detail than she did the pre-test poem ("Birds"), she makes many more inferences about the details in that text. She **responds** to each line of the post-test poem by paraphrasing and making **inferences** about the concepts of the text.

Barbara asks more questions about the details of the text in her post-test interpretation. She asks only about the definitions of two words ('beleaguered' and 'kestrel') in her pre-test interpretation. In the post-test interpretation, Barbara struggles, however briefly with the way the word "armor" is used and what it signifies in the poem and is thus struggling with the metaphorical level of the word and not simply its literal definition. She also struggles, briefly, with the meaning implied by the two-word phrase, 'fur throat' (page four, lines 14 to 16) in her post-test protocol, and what the poet means by going 'bare' (page five, lines 3 to 9).

In the post-test interpretation, Barbara **expands and clarifies her interpretation** by rereading to a greater extent than in the pre-test interpretation. Though she doesn't actually reread the post-test poem she pauses after first reading and responding to the post-test poem in a line-by-line fashion, comments on the title (page three, line 45) and then on page four discusses the relevance of the poem's title. She rereads the line 'Take off your shoes then' (page five, line 3) and seems to 'rescan' the poem even if only briefly (see page five, line 18). She does not do this at all in the pre-test interpretation.

The general difference between the pre-test and post-test interpretation is the 'degree of distance' between Barbara and the text. That is, because she **reads and responds** to the post-test poem a line or two at a time she is more involved with the details of the text. As a result, Barbara's reading more fully resembles the series of statements that describe a category 4 reader in her post-test interpretation than it does in her pre-test interpretation. Her **synthesis** results from her having more closely attended to the words, phrases and segments of the text. She **reads and responds** to the text in more detail in her post-test. As a result of the increased 'closeness', Barbara's post-test interpretation is more fully **expanded and clarified**. Her **inferences** are more closely aligned with and supported by details in the text as well, as a result of the more attentive line-by-line reading. Aside from the fact that Barbara refers to and briefly attempts to align the title of the poem with the concepts symbolized in the post-test poem, there is not a great deal of difference between the pre-test and post-test interpretation in terms of **critical reaction**. That is, in neither case does she comment to any extent on the style, structure, or tone of the text. Thus, though both Barbara's pre-test and post-test protocols are those of a category 4 reader, there are many differences between the two protocols in terms of the extent to which she uses the key reading processes.

Student: Nesbitt A.

Pre-test poem: Cyclops

Post-test poem: Birds

Pre-test Protocol Analysis. The pre-test analysis of Nesbitt's interpretation of Cyclops was presented as an sample of a category 2 protocol (pages 95 to 103) Therefore the analysis of his post-test protocol is now presented

Post-test Protocol Analysis. In his post-test interpretation, Nesbitt reads as a category 3 reader.

After the responding-aloud process is explained, Nesbitt **responds** that the poem is about, 'a bird in the forest . . . that's about to be tortured' (page one, lines 20 to 24). This 'frame' is maintained throughout Nesbitt's reading of the poem. He **infers** that, 'maybe the bird did something wrong because of the weapon kestrel hard as a blade's curve' (page one, lines 28 & 29) He thus explains his **inference** by referring to some details in the second line of the poem. He reads, 'Whatever the bird does is right for the bird to do' (page one, line 31) and immediately explains that if the bird, 'killed another animal that's OK 'cause he's a bird' (page one, lines 31 & 32). He has said the poem is, 'about a bird in the forest' (page one, line 20), 'that's about to be tortured' (page one, line 24), that, 'maybe it did something wrong' (line 28), and that, 'if he killed ... another bird that's OK 'cause he's a bird' (lines 31 & 32). The underlined words all appear to refer to the same 'bird'. Thus, he is saying that the bird is 'about to be tortured' (page one, line 24) *and* that 'if he killed another bird, that's OK' (page one, lines 31 & 32) If it was 'OK', then his general **inference** that he is about to be tortured for it is illogical

Nesbitt **expands and clarifies** his interpretation by asking about the word 'kestrel' (page one, line 36) then begins to **read and respond** to the poem though he does not read aloud which makes it difficult to relate what he says to specific lines and segments of the poem. He says, 'the kestrel is flying through the sky. He's looking down at anything that's dead or he's looking for food' (page two, lines 3 & 4). Then Nesbitt says, 'he looks down at somebody being tortured or something .. maybe lying down or - he wants to pick it up and bring it to his nest' (page two, lines 5 to 17). These four statements are all **inferences** about what the kestrel is doing. The first,

(underlined) third, and fourth statements are related to Nesbitt's general frame about 'torture' (announced on page one) The second statement is a general **inference** probably related to his general knowledge about birds He comments that the birds are 'maybe singing a goodbye song' (page two, line 22) He says, 'maybe they're singing a goodbye song to the bird that's gonna be tortured' (page two, lines 30 & 31) and then says, 'the bird is upset that he's being tortured by his own people' (page two, lines 35 & 36) So on this page Nesbitt has said first of all that the kestrel is flying through the sky looking at 'somebody being tortured' (page two, line 9), that the birds are singing a goodbye song to 'the bird that's gonna be tortured' (page two, lines 30 & 31), and that 'the bird is upset that he's being tortured by his own people' (page two, lines 35 & 36) Though Nesbitt maintains his general frame that the poem is about 'torture' and aligns various details from each stanza with this frame he expresses contradictory and illogical statements. He attempts to **expand and clarify** his interpretation by asking, 'Does beleaguered mean tortured?' (page two, line 40) and the literal definition of that word is explained to him.

Nesbitt continues to **infer** what he reads in the context of his initial frame; he says, 'Maybe they started torturing and the blood is coming out' (page three, line 5). He appears to be responding to a phrase in the second line of the third stanza in saying, 'it's the blood they gave me 'cause it's the blood inside you originally that's coming out' (page three, lines 6 & 7) He thus **infers** that the word 'blood' in this stanza relates to his frame of 'torture' but his logic is very difficult to follow. It's also difficult to know to what or to whom Nesbitt refers in saying 'they started torturing and the blood is coming out ... it's the blood they gave me 'cause it's the blood inside you originally that's coming out. And his heart is where they're hitting or something ... 'cause they're fighting for dominion' (page three, lines 5 to 8). He has previously referred to somebody being tortured, a bird about to be tortured and an animal that was killed (on page one of his protocol), but the word 'they' does not clearly point to any of these subjects and it seems that Nesbitt may be uncertain about to whom or what he refers when he says, 'they', 'you' and 'me' as he does. He says, 'they're fighting control over the people like over the birds. Maybe like there's some birds that think they're superior ... 'cause here it goes "all different, ail with a wish and a will to save me" so the people that are inferior try to save the birds' (page three, lines 17 to 20; his

first phrase is recorded just as he expressed it in his protocol) Aside from the difficulty of knowing to whom Nesbitt is referring in using the word 'they're', it is also difficult to follow the line of thought about 'control' (page three, line 17), 'birds that are 'superior' (page three, line 18), and people that are 'inferior' who 'try to save the birds' (page three, line 20) Further, this line of thought is not clearly related to Nesbitt's references to torture mentioned over the previous few pages This rather confused line of reasoning continues, Nesbitt says, 'so there's like - the people that are inferior to them try to save the other birds' (page three, lines 33 & 34). He then continues, referring to his frame about 'torture', saying, 'and the people that are torturing him try to turn him .. they wanna make him like him or be a slave or something' (page three, lines 38 & 39) It appears that in saying, 'the people that are torturing him try to turn him' (line 36), Nesbitt is attempting to align his reference to torture with what he has previously said about control. Although he is making a genuine attempt to read the poem, and incorporate various details from it within an interpretation that seems to generally be about 'torture', he is not quite doing so coherently.

Nesbitt continues to interpret the details of the poem according to his initial frame. He says, 'They wanna make him like him or be a slave or something' (page three, lines 38 & 39) and when I ask him, 'Who do you mean?' (page three, line 45), he responds, 'Like the so called if it's a bird government or something. They're trying to make an example of him When they beat him maybe the rest are gonna be scared' (page four, lines 3 to 8). These references to 'control' and 'saving the birds' (page three, lines 17 through 34) and 'bird government' (page four, line 3) appear to derive from Nesbitt's reading of the third stanza. The notion of control seems to have been **inferred** as a result of his reading of the last two lines of the third stanza Though it is clear that Nesbitt is reading the third stanza and attempting to build an interpretation around the notion of 'torture', he also seems prompted by details in these lines to make statements (about a 'bird government', people that are 'inferior' and people making 'him' into a slave) that seem loosely *associated* with details in the poem but not clearly connected either with his 'torture' theme or even logically related one to each. He clearly says that, 'the bird is being tortured' (page four, line 20), that, 'He's only think about the past' (page four, lines 22 & 23) and 'Maybe the stone can be his grave' (page four, line 32). He then **reads and responds** by

saying, 'Like he tries to impress all the other birds'(page four, line 41) It is not at all clear how these statements relate to the general frame about torture, nor are each of these statements clear. This concludes Nesbitt's first reading of the poem. Though he has frequently referred to the subject of torture, he has not quite brought the various words, phrases and segments of the text clearly together to bear coherently on that theme. Rather he has referred to many ideas and made many **inferences** that, though *associated* with that theme and implicitly related to concepts from the text, are not clearly integrated with or linked to the general frame that 'the bird is being tortured' (page four, line 20).

Nesbitt begins to **expand and clarify** his interpretation by rereading certain lines of the poem. He refers to the third sentence in the poem saying, 'The third sentence in the poem? Thrush is the blood coming out' (page five, lines 14 & 15). After asking him if he knows what 'thrush' means and he responds, 'It's like if ah something comes out rapidly' (page five, line 19), I explain what the word means. Nesbitt immediately says, 'like he's a big bird but to his mother he's just a little bird' (page five, lines 28 & 29). He then restates a line from the text saying, 'OK he's bigger than a full drop of water' (page five, line 37), and questions the meaning of the two-word phrase 'shrieking swerve' (page five, line 41) which I explain

In response to details in the first stanza, Nesbitt **infers**, 'OK the parrot's tryin' ta - maybe there - some birds are chasing him. He's tryin' to get away from them. .. OK maybe he he killed the parrot. ... The one who's being tortured killed the parrot' (page six, lines 9 to 18). In saying that, Nesbitt returns clearly to the theme or general frame with which he originally began and has referred to throughout his interpretation. He reads from the poem: 'Whatever the bird does is right for the bird to do' (page six, lines 22 & 23) and then says, 'Maybe he wanted to eat the parrot. That's why they killed him ... The bird hopes that other birds could save him 'cause he wants to live' (page six, lines 27 to 36) Nesbitt appears to make this **inference** in connection with the reference to 'hunger' in the second line of the second stanza rather than in response to the first line of the second stanza, which he has just previously read. Thus he is both saying that the bird has been tortured because he killed the parrot and wanted to eat the parrot and, 'that's why they killed him (page six, line 31) AND that the bird hopes that other birds can save him (page six, lines 35 & 36). These statements do not sensibly follow one another. Nesbitt does not explain how *all* of these statements can be true neither does he

explain any of the statements he has previously made about the 'thrush', 'bird governments', 'impressing other birds' (page four) and the various other statements made about the poem in response to stanzas three and four

Nesbitt concludes his reading of the poem by saying, 'The bird who's being tortured he wants to ah - he hope that the birds can save him - the other ones' (page six, line 35 to page seven, line 3) He may be referring to the birds that are mentioned in stanzas one and two of the poem. He then expresses uncertainty saying, 'I'm having problems with this poem' (page seven, line 7) and concludes that he has, 'nothing else to say' (page seven, line 12).

Comparison of pre-test and post-test protocols. Nesbitt's pre-test reading pattern is that of a category 2 reader. His post-test reading pattern is that of a category 3 reader. Although, in both cases, he did not arrive at a fully coherent **synthesis** of the text (according to the way it is defined on the second page of the reading scale), there are many differences between his pre-test and post-test interpretations in terms of how he *approximated* **synthesis** of the various elements of the text

Nesbitt began both his pre-test and post-test interpretations with a general statement explaining his initial interpretation of each poem after having heard them read aloud once. In response to the pre-test poem, he said that 'Cyclops is even more scared than the people' (page one, line 20) and made several confused references throughout the poem to 'him', 'a man', 'a monster', and 'they' thus conveying that he was confused about to whom, in fact, he was referring. And, in the pre-test interpretation, Nesbitt also made many statements that seemed either not to make sense given the details in the poem or which were aligned with inappropriate details in the text. He also **read and responded** to the pre-test at random, making one statement after the other which were not at all aligned, explicitly or implicitly, with the previous statement or, often, with the details in the text. In many cases, it was difficult to know what he was reading in making many of the statements he did.

In the post-test interpretation, it is far easier to follow what Nesbitt says, and where he is reading from the text. Though the statements he makes are often not aligned with details in the text, there is usually at least an implicit connection between what he says and what he has **read and responded** to

And, though he often does not draw clear connections between one statement or inference and the next, talking for example about a 'bird government' (page four, line 14), then, 'thinking about the past' (page four line 23), then about how 'the stone' can be his grave (page four, line 32), and 'impressing all the other birds' (page four, line 41) these statements are far more connected to his general theme (about torture) than are the comments he makes about the confused series of (often) incoherent statements he makes during his pre-test interpretation

Thus, though in both the pre-test and post-test interpretation, Nesbitt did not **synthesize**, the many statements made during the post-test are *generally* more relevant to the theme or frame to which he refers in his post-test interpretation than are the series of statement made during the pre-test interpretation

Nesbitt **reads and responds** to the pre-test poem ("Cyclops") in a much more erratic manner than he does to the post-test poem ("Birds"). In the pre-test interpretation, many of Nesbitt's statements contradict one another. Many statements are made that seem either illogically related to the details in the text and/or are not explicitly related to the concepts in the text. Also, in his pre-test interpretation it is as though Nesbitt views the interpretive process as one whereby he should make one statement after the other until, as he said at the end of that interpretation, he, 'runs out of things to say' (line 36, page six). It is often difficult to follow Nesbitt's progress through the pre-test poem since he does not **read** aloud from the text then **respond** to it, and because many of his statements seem disconnected with what is represented in the text

In the post-test interpretation, Nesbitt **reads and responds** to the text in a much more comprehensible manner. His responses are usually clearly connected with an identifiable line and/or segment of the text though not always *explicitly* so. Because Nesbitt reads many lines from the text aloud, then responds, it is far easier to follow his post-test interpretation. He appears to have arrived at a method or process by which he reads and responds in his post-test interpretation.

There is an indication that Nesbitt brings his background experiences to bear on his interpretation of the post-test much more than he did during the pre-test interpretation. In making the responses he does during the pre-test interpretation, he seems to rely on a literal comprehension of isolated words

and phrases; he does not assimilate the details within a coherent frame nor does he attempt to show any relationship between one statement and the next. In the post-test interpretation, however, he brings a generally coherent framework (torture) to bear on his reading of the text, and it would seem that for that reason he is able to, even if implicitly, bring his background experience and/or knowledge to what he reads.

There are differences between Nesbitt's pre-test and post-test interpretation in terms of how he **expands and clarifies** his interpretation. He asks more questions about the post-test text than the pre-test one. He asks, for example about the meaning of various words and terms in his post-test interpretation, whereas he asks only about one term during the pre-test interpretation. That may, of course, be attributed to the fact that he simply found more difficult words in his post-test poem. However, the manner in which he read the pre-test poem would suggest that he *was* confused and might therefore have had occasion to seek answers which could have aided him in understanding that text.

Nesbitt read the pre-test poem in an erratic manner, making it difficult to know if he did reread it or if, instead, he merely read back and forth through it, making one disconnected statement after the other about it. It is clear that he not only read through the post-test poem in a generally clearer and more coherent fashion, but that he also reread at least some portions of the post-test poem. He comes to the end of his first reading of "Birds" on page four of his protocol and then refers (one page five, line 6) to the third sentence in the poem. From there, he comments further on details from the first two stanzas of the poem through to page six of the protocol where he attempts to assimilate the details from the first two stanzas within his 'torture' framework. Though he eventually (on page seven, line 7) says that he is having troubles with the poem, which he does not attempt to resolve, he does, in the post-test, show far more evidence of rereading or reviewing the poem. He does not do this at all to any discernible extent in the pre-test interpretation.

In attempting to **expand and clarify** his interpretation, Nesbitt expresses himself much more clearly in the post-test interpretation. Because, his post-test responses are far more connected with that text, it is far easier to understand what Nesbitt means when he interprets it. He explains himself to a greater extent, and each remark is somewhat more, though not fully,

coherent in relation to previous statements than was the case with the pre-test interpretation.

The **inferences** Nesbitt makes in his post-test interpretation are more closely aligned with the text than those made during the pre-test. On page one of the post-test interpretation, he says, 'maybe it did something wrong . . . because of the weapon kestrel hard as a blade's curve' (lines 28 & 29), and on page three, he says 'it's the blood they gave me 'cause it's the blood inside you originally coming out', (lines 6 & 7) and 'there's some birds that think they're superior . . . 'cause here it says ' (page three, lines 18 & 19), and 'the bird hopes that other birds could save him 'cause he wants to live' (page six, lines 35 & 36). There are few instances of such explicit reasoning in the pre-test interpretation and, when attempts are made to do so, they are confused and not logically related to the details in the text. Thus, in general, Nesbitt's **inferences** are more closely associated with details in the text in the post-test interpretation than in the pre-test interpretation.

There is no identifiable difference between the two interpretations in terms of **critical reaction**. Nesbitt makes no statements about the style, structure and/or tone of either the pre-test or post-test poem.

Nesbitt's reading pattern has changed from that of a category 2 reader in his pre-test interpretation to that of a category 3 reader in his post-test interpretation. Though he does not arrive at a fully coherent **synthesis** of the ideas symbolized in the text in either interpretation, he makes a much more coherent and comprehensive approximation to **synthesis** in his post-test interpretation. Nesbitt's **pattern of reading and response** is more fully integrated and connected to the text in the post-test interpretation. He also **expands and clarifies** his interpretation by much more clearly explaining himself, rereading and by asking more direct questions about the text in his post-test interpretation. His **inferences** are more logical and more explicitly connected with the text during the post-test interpretation.

Student: Trish G.

Pre-test poem: Cyclops

Post-test poem: Birds

Pre-test protocol analysis. In her pre-test interpretation of Cyclops, Trish's reading is that of a category 2 reader.

The responding-aloud procedure is explained (page one, lines 3 to 20) After the poem is read aloud, Trish **responds** by describing a personal experience; she says, 'It makes me think of a night there when you're a little kid and maybe you're at camp and they say this story at campfire and . you have to go to the bathroom ... but it's in the woods' (page one lines 27 to 41)

Trish continues to **respond** to the poem by elaborating on her experience of camp. She says, 'You go to this bathroom in the woods and then you think of just the story you just heard and then you're walking around - the slightest little noise . jumps and everything and then you say no I'm not scared, I can't be scared . ' (page two, lines 3 to 10) She refers to 'noises' saying, 'all the noises and everything they defeat you - you're just scared out of your pants and everything. Makes me think of camp . 'cause we do that' (page two, lines 14 to 19) She does not yet align these experiences with any of the details in the poem She then refers to being, 'around the fire' (page two, line 23), then refers to, 'the leaves .. 'a monstrous night' (line 27), which are three words literally contained in the poem. In making these statements, she implies that these details in the poem remind her of her camp experience, but thus far in her **response** to the poem she is not aligning such experiences with an interpretation of the poem. She continues to describe her camp experience, saying, 'Oh yeah. While the trees and everything - you look around - like oh my God get me out of here ... and sometimes - I got some friends across the lake and go for walks and oh my God in the forest and everything Oh dear, just thinking about it gives me goose bumps' (page two, lines 32 to 39).

Trish refers to the phrase mosquito-doped, then reads, 'The flashlight a single orange eye' and is again reminded of a similar experience She says, 'that's it, that's it ... makes me think of this person I know oh yeah that's what it makes me think of - walking in the forest, no moon, no flashlight after a scary ghost story' (page three, lines 11 to 20) It seems that the personal experiences she has described on pages one and two of her protocol influence how she interprets the poem and that, in fact, she is **responding** primarily to

her experiences, and to the poem to a much lesser extent. She continues to do so, for example, by **reading and responding** to the first three stanzas as though they, in fact, describe her experience in particular. She says, 'I was reading about a path with no moon and there's a flashlight . . . you see the light of the flashlight and you're not able to see farther than your own sight or shape your heart's pounding or terror you're stepping on the leaves - that's making a noise like a sore throat' (page three, lines 26 to 44). In paraphrasing the poem as she does in these lines, she seems to identify to a great extent with the 'you' that is mentioned in the poem. She doesn't say, for example, that the *person's* heart is pounding with terror, or '*she*' or '*he*' can't see further than '*his*' or '*her*' own shape. It's as though, in **reading and responding** to these (and most other) lines of the poem, she has assumed the identity of the 'you' in the poem and is reading as though she were that person. She says the poem makes her think of walking in the forest with, 'no flashlight' (page three, line 20) and then a few lines later in her protocol says, 'you see the light of the flashlight' (page three, line 31). This contradiction is caused either by a misunderstanding of the literal details in the text, which clearly refer to the flashlight as a single orange eye (in the first stanza) or she is thinking more of the personal scenario she has previously described and doesn't intend to imply that she understands the text to mean that there is, 'no flashlight'. There is another indication that she may have literally misread the text and/or is paraphrasing it inaccurately. She says, for example, 'that's making a noise like a sore throat' (page three, lines 43 & 44), when the text reads 'what makes a bristling noise like a fur throat'. Trish demonstrates that she has read the text as 'sore throat' by clearing her throat. Thus far, she has **responded** by paraphrasing the first, second and third stanzas and reading the poem largely in the context of her personal experiences.

Trish does not comment on or refer to the fourth or fifth stanzas. She repeats a line from the sixth stanza saying, 'don't disguise yourself' (page four, line 9). She then makes two or three disjointed statements that are difficult to follow; she says, 'you can smell the fire . . . no oh something or somebody is watching you from somewhere - they're hiding and it's like you're some kind of cold fire' (page four, lines 9 to 11). These (underlined) terms are almost exact restatements of some phrases from stanza seven of the poem; Trish does not though attempt to *interpret* these phrases. She does not

attempt to sort out the uncertainty she reveals in saying, 'you can smell the fire ... no ... oh somebody or something is watching you from somewhere' (page four, lines 9 & 10). She then **responds** similarly to the last two stanzas saying, 'in the night with big claws where there isn't danger nobody knows about - I'm the hugest monster' (page four lines 15 & 16). She appears to have interpreted the phrase, 'where danger is not knowing' in the second-last stanza to mean, 'there isn't danger' (page four, lines 15 & 16) which is an inaccurate paraphrase of the second-last line in the poem. Trish then says, 'it really makes me think of camp' (page four, line 21), and, 'I got this image in my head, I can see the forest and campfire and everybody gathered around and then after that walk at midnight and somebody chickens out and brings a flashlight along' (page four, lines 26 to 28). This statement reveals that Trish assimilates various details from the poem within her initial recollection, or framework, of 'camp', but she does so by generally fitting the details of the text within her camp experience(s) rather than establishing an understanding of the poem and then determining how her experiences relate to the details and/or scenarios of the poem. Her recollection of camp dominates her interpretation of the poem. She **reads and responds** to the poem in the context of her experiences of camp and nature. She says, 'it makes me think of leaves. Makes me think of nature in a way' (page four, lines 37 & 38) but makes only a cursory attempt to align these **inferences** with details in the text, saying, 'Cause they mention leaves and a river and the cold fire' (page four, lines 42 & 43). Trish has not yet expressed a **synthesis** of the details of the poem.

Trish confirms that she reads the poem within the context of her own experience of camp saying, 'makes me think of camp and nature' (page five, lines 5 & 6). She then says, 'The only thing I don't understand is mosquito-doped' (page five, lines 15 & 16). She then resolves this uncertainty saying, 'you have to wave your hand around to ah whosh the mosquitos away' (page five, lines 29 & 30). She does not attempt to align her understanding of this phrase with the other concepts that are symbolized in the poem. She has made general associations between some details in the poem and her experience of camp. Having read through the poem once, she says, 'Oh well then, I understand it ... that there are alot of mosquitos and that person is shooin' . . them ... telling them to go away ... I don't think there's anything else' (page five, line 34 to page six, line 6).

ish again refers to the framework within which she has assimilated the details of the poem; she says, 'I still have that image in my head of camp and a midnight walk with somebody with a flashlight. ... that one image I have ... I'm going through it and I still - there's nothing else to add' (page six, lines 10 to 16).

test protocol analysis. In her post-test interpretation, Trish's reading is of a category 3 reader.

The responding-aloud procedure is explained (page one, lines 3 to 15), and when the poem is read aloud Trish begins to **expand and clarify** her interpretation by asking for the definitions of these words "kestrel", "thrush", "veiling", "beleaguered" and "dominion" (page one, lines 19, 23, 27, 37, and 39)

Trish comments, 'This poem is making me think of all different birds could be ah ... it makes me think of everything they do - the way they sing they eat ... and they fly across the sky you know in a large group ... and ... some of them fight for something' (page two, lines 8 to 18) She then **is critically** by briefly commenting on structural elements of the poem, e.g., 'At the end of each paragraph says, what birds are and what they do ... that's you know how to me every paragraph is ending. Those that birds are and what they should do' (page two, lines 22 to 24) Trish comments that the poem makes her 'light kind of' (page two, line 28) and says, 'feeling different impressions of the way it could be' (page two, line 29). Thus, she refers to personal experiences but as yet does not interpret the poem totally within the context of them as she did with the pre-test interpretation; she acknowledges various initial reactions to the poem.

Trish begins to **read and respond** to the poem by repeating many lines of the text and briefly paraphrasing them. She reads, for example, the first line of the text and says, 'So whatever it is ... it's perfect to him, to the bird' (page three, lines 3 & 4) And after reading the remainder of the first line she generally paraphrases it by saying, 'it talks about three birds in' (page three, line 9) and then **infers**: 'OK weapon kestrel hard as a blade's ... that's prob'ly that bird's weapon. It's prob'ly as hard as the curve of a ...' (page three, lines 10 & 11) She **reads** another line of text: 'Thrush as a mother or a full drop of water' (page three, line 15) and **virtually** **repeats**: 'That bird is as round as a mother or as full as a drop of water' (page

three, lines 15 & 16). She reads again: 'Fruit-green parrot wise in his shrieking swerve' (page three, line 24) and **infers** that, 'the parrot is loud' (page two, line 25). Trish then **infers** that the line: 'whatever the bird does is right for the bird to do' (page three, line 34) means, ' . whatever it does is what it's supposed to do' (page two, line 35) thus replacing the exact line from the text with a synonymous one. Similarly, she **reads and responds** by paraphrasing another line of the poem: 'Cruel kestrel dividing in his hunger the sky'- OK that bird is mean and ah it divides the sky like this part is mine. Don't go fly here' (page three, lines 35 to 37). Trish is **inferring**, 'the bird is mean' (page three, line 36) presumably on the basis of the word, 'cruel' in the second line of the second stanza. She again **reads** from the text: 'Thrush in the trembling dew beginning to sing' (page three, line 41) and **infers**, 'it's just sitting down in the grass that still is wet from morning dew' (page three, lines 42 & 43). Thus far Trish is **reading and responding** to the poem by paraphrasing it line by line in brief statements that are consistent with the literal details; in doing so, she is also making **inferences** that are logically (though not explicitly) associated with details in the poem.

Trish reads from the text: 'Parrot clinging and quarrelling and veiling his queer eye' (page four, lines 7 & 8). she **infers** that 'the parrot is prob'ly hanging onto something and is fighting prob'ly with another one' (page four, lines 8 & 9). She **infers** also, that 'his queer eye' means 'the mean look in his eye' (page four, line 13). She reads from the text again: 'All these are as birds are and good for birds to do' (page four, line 17) restating this line almost verbatim. She reads the third stanza aloud (page four, lines 26 to 30) and **infers**: 'this could be maybe one specific bird' (page four, line 30) thus perhaps inferring that the 'I' of this third stanza is a bird. She confirms her understanding of the word "beleaguered" (page four, lines 31 & 35), then **infers** that the bird 'is prob'ly like worn out from his own people - like that bird's own people' (page four, lines 43 & 44). Throughout her interpretation to this point, Trish **reads and responds** by paraphrasing the poem line by line and making **inferences** that are logically associated with details in the poem.

Trish reads: 'the blood that feeds my heart is the blood they gave me' (page five, line 3); she immediately **infers** that the blood they gave me is 'from their part, their group of birds' (page five, lines 3 & 4). She does not, though, clarify to whom she refers in saying 'their'; she says, in fact, 'I can't do anything about it' (page five, line 8). She reads again from the text: 'And my heart is

the house where they gather and fight for dominion' (page five, lines 12 & 13), and infers, 'That's prob'ly a bird the fight a lot for ... it to be like top - on the top' (page five, lines 19 & 20). She has asked that the word "dominion" be defined early (page one, line 39) in her interpretation. Now, having read: 'My heart is the house where they gather and fight for dominion' (defined for her as meaning control) she **infers** that 'a bird' wants to be on top. Interestingly, Trish says, 'a bird' here where on the previous page (page four, line 30), she has referred to 'one specific bird'. It may be that she is not assimilating what she has subsequently read within the framework, or perspective, of that 'one specific bird'. She reads again: 'All different, all with a wish and a will to save me' (page five, line 22), and immediately **infers**, 'his warning to fight for everything, to be on top is different and it all has a different wish and he wants kinda to save himself from all the fighting' (page five, lines 23 to 25). She appears, in fact, to be referring to one specific bird when she says, 'he wants to kinda like save himself from all the fighting' (page five, lines 24 & 25). She reads: 'To turn me into the ways of other people' (page five, line 29) and **infers** that 'he wants to get smoother like maybe one of - more bird are' (page five, line 30). She has previously read line one of the third stanza (page four, lines 22 & 26) and has clearly referred to the phrase 'my own people' from that line as 'his own people - like that bird's own people' (page four, lines 43 & 44). She also says, 'the people - those are the birds you know' (page five, line 38). Given that she has thus referred to 'my own people' as 'the bird's own people', she **infers** that the line: 'To turn me into the ways of other people' means, 'he wants to get smoother' (page five, line 30), like nicer, calmer. She does not further explain what she means in saying that (presumably) the 'bird' wants to get nicer, calmer but there is general coherence in the statements she has made. She has, for example, referred to 'a bird' that, 'is prob'ly like worn out from his own people - that bird's own people' (page four, lines 43 & 44), that, 'he wants kinda like to save himself from all the fighting', (page five, lines 24 & 25) and 'he prob'ly wants to get smoother' (page five, line 30), which she suggests means 'nicer, calmer' (page five, line 34). Although her statement, that the bird fights, 'a lot for .. it to be on top' (page five, lines 13 & 14) is somewhat contrary to the image of a bird that wants to save himself from all the fighting, most of the statements she has made are coherent and her **inferences** usually logically aligned with the details in the text. Trish reads from the the text: 'If I could leave their

battleground for the forest of a bird, I could melt the past the present and the future in one and find the words that lie behind all these languages' (page five, lines 42 to 44). In interpreting these lines, she virtually restates them replacing (the underlined) terms with what she *infers* them to mean. For example, she says, 'if I could leave the fight for another forest . . he could just forget about the past there and the present that he had ... and the future and understand what they all meant when they were shrieking at each other or singing at each other' (page five, line 44, to page six, line 7). She *infers* the word 'battleground' means fight, the phrase 'the forest of a bird' means another forest. She also infers the phrase 'melt the past, the present and the future' means forget about the past there and the present that he had, and that the phrase 'find the words that lie behind all these languages' means understand what they all meant when they were shrieking at each other or singing at each other. She is **reading and responding** to the poem by paraphrasing it and simultaneously making inferences that are logically and clearly aligned with the details in the text. Were she to formulate a statement that integrated the various interpretive statements she has made so far, she would be **synthesizing**.

Trish continues by reading again from the text: 'I could fuse my passions into one clear stone and be simple to myself as the bird is to the bird' (page six, lines 7 & 8). She then struggles to understand the term, 'passion', saying, 'could put its um passion - what could they mean by passion?' (page six, line 10). She eventually resolves her uncertainty about it (after I respond that, 'it depends'- page six, line 15). In attempting to sort out the meaning and relevance of the word to the poem, she says, 'Like passionate hate . . ah something you feel strong about' (page six, lines 19 to 33). Having worked to **expand and clarify** her interpretation of this term, she says, 'Oh I know. Then I could fuse all what he really strongly wants .. in one clear stone that could maybe in his mind ... what he really really wants .. and than act simple to myself as the bird is to the bird' (lines 35, page six to line 3, page seven). She thus resolves her uncertainty about the meaning of the term "passion" and maintains her pattern of **reading and responding** by replacing certain terms in the text with what she *infers* them to mean (in the underlined statements just cited). She does not make any statement(s) that express a generally coherent **synthesis** about the various interpretive statements she has made

Trish concludes her interpretation of the poem by saying that the bird will, 'act simple to myself as the bird is to the bird ... as a bird is supposed to be to itself' (page seven, lines 3 to 7). She has **read and responded** by consistently paraphrasing most lines and segments of the text and making **inferences** that are usually clearly and logically aligned with the details in the text. She has **expanded and clarified** her interpretation by expressing herself with clarity for the most part; she has also delayed closure until she has at least read through the text once touching on most elements of it. Trish reveals that she understands the reading process she has followed in interpreting the text. She says, 'Wow I never been into a poem this deep before ... from line to line like that it's easier ... I understand this poem. I mean my understanding of it. ... I understand myself how I feel about it' (page seven, lines 11 to 39). She continues to explain her awareness of the understanding she has reached and how she has done so; she says, 'the words I asked that I didn't understand now I understand ... I gave my point of view of every line and what I think about it' (page eight, lines 3 to 7).

Comparison of pre-test and post-test protocols. Certainly, Trish's pre-test and post-test reading patterns are different. Her pre-test reading pattern is characterized as category 2 reading and her post-test as category 3 reading. But, the post-test reading pattern is not as easily classified as strictly within *one* reading pattern according to the manner in which the categories are defined in the reading scale. For example, in reading down the list of statements that characterize a category 4 reader, it would seem that many of *these* statements apply to Trish's post-test reading pattern. In her post-test interpretation, she does, for example, **read and respond** by paraphrasing most segments of the text, she **expands and clarifies** her interpretation by questioning some details of the text (various words and terms on page one of her interpretation and the term "passion" on page six, lines 10 through 33). She has worked steadily through the poem in making her interpretation, and she has decribed the general pattern of her thinking (on the last page of her interpretation). She has also expressed herself with reasonable clarity most of the time and her **inferences** are logically associated with the details of the post-test poem. BUT, one critical and important difference between the category 3 and 4 reading pattern is that the category 4 reader reaches a **synthesis** by assimilating the various words, phrase and segments of the text within a coherent frame; the

category 3 reader does not. Though Trish has **read and responded** by paraphrasing most lines and segments of the post-test text, she does not express an understanding of the underlying theme in a manner that **synthesizes** or draws together the understanding she has of those various, separately understood lines of the text. For this reason, her reading pattern is defined as a category 3 reading in her post-test interpretation.

There are many differences, nonetheless, between the pre-test and post-test interpretation in terms of the *degree* of **synthesis** reached. In her pre-test interpretation (of "Cyclops"), Trish reads primarily in the context of her initial impression of the poem. That is, she reads and assimilates most details within the framework of a personal experience (camp) although she does not clearly align the details of the text with that experience. She reads with the image of, 'the forest and campfire and everybody gathered around and a walk at midnight', as she puts it (on page four, lines 26 to 28) of her pre-test interpretation; the text is secondary to the recollection of her camp experience. The one summation Trish makes of the pre-test interpretation is primarily of how the text reminds her of her camp experience.

In the post-test interpretation, Trish's attention is consistently focused on the text; her initial impression gives her, 'different impressions of the way it could be' (page two, line 36) but her subsequent **reading and response** to the poem is not dominated by that initial reaction as was the case in the pre-test interpretation. She says, for example that the poem 'is making me think of all different birds ... and ... everything they do ... and makes me feel light kind of' (page two, lines 8 & 9, and 28). She does not, however, read the text with these thoughts and images primarily in mind. Trish reads the post-test poem line by line and, according to the way she interprets particularly the last two stanzas, it would seem that she has a tacit sense of the poet's overall theme or message even though she does not explicitly express it. She says, for example, that the bird wants to 'save himself from all the fighting' (page five, lines 24 & 25), that 'he' wants to get 'nicer, calmer' (page five, line 34) and 'fuse all what he really strongly wants' (page six, line 35) and 'act simple to myself as the bird is to the bird' (page seven, line 3). Though there are places in her post-test interpretation that Trish refers to 'a bird' and 'one specific bird' and even sometimes even 'I' (see page six, line 35), and thus her reference to the central figure of the poem is not consistent, it does seem that she has a sense

of the poet's general theme or message. Her interpretation of the pre-test poem does not demonstrate such an understanding of a message or theme.

There are differences between the pre-test and post-test interpretation in terms of the way Trish **reads and responds** to the text(s). In the pre-test interpretation Trish reads the entire text in light of her camp experience. She does not read the text at all as closely in her pre-test interpretation as she did in the post-test interpretation. In the post-test interpretation she **reads and responds** by paraphrasing each line and though she does not explain a relationship between one line with the next there is a growing sense, as the interpretation progresses, that she perceives an underlying theme within which she paraphrases each line. This is especially evident on page six of her protocol, where she incorporates details from the first and second stanzas in saying, 'and find the words that lie behind all those languages and understand what they all meant when they were shrieking at each other or singing at each other' (lines 5 to 7).

There are differences as well between the pre-test and post-test in terms of Trish's attempts to **expand and clarify** her interpretation. In the pre-test interpretation she made one generally incoherent interpretation - incoherent because her statements are made more in response to a recollection of a personal experience than of the text. She is not at all as aware of her general approach to **reading and responding** to the text; she has reached closure relatively easily and expressed herself unclearly in the pre-test interpretation. In the post-test interpretation, she works steadily through one interpretation; she delays reaching closure until she has read and responded to each line of the text, and she expresses herself with reasonable clarity.

In her pre-test interpretation, Trish makes **inferences** that are inappropriate given the details in the text. In fact, as has been mentioned frequently, Trish's statements in her pre-test interpretation are more associated with a personal experience than with the text. But in her post-test interpretation, Trish makes frequent **inferences** that are clearly associated with details in the text. She usually does so by replacing details literally represented in the text with terms that she **infers** them to mean. Though she does, at times, refer confusedly to some details in making a general inference about whether the point of view in the poem concerns one specific bird, or *a* bird, there is more association between the inferences and the text in the post-test interpretation.

Trish refers to some structural principles of the post-test poem (see page two, lines 22 to 24); she does not do so in her pre-test interpretation. She does though comment on how both poems made her feel. Thus, there are not many differences between the two interpretations in terms of **critical reaction**

In general then, there is far more evidence of **synthesis** in the post-test interpretation than in the pre-test interpretation. This may be attributed to the fact that Trish **reads and responds** to her post-test poem far more closely than she does her pre-test poem. Perhaps because she is more attentive to the post-test text and approaches it with a more conscious general reading strategy (**reading and responding** to each line of the text, as she put it on the last page of her post-test protocol), she is better able to **expand and clarify** her interpretation in reading that poem. The increased attention she pays to the text may also account for the more logical **inferences** made during the post-test interpretation and the fact that these inferences are more closely aligned and associated with details in that text.

Student: Donald M.

Pre-test poem: Birds

Post-test poem: Cyclops

Pre-test protocol analysis. In his pre-test interpretation Donald's reading is that of a category 2 reader.

The responding-aloud procedure is explained (page one, lines 3 to 13). After the poem is read aloud, Donald initially responds by saying he has 'no idea what it's talking about' (page one, line 28). He thus approaches the poem without expressing a general frame or personal experience within which he might assimilate the concepts symbolized in the text. He reads the entire poem aloud (page one, line 44 to page two, line 19) stopping only to ask that the word "beleaguered" be defined (page two, line 8)

After reading the poem aloud, Donald announces that the poem, 'still doesn't make any sense' (page two, line 23). He asks that the word "kestrel" be defined, (page two, line 33) then says that, 'in the same paragraph they're talking about . . . whatever the bird does is right for the bird to do' (page two, lines 37 & 38), thus restating almost verbatim the first line of the second stanza. He does not attempt to interpret the first stanza. His **inference** that, the bird has no rules . . . - it does what it wants' (page two, line 42) is not clearly aligned with any line in particular and could thus be a generalization about the first two stanzas, or either one of the first two

Donald makes the statement that, 'whatever it does comes naturally' (page three, line 3) which could be his generalization about the second stanza or the last line of that stanza; he does not explain his reactions in any detail. He reads the third line of the third stanza and asks about the word 'dominion', saying, 'they say ah they gather and fight for dominion, what do they mean?' (page three, line 4). He then makes an **inference** that is not clearly aligned with any aspect of the text, though it would seem to relate to the third stanza; he says, 'So I guess they're talking about . . . when the parents brought up the bird' (page three, lines 8 & 9). He offers no explanation about why he says this or to what line or segment of the text he refers in saying it. He reads the second line of the last stanza: 'I could melt the past, the present and the future' (page three, line 14) and without responding to it asks about how he should proceed saying, 'So now what do I do? Just keep on reading?' (page three, line 15). He then refers to the first line of the poem saying, 'Like

in the first sentence they're - sort of they're describing that um a bird is perfect ... there can't be anything wrong with the bird ... We can't change a bird, a bird's just made the way it is' (page three, lines 21 to 27) This statement appears to be a paraphrase of both the first line of the poem and a generalization about the first stanza though the statement is not specifically aligned with details in the text. Donald then makes a generalization about the second stanza saying, 'They're describing different birds ... their characteristics are the way they're supposed to be and nothing should change that' (page three, lines 36 to 41). He makes an **inference** apparently in response to the third stanza saying, 'It's like the parents of the bird are doing all they can to make it live' (page three, lines 45 & 46) Donald's has **read and responded** by paraphrasing each stanza in a brief statement. He has not yet attempted to express a **synthesis** about the theme of the poem nor has he attempted to relate one interpretive statement with the next

Donald explains that it's the goal of the parents to make the bird live ' ... it's sorta like that's their goal, that's all they wanta do' (page four, line 5) thus **inferring** what the third stanza means. He then asks somewhat uncertainly, 'So is that it or ...' (page four, line 17) I remind him that he can read as many times as he wants; he then refers to the first sentence of the third paragraph saying, 'The only thing I don't understand is in the first sentence of the third paragraph' (page four, lines 28 & 29) He asks, 'Is it ah the bird saying that as it's beleaguered by its own people or ...' (page four, line 45)

After a thirty second pause, Donald says, 'it's like a person saying he wants to be a bird' (page five, line 6). This statement may be an **inference** about the line about which he has expressed uncertainty (i.e. I am torn and beleaguered by my own people), or may be about the poem in general. He indicates he has reached closure saying, 'That's about it' (page five, line 10) and in response to a question I ask him: 'What is your understanding of it then?' (page five, line 17), he makes four statements that seem to generally describe the topics of each stanza. He says, 'They're describing different birds and how they're so simple in themselves ... talks about a person that wants to be a bird ... that wants to be as simple as a bird' (page five, lines 19 to 31) Generally, Donald has **read and responded** to a few lines of the text in little detail by paraphrasing the literal meaning of each stanza.

Post-test Protocol Analysis. Donald's reading pattern is that of a category 2 reader for his post-test interpretation as well. Since his post-test interpretation is quite similar to the pre-test interpretation, I will proceed directly to a comparison the two protocols in order to demonstrate the parallels between the pre-test and post-test interpretation.

Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test Protocols. There are no noteworthy differences between Donald's pre-test and post-test interpretations. In fact, the degree of similarity between them is striking. After the responding-aloud procedure is explained in the post-test interpretation (page one, lines 3 to 11), Donald responds by saying, 'I think he doesn't really seem to me to be talking about a Cyclops. It sounds like something in nature but I don't know what' (page one, lines 15 to 17). He makes a very similar statement after hearing the pre-test read aloud; he said, 'I have no idea what it's talking about. I know it's talking about a bird and how it's simple but that's about it' (page one, lines 28 & 29, pre-test). He asks that the term 'mosquito-doped' be explained (page one, line 21), and similarly asked that a term ("cruel kestrel", page two, line 33, pre-test) be defined after he read the poem, "Birds" aloud in the pre-test interpretation.

Presumably after reading the first stanza of the poem, Donald comments that, 'I don't know who they're talking about' (page two, line 4), and 'I don't really understand this' (page two, line 9), and, after a one minute, forty-seven second pause (page two, line 15), he says, 'I think it could be talking about alot of things 'cause there's no hugest monster, one hugest monster. So I think through the poem it could be talkin' about a lot of different things' (page two, lines 29 to 31). In the pre-test interpretation after reading "Birds" aloud he similarly comments, 'still doesn't make any sense' (page two, line 43). Thus, in both the pre-test and post-interpretation, on the first two pages of Donald's protocols, he expresses immediate uncertainty, after which he makes brief general statements of uncertainty.

Donald makes a brief summary comment about the first one or two stanzas in his pre-test interpretation referring to what he feels is the topic of the third stanza. 'I guess they're talking about ... when the parents brought up the bird' (page three, lines 8 & 9). He then comments that he does not understand the last stanza (page three, lines 9 & 10) and reads one line from the last stanza (page three, line 14). After expressing uncertainty about how

he should proceed (page three, line 15), he makes brief statements about the literal details in the first and second stanzas (page three, lines 21 to 23, line 27, line 36, and lines 40 & 41), then a statement about the third stanza (page three, lines 45 & 46). In a similar fashion, Donald **reads** and **briefly responds** to various lines of the post-test poem. For example, he **reads** from the text (page three, lines 3 & 4 of "Cyclops") and **responds** by saying, 'I have no idea what that means. First, it's like someone walking down a path' (page three, lines 4 & 5). He comments that, 'it sounds like they're talking about a Cyclops' (page three, lines 9 & 10) but he does not elaborate on this **inference** nor does he clearly align this statement with details from the poem. He may simply be responding to the title of the poem. He **reads** from the poem 'A single orange eye unable to see what is beyond the capsule of your dim sight' (page three, lines 12 & 13) and **responds** by restating the first line and title of the text '... they're talking about a Cyclops walkin' down a path' (page three, lines 15 & 16). He reads: 'What shape contracts to a heart with terror' (page three, line 20), and **infers** 'he got scared of something ah someone got scared' (page three, lines 21 & 22). He reads again: "'bunks' among the leaves ... what makes a bristling noise like a fur throat' (page three, lines 23 & 24) and **infers** 'Seems like someone's walkin' down a path and they hear a noise' (page three, lines 24 & 25). He says, 'someone's walkin' down a path and not 'Cyclops is walkin' down a path' even though he has previously stated that, 'it sounds like they're talking about a Cyclops' (page three, lines 9 & 10). He reads from the text again: 'Is it true you do not wish to hurt them?' (page three, line 36) and **infers** that, 'it's sorta like the person's thinking about what that noise could be and .. it doesn't wanna hurt them' (page three, lines 36 to 38) but he doesn't explain who or what he means by them, nor why he assumes 'the person's thinking about what that noise could be' (page three, line 37). He **reads** again: 'Is it true you have no fear? Take off your shoes then. Let your eyes go bare. Swim in their darkness as in a river' (page three, lines 38 to 40), **responds** by saying, 'I don't really know what that means' (page three, lines 40 & 41) and then comments that, 'I don't know what they could be talking about' (page three, lines 44 & 45) in referring to the last three stanzas of the poem.

In both Donald's pre-test and post-test interpretations he expresses statements of uncertainty followed by brief statements that either generally summarize stanzas, virtually restate lines from the text, or refer to some

topics in the text. He does not consistently explain the relationship between one response and subsequent ones, making only very brief general statements about each text. About the pre-test poem, he says, 'it's like the parents of the bird are doing all they can to make it live' (page three, lines 45 & 46) 'and it's sorta like that's their goal, that's all they wanta do' (page four, line 5) And about the post-test, he says, 'it sounds like they could be talkin' about pollution maybe' (page four, line 6) And in the post-test interpretation, he says, 'I can't really figure out this poem' (page four, line 10) In response to the pre-test poem, he says, 'the only thing I don't understand is in the first sentence of the third paragraph' (page four, lines 28 & 29). In each protocol then, he makes brief general statements about the poems and then comments, 'that's about it' (page five, line 10, pre-test) and, 'I guess that's all I can get out of this poem' (page four, line 38, post-test). In neither the pre-test nor post-test interpretation does he clearly align the statements he does make with the various words, phrases and segments of the text or synthesize by assimilating the details of text within a consistent frame. And in both cases he has **responded** to the text by making brief comments in response to some details from some lines of the text.

For these reasons, Donalds pre-test and post-reading patterns are both characterized by the statements describing a category 2 reader. It is relevant to point out that Donald was absent for 5 of the 13 days of the small-group discussion and therefore may not have developed the confidence in himself or the familiarity with the **reading and response** process of his group to have refined the process by which he read and responded to poetry.

Student: Rick C.

Pre-test poem: Birds

Post-test poem: Cyclops

Pre-test protocol analysis. Rick reads according to the pattern of a category 2 reader in his pre-test interpretation.

The responding-aloud procedure is explained (page one, lines 3 to 14) and Rick's initial **response** after *hearing* the poem read aloud is the most coherent statement he makes about the overall meaning or theme of the poem, these statements are clearly and logically associated with the concepts symbolized in the text. He says, for example, 'It's about a guy that doesn't like what's going on so he thinks birds . . . got more freedom . . . thinks he would rather be one of the birds than a human being . . . 'cause they lead carefree lives . . . like they just go anywhere . . . 'cause they're free . . . and he just doesn't like how humans are' (page one, lines 24 to 41)

After expressing his initial reaction, Rick begins to **read and respond** to the poem. He says, 'Well he thinks the bird is perfect' (page two, line 8) which appears to be made in response to the first line of the poem but because he does not read aloud for almost the first half of his interpretation it is sometimes difficult to discern the associations between what he says and what he reads. If his statement in line 8 is a response to the first line of the poem, as it appears to be, he is basically restating that line of the text. He expresses uncertainty about the word kestrel. 'I'm not sure what kestrel is' (page two, line 12) which I define: 'Kestrel is a bird like a hawk' (page two, line 14). His subsequent statement: 'He thinks the bird is the best animal to be 'cause it's wise' (page two, line 16) may be an **inference** about the meaning of the first stanza or the last line of the first stanza. He reads the second stanza silently (pausing for 7 seconds then for 23 seconds, page two, lines 21 & 22) and then, in saying that, 'it's less complicated a life to lead . . . he thinks that people they want them to be just like his family . . . ' (page two, lines 22 to 27), he appears to be making an **inference** about both the third and fourth stanzas. Rick doesn't, however, read aloud or refer to any specific details in the text and thus it's difficult to clearly associate what he says with what he reads. He makes confusing references to 'he' (page two, line 8) and he has previously referred to, 'a guy that doesn't like what's going on' (page one, lines 24 & 25), then says, 'they want them to be just like his family' (page two, line 27)

Then, Rick says, 'his family - he wants them to be just like him but he wants his own life ... life' (page two, lines 32 & 33). He may mean he wants 'people' 'to be just like his family' (page two, line 27) Because these **inferences** are not consistently aligned with details in the text, it is difficult to follow their progression from one line to the next. Aside from this difficulty, it is difficult to see how his **inferences** are associated with what he reads. After stating, 'They want them to be just like his family . . . like his own blood' (page two, lines 27 & 28), he says, 'His family he wants them to be just like him but he wants his own like um life' (page two, lines 32 & 33). I ask him a question that might lead him to draw a connection between what he says and the text: 'What's making you think that? What are you seeing there?' (page two, line 35). He responds by reading, 'My heart is the house where they gather and fight for dominion and the blood that feeds my heart is the blood they gave me', then says, 'he's sort of like them but he wants to be more original' (page two, line 43). His statement about being 'more original' seems generally associated with the concepts of the third and fourth stanzas, and with the general reaction he has expressed after listening to the poem read aloud once. But the connection or relationship between his statements and the details in the text is not stated.

Rick says, 'Well he wants a simple life' (page three, line 3); this statement appears to be associated with the last line of the poem which reads: 'and be simple to myself as the bird is to the bird'. He appears to be working toward an interpretation of various lines from the last stanza in (page three, lines 3 to 34). He says, for example, 'he wants to leave the place where he was always' (page three, line 7) thus paraphrasing the first line of the last stanza. Rick then **infers**, 'he wants to understand the language I guess bird calls ... and all the other languages in the world' (page three, lines 7 to 20). These statements seem related to the 2nd and 3rd lines of the last stanza. He then **infers**, 'He wants to put all his feelings and all his thoughts into one . . . little stone so he won't have to - so he'll be organized' (page three, lines 28 to 30), thus working at an understanding of the second-last line of the poem. He then says, 'that's about it' (page three, line 38) without actually bringing the various **inferences** he has made together in a coherent statement about the text. It seems as though, by listening to the poem read aloud Rick was able to formulate a clear and coherent statement about its meaning (see page one, lines 24 to 41). However, when he has read it himself he cannot, thus far in

his interpretation at least, assimilate the concepts symbolized in the text with the understanding he expressed after *hearing* it read. His initial response to the poem was to say, 'he would rather be one of the birds than a human being' (page one, line 29).

After being reminded that he can read the poem as often as he may want to, Rick reads the third line of the poem: 'thrush round as a mother or a full drop of water' (page four, line 7) and responds: 'I'm not sure what he's tryin' to say there' (page four, line 11). I explain what a thrush is (page four, lines 13 to 19). Without making any interpretive statements about the line he has just read, he then reads some words from the fourth line of the poem: 'parrot's shrieking swerve' (page four line 26) and virtually restates a phrase from the last line from the first stanza: 'there's not much else beyond bird' (page four, line 29). He refers to these details and/or lines in the text without making **inferences** about them or attempting to interpret the concepts symbolized by these lines by paraphrasing them. He reads: 'Thrush in its trembling dew beginning to sing' (page four, lines 33 & 34), and **infers**, 'so it's peaceful' (page four, line 34). Rick then restates the first line of the 2nd stanza saying, 'they do it so it's right for them to do it' (page four, line 35). He then reads from the text 'All different, all with a wish and a will to save me' (page four, line 43) then **infers**, 'so I guess it's saying that most people they care about him - they wanna help him' (page six, lines 3 & 4). The **inference** that people 'care about him' appears related to the phrase 'save me' in the line he has just previously read from the text.

In following Rick's references to 'he' and 'him' throughout his protocol so far, it would appear that such pronouns refer to 'a guy' (page one, line 24), but he has not clearly identified who he means when using these pronouns so whether or not he is, in fact, sure of himself is not clear. He **reads** from the text: 'If I could leave their battleground for the forest of a bird' (page five, lines 8 & 9), and **responds**, 'that's basically what he 's tryin' to say' (page five, line 11). It's as though the literal words in the text so coincide with or so clearly express the implicit understanding he has of the text that he cannot express it otherwise himself. But, he has not yet expressed a **synthesis** of what he has read. Rather, he has **read and responded** to lines of the poem one at a time and has not yet expressed any relationship between the various interpretive statements he has made. He reads again: 'I could melt the past, the present and the future in one and find the words that lie behind all these languages

and I could fuse my passions into one clear stone and be simple to myself as the bird is to the bird' (page five, lines 13 to 19) and hesitantly says 'he's saying ... simple or ...' (page five, line 23). In restating one of the words from the last line of the poem, as he has here, he may be depending on the word 'simple' to elliptically express his understanding of perhaps both the poem and/or the last stanza. But, he has not yet expressed a coherent understanding of these lines of poem. After I ask him if he wants to say anything else about the poem (page five, line 36), he again responds, 'that's most of it' (page five, line 34) as he has previously (page three, line 38).

Rick then *seems* to express a general understanding of the poem; he says, 'well could mean ... birds are ... they don't fight over stuff as much ... they just lead carefree lives ... just happy always ... I guess he doesn't want to have a big challenge in life 'cause birds don't have much to think about ... humans have a lot more worries so ... just to get away from it all would be better ... so I guess he just wishes ... he could ... like he could move ...' (page five, line 43, to page six, line 23). These statements are generally similar to the understanding Rick has expressed after *hearing* the poem read: 'it's about a guy that doesn't like what's goin' on so he thinks birds are like - got more freedom ... thinks he would rather be one of the birds than a human being' (page one, lines 24 to 29). None of the concepts he has just expressed (from line 43, page five to line 23, page six) are related to any of the statements he has made as he has *read and responded* to the poem throughout his protocol. The only concept mentioned (in his just cited statement - page five, line 43 to page six, line 23) that relates to previously mentioned interpretive statements in his protocol is the phrase '[birds] lead carefree lives' (page six, line 4). He said exactly this in one of the statements in his initial response to the poem: 'they lead carefree lives' (page one, line 33). It is difficult to know if the statements from line 43, page five to line 23, page six are an assimilation of the interpretive statements he has made so far as a result of his reading or a repetition of his initial response. He says, '... it wouldn't be as easy ... it wouldn't be as hard to leave. They don't need money' (page six, lines 23 to 25), and is thus making a comparison (i.e. 'as easy' .. 'as hard') through these underlined phrases. But he doesn't identify the terms he is comparing though it appears that he is comparing birds and humans for he has previously said, 'humans have a lot more worries so just to get away from it all would be better' (page six, lines 13 & 14). He then *infers*, 'he doesn't want

to be with them. If he could ever become - like when he dies he could like turn back into a bird. So I guess that's what he wants' (page six, lines 35 & 36). These statements are difficult to understand given what he has previously said on this page of his protocol. He may mean 'the guy' doesn't want to be with the birds, when he says them (page six, line 35), and yet he seems to have implicitly suggested that 'the guy' simply wants to live like the birds because 'they lead carefree lives' (page six, line 4). In saying 'he doesn't want to be with them' and 'when he dies he could like turn back into a bird' (page six, lines 35 & 36), he seems to be responding to the poem on rather a literal level as though 'the guy' or 'he' might actually be with the birds or even become a bird. In saying what he does from line 43, page five to line 23, page six Rick is expressing an understanding of the poem at a metaphorical level, as though the birds *represent* a peaceful existence, one that 'the guy' wants for himself. Thus, whether or not Rick's conclusion is that the poem centers on a 'guy' who wants to get away from it all and lead a carefree life with few worries as *represented* by the life of the birds, or whether he concludes that 'the guy' *actually* does not want to be with birds, and/or wants to turn back into a bird, is quite vague. For all of these reasons, it cannot be said that Rick expresses a coherent **synthesis** of the ideas symbolized through the text. He then says, 'he still likes to have a family so he could be responsible I guess' (page six, lines 37 to 42). He does not explain this statement and it is not clearly associated with any identifiable segment or line from the text. When asked to explain (page six, line 44), he says, 'Well it's talking about thrush round as a mother or a full drop of water ... and ah looking for food . the cruel kestrel dividing in his hunger the sky' (page six, line 46, to page seven, line 6) but how these lines are aligned with 'he' still wanting to 'have a family' and wanting 'to be responsible' is not at all clear.

Rick says, 'I think being a bird isn't all that great 'cause it's - there's lots of danger around and sooner or later the air isn't gonna be free 'cause it's pollution and there's gonna be too much planes in the sky' (page seven, lines 10 to 13). This statement about being a bird is related to a statement he made previously, 'when he dies he could like turn back into a bird' (page six, lines 35 & 36) but there seems to be no connection between saying 'I think being a bird isn't all that great' (page seven, line 10) and other statements about 'dangers' and the air not being 'free' (page seven, lines 11 & 12). References to 'danger' and 'pollution' appear to be related to an aspect of background

knowledge about pollution and not aligned with details in the text. Also, in talking about 'being a bird' he is removed from the notion, expressed on page six and page one of his protocol, about 'a guy' and/or 'humans' leading 'carefree lives'. He says, 'if the way he's doing it . if he wants to be a bird - he wants to lead a carefree life but there won't be any challenges' (page seven, lines 17 to 19). First of all, he does not explain what he means by challenges, or what he means by 'the way he's doing it'. It isn't really clear that the phrase, 'if he wants to be a bird' is intended to *symbolize* the fact that 'the guy' wants to lead a carefree life or if he *literally* wants to be a bird and thus live a carefree life. He says, 'that's just his own opinion' (page seven, lines 23 & 24) which may be a qualification of his previous statement that, 'there won't be any challenges' (page seven, lines 18 & 19) but this is not clear. From this part of his protocol onward he makes statements which are increasingly confused, not aligned with the text and not clearly related to either of the two possible scenarios to which he has thus far referred (i.e. 'the guy' wanting to lead a carefree life *like* a bird or 'the guy' *actually* wanting to be a bird). He says, 'that's just what he really wants' (page seven, line 28), but it isn't at all clear what he means by this and what he next says is largely incoherent and not *clearly* related to concepts previously expressed: ' 'cause there's more ways to expand 'cause ah new technology like a bird's life could only have much stuff to do for fun, pleasure - birds have lots of stuff' (page seven, lines 33 to 35). He then makes another statement which is not explained or aligned with the text. 'wars and ... you have to use the money to pay for all of these things ... Basically it's stuff like that' (page seven, lines 39 & 40).

When asked again if he wants to read and see if there's anything else' (lines page eight, lines 3 & 4), he responds with another vague statement which he does not explain or align with anything he has previously said: 'you could have all sorts of different experiences in life - learn different languages . travel around the world' (page eight, lines 6 to 12). He seems to be expressing an opinion as to why it would not be advisable to actually become a bird, and, in doing so, touches on details of his own background knowledge in a cursory fashion: 'as a bird you could travel around the world too - it's easier but you won't see as much stuff. It's - the world would be too big for you . you wouldn't like to - if it's humans then you . you have to pay money for a plane and stuff . it would take so long just to gain that much money - I guess he doesn't . want to work as hard' (page eight, lines 16 to 27).

In saying what he does here he seems to be expressing a general opinion about why being a bird would not be a desirable state of affairs rather than aligning such an inference with the details of the text. He closes without really **synthesizing** the various interpretive statements he has made about the meaning of the text

Post-test Protocol Analysis. In his post-test protocol, Rick's reading pattern is that of a category 4 reader.

Rick expresses an initial response after hearing "Cyclops" read aloud. He says, 'it's about a guy who feels good about himself at the time he's on top of the world ... he thinks the most powerful creature is prob'ly an imaginary creature called Cyclops . . he's being like the Cyclops right now . . and he's like a huge monster - like he just feels good about himself' (page one, lines 13 to 31) He then begins to read: 'You going along the path, mosquito-doped, the flashlight a single orange eye unable to see what is beyond the capsule of your dim sight' (page one, lines 40 to 42). Perhaps with the notion of 'an imaginary creature called Cyclops' in mind he interprets the first few lines of the text to mean: 'he's imagining himself going along the path' (page one, lines 42 & 43)

Rick continues to interpret the first few lines of the text supposedly still with the frame in mind that 'the guy' is *imagining* himself on a path; he says, 'It's dark out . . well the flashlight's *like* a single orange eye' (page two, line 3) He reads: 'unable to see what is beyond the capsule of your dim sight' (page two, lines 7 & 8) and **infers** that, ' ... he's prob'ly in a forest' (page two, line 8) Whether or not Rick is still proceeding with the assumption that 'the guy' is still imagining or not is not clear at this point. He doesn't say, for example, that he *imagines* himself in a forest. He continues, reading from the text 'what shape contracts to a heart with terror' (page two, lines 12 & 13) and **infers**, 'he's prob'ly scared . . he's so scared that he doesn't - like his heart is usually shaped in the normal way . . so he's so scared that his heart is just beating harder . . like it might be in a different shape' (page two, lines 13 to 27) He interprets these lines as though 'the guy' is *actually* scared and as though his heart is *actually* beating harder and is *actually* in a different shape rather than supposing these phenomenon to be *imaginary*. He reads from the text again: 'bumps among the leaves, what makes a bristling noise like a fur throat' (page two, lines 31 & 32) and **responds** by paraphrasing these lines, he **infers**, 'well it's like the noise from the leaves like it's a fur throat ya

know when you clear your throat' (page two, lines 34 & 35). Rick then indicates that he is, in fact, interpreting what he has so far read consistent with a 'guy' imagining this happening. He says, 'It's like that noise. Like he imagines like that' (page two, line 39). He reads from the text again: 'Is it true you do not wish to hurt them? Is it true you have no fear? Take off your shoes then and let your eyes go bare. Swim in their darkness as in a river', (page two, lines 39 to 41), then expresses uncertainty: 'I'm not sure what he's talkin' about' (page two, line 43). He then suggests a possible interpretation. 'Maybe the leaves . . . doesn't wanna step on them' (page two, lines 43 & 44)

Rick now suggests an alternative interpretation of the line previously read: 'Is it true you do not wish to hurt them?' saying, 'maybe he's thinkin' about something else' (page three, line 3). It is not clear what he means in saying this, and he does not explain this response. He continues to **read**: 'Is it true you have no fear? Take off your shoes then. Let your eyes go bare, swim in their darkness as in a river. Do not disguise yourself in armor. They watch you from hiding' (page three, lines 8 to 10), then **responds**, 'I think the guy is afraid of something . . . and that he thinks something's after him and well he's pretending to be brave and ...' (page three, lines 10 to 16). In making these statements, it seems he is assuming that 'the guy' is actually thinking that 'something's after him' (page three, line 15) and not that he's still 'imagining himself going along the path' (page one, lines 42 & 43). He continues to **read and respond** by paraphrasing and making **inferences** about each segment of the text. He says, 'take off your shoes and just relax and let your eyes go bare and maybe open your eyes. Wake up' (page three, lines 16 to 18). His **responses/inferences** are quite clearly and logically aligned with lines and details from the text; at this point in his protocol, he now seems to interpret the poem from the perspective of a person *actually* 'afraid of something' (page three, line 11). Rick says, 'He keeps on going and .. it's just like keep on walking like you're swimming in a river' (page three, lines 23 & 24). He reads, 'Do not disguise yourself in armour' (page three, line 28), and **infers** that this line means, 'don't put up an act ... just be ah how you are and how you're feeling' (page three, lines 28 to 30). He reads again: 'They watch you from hiding. You are a chemical smell, a cold fire, you are a giant and undefinable' (page three, lines 35 & 36), and makes a few statements about 'a chemical smell'. He says 'they can detect him' and 'a chemical smell could be something powerful' (page three, lines 36 and 37 & 38) but he doesn't clarify

who or what he means by 'they'. What he is doing so far is **reading and responding** to the poem line by line, making **inferences** that are usually clearly aligned with concepts symbolized in the text though it isn't certain yet whether he is tacitly maintaining the frame according to which he began to read and interpret (i.e. 'imagining himself going along a path', or interpreting the poem in the context of a 'guy' actually walking in the woods. He **expands and clarifies** his interpretation in attempting to sort out the association between the two-word phrase, cold fire, though he doesn't quite arrive at a clear interpretation of this phrase saying, 'it's the opposite like the fire is usually ah hot so it's hot would be not as powerful and cold would be more tough' (page three, lines 42 to 44). He then reads the last few lines of the poem: 'In their monstrous night thick with possible claws where danger is not knowing you are the hugest monster' (page three, line 43 to page four, line 3).

Rick now clearly refers to two differing perspectives from which the poem could be written. He says, 'this guy could be imagining' (page four, line 3), thus being consistent with the general frame within which he began to read and interpret the poem. He then says, 'or he could be an animal that looks like a Cyclops' (page four, lines 3 & 4). He seems to be reacting to the phrase, 'thick with possible claws' in suggesting that 'he' could be an animal. He rereads: 'thick with possible claws where danger is not knowing' (page four, lines 8 & 9) and **infers**, 'he doesn't know what's gonna happen to him. Doesn't know what's gonna happen but he wants ' (page four, lines 9 & 10). His response implies that he interprets the phrase, 'not knowing' to mean 'he' *doesn't* know, rather than danger *is*, or can be defined as, not knowing. Then, in responding to the last line of the text, Rick again reverts to the original frame within which he began to interpret the text, he says, 'he's prob'ly trying' to make himself think' (page four, lines 12 & 13) but he doesn't explain what he means by that. He summarizes his understanding of the poem thus far: 'the first part is saying about how he - how he's really scared. And then near the end he's like psyching himself out - making him think that he's powerful. So he won't be as scared. and ah Cyclops is maybe a creature in his mind that's powerful so every time he's scared he thinks that he's this creature so maybe he will be ah less free and that's why he goes ah - like he starts off they watch you from hiding. He goes you are a chemical smell. First he goes least then he goes finally to . ' (page four, lines 17 to 28)

Though he does not quite express a coherent **synthesis** of his understanding of the poem thus far, he is consistently working to assimilate the details of the poem within a coherent frame. He is also **reading and responding** by paraphrasing most segments of the text, tacitly bringing his relevant experiences to bear on what he reads, and explaining his reactions in appropriate detail. After reading the phrase from the text: 'do not disguise yourself in armour' (page four, line 42), he comments that 'that changes everything I just said' (page four, line 43). He is thus indicating his awareness of how the elements of the poem bear on his engaged transaction with it and, in the ensuing twelve pages of his protocol, he works to **expand and clarify** his interpretation by questioning the details of the text, rereading many times in light of his evolving interpretation, and working through his interpretation many times as he varies it in accordance with textual elements. He is expressing uncertainty and delaying closure as he works to resolve it.

Rick reconsiders his interpretation of the text in light of what he has previously reread (i.e. 'do not disguise yourself in armour'- page four, line 43). Rick explains, 'Well do not disguise yourself in armour' (page five, line 3) means, 'put on some armour. Become that Cyclops in your mind . . . to make him imagine that he's not scared . . . undefeatable . . . and if you think that you are, you'll always get what you want' (page five, lines 5 to 10). He is expressing a general **synthesis** of the poem in these lines. He further elaborates on this and assimilates what he says within the frame that he has previously expressed; he says, for example, 'he's imagining all this. He 's not really in this place . . . and he's saying this problem you can't figure out . . . the problem would be he's scared of something that's gonna get him' (page five, lines 12 to 14). In expressing his **synthesis** of the text in this manner, Rick does not explain what he thinks the problem actually is (other than that 'the guy' is scared of something), but he does align various details in the text with his assumption that 'the guy' in the text has a problem, imagines himself lost in the woods and that if he thinks he's a Cyclops, he might resolve his fear. At times Rick refers to 'he' and at times to 'the guy' (page five, line 11). This makes it difficult to know if Rick means that the poet is saying all this *about* 'the guy' in the poem or if the 'he' in the poem is saying all this to himself. For example, Rick says, 'He just made himself scared. Now he goes do not make yourself scared . . . you imagine that you're not scared - to make him imagine he's not scared, to believe that he's a Cyclops' (page five, lines 4 to 8).

It's very difficult to follow these references and to know clearly to whom or what they refer. This difficulty continues when he reads from the beginning of the text again: 'You going along the path' (page five, line 38) and responds by saying, 'well when he says you, that could prob'ly mean that the reader and he's trying' ta make him think that it's you that's scared' (page five, lines 38 to 40). It is very difficult to know what or who Rick means in using all these pronouns: the reader, the poet, the 'guy' imagining or the imaginary 'guy'. Rick continues his second reading of the text and as he paraphrases each line, this inconsistency in his use of reference(s) continues. He reads: 'going along the path mosquito-doped with no moon, the flashlight a single orange eye' (page five lines 40 & 41). He **infers** that, 'it's dark and there's no light so you use a flashlight and there's lots of mosquitos around' (lines 42 & 43). He reads again: 'Unable to see what is beyond the capsule of your dim light' (page five, lines 43 & 44)) and **infers** that 'he can't see what the future lies ahead of you' (page five, line 45 to page six, line 3). It's as though Rick sometimes unconsciously interprets the poem as though it is about a particular 'guy' and sometimes (when he uses the word 'you') as though the poem is making a point about people in general.

Rick reads: 'What shape contracts to a heart with terror' (page six, lines 3 & 4) and interprets the words, 'shape' and 'heart' literally, commenting on the shape of a 'scared heart': 'a heart that's scared how is it shaped like?' (page six, line 4). He then reads again: 'bumps among the leaves, what makes a bristling noise like a fur throat' (page six, lines 8 & 9) and now concludes that the whole poem could be about life: 'this whole poem could be about life and life is like a path that you don't know' (page six, lines 10 & 11). He **infers** that the 'bumps would be the problems and the heart would be the way you feel' (page six, lines 15 & 16) in response, it would seem, to the third stanza. He then says (again referring to the third stanza), 'that part would be ah like you don't know what's ahead of you in the future in life and um he goes what makes a bristling noise like a fur throat . or it could be ah if he's feeling his throat and there's a - the noise ya make when ya go feel' (page six, lines 22 to 29). Rick continues to make inferences about the third stanza, saying, 'what makes a bristling noise like a fur throat or it could be ah if he's feeling his throat and there's a - the noise ya make when ya go - feel (he gestures toward his throat' (lines 27 to 29). So far he has **read and responded** to the text in detail, aligned his **inferences** with details in the text, has worked to **expand**

and clarify his interpretation by rereading and has explained himself in generally appropriate detail. He has not yet clearly established whether the 'you' in the poem is the poet speaking to the reader, or a 'guy' speaking to himself or an animal. He has also not yet clearly established whether the poem is about problems 'the guy' faces in life or about how problems affect people in general

Rick reads 'bumps among the leaves' (page seven, line 3) and **infers**, 'that's the problems (page seven, line 3) He reads again from the text: 'Is it true you do not wish to hurt them (page seven, lines 3 & 4) and expresses uncertainty about to whom the word 'them' refers: 'I still can't figure that out' (page seven, line 5). He **infers**, 'it could be somebody could be the problem' (page seven, line 13) and then says, 'or he could be running away from something he could prob'ly hurt them but he doesn't want to hurt them . and that's why he's running away. He's running away from his problems' (page seven, lines 15 to 17) He reads from the text again 'Is it true you do not wanna hurt them' and 'Is it true you have no fear?' (page seven, lines 22 & 23) and **infers** that, 'maybe he's pretending that he is scared like he's running away from his problem which would mean he has no fear' (page seven, lines 24 to 26) He is **reading and responding** to the text, making **inferences** that are clearly aligned with it and concludes that the message of the poem could be, 'you shouldn't quit in life' (page seven, line 41) Thus, Rick's general **inference** as a result of reading the line, 'Is it true you have no fear?' is 'just keep on going Don't quit' (page seven, line 33) Thus, Rick has expressed different **inferences** about four lines of the text (i.e. Is it true you do wish to hurt them?; Is it true you have no fear?; Take off your shoes then, let you eyes go bare; and swim in their darkness as in a river) The thrust of his interpretation in this section of his protocol revolves around the underlined reference them, and the word leaves which Rick concludes means problems. Rick **infers**, as he has before (page five, lines 3 & 4), that 'do not disguise yourself in armor' means, 'don't put up an act'. He reiterates: 'do not disguise yourself in armour ... um .. just relax and um blend with it ... just keep going. Don't quit. Do not disguise yourself in armour. Don't always put up an act. Like um he could be running away from his problems and that wouldn't solve it so he goes, don't run away from the problems' (page seven lines 29 to 33; lines 45 & 46, and page eight, line 3).

Rick has consistently referred to the fact that 'this whole poem could be about life and life is like a path . . . and the bumps would be problems' (page six, lines 10, 11 and 15) and that the message of the poem is 'you shouldn't quit in life' (page seven, line 41), and now relates each line he reads within that general framework. He further refines this general framework saying, 'like the problem could be himself Maybe he wants to put on armour to hide himself from the world you know Like right now suppose he is running away from his problems? This guy would be like hiding and running away so if he's wearing armour that would - he's hiding and running away" (page eight, lines 4 to 15) He reads 'they watch you from hiding' (page eight, line 19) and continues to interpret each line within this 'problem' framework He reads, 'you are a chemical smell, you are a cold fire' and infers that 'chemical smell' and 'cold fire' (page eight, lines 21 & 22) somehow means, 'you'll always be there' (page eight, line 22) but it is, again, confusing to understand if, in saying, 'you'll always be there', he means the problems will always be there or 'the guy' will always be there In previous lines (page eight, 19 & 20) for example, the word 'they' seems to mean, problems and the reference(s) to 'you' in the phrases 'you're hiding' (page eight, lines 19 & 20 and 'you're trying to run away from your problems' (page eight, line 20) seems to mean 'the guy' in the poem Even though Rick consistently assimilates most of what he reads within his framework about 'problems' he is not always clear and consistent about the way he uses such pronoun references This is, again, a problem when he says, 'even though you run away from home, you'll still be there 'cause you're the hugest monster . .' (page eight, lines 30 & 31) Does he mean even though the guy runs away from home, the problems will still be there? And when he says, 'if you're in the armor they'll still see you in the armor' (page eight, lines 32 & 33), it would appear that he means the problems will still see you, but his previous lack of consistency in using such pronoun references make his protocol difficult to follow here. In lines 3 & 4 he has **inferred** that the detail about armour means, 'maybe he wants to put on armor to hide himself from the world you know' (page eight, lines 5 to 9). Then in lines 32 & 33, page eight he appears to **infer** that (presumably) 'the guy' is literally wearing the armour; he says, 'if you're the Cyclops in armor, the armor would be big' (page eight, lines 37 & 38). Rick assumes that 'you' are 'wearing the armor' (page eight, line 42), that 'you're the hugest monster' (page eight, lines 42 &

43), that 'you can't be missed ... so your problems will always be there. You can't forget about them You'll always see it' (page eight, lines 42 to 44). Even though it is clear that Rick continues to align most details from the text within his 'problem' framework, his use of pronomial references remains confusing.

Rick reads from the text: 'in their monstrous night thick with possible claws where danger is not knowing' (page eight, line 45, to page nine, line 3), and now decides that 'it could be someone else's problem' (page nine, lines 9 & 10) it's not clear why he then says, 'if you ever have ah problems you shouldn't run away from them so it's tryin' ta give a message to ah the leader' (page nine, lines 14 to 16) He asks about the word 'undefinable' (page nine, lines 16 & 17) and based on my response (i.e. something you can't grasp, can't explain - you can't quite understand it', page nine, lines 19 & 20), says, 'you don't understand why you're here ... why it happened' (page nine, lines 26 & 27) His protocol to the end of page nine is quite difficult to follow and not clearly aligned with the text though again he consistently refers to 'the problem' 'You're facing the problem - if you can't escape from it you're there - in their monstrous night they'll always be there to remind you ... you still have your problems' (page nine, lines 36 to 42)

Rick says, 'they'll always be grasping at you' (page ten, line 3) He rereads the phrase 'where danger is not knowing' (page ten, line 8) and his subsequent interpretation centers primarily on the phrase 'not knowing' He says, 'one day when you don't even think about it they're gonna get you like without even knowing' (page ten, lines 9 & 10) Rick thus assimilates this phrase within his framework about problems He then assimilates various details of the text within his 'problem' framework inferring, 'the Cyclops would prob'ly represent the problem .. about how you feel with the problem and it's like you're really scared and then you're running away from it halfway through' (page ten, lines 18 to 22) After I ask him a question about where in the poem is 'halfway through', he points to the line 'do not disguise yourself in armour' and says, 'it's saying ah - do you really wanna run away from them? Is this what you really want? It's like you're asking yourself questions' (page ten, lines 27 & 28). He says, 'When you're running away you're sort of - you feel like - nothing can get you. You're not afraid of anything. So he's asking if you really aren't afraid of anything. Is that what you really want? - To hide away from ... the rest of the people' (page ten, lines

38 to 44). As difficult as it sometimes is to follow his thinking and the manner in which he uses pronouns and general references, Rick has consistently maintained the poem is about problems, facing problems and running away from problems from page six to this point in his protocol

Rick rereads the line: 'is it true you do not wish to hurt them?' (page eleven, line 3) and **infers** that, 'hurt them', would be ah just maybe it's hurt other people' (page eleven, lines 3 & 4), then contradicts himself, saying, 'when you don't wanna hurt them That would mean like you're running away from problems' (page eleven, lines 12 & 13) I attempt to determine what or who, in fact, he does mean in referring to them 'Hurt your problems you mean? Is that what the 'them' is?' (page eleven, lines 16 & 20) and Rick says, 'Well ah I was thinking about people people with the problem like you have the problem and it would prob'ly concern other people also 'cause ah the problem would ah probably be made by other people or it could be made by yourself Well it could be - mean both - people and the problem' (page eleven lines 22 to 33) All of these statements result from his attempt to interpret the line 'Is it true you do not wish to hurt them?' (page eleven, line 3) After saying this, he then remarks that, 'Is it true you do not wish to hurt them?' could be, 'your feelings. Is it true you do not wish to hurt your feelings maybe' (page eleven, line 41) He then reads 'Is it true you have no fear?' (page eleven, line 42) and, instead of making a statement about that line, he overlooks it and says, 'if you hide that means you won't hurt anybody but yourself' (page eleven, lines 43 & 44) He then reveals that he is rather confused. 'Well it's kind of confusing' (page eleven, line 45)

Rick rereads: 'Is it true you have no fear, take off your shoes then' (page twelve, line 5) and says, 'he's saying you should just he's thinking to himself. This is his conscience speaking and it's saying you shouldn't put up an act, you should just be the way you are otherwise you'll be like - if you don't solve your problem you'll be like on the rest of the world' (page twelve, lines 5 to 18) These statements are coherent unto themselves but are not closely aligned with the details of the poem They are, though, consistent with the general framework within which he has interpreted most details in the poem. He interprets 'they watch you from hiding' (page twelve, lines 22 & 23) to mean, 'no matter what you do they'll always be there' (page twelve, lines 23 & 24). Rick then struggles to interpret the significance of the terms, "cold fire" and "chemical smell" (page twelve, lines 28 to 39) He **infers**

that 'chemical smell', being the 'opposite of a normal smell' (page twelve, line 27), means, 'it's not a typical problem . and the smell is like strange chemical smell. And it's not made by you maybe. The problem was prob'ly not made by you It was made by some other people' (page twelve, lines 32 to 34). He then **infers** that, 'you are giant and indefinable' (page twelve, line 36) means, 'that would be where he comes - gets Cyclops from' (page twelve, line 37). He **infers** that, 'their monstrous night' means, 'the problems . it's like maybe you're sleeping on it' (page twelve, lines 38 & 39). Rick's reading and interpretation is at an entirely metaphorical level; most of the literal details in the poem somehow represent imagining problems, sleeping on problems and/or problems caused by other people. In **inferring** that each line and detail means such, Rick often does not explain the relationship between the *literal* details in the poem. Instead, such details become subsumed within his general metaphorical framework which remains consistent. Rick introduces another possible variation about how the details in the poem might reflect on his 'problem' framework. It seems that in referring to 'he' as he does (page twelve, line 44), Rick is still referring to a 'guy'. He says, 'he's dreaming that he's walking along the path would represent his problems' (page twelve, lines 44 & 45)

He has previously explained that 'giant and indefinable' (page twelve, lines 36 & 37) means, 'that would be where he comes - gets Cyclops from'. He now says, 'giant and indefinable well you don't know why it's happening. Ya just know it's happening and ya have to some - well you're supposed to do something about it but he's not gonna do anything about it' (page thirteen, lines 3 to 5). Immediately he continues by saying, 'or it could be a nightmare' (page thirteen, lines 5 & 6) presumably explaining what else might be 'giant and indefinable'. He then reads from the text, 'in their monstrous night thick with possible claws where danger is not knowing' (page thirteen, lines 6 to 8) and **infers**, 'well like if you're - if he's dreaming about ah the dream. Like any time it could happen that it gets solved. It solves by itself' (page thirteen, lines 8 & 9). He then reads: 'thick with possible claws' (page thirteen, line 10) and **infers** that this line means, 'there's always the possibility that it could be solved by itself' (page thirteen, lines 10 & 11) consistently explaining how the literal details mentioned in the text represent the exclusively metaphorical interpretation he has made. Rick continues to speak about how 'you should try and solve them' (page thirteen, lines 18 & 19), that 'it does not

matter what is gonna happen, in the end your problems are like it's gonna . you're gonna get your problems. They're always gonna come back to you 'cause you're the hugest monster' (page thirteen, lines 28 to 31) Rick relies on one line ('you're the hugest monster', page thirteen, line 35) to infer that, 'maybe you're in the forest and there's all these little forest creatures these little problems and the problems could be the Cyclops. He's imagining the problem as the Cyclops. A monster he has to overcome' (page thirteen, lines 35 to 42). He does not explain from where the 'little forest creatures' have materialized but in saying the problems could be the Cyclops, he is consistent with what he has said earlier. 'the Cyclops would prob'ly represent the problem' (page ten, lines 18 & 19)

Rick suggests, 'the then .. could be the one with the problem and you are the one . that caused it and you're the giant that . ' (page fourteen, lines 3 to 5). He then says, 'that wouldn't work' (page fourteen, line 5) implying that he is consciously monitoring his interpretation. Then, in lines 21 to 33, he reads quickly through the poem and aligns certain lines and details from the poem with this tentatively suggested framework saying, 'well it could work a little bit' (line 21). In these lines of his protocol Rick makes one of the most coherent statements thus far. He explains a clear association between the 'you' and 'them' that are literally referred to in the poem. He does this most clearly in lines 21 to 25 when he says, 'you're the one that caused the problem and he goes did you really wanna do it? And is it true that you're really not scared of the person that you caused the problem on? And ah if there are bumps among the leaves well this could be describing the other person . ' The underlined references in these lines clearly refer to one person and, though he does not clarify who he means in saying he, the relationship between the underlined references and 'the person' are clear and are coherently related to the general progression of references in the poem. It would seem to be more consistent for him to have then said, 'they're watching you along the path' instead of 'you're watching the person along the path' (page fourteen, lines 25 & 26) but his next statement clarifies this somewhat for he says, 'you're the one the one they're watching from - watching the person from hiding' (page fourteen, lines 26 & 27). Again though in the next line he switches the identities of the 'you' and 'them', saying, 'they're a smell a chemical smell which you can always sense them around' (page fourteen, lines 28 & 29). To have been fully consistent with

what he said in lines 21 to 25, and with the text for that matter, he might have said, you're a chemical smell and they can always sense you. But, then in the next line, he becomes consistent again with the manner in which the references were used in lines 21 to 25; he says, 'you're the one that's the problem - the giant - the hugest monster - your biggest problem' (page fourteen, lines 29 to 31). The flashlight, he says, could represent a friend 'wif him to help him find his way out' (page fourteen, line 33). Mosquito-doped, he says, (page fourteen, lines 38 & 39) ' would prob'ly be little problems'

Rick concludes, ' basically it's like that but it would be a problem - the whole poem's about ah problems and ah the way to solve them If you solve them by running way it's saying that it will come back to you always You can't get away from those problems' (page fifteen, lines 3 to 6). On the rest of this page, Rick reiterates many of the general statements he has previously made but he does not further embellish the coherent statement he made on page fourteen (lines 21 to 25). He does explain how he perceives the development of the theme, saying, 'first it's gonna be a little thing, sort of like a chemical smell and then it's gonna be medium and then you're gonna turn into a monster inside you You're gonna feel hatred and anger or scared . first you start off scared then the more you get used to it .. (page fifteen, lines 23 to 33) He then continues to align various details of the text within his general interpretive frame 'Well first you start off scared then the more you get used to it like from that the chemical smell could turn into like a smell and a fire The smell could come from a fire and then it goes into - from fire it come from the giant The fire would mean hatred Smell would be you could sense the person and the giant would be real anger . And the monstrous night would be ah always - the problem is a monstrous night Every night you sleep you dream about this monstrous night you're facing all the time. And um it always reoccurs sort of mosquito-doped - let your eyes go bare, swim in their darkness as in a river . well even though you have this problem you should keep on goin' with your life You shouldn't stop here You might wanna solve them but ya might also want to run away from your problems' (page fifteen, lines 33 to page sixteen, line 4)

Rick again reiterates much of what he has previously said thus further embellishing his **synthesis** of the elements of the poem (lines 8 through 41) He consistently assimilates most words, phrases and segments of the text

within his interpretive frame and concludes, 'the message I think is don't run away from your problems ... because it will eventually come back . . and it'll never be solved' (page sixteen, line 43 to page seventeen, line 7)

Comparison of pre-test and post-test protocols. Rick's pre-test and post-test reading patterns are quite different. The pre-test reading pattern has been characterized as that of a category 2 reader, the post-test as that of a category 4 reader. The two protocols are different according to the manner in which Rick uses all of the reading processes outlined in the scale

In the pre-test interpretation Rick did not express a coherent **synthesis** of the text. He made a generally coherent statement after *listening* to the poem read aloud. He also paraphrased some lines and segments of the text but he did not do so clearly nor did he explain the relationship between various statements made. He referred vaguely to personal experiences (about technology and wars and travelling around the world on the last few pages of his pre-test interpretation) but these experiences are not clearly aligned with the details of the text. He **read and responded** to some lines of the text and to some segments of it but he did so with uncertainty and apparant confusion. He announced closure at line 38, page three of his pre-test interpretation and continued to comment on the poem only after being reminded that he could read through as many times as he wanted (it may be that he would simply have stopped reading and responding to the poem at this point had I not explained that he could reread. He may have done so to oblige me rather than to broaden his understanding of the poem). His subsequent remarks on pages four to line 23 on the page five, are brief statements about various details from the poem. After being reminded again, at this point, that he may read and comment further, he again continues making vague, general statements about birds and the 'guy' in the poem, often confusing the two, or talking about them at both a literal and metaphorical level. His **inferences** are often related to inappropriate details in the text.

In the post-test interpretation, Rick expresses a reasonably coherent **synthesis** of his understanding of the poem. Many of his reference(s) to specific details in the poem are not always *specifically* aligned and/or clearly related to his 'problem' framework, but he consistently assimilates and/or infers the poem's details within his 'problem' theme and thus does **synthesize** according to the way it is defined in the reading scale. Rick reads

and responds by paraphrasing the text repeatedly in his post-test interpretation. He does so to a thorough extent overlooking not one detail of the post-test poem. And in his constant referral to 'problems', he would seem to be tacitly aligning his own schemata and/or experience with problems with the concepts symbolized in the text. He has not only explained his reactions in appropriate detail but in rereading as often as he did, he worked through varying interpretations of his 'problem' theme and made consistent and repeated attempts to explain himself thus thoroughly **expanding and clarifying** his interpretation. The length of the two protocols (pre-test, eight pages; post-test, sixteen and-a-half pages) testifies to the difference between them in sheer quantity of explanation and rereading. He expresses uncertainty, attempts to resolve it and delays closure (voluntarily) to a far greater extent in the post-test interpretation. Rick's **inferences** are generally of a metaphorical nature in the post-test interpretation, that is, he assimilates most details symbolized in the text within the 'problem' framework. Thus, the **inferences** made are consistently and logically related to this framework at a metaphorical level. He generally does not make **inferences** that explain the relationship between the various literal details of the poem. Nonetheless, Rick does align his **inferences** with all of the details in the text, however densely metaphorical these inferences are.

In general then, there is a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test protocols in regard to **synthesis**; in the post-test there is synthesis, in the pre-test there is not. Rick **reads and responds** to the post-test text in much more detail, he paraphrases the text closely, reads it within the context of his background knowledge about 'problems' and explains his reactions in generally appropriate detail. His **reading and response** of the pre-test poem was unclear, personal experiences were inconsistently aligned with it and he explained his reactions in little detail. When reading the post-text, Rick **expanded and clarified** his interpretation by rereading, working repeatedly through varying interpretations related to his general 'problem' frame, resolving whatever uncertainty he expressed, expressing himself with reasonable clarity most of the time and certainly delaying closure. The pre-test interpretation was not at all **expanded and clarified** to this extent; he did not reread the text, did not resolve uncertainty, expressed himself with inconsistency and confusion and was ready to reach closure after a brief reading. **Inferences** made during the post-test interpretation are related to and

aligned with the details in the text; most of the details of the text are **inferred** within the context of Rick's 'problem' frame. **Inferences** made during the pre-test are inconsistently aligned with the text, contradictory and often illogical given the details in the text

Student: Sarah M.

Pre-test poem: Cyclops

Post-test poem Birds

Pre-test Protocol Analysis. Sarah's pre-test reading pattern is not as readily characterized by the reading scale as some of the other readers'. Her reading is aptly profiled by *almost* all of the statements describing a category 4 reader except the first, very important statement in the category 4 column which describes a reader who **synthesizes**. Sarah does not express a coherent **synthesis** of the text in her pre-test interpretation and thus, according to the scale, is not a category 4 reader. But, neither is her reading that of a category 3 reader according to most of the statements in that column. Though, she does not **synthesize**, the other statements in the category 3 column describe a poetry-reading process that is not as thorough and refined as Sarah's. For these reasons, Sarah's pre-test reading pattern is best described as primarily that of a category 4 reader whose protocol is that of a category 3 reader in one critical regard - lack of **synthesis**.

After the responding-aloud procedure is explained, Sarah expresses confusion 'I don't make much sense of it all right now' (page one, lines 22 & 30), then questions the meaning of the word "Cyclops": 'What does the first word Cyclops - Cyclopes or whatever?', (page one, line 34). This is explained: 'it's a character from mythology - from Greek mythology and Cyclops was a monster - a giant who had only one eye' (page one, lines 37 to 39). After a pause of half a minute, (page one, line 41), I remind Sarah to read and think out loud. She reads from the poem silently (page one, line 41 - 41 second pause) and **infers**, 'when I read the flashlight a single orange eye and ah unable to see what is beyond the capsule of your dim sight .. well it gives me the impression that ah can't see well' (page one, line 44 to page two, line 3).

She then refers to another line: 'bumps among the leaves' (page two, line 19), and says, 'I can't seem to make sense of the other .. I don't understand it at all' (page two, lines 15 & 19). She then strives to **expand and clarify** what she is reading, she asks, 'Am I missin' somethin'? Are they talkin' about somethin' there' (page two, lines 27 & 28). Again, she expresses uncertainty and general confusion. ' 'cause I don't see it. I don't understand' (page two, line 32). Sarah refers to the line in the poem: 'Is it true you have no fear?', saying, 'I think it's talkin' to this ah .. whatever it's called. I don't know.

Sayin' ah is it true you have no fear I think it's talkin' to the monster or whatever' (page two, lines 41 to 46) She is unable to explain who she means in referring to 'it' She says, 'I don't understand what he's - what his point is' (page three, line 5); it is equally unclear to whom she refers in saying his

She reads: 'Is it true you have no fear?' (page three, lines 11 & 12) and comments that, 'I don't see how there's any connection with swim in their darkness as in a river' (page three, lines 16 to 18) She is clearly aware that she is, in fact, trying to **infer** a connection between the lines she previously read from the text; she says again, 'I can't find any connection I can't make sense of this' (page three, line 22) After being reminded that she may continue reading until she feels satisfied with her interpretation, she reads from the text again. 'do not disguise yourself in armor', (page three, line 33), and says, 'I kind of get the feeling that he's not human - a machine or something' (page three, lines 37 & 38) It is not clear though, to what she refers in saying 'he's not human' It would seem that she is referring to the 'you' in the poem but this is not clear

Sarah reads. 'you are a chemical' (page four, line 3) rather than 'you are a chemical smell' as the punctuation of the poem suggests this line in stanza seven should be read She clearly relies on this line in **inferring**, 'makes me believe that whatever it is isn't really human' (page four, lines 3 & 4) She reads. 'A cold fire' (page four, line 8) and makes a deliberate attempt to understand the meaning of this two-word phrase by working at a literal interpretation of each word; she says, 'was thinkin' fire that doesn't give off heat And I think ah that's kind of impossible so I thought ah something growin' inside of you Doesn't give off too much heat 'cause you know it's inside of you ' (page four, lines 8 to 18) She is thus **reading and responding** by attempting to paraphrase She is also working to **expand and clarify** her interpretation by questioning details of the text, expressing uncertainty and attempting to resolve it, describing her thinking, expressing herself with reasonable clarity and delaying closure She attempts to establish the identity of the 'you' in the poem saying, 'whatever it is it's big and it's big goin' along the path whatever it is it's walkin' along the path' (page four, lines 22 to 29). She then refers to the phrase mosquito-doped 'Ah mosquito-doped, I don't understand what that . ' (page four line 33) and, after I literally define each of the two words separately, she **infers** 'Ah covered with mosquitos or swarmed on you' (page four, line 45)

Sarah **infers** (presumably after reading the the second line of the text silently), 'there's no moon so it's dark and .. the one that he has is ... but it's what he's using as a light' (page five, lines 5 to 10) It would seem that the word 'one' refers to the flashlight She reads again: 'unable to see what is beyond the capsule of your dim sight' (page five, lines 10 & 11) and then says 'that I think is the same with everybody' (page five, lines 11 & 12) She perhaps means that anybody using a flashlight is similarly unable to see beyond the beam of the light What Sarah has done so far is **read and respond** by rereading, paraphrasing the text quite closely and attempting to make **inferences** about the details in the text. She has also made explicit reference to the thinking and/or logic she uses to **expand and clarify** her interpretation She expresses deep frustration by sighing noticeably (see line 20), reads the phrase, 'contracts to a heart with terror' (page five, lines 20 & 24), expresses more misunderstanding 'I don't really understand what I can't make any sense of it' (page five, lines 28 & 29) then refers to the process she uses to make sense of the poem so far 'I seem to picture ah - this monster . bein' scared or in a rush or somethin' ' (page five, lines 33 & 34) Sarah continues to make an attempt to understand what the 'you' in the poem is; she says, 'I can't really see it I don't know' (page five, line 38) She reads the phrase, 'a fur throat' and expresses uncertainty about what this could mean 'A fur throat - I don't know what ' (page five, line 42). Because she is quite frustrated, I make a few comments to her about this phrase, though these comments are quite non-directive 'Well you know what a throat is and you know what fur is So it's just a question of figuring out why the author's put the words together that way' (page five, line 44 to page six, line 8) She rereads from the text again. 'What makes a bristling noise like a fur throat' (page five, line 29) She expresses confusion 'What makes a bristling noise like a fur throat? .. I don't I don't know what - what the point is' (page six, lines 25 to 27) She then rereads the line a third time, expresses more confusion and then continues reading another line from the text: 'And then it says, is it true you do not wish to hurt them?' (page six, lines 27 & 28) She says, 'gives me the impression that they're talkin' about - when they say what makes? They're talkin' about the what Do you understand what I mean?' (page six, lines 40 & 41) When asked to, 'say a bit more about that' (page six, line 39) she responds, 'what makes a bristling noise like a fur throat . something's makin' a noise like a fur throat and from what I can make this out, it's askin' is it true that

the monster doesn't want to hurt them. But I don't know what it is that makes the fur throat and that doesn't make sense because I should be gettin' somethin' up top but I can't' (page six, lines 41 to 46) She continues to **read and respond** by attempting to paraphrase, explain her reactions in appropriate detail and work to **expand and clarify** her understanding by questioning the details of the text, rereading, attempting to resolve her uncertainty, expressing herself with reasonable clarity, and delaying closure. She clearly explains her attempts to make **inferences** by referring to key segment and details in the text.

Sarah continues to read from the poem. 'Is it true you have no fear? That's straightforward' (page seven, lines 5 & 6) She reads 'let your eyes go bare' (page seven line 10) and responds, 'makes me wonder if they're still talkin' about the creature because it says up here one single orange eye and down here it says eyes' (page five, lines 24 & 25) She is thus monitoring her reading and continuously working to **expand and clarify** her thinking by relating relevant details of the poem to her understanding of other lines and segments. For example, she says, 'it kinda makes me wonder if they're still talkin' about the creature because it says up here one single orange eye and down here it says eyes. Kinds makes me wonder there. I can't see it. But when I read that - . it kinda makes me if they're talkin' about you - talkin' about a flashlight. It might have an orange light to it' (page seven, lines 14 to 31) Sarah is clearly relating lines and details of the poem with relevant others; she is aware that she does not know the identity of the 'you' in the poem and she aligns various details of the poem *with* the 'you' in her attempt to sort through her clearly expressed confusion. She reads 'Let your eyes go bare' (page seven line 43) and again responds, 'I don't understand that. It's sayin' ah . it's givin' me the impression up top that it's dark out and ya can't see nothin' except for the light you have and then it says let your eyes go bare. I don't understand' (page eight, lines 3 to 13)

Sarah reads 'Swim in their darkness as in a river' (page eight, lines 13 & 14) and responds with an attempt to paraphrase. She says, 'When they say their - they're referring to ah whatever it is that's makin' the noise or whatever' (page eight, lines 18 & 19) She then repeats this pattern of **reading and replying** by attempting to paraphrase, she says, 'when I read the third one down again? Contracts to a heart? I'm startin' to wonder if um its just referrin' to the creature or me - whatever - it's just walkin' says ah makes a

bristling noise like a fur throat That's be you walkin' on the leaves. And then when I read ah is it true you do not wish to hurt them I'm thinkin' of the leaves but that really doesn't make sense so that's about all the sense I can make out of it you know' (page eight, lines 27 to 43) Sarah works steadily at her interpretation and associates the flashlight with 'your eyes'. She has previously said, 'It kinda makes me wonder if they're talkin' about you - talkin' about a flashlight It might have an orange light to it .. bein' maybe as you're your eyes because it's 'oo dark' (page eight, lines 30 & 31). She has consistently attempted to identify the 'you' in the poem and brings relevant details from the poem to bear on this reference.

Sarah continues to read in an attempt to expand and clarify her interpretation. 'Just let your eyes go bare, it gives me the impression um just walk, don't be careful, just go and relax' (page nine, lines 7 & 8) She again reads 'Do not disguise yourself in armor' (page nine, line 16) She *infers*, 'don't build yourself so there's a wall around you' (page nine, line 17) She relates this statement with her previous understanding of that line saying, 'that's the opposite of what I said earlier 'cause I thought before that um it meant somebody that would be in an armor suit so I don't know' (page nine, lines 18 to 20) As she continues, she again relates what she says to a previously expressed understanding 'and when it says they watch you from hiding that ruins everything I just said about the leaves because leaves can't watch you from hiding so I'm lost again' (page nine, lines 24 to 26) In consistently attempting to **expand and clarify** her interpretation, Sarah explicitly points out her own confusions and contradictions She reads from the text again: 'Their monstrous night thick with possible claws' (page nine, lines 26 & 27) and *infers*, 'gives me the impression of bears somehow ... or animals that could hurt you' (page nine, lines 32 & 36) She then describes the logic supporting her inference, 'like when you say claws thinkin' of claws so somethin' could hurt you' (page nine, lines 36 & 37).

Sarah comments, 'That's about all the sense I can make out of it. I can't seem to figure anything else out. When it says you are the hugest monster ... it makes me think about you're in the woods . and all the animals seem smaller than you then when I think about it, bears and stuff like that wouldn't really be smaller . so you have to go back to thinkin' it's a huge creature and that was the third thing that I think about so I'm just - funny. I don't make any sense out of it' (page nine, 38 to page ten, line 6). To this

point, Sarah has **read and responded** by bringing many relevant details of the poem to bear on her attempt to identify the 'you' in the poem, she has **paraphrased** the lines of the text and made logical **inferences** about the details in the poem. And in **expanding and clarifying** her interpretation, she is also quite clearly focused on, and aware of, why she reads and how she relates the elements of the poem. She says, 'I don't see it ... that's about it ... I said opposites though, I said like one minute it's me and the next minute it's a creature' (page ten, lines 10, 22 & 23). She is aware that she has not reached a **synthesis** of the elements of the poem.

Post-test Protocol Analysis. Sarah's post-test reading pattern is that of a category 4 reader.

After hearing the poem read aloud, Sarah's initial response is 'I think it's basically about one person who sees the life of a bird as perfect like ... and what the bird does is perfect. Like we - as humans we do things that are wrong but he's thinkin' that the bird just has its own ways. Everything's perfect ... and he's rather be a bird. Well have the life of a bird' (page one, lines 24 to 35). She thus establishes a general framework within which she may assimilate the details symbolized in the text. Sarah asks about the meanings of "kestrel" and "dominion" (page one, lines 39 & 45).

Sarah reads the first line of the poem (page two, lines 4 & 5), and expresses some uncertainty and frustration as she attempts to establish the literal meaning of the phrase by paraphrasing it. She says, 'I don't understand this ... perfect. Is perfect in the bird. ... The only thing I can think of is he's - that there's perfection in the bird' (page two, lines 9 to 15). She reads the second line of the text, asks about the word "kestrel" 'What's - it says weapon kestrel?' (page two, line 23) and I define it for her. She then struggles to **infer** the significance of the word weapon saying, ' ... so the weapon is just somethin' I'm supposed to think about? Or does that have to do with the bird? ... It's just like that word. It's just the bird alone' (page two, lines 31 & 32). She repeats the second line of the text replacing the word "kestrel" with the term that I have used to define it for her (i.e. hawk), saying 'Weapon hawk hard as a blade's curve ...' (page two, line 41). Sarah continues to struggle toward an **inference** of the second line of the text. She says, 'thinkin' of the beak maybe ... hard as a blades' curve. And a blade that might have a curve - the beak might have a curve in it ... and the weapon would be

his beak 'cause he uses it to do different things' (page two, line 45 to page three, line 11). In **reading and responding** by as she does here by paraphrasing, and in **expanding and clarifying** her interpretation after initially expressing uncertainty about this line of the poem, Sarah **infers** that the blade's curve might be a beak. She then explains the association she perceives between 'beak' and 'blade' by concluding that weapon, beak and blade are synonymous because they are all used to do different things. Sarah asks about the word "thrust", (page three, line 15) which I define after clarifying that the word is, in fact '*thrush*'. She then **reads and responds** by and paraphrasing the third line from the text: 'Thrush round as a mother or a full drop of water. I guess that line's just saying this thrush type of bird is plump' (page three, lines 19 & 20). She then about the word 'swerve' the literal meaning of which is defined. She then refers to the fourth line of the poem and agains responds by paraphrasing it saying, 'Fruit-green parrot - that'd be describing the color of the parrot maybe' (page three, lines 28 & 29). She then aligns details of her background knowledge about parrots with this fourth line of the text saying, 'they say parrot's are sometimes wise. They can say words and stuff' (page three, lines 33 & 34). She **infers** that 'shrieking swerve' means, 'just the way he moves I guess .. it's quick' (page three, lines 38 to 43). She has thus **read and responded** to the first stanza by paraphrasing each line, making inferences that are logically related to the details in the text, and **expanded and clarified** her interpretation by asking questions about words that she doesn't understand. She has also expressed some uncertainty (page two, lines 40 & 41, in referring to the second line of the poem) which she has worked out.

Sarah reads the last line of the first stanza and **infers** that 'a bird is a bird and no matter what way you describe it it's gonna be a bird' (page four, lines 5 & 6). This statement also paraphrases the first stanza. She reads the first line of the second stanza (page four, line 9), and **infers** that 'everything he does is right. He has his own ways ... there's not really any laws' (page four, lines 10 & 14). She **reads** the second line of the second stanza and **responds** by expressing a tentative interpretation of that line by aligning an aspect of her background knowledge with it, after which she then makes an **inference** about details in that line. She says, 'usually when I think of hunger I think you want somethin' now .. maybe he wants the sky. He usually doesn't want to be on the ground' (page four, lines 25 to 30). The **inference**, aligned with her experience of 'hunger', is that 'maybe he wants the sky. He doesn't want

to be on the ground' She reads the third line of the second stanza, and comments on the phrase 'trembling dew' from that line; she **infers** that, 'maybe it's trembling dew because there's wind or somethin' (page four lines 33 & 34). By thus commenting only about the phrase 'trembling dew', Sarah overlooks the subject of that phrase - the thrush. She then briefly reads and responds to the fourth line of the second stanza by **inferring**, 'the next line's just describing how clever a parrot would be' (page four, lines 38 & 39). She then reads and paraphrases the last line of the second stanza. 'It's just saying that again the bird he does these things. It's what he does' (page four, lines 43 & 44).

Sarah makes a clear and coherent summary of the first two stanzas. She says, 'so far we have just the first two paragraphs. We have just three types of birds being described ... it's saying that that's their life and that's their life and what they're doin' is right. And I'm thinkin' maybe that birds don't do things wrong. like I mean if you're walkin' down the road and they plop on their head, well they don't mean to so . . .' (page five, lines 4 to 7). In saying this, Sarah consolidates her (previous) line by line paraphrase of the first two stanzas, and aligns a detail of her general experience about birds with that summary. She reads the first line of the third stanza, asks about the word "beleaguered" and **infers**, 'I guess - I think that's saying that a bird wouldn't be' (page five, lines 24 & 25), meaning that the bird wouldn't be beleaguered. She has originally pointed out a contrast between birds and humans on the first page of her protocol and **infers** that the phrase 'beleaguered by my own people' is in contrast to the life of a bird which is not "beleaguered". She makes another statement about this phrase: 'he sees that all these people as one maybe but they fight. That doesn't make sense. I can't think of what I'm tryin' ta say' (page five, lines 30 & 31). After expressing such uncertainty, she continues to read and **infers** that 'the blood that feeds my heart' means '... he was born from them. It's all the same blood' (page five, lines 36 & 37). She has interpreted the poem, to this point, by **reading and responding** by paraphrasing it one line at a time, making **inferences** that are clearly aligned with it and also aligning her own experiences with relevant segments of the text. She has also **expanded and clarified** her interpretation by questioning details of the poem, expressing uncertainty which she attempts to resolve, describing her thinking at times and expressing herself with reasonable clarity as well as delaying closure in doing so. Sarah reads the third line of the third

stanza. 'My heart is the house where they gather and fight for dominion' (page five, lines 41 & 42). She then immediately **infers** that, 'maybe he's saying it's not a physical fight ... it's inside of him It's his heart that everybody seems to you know that's where he sees it all . maybe the person is ah - they see things different and maybe they're expressing themselves Like they're not keepin' it to themselves .' (page five, line 42 to page six, line 12).

Though Sarah does not specifically explain who she means by 'the person' and 'they', or explain what kind of a 'fight' she thinks it is, she clearly **infers** that there is a difference of opinion being expressed. She elaborates on this in the next few lines saying, '... maybe the other people think that this person is ah a little off the rocker or a little ya know just different' (page six, lines 20 & 21) She reads from the text again and immediately **infers** that 'to turn me into the ways of other people would be to make them one of them' (page six, lines 25 & 26). She then reads from the text and expresses some confusion about the first line of the last stanza: 'I could leave their battleground for the forest of a bird ... if the forest of a bird ... I don't really understand that' (page six, lines 30 to 32) Though she has not referred clearly to whom she means by 'the person', 'they' and 'other people' she *has* clearly expressed her understanding of 'things' being seen differently, people not keeping things to themselves and 'other people' making someone 'one of them' She rereads: 'it says the forest of a bird' (page six, line 36) and aligns an aspect of her personal knowledge with this line of the poem. She says, 'It's like the saying um I can't think of the saying. They go together like birds of a feather . And I cannot - every time I hear that I think it's stupid' (page six, lines 41 to 46) but she doesn't align this statement with her understanding of any concepts symbolized in the poem

Sarah comments on the manner in which poets make certain phrases to represent different concepts saying She attempts to **expand and clarify** her understanding of the phrase, 'the forest of a bird' by commenting on a poet's deliberate use of language: 'I don't understand how poets do that I don't understand the meaning of it. The forest of a bird I guess just the forest belongs to the bird That's what they're tryin' to say' (page seven, lines 5 to 7). She thus **infers** that the phrase 'the forest of a bird' means, 'the forest belongs to the bird' (page seven, line 7). She reads from the text again: 'I could melt the past, the present and the future in one and find the words that lie behind

all these languages' (page seven lines 7 to 9). She immediately **infers**, 'melt the past slowly and get rid of it' (page seven, line 9). She also then expresses uncertainty about the phrase from the text 'melt the past, present and the future'. She says, 'He's gonna melt the past, the present and the future. I don't get that. When I think of melting I think of a slow process. something goin' away slowly' (page seven, lines 18 & 19). Again she repeats her uncertainty about this line thus delaying closure in an effort to **expand and clarify** her interpretation. She repeats, 'He says I could melt the past, the present and future. That don't make sense. OK maybe he could melt the past and put the present and the future in one. Maybe he's doin' like that' (page seven, (lines 29 to 31)). She continues to work at an interpretation of this line, **inferring**, 'So what's happening now, what's happened in the future is going to be one maybe one new life' (page seven, lines 35 & 36). Sarah continues to **read and respond** to the last stanza of the poem. She reads the third-last line of the poem: 'Find the words that lie behind all these languages', and expresses confusion about the word 'languages'. She says, 'I don't know why he says languages' (page seven, lines 40 & 41). She then **infers** that 'he' might be 'tryin' ta discover the meaning behind bird talk. Like how they squawk or whatever. Maybe that's what he's referrin' to as these languages. maybe then he's tryin' to find the human words for the bird talk' (page eight, lines 3 to 6). She immediately moves from this **inference** to another about the point of view from which the poem is written saying, 'So I don't know if it'd be a bird now or not. Like in his mind I don't know what' (page eight, lines 6 to 8).

It's not clear what Sarah means in saying, 'I don't know if it'd be a bird now or not. in his mind'. She may mean, 'I don't know if the person would be a bird now, but she has been working through the text from the point of view that the 'I' in the text has *been* a person, as she said on the first page of her protocol. She hasn't ever said that the text *is* about a bird so it is perplexing to see that she doesn't think it is a bird 'now'. She continues to read without clarifying this, asking about the word "fuse" (page eight, line 8). She then **infers** what is meant by the phrase, "clear stone". She says, 'maybe he's referrin' to his life as a clear stone because as humans - people do things wrong but he's still thinkin' the bird is perfect. . so it'd be clear because it'd have no faults in it' (page eight, lines 20 & 21). Sarah explains this **inference** by associating the phrase "clear stone", the bird's life, and 'his life' which,

presumably, means 'humans' lives. She then relates this inference with the last line of the poem: 'And be simple to myself as the bird is to the bird. He's just saying ah the bird in his own life is ah simple. He's just does things right. He does what's supposed to be done. And that's the way he wants to be' (page eight, lines 22 to 25). She then announces that, 'that's about all I can get from it' (page eight, line 29).

Sarah expresses a coherent **synthesis** and, in doing so, relates various lines and details in the poem. She says, 'OK it's a guy and he's - or a girl. They're comparing their life - saying how bad it is compared to the life of a bird because he sees no faults in a bird (page eight, lines 39 to 41). She then refers to two lines in the third stanza: 'He's torn and beleaguered by my own people' (page eight, line 45 to page nine, line 9) and says, 'maybe he's confused there because someone from his family is on the wrong side and he's good and maybe he doesn't understand how two people could be different like that 'cause birds are all the same maybe he thinks . They all wanna give him a different type of life' (page nine, lines 11 to 18). She further elaborates on this statement: 'Like ya know do it my way. Do it my way. Live like me. Live like me. And he sees it as one large battleground. Just people tryin' to constantly tryin' to change people. People doin' things ya know not right. Says I could melt the past and he's sayin' that if he could maybe live the life of a bird or be in the forest alone maybe ya know isolate himself from the rest of the world then he'd be able to forget it. Melt the past. He'd be able to forget it. That's about all I can get from it' (page nine, lines 27 to 34). In elaborating on her previous **synthesis** as she has done here, she **expands and clarifies** her interpretation and consolidates her previous **reading and response** to the entire poem. In this statement of her protocol, Sarah **synthesizes** her line by line paraphrasing of the various words, lines and segments and assimilates virtually all the **inferences** she has made throughout her interpretation.

Comparison of pre-test and post-test protocols. The most important difference between Sarah's pre-test and post-test interpretations, is that in her post-test interpretation she expressed a coherent **synthesis** of the poem; in her pre-test interpretation she did not. This difference has an interesting effect on her pattern of **reading and response, attempt(s) to expand and clarify her interpretation** and the manner in which she **supports her inferences**. For

example, Sarah paraphrases both texts closely and carefully, explains her reactions in generally appropriate detail, rereads, attempts to resolve uncertainty, is aware of her interpretative process, expresses herself with reasonable clarity and logically aligns her **inferences** with the details of both texts. As she responds to the post-test text, she is able to assimilate all such responses within a coherent framework, conclusively express a coherent **synthesis** and interweave various concepts, about which she has made logical **inferences** and general summaries, within that coherent **synthesis** at the end of her interpretation. She is not able to draw the various interpretative **responses**, attempts to **expand and clarify** her interpretation, and **inferences** into a coherent **synthesis** in her pre-test interpretation. As a result, the post-test interpretation is more coherent than the pre-test though all of the interpretive elements (as outlined in the reading scale) are present in both protocols. This difference makes Sarah's post-test interpretation clearly that of a category 4 reader, where her pre-test interpretation is not *quite* that of a category 4 reader due to the absence of **synthesis**. There is no great difference between the two protocols in terms of **critical reaction**.

Student: Eric B

Pre-test poem: Birds

Post-test poem: Cyclops

Pre-test Protocol Analysis. In his pre-test interpretation, Eric's reading is that of a category 4 reader

The responding-aloud procedure is explained (lines 3 to 20), and Eric initially expresses uncertainty and puzzlement: 'Well I know it's talkin' about birds - that's one thing. ... I don't really understand - I know it's saying something about birds and everything ... and maybe how peaceful its life is or how like ... how cruel it is - I don't know (page one, lines 26 to 32) He then reads the first line and a phrase from the second line of the last stanza: 'If I could leave my battleground for the forest of a bird, I could melt the past - it's kind of complicated' (page one, lines 36 & 37).

Eric begins to **expand and clarify** his interpretation by asking about the word "kestrel" (page one, line 45), and the phrase "shrieking swerve" (page two, line 5), and I define these terms (page two, lines 3 & 12) The responding-aloud procedure is reviewed due to Eric's uncertainty about how to proceed: 'how about reading it through yourself now and as you read it perhaps one line at a time or two or three or whatever way you decide to do it, just sort of read it and tell me what you're thinking as you're trying ... you can read it as many times as you want to until you're satisfied with your understanding of what it means' (page two, lines 24 to 34), after which Eric reads the first two stanzas aloud (page two, lines 36 to 42).

Eric **responds** by attempting to paraphrase what he has read and also makes **inferences** that are generally aligned with details in these stanzas: 'the bird it's maybe suffering maybe - probably no or I know the kestrel's a ah ... a hawk or something - maybe hawks are supposed to be dane ... it's kind of complicated ... so can I read it over again' (page three, lines 3 to 11) In these lines Eric has begun to **expand and clarify** his understanding (as well as establish the literal meaning of some details in the first two stanzas) by expressing uncertainty and attempting to resolve it by rereading. He rereads the first line of the text and expresses more uncertainty: 'Whatever the bird is is a perfect - is perfect - so that means ... whatever the bird is it's ah ... I don't - I don't think I can get that line' (page two, lines 17 to 20). Eric then rereads the first and second stanzas and works at **expanding and clarifying** his interpretation by asking a

question about the second line of the second stanza: 'Is he like that - kes - it's cruel - the kestrel is supposed to be mean?' (page two, line 37). He thus does not overlook details he does not understand but rereads the text, expresses difficulty and asks a question about the text. He then tentatively *infers*, 'Maybe he's eating - well just killing other birds or taking food. I don't know' (page two, lines 44 & 45), this statement is clearly aligned with details from the first and second stanza.

Eric then says, 'that's about it' (page four, line 9), and I assume he is referring to his understanding of the first and second stanzas. Thus when he asks, 'do I keep on reading?' (page four, line 13), I tell him, 'sure' to suggest that he *may* do so, though not *directing* him to. He then reads the third stanza aloud (page four, lines 17 to 20), and responds by tentatively *inferring* the general message or point of the poem, he says, 'well the other two stanzas - I think well - I doubt it - are comparing maybe ah their life to maybe an animal life - somethin' like that. I don't know if it's right' (page four, lines 21 to 27). After I suggest that he can, 'read through again and again if you want to' (page four, lines 29 & 30), he rereads the last stanza aloud and responds, 'I don't get it. I just don't get this at all. I keep trying but it's kind of complicated. Can I read it one more time' (page four, line 43 & page five, lines 3, 7, & 12). He continues to **expand and clarify** his interpretation by rereading, and expressing uncertainty which he attempts to resolve. He is also clearly expressing the confusion he experiences in attempting to interpret certain details in the poem.

He rereads the first two stanzas (page five, lines 16 to 22), seems confused and uncertain about what to do: 'I just can't get it - it's kind of hard. Well I know it's wrong but I think like something - I know it's about birds and how birds suffer or something - like - this is hard to explain. And like what I think is like maybe he's somebody ah - the poet is comparing his life - I mean like humans to maybe animals - to make a - like to draw a point - or something ... which I doubt' (page five, lines 27 to page six, line 15). In saying this, Eric is expressing a very broad, though reasonably coherent statement about the general message of the poem. He does not yet say what he thinks that point is but he continues to **expand and clarify** this aspect of his interpretation in subsequent lines. Eric says, for example, 'he's saying that. 'cause he goes he's beleaguered by his own people - that's being like bothered?' (page six, lines 19 & 20). He then *infers*, (based on his understanding of 'beleaguered'): 'so

maybe he's like saying that like with the birds - maybe a bird is like kestrel .. well doin' the same thing to the smaller birds .. like bothering them - taking the food away .. um he's comparin' that to - well to birds and all' (page six, lines 28 to 42) In saying this, Eric is elaborating on his general statement that the 'poet is comparin' his life to .. to animals to draw a point' (page six, lines 5 to 7) The very general **synthesis** on page six (lines 5 to 42) has been expressed after Eric has **expanded and clarified** by rereading, expressing uncertainty and expressing himself with reasonable (if tentatively expressed) clarity and made **inferences** that are with reasonable clarity aligned with details in the poem

Eric **reads** from the last stanza: 'If I could leave their battleground for the forest of a bird', and **responds** by attempting to paraphrase it. He says, 'that means if I could leave their battleground - that means the people - I think is maybe his people' (page seven, lines 6 to 8) He **infers** here that the phrase 'their battleground' (in the first line of the last stanza) refers to the people's battleground He then reads 'for the forest of a bird' and **infers**, 'that means maybe where the birds are' (page seven, line 12) He then reads the last stanza (page seven, lines 13 to 41), and as he does so says, 'I don't get that .. I just can't figure out what they're trying to say .. and when it says language, does he mean language speech?' (page seven, lines 18 & 19, 31 & 42).

Eric **infers** that the line, 'find the words that lie behind all these languages' means, 'maybe find the prob- .. the reasons why all these things happen' (page eight, line 3) He then struggles with various interpretations of what the term, 'languages' means He **infers**, 'but languages doesn't have nothin' to do with ah like by languages he means .. tongues .. like you know speech but here he goes "find the words that lie behind all these language" - maybe he could be saying languages is like maybe the problems I don't know. I guess so .. The problems - ah what's goin' on - the reasons behind all this and then he could .. clear everything up like put everything away like finally figure it out .. means to be simple to myself - means at last to be at peace with myself maybe, I think .. as he says to the bird is to the bird' (page eight, lines 7 to 26) Eric has **expanded and clarified** his interpretation over the last several lines of his protocol, he has reread the last stanza, questioned the meaning of different terms in it, expressed uncertainty, made **inferences** about the meaning of the various phrases, and clearly aligned what he has said with the details of this stanza. These interpretive processes serve to

expand on his general **synthesis** that the poet is comparing his life to that of animals and/or birds (see page six, lines 5 to 7) Having **read and responded** and **expanded** his understanding of these last two stanzas to this extent, he then furthers **clarifies** his understanding of lines from the last stanza 'I could melt the past, the present - I'm not too sure about that' 'If I could leave their battleground for the forest of a bird' when he says battleground he means maybe the people that's are - that are beleaguering him or bothering? '(page eight, lines 33 to 44) This (underlined) **inference** is clearly and logically aligned with details of the poem

Eric reads the last stanza of the text again and, intersperses his reading of each line with interpretive **inferences** that are clearly and logically aligned with the details in the poem. In doing so, he also refines the **synthesis** he has previously expressed. He says, for example, 'he could melt the past, present and future in one and he might try to find the reasons, the secrets or the problems behind all these' 'like well all these you know things that are going on .. and finally he could like prob'ly put everything into one and figure it out and then he'd be at peace with himself' (page nine, lines 7 to 14) Eric then asks about what the poem 'actually' means (page nine, line 23) and I reassure him that I am interested in the process *he* has followed to reach his interpretation and that he may read if he wishes to (page nine, lines 37 to 42) He rereads the third stanza (page ten, lines 8 to 11), announces that, 'it's pretty complicated' (page ten, line 12), then rereads the second line of the second stanza, and continues to read the third stanza aloud pausing for a few seconds here and there as he does so. He confirms his understanding of the term "beleaguered" (page ten, line 33). After rereading: 'I'm torn and beleaguered by my own people. The blood that feeds my heart is the blood they gave me', he simultaneously uses key reading processes and subprocesses in **expanding and clarifying** his **synthesis, reading and responding** to many details in the last stanza and making **inferences** that are logically aligned with details in the text. He says, 'I'm thinkin' that maybe they're saying like since he's saying that um he's torn and beleaguered by his own people' 'maybe like you know how people say you're the same blood - that means you're the same family or ah same country, same race and maybe he's sayin that the blood that's going through his veins or his blood that he has the same blood like them - his own people even though they're bein' - he's being tortured, bothered by them' 'same country, same language or something and he's saying that well the

blood that feeds my heart, or the blood that's going through me is the same blood that well same basic blood, I mean same people that are bothering me' (page ten line 38 to page eleven, line 13). He then rereads the last stanza and again **expands and clarifies** his previously expressed **synthesis** as he makes **inferences** logically aligned with details in that stanza: 'And my heart is the house where they gather and fight for dominion . maybe that line means that well 'cause of that - 'cause for the same reason they're still fighting like they're still against each other All different, all with a wish and a will to save me, to turn me into the ways of other people .. maybe he's like tryin' to say that maybe he's different from them or he doesn't believe what they believe and ah 'cause of that it's causing the fight and well they're tryin' to turn him away to go with them or something' (page eleven, lines 21 to 29) Eric continues to **expand and clarify** his interpretation; he rereads the first stanza and paraphrases it, then concludes by assimilating details from the first two stanzas within his overall **synthesis**. 'they're sayin' that whatever the bird does - it should be that way because basically they're animals and they . whatever birds do it should be that way but maybe this poem is trying to tell you is that us - we shouldn't be that way. Like would never have a kestrel ah dividing hunger Maybe taking the food away or killing - it's just part of nature for birds to do that but when it comes to us like - you know people - we shouldn't be doin' that you know We should be stayin' as one - same people and as he said all these are birds and are good for birds to do That means it should be that way, whatever happens. It's just nature . ' (page twelve, lines 3 to 19). Eric continues to elaborate on his understanding of how the second stanza relates to his interpretation then concludes, 'they're sayin' whatever the bird is is perfect in the bird - it should be that way but with us it shouldn't be and that's maybe what the whole poem is try n' to say' (page twelve, lines 36 to 38) Eric's protocol is a clear example of a category 4 reader; he has used all of the reading processes outlined in the scale for this pattern of reading.

Post-test Protocol Analysis. In his post-test interpretation Eric's reading is also that of a category 4 reader

The responding-aloud procedure is explained (page one, lines 3 to 24) and after the poem is read Eric refers to the title of the poem and makes a brief statement about his knowledge of Cyclops: 'I know what Cyclops is. It's

usually some monster with one eye' (page one, lines 34 & 35). He also makes a brief statement about his general knowledge of poetry; he says, 'I know like in poems OK they can't be too easy because Cyclops in the poem'll talk about that because it's usually ah a different meaning you know' (page one, lines 39 to 41). In saying that concepts or words such as 'Cyclops', 'usually have different meaning', Eric describes his metacognitive knowledge about reading poetry. He is thus perhaps establishing how he will read the poem, i.e. by assuming that the literal details symbolize 'different meanings'.

Eric asks about the word "Cyclops" and confirms that his understanding is accurate (page one, line 45 to page two, line 14). He then **reads and responds** by paraphrasing the first stanza and aligning some knowledge about Cyclops with the details in that stanza: 'you going along the path, mosquito-doped with no moon, the flashlight a single orange eye . well the flashlight a single orange eye unable to see what is beyond the capsule of your dim sight I'm just gonna explain the first ... ah well the first stanza is pretty straightforward . . like the guy's walking down a path. It's nighttime There's a lot of mosquitos around and there's no moon which makes it really more darker. And the flashlight is describing what the flash it looks like a single orange eye . Now as I know that a Cyclops usually has one eye so maybe that could have a sort of a connection' (page two, lines 18 to 36). He thus **infers** that there may be some association between the Cyclops and the 'single orange eye'.

Eric reads the second stanza: 'Unable to see what is beyond the capsule of your dim sight, what shape' (page two, lines 44 & 45). As most students, he does not continue the conclusion of the phrase: 'what shape contracts to a heart with terror...'. He stops there and thus does not read the second and third stanzas as one continuous phrase as the syntax and punctuation suggest it should be read. He paraphrases this second stanza and, at the same time, makes an **inference** about the phrase, 'capsule of your dim sight'. He says, 'that means you're walking He's - the guy's walkin' down the path and like the flashlight is like illuminating the pathway but you can't see beyond like a certain way your eyes can't go beyond You don't know what's waiting for you at the other end' (page two, line 45 to page three, line 12). Eric then reads the third stanza but, because he has not read it as a continuation from the second, he does not realize that '*contracts to a heart*' follows from the second stanza. He thus does not also see that the word *what* is elliptical in the

phrase, 'bumps among the leaves' and that the phrase is intended to be read as. '*what* bumps among the leaves'. For these reasons, he reads: 'Contracts to a heart with terror Bumps Among the leaves What makes a bristling noise like a fur throat' and **infers**: 'maybe the *guy* is scared Like he doesn't know what's going from either end of this path Starts getting scared and his heart starts to pump up, beat, go bumps' (page three, lines 23 to 29) By making an association between 'the guy' and 'terror (rather than *what shape* contracts with terror, and *what shape* bumps among the leaves) Eric has thus established a frame within which he **infers** that 'the guy' is scared He then reads. 'bumps among the leaves, What makes a bristling noise like a fur throat' and **infers**, 'he's prob'ly walking over the leaves which makes funny noises which is prob'ly giving him scared 'Cause when you're scared your imagination always wants .. wild you know ... so he starts to get scared I think' (page three, lines 35 to 42)

Eric reads from the text. 'Is it true you don't wish to hurt them' (page four, line 3) and **expands and clarifies** his understanding by expressing uncertainty which he attempts to resolve He rereads this line and says, 'maybe in the poem like you're the Cyclops - you're the Cyclops ... like since they describe the Cyclops as - it has one eye right? ... so maybe you're ... the monster. ... 'cause you have the flashlight. You resemble the . Cyclops in a way' (page four, lines 9 to 19). Having established this **inference** about the identity of the 'you' in the poem, Eric then refers to a detail about the 'bristling noise' mentioned previously in the poem. 'while you're walkin' you're makin' a noise' (page four, line 23) He **infers** that, 'You're prob'ly scaring somebody else' (page four, lines 23 & 24) meaning 'the Cyclops' is doing so In saying this, Eric revises a previous statement: 'the guy is scared . like he doesn't know what's going from either end of this path' (page three lines 23 & 24) Eric reads the phrase, 'Is it true you do not wish to hurt them?' (page four, line 33) and **infers**, 'you're just a guy takin' a walk through the night' (page four, lines 34 & 35). This response seems more aligned with his general statements about what 'the Cyclops is doing' (walking and making a noise - page four, line 23), than any of the details in the line he has just read from the text Again he reads: 'Take off your shoes then. Let your eyes go bare Swim in their darkness as in a river' His subsequent statements are loosely related to the details referred to in these lines For example, he **infers**, 'maybe he's lookin' for somebody or he's lookin' for somebody but maybe he's lookin' for

somebody I don't know in the forest. I don't know playin' a game. I don't know what they're doin' (page four, lines 35 to 40) He does not persist in attempting to interpret these lines and it is not clear who or what he means by 'they're'. It is interesting that Eric does not attempt to sort through his difficulty with these lines. He has clearly established his understanding of who the 'you' is in each of these lines, having previously said, 'you're the Cyclops' (page four, line 9), and 'you're like you're the monster' (page four, line 17) and 'you resemble . the Cyclops in a way' (page four, lines 18 & 19) Yet when he has read the previously referred to four lines in the poem, (after having also previously established that 'you're scaring somebody else' - page four, lines 23 & 24), he repeatedly remarks that 'he's lookin' for somebody I don't know playin' a game' (page four, lines 38 & 39). These remarks seem inconsistent, both with the details mentioned in the lines of the text that Eric has just read, and the statements he has previously made about 'the Cyclops' (unless, in saying 'he's looking for somebody', Eric means that Cyclops is looking for somebody) To first say that 'the guy' is the Cyclops, that he is making a noise and scaring everybody and that he is the monster, and, then remark that he is looking for somebody playing a game, is contradictory and curiously inconsistent with Eric's pattern, thus far, of making **inferences** clearly and logically associated with the details and concepts symbolized in the text. He reads the line, 'is it true you have no fear' (page four, line 44 line 41) and makes an **inference** about this line as though it is a statement instead of a question. He says, 'it goes maybe you're not scared 'cause you're lookin' for the people You're lookin' for the well not the victims but the people you know. You're lookin' for them so you're not scared' (page four, line 44 to page five, line 4).

Eric rereads two lines from the fifth stanza: 'Take off your shoes then, let your eyes go bare' (page five, line 5) and **infers** both that, 'you take off your shoes you won't hear anything' (page five, lines 5 & 6), and then seeming to rephrase that thought says, 'you be . . . quieter so they won't hear you coming' (page five, lines 6 & 7) He then reads from the text 'let your eyes go bare (page five, line 7) and **infers** ' ... you keep a good watch out for them or keep on lookin' (page five, lines 8 & 9) He reads again 'Swim in their darkness as in a river' (page five, lines 9 & 10) and **infers**, ' when it's dark, you can see them but they can't see you .. you know where they are but they don't know where you are' (page five, lines 10 to 12). He also **infers** that 'their darkness' is

'like a big void - like they don't know ... where you are' (page five, line 14) In **reading and responding** as he does here, Eric's **inferences** are consistent with most details of the general interpretive framework established on the previous page. That is, the responses he has made are logically aligned with the interpretation that 'you' or 'the guy' in the poem is the Cyclops. Though he does not identify what, or who he means in using the words they, them and their, it is clear who he means in using the word, 'you' and Eric expresses a clear and consistent relationship between 'you', and 'they' and 'them'. He summarizes his understanding of this relationship, saying, 'they get scared at you 'cause you just walk in without them knowing you know you're free and you're not scared you know. You're the one that's lookin' for them so you ... have no fear at all' (page five, lines 18 to 24). He reads from the text again: 'Do not disguise yourself in armour (page five, line 25) and continues without responding. He then reads from the text again: 'They watch you from hiding. You are a chemical smell, a cold fire. You are giant and indefinable' (page five, lines 30 & 31) and makes **inferences** that are logically related with the details symbolized in the text and consistent with the general frame (i.e. that 'you' are the Cyclops that's 'lookin' for them') within which he has been interpreting the concepts symbolized in the text. For example he **infers** that '... you're lookin' for somebody but they know you're coming now and .. maybe they could smell you ...' (page five, lines 32 to 34). He rereads: 'A cold fire, you are giant and indefinable' (page five, line 39) and **infers**, 'they can't define what you are or who you are' (page five, lines 39 & 40). And he then reads the rest of the poem (page five, lines 40 to 42) and **infers** that, '... they can't define what you are or who you are for them, they don't know what you are - who you are so for them like their imagination .. runs wild... you could be anything for them ... and right now for them, you're the hugest monster coming to get them' (page five, lines 39 to page six, line 8).

Eric deliberately **expands and clarifies** his interpretation saying, 'I'll go back again 'cause there's some things I didn't get' (page six, line 21). He then rereads the fifth and sixth stanzas and again interprets the statement 'Is it true you have no fear', to mean '... maybe you don't need any protection ... 'cause you are the monster. You're not scared of anything so you don't need any armour to protect yourself 'cause you are big. You're huge. I think that's all I can get' (page six, lines 32 to 35). He has assimilated most details of the poem within the frame that he has previously expressed on page four of his

interpretation: 'you're the monster. Like ... 'cause you have the flashlight. You resemble the Cyclops in a way' (page four, lines 17 to 19).

Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test Protocols. Both of Eric's protocols are that of a category 4 reader but in his *pre-test* interpretation, he uses the reading strategies described in that category more extensively than in his post-test interpretation. He rereads, and **expands and clarifies** his pre-test interpretation in much more detail and thus makes more **inferences** in the pre-test interpretation. As a result, he aligns many more details of the text with the **synthesis** he expresses in his pre-test interpretation. These differences between the two protocols are pointed to by the length(s) of the two protocols; the pre-test one is twelve pages, the post-test, six.

There are differences between the two protocols in regard to the manner in which Eric expresses his **synthesis** of the two poems. In the pre-test interpretation, he reads with much more uncertainty, expressing doubt about his ability to read and interpret the poem *Birds*. Perhaps as a result of this, he **expands and clarifies** his interpretation by rereading more and making more attempt to confirm some of the statements he makes in each rereading. For example, he **reads and responds** to the first stanza to page four in his pre-test protocol. On page five, after making an attempt to interpret the third stanza, he rereads the first two stanzas, and subsequently makes another attempt to interpret these lines from the poem. Then on pages six through eleven, he reads and makes repeated efforts to interpret the last two stanzas. He consistently works through whatever uncertainty he expresses, asks many questions about the details of these stanzas, and rereads particular lines from this part of the poem. As a result, the **synthesis** he expresses is an assimilation of almost all of the various words, and segments of the text. Even after expressing a coherent statement about the text, he rereads the text repeatedly, and on the last page of his protocol, makes another statement that, again, coherently expresses his understanding of the poem's theme.

In the post-test interpretation, Eric does not reread at all to the extent that he did in his pre-test interpretation. He reads through the text once, paraphrasing it and making **inferences** that are generally clearly aligned with and logically related to the concepts symbolized in the text. He then rereads various lines from the last half of the poem but he does not reread any of the lines of, or express any uncertainty about the first half of the poem. His

synthesis, thus, is more general than that expressed in the pre-test interpretation; it is not as careful, or as detailed an assimilation of the words, phrases and segments of the text as that made in the pre-test interpretation

Because of the sheer amount of rereading completed in the pre-test interpretation, Eric's **reading and response** there is more detailed and substantial than that of the post-test interpretation. He overlooks a line during his interpretation of the post-test poem (the line, 'do not disguise yourself in armour' for example) and paraphrases other lines only once without rereading at all. In the pre-test interpretation, he reads each line of the text at least twice, explains his reactions in more detail, asks more questions about the details of that text, expresses and resolves more uncertainty and delays closure to a greater extent than he does in the post-test interpretation. As a result of rereading, and making more responses to the pre-test poem, Eric **expands and clarifies** his interpretation to a greater extent when reading that poem than he does when reading the post-test poem

Thus, one of the general differences between the pre-test and post-test interpretation is that Eric's **synthesis** of the pre-test poem is a more comprehensive assimilation of the details in the poem because it more thoroughly brings the various words, phrases and segments of the text to bear on that synthesis. Also, the pre-test protocol is more substantial as well because Eric **reads and responds** to the pre-test poem in much more detail; that is, he rereads that text much more than he does the post-test poem. As a result of the frequent rereading of the pre-test poem and attempts to resolve the uncertainty he expresses, Eric **expands and clarifies** his pre-test interpretation much more than he does his post-test interpretation. It may be that because Eric is more sure of himself and more aware of what he is doing when he reads the post-test poem he feels less need to reread the post-test poem. In both the pre-test and post-test interpretation, the **inferences** made are aligned with and logically related to the details of the texts. Thus there is not a difference between the two interpretations in this regard. In the post-test interpretation Eric indicates that he has an increased awareness of how to read poetry and also more awareness of how poets use language to make their points (page one, lines 39 to 41). In the pre-test interpretation, Eric did not at all convey such a conscious understanding of and experience with reading poetry. In fact, when reading the pre-test, Eric repeatedly expressed doubt over

his ability to read and interpret poetry. Thus, the post-test interpretation is more sophisticated in terms of critical reaction.

Student: Nat Y.

Pre-test poem: Cyclops

Post-test poem: Birds

Pre-test protocol analysis. In his pre-test interpretation, Nat reads as a category 4 reader.

The responding-aloud procedure is explained (page one, lines 3 to 12). Nat then immediately responds with a very broad and general statement that touches on various aspects of the first two stanzas. He makes a broad general **inference** (the term inference is used here because Nat was quite intently *reading* along with and following the poem as it was being read aloud) in saying that, 'the bird represents different types of people ... so like the kestrel would be represented by cruel people ... warring people and a thrush would be ... just the normal people around ... and um the parrot would sorta be a bit the less fortunate ones' (page one, lines 18 to 39). These statements are generally aligned with the details symbolized in the text. Nat reads the poem over silently for two and a half minutes and then makes another broad statement that very generally **synthesizes** the various words, phrases and segments of the text. He confirms his initial reaction to the poem, saying that the poem is, 'talking about different kinds of people and the person who is talking in the poem wants to escape from this type of quarelling they do all the time as in cruel people always molesting the unfortunate ones ... and he wants to leave ... the battleground for a different forest, a different place where ... everything can be as one ... and just be a simple person ... and to coexist with people ... as birds do with birds' (page one, line 36 to page two, line 6). It is important to note that Nat makes this statement after reading silently for two and a half minutes. He does not *explicitly* align the various words, phrases and segments of the poem with what he has just spent a fair bit of time reading but, judging by the general coherence of the statement he makes after reading the poem, I have inferred that he has, in fact, brought the various elements of the text to bear on the statement he has made. His statement implies that he has made various **inferences** in reaching such a conclusion but, again, their logic and coherence is implicit in his general **synthesis** rather than made in line-by-line response to the poem.

Nat then **reads and responds** to various lines of the first stanza by making inferences about what each bird 'represents'. He says, '... the first line could be represented as people ... could be put as whatever a person is is perfect in the person ... the thrush could be represented as ... a female because it sounds as if um the female is pregnant' (page two, lines 10 to 17). Nat clearly explains his **inference** that the thrush is pregnant by aligning it with ... detail in the text. His interpretation of the first stanza of the poem is logically related to the general **synthesis** he has previously stated. He then also aligns the last line of the first stanza with his general framework of the poem: 'The last line of the first verse um describes that a person is what he is and cannot reach beyond what he is (page two, lines 25 to 27); he replaces the word 'bird' with the word 'person'. Nat then reads the first line of the second stanza and immediately makes a general statement about this stanza. He says, 'all the things they describe in the second stanza says that whatever a person does is what's good for the person to do' (page two, lines 37 to 39). He similarly makes such a summation of the third stanza saying, 'the third one tells about a person who is frustrated with what the people do ... knows that other people are trying to change him or her into what they think he or she should be' (page two, lines 39 to 42). This last **inference** is, again, aligned with and logically related to the details in the third stanza but Nat does not refer to other relevant details in these stanzas and/or indicate how he relates this statement with other details in these stanzas. Thus these interpretive statements are logically related to the frame within which Nat has interpreted the entire poem but he does not explain any of his responses in much detail nor does he align these general inferences with specific details in the text.

Nat then makes one summary statement about the third stanza which, as with previous statements, is related to his general statement about the poem but he does not specifically align any of the details in this stanza with his general understanding of the poem. He says, 'he wants to leave the battleground for a different place where everyone can coexist as one' (page three, lines 3 & 4). This response is almost a word-for-word repetition of the statement Nat made after silently reading the poem. Thus, in making this last statement on page three of his protocol, he reaches the same conclusion as when he first read through the poem. He has made a coherent, though very broad **synthesis** of the poem by formulating generalizations about the concepts symbolized in the text. He has done so by reading the poem once

silently, briefly rereading each of the stanzas, then making the generalizations that he did

Post-test protocol Analysis. Nat's post-test protocol is that of a category 4 reader as well. The think-aloud procedure is explained to Nat (page one, lines 3 to 14). He asks about the phrase mosquito-doped (page one, lines 18 & 19), an explanation is given (page one, lines 21 to 35), and Nat then rereads the poem silently. He then suggests a tentative **inference** about the 'you' or subject of the poem. He says, '... could be that it's a child going trick or treating and he's with a flashlight that ah shines an orangy glow' (page one, lines 41 to 43). Interestingly, Nat's interpretation took place on Nov. 2nd, just a few days after Hallowe'en. So his statement that the poem may be about 'trick or treating' suggests that he is aligning his experience - perhaps a particular experience - with the concepts symbolized in the poem.

He then immediately makes another statement related to his previous one about the child trick or treating. He says, 'he or she's just scared because there's these rustlings in the leaves and he hears some sort of growling' (page two, lines 3 & 4). As he makes this response, Nat is looking closely at the poem. Though he does not read lines from the poem aloud and then respond, he is in fact paraphrasing the text a line or two, or stanza at a time. The statement just referred to is made in response to the first three stanzas. He **infers**, like many other students have, that these first ten lines of the poem describe a 'you' that is scared (rather than that a 'shape contracts with terror'). He does, though, explain this inference in saying that 'he's' scared 'because there's these rustlings in the leaves ... from something furry you know like a wolf's growl or something' (page two, lines 3, 4, and 8 & 9). His **inference** that a wolf is growling seems associated with the phrase 'bristling noise like a fur throat'. For the rest of this page, Nat's responses are consistent with his general frame (that 'it could be that it's a child trick or treating', page one, lines 41 & 42) and are associated with details of each line of the text but he does not read the text aloud and then respond, so the connections between what he says and the details of the text must be inferred. For example, it is clear that Nat is responding to the question that comprises the fourth stanza and the first line of the fifth stanza when he says, 'So then he asks himself is this true you're not scared of monsters' (page two, lines 13 & 14). The word monsters would appear to be his **inference** of what the word 'them'

relationship between the 'you' (child trick-or-treating) and 'them' (hunter) may be 'distorted' as suggested by the title of the poem. Nat then makes an **inference** of another line of the poem. Swim in their darkness as in a river - it's like ya know just plowing through the darkness as like when you're swimming ya just plow through the water' (page five, lines 43 to 45) but he does not relate his understanding of this line to the theme of 'trick-or-treating'

Comparisons of Pre-test and Post-test Protocols. In both the pre-test and post-test interpretation(s), Nat's reading is that of a category 4 reader. But there are many differences between the two protocols. Nat's uses all of the key reading strategies to a much greater extent in his post-test interpretation.

First of all, there are many differences between the two protocols in terms of how Nat **synthesizes**. In the pre-test protocol, he reads the poem silently, then makes a statement that expresses a brief yet generally coherent understanding of the general 'theme' of the text. He then makes some brief and general comments about the first two stanzas after which he makes a brief statement about the last two stanzas. Nat's pre-test protocol presents certain difficulties in attempting to characterize his interpretation according to the reading scale. The reading scale was designed for use with 'responding-aloud' interpretations. Though the statements Nat makes in his protocol suggest that he did, in fact, *interpret* the poem, he did not do so *aloud*. He read the poem to himself for two and a half minutes before he began speaking about it. Because of the general coherence and comprehensive nature of the statement he made about the poem after that, I have inferred that he engaged in most of the strategies that describe a category 4 reader. Also, judging from the explicit and reasonable **inferences** that were clearly aligned with the first and second stanza(s), it would seem that the other (more general) statements he made were also aligned with the text, though done so silently. Thus, though reached silently, his **synthesis** is generally comprehensive and appears to bring the various words, phrases and segments of the text comprehensively together to bear on that synthesis.

In the post-test interpretation, on the other hand, Nat's **synthesis** of the text is made by progressively assimilating details of the text within the general frame that he states after first hearing the poem read and questioning certain

details of the poem. Because he explicitly articulates his understanding of most lines and stanzas of the text, makes **inferences** about the details of most lines and makes responses that are consistently aligned with the text, his **synthesis** of the ideas symbolized in the text (within the 'trick-or-treating' frame) is more 'connected' to the poem. That is, through the sheer act of *verbalizing* a line by line interpretation, he explicitly relates the various elements of the poem to his frame (about trick-or-treating). Thus, the synthesis that Nat expresses in his post-test interpretation is referred to in various places throughout his post-test protocol. For example, he refers to the 'trick-or-treating' frame on page one, line 42, and indicates that he assimilates the various details of the poem consistently within that frame by referring to 'that person's costume' again (page four, line 31). This reference suggests that Nat's **inferences** and responses are anchored to and consistently assimilated within the 'trick-or-treating' frame. Thus, where the pre-test **synthesis** is briefly stated once, is *generally* comprehensive, and silently assimilates the various words, phrases, and segments of the poem, the post-test synthesis explicitly assimilates the words, phrases and segments of the text and because of this his various inferences and responses are *specifically* interpreted and aligned with his synthesis there.

Nat's **reading and response** process is also much different in the post-test interpretation. Where he made a few very general comments about the poem and read and responded aloud to only the first two stanzas in the pre-test interpretation, he paraphrased the text thoroughly, aligned experiences with relevant aspects of the post-test poem and explained his reactions in appropriate detail when interpreting the post-test poem.

Nat's pre-test and post-test interpretations also differ in the extent to which he **expanded and clarified** his interpretation(s). As mentioned his pre-test interpretation was very general and very brief. In the post-test interpretation, he asked various questions about critical details of the post-test poem, he reread, he worked consistently through his interpretation and he resolved whatever uncertainty he expressed as he attempted to interpret that poem. He also expressed himself with reasonable clarity and delayed closure. Because much of his pre-test interpretation was completed silently, none of these elements were present in his pre-test protocol.

There were also many differences between the pre-test and post-test protocol in terms of **inferencing**. Nat's inferences were of a very general

reread the first two stanzas until he was sure of the literal meaning of these lines of the text, and/or had made **inferences** about the details in the text. He then read the last two stanzas similarly. After doing so, he then formulated a general statement about the theme or message in the text (page seven, lines 21 to 35). From that point, Robin continues to read and make **inferences** about the last two stanzas, then again states another generalization, consistent with the first, that comprehensively brings the various words, phrases and segments of the poem to bear on that statement. Similarly, though the post-test protocol was almost six pages shorter than the pre-test, Robin **read** through and **responded** to most lines of the post-test text, making **inferences** that were generally logically aligned with details in it. He then began tentatively formulating a general **synthesis** of the details in the text by assimilating most details of the text within the 'pollution' frame. Then, just as in the pre-test interpretation, he began to reread the text and aligned various relevant details with the points (or messages) he felt the author was making. Thus in both the pre-test and post-test interpretation(s), Robin worked toward a general **synthesis** of the ideas of the text by forming a comprehensive interpretation which brought the various words, phrases and segments of the text(s) to bear on that interpretation.

In general then, Robin's **reading and response** process, though initially tentative in the pre-test interpretation, is similar in many regards in both interpretations. He read through each text by paraphrasing most segments of it and explaining reactions in generally appropriate detail. And the **synthesis** he works toward in both interpretations would seem to be related to general background knowledge. For example, in his pre-test interpretation his general statement (that humans try to force into birds what humans think they should be able to do) is aligned with what would appear to be general knowledge about 'what humans do with all the animals'. And, his post-test interpretive frame of 'pollution', within which he assimilates most details of the text, would also appear related to what would be considered general knowledge about the environment.

Also, in **expanding and clarifying his interpretation**, he questioned details of both texts, reread both, worked through one interpretation, resolved whatever uncertainty he referred to, and expressed himself with reasonable clarity in both cases. He also deferred closure with both texts, though did so to more of an extent with the pre-test interpretation.

Robin's **inferences** are clearly and logically related to both texts, and in both interpretations, he made similar **critical reactions** by questioning the point of view from which each poem was written. For all of these reasons, the pre-test and post-test interpretations are generally quite similar

Having now presented an analysis of the nine readers' pre-test and post-test responding-aloud interpretations, and compared the protocols according to the criteria set forth in the reading scale, the major findings and implications of this study are presented in the next chapter.

Chapter Four

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter addresses the three research questions directing the study; conclusions related to each of these questions are first presented. Implications for teaching and research are then outlined, followed by a discussion of the limitations of the study. Finally, the chapter discusses the extent to which this study furthers work in the field of reading and reader-response research and theory.

The three research questions directing the study are:

- 1) What are the processes by which reluctant adolescent-readers read and interpret poetry?
- 2) As a result of independently discussing poetry in small groups, will such adolescents refine the processes by which they read and interpret poetry?
- 3) How can change(s) in the processes by which adolescents read poetry be demonstrated?

Conclusions

Processes By Which Reluctant Adolescent Readers Read Poetry. The processes by which reluctant adolescent readers read poetry have been identified as a result of analyzing the responding-aloud protocols of thirty such readers' interpretations of various poems. These (five) 'key' reading processes are **synthesizing, reading and responding, expanding and clarifying, inferencing, and reacting critically.** At first glance, to identify a reading process as, for example, **reading and responding** and **expanding and clarifying** may seem to beg the obvious. Of course all readers read and respond and, as they do so, they expand and clarify their interpretations of what they read. Both of these phrases, though, are deliberately used to describe a critical reading process that is broad and implies a range of subprocesses. In fact, the analysis of the responding-aloud protocols gathered for this study reveals that **reading and responding** is comprised by such subprocesses as paraphrasing, describing experiences, aligning experiences with the text, and explaining reactions.

Similarly, the term **expanding and clarifying** is characterized by such subprocesses as questioning details of text, rereading, expressing uncertainty, describing thinking, (degrees of) expressing ideas with clarity, and delaying closure. Each of the (five) key reading processes are used to widely varying extents depending on the reader, the reading context, and the text.

By closely analyzing the responding-aloud protocols gathered for this study, it was determined that there were five groups or categories of readers. That is, the extent to which the five key reading processes were used is distinguished across five boundaries. Readers in category 5, for example, use all of the reading processes and subprocesses and do so repeatedly and thoroughly. On the other hand, readers in category 1 do not use all of the reading processes and subprocesses. Further, the analysis of their responding-aloud protocols reveals limited command of the reading processes identified in their protocols.

The five key reading processes, subprocesses, and the varying extents to which the adolescent readers of this study use these processes are presented in an analytic reading scale, this scale appears in chapter two (pages 51 and 52). This reading scale plays an important role in this study. First of all, the processes by which adolescents read and interpret poetry are identified in this scale. In addition, these reading processes are qualitatively distinguished in the scale (to five varying extents) according to how each reading process and subprocess is (or is not) used by the readers who participated in the study. Thus, the first research question is addressed by the reading scale; the processes by which adolescent readers read and interpret poetry and the extent to which they do so is set forth in this scale.

Effect(s) of Independent, Small-Group Discussion of Poetry. This study also seeks to determine the effects of independent, small-group discussion of poetry on the processes by which reluctant adolescent readers read and interpret poetry, that is, will such small-group discussion result in a refinement of such reading processes. After independently discussing poetry in small groups (of three students each), over a one-month period, six of the nine adolescent reluctant readers who participated in the study refine the process(es) through which they read and interpret poetry.

The degree of refinement of the students' reading processes, is determined through a comparison of the readers' pre-test responding-aloud

protocols with his or her post-test responding-aloud protocol according to the five-point reading scale designed and applied by the researcher. Each pre-test and post-test protocol is analyzed, scored and compared according to the scale. The pre-test and post-test scores are presented in a chart below; the names are listed in the chart in the order in which they were discussed in the previous chapter. In cases where a student's pre-test and post-test score are the same, yet one or the other protocol demonstrates more sophisticated use of the scale's reading processes within that category, the larger, highlighted numeral signals this. Italics are used to highlight students whose pre-test and post-test reading patterns remain similar.

Student	Pre-test Score	Post-test Score
Barbara N.	4	<u>4</u>
Nesbitt A.	2	<u>3</u>
Trish G.	2	<u>3</u>
<i>Donald M.</i>	2	2
Rick C.	2	<u>4</u>
Sarah M.	3	<u>4</u>
Eric B.	<u>4</u>	4
Nat Y.	4	<u>4</u>
<i>Robin K.</i>	4	4

It is very important that a point made in chapter two be reiterated here. Each of these numbers is a code representing a complex poetry-reading process. Presenting a chart such as the one shown has the advantage of allowing me to compress the answer to the second research question in a quick visual survey. It has the disadvantage, though, of implying that the reading process may be reduced to a number or, worse still, that a reader's process is scored according to an absolute value system. Each of the numbers stands for a poetry-reading process; each number signifies the general extent to which each reader used the key reading processes and subprocesses set forth in the reading scale, and each of the five numbers are relative to one another. Thus, though these 'numbers' are presented here for the sake of summary, they are not intended to imply a quantitative or strictly numerical account of

the processes by which any of the students interpreted poetry. Each of the numbers is representative of the extent to which the readers used the reading processes set forth in the scale; each time even the same number is used, it should be assumed that, though it may signify general similarities about readers, it never implies completely identical use of the key reading processes and subprocesses.

Some of the major differences between the pre-test and post-test protocols are the extent to which the students **read and respond** to the details of the post-test text, **expand and clarify** their post-test interpretations, and align their **inferences** with the details symbolized in the text. Barbara, Nat, Trish, Rick, and Nesbitt **read and respond** to the post-test text, for example, by paraphrasing more lines and segments of it and explaining their reactions to a greater extent; they are more attentive to the post-test text. Barbara is much more confident when reading the post-test poem; she expresses no disaffection for poetry or lack of confidence in her ability to read and interpret the post-test poem. Nat **reads and responds** to the post-test poem by actually *verbalizing* his thoughts about it. This suggests an increased confidence in his ability to read and respond to poetry, as compared to his pre-test interpretation where he makes brief statements about the poem after reading it once silently. And, as a result of reading and responding to the post-test poem verbally, Nat's reactions are more frequent and explicitly aligned with details in the text.

Some readers do not **synthesize** when reading the pre-test poem, yet do so when reading the post-test poem. Sarah, for example, does not **synthesize** when reading the pre-test poem, yet does so when reading the post-test poem. Because she cannot establish a 'frame' within which she can assimilate the various details of the pre-test text, she is also not able to make **inferences** about many of the details of the post-test poem. These factors affect the extent to which she is able to **read and respond** to the text; that is, in paraphrasing the text, describing relevant personal experiences and aligning them with the text, and explaining her reactions she is frustrated due to her inability to do so according to a frame of reference. Similarly, Sarah's inability to establish a frame affects her attempts to **expand and clarify** her pre-test interpretation. Though she does question details of the text, she is not able to resolve the uncertainty she expresses, cannot reach a coherent understanding of the text, does not reread, and though she certainly expresses her interpretive

difficulties with clarity, cannot clearly express a coherent understanding of the poem. In her post-test protocol, Sarah **synthesizes**, which she is not able to do in her pre-test interpretation. Sarah's post-test protocol exemplifies balanced use of all of the key strategies. What her protocols (and all others) demonstrate is not only the recursive nature of the use of the strategies, but also that the extent to which the reader **synthesizes** affects the extent to which the other key reading strategies are used.

Barbara, Nat, Trish, Rick and Nesbitt **expand and clarify** their post-test interpretations by rereading more often and delaying closure to a greater extent. They also make **inferences** that are more clearly aligned with the details in the text. In Nesbitt's post-test protocol, for example, his inferences are much more logically related to the details in the text than is the case with his pre-test protocol. Though he does not **synthesize** by coherently assimilating the various words, phrases and segments of the text within a coherent frame, the **inferences** made during the post-test interpretation are much more consistently related to the details in the text than is the case in his pre-test interpretation.

As a result of **reading and responding** to the poem in more detail in her post-test interpretation, **expanding and clarifying** her interpretation to a greater extent, and making **inferences** that are more logically aligned with details in the text, Trish comes close to a **synthesis** - to assimilating the various details in the poem within a coherent frame in her post-test interpretation. Rick also uses all of the five key-reading processes in his post-test interpretation. As a result of delaying closure and rereading to the extent that he does in his post-test interpretation, he is able to **synthesize** by assimilating the various words, phrases and segments of the text within a coherent frame; he is not able to do so in his pre-test interpretation. He also makes many *more inferences* in his post-test interpretation.

Robin and Donald read both the pre-test and post-test poem similarly. In fact, Donald's use of each of the key reading strategies is almost identical in his pre-test and post-test interpretations. Robin, too, though the pre-test protocol is longer than the post-test protocol, shows a very similar pattern of **reading and response**. Donald was absent for five of the thirteen days of the study, thus perhaps not sufficiently engaged in the small-group discussion process to have changed his reading and response process. It is difficult to identify the reason for the similarity in Robin's pre-test and post-test reading

processes. Perhaps because Robin uses all of the five key reading processes in his pre-test interpretation and is thus a fairly sophisticated reader to begin with, his response pattern is relatively stable and the (13 days of) small-group discussion of poetry does not, therefore, have that much effect on his pattern of response. Or, it may be that because Robin participated in group that missed one of its members for five of the thirteen days of the study (Donald), there was not sufficient time in just the eight days that the three group members were there to develop a style, familiarity, or group cohesion. The other member of that group of three recorded his post-test interpretation on a tape that was defective so it is not possible to know if he did or did not refine the processes by which he read poetry as a result of the small-group discussion.

Eric is much more engaged by the pre-test poem than the post-test one. He expresses a great deal of doubt about his ability to read and interpret the pre-test poem, and seems anxious to cooperate, and even 'please' me (the researcher and interviewer). Even though I assure him that his interpretation of the poem is not being scored and will not affect his school marks, he appears anxious to reread the poem and work to reach an understanding of the various words, phrases and segments of the pre-test poem. Eric is far more confident of his ability to read and interpret the post-test poem and also less concerned about how his interpretation will effect his school grades; he is much less intent on 'pleasing the teacher'. Thus, he reads and expresses himself in a relatively straightforward manner and is much more comfortable about reaching closure.

Of the six students whose post-test interpretations scores are higher than their pre-test scores, all appear more confident when reading the post-test text. They have developed an approach to reading a poem and refined the processes by which they read poetry after small-group discussion. They **read and respond** to more details in the poem, are better able to assimilate their inferences according to a frame of reference even when they do not reach a fully coherent **synthesis** of the poem. The students also **expand and clarify** their interpretations by questioning more details of text, reading more frequently, expressing uncertainty and seeking to resolve it to a greater extent, expressing themselves with greater clarity, and delaying closure to a greater extent; these differences in their processing result in a more coherent interpretation of the post-test poem. **Inferences** made during the post-test interpretation are more logically related to the details in the text. Also the

inferences they make are more consistently related to previous, and succeeding inferences in their interpretation(s) than is the case during the pre-test interpretation. For these reasons, six of nine students are identified as having refined the processes through which they read and interpret poetry

The differences between the pre-test and post-test interpretations may arise as a likely result of the small-group discussion procedure in which the students were engaged (for 13 days over a one-month period). Initially, some of the students sometimes had to be encouraged to continue their discussion of each poem during the first few days of the study. Nat, Trish and Rick, in particular, read quickly at first, reached a consensus and were anxious to conclude their discussion. They were encouraged to read again to see if all details of a poem could be assimilated within their interpretation (though the prompts were not phrased in this manner). If any group needed prompting or encouragement, I asked them to, "reread the poem line-by-line or stanza-by-stanza to see if you see anything else you may have overlooked or think of differently". Students were also asked if there were particular lines or phrases they were unsure of and wanted to discuss with each other. Given such encouragement, students reread, asked questions of each other and carried on a continuous discussion according to the rhythms and preoccupations of each group. After the first three days of the study, even Nat, Trish and Rick carried on independent of encouragement for the full twenty minutes of small-group discussion. Often the discussions (particularly Barbara's, Eric's and another student's in that group who recorded her post-test interpretation on a defective tape) became quite heated. Students were anxious to defend 'their' interpretation in light of particular lines and segments of each poem.

The large-group discussion also contributed to the refinement students showed in their (post-test) reading process. Students became increasingly interested in hearing and responding to the reports made for each small group (of three students each). Thus, students were called on to defend various interpretations by referring to words, phrases and segments of the (respective) poems. And, I often posed open-ended questions during the large-group discussion phase of each class period. The students were asked how the details of the poem contributed to (or in some cases contradicted) their interpretations, and to the mood and feeling of the poem, and why the poet used certain phrases. Thus, students were constantly talking about each poem throughout each of the thirteen class periods of small-group discussion.

The students became increasingly engaged by the poetry they read as a result of their discussions. They required no encouragement to maintain their reading and response to the (thirteen) poems after the first few days of the study. Because of their engagement, the students became not only comfortable about reading poetry, but each developed patterns of response through participation in his or her small-group discussion, large-group discussion and as a result of the free-written journal entries (which they wrote in response to each of the thirteen poems). As the students became increasingly engaged, less self conscious, and more confident, each gradually developed a style or pattern of response that was comfortable for him or her. At the same time, each student was continuously challenged by the group process, and, therefore, though each became increasingly comfortable, none of the students became blasé about reading and responding to poetry.

Sarah was able to synthesize when reading the post-test poem though unable to do so in their pre-test interpretation. She was bewildered and frustrated by "Cyclops" in her pre-test interpretation. It would seem that because Sarah, as well as most of the other students, became so involved in their reading and the active discussions of their small-group(s), they learned to pursue the challenges each poem offered, to sort out their interpretive difficulties and to, as Smith (1985) put it, ask questions and seek answers of the text. The increasing engagement and confidence developed by the students, I think, allowed them to become closer to the text and to develop a relationship with it. Instead of being daunted by, resistant to and/or overly preoccupied with certain elements of the text, the students, to varying extents, learned to assume a wholeness in each poem and became interested in determining just how the elements of each poem contributed to it. The small-group and large-group discussions thus became the forum through which students were better able to synthesize by assimilating the various words, phrases and segments of the poems they read within a coherent frame.

Demonstrating Change in the Poetry-Reading Process. The students' pre-test and post-test responding-aloud protocols were compared using the 5-point reading scale designed and applied by the researcher. Thus, to say that a student's reading processes were refined or changed as a result of the small-group and large-group discussions is to imply that the students became better able to **synt. esize, read and respond** (according to four subprocesses) **expand**

and clarify their interpretations (according to seven subprocesses), **support their inferences** (according to two subprocesses) and **react critically**. These reading processes are set forth in the reading scale previously referred to and are qualitatively differentiated according to five differing extents to which readers use these five key reading processes. Major change in the use of these key reading processes results in an increased score according to the five (scores) that are set out in the reading scale. Thus a change in a reader's score implies that the reader *markedly* changed the reading, thinking and/or language processes that are accounted for and qualitatively differentiated in the reading scale.

Moderate change in the processes by which readers read and interpret poetry may also be demonstrated according to the reading scale. Readers whose pre-test *and* post-test responding-aloud protocol was scored as a 4 (Barbara for example) nonetheless may refine the processes by which they read poetry. Such moderate change is also demonstrable according to the reading scale; the fifteen statements describing the reading process of a category 4 reader may be more *fully* approximated yet not have changed enough for a reader's score to change. In this case, the reading scale may still be used to demonstrate changes in a reader's reading processes. For example, it may be that ten of the fifteen statements describing a category 4 reader account for a reader's pre-test reading processes whereas all of the statements may apply to the reader's post-test protocol. It may also be that though all of these fifteen statements apply to both a reader's pre-test and post-test protocol, there may be many more instances of the use of such reading and language processes in a reader's post-test protocol. Various degrees of change(s) in readers' reading and language processes may be demonstrated according to the reading scale. In describing *and* differentiating processes by which adolescents read poetry, this scale may be used not only as an instrument according to which change in reading processes may be demonstrated, it is also faithful to the demands of researchers and theorists stressing that reading assessment actually focus on reading and language *processes* instead of isolated skills or written accounts of the reading process (Pearson and Valencia, 1987; Henk, 1987; Tough, 1976; Hayhoe, 1985; Dixon, 1987; D'Arcy, 1973).

Implications

Teaching Implications. Theory and research on teaching the reading process stresses the importance of context. Green and Bloom (1984) hold that reading is a cognitive process embedded in social and linguistic contexts. Cazden (1988) stresses the role that peer group discussion plays in promoting cognitive growth, and Barnes (1971) has encouraged teachers to develop classroom contexts that promote active engagement and exploration on the part of students. Dias (1970) has demonstrated that small-group independent discussion of poetry results in improved scores when comparing pre-test and post-test *written* responses to poetry. This study suggests that, as a likely result of their involvement in small-group discussion, six of the nine adolescent readers featured in this study have refined the *reading* processes by which they read poetry. When the students who participated in this study were encouraged to discuss poetry according to their own preoccupations, most of them became better readers according to the comparison of their pre-test and post-test reading processes (as inferred from their responding-aloud protocols).

None of the students who participated in the study were directly taught how to **synthesize, read and respond, expand and clarify** their interpretations, **support their inferences or react critically** to poetry either in their small-group discussions or when they recorded their individual pre-test and post-test responding-aloud interpretations (to both poetry and non-literary text) throughout the period of time preceding the formal study. This implies that students bring a complex range of language and thinking processes to any 'act' of reading. Thus, we may infer from the study that by structuring situations in which students are actively engaged in using language to explore ideas, teachers will be promoting growth in reading and language processes. Students should be given much more time and responsibility in the classroom to read and respond to literary *and* non-literary text, to ask their own questions and that they do so with the guidance of teachers who recognize the tremendous potential students have to direct their own learning.

Research Implications. Though responding-aloud protocols may interfere with processes by which the mind engages experience(s) (Cooper and Holzman, 1983) they are also a means by which we can 'see' or infer what those processes are. Thus, this study upholds the importance of responding-

aloud protocols (or think-aloud protocols) established by other researchers investigating the literary response process (Dias, 1985; Holland, 1975; Kintgen, 1983). Through the analysis of responding-aloud protocols, this study identified five key-reading processes used by adolescents to interpret poetry.

The reading scale that both identifies these five key-reading processes (and respective subprocesses) and differentiates five varying extents to which such processes are used by adolescent readers may be used in other research settings. It may be used over long-term research to follow the development of the reading processes and subprocesses (identified in the scale). It may be used in comparative studies as a tool by which to compare use of these reading processes in various settings under variable circumstances. It may also be used to compare reading processes used by students after involvement in various experimental teaching designs.

Limitations

Number of Students Participating. Though the reading scale is based on the analysis of a reasonably large number of protocols gathered during preparatory work for the study and during the formal study itself, it would have been preferable to have had more students involved in the small-group discussion of poetry and thus more pre-test and post-test protocols to compare. Had there been more pre-test and post-test comparisons the study may have been able to make a stronger statement about general patterns of reading improvement as a result of small-group discussion of poetry. To say that six of nine students' reading processes were refined after only thirteen days of discussion (over a month) is a reasonably modest attestation to the value of such an approach to teaching. To have been able to say, however, that twenty of twenty six students, for example, refined the processes after reading poetry via independent small-group discussion would make an even more convincing case for its value.

Design Limitations. The descriptive design used in this study limited the study to a certain extent as well. If an experimental design found that the nine students' (experimental group) scores were 'significantly' higher than nine students' scores in a control group, who had been taught according to

another teaching method, the results might more convincingly support the value of small-group discussion.

Statistical Validity Limitations. A third possible limitation is that the pre-test and post-test protocols were analyzed and scored by the researcher thus introducing a possible bias effect. Had the eighteen protocols that are featured in this study been blindly and independently scored, a reliability coefficient would lend statistical strength to the findings.

Contributions to Research and Theory

The strongest contribution made to research and theory about the nature of the reading process is that the detailed analysis of the responding-aloud protocols demonstrates *how* adolescent reluctant readers actually use the reading processes discussed by researchers and theorists. Reading has been described as a complex process that is primarily a language and thinking activity (Goodman, 1967; Smith, 1971, 1985), and reader-response critics and theorists are interested in defining and exploring the nature of the reader's relationship with text (Rosenblatt, 1978; Mailloux, 1982; Iser, 1978; Fish, 1980; Bleich, 1978; Holland, 1968, 1975). Through the analysis of the responding-aloud protocols, this study demonstrates how adolescent reluctant readers use various reading processes *as* they read poetry.

How Readers Synthesize and Its Effect on Aesthetic Engagement. Bartlett (1932) proposed that the reading process is one primarily characterized by readers' abilities to appropriate concepts of text(s) within conceptual configurations or 'frames' of their particular experiences. Specifically, he said that during reading "the immediate data are at once fitted to, or matched with, a perceptual pattern which appears to be pre-existent so far as the particular perceptual act is concerned" and that because this 'scheme' is utilized "the immediate perceptual data have meaning, can be dealt with, and are assimilated" (p. 44). Anderson and Pearson, too, stated that readers comprehend texts by finding a 'mental home' for the concepts symbolized in them and that to do so they make inferences about how these concepts may be assimilated according to particular 'mental homes' or 'schemata'. This study has, in fact, demonstrated that the extent to which the nine readers were able

to synthesize - to coherently assimilate the various words, phrases and segments of the text within a (consistent) frame - affected their ability to comprehend *and* appreciate what they read.

In fact, the extent to which the nine readers in this study were able to synthesize, or find such 'mental homes' for the concepts of the poems they read had a considerable influence on their ability to understand and appreciate the poem. Readers who were able to synthesize - to assimilate concepts in the poem(s) within a consistent frame - were the most 'sophisticated' and satisfied readers. The reading scale used to identify and qualitatively differentiate among the reading processes of the nine readers who are featured in this study is designed, in fact, to reflect the readers' abilities to synthesize, or assimilate concepts symbolized in texts within a 'frame', or 'mental home', or 'scheme'. Readers who were able to do so are characterized as category 4 and 5 readers according to the scale. It is just such readers who were able to coherently appropriate the various words, phrases and segments of the poems they read within consistent 'frames'. Thus, the study demonstrates *how* readers were or were not able to 'synthesize' and that the extent to which they are successful as readers of poetry depends, to varying extents, on this key reading process.

Rick's post-test protocol is a fascinating example of a reader's meandering struggle to actually construct a 'scheme' for the ideas symbolized in the text - to synthesize. From pages one to four in his post-test interpretation of "Cyclops", Rick reads and responds to the text by paraphrasing and continuing to expand and clarify what he has previously said about it. He monitors the evolving sense he is making of the poem saying, 'that changes everything I just said', (line 43, page four of his protocol), then rereads the poem again from the beginning. He reads through the poem again, making various inferences about the overall point or theme, finally concluding, '... blend with the surroundings, with ah your problems ... just keep going don't quit. ... That could be the message ... you shouldn't quit in life' (lines 31 to 41, page seven of his protocol). Rick then works to assimilate the various words, phrases and segments of the poem within that frame for the rest of his protocol. He thus refines his understanding of the frame within which he is assimilating the details of the poem in doing so and finally concludes on page sixteen of his protocol, '... ya might also wanna run away from your problems ... so if you do you should just keep on going. No matter what you choose,

you should still keep on going in your life' (page sixteen, lines 3 to 9). Rick's protocol attests both to the importance of synthesis, the role that it plays in the reader's processing of the poems, and the manner in which all of the other reading processes set out in the reading scale relate to the extent to which the reader synthesizes

Sarah's inability to synthesize in her pre-test interpretation - to put all the 'little lines together', to make them 'fit', as she put it - affected her enjoyment or aesthetic engagement with the concepts symbolized in the poem she read; other readers were not so affected by their inability to do so, perhaps because they were not so aware of the fact that they weren't doing so. Trish, for example, did not reach a synthesis of the ideas expressed in "Cyclops" when she read it for her pre-test interpretation, and seemed to quite happily 'live through' experiences she recalled of camp as prompted by that poem. Barbara, on the other hand, did coherently assimilate the various words, phrases and segments of the poem, "Birds" during her pre-test interpretation, yet repeatedly expressed a dislike for poetry and a lack of confidence in her ability to read and understand it. Thus, whether or not the reader synthesizes does not necessarily affect the affective engagement they experience with the poem they read

How Readers Expand and Clarify Interpretations. This study also demonstrates how students question details as they read, work through their interpretations, express and resolve uncertainty, describe their thinking and express varying degrees of 'comprehension monitoring' as Baker and Brown (1984) put it. Barbara, Sarah, Rick, Eric, and Robin all made clear statements referring, in various ways, to their awareness of the affective and cognitive processes in which they are engaged as they read and respond to the poem(s). Sarah's pre-test protocol is full of such statements, noted above. Rick's post-test protocol also has examples of 'comprehension monitoring'; the sheer length of his protocol also attests to his continuous effort to construct the coherent synthesis he does of the concepts of that text. Barbara too, in making the statements she does about not needing to understand all the 'little bitty words' (line 10, page seven of her pre-test protocol) and her awareness of what she likes in poems (expressed throughout page seven of her pre-test protocol), as well as *how* she reads poems (see line 9, page six of pre-test protocol) all point to the metacognitive awareness she has of her reading process. Trish

too, says, 'Wow I never been into a poem this deep before ... from line to line like that it's easier . I understand this poem I mean my understanding of it ya know I mean different people could have different understandings but my understanding I understand myself how I feel about it the words that I didn't understand now I understand' (lines 11, 21, 33 & 34, 38 & 39, page seven, and page eight of her post-test protocol) Eric expresses an awareness of his reading and responding process throughout his pre-test protocol All of the students expanded and clarified their interpretations to varying degrees as they read and responded to the poems. Such efforts are even reflected in the questions the students asked of the words they did not understand; without realizing they did not understand they would not have questioned these details of the text(s)

How Adolescents Use Key Reading Processes. This study demonstrates that reading poetry is a complex, recursive thinking process. This is clearly demonstrated by Rick's post-test, responding-aloud protocol and Eric's pre-test interpretation of "Birds" (though is certainly evident in all the protocols) In these protocols, Rick and Eric used all of the key reading processes repeatedly and simultaneously, that is, in synthesizing, they read and respond to the text AND constantly expand and clarify their interpretations AS WELL AS make inferences Each of the reading processes is inextricably related to their use of the other reading processes For example, in synthesizing the elements of the text within a coherent frame, they also make inferences about the frame or 'scheme' within which those details were assimilated. At the same time that they align an experience with the text they also make inferences about how details in the poem might be interpreted in light of background knowledge and experience. In questioning the details of the text, delaying closure, and making the varying interpretations they did, they expand and clarify their interpretations, thus working toward synthesis AND in so doing, continuously make inferences about the overall frame within which the various words, phrases and segments might be coherently assimilated.

The analysis of the eighteen responding-aloud protocols demonstrates *how* reading is a complex psycholinguistic language and thinking process, *how* text is interpreted in light of the readers' 'schemata' or 'frames' of background experience, and *how* the reader's role is an active one, dependent on a complex interplay of the readers' language and thinking processes. All of

the eighteen protocols attest to this. The view that reading is a linear, or information processing activity, whereby readers perform one discrete thinking task after the next is not upheld. The reading processes used by the readers were interdependent and recursive. The extent to which readers used one of the key reading processes was usually commensurate with the extent to which they used all others.

How Reading is a 'Transaction'. The analysis of the responding-aloud protocols also upholds the view of reading as a transaction (Rosenblatt, 1978). The text(s) and the reader(s) 'compenetrated' to produce the protocol - the 'transaction'. There is no protocol without each reader's activity in relationship to the poem as she organizes as a set of verbal symbols. And, in particular, the protocols uphold Rosenblatt's description of aesthetic reading; she says, "in the evocation of a literary work of art, this openness of the text takes on special importance, while at the same time the reader must pay especially close attention to the exact words of the text" (1978, p. 88). The readers were, in fact, paying close attention to all that the words of the literary text summoned up for them. The nine readers were not swayed by "subjectivist" interpretations with no reference to the "textual signifiers" (Alcorn, 1987) nor did the text 'denote the role of the reader', or 'imply what the role of the reader might be', as Iser (1978) has suggested. If that were the case, there could not possibly have been the spectrum of interpretations that were evidenced by the eighteen different interpretations represented in the protocols. In fact, it appeared that the readers were reading to establish the literal sense of the poem, and at times 'living through' the experience of the poem, as was especially the case with Trish's pre-test interpretation of *Cyclops* when she was carried back to her 'camp experiences'.

This study has come as close as may be possible, given current methods of investigating the reading process, to describing the nature of adolescents' engagements with literary text. The study has identified key reading processes, demonstrated how these processes were used, and compared the reading processes used before and after the students' involvement in small-group discussion of poetry.

This manuscript began with a comment by E. B. Huey (1908), he said that "to completely analyze what we do when we read would be . . . to describe very many of the most intricate workings of the human mind as well as to unravel

the tangled story of one of the most remarkable specific performances that civilization has learned in all its history" (p. 8). Indeed, the attempts to unravel the intricate workings of adolescents' minds as they engage in such specific reading 'performances' with poetry testify to Huey's remarks. This study has presented a careful and in-depth analysis of *how* one particular group of adolescent reluctant readers read and respond to poetry. Further, the results of the study demonstrate that the processes by which adolescents read poetry are complex and recursive, and that they are rooted in the many-colored fragments of both past and present contexts. When adolescents read poetry, they bring a kaleidoscopic range of thought and feeling to bear on each such act; this study presents a clear and well focused look at how a very few of them engage in such 'remarkable specific performances'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Afflerbach, P. & Johnston, P. (1984). Research methodology on the use of verbal reports in reading research. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 16, 307-322.
- Alcorn, M. W. Jr. (1987). Rhetoric, projection, and the authority of the signifier. *College English*, 49, 137-157.
- Anderson, R. C. (1977). Schema-directed processes in language comprehension. In A. M. Lesgold & J. W. Pelegriano (Eds.), *Cognitive psychology and instruction*, New York: Plenum Press.
- Anderson, R. C. & Pearson, P. D. (1984). A schema-theoretic view of basic processes in reading comprehension. In P. D. Pearson, R. Barr, M. L. Kamil & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*, New York: Longman.
- Anderson, T. H. (1980). Study strategies and adjunct aids. In R. J. Spiro, B. C. Bruce, & W. F. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension*, Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Anderson, T. H. & Armbruster, B. B. (1984). Studying. In P. D. Pearson, R. Barr, M. L. Kamil & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*, New York: Longman.
- Applebee, A. (1978). ERIC/RCS Report. The elements of response to a literary work: What we have learned. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 11, 255-271.
- Applebee, A. (1978). *The child's concept of story*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Athey, I. (1985). Reading research in the affective domain. In H. Singer & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Ausubel, D. P. (1968) *Educational psychology: A cognitive view* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Ausubel, D. P. (1978). In defense of advance organizers: A reply to the critics. *Review of Educational Psychology*, 48, 251 - 258.

- Baddeley, A. & Lewis, V. (1981). Inner active processes in reading: The inner voice, the inner ear, and the inner eye. In A. M. Lesgold & C. A. Perfetti (Eds.), *Interactive processes in reading*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Baker, L. & Brown, A. L. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In P. D. Pearson, R. Barr, M. L. Kamil & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*, New York. Longman.
- Barnes, D. (1971a) *Language, the learner, and the school*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.
- Barnes, D. (1971b) Classroom contexts for language and learning. *Education Review*, 23, 235-247.
- Barnes, D., Churley, P. & Thompson, C. (1971). Group talk and literary response. *English in Education*, 5, 63-76.
- Bartlett, F. C. (1932). *Remembering*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press
- Baumann, J. F. & Ballard, P. Q. (1987). A two step model for promoting independence in comprehension. *Journal of Reading*, 30, 608-612.
- Beach, R. W. (1973) The literary response process of college students while reading and discussing three poems. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 34, 656A.
- Bicknell, S. (1986) On not teaching literature and reading. In S. N. Tchudi (Ed.), *English teachers at work: Ideas and strategies from five countries*. New Jersey: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1986.
- Biddulph, J. (1986). One teacher's approach in a New Zealand primary school. In S. N. Tchudi (Ed.), *English teachers at work: Ideas and strategies from five countries*. New Jersey: Boynton/Cook Publishers.
- Bisanz, G. L. & Voss, J. F. (1981). Sources of knowledge in reading comprehension: Cognitive development and expertise in a content domain. In A. M. Lesgold and C. A. Perfetti (Eds.), *Interactive processes in reading*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Bleich, D. (1978). *Subjective Criticism*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Bloom, D. & Green, J. (1984). Directions in the sociolinguistic study of reading. In P. D. Pearson, R. Barr, M. L. Kamil & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*. New York: Longman
- Bridge, C. A. & Winograd, P. N. (1982). Readers' awareness of cohesive relationships during cloze comprehension. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 14, 299-312.
- Britton, J. (1970). *Language and learning*. London: Allen Lane
- Britton, J. (1980). Shaping at the point of utterance. In A. Freedman & I. Pringle (Eds.), *Reinventing the rhetorical tradition*. Conway, Arkansas: L&S Books for the Canadian Council of Teachers of English
- Brown, A. L. & Smiley, S. S. (1974). The development of strategies for studying texts. *Child Development*, 49, 1076-1088
- Brown, A. L. (1980). Metacognitive development and reading. In R. J. Spiro, B. C. Bruce & W. F. Brewer, (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension*. Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Brubacher, M. & Payne, R. (1985). The team approach to small group learning. In M. Maguire & A. Paré (Eds.), *Patterns of development*, Canada: The Canadian Council of Teachers of English
- Bruce, B. (1981). A social interaction model of reading. *Discourse Processes*, 4, 273-311.
- Bryant, C. (1984). Teaching students to read poetry independently: An experiment in bringing together research and the teacher. *English Quarterly*, 17, 48-57.
- Carey, R. F. (1985). The reader, the text, the response: literary theory and reading research. *English Quarterly*, 18, 17-23
- Carpenter, P. A. & Just, M. A. (1981). Cognitive processes in reading: Models based on readers' eye fixations. In A. M. Lesgold & C. A. Perfetti (Eds.), *Interactive processes in reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Carver, R. P. (1987). Should reading comprehension skills be taught? In J. E. Readence & R. S. Baldwin (Eds.), *Research in literacy: Merging Perspectives*. Alexandria, VA: 36th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference.

- Cazden, C. B. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Chase, N. D. & Hynd, C. R. (1987). Reader response: An alternative way to teach students to think about text. *Journal of Reading*, 30, 530-540.
- Cooper, C. R. (Ed.). (1985) *Researching response to literature and the teaching of literature: Points of departure*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation
- Cooper, C. R. (1971) Measuring appreciation of literature: A review of attempts. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 5, 6-23.
- Cooper, M. & Holzman, M. (1983) Talking about protocols. *College Composition and Communication*, 34, 284- 296.
- Danks, J. H. & Hill, G. O. (1981). An interactive analysis of oral reading. In A. M. Lesgold & C. A. Perfetti (Eds.), *Interactive processes in reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- D'Arcy, P. (1973) *The Reader's Response*. London: Alden & Mowbray Press.
- De Beaugrande, R-A. (1978). Information, expectation, and processing: On classifying poetic texts. *Poetics*, 7, 3-44.
- Dias, P. (1979). Developing independent readers of poetry. *McGill Journal of Education*, 14, 199- 213
- Dias, P. (1985). Researching response to poetry - Part I: A case for responding-aloud protocols. *English Quarterly*, 18, 104-119.
- Dias, P. (1986a). Researching response to poetry - Part II: What happens when they read a poem. *English Quarterly*, 19, 9-22.
- Dias, P. (1986b) Making sense of poetry: Patterns of response among Canadian and British secondary school pupils. *English In Education*, 20, 44-52.
- Dias, P. (1987). *Making sense of poetry: Patterns in the process*. Canada: The Canadian Council of Teachers of English.
- Dias, P. & Hayhoe, M. (1988). *Developing response to poetry*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

- Dias, P. (1990). A literary-response perspective on teaching reading comprehension. In D. Bogdan & S. B. Straw (Eds.), *Beyond communication*, Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.
- Dillon, G. (1978). *Language processing and the reading of literature*. Bloomington & London: Indiana University Press.
- Dillon, G. (1980). Discourse processing and the nature of literary narrative. *Poetics*, 9, 163-180.
- Dillon, J. T. (1985). Using questions to foil discussion. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 1, 109-121
- Dixon, J. (1973) Processes of formulation in group discussion. *Educational Review*, 26, 241-250.
- Dixon, J. (1987). Becoming a maturer reader. *The Reading Teacher*, 40, 761-766.
- Doughty, P., Pearce, T. & Thornton G. (1972). *Exploring Language*. London: Edward Arnold
- Durkin, D. (1979). What classroom observations reveal about reading comprehension instruction *Reading Research Quarterly*, 14, 481-533.
- Eagleton, T (1983). *Literary theory: An introduction* Minneapolis. University of Minnesota Press.
- Engbrecht, R. (1986) Individualizing approaches to poetry In S. N. Tchudi (Ed), *English teachers at work: Ideas and strategies from five countries* NJ: Boynton/Cook Publishers Inc.
- Ericsson, K. A. & Simon, H. A. (1980). Verbal reports as data. *Psychological Review*, 87, 215- 251.
- Fillion, B. (1981). Reading as inquiry: An approach to literature learning. *English Journal*, 70, 39-45.
- Fish, S. (1980). *Is there a text in this class?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Forehand, G. (1965). Problems of measuring response to literature. *The Clearing House*, 40, 369-375.
- Frye, N. (1957). *The anatomy of criticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Gambell, T. (1986). Literature: What we teach. *English Quarterly*, 19, 92-172.
- Gibson, E. J. & Levin, H. (1975). *The psychology of reading*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Glazer, S. M., Searfoss, L. W. & Gentile, L. M. (Eds.). (1988). *Reexamining reading diagnosis: New trends and procedures*. Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Glushko, R. J. (1981) Principles for pronouncing print: The psychology of phonology In A. M. Lesgold & C. A. Perfetti (Eds.), *Interactive processes in reading* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Golden, J. (1986) Story interpretation as a group process. *English Quarterly*, 19, 254-266.
- Golinkoff, R. M. (1976). A comparison of reading comprehension processes in good and poor comprehenders. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 4, 623-659.
- Goodman, K. (1967). Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. *Journal of the Reading Specialist*, 6, 126-135.
- Goodman, K. (1970). *Miscue analysis: Applications to reading instruction*. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Goodman, K. (1985) A linguistic study of cues and miscues in reading. In H. Singer and R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading*. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Gough, P. B. (1972). One second of reading. In J. F. Kavanagh & I. G. Mattingly (Eds.), *Language by Ear and Eye* Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973) *Explorations in the functions of language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hansson, G. (1973). Some types of research on response to literature. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 7, 260-284.
- Harker, W. J. (1987). Literary theory and the reading process: A meeting of perspectives, *Written Communication*, 4, 235-252.
- Harris, W. V. (1986). Toward an ecological criticism: Contextual versus unconditioned literary theory. *College English*, 48, 116-130.

- Harste, J. C. & Burke, C. L. (1980). Examining instructional assumptions: The child as informant. *Theory Into Practice*, 19, 170-178.
- Hayhoe, M. (1984). Sharing the headstart: An exploratory approach. *The English Quarterly*, 17, 39-44.
- Hayhoe, M. (1985a). Reading and literature. In P. J. A. Evans (Ed.), *Directions and misdirections in English evaluation*. Canada: The Canadian Council of Teachers of English.
- Hayhoe, M. (1985b). Who needs to do what and why? The curious state of assessment in English education. In M. Maguire & A. Paré (Eds.), *Patterns of development*. Canada: The Canadian Council of Teachers of English.
- Henderson, E. N. (1903). A study of memory for connected trains of thought. *Psychological Monographs*, 5, 1-94.
- Henk, W. H. (1987). Reading assessments of the future: Toward precision diagnosis. *The Reading Teacher*, 40, 1987, 860-870.
- Hillocks, G. Jr. & Ludlow, L. H. (1984). A taxonomy of skills in reading and interpreting fiction. *American Education Research Journal*, 21, 7-24.
- Holland, N. (1968). *The dynamics of literary response*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Holland, N. (1975). *5 readers reading*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Huey, E. B. (1908). *The psychology and pedagogy of reading*. New York: Macmillan.
- Hunt, R. A. (1982). Toward a process-intervention model in literature teaching. *College English*, 44, 345-357.
- Hunt, R. A. & Vipond, D. (1985). *Crash-testing a transactional model of literary reading*. Paper presented at the colloquium, "The New Rhetoric and the New Literary Theory", Department of English, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh.
- Hunt, R. A. (1986a). *Shunting information and making contacts: Empirical studies of reading as transaction*. Paper presented at the Eleventh World Congress on Reading, London, England.
- Hunt, R. A. and Vipond D. (1986b). Evaluations in literary reading. *Text*, 6, 53-71.

- Hunt, R. A. (1990). The parallel socialization of reading research and literary theory. In D. Bogdan & S. B. Straw (Eds.), *Beyond communication* Portsmouth, NH: Boyton/Cool Publishers.
- Iser, W. (1978). *The act of reading: A theory of aesthetic response*. London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Jenkins, J. R & Peny, D. (1981) Teaching reading comprehension in the middle grades. In R. J. Spiro, B. C. Bruce & W. F. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence, Erlbaum Associates.
- Johnston, P. H. (1984). Assessment in reading. In P. David Pearson, R. Barr, M. L. Kamil & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*. New York: Longman.
- Johnston, P. H. (1986). A Vygotskian perspective on assessment in reading. *Reading - Canada - Lecture, 4*, 82-92.
- Katz, L. & Feldman, L. B. (1981). Linguistic coding in word recognition: Comparisons between a deep and shallow orthography. In A. M. Lesgold & C. A. Perfetti (Eds.), *Interactive processes in reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kavale, K. & Schreiner, R. (1979) The reading processes of average and above average readers: A comparison of reasoning strategies in responding to standardized measures. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 15, 102-128.
- Kamil, M. L. (1984). Current traditions of reading research. In P. D. Pearson, R. Barr, M. L. Kamil & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*. New York: Longman.
- Kintgen, E. (1983). *The perception of poetry*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Kintgen, E. & Holland, N. (1984). Carlos reads a poem. *College English*, 46, 478-491.
- Kintsch, W & van Dijk, T (1978) Toward a model of text comprehension and production. *Psychological Review*, 85, 363 - 394.
- Klemenz-Belgardt, E. (1981). American research on response to literature: The empirical studies. *Poetics*, 10, 357-380.

- LaBerge, D. & Samuels, S. J. (1977). *Basic Processes in Reading: Perception and Comprehension*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Langer, J. & Smith-Burke, M. T. (Eds.) (1982). *Reader meets author/bridging the gap*. Delaware: International Reading Association
- Lennox, W. H. , Small, J. J. & Keeling, B. (1978). An experiment in teaching poetry to high school boys. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 12, 307-320.
- Lesgold, A. M. & Perfetti, C. A. (Eds.) (1981). *Interactive processes in reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.
- Levy, B. (1981). Interactive processing during reading. In A. M. Lesgold & C A. Perfetti (Eds.), *Interactive processes in reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lorch, R. F, Lorch, E G. & Morgan, A. M. (1987). Task effects and individual differences in on-line processing of the topic structure of a text. *Discourse Processes*, 10, 63-80.
- Mailloux, S. (1982). *Interpretive conventions: The reader in the study of American fiction*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Massaro, D. W. (1984). Building and testing models of the reading process. In P. D. Pearson, R. Barr, M. L. Kamil & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*. New York: Longman.
- Mathewson, G. C. (1985). Toward a comprehensive model of affect in the reading process. In H. Singer & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading*. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- McCallister, J. M. (1930). Reading difficulties in studying content area subjects. *Elementary School Journal*, 31, 191-201.
- McConkie, G. W. & Zola, D. (1981). Language constraints and the functional stimulus in reading. In A. M. Lesgold & C. A. Perfetti (Eds.), *Interactive processes in reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- McCormick, K. (1985). Theory in the reader: Bleich, Holland and beyond. *College English*, 47, 836-850.
- Mills, R. W. (1974). Small group discussion. *English in Education*, 8, 10-21

- Moffett, J. (1968). *Teaching the universe of discourse*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Moffett, J. (1990). Ways of teaching literature. In D. Bogdan, D. & Straw, S. B. *Beyond Communication*, Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cool Publishers
- Montague, M. & Tanner, M. L. (1987). Reading strategy groups for content area instruction. *Journal of Reading*, 30, 716-723.
- Morris, E. C. (1976) Critique of a short story: An application of the elements of writing about a literary work. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 10, 157-175.
- Newell, A. & Simon, H. A. (1972). *Human problem solving*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Newkirk, T. (1984) Looking for trouble: A way to unmask our readings. *College English*, 46, 8, 756-765.
- Nist, S. L. & Simpson, M. L. (1987). Facilitating transfer in college reading programs. *Journal of Reading*, 30, 620-625.
- Odell, L. & Cooper, C. R. (1976). Describing responses to works of fiction. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 10, 203-225.
- Olshavsky, J. E. (1977). Reading as problem solving: An investigation of strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 12, 654-674.
- Palinscar, A. S. & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction*, 1, 117-175.
- Paratore, J. R. & Indrisano, R. (1987). Intervention assessment of reading comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, 40, 778-784.
- Pasquin, L. (1986). The uses of literature. In S. N. Tchudi (Ed.), *English teachers at work: Ideas and strategies from five countries*. New Jersey: Boynton/Cook Publishers.
- Pearson, P. D. (1985). Changing the face of reading comprehension instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 3, 724-738.

- Perfetti, C. A. & Roth, S. F. (1981). Some of the interactive processes in reading and their role in reading skill. In A. M. Lesgold & C. A. Perfetti (Eds.), *Interactive processes in reading*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Peterson, P. L. & Wilkinson, L. C., Hallinan. (Eds.). (1984). *The social context of instruction*. New York: Academic Press
- Piaget, J. (1932). *The language and thought of the child*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Pichert, J. W. & Anderson, R. C. (1977). Taking different perspectives on a story *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 69, 309-315.
- Pikulski, J. J. & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (1982) *Approaches to the informal evaluation of reading*. Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Polanyi, M. (1966) *The tacit dimension*. NY: Doubleday.
- Pradl, G.. (Ed) (1982). *Prospect and retrospect: Selected Essays of James Britton*. NJ: Boynton/Cook Publishers.
- Purves, A. (1973). *Literature education in ten countries*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Purves, A. & Rippere, V. (1968). *Elements of writing about a literary work: A study of response to literature*. Research Report No. 8. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English
- Purves, A. (1984). The potential and real achievement of U. S. students in school reading. *American Journal of Education*, 93, 82-106
- Reynolds, C. L. (Ed.). (1984). *Assessment and learning in English*. Australia: Victorian Association for the Teaching of English, 1984.
- Richards, I. A. (1929). *Practical criticism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Richek, M. A. (1987). DRTA: 5 variations that facilitate independence in reading narratives. *Journal of Reading*, 30, 632-636
- Roemer, M. G. (1987). Which reader's response? *College English*, 49, 911-921.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem*. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press.

- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1981). On the aesthetic as the basic model of the reading process. *Bucknell Review*, 26, 17-32.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1984). The literary transaction: Evocation and response. *Theory into Practice*, 21, 268-277.
- Rosenblatt, L. M. (1985). Viewpoints: Transaction versus interaction - A terminological rescue operation. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 19, 96-107.
- Rosenshine, B. V. (1981). Skill hierarchies in reading comprehension. In R. J. Spiro, B. C. Bruce & W. F. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rosenshine, B. & Stevens, R. (1984). Classroom instruction in reading. In P. D. Pearson, R. Barr, M. L. Kamil & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*, New York: Longman.
- Rouse, J. (1983). An erotics of teaching. *College English*, 45, 535-548.
- Rumelhart, D. E. (1980). Schemata. The building blocks of cognition. In R. J. Spiro, B. C. Bruce & W. F. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rumelhart, D. E. & McClelland, J. L. (1981). Interactive processing through spreading activities. In A. M. Lesgold & C. A. Perfetti (Eds.), *Interactive processes in reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Samuels, S. J. & Kamil, M. L. (1984). Models of the reading process. In P. D. Pearson, R. Barr, M. L. Kamil & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*, New York: Longman.
- Schleifer, R. (1987). Deconstruction and linguistic analysis. *College English*, 49, 1987, 381-395.
- Scholes, R. (1985). *Textual Power: Literary theory and the teaching of English*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Silkey, S. & Purves, A. (1973). What happens when we read a poem? *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 7, 63-72.
- Slatoff, W. J. (1970). *With respect to readers: Dimensions of literary response*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.

- Smith, F. (1971). *Understanding Reading* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Smith, F. (1985). *Reading Without Nonsense*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Spiro, R. J. (1980). Prior knowledge and story processing: Integration, selection, and variation *Poetics*, 9, 313-327.
- Spiro, R. J. (1982) Long-term comprehension: Schema based versus experiential and evaluative understanding. *Poetics*, 11, 77-86
- Squire, J. (1964). *The responses of adolescents while reading four short stories* Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Stanovich, K. (1980). Toward an interactive-compensatory model of individual differences in the development of reading fluency *Reading Research Quarterly*, 16, 37 - 71.
- Sternberg, R. J., Powell, J. S., & Kaye, D. B (1982) The nature of verbal comprehension. *Poetics*, 11, 155-187.
- Straw, S. B. (1989). Collaborative learning and reading for theme in poetry. *Reading Canada Lecture*, 7, 191-200
- Straw, S. B. (1990). Conceptualizations of communication in the history of literary theory In D Bogdan & S. B Straw (Eds), *Beyond communication*, Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers
- Suleiman, S. R & Crosman, I. (Eds.) (1980) *The reader in the text* Princeton University Press.
- Tchudi, S. N. (Ed.). (1986). *English teachers at work: Ideas and strategies from five countries*. NJ: Boynton/Cook Publishers
- Thomson, J. (1987). *Understanding teenagers' reading*. Melbourne, Australia: Methuen Australia.
- Thorndike, E. L. (1917). Reading as reasoning: A study of mistakes in paragraph reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 8.
- Tierney, R. J. & Cunningham, J. W. (1984). Research on teaching reading comprehension. In P. D. Pearson et al (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*, New York: Longman.

- Tompkins, J. P. (1980). *Reader-response criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Torbe, M. (1974). Modes of response: Some interactions between reader and literature. *English in Education*, 8, 21-32.
- Tough, J (1976) *Listening to children talking: A guide to the appraisal of childrens' use of language* London: Ward Lock Educational.
- Tough, J. (1979) *Talk for teaching and learning* London: Ward Lock Educational.
- Travers, D. M. (1984) The poetry teacher: Behavior and attitudes. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 18, 367-384.
- Valencia, S & Pearson, P D (1987) Reading assessment: Time for a change. *The Reading Teacher*, 40, 8, 726-734.
- Van Dijk, T. (1980). Story comprehension: An introduction. *Poetics*, 9, 1-21.
- Venezsky, R. L. (1984). The history of reading research. In P. D. Pearson et al (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*, New York: Longman
- Vipond, D. & Hunt, R. A. (1984). Point-driven understanding: Pragmatic and cognitive dimensions of literary reading. *Poetics*, 13, 261-277.
- Vygotsky, L (1978). *Mind in Society : The development of higher psychological processes* M. Cole (Ed.), Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge: MA: MIT Press.
- Whale, K. B. & Gambell, T. J. (Eds) (1985). *From seed to harvest: Looking at literature*. Canada: The Canadian Council of Teachers of English.
- Wigfield, A. & Asher, S R. (1984). Social and motivational influences on reading. In P D Pearson et al (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*, New York: Longman.

APPENDIX "A"

BIRDS

Whatever the bird is, is perfect in the bird.
Weapon kestrel hard as a blade's curve,
thrush round as a mother or a full drop of water,
fruit-green parrot wise in his shrieking swerve —
all are what bird is and do not reach beyond bird.

Whatever the bird does is right for the bird to do —
cruel kestrel dividing in his hunger the sky,
thrush in the trembling dew beginning to sing,
parrot clinging and quarrelling and veiling his queer eye —
all these are as birds are and good for birds to do.

But I am torn and beleaguered by my own people.
The blood that feeds my heart is the blood they gave me,
and my heart is the house where they gather and fight for
dominion —
all different, all with a wish and a will to save me,
to turn me into the ways of other people.

If I could leave their battleground for the forest of a bird
I could melt the past, the present and the future in one
and find the words that lie behind all these languages.
Then I could fuse my passions into one clear stone
and be simple to myself as the bird is to the bird.

J. W.

(Judith Wright)

CYCLOPS

You, going along the path,
mosquito-doped, with no moon, the flashlight
a single orange eye

unable to see what is beyond
the capsule of your dim
sight, what shape

contracts to a heart
with terror, pumps
among the leaves, what makes
a bristling noise like a fur throat

Is it true you do not wish to hurt them?

Is it true you have no fear?
Take off your shoes, then,
let your eyes go bare,
swim in their darkness as in a river

do not disguise
yourself in armour

They watch you from hiding;
you are a chemical
smell, a cold fire, you are
giant and indefinable

In their monstrous night
thick with possible claws
where danger is not knowing,

you are the hugest monster.

Margaret Atwood
(Canadian)

APPENDIX B

Poems used for small-group discussion

The Bear on the Delhi Road by Earle Birney
In Broken Images by Robert Graves
Arctic Rhododendrons by Al Purdy
The Landlady by Margaret Atwood
Winter Kill by Richard Eberhardt
The Thought-Fox by Ted Hughes
Anthem for Doomed Youth by Wilfred Owen
Lone Leather by A. M. Klein
Game After Supper by Margaret Atwood
In A Season of Unemployment by Margaret Avison
The Snow Man by Wallace Stevens
An Ordinary Day
Detail by Al Purdy