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Abstract

This study was a response to the current movement to introduce more Canadian content into the literature curriculum of Canadian schools. It examined the assumptions behind the movement by asking three main questions: (1) To what extent are Vancouver students able to recognize Canadian poems? (2) Do Vancouver students respond to Canadian poems in a way that is measurably different from their response to other poems? (3) Do any such differences in response depend upon information extrinsic to the poems—such as that provided in the label "A Canadian Poem"—and thus derive from attitudes established prior to the reading of a particular poem rather than, or as well as, from an encounter with the poem itself? These questions were shown to relate to important general questions about student response to literature, especially those bearing upon the relationship between a literary work and the world known to the reader.

The design (a fully crossed 2 x 2 "factorial" with 12 replications) provided that twenty-four Vancouver grade eleven classes listen to taped recordings of a pair of unfamiliar poems and, concurrently, read them privately. The students were then asked to respond to the poems freely, in writing.

There were twelve poem pairs, each pair consisting of one Canadian poem and one New Zealand poem. All poems
represented landscapes. Each pair was presented to two different classes (in reversed order to counter order effects). The Canadian poem set was refined by sampling half from British Columbia and half from other Canadian regions. Separate analysis was made of responses to each poem sub-group.

Each class was divided, randomly, in two. The Canadian poem in the pair that was given to one class sub-group was labelled as Canadian. The New Zealand poem in the same pair was labelled as Non-Canadian. The same Canadian and New Zealand poems given to the other class sub-group were not so labelled.

The responses were subjected to content analysis by a scheme designed for the study. Its reliability by percentage overlap was 91.5%. Analysis was descriptive, with the Chi-Square statistic assisting description. A number of supporting instruments were employed to make possible various finer comparisons and to yield data for future research.

Of the research questions, the first and second were answered negatively: little discriminatory recognition and little response difference were detected. The third question was answered positively: there was considerable evidence that students, when they knew the origins of the Canadian poems, favoured those poems in a variety of response dimensions (such as Evaluation, Comprehension, Visualisation, and Involvement). Regional differences did exist, the British Columbia poems being less favoured than the other Canadian poems.
The attempt to establish a working base for ongoing exploration was successful. Statistically significant and/or important findings emerged in several areas. Some were: the adjectival pairs students used in characterizing their responses to the poems; stated preferences between poems; the effects on response when there is strong "transfer" between the poem and what is familiar to the student; and the students' desire for more Canadian literature in their schools.

The study concluded with a statement of implications for curriculum planning and teaching strategy, and some suggestions for future research.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND THE CHOSEN APPROACH

THE PROBLEM

Canadian Literature for the Canadian Literature Curriculum

The Claims

Over the last few years there has been a growing pressure to increase the Canadian content of literature in Canadian secondary schools. This pressure has been manifested in at least fifty articles in the educational and literary journals and in several theses and research papers.\(^1\) It has been evident in a recent dramatic increase in the amount of Canadian literature taught in schools and universities. And it has been documented, with respect to the secondary schools, by two surveys—Crawford (1973), Stewart (1974)\(^2\)—which report a strong demand from both student and teacher for even more Canadian content. The arguments put forward in support of such an increase are varied and often vague, but some raise important issues.

The major ground upon which an increase in Canadian content is argued might be labelled "acculturation." This label shelters a variety of arguments. The loudest and probably the weakest of these stress the more political aspects of nationalism: Canadian literature should be taught to preserve national integrity, especially where that is threatened by the USA;\(^3\) it should be taught to promote national confidence, pride, and a
patriotic faith in Canada's destiny; it should be taught to create a broader "social" understanding and thus to strengthen national unity; and it should be taught—a somewhat circular proposition—so that Canadian writers will have an audience.

These arguments place upon the literature a value that is not central to literary purposes. More nearly dealing with Canadian literature as a national literature are the arguments which treat "acculturation" as an acquaintance with a Canadian "view of things," a set of Canadian "realities." Those who put this case propose the goal of national self-understanding through literature rather than the latter's enlistment in a quasi-political campaign for national unity. They usually assume unity. Sometimes there is, indeed, reference to a geographical and historical diversity. But more common are generalized references to a single "distinct people, with a common history, inhabiting a clearly defined territory"; the literature embodies a "cultural identity . . . . worthy of expression," a view of the life of the country treated with intensity, "one of the clearest voices" of the nation, a record of "what the Canadian imagination has reacted to," and (in poetry) "the fullest and most adequate expression of Canadian thinking and living." One writer mediates between unity and diversity: "A people that knows its own literature knows its own family, however various."

Proponents of acculturation as an acquaintance with
Canadian "realities" sometimes call for the teaching of Canadian literature as an antidote for ignorance, apathy and "cultural deprivation," sometimes to instil in students an "awareness" of self or "self image." They also point to the possibility that Canadian literature, far from dispensing mere "knowledge" of things Canadian, might engender a special kind of response in Canadian students, offering a peculiar intensity of literary experience, a "sense of excitement which no other literature can have." The vast majority of young readers, they claim, need help from concrete references and from reflections of their own experiences and nostalgias. Students need to feel "I have seen this, I know it, I have heard of it in Canada." By providing such an experience Canadian literature might increase reading comprehension and involvement, even fostering literary pursuits beyond its own domains.

The call for an increase in Canadian content invites more questions than it presents certainties. Many writers, it is true, point to their actual experience with students to support their claims. They report greater "interest," "enthusiasm," "enjoyment," "liking," "excitement," "involvement," "responsiveness," "spontaneity," and "life." Some also claim that students read more. But such reporting is never highly reliable and it does not usually question its assumptions.

Nor do the surveys ask fundamental questions. Further,
their findings are probably biased, through sampling flaws, towards those teachers already wanting more Canadian content in the schools. Even Crawford, an admitted "promoter," acknowledges this point: if "158 teachers across Canada report their students 'indifferent' [to Canadian literature], a staggering number of students must feel so."\(^2\)\(^3\) The Crawford and Stewart surveys are seriously flawed in other ways too.\(^2\)\(^4\)

The present study focused, however, on the chief shortcoming in all work to date--the failure to examine assumptions.\(^2\)\(^5\) Three fundamental issues were examined.

Statement of the Problem

Question 1. Are Canadian students able to recognize Canadian literature as being such?

The promotional writing usually assumes that such an ability exists and it accepts, often implicitly, the premise that a distinctively Canadian literature also exists. Yet geographical (and even cultural) definitions seem to lead to regional conclusions.\(^2\)\(^6\) Any call for Canadian literature as the treatment of an experience with the land must finally account for regional works.

The question of recognition, then, was twofold:

(a) Are Canadian students able to recognize their nation's literature?

(b) Are Canadian students able to recognize their region's literature?
Question 2. Are Canadian students sensitive to Canadian literature in a way that yields a response that is measurably different from their response to other literature?

Those promoting Canadian literature often claim a greater quality and intensity of "response" to Canadian literature but offer no formal measures. Informal estimations gauging "enjoyment," or relatively loose assessments of "involvement," "responsiveness," and such-like are their data. Yet it is possible to probe student response more fully and to direct analysis towards any response patterns that might reveal, between reader and work, some distinctive national or regional "attitude" or "identity."

Question 3. Are the responses of Canadian students influenced by information extrinsic to the literary work -- such as that provided in the label "A Canadian Poem" -- and thus derived from attitudes established prior to the reading of a particular work rather than, or as well as, from an encounter with the work itself?

Extrinsic material has always appeared in school lessons and anthologies: material identifying a place described in a landscape poem or noting a poet's nationality are examples. The practice is given prominence by the arguments of the politico-acculturists and by the "Canadian Studies" idea (which
frequently uses literature to open and develop social and historical enquiries). One teacher, reported by Crawford, suggests that labelling can affect student attitudes:

if a module is advertised as "Canadian content" the students expect ready identification with the material and are not wholly satisfied with Canadian authors whose work does not meet this specific expectation.27

These three questions are all, in varying degrees, susceptible to empirical enquiry. Before they are narrowed for purposes of experimental design they will be examined in a theoretical and empirical context wider than that provided by the articles dealing only with the Canadian school issue.

The Questions in Wider Focus

Research into Literary Response

Some Current Preoccupations and Progress

Perhaps the supreme educational justification for pursuing the three questions just stated is that they fit within the now intensifying quest to find, in a thorough-going and objective fashion, what actually occurs when students interact with literature.28 For many years, research did not move far beyond documenting students' literary preferences or analyzing the content of the works used in schools. For roughly the last decade broader and deeper facets of students' interactions with literary works have been investigated. Students' initial
responses, later reflections, critical comments, free discussions, and the like have been given close attention. Barnes, Churley and Thompson provide one example of the techniques used. They analyzed tape-recordings of high school students freely discussing, in small groups, a novel the students had just finished reading. Squire provides another example. He recorded, in non-directive interviews, the responses of adolescent readers at different points in their progress through a short story. He then analyzed the interview material by a content analysis scheme (which Purves later refined and others then put to wide use).

Approaches like these have made it possible to map more clearly the outlines of student response. Such work has been frequently and well reviewed. However, two lines of enquiry have special relevance to the present study and thus merit discussion here. The Barnes team, and others, have demonstrated that students seem to benefit greatly from an immediate post-reading, free-discussion of literary works. The students raise points that teachers are unlikely to anticipate and "teach" to. If first allowed to discuss freely, the students thereby equip themselves to move from the limited, "illogical," often circular and inconclusive, initial discussion to more critically sophisticated enquiries. These findings demand that teaching procedures and standards of critical respectability in schools be re-examined. They suggest, for instance, that
children are usually asked to [formally] verbalize and conceptualize before they have had enough working experience to give them an "internalized" understanding. 34

the teacher . . . may set up topics and levels of discussion which fail to mesh in with whatever responses pupils make for themselves, and then he is likely to be puzzled why so few of them are willing to talk about a book they seem to have enjoyed. 35

Squire, Purves and their many followers have begun to show what are the various postures students commonly adopt towards different literary works in different conditions. Their findings are now being brought together to assemble, with particular reference to the USA, a profile of student response in a wide variety of circumstances. Curriculum planning and teaching methodology should eventually benefit from this information. In the same spirit as Barnes, Purves has pointed out that:

At the stage of the expanded response, the evaluator needs to look at the students' preparedness to talk or write about the category or categories of criticism intended in the curriculum. If, for example, the curriculum intends that the students shall apply contextual information, the evaluator must determine whether the students possess the information and the procedures for applying it to texts. If the curriculum is much less prescriptive about categories, the evaluator must first determine what questions the students are seeking to answer as they read and expand their response to the texts and how well they answer the questions they have chosen to ask. 36

Plainly, studies in areas such as the two just mentioned can tell us a great deal about the interests and needs
of students and suggest to us what responses we might expect from students.\(^{37}\) They can help us decide how to handle a given work until engagement has been fully established. They can show us what sorts of verbalization to expect and what disturbances and confusions prevent fullest appreciation. They can demonstrate the effects of certain types of questions, asked at certain times, and of teaching certain critical terms and critical patterns. In these ways research into response can indicate, to some extent, the patterns of response behaviour and development upon which teaching strategems, levels, and sequences might be built. It can help teachers build, or rebuild, the distinctions between suggestion and indoctrination;\(^{38}\) between guidance and the destruction of interest.\(^{39}\)

Research findings also promise a better typology of literary works—one developed according to the response patterns different works might elicit.\(^{40}\) There is a great need for a better knowledge of the books that will match the developmental patterns of different students. As Margaret Early wonders, how can "any book selection committee . . . operate without first trying out the possible choices on adolescents?"\(^{41}\)

Some authorities raise cultural issues in this connection, expressing the need to find "in any period or from any country the literature that best conveys human and social values to a particular reader or class of readers."\(^{42}\) There is ample evidence that teachers often fail to anticipate such things as children's reading interests. The most recent finding in this
connection is that of the prestigious IEA study, which explored literature education in ten countries: one of the "school variables" least related to levels of student interest and capacity in literature is the teacher's assessment of those levels. Systematic enquiry is needed to assist the teacher.

Preoccupations and Findings Bearing More Closely Upon the Questions Raised for Present Study

The current research movements bear closely, if generally, upon the present study. Modern research also relates closely to the specific questions posed here. It emphasizes the importance, and makes possible a more sensitive measurement, of several variables contained in the research questions.

(1) Acculturation

Acculturation is no longer simply a demand made by those looking to the establishment or health of a cultural heritage or to the health of individuals within a culture—though that demand is also strongly made outside Canada. Nor is it merely an assertion that a unique literary identity can exist—though that too is strongly maintained outside this country. Rather, cultural biases are being seen for their effects on literary response itself.

The effects are being increasingly well-documented. We are finding out more about ethnically-influenced preferences. We know that it is possible to influence student values and
literary tastes by controlling, on cultural lines, the literature students read.\textsuperscript{46} We know that their patterns of "critical" response are influenced by teaching practices and that such patterns are distinctive to different nations.\textsuperscript{47} We know that students belonging to cultures foreign to that of the work being read can encounter immense difficulties in comprehending and appreciating the work—difficulties which are manifested in attitudinal resistance as well as in difficulties of intercultural "comprehension."\textsuperscript{48} The present study was designed with this knowledge in mind.

(2) Transfer

Modern research has also elevated as an issue and made more susceptible to testing the effects that result when "transfer" can take place: when, that is, a close link exists between what is familiar to the student and the content of a particular literary work.

The need for transfer has long been publicized by Louise Rosenblatt:

like the beginner, the adolescent reader needs to encounter literature for which he possesses emotional and experiential "readiness." He, too, must possess the raw materials out of which to evoke in a meaningful way the world symbolized on the printed page. To avoid the mere translation from one set of words to another, that world must be fitted into the context of his own understanding and interests. If the language, the setting, the theme, the central situation, all are too alien, even a "great work" will fail. All doors are shut. The printed words will at best conjure up only a ghost of a literary experience. The literary work must hold out some
link with the young reader's own past and present preoccupations, emotions, anxieties, ambitions.

Rosenblatt has never been alone in her cause and it has received recent support from such figures as Barnes, Dixon, the IEA researchers, Loban, Purves, Squire and Russell.

Transfer may, according to the theory, take a variety of forms. A link with the familiar can be established through the work's treatment of a geographic region familiar to the reader, through the story's "evoking a situation or attitude that the child himself has experienced," through the reader's identification with a character resembling him, or, more generally, through his identification with the author's "thinking and feeling." The latter might emerge in material which is ethnically congenial to the reader or which expresses sentiments in accordance with his own chauvinisms.

Several of the possible forms of transfer are particularly relevant to this study. Transfer to region or locality may foster a very special response. As George Bowering has written

I agree with A.E. Housman, William Carlos Williams and John Dewey that one would best begin by studying the local, and move then outward, in terms of space and time. This would mean not just Canadian books, but B.C. (or Vancouver) books first, then Canadian books, then maybe 19th century Canadian books, then other books in the English language, then Latin American and European books. I think that interest would be aroused (I remember the shock and delight I experienced when I first read fiction -- and even poetry -- that was set in a place where I had lived) when the student was able to experience
the results and process of a writer's (human's) coming to grips with language, by way of language, with his place, his locus.53

Crawford also ties this theme to learning theory:

Might not a study begin with a province (where feasible), spread outward to a region, with the ultimate goal Canada and the world? The outward spread from known to unknown is a sound teaching approach.54

Transfer may be based upon patriotic feelings and be brought forth by the disclosure of a poem's national origins. Also, if the increasing number of investigations into groups differentiated on ethnic background has wider reference, transfer based upon local group identity should exist.55 Transfer may arise from broader cultural affinities too. That familiar theme of the Canadian promotion is echoed by writers with other nations in mind. Harding, for example, reports an opinion of the Dartmouth Seminar: "in entering into the 'virtual experience' of influential works of literature a child is offered a flow and recoil of sympathies that accords with the culture pattern in which he is growing up."56

Several studies have manipulated variables related to transfer and shown that it is an active factor;57 but what is its actual role in response? A few stress its importance as a fundamental human need to be fulfilled for its own sake;58 most point to the secondary response elements that can be reached more easily, or only, if transfer is first made.59 (A parallel
may exist between the latter propositions and the set of learning theories, alluded to by Bowering and Crawford, which hold that students should meet the immediately understandable, tangible or literal before attempting generalizations and before new material is introduced.\(^\text{60}\) The secondary response elements held to be more or less dependent upon transfer include interest, engagement and involvement, and enthusiasm for class discussion. Transfer is also linked with the development of considered appreciation.

The connection with interest is most strongly established by studies showing that interest (and enjoyment) and familiarity vary together. Of these studies, Rankin's examining the Newbery prize-winning novels is highly pertinent to the present investigation:

Only one of the highly popular books of fiction for children has its setting in a foreign country; all but one of the less popular Newbery books of fiction have their settings in a foreign country. That exception, the scene in *Waterless Mountain*, is laid among the Navaho Indians, a setting foreign to most American children.

In none of the story settings would it be difficult for the average young person to imagine himself. Even when . . . the setting is in a foreign country, that locale is not described so that it would lead the reader to think it "queer" or "different."\(^\text{61}\)

Interest is related to involvement. Both appear to relate to transfer through "accessibility" and through the "vicarious experience" which depends partly upon transfer.\(^\text{62}\)
As the IEA literature committee speculated, positive attitudes and interest might relate to "one's degree of transfer between literary and non literary events."\(^{63}\)

The connection between transfer and more considered appreciation is traced by such figures as Barnes, Gerber, Purves and Beach, and Vine.\(^{64}\) Its pedagogical implications are best stated by Barnes. According to him, students left to free discussion

treat the character as if he were a real person, and ascribe hypothetical feelings and motives to him. This seems a stage of imaginative insight which may well be a necessary preliminary to more mature ways of looking at fictional characters . . .

This is not to argue that we should not at times encourage older pupils towards a more 'distanced' way of talking about literature. On the contrary, we should help them towards this by seeing to it that they explore the possibilities of the simpler forms of empathy ('identification', perhaps) before expecting them to step back from the experience.\(^{65}\) [italics mine]

It is not my purpose to argue the extent to which "transfer" should be fostered in literature teaching. Clearly it is just one facet of literary response. But the connection with the familiar seems sufficiently important to warrant research attention.

(3) Prior Attitudes

Attitudinal studies offer other findings closely related to the present study. Ethnically-derived attitudes, for example, are increasingly seen as determinants of response.\(^{66}\)
Especially interesting is the phenomenon, termed "low self-image," found in many minority groups. Comment on Canadian culture and pilot work for this study both suggested that Canadian students might act quite like children from minority groups when asked to respond to their own literature. Pilot students demonstrated a low regard for Canadian literature in general and exhibited constricted responses to the poems they received. Attitudinal studies also demonstrate the difficulties (noted under "acculturation") experienced by students in cross-cultural reading situations. Their difficulties are at least partly attitudinal. The "background" material often given students to help them "enrich" their reading also raises attitudinal issues: attitudes can be set up, brought into focus, or altered by providing authorial biographies, attributing national origins to a work, or merely giving the author's name. The few studies that have been made on such effects in the more affective areas of response have shown them to be significant.

Attitudes, then, must be counted important response variables. By "knowing the attitudes of people it is possible to do something about the prediction and control [in a pedagogical sense] of their behaviour." For the present study, the assumption seemed reasonable that attitudes, where they existed, would influence measured response. Similarly reasonable was the assumption that extrinsic material, like national labels, would strengthen the effect of such attitudes (in whatever direction). The results of the pilot studies reinforced these conclusions.
Cultural Questions and Literary Response

Study into literary response often doubles as a study of cultural questions. For example, the IEA and other studies have revealed that most countries now promote their native literature and influence their students' responses along culturally distinctive lines. Implicitly, such studies raise questions as to the extent to which work and student respectively influence responses. As Wainer and Berg ask

Could it be that [our] criteria emerged because of prevailing American cultural attitudes ingrained in the students themselves or are they inherent only in this particular set of stories, a peculiarity of Maupassant's vision of the universe? . . . one could use the same stories with a subject population with different cultural backgrounds.

Other writers pursue this idea with the USA and Britain in mind:

many studies related to ethnic literature and the response patterns and achievements that emerge from the teaching of these literatures might well be undertaken. Not only should these studies deal with a group reading its own literature but with a group reading literature of other groups.

The need is just as great in Canada. The present study was designed to meet this need.

Some researchers suggest that indirect approaches to cultural questions, such as through literary response, might yield richer and more valid information than do direct instruments like objective-type cultural question-sets. In respect of literary culture itself (including both works and criticism)
such a mixed approach might indicate what the younger generation is likely to take from and add to the culture. University teachers, in particular, might value such information about their student populations. The student himself should benefit by being helped to understand his cultural milieu. The immigrant especially, with his intricate and difficult adjustment problems, should benefit if cultural norms are better known as they relate to the material he receives in class.

The Need for Better Methodologies

The Canadian studies reviewed at the beginning of this chapter have been limited by the relatively superficial questions they have asked. Within these limitations they have also been flawed by methodological shortcomings.

In the latter respect the studies re-affirm a more general need for experimental approaches, particularly in the affective domain. Experimental techniques offer the best means by which to avoid researcher bias. They also make it possible (by manipulating variables) to probe response more deeply than is possible with description or survey.

There is, however, also a continued need--Hansson calls it "urgent"--for descriptive studies. The term encompasses response or preference surveys. The latter can demonstrate "to the teachers, and to those who teach the teachers, what happens when groups of young people respond to literature" in something like "normal" conditions. They can help fill
our need to know where our students are. The term also includes much anthropological investigation. The questions stated for the present investigation involved probing culturally-influenced responses and collecting questionnaire information on related issues. Both approaches seek to discover, as the anthropologist does, what:

categories . . . informants use. What are their categories and what do they mean? How is their knowledge organized and classified? Answering these questions is what discovering culture is all about.

A helpful strategy for beginning research is asking a grand tour question; i.e., have an informant tell about the activities and people one is interested in. This will help one find out the meaning of the different parts of the cultural setting you are studying.

Using descriptive techniques in these fields helps fill the need expressed by some research leaders for "other modes of research than the experimental or the large-group survey. The anthropological and psycho-analytic studies provide possible guides."

Experimental and descriptive techniques can work together with profit. Description is likely to be precise only when it is clear who and what is being measured--at least in the sense that the study can be replicated. In the light of the Canadian research already reviewed, it is especially important that any attempt at description be accompanied by appropriate controls. Combining techniques has recently gained impetus under the principle of "multiple" or "triangulated" operationalism.
Because human behaviour is so complex, it cannot be adequately measured by a single term or a single dimension. Accordingly, the "most fertile search for validity" comes, as Webb puts it:

> from a combined series of different measures, each with its own idiosyncratic weaknesses, each pointed to a single hypothesis. When a hypothesis can survive the confrontation of a series of complementary methods of testing, it contains a degree of validity unattainable by one tested within the more constricted framework of a single method.  

The present study combined descriptive and experimental approaches. It set up several different, but complementary, methods of testing.

Another set of methodological, or quasi-methodological, needs is to frame questions likely to produce results (and material) which will speak fairly directly to teachers. This means, among other things: using classroom settings where possible; asking questions that have useful outcomes for teaching; showing teachers that the students' responses have not been violated by the methods used to measure them; using more than numbers to gauge and report findings; and preserving room for questions of value in applying results. Too few investigators have recognized their responsibility to help the teacher see the "difference in effect between [teaching] approaches." Better communication might promote a disposition in the schools to reflect upon, experiment with, and evaluate new (and old) approaches to literature. Such methodological needs have influenced the shape of this study.
Summary

The three questions posed for study fit within an intensifying quest on the part of educational researchers to find what actually occurs when students interact with literature. By detailing patterns of response behaviour and development, their enquiry is establishing a firmer ground upon which to build teaching stratagems and sequences. This new research also relates more specifically to the three questions raised in the present study: cultural factors influencing response, prior attitudes towards a topic, and transfer, are all being more fully explained, conceptually refined and made susceptible to measurement. A review of methodological needs shows the desirability of combining various measurement techniques and of establishing or maintaining communication with teachers. A design calculated to meet these desiderata follows.
THE CHOSEN APPROACH

The Questions Narrowed

Question 1. To what extent can Vancouver grade eleven students who do not know of the origins of Canadian poems nevertheless recognize them as being (a) national or (b) regional (British Columbian)?

The conditions "Canadian," "regional," and "foreign" poems were built into the design (following). Question 1 was approached through questionnaire.

Question 2. To what extent do Vancouver grade eleven students respond differently to their nation's poetry or to their region's poetry, than to poetry from other countries?

This question was approached through free response and content analysis.

Question 3. To what extent do differences in response as sought above (and if they exist) depend upon the students' being told of the origins of the poetry?

The conditions knowledge and non-knowledge were built into the design. Question 3 was approached through free-response and content analysis.
The Design

The design (see Figure I for a representation) was a fully crossed 2 x 2 "factorial" with 12 replications. It provided that 24 Vancouver grade 11 classes listened to taped recordings of a pair of unfamiliar poems and, concurrently, read them privately. The students were then asked to respond to the poems freely, in writing. The free, written, responses were subjected to content analysis. (See Table I for category headings.) Information so gained was used to answer the research questions.

There were 12 poem pairs, each pair being presented twice (in reversed order to counter order-effects). Each pair consisted of one Canadian poem and one New Zealand poem, thus embodying the independent variable "Poem Origins." Poem content was limited by sampling from descriptive landscape poems written since the beginning of the 1930s.

"Poem Origins" was refined by dividing the Canadian poems into half from British Columbia and half from other Canadian regions. Separate analysis was made of responses to each poem group.

Each class was divided, randomly, in two. The Canadian poem in the pair that was given to one class sub-group was labelled as Canadian. The New Zealand poem in the same pair was labelled as Non-Canadian. The same Canadian and New Zealand poems given to the other class sub-group were not so
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labelled. Thus the two class sub-groups embodied, through labelling and non-labelling, the independent variable "Knowledge."

Had any students possessed "Knowledge" in advance of the experimental session ("Pre-Knowledge"), the "Knowledge" condition was to be preserved by the separate analysis of data from those students. Similarly, there was to be a separate analysis of the data from any students who were neither experimentally told nor knew in advance the "Origins" of the poetry but who nevertheless signified at the end of the experimental period that they had "guessed" such "Origins" ("Deduced Knowledge").

The integrity of the student base, Vancouver students, was preserved by the separate treatment of data from those students who had not lived (a) in Canada or (b) in British Columbia during all of the five years immediately preceding the study.

Several supporting instruments and procedures served to provide controls and furnish data for supplementary analysis: a questionnaire ascertaining students' past places of residence; a questionnaire gauging students' "Pre-Knowledge" and "Deduced Knowledge"; a questionnaire assessing students' personal and school experience with Canadian literature; a questionnaire checking students' awareness of the study's purpose; a supplementary content analytic probe within and across the main
analytical categories; and a separate analysis of the responses of the groups who were excluded from the main study--where their numbers warranted it. Grounds for separate analysis, in addition to those already mentioned, were: a student's awareness of the study's purpose before, or early in, the experimental session; and "high" familiarity with Canadian literature ("Extensive Canadian Reading").

The overall design created optimum conditions for gathering data on certain facets of student response which, though not related to the central hypotheses, did seem to warrant later study. The instruments designed to such ends appear in the testing battery (Appendix II). The corpus of free-response material created by the central investigation provided similar opportunities for future research. Some specific approaches are suggested and some tentative findings reported in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II

FREE RESPONSE AND CONTENT ANALYSIS

WRITTEN, FREE, IMMEDIATE RESPONSE

Literary Response

Response is a designation for "that Gordian combination of affective, cognitive, perceptual, and psycho-motor activities that take place when a person reads a book." It is a label for all that the reader feels, thinks or does as a result of his reading, hearing or watching performed a literary work. Response may manifest itself overtly in some action or expression; it may never be outwardly expressed. It may occur as immediate reflection; it may surface only years after initial reading. Its public expression and inner manifestation probably never coincide fully.

Definitions of response are seldom satisfactory. Like those of the IEA and Purves below, they are usually at once too specific and too vague:

Response is best defined as the ongoing interaction between the individual and the work, an interaction that may continue long after the individual has finished reading. This response is never made fully explicit, for one could not tell of all the associations, ideas, feelings, and reflections that take place as one reads a novel, say, or after one has finished it.

Response begins the moment one first confronts the work and ends—well, in some cases, it ends only
when the individual dies. It includes reading, thinking, feeling, and acting in some relation to the stimulus of the literary work. It manifests itself in a variety of ways.4

An alternative to making conventional definitional statements is to detail the variable-sets which, in concert, make response possible. Thus response might be said to involve someone who responds. It involves something which is responded to. It involves the circumstances in which the interaction between reader and work takes place.5 And it involves the mode of response.

There are those who stress the first variable-set. As a group their comments range widely from stressing the "primacy of subjectivity"6 and the "individual character"7 of response to the quieter assertion that

What the reader brings to the text is as important as the text itself in determining the kind of response the reader will have.8

Others will not allow the reader's role in response, and the complexity that derives from his contribution, to diminish the contribution made by the work itself. The latter triggers response and is much more than a trigger. It possesses its own inherent power.9 It is itself a source of response complexity:

Literature is by nature so much concerned with multiple levels of meaning, the tensions of meaning inherent in ambiguity and metaphor, and
the subtle significance of statements and events
that objective certainty will often be impossible. 10

There is little argument that circumstances of reading influence
response. Response modes are acknowledged as being important
too; they will be discussed later (see below, p. 33 et seq.).

Most recent research into literary response has assumed
a dynamic, complex, relationship operating between all four vari-
able-sets. It has largely accepted, and consolidated, the
"transactionist" view of literature as a "mode of experience to
be reflected on" rather than as a discrete subject matter for
analysis. 11

The present investigation was similarly based upon the
assumption of a four-way relationship. The reader's role was
acknowledged—he was held to embody attitudes towards nations
and literature, and his idiosyncrasies were controlled by measure-
ment across class groups. The literary work's role was acknowl-
edged—poems embodied "National" or "Regional" "Origins" and
literary characteristics. The circumstances of reading were
acknowledged—it being assumed necessary to cancel out their in-
fluence by standardizing procedures across groups. The mode of
response was acknowledged—care being taken in choosing which mode
to ask students to respond in.

One virtue of the term "response" is that it distin-
guishes between, on one hand, a reader's primary reaction to a
work and, on the other, criticism and appreciation (which the
primary reaction may or may not also be). The latter depend
upon response but go further. Whereas response entails no
necessary evaluative act, appreciation does. When we "train" students to express response in particular ways (under names like "critical reading," "explication de texte," "criticism," "taste," or some other term), when we encourage them to prefer certain works and certain interpretations, when we ask them to consciously analyze and give reasons for their responses, when we have them attempting to "extract" the "full meaning" from a piece, when we attempt to have them counter effects of personal preference in order to judge "fairly," then we are asking them to move from response to criticism and appreciation. The distinction is important because the present study was an attempt to start at the beginning: to find what and where Canadian students' responses are with respect to Canadian literature before asking that they be moulded or trained. It dealt with criticism only in Norvell's sense: "Children are the truest of all critics when they are free to speak their minds in simple terms."

"Response" in (Empirical) Educational Research

"Response," as a concept, is elusive and amorphous. How, then, to measure it?

Should the candidate report on his enjoyment of what he is reading? Should his taste be measured against some norm? Should we take an electroencephalograph?

Whatever choice he makes a researcher will measure only one facet, or a very few, of response. Researchers have generally
accepted this fact and rejected the possibility of assessing, in any single "observable behaviour," the global concept "respond to a work of literature." Instead they have set about "fathoming and cataloguing the ingredients"; refining from the scientifically vague phraseology of literary appreciation and response some specific components. To the latter they have attached, in the context of psychology and psychometry, behaviours that seem to offer a direct approach to empirical measurement. In short, research has been predicated upon the "operational" definition of response elements. If a global concept "response" is ever suggested it is usually as an aggregation of such elements.

The research has never been easy; behaviours are hard to find. The search for them is caught in a tension between the multifaceted "humanistic encounter with literature and the mechanical appraisal of education." The first sets considerable store by the complex and allusive; the second places weight on the conceptually simple and objective.

Moreover, the problems do not end with refinement or definition. The very means used to "measure" response may change or destroy it. And when attempts are made to preserve "normal" reading conditions, as when a teacher observes and records during "normal" lessons, the data collected is not usually of the sort that would "satisfy a cost accountant." An added difficulty is that response is probably no "series of static decisions [but] a continuously moving, changing, thought
process." It is quicksilver to the behaviourists' meshes.

Given such problems, it is important that behavioural research into response to literature be seen for what it is—a particular type of exploration into particular parts of the literary or aesthetic experience. Like all literary endeavour it defies absolute validation.

To introduce the specific response-measures that follow, an analogy is useful. If specific response behaviours can be compared to representations on a radar screen, deeper response might be acknowledged as the objects represented, merely, by the blips. The blips offer no fine definition; they do indicate a presence. Response proper might be seen vaguely, in glimpses and not-quite-surely, but it is represented.

Again, because the blips on one scanning do not assure their subject's fixity in space, response manifestations "identified" in the present experiment might not be assumed stable. Yet on different scanners and over repeated scannings similar patterns would suggest a stable presence. Accordingly, where different school classes show similar patterns in expressed responses the latter might be held to indicate stable—at the time—response factors.

Similarly, as the tracking of objects over time will register directional movements, so future replications of the present experiment at different student age levels might yield information more firmly establishing the nature, through show-
ing their development, of the response factors that were measured here.

Finally, the radar analogy offers a caution. The scanner most clearly picks up general groupings or movements. Massed blips and gross movements tend to obscure lesser patterns. This study, too, as a first enquiry, dealt mainly with gross movements and generalities. If it did not register smaller patterns and movements that might only be because it was not equipped to find them.

Some Aspects of Response: The Present Study

Expressed (Written) Response

The tangible facet of response chosen for the present study was its verbal expression. It is true that the elements of writing about literature "are not necessarily identical with the elements of response" itself. All that is thought, felt, or even spoken will not be written down. When it is, writing tends to impose its own logic upon response. And written response is influenced by educational background: nations or cultures, it is known, and possibly individual schools or school areas too, foster distinctive modes of approach to and expression about literature.

On the other hand there were advantages in using written response: it is the facet most susceptible to analysis and "measurement"; it is the one most widely probed in research;
a student used to writing in response to poetry, but not to being interviewed personally or talking in isolation, may express in writing something much closer to the "psychological event" of responding than he would in an interview; because the person who evaluates his writing is more distant than an interviewer, the student might have less fear of offending him (or less desire to offend him); and written response is a form valued by teachers.28

Since students were randomly assigned to experimental groups within intact classes, and since both student groups worked in the same (written) response mode, differing facility in expression between students should not have caused any confounding of variables.29

Free Response

In spite of the labour it demands, the free response technique seems to many teachers and researchers, and for many purposes, the most acceptable method by which to probe literary response.30

Insofar as it deals with the student's own, unprompted, ideas and words, free response offers a relatively direct approach to deeper response—including underlying attitudes. For the same reasons, it preserves the personal quality of response in all its complexity, integrity and texture.

Further, it ensures that the direction of an enquiry
and its modes of analysis do not predetermine response patterns to the same extent as do many other approaches. Techniques like personal questioning, or instruments like multiple choice question sets and semantic differentials often mould the responses they pretend to discover. By contrast, an analysis of free response may follow a subject's expression in several different directions and to several different levels. It is exceedingly important in pioneer work to avoid the imposition of a priori patterns upon response. Response patterns must be allowed to announce themselves. They should be anticipated only generally and as possibilities. For these reasons, at least, free-response possessed a particular validity for this study.

It is true that free response does not eliminate previously-learned response patterns or the influence of particular experimental formats, procedures, and instructions. Still, response will always compromise between "individuality" and outside influences. And since, in the present study, twenty-four classes were involved, response patterns should not have been simply artifacts of, or confoundings with, differences in learned response patterns. (No such differences were, in fact, detected.)

There is still the danger that an analytical scheme can force responses into its own procrustean bed, distorting or obscuring their nature. But because analytical patterns can be established post priori, because they can be altered, and
because several can be used at once—as the intact free responses suggest or allow—the danger can be minimized. This point is reinforced somewhat by the number of different analytical schemes that have been created for different response materials. It is similarly reinforced by an often expressed satisfaction—ultimately subjective, yes, but from respected figures—that the identified patterns do inhere in the material. The IEA team, Sussams, Smith Tyler et al., and Loban respectively have reported their experiences:

This expressed response exists in a pattern which can be described... [italics mine]

no-one can read through their statements—there are well over 600 of them—without finding certain impressions taking shape in his mind. [italics mine]

These comments were sorted until the following widely prevalent modes of response were discovered. [italics mine]

By reading all of the responses to "Miss Brill" several times, the experimenter became aware that they ordered themselves into distinct categories and that a design for content analysis could be developed on the basis of the systematic character of responses to a single story. [first italics mine]

I have had the same experience. I also have had to reject extant analytical schemes because they failed to deal adequately with the patterns established by the pilot study responses and, later, by the full study responses.

The free response technique, then, helps avoid the
imposition of categories upon responses. It also counters the "right-answer" syndrome. Research with attitude scales and experience with multiple choice tests indicate that students will tend to answer in the way they think the teacher or researcher would answer or prefer them to answer. Such a condition is disturbing even in "comprehension" testing; in studies designed primarily to gauge personal feelings and attitudes, and depending upon their frank expression, it cannot be entertained. Rather than ask the reader to concur with, and second-guess, a pre-determined "right" answer (as a question set might) it seemed more appropriate in this study to allow him to construct his own meanings and significances.

Precisely because free response does not direct students towards any specific areas or "answers," some researchers have feared that the technique will not produce data sufficiently related to their research-interest or sufficiently differentiated on key variables to make it worth-while using. But most implemented research projects using free-response have demonstrated that the fear is misplaced. Pilot work for this study also allayed the fear: the response data bore closely on the research questions and exhibited sufficient variance to encourage further exploration. Besides, differences that emerge without direct prompting are more likely to be of educational and cultural significance than those that must be teased out.

For all these reasons free response seemed a sound technique with which to open the investigation into Canadian
student literary response. It is disposed to map broad response configurations first; it does not, inherently, predict their shape. Its product should be a neutral description upon which subsequent questions of response-quality, teaching approach, and the like can be framed. Other pioneering studies, including the IEA project, have started at the same point and assumed the same predication.

Immediate Response

The term "response" must be narrowed still further so that it may be observed. "Immediate" response was chosen for several reasons. It has its own, inherent, interest and importance for teaching. Gauging response at a first sitting reduces the number of extraneous variables acting upon response. And immediate response may maximize attitudinal variables.

To measure immediate response is not to deny that response may change—though great change should not be too freely assumed. Nor does a response written at a first reading deny the reader a period of initial reflection. A reflection period between reading and writing was encouraged in the present study. (See below, pp. 86-7.)
Content Analysis in General

Content Analysis Defined

Content analysis attempts, in its various forms, to control the amorphous and elusive qualities of verbal expression by systematically describing and counting recurring categories of manifest content. The categories in a content analysis scheme are usually shaped, not only to reflect accurately the content, but also to yield data relevant to specific hypotheses. Results can be expressed numerically and thus made susceptible to statistical analysis.

The principle behind content analysis is not new:

Anybody who has ever looked at written materials or listened to talk or speeches and thought of ways to categorize and order the elements therein has been using content analysis. It has been in use informally for a long time.

Even so-called qualitative and subjective modes of analysis frequently employ quantitative descriptions and terms, like "repeatedly," "rarely," "usually," and "often." Behavioural science has merely applied explicitness, rigour, and formality to the idea, requiring that an initial period of speculation and enquiry with such descriptions be followed by, first, the formulation, definition, and differentiation of categories, and then by a more or less rigorous analysis in their terms.
Content analysis has received increasing attention in recent years. Its widespread use in communications research led to formal reviews in Berelson (1952) and Muehl (1961). Its use in important literary response studies by such figures as Richards, Taba, Meckel, Loban, Squire, and the IEA greatly elevated its status in that field, where it is now widely and variously employed.

The Reasons for Choosing Content Analysis

The decisions to use free response and content analysis were, in fact, one. Free responses cannot easily be analyzed and applied to hypotheses or research questions except by some form of content analysis. The technique provided a means by which to control this enquiry once patterns had been found. It was well-suited to cope with the more than 500 response protocols that were generated.

Content analysis has other advantages. Because it does not preshape the content under analysis, the technique permits alternative patterns or analytical modes to be applied. Statements within categories remain alive to examination. It thus meets, to some degree, the several objections that might be raised to the empirical assessment of response: that categorization violates the "essential dynamics of the transaction"; that it is blind to the peculiar complexity of literary response; and that, as in gross or poorly adapted applications, it hides sub-behaviours within or between its categories.
Problems with Content Analysis

Of course content analysis is not without problems. First, it is extremely time-consuming by comparison with most measurement techniques. Second, the gap between humanistic interrelationship or complexity and empirical quantitative behaviours cannot be fully bridged even by supplementary techniques.\textsuperscript{55} Intended ambiguities, varied levels of meaning, nuance, and so on, may defy the content analyst. The objectivity and simplicity of the technique must not be mistaken for completeness. Third, notwithstanding the fact that content analysis is always applied to responses previously made and usually only after close attention to patterns in those responses, it may still impose patterns upon them. Fourth, even the distinction between manifest and latent content, of which the former is normally the subject of analysis, cannot always be sustained. The "what-is-said" is sometimes so inextricably bound up with the "why" and "how" that it cannot be fully understood without reference to them.\textsuperscript{56} Fifth, for most of the reasons listed, the validity of any given analysis scheme cannot be unequivocally established. Though cases can be made to support a particular scheme, its validity is ultimately a "face" validity: it is valid to each reader in proportion as he accepts its terms.\textsuperscript{57}

These reservations having been noted, content analysis was still the best analytical procedure for the present purpose.
Care was taken, both in developing the system itself and in employing supplementary analysis, to reduce its shortcomings.

Criteria for Developing a Content Analysis Scheme

There are three criteria, apart from that demanding simplicity and clarity, usually considered in developing a content analysis scheme. The most important has already been discussed: the scheme should closely follow, or be derived from, the material being analyzed; analytical units should be developed only after sample material has been closely scrutinized. Second, the research questions should determine which of the various patterns that can be traced (or items that can be found) in any given content will be submitted to analysis. Third, a criterion subordinate to the first two, is that which seeks generalization. There is added value in a scheme that refers beyond its specific concerns to some other scheme, analytical system, or theory.

One difficulty in applying the third criterion is that it can distort the primary study; true generalizability is difficult to establish. A conspicuous example of this difficulty is furnished by the Purves-Rippere scheme "Elements of Writing About a Literary Work." It was designed in connection with the IEA international study but the breadth of that study and research enthusiasm have lent the scheme wider currency. Now an increasing number of researchers, all with their different materials, purposes and assumptions are finding
that it does not meet their needs. In fact the National Assessment of Educational Progress has added three categories to Purves's original four. Schemes other than Purves's prove the same point. What Berelson wrote in 1952 of communications analysis is still true today of literary-response analysis:

> it is premature to attempt to formulate content analysis categories for application to all problems and all materials.

The Scheme Used in This Study

The Need

The Scheme (hereafter capitalized) used in this study was developed to analyze pilot response-material after existing schemes proved inadequate. Information relevant to the study and clearly present in the response material was not being drawn into categories in any useful way.

The Classification Unit: Its Physical Parameters

Categorization was made on semantic grounds since the study was concerned with meanings. The categorization unit was the single "statement" (others have variously called it an "assertion," an "idea," a "proposition," a "thought-unit," a "communication" and so on). Its length was determined by consistency of statement or continued correspondence to a coding category or set of categories. The statement was judged to have ended when the coder found he needed a new category or
set of categories to reflect the content.

Grammatical units were rejected because several semantic elements of response can be merged in one clause or sentence and because one semantic element of response can overlap several grammatical units. Indeed, the written style that free response allows the responder to use often obscures the parameters of the grammatical unit itself. With these problems, to code the latter would have been to screen unnecessarily the main enquiry.66

Decisions on classification were permitted to take context beyond the unit into account. In this way the Scheme was better equipped to cope with obscurities within the classification unit and with response unity and complexity.

Response complexity was also met by the multiple classification of statement units where their content indicated multiple meaning. Many statements received more than one placement.

The Number of Classification Units

The chosen number of categories was governed jointly by the nature of the final response material and the research questions. Optimum analytical coherence and reliability seemed to exist at the present number (i.e. 11, see below, Table I). A supplementary analysis "Within and Across" (see below p. 91) was designed to cut across the main analytical scheme and offer
alternative viewings.

The Meaning of Each Category (Table I is a summary of the categories.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE CONTENT ANALYSIS SCHEME: CATEGORY HEADINGS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Evaluation  
2. Comprehension  
3. Description - Recapitulation  
4. Transfer - Place  
5. Transfer - Special  
6. Visualisation  
7. Involvement  
8. Depth  
9. Interpretation  
10. Form  
11. Dictums and Predispositions

The meaning, and validity, of each category depends upon the degree of "sameness" between statements placed
together. To illustrate this "sameness" and to allow the present reader to ascertain the appropriateness of the labels and descriptions given each category, examples of response statements are displayed below. (Some examples of complete response protocols are displayed in Appendix IV, A.)

Sometimes in response protocols, apparently simple phrases can strike different readers or the same reader in different ways. For example, "this interests me" can mean that the responder is beginning to be attracted to a work, that he is beginning to think through an idea that the poem has suggested to him, or that he finds the poem to be of a type which has always interested him and which, accordingly, he "likes." Key words under each category show what policy was decided upon for consistent coding in such cases. Notes sometimes elaborate upon these decisions. Any statement could be placed in several categories. Its appearance (below) in one, on what may be relatively slight grounds, does not necessarily indicate an oversight of the more obvious placement.

Placement in a category depended upon manifest content, not upon the statement's "value" (see below, p. 54, What the Categories Represent).

The following statements are printed as the students wrote them.

(1) Evaluation

Statements in which the student expresses, of the
total poem: "enjoyment," "pleasure," "liking," etc. (positive); or their opposites (negative). This category brings together statements in which the student indicates his satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the whole poem.

   e.g. positive:

      I liked the poem more than the other one.
      Overall I found #2 the most enjoyable.

   negative:

      But I didn't like it very well.
      They're not either what I would call good poems.

Notes:

   (i) This category excludes evaluative statements that apply only to parts or features of the poem, to the scene it portrays, or to the peculiarities of the recorded presentations.

   (ii) The category duplicates, to some extent, that dimension of evaluative response measured by the Likert type preference scale (see below, p. 159). Since all students responded to the scale, and since the scale measured intensity of preference to some degree, the overall profile of student preference between poems was taken from that scale. Category 1 served to show the preferences only of those students who cared to express them freely. There was a high degree of association
between the Likert scale and Category 1 (see below, p. 61).

(2) Comprehension

Statements in which the student refers to reading and "understanding" difficulties or their opposites, in more or less direct terms.

Positive relates to positive "understanding," grasped "meaning" (but not "meaningfulness"—see Category 7, Involvement), "clarity," etc. (positive); or their opposites (negative).

e.g. positive:

#1 poem seemed easier to understand overall.
Poem #2 is also easier to read.

negative:

I think poem #1 is not clear, it doesn't get the message across.
All this just makes it hard to understand.

(3) Description-Recapitulation

Statements in which the student simply describes the landscape portrayed in the poem, offering no interpretation.

e.g. This stream starting on a mountain top and running down through its life until it reaches the sea. Through the forests and eroded debris.
The clouds are drifting slowly across the sky, and the water is quite still.

(4) Transfer-Place

Statements specifically identifying the scene or setting portrayed in the poem.

e.g. positive:

It reminds me of our mountains the morning after a super hot day.

It reminded me of a mountain I saw one time while going through the Rockies.

negative:

It tells you how the situation is without people and you compare it with your own places or known places with people.

"The Scene" is just like a Shagra-La set up. An imaginary make-believe world.

(5) Transfer-Special

Transfer statements relating to the world known to the student. The student says, explicitly or implicitly, "this is the way my world is" or "is not." Indicators include: "believable," "true," "real," "relevant," etc. (positive); or their opposites (negative).

e.g. positive:

The first one was easier to understand because it dealt with a very real situation.
This poem moved me in a special way because I have had similar happenings on the waters.

It gives me a more relaxed feeling than the second one because everything seems to be more normal. There is still the lifelessness but it is all right in the first poem. The environment agrees with the lifelessness.

negative:

I have always thought of water as a continuously moving thing that is very alive. In the above line of the poem though the water is as lifeless as everything else. It is asleep and indifferent to existence.

I have never seen like it [Fall] described in the poem. The setting is definitely somewhere else.

(6) Visualisation

Statements in which the student indicates, in relatively direct terms, that he is able to "see" clearly or vividly the scene portrayed in the poem.

e.g. positive:

You can really see the mud and old rotted posts.
I could picture the scene right away.

negative:

In the second one you can't really see the scene.

For the second poem I cannot think of anything that suggests a setting of some kind . . . it is too confusing and I myself can't sort it out.
(7) Involvement

Statements in which the student indicates that he became "caught up" in the poem, through words or statements like: "depressing," "suspenseful," "moving," "gripping," "interesting," "reminding," and "I felt I was there," etc. (positive); or their opposites (negative).

e.g. positive:

I found the poem to be slow, sad, and depressing.
This poem is so full of mystery and energy.

negative:

Neither poem made me feel relaxed, tense, or anything else.

[The poem] only told you about it not really let you see, feel, or hear the insides of it.

Note:

This category is distinguished from Category 1 (Evaluation) in that it contains statements less distanced and judgmental than those in 1. The following statement is scored under Category 1 for "good" and Category 7 for "interesting":

The second poem wasn't as good or interesting as the first.

(8) Depth

Statements in which the student attributes depth of
meaning to the poem.

e.g. positive:

To me it has a lot more meaning to it.
The first one was very deep and hard to understand, at least for me.

negative:

I think maybe this poem is too clear or tells you too much. This inhibits me to let my imagination go.
The first poem does not have much meaning to it.

(9) Interpretation

Statements in which the student assigns a meaning or meanings to the poem.

e.g. I guess the point these poems are trying to make is that the sea or ocean is peaceful, secluded world on its own.
And it tells you how some sounds never rest like the sound of the wind.

Note:

Interpretation is also approached through the analysis "Significant Adjectival" (below, p. 143) to the extent that the latter do reveal interpretations.

(10) Form

Statements in which the student refers to structural
elements in the poem, to the craft of writing generally, or to
the common stylistic modes by which literary works are classi-

dified.

  e.g. because it was too full of vague imagery
      and things that might be symbols or might not.
      It was the word or phrase sound that was
      important, not distinctly the word or
      phrase meaning.
      more poetic and flowing also.

Note:

This category often contains, in practice, many
statements in which students superficially, loosely, and some-
times apparently dutifully, use (or mis-use) formal terms like
"image" and "symbol."

  e.g. However contradicting symbolism along with
      the general plot made the poem somewhat
      confusing.

(11) Dictums and Predispositions

Statements in which the student suggests by fairly
direct comment, literary desiderata or the attitudes with which
he would approach any poem.

  e.g. I like to read Canadian works, especially from
      my own province. I think it means more to me.
      I think, to be able to make the poem express feel-
      ing, there must be a great deal more action.
      Nature is good in poems if they can describe it
      like it is.
What the Categories Represent

It is both useful and statistically necessary to view each category as embodying a separate probe. The categories, although they are inter-related, are not taxonomic; they were not assigned relative values for scoring purposes.

It is always difficult, and it seemed counter to the spirit of this study to assert the primacy of any one category or to posit any category hierarchy. Schemes for analyzing literary response are rarely taxonomic, never convincingly so. Further, the present study aimed to find out if patterns existed, not to argue category value or, directly, teaching approaches. Studies which attempt to combine these goals always risk their own distortion. Nor did this study judge the "quality" or "accuracy" of responses. Such judgment was, mainly, left to later study. Similarly, the inter-relationship between categories, suggested above, is to be examined closely in future research (see below, p.166).

Coding Details

Coding was carried out only after class protocols were shuffled and student numbers masked (the numbers identified Knowledge conditions).

Each statement was scored by the appropriate category number/s and by valence. The classification for each whole response protocol (and poem pair) was obtained by collapsing to
a single score all scores registered under each category for each poem. These collapsed scores were called "Frequency" scores.

Often the collapsed scores differentiated between poems either because only one poem was scored in that category or because valence differentiated the scores. Where no such automatic differentiation occurred, responses were examined to see whether some statement, tendency, or nuance of expression would allow differentiation (as would, usually, "especially," "less so," or "not as much"). Where differentiation was possible, a positive or negative score was assigned to one of the poems. Thus, from Frequency scores, "Comparative" scores were reached by deciding which poem, Canadian or New Zealand, was the one more positively treated in each category. If no differentiation could be made, the poems were scored equally. If no scores were registered, a blank was left.

The use of one Comparative score per occurrence, per classification unit, per poem, sustained the radar analogy and principle. The scanner reveals locations and directions, mass intensities far less precisely. To state numbers or proportions of words, or degrees of emphasis, in each protocol would have been to make demands of the free response technique that it is not designed to handle. (A gross quantitative measure was made independent of the Scheme. See below, pp. 108, 141.) The technique does not, for example, assume that the length of
each statement corresponds to its importance in the response. Besides, Berelson suggests that "large units of analysis provide as accurate a picture of subject matter and partisanship as small units of analysis."^70

Comparative scoring coped neatly with difficult-to-classify statements. A classification could be arrived at through a statement previous to or subsequent to that which was troublesome. The dubious statement did not have to be, directly, asserted to mean such-and-such, as it must in word-counting. Comparative-score analysis coped in a similar way with repetitions in response protocols. Repetitions did not, finally, score twice.

The Comparative-score analysis used in this study thus preserved responses from undue experimental or behavioural distortion.

Finer Scoring Details

Answers to the research questions were sought by observing, in each category, the relative frequencies of the Comparative scores under the different experimental conditions. To assist in describing these frequencies the Chi-Square statistic was employed (see below, p. 101).

The sorting of the numerical data and some statistical testing was carried out at the UBC Computing Centre using the program Statistical Package For the Social Sciences (SPSS).
The Validity of the Scheme

General

Validity in content analysis is, however one labels it, a matter of judgment and agreement.\(^{71}\) There is no absolute validity. Within a given scheme, individuals might disagree over anything from a particular item placement to the basic principles of analysis.\(^{72}\)

For the present scheme, I suggest four areas of judgment and possible agreement: my own judgment ("Claimed Validity"); that "purchased" from studies or discussions whose analytical schemes relate significantly to the present work ("Purchased Validity"); that of others who, on reading this dissertation, accept the Scheme ("Attested Validity"); and that accumulating as other approaches and data echo my findings under the Scheme ("Accumulating Validity").

Claimed Validity

I have already asserted the validity of many features of the Scheme. It reflects well the actual responses to the landscape poems; it provides categories both capable of distinguishing responses relevant to the study's purposes and sufficiently limited to render response material manageable; and it has the capacity to handle multiple meanings in response statements.
Procedures that I followed in order to attain this validity include: a thorough investigation of existing systems; post priori construction and revision; extensive direct comparison of statements within categories (by scissors-and-paste procedures); and reliability checks and discussions. The Scheme was under constant review.

Purchased Validity

Existing schemes were the starting point in the development of the Scheme. Although the latter was developed because the former proved inadequate to the present response-material, relationships remain between the two. Category 1, Evaluation, provides an example of such "purchased" validity. The example, incidentally, also demonstrates the need for the present Scheme.

Evaluation corresponds, in part, to the "Engagement-Involvement" and "Evaluation" categories of Purves's "Elements of Writing About a Literary Work." Purves's two categories contain, respectively, statements such as: "I do not usually like Coleridge, but 'Kubla Khan' was different"; and "These are good poems--clear, intimate and living."73 My Category 1 breaks down, for its own purposes, the distinction between the statements that Purves suggests in his category titles. In both statements the student positively evaluates. To be sure, the student is saying other things as well but that is a response complexity that my Scheme, not Purves's, is designed to accommodate.
So it is with many schemes: there are points of agreement and points of difference. Category 1 corresponds to the sub-category "General Judgments" of Squire's scheme but denies his common grouping, in that category, of statements like: "I like it"; "it seems real"; and "it goes in one ear and out the other." However Squire also maintains my distinction between evaluation and involvement.

Smith, Tyler et al., for their large-scale probe, the "Eight-Year Study," created a category "Satisfaction in the Thing Appreciated" which they characterize as follows:

Appreciation manifests itself in a feeling, on the part of the individual, of deep satisfaction in and enthusiasm for the thing appreciated. The person who appreciates a given piece of literature finds in it an immediate, persistent, and easily-renewable enjoyment of extraordinary intensity.

one wants to learn whether or not a person actually prefers the works of art with which he is able to communicate.

Category 1 also relates to three categories--"Receiving (Attending)," "Responding," and "Valuing"--of Krathwohl, Bloom and Masia's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (Affective Domain).

The list of schemes goes on. In none does categorization fully coincide with mine. But all demonstrate a belief that a response element "evaluation" does exist. They further
demonstrate a wider belief in the primary importance of "enjoy­ment" in literature. Rosenblatt confidently maintains: "Few teachers of English would deny that the individual's ability to read and enjoy literature is the primary aim of literary study." Muller speaks in the same vein: "They [the Dartmouth Conference] agreed that the teacher should choose reading that is meaningful, interesting, and enjoyable to children." And Hansson, in defending the subjectivity of evaluation, reminds us that teachers and students will continue "to evaluate and to argue, at least silently, for their positive or negative opinions of their reading."

A similar validation can be purchased for all of the present Scheme's categories.

Attested Validity

Attested validity takes two forms for the present Scheme. First is the intensive examination given it in reliability checking. High reliability in analyzing semantic content depends upon more than "face validity" for the co-scorer; it requires that both scorers understand the particular scheme. High reliability indicates a deeper validity. Second, anyone reading this dissertation will be, and must be, his own judge of validity. The Scheme's terms and procedures are fully announced to this end.

Accumulating Validity

In general not immediately available, this form of
validity will be most directly gained from the specific future research outlined below (see below, p. 158) if it produces results in agreement with those produced by the Scheme. One finding that the present study's results have, in fact, already contributed to this form of validity, is the high correlation ($\text{l} = .67^{**}$) between Category 1 (Evaluation) and preferences registered on the Likert scale.\textsuperscript{83}

The Reliability of the Scheme

The most commonly employed reliability formula in literary response analysis is Lewin's. It reads

\[
\frac{2 \times \text{the sum of agreements}}{\text{sum of items checked by both examiners}}
\]

Instruments analyzing response by Lewin's formula have produced coefficients like .85 (Lewin), .89 (Loban), and .83 (Squire).\textsuperscript{84} Purves considers a correlation coefficient of .75 to be high in a literature test.\textsuperscript{85}

Because of the multiple placement principle, which I considered vital in order to reflect the often multilayered texture of response utterance, the present Scheme could not be checked using the Lewin formula. A form of percentage overlap was used instead. An independent analyst coded two randomly chosen protocols from each class—a total of 48 protocols or 10\% of the student sample. I had arrived at 188 Comparative
scores in that sample. The check-coder differed to the extent of 16 scores (2 more and 14 fewer). Non-agreement thus amounted to 8.5% and the reliability estimation to 91.5%—very high, even by the percentage method. Moreover, a good proportion of non-agreements were scoring omissions, not differences between the coders on scores actually given.
CHAPTER III

EXPERIMENTAL PRACTICES AND DECISIONS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter details features of the design and discusses (against the background of the earlier, more general, discussion) the reasons for deciding upon each feature. It is important to remember that the design was shaped to reveal not the intricacies of possible response to any given poem but generalized response sets with respect to the chosen poems as groups.

DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

Note:

The definitions immediately following relate to the broad design. (Some other terms, such as those used to describe content analysis categories and statistical units, are defined elsewhere.) Capitalization of the key terms will now replace quotations marks.

Poem Origins

Poem Origins: the geographical area (region or nation) whose landscape is portrayed, or is ostensibly portrayed, by a particular poem—as in Canadian, Rest-of-Canada, British Columbia, or New Zealand poetry.

Canadian (Can) Poetry: English poetry (not a translation into English) portraying a scene that is, or could easily be, Canadian.
British Columbia (BC) Poetry (Regional): English poetry (not a translation into English) portraying a scene that is, or could easily be, in British Columbia.

Rest-of-Canada (RC) Poetry: Canadian poetry other than that defined as British Columbia poetry.

New Zealand (NZ) Poetry: English poetry (not a translation into English) portraying a scene that is, or could easily be, in New Zealand.

CAN/NZ: poem pairs made up of CAN and NZ works.

RC/NZ: poem pairs made up of RC and NZ works.

BC/NZ: poem pairs made up of BC and NZ works.

Student Origins

Student Origins: the region or nation in which students resided during all of the five years immediately preceding the study (from and including 1970).

Canadian Students: students whose Origins are in Canada.

British Columbia Students: students whose Origins are in British Columbia.

Rest-of-Canada Students: students whose Origins are in Canada but not in British Columbia.

Foreign Students: students whose Origins are not in Canada.
Student Knowledge, Awareness, and Recognition

Knowledge: a student's awareness that a particular poem was written in, or portrays, the landscape of a particular region or nation.

Pre-Knowledge: a student's Knowledge in advance of the experimental session.

Deduced Knowledge: a student's Knowledge by reason of the student's noticing or feeling in one poem (and in the absence of Given Knowledge) evidence by which he correctly assigns to it its Origin.

Given Knowledge (GK): a student's Knowledge by reason of his being given, in an experimental session, a poem pair of which one poem is labelled "A Canadian Poem" or "A B.C. Poem" and the other poem is labelled "Non-Canadian."

Denied Knowledge (DK): a student's lack of Knowledge of both poems presented to him. It is the counterpart and opposite of the experimental treatment Given Knowledge.

Awareness, being Aware: a student who is aware of the study's procedures or purposes before he has completed his free response is deemed to be Aware.

Recognize, Recognition: a behaviour by which the student signifies that he possesses Knowledge that a particular poem portrays the landscape of a particular region or nation.
**Extensive Canadian Reading:** a student's contact with Canadian literature when that contact is registered as 4 or 5 on the scale "What Do You Know of These Poems?"

**THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES**

**Poem Origins**

**General**

To control Origins was the obvious method by which to obtain a relative measure of the effects of Canadian poems on Canadian student responses. Pilot studies using a Rest-of-Canada / New Zealand comparison produced variance strengthening this assumption.

**The English-Canada / New Zealand (CAN/NZ) Comparison**

An experimental comparison is best made between items differing on key points but alike in other respects so that extraneous variables are reduced to a minimum. The literatures of English-Canada and New Zealand provided such a comparison.

English literary development in the two countries—both are British "Older Dominions"—has involved a parallel pre-occupation with landscape and a remarkable simultaneity in breaking, from about the 1930s, with older, "imported," poetic traditions. The pairing of poems from these countries thus seemed more justified than would, say the pairing of Canadian and British landscape poems.
The Rest-of-Canada / British Columbia Comparison (RC/NZ cf. BC/NZ)

The Canada / New Zealand comparison could be enriched, without being distorted, by a regional sub-comparison. The sub-comparison was designed to show (primarily) whether poetry of the students' own region produced a response different to that produced by the Rest-of-Canada poetry. A concern with region was reviewed in Chapter I.

I assumed that the whole range of BC landscape would be familiar to Vancouver students, through their daily proximity to mountain and sea and through an awareness of the Okanagan as a dry-belt. The latter point was not critical: BC landscape poetry deals mostly with mountain and seascape and the poetry sample reflected that. Students who had not lived in BC for the five years immediately preceding the study were eliminated from the main analysis (see below, p.88)

Knowledge of Origins

To control Knowledge seemed the best way to find whether differences in response, to national and foreign poetry, if they occurred, depended upon students being directed towards poem differences or whether response difference could be triggered by factors inherent in the poems. As an example, the former was to be assumed true if differences in response occurred only with labelled poems (Given Knowledge). The absence of differences based upon Given Knowledge was not to be, in itself, grounds to
deny the existence of a prior attitude towards things Canadian. If Origins was a very powerful determinant of response it might have overwhelmed any effects related to the labels.¹ Pilot studies, however, because they showed variance based on Given Knowledge, indicated both that Origins would not overwhelm Knowledge and that the label would be a sufficient trigger.

THE LITERARY MATERIAL

Literature

The choice of literary material reflected my personal interests and the general need for more knowledge of literary responses. Insofar as the study treated Canadian cultural questions, the choice recognized a proposition put by George Woodcock:

To expound the Canadian identity in merely political or sociological terms is, in the last resort, to talk in abstractions; if we wish to feel concretely and imaginatively what it means, we have to turn to our writers . . . who have given form to our experience of the land, who have put Canada into our minds and man within it as living imaginative entities.²

[italics mine]

Literary material, then, served a dual purpose: providing works in themselves worthy of study as response objects; and providing thresholds to broader, culturally determined, attitudes.

The fact that individual students respond differently to given works did not pose an obstacle to this study.³ A
pattern of response across students was anticipated for two reasons: other research shows that common patterns of response do emerge over and above individual differences; and sufficient numbers of students were to respond to each poem to ensure the emergence of any representative pattern.

**Poetry**

**General**

The reasons for using poems as literary response objects included: my own interests; the centrality of poetry in English literature; its high and long-held place in the literature of each source country; the fact that poetry is the genre receiving greatest attention as Canadian literature in Canadian schools; the particular need for developing more successful instructional strategies in poetry; poetry's frequent (as seen in descriptive landscape poetry) lack of overt message, a quality which met the experimental need to open response to the influences of prior attitude as much as possible; and its frequent brevity, which often made possible the presentation of complete works or unified sections of works, enhancing content validity and stabilizing response patterns.

**Poem Type**

**Rural Landscape Poetry**

Rural landscape poetry reflects an important poetic tradition in each source country; both have been deeply pre-
occupied with landscape.

Rural landscape provided, too, a direct approach to transfer; students are likely to share a view of landscape with a poet before they share, say, his satirical view of social mores.

Further, it is axiomatic of experimental study that variables of interest be isolated and that extraneous variables be eliminated. Restricting the sample to descriptive landscape poems best served this dual purpose. After all, landscape is perhaps the most clear-cut of the content factors distinguishing poems and the one most often existing alone (relatively speaking) in poems. Moreover, its pictorial quality makes pairing much easier than with, for instance, poems depicting human characters. Accordingly, landscape was the best and possibly the only criterion for content selection which would admit poems sufficient in number and alike in type to provide satisfactory poem sets for the study. As well, using recognizable landscape as a primary identifying criterion for Origins avoided the problems that birth-place, upbringing, etc., pose to identification of origins by author.

A final and probably overwhelming argument for using landscape poems was that they produced, in pilot studies, responses more clear-cut than did poems with other, or mixed, subjects.
Descriptive Landscape

The restriction to mainly descriptive poems was necessary so that certain content variables which often occur in poetic landscapes and which are in themselves powerful influences on response could be eliminated. Other investigations have shown, and pilot studies for this research showed, the need to eliminate poems which contain, to any major extent: a strong narrative or dramatic action; a focus on human character or on animals; humour; an overt patriotic message; or overt didacticism. Poems containing such elements were accepted for use only where the troublesome elements seemed to lie in balance between pairs or where descriptive elements appeared to overwhelm them. Such a poem pair was "Prairie Bred"/"Canterbury" (see Appendix I, A).

The descriptive criterion also met the need for relatively unstructured response objects. The less structured response objects are, the more response will reveal attitudes. Descriptive landscape poems usually allow, within and beyond their manifest content and form, considerable scope for personal reflection.

Simple Content

Relatively simple poetry was chosen in order that "reading" or "comprehension" difficulties would not restrict "access" to the poems or act otherwise (as they did in one pilot
study) as intervening variables. Although the nature and role of "comprehension" is poorly understood it does appear likely that ease of understanding will promote attitudinal effects and fullness of response for most students. Both are especially desirable with immediate-response techniques.

Choosing simple poems (and supplying glossaries and other reading assistance) also eliminated any need to attempt so-called "comprehension testing" for each poem. Not only is the validity and utility of such testing highly dubious with respect to poetry but to test for comprehension would be to introduce an atmosphere of "examination" that I wished to avoid. Freedom from the "right-answer" syndrome or other pressures is probably a precondition of free, frank response.

The decision for simplicity would not, it was assumed, mean any loss in terms of poem "attractiveness" or "appropriateness" for students. For one thing there is research evidence that a poem "liked" at one grade level will be liked two or three levels above or below that level. For another, poem quality is not gauged by appropriateness to grade level; good or great poems can be simple poems.

Simple Form

By carrying simplicity to form, the latter's effects as an extraneous variable could also be reduced. Formal complexity might well have obscured the landscape content.
Simplicity in form was judged in the light of the several studies showing that the formal features most appealing to students include "simple style," "concrete and clear language and characterization," "clarity," "obviousness," and "order." The present study was not absolutely restricted to such poems, however. Since content is well established as being a more powerful variable than form and since pairing of poems formally alike should eliminate form as a variable (even though the poems may be formally complex), a particularly well-matched pair of poems was not rejected on grounds of formal complexity (e.g. "Moondance"/"Hill Country").

Period From Which Drawn: "The Poetry of the '30s, and After"

The poem sample was restricted to relatively modern works, for several reasons. First, the results of a study by Andrews suggest that a single period should be chosen in order to avoid confounding variables by cross-period pairing. Second, literary history in Canada and New Zealand offered a neatly defined period, the happy coincidence in development (already touched upon) strongly recommending the 1930s as the point at which to begin sampling. Third, reflecting this literary development, the New Zealand school anthologies are largely restricted to "modern" poetry; the more recent Canadian anthologies only slightly less so. To sample from this period was, accordingly, to relate to the anthologies and so obtain both a
special relevance to teacher needs and, roughly, a reading-level check.

The period from which any poems are drawn will have an effect on preferences and response patterns. Many teachers and some studies have, for example, affirmed the greater popularity of modern poetry. The conclusions one draws from the present study must be qualified by reference to the sampling period.

The Number of Poems

Three considerations governed the number of poems chosen. First, there should be sufficient to constitute a reasonable representation from each country—though it is conceded and suggested that the final sample is open to the reader's own sense of what is representative or characteristic of each country. Second, there should be enough poems to permit patterns of response to emerge over and above effects peculiar to different poems. Third, the number should not be so great as to make the experiment unmanageable (without the support of a research team). The chosen number—24 poems or 12 pairs—seemed to balance these considerations. The even number allowed the Canadian sample to be split equally into the RC and BC groupings.

The Need to Pair Poems

Information that had to be given in the experimental
sessions ruled out further sessions with the same students. With just one sitting, the only practical way to have students respond to the poems as fully as possible was to present a minimum number of poems. Two, differentiated on the key variables, was the minimum. There are many precedents and recommendations for this procedure. Certain analytical advantages also ensued from it.

Matching the Poems

The Need to Match (by Content)

The decision to match poems was made mainly to reduce the effects of the most powerful variable, content, as it influences response to a particular topic. Reducing this influence should have increased the chances that any differences relating to general transfer and prior-attitude would emerge. If matching had not been carried out the number of poems tested would have had to be far greater in order to achieve generalizable results.

Matching cannot be absolute. That fact was, indeed, a condition upon which this study relied. (For a discussion of the recent well-announced IEA difficulty in "matching" poems, see Appendix I, B.)

Matching on Other Variables

While content factors made up the primary criteria for matching, an effort was made to ensure likeness in such other
elements as level of difficulty, and length.

Independent Opinion on the Pairs Offered

There are no absolute criteria by which to match poems. My initial pairings were submitted to my advisory committee for their opinions. Where substantial objections were raised to the use of any particular poem set, that set was withdrawn.

Sampling Procedures (Poetry)

Initial searches for suitable material were made in grade twelve Canadian and New Zealand school anthologies. To reduce or eliminate student familiarity with poems, to provide BC regional material, and to produce enough poems to make 12 "good" pairs possible, the search was taken beyond the school anthologies (see Bibliography, Sources of Poems).

Though only 5 of the final 12 Canadian poems came from the school texts, they served as a guide to the maximum acceptable "reading-difficulty" levels in all poem samples. They also reinforced content validity and relevance to teacher needs by maintaining a link with school material. Special care was taken to see that no poems from Canadian school texts were used with classes which were acquainted with the text. (See below, p. 87, Student Familiarity With, and Knowledge of, Poems.)

Over 350 poems (or self-contained sections of long poems) that met the descriptive landscape criterion and which
were not longer than about 40 lines or shorter than 5 were copied and checked again for suitability. About 250 survived the second scrutiny.

Reference to place names disqualified some poems— as violating the control on Knowledge. Some other poems that presented the same difficulty were retained by my replacing, while retaining their sense, one or two words. My committee was asked to judge the replacement word's adequacy in the (later) short-list. (Some examples of the changes are shown in Appendix I, A.) Some material was retained which might give away Origins to a well-read individual seeking to find the same. To eliminate all such references would have been to deny distinctiveness in landscape and to deny, therefore, the terms of this study. Besides, the important reference to a "rabbiter" in a New Zealand poem did not, in itself, seem to persuade Canadian pilot students that the poem was foreign. If they thought the poem to be Canadian and the term seemed strange to them it was rationalized as archaic or "Eastern".

The 250 surviving poems were then placed under the categories their content suggested. Categories like: Mountains, Sea-Coast, The Seasons, and The Dry-Belt emerged. From within these categories the best possible poem pairs were assembled, regardless of how well each category was represented (though in fact the final sample covered scenes of winter cold, mountain and valley, plains, lake and stream, sea-coast, estuary, and
harbour; and two national "panoramas"). Of 20 pairs finally chosen for their merit (as pairs) 12 were randomly selected. (Response data attested to their merit, see below, p. 105, The Neutrality of the Poem Base.)

THE STUDENT SAMPLE

The Schools

The Vancouver area was chosen mainly for logistic convenience. There was another advantage: Vancouver, as a British Columbia area, represents a part of Canada which the Stewart survey indicates is one of the least active in teaching Canadian literature. Problems of familiarity with poems might, therefore, have been reduced.

Particular school districts were largely dictated by school board policies. However, a good balance of the possible geographic and socioeconomic areas was achieved, an equal number of classes being taken from the West Vancouver, Port Coquitlam, Burnaby, and Delta school districts.

The Grade Level

School preferences dictated the grade 11 level. There were many reasons for choosing a senior level.

First, the senior secondary years are the ones in which indigenous literature receives greatest stress both internationally and in Canada.
Second, pilot studies indicated that the free-response technique would yield more from senior classes. Pilot grade 12 classes exhibited a richer response repertory and displayed greater ease and seriousness in the non-teaching situation than pilot grade 10 students. One reason for the grade 12 disposition may have been that, as shown by widespread research into preferences, increasing age renders students more receptive to nature poetry and to the content of reflective lyric poetry generally. Another reason might have been a greater sympathy amongst senior students for university research; yet another their greater facility in writing.

Third, other researchers suggest that, while the "preoccupations of the reader are important ingredients in literary response, preference, and understanding" at all age levels, the older the student the more definite and stable his response tends to be. He will yield increasingly clear-cut, consistent, response patterns.

Fourth, two important variables were likely to be maximized with an older group. One was Deduced Knowledge as that might partly depend upon heightened literary sophistication. The second was "transfer" as that probably increases with experience in regional and Canadian landscape (directly and through literature).

Fifth, since interests and critical response patterns stabilize after about age 16, the older students are on the
threshold of adult response patterns. Grade 11 thus offered a glimpse of two worlds: pointing back through the grade-school years and forward to university and adulthood. Partly for this reason the most senior school grade was one of the two levels tested in the IEA study.

Finally, choosing from one extremity of the secondary-school grade levels left ample room for future research at a level clearly distinguished from that used in this study.

Sample Size (Student)

Sample size was set to meet two related requirements. First, relative to the number of independent variables being manipulated, sufficient students must respond to each poem pair to allow significant response patterns to emerge. Second, student numbers must be sufficient to produce response patterns that will be both reliable and considered representative of the given student population.

Since literary response has been shown as a highly personal phenomenon, student sample size was large. The figure, 500-600, was decided upon in consultation with the statistics and design specialists in the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia. The figure compares well with that used in similar studies.
Intact Groups

School and school board practices dictated that intact classes be used. This was not a problem in that each study group was controlled within itself. Intact class experimentation may even prove to be a positive advantage in communicating research results to teachers.

Individual Students

Within classes certain students were to be eliminated, as already discussed. (For specific instruments and procedures, see below, p. 87 Student Familiarity With, and Knowledge of, Poems.) Eliminated students did, in fact, undergo the experimental procedures: their designation depended upon information they gave during such procedures. There was no visible segregation.

TAKING THE EXPERIMENT INTO THE SCHOOLS

Arrangements with Class Teachers

Following discussions with the appropriate school boards and principals, individual class teachers were contacted, thanked for their participation, informed of the nature of the experiment and asked to provide: a class list, gross information on student Origins, assessments of possible poem familiarity, and a few other administrative details. (See Appendix II, A, Introduction to Teachers.)
The need for teacher reticence vis-a-vis the class was stressed. This need emerged in a pilot study where one teacher, in introducing the researcher, inadvertently gave information that violated the Denied Knowledge and non-Awareness conditions.

**Classroom Procedures**

**Overall Time Scheme**

Poem sets were presented to classes mainly during the morning periods—to maximize and standardize student freshness and receptivity. Each poem pair was presented twice to counter possible order effects and to increase student numbers per poem-pair. Work with classes in the schools covered the month of April 1975.

**Instrument Format**

Instrument format was standardized and informal: the first because format does affect response; the second to avoid an examination atmosphere.

For a chronological summary of procedures discussed from this point on, see Appendix III.

To avoid distracting the class by handing out each
instrument as it was required, forms were bound in booklets. It was necessary to create two booklets so that the difference in poem labelling would not be observed during any class interaction in the introductory stages, and so that the free response stage could be completed without the later instruments being seen (they might have influenced the earlier free response). Integrity of response to the later instruments, which was not so important, was encouraged by asking that students not move on to a new page before completing the one they were on (see Appendix II, F, Instruction Sheet, Booklet II).

Form packages were numbered in advance. Numbers were keyed, randomly, to student names from the class lists. There were several reasons for this procedure. First it facilitated random grouping (and blocking on sex—see below, p. 166). Second, it was intended to assure anonymity and so, presumably, encourage frankness. The students were told that only I would ever know what name corresponded to what number and that I needed to know only because I might wish to ask a student about a particularly interesting point he had made. (See Appendix II, B.) Once that task is complete the class lists will be destroyed. Third, numbering assisted data processing: even numbers were used for students in the Given Knowledge condition, odd numbers for students who were Denied Knowledge.

Introduction to Students

The student introductory form (Appendix II, B) was
designed to establish the study as important for the students, to orientate them to their task, to encourage frankness in response (both by stressing its importance and by allaying examination fears and assuring anonymity) and to provide the first set of instructions. The latter pertained to seating and the distribution of Booklet I.

Presentation of Poems

Poems were presented usually with title but never with the poet's name. Titles did not appear or were altered when, as with the place name Vancouver, it grossly violated the Denied Knowledge condition (see Appendix I, A). As already indicated some poems were presented with one or two words replaced, for the same reason (see above, p. 77).

A poet's name (and even nationality) is probably better known than his individual works. Two studies indicate that awareness of the poet's name, when manipulated as a variable, does affect response. Other researchers, including Richards, have also omitted the poet's name in presenting his works.

Where words or phrases posed potential barriers to understanding in any given poem, a glossary was printed at the poem's foot to give suggested meanings. The vast majority of pilot students reported that such glossaries were a help. Of the few who reported that the glossaries were not necessary, only two showed signs of being upset by them. My committee was
asked to pass judgment on the need to give meanings in any given case and on the meanings/interpretations I actually offered.

The RC poem presented to students in the Given Knowledge condition carried the label "A Canadian Poem" in brackets under and to the right of the title. The BC poem carried, similarly, the label "A B.C. Poem." The NZ poem presented in the Given Knowledge condition carried the label "Non-Canadian."

Following accepted theory, each poem pair was presented in a different order at its two presentations. Pilot work for this study indicated that students would write more on the first poem read, especially when it was also the most popular poem. Other, finer effects might also have resulted from order. (They will be pursued in future research—see below, p. 167.)

The reading orders were as follows:

Order 1 (The Canadian Poem First):
Reader 1 (Poem 1, Poem 2),
Reader 2 (Poem 1, Poem 2).

Order 2 (The New Zealand Poem First):
Reader 1 (Poem 2, Poem 1),
Reader 2 (Poem 2, Poem 1).
Elimination of Teaching Variables

Because teaching-effects constitute very powerful variables which would gravely threaten the experiment, the poems were not "taught" other than indirectly through the readings and glossaries. Students were aware that a "free" response was the principal requirement (see Appendix II, B).

The Readings

The students received the poems aurally as well as visually. Each poem was read twice: once by me (New Zealand dialect) and once by Professor Frank Bertram (Canadian dialect), Department of English Education, UBC. There were several reasons for double presentation: oral deliveries, by adding both colour and interpretive suggestion, help minimize comprehension difficulties related to silent reading; oral presentation may, in itself, promote student verbalization in response; retention of the written poems permits supplementary and continued silent reading and caters for probable differences in receptive style between students; oral presentation offered the opportunity to present each poem once in, roughly speaking, the dialect appropriate to poem Origins; and oral presentation gave fuller control over reading order.

Free Response

Instructions to students were designed to encourage freedom in response without suggesting that they ignore the
poems. An effort was made to have students reflect upon and "digest" the poems before offering any overt response. Comments from some pilot students confirmed this need. Two formal readings of each poem were given and time elapsed between readings. Students were told that they were under no great time pressure (see Appendix II, C).

Response did not depend upon recall. Students were encouraged to re-read the poems as much as they wished.

In the initial Free Response instructions (Appendix II, E) students were asked to ensure that it was always clear which poem they were referring to in free response. Pilot studies showed the necessity for this.

Student Familiarity With, and Knowledge of, Poems

Several steps were taken to check upon, and control, familiarity and Knowledge. First, sampling procedures were calculated to produce unfamiliar poems and teachers previewed the poem and anthology list (see Appendix II, A, Introduction to Teachers). Second, classes were asked, at the beginning of each experimental session, whether they had heard about the study from anyone. Any individuals who were so Aware were to be transferred immediately to the Given Knowledge condition if they were not already there. The extent of their knowledge was to be gauged by interview at the conclusion of the experimental period and a decision made about retaining their response data.
Third, student Awareness was checked in the full study by the instrument "Hunches" (Appendix II, J) and, through overlap, by the instrument "What Do You Know of These Poems?" (see below, p. 89 and Appendix II, H). Fourth, the supporting questionnaire "What Do You Know of These Poems?", insofar as it probed familiarity, served a two-fold purpose. Partly it checked that the poems were indeed unfamiliar (as poems--Knowledge is of Origins). Any student for whom poems were familiar was to be eliminated from the study. (In the event, there was only one such student.) And partly "What Do You Know of These Poems?" checked that students in the Given Knowledge condition did notice the labels (those who did were analyzed as part of a special group under Possessed Knowledge) and checked that students in the Denied Knowledge condition did not otherwise have Pre-Knowledge. Any who did were to be eliminated from the analysis.

Student Origins

A student's place of residence in the five year period preceding the study was assumed to be an important variable: the determinant of feeling for and attitude towards landscape and things Canadian. It was therefore checked by teachers (see Appendix II, A, Introduction to Teachers) and through direct question to students (see Appendix II, I, "Places You Have Lived"). The five year period was chosen arbitrarily.
SUPPORTING INSTRUMENTS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The instruments and procedures outlined in this chapter have already been discussed in various connections. Here they are treated as distinct units.

In most cases the supporting instruments and procedures were designed to promote experimental rigour. Some also served the principle of multiple operationalism, validating (or invalidating) and enriching the central approach. The same principle informed the content analysis Scheme's multiple probe. The principle will be extended further in future research.

The Instruments and Procedures

"What Do You Know of These Poems?" (Appendix II, H)

This instrument ascertained student familiarity with the poems and Knowledge of their Origins. It served a three-fold purpose. Two (already discussed, see above, p. 88) were: to control student familiarity with the poems and to control Pre-Knowledge. The third was to find out whether students were able to Recognize poems (Research Question 1) and to find what reasons they gave.

"Places You Have Lived" (Appendix II, I)

This instrument (already discussed, see above, p. 88)
ascertained student Origins. It was designed to control RC and Foreign student variables and to set up those sub-groups for separate analysis

"Hunches" (Appendix II, J)

This instrument ascertained student Awareness of the study's purpose. Although pilot work indicated that the experimental procedures and instruments did not reveal the study's purpose, it also showed that teachers might do so in introducing the study or myself to the class (see cautions directed to the teacher in Introduction to Teachers, Appendix II, A). It thus seemed advisable to check Awareness directly by questionnaire as well as by the question at the beginning of the experimental session (see above, p. 87). Overlap with the questionnaire "What Do You Know of These Poems?" (Appendix II, H) provided a third check.

"Your Opinions" (Appendix II, K)

This instrument ascertained students' personal and school experience with Canadian literature. The instrument was, in total, designed to carry future research into other attitudinal dimensions of the Canadian literature question. But scales 1 and 2 also provided a check upon student familiarity with Canadian poetry. If an individual indicated that he had already had a great deal of contact (Extensive Reading) with Canadian literature (ratings 4 and 5 on scales 1 and 2) his
responses were examined separately (see below, p. 117).

"Sub-Groups"

This procedure analyzed the responses of students in special groups. The potential sub-groups comprised: Extensive Canadian Reading, Pre-Knowledge, Aware, Rest-of-Canada, and Foreign, students. The necessity for their elimination from the main sample was to be turned to comparative analytical advantage if they proved to be sufficient in number.

"Within and Across"

This procedure constituted a supplementary content analysis. The main analytical burden rested, because of their appropriateness and relative objectivity, upon the content analysis measures already described. To shore up, enrich, and expand upon the Scheme's categories and to offer alternative probes without disrupting its application and cogency, protocols were further examined within and across the Scheme's categories. Many researchers have employed such supplementary analysis or suggested it.32

Clearly, any corpus of material can be analyzed in a great many ways. The approach Within and Across followed lines of enquiry suggested by others' investigations and theories, by pilot work, and by speculation. It searched only for response manifestations that appeared to have been affected differently by the two sets of independent variables. Only one such
manifestation finally emerged, Quantity of Writing (see below, p. 108). Response manifestations not so affected, or requiring very extensive analysis in themselves, were simply identified for future research. Examples are "Significant Adjectivals" (see below, p. 143) and "Transfer" (see below, p. 148).

ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Assumptions

Many of the assumptions upon which this study was built have already been defended. Where that is so they will not be closely treated again. The assumptions fall into three groupings: those relating to the reading process and response per se; those relating to cultural bias in students and in poems; and those relating to closely experimental procedures.

The first group held that both the poem and reader contribute to response, and that a bias in both might be required to produce a distinctive response-type. If a distinctive response-type did appear in Vancouver students' responses to Canadian works then that was to be attributed to something called a Canadian national feeling between reader and work—or even "identity" if it occurred when the poems were not labelled as Canadian.

Identity was assumed to be an affinity between a student's "way of seeing things" and a distinctive setting or vision expressed in his nation's poetry. The total experiment
did not depend upon any certainty that an affinity exists. The existence of a national feeling or identity should be seen as a dependent variable which was indirectly examined through the students rather than as an assumption which would, if it had proved false, undermine the experiment.

Not that it was unreasonable to assume a national feeling or identity. With respect to students, pilot work suggested that significant variance would occur. Other student-response studies show cultural forces to be at play in other nations. With literary works there is a general Canadian confidence that a national literature will express a national identity: claims specific to the Canadian school promotion have already been noted (see above, p. 2); and Canadian writers have commented more generally. Watters, for example, keys an article to Emerson's statement that individual nations might possess a unique, "original relation to the universe." Frye claims that "Canadian literature . . . records what the Canadian imagination has reacted to, and it tells us things about this environment that nothing else will tell us." Pacey speaks of the creation in Canadian literature of "a distinctive conception of man's lot on the earth." And Jones holds out the possibility of tracing in the nation's literature certain elements of a "view of life, a view of man and his relationship to the universe of a fundamental kind, which is surely what we must mean by a Canadian identity. . . . "
True, the exact nature of the Canadian sensibility or view of things is never altogether clear. Perhaps it is not defineable. Approaches to the question often re-phrase rather than answer it, as does this of J.P. Matthews:

When I came to Canada from Australia eighteen years ago to undertake a comparative study of Canadian and Australian poetry, I was immediately struck by the extraordinarily distinctive tang of the Canadian statement in literature. No matter from what regional base it emerged, there seemed to be a very marked attitudinal cohesiveness . . .

In both nineteenth and twentieth century writers, in all genres from B.C. to the Maritimes I suggest, one is able to see a series of interlocked reactions to life in this country. They are not the same, I would emphasize that too of course, the way in may be different, but the conclusions are very often astonishingly similar.

Or they call down continued debate rather than widespread agreement. Still, as Matthews suggests, the debates do encompass themes not too diverse: dealing with hardships of climate and settlement, the notion of the garrison and the wilderness, the rock and the butterfly, survival and victims, and so on. If these themes are local or regional rather than Canadian the present study was designed to meet that circumstance.

Of the third group of assumptions, the closely experimental factors, only a few need further explicit statement. It was assumed: that the poems were reasonably representative of each nation and region in the period chosen; that students would respond "honestly" and "frankly"; that students' immediate,
free, written responses would bear some close relationship to
deeper responses or that they would be, at least, interesting
and important to teachers; and that sufficient variance to make
the study worthwhile would be exhibited on at least one of the
critical variables.

Limitations

Introduction

As with assumptions, most limitations have been
treated elsewhere. Limitations fall into two classes: those
which closely experimental exigencies imposed upon the study and,
therefore, upon the conclusions one can draw from the study; and
those which amount to disclaimers on my part.

Experimental Delimitations

The experiment could not indicate whether any absence
of distinctive response patterns was simply a measure of student
inability to sense and report differences inherent in the poem
groups.

Results must be attributed only to like students re-
sponding to like poems in like conditions. The onus is upon
any one who would apply the results more broadly to show the
grounds upon which he does so. Differences in student age and
geographic location (note particularly the exclusion of French
Canada) might alter responses greatly; as might the introduction
of teacher variables. So too might responses be altered by the absence of an experimental situation or even the absence of precisely this study's experimental situation. Despite the steps taken to play down "test" conditions, all students probably experienced "Hawthorne" influences. (These should not have operated differently between groups and classes to violate the treatments and controls.) It is quite possible, nevertheless, that response tendencies would hold, although at different levels or in different proportions, if the study's particular conditions were not fully replicated.

The study focused on broad response patterns, not on individual student responses. Any individual student, even though he might be like those in the study and be responding in like conditions, should not be expected to respond along exactly the lines discovered in this study.

The study did not examine long-term effects, or responses other than those written and (mainly) "free:"

Disclaimers

Though the results of the study appear to have teaching, curriculum, and other implications, and although I do make some suggestions in their light, the study did not directly consider desiderata in those areas. It dealt in behavioural expectations to the exclusion of the other considerations (such as value judgments) that must bear upon decision-making.
I do not suggest, by my focus on Canadian literature, that only, or mainly, Canadian literature should be taught in Canadian schools. That is not my view. For literary and cultural reasons and for reasons relating to imaginative growth, it seems to me that developing breadth and quality of reading are the primary justifications for teaching English literature.

Equally, the use of a comparative experimental methodology does not suggest that I believe only or mainly comparative methods be used in schools—though I do, in fact, give them high place.
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STATISTICAL NOTE

Chi-Square was used as a descriptive aid, as a shorthand to express degrees of difference, rather than as an inferential device. It indicates levels of frequency difference under each category. It was applied only to actual responses in each category; it did not take into account the number of students who might have responded in the category. To use an analogy, Chi-Square was employed to help identify the distinct ridges and peaks, the responses that discriminated between poems; it says nothing directly of the terrain from which those peaks took their rise. Any inference about the terrain is made on conceptual, not statistical grounds. I acknowledge the need for caution in generalizing from such a specialized sample.

Chi-Square was not employed where expected frequencies fell below 5 per cell. The device $X^2 = n/a$ (not applicable) indicates when expected frequencies were too low to test data that otherwise appeared worth testing.

Levels of significance are indicated as follows: better than (smaller than) .10, one asterisk; better than .05, two asterisks; and better than .01, three asterisks. (The smaller the significance value, the less likely it is that the effect is the result of chance variations. The effect, therefore, is "better.") With 1 degree of freedom, a Chi-Square ($X^2$) of 2.71 or more is significant at the .10 level, a $X^2$ of 3.84 or more is significant at the .05 level, and a $X^2$ of 6.63
or more is significant at the .01 level. No cases occurred where degrees of freedom exceeded 1. I intend such presentation to provide optional levels of stringency and to encourage the reader to make his own statistical inferences—both ends being especially important in exploratory work. The exploratory nature of the work and the concomitant desire to avoid Type II error (the rejection of a true hypothesis) also explains the use, in my discussion, of .10 as the operative significance level. I acknowledge that the use of extreme groups "inflates" significance levels.

Unless otherwise indicated, Chi-Square was calculated on the assumption of chance distributions. Often, under Given Knowledge, the parallel Denied Knowledge findings might be considered to provide a sounder base and sometimes a more stringent test. But Denied Knowledge respondees included some with Knowledge (Deduced or "Possessed" Knowledge [see below (1, b)]) and others who might have "sensed" a poem's Canadianness. It was not a fully neutral base. Still, Chi-Square was based upon expectations other than chance when the effect of those expectations was important—as when I tested for lack of independence (or by, as I will refer to it, a 2 x 2 Chi-Square).

BASIC DATA

The Student Sample

A total of 551 students underwent the testing procedures. The sample designated for close study, Greater Vancouver
students, amounted to 477. It will be the "main sample" referred to from this point on. The BC (outside Vancouver area) sub-group was too small (n = 33) to tell whether its members responded differently, as a group, from the Vancouver area students. Therefore "Vancouver area" (n = 477) included the BC sub-group.

The students excluded were made up of two groups: 45 (Rest-of-Canada) students who had lived elsewhere in Canada for all or part of the period from and including 1970; and 29 (Foreign) students who had lived outside Canada during all or part of the same period. Apart from their consideration under (1) Recognition (below), and the consideration of Foreign students under (5) Transfer (below), analysis of the latter two groups was not followed through in a direct fashion. The groups were too small. Under the present free response method, with a student sample of 45 or 29, response frequencies in each category were tiny. Also, in the case of Foreign students, student Origins were too diverse to justify single-group treatment.

Three other groups were, according to the design, designated for possible exclusion from the main analysis. One, the "Extensive Canadian Reading" group, was examined separately under Recognition. Thereafter it was included in the main sample because of its small size and because its members showed themselves no better than other students at Recognizing the
Canadian poems. The second and third groups, which were to be made up of those students Aware of the study's purposes and those students with Pre-Knowledge, did not materialize.

Other student sample details include (n = 477):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under Knowledge</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under Origins</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC/NZ</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC/NZ</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under Order</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian poem first</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand poem first</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Sex</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There thus existed a good balance of student numbers under each of these variables.

While there was some variation between the student numbers receiving each poem pair (28 students was the lowest and 58 the highest number receiving a particular pair), only 3 poem pairs were received by fewer than 40 students.

The Distribution of Responses Over Poem Pairs

Responses in each category were derived quite evenly from the 12 poem pairs. Exceptions were Comprehension and Quantity of Writing (see below, p. 108). Under Comprehension,
4 poem pairs gave rise to relatively discrepant scores between the poems. However, the apparently difficult poems were distributed evenly between Canada and New Zealand (2/2) and also between the RC/NZ and BC/NZ conditions (1/1, 1/1). Therefore the inclusion of four difficult poems (in relative terms) should not have affected the overall findings. Under Quantity of Writing the greater response length devoted to Canadian poems was accounted for by 3 poems: "Valley of Wenkchemna" (cf. "Hill Country," 15/5, $X^2 = 5^{**}$); "Lagoons, Hanlan's Point" (cf. "The Anchorage," 24/9, $X^2 = 6.8^{***}$); and "The Sleeping Beauty" (cf. "A View of Rangitoto," 26/9, $X^2 = 8.3^{***}$). With no other pairs was significance reached.

The Neutrality of the Poem Base

As revealed by content analysis and by the Likert scale, the poems (over all pairs) were of practically equal popularity. Under Denied Knowledge, the Means for the two poem groups on the Likert scale were exceedingly close—4.389 and 4.385 (both between the scale points "fairly good" and "good"). A correlated t test for the difference between 2 correlated means produced a value of only .04.

Under Recognition in the Denied Knowledge condition (as will be reported below, Specific Findings (1)) the Canadian poems did not betray their Origins to an extent that differentiated them from the New Zealand poems.
In terms of free response and under the Denied Knowledge condition (as will be reported below, Specific Findings (2)) the Canadian and New Zealand poems did not stimulate different response patterns except in one category.

Thus, the balance in preference, Recognition, and free response scores suggests that the poem sample was well suited to serve as a base for comparisons between the Denied and Given Knowledge conditions.

**The Numerical Importance of Each Category: The Frequencies of Scores**

The number of responses under each category (using Frequency data under Denied Knowledge) varied widely (see Table II). The categories most frequently receiving the students' responses were, in this order, Involvement, Interpretation, and Evaluation. Then, with roughly equal weight, came Comprehension, Visualisation, Form, and Dictums. Given Knowledge made little difference to this pattern. Only Transfer-Place (moving from 12% to 17% for the Canadian poems) and Transfer-Special (moving from 1% to 4% for the Canadian poems) markedly changed with Given Knowledge.

Most students (75%) did discriminate between poems in at least one category of the content analysis Scheme. However, few produced Comparative scores in more than 3 or 4 categories.
The most conspicuous categories under Frequency data were not the same as under Comparative data. (See Table V.) In the latter case, Involvement, Evaluation, Visualisation, and Comprehension were the most conspicuous. The difference is best explained by examining the cases of Interpretation and Evaluation. Interpretation declined in importance when Comparative scores were used because the many stock response-postures that fell under its label were usually applied, non-discriminately, to both poems. In Evaluation, by contrast, many responses did single out one poem of a pair and so were scored similarly under both Frequencies and Comparatives.
As a result of supplementary content analysis (see above, p. 92) it was found that significant differences emerged between poem groups on the amount of writing students devoted to each group (cf. above, p. 55). The following analytical method was used: the number of words students applied to each poem was counted; where a difference of 10% emerged (1 word in every 10) the poem with most words was scored positive under "Quantity of Writing." The findings are reported in the next sections.

SPECIFIC FINDINGS (1): RECOGNITION

This section (1) deals with Research Question (1):

to what extent can Vancouver grade 11 students who do not know of the origins of Canadian poems nevertheless recognize them as being (a) national or (b) regional (British Columbian)?

It finds that:

the students were unable to distinguish a Canadian or BC landscape poem from a New Zealand landscape poem read beside it.

A fuller conclusion can be found below, p. 119.

(a) The Canadian and New Zealand Poem Groups as Wholes

(i) Denied Knowledge

Question: (Research Question 1, a)

To what extent can Vancouver grade 11 students who do not know the Origins of Canadian poems, nevertheless Recognize them as being Canadian?
The extent of Recognition could be gauged under Denied Knowledge. In order to know whether the students were discriminating between poem Origins the extent of Recognition was compared with that relating to the New Zealand poems (i.e., Recognizing them as being foreign).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE III</th>
<th>RECOGNITION OF ORIGIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DENIED AND GIVEN KNOWLEDGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(% of: K- 236; K+ 241)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Canadian and New Zealand Poem Groups</th>
<th>The Canadian and New Zealand Poems Both Correct Compared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAN CORRECT</td>
<td>NZ CORRECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-</td>
<td>K+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 30.9^{***} \]
\[ x^2 = 20.8^{***} \]
\[ x^2 = 82.53^{***} \]

Data: (Table III, A)

Of students in the Denied Knowledge condition, 38% Recognized the Canadian poems (or 48% if calculated as a proportion of those who, validly, completed the questionnaire). The figures were similar to those for the Recognition of the
New Zealand poems as being foreign (35% or 46%) though in both cases the Canadian figure was marginally greater.

However, 41% (or 54%) of the students called the New Zealand poems Canadian. An almost identical number called the Canadian poems foreign.

Discussion:

Although roughly half the students Recognized the Canadian poems, their placement of the New Zealand poems suggests that the students were calling half of all poems Canadian regardless of true Origin. In fact more (though not significantly more) students called the New Zealand poems Canadian than they did the Canadian poems.

Conclusion:

Because the students could not discriminate between the Origins of the Canadian and New Zealand poems, they cannot be said to have clearly Recognized the Canadian poems under the terms of Research Question (1, a)

Notes:

The fact that there existed little discrimination between Origins under Denied Knowledge lent a greater validity to the Denied Knowledge/Given Knowledge comparison using free response data. Denied Knowledge did apply to Canadian and New Zealand poems equally. (Given Knowledge will be examined
The question arose as to the number of students who correctly and fully discriminated between the poems (calling the Canadian poem Canadian and the New Zealand poem foreign). The question is pursued below (1, b).

(ii) Given Knowledge

Question:

to check that students under Given Knowledge did notice and accept the labels, and so establish the two Knowledge conditions under which free responses could be compared. Students under Given Knowledge should have Recognized Origins much more often than students under Denied Knowledge.

Data: (Table III, A)

Under Given Knowledge 76% of the students validly and correctly answered the questionnaire ascertaining the remembered Origin of the Canadian poems. The corresponding figure for the New Zealand poems was 64%. The difference was not significant.

The differences between correct answers under Given Knowledge and correct answers under Denied Knowledge were significant ($X^2$ Canada Correct = 30.9***; $X^2$ N.Z. Correct = 20.8***).
Conclusion:

The students under Given Knowledge exhibited a Recognition of Origins sufficiently different from those under Denied Knowledge to justify the analysis of free-response under each Knowledge condition.

Note:

The percentage of those Given Knowledge students not answering correctly (24% and 36%) is puzzling. They may have misapplied the labels, not read them, rejected them, forgotten them, become fatigued, and so on. The percentage again suggested a separate examination of the free responses of those students who did correctly and fully discriminate between the poems (i.e. of those students who actually Possessed Knowledge).

(b) Recognition of Origins Considered as a Joint Event (Students Fully Discriminating Between the Paired Poems)

Question:

How many students correctly and fully discriminated between the poems (calling the Canadian poem Canadian and the New Zealand poem foreign)?

Data: (Table III, B)

A total of 152 (31% of 477) students correctly discriminated between the Canadian and New Zealand poems. Of
these, 132 were Given Knowledge students (54% of 241) and 20 were Denied Knowledge students (8% of 236).

Discussion and Conclusion:

In the case of Denied Knowledge the figure was low but consonant with the low Recognition under Denied Knowledge already discovered (see above, 1, a, i). The present finding emphasized that students without Given Knowledge were not able to discriminate between poem Origins.

In the case of Given Knowledge, the figure was surprisingly low. However, 57 (23% of 241) students returned responses invalid for the purposes of assessing discrimination; and 53 (22%) called the Canadian poem correctly but failed to call correctly, or call at all, the New Zealand poem. Only 29 (12%) called the Canadian poem "foreign" in denial of the label, whereas 99 (42% of 236) under Denied Knowledge called the Canadian poem foreign.

While 132 (54%) is, then, a conservative estimate of discrimination under Given Knowledge, it remains surprisingly low. Explanations for such a "denial" of the labels must include the possibilities that some students were not impressed by the label's importance or preferred to think that the Canadian poem was not Canadian or the New Zealand poem was not New Zealand.
Note:

These findings further recommended the separate content analysis of free responses for those students who did discriminate correctly and fully. Such students were called Correctly Possessed Knowledge (PK+) students. They were compared with Incorrectly Possessed Knowledge (PK-) students. The latter group was made up of those who were absolutely wrong (calling the New Zealand poem Canadian and vice versa), or wrong about one poem while failing to answer the other. (The absolutely wrong group was too small for useful comparison. The second group was "wrong" in that it exhibited both error and, presumably, doubt.) This comparison is found below under Specific Findings (3, B).

(c) Recognition as Influenced by the RC/NZ and BC/NZ Conditions

Question: (Research Question 1, b)

To what extent can Vancouver area Grade 11 students who do not know the Origins of the Canadian poems nevertheless Recognize the poems when they are regional (B.C.)?

The extent of Recognition could be gauged under Denied Knowledge. In order to know whether the students were discriminating between poem Origins, the figure was compared with that for Recognition of the Rest-of-Canada poems and the New Zealand poems.
(i) Recognition of the Canadian Poems

Data: (Table IV, A)

Under Denied Knowledge, 48 students (41% of those under Denied Knowledge in the RC/NZ sub-condition) Recognized the RC poems and 42 (36%) Recognized the BC poems (as Canadian). Under Given Knowledge the figures were 90 (76%) and 95 (77%). The differences were not significant.

Discussion and Conclusion:

There existed neither significant differences nor a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE IV</th>
<th>RECOGNITION OF ORIGIN CANADIAN AND NEW ZEALAND POEMS UNDER THE RC/NZ AND BC/NZ CONDITIONS (% of: K-, RC/NZ 118, BC/NZ 118; K+, RC/NZ 118, BC/NZ 123)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) The Canadian Poems</td>
<td>(B) The New Zealand Poems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-</td>
<td>K+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
trend across Knowledge conditions. The students appear to have been no more able to recognize the poetry of their own region than that of their nation as a whole.

(ii) Recognition of the New Zealand Poems

Data: (Table IV, B)

Under Denied Knowledge 38 (32%) students correctly placed the New Zealand poem (as foreign) when it was paired with a Rest-of-Canada poem, whereas 45 (38%) correctly placed it when it was paired with a BC poem. Under Given Knowledge the figures were 73 (62%) and 83 (67%). The differences were not statistically significant.

Discussion:

Although, under both Knowledge conditions, the New Zealand poem was more accurately identified (as foreign) when it was paired with a BC poem, the trend was not significant.

Conclusion:

These findings paralleled those under (i) immediately above. Together they answered Research Question 1, b: the students did not, in Recognizing Origins, distinguish between their region's poetry and foreign poetry any better than between their nation's poetry and foreign poetry.
(d) **Special Notes**

(i) Recognition by Those Students Designated as Having Extensive Canadian Reading. (Recognition by those students who, as the design speculated, might have responded to Canadian literature differently from the general group. The group comprised 80 students who scored 4 and 5 on the scales Opinion 1 and Opinion 2.)

**Question:**

To ascertain whether those students who claimed to have had the most contact with Canadian literature, privately and in class, Recognized the Canadian poems' Origins more readily than other students did and whether, therefore, the former students should have been treated separately under free response.

**Data and Discussion:**

Under Denied Knowledge 15 Extensive Canadian Reading students Recognized the Canadian poem, 17 called it foreign. This proportion of correct students (47%) was very similar to that of the main sample. The ratio of correct Recognitions under Denied Knowledge (15) to those under Given Knowledge (32) was, again, almost identical to the ratio in the main sample (.47 cf. .49).

**Conclusion:**

Students with Extensive Canadian Reading did not
Recognize Canadian Origins more readily than other students.

For this reason, and because of the relatively small size of the group, there seemed no point in analyzing its free responses separately.

Note:

In fact an association between, on one hand, relatively high (not necessarily Extensive) Canadian Reading and, on the other, Correctly Possessed Knowledge, will be shown in a future report (see below, p. 163). In proportion to the strength of that association, the special analysis of free response under Possessed Knowledge (below, 3, B) did carry through a separate analysis of those students with relatively high Canadian Reading.

(ii) Recognition by the Student Sub-Group Rest-of-Canada

(Rrecognition by those students who, as the design proposed, were left out of the main analysis as violating the integrity of the student base, Vancouver area students.)

Question:

To ascertain whether this group of students Recognized Canadian Origins more or less readily than other groups.

Data and Discussion:

Under Denied Knowledge 10 Rest-of-Canada students Recognized the Canadian poem, 8 called it foreign.
This was a higher rate of Recognition than for the Vancouver students (and, curiously, it was even higher with the BC poems —9 cf. 5) but the sample was too small to be reliable.

The ratio of correct Recognitions under Denied Knowledge (10) to those under Given Knowledge (21) was almost identical to the ratio in the other samples (.48 cf. .47 and .49).

Conclusion:

Except where it was unreliable, there was no data suggesting that the Rest-of-Canada students Recognized differently than the other groups.

(e) Recognition: General Conclusion and Discussion

The students did not appear able to Recognize Canadian or BC landscape poetry to any important extent. While about 50% of the students Recognized the Canadian poems, the findings for the New Zealand poems and for full discrimination suggested that students were calling 50% of the poems Canadian for reasons not peculiar to the particular poem pairs before them. If this is true it might be accounted for by the nature of the poem sample, or possibly by some heightened consciousness of Canadian literature as a result of the pressures reviewed in Chapter I.

Under Given Knowledge there was sufficient Recognition to warrant the analysis of free response under each Knowledge condition as proposed. However there was also sufficient non-Recognition to recommend the supplementary analysis
of free response under "Possessed Knowledge." The extent of non-Recognition suggests, but only suggests, that not all students found the labels "A Canadian Poem" and "A B.C. Poem" particularly noteworthy.

SPECIFIC FINDINGS (2): FREE RESPONSE: DIFFERENCES INHERENT IN THE POEMS (DENIED KNOWLEDGE)

This section (2) deals with Research Question (2):

to what extent do Vancouver Grade 11 students respond differently to (a) their nation's poetry or to (b) their region's poetry, than to poetry from other countries?

It finds that:

there were no general trends suggesting that the students responded differently to the Canadian and New Zealand poem samples when they were not told of the Origins of the samples.

A fuller conclusion can be found below, p. 124.

(a) Comparative Scores

(i) The National (Canadian and New Zealand) Poem Groups as Wholes

Question:

Did the frequencies of Comparative scores in any category differ significantly (between the national poem groups), thereby denoting a difference in response to the Canadian, as opposed to the New Zealand, poems?
The scores for the Canadian and New Zealand poems were almost identical in each category except for a significant difference, favouring the Canadian poems, under Transfer-Place and for the trends towards the Canadian poems under Visualisation and towards the New Zealand poems under Comprehension. Across the remaining categories there were no apparent trends.
Conclusion:

The difference registered in Transfer-Place suggests that some students did recognize settings and make reference to them. For the rest, there appears to have been no special response to the Canadian poems where those poems were not identified as such.

(ii) The RC/NZ and BC/NZ Conditions

Question:

Did the patterns of scores under the RC/NZ and BC/NZ conditions differ to the extent that the two conditions could be regarded as influencing response?

Data and Discussion: (Table VI)

There was no difference in pattern of response, as opposed to volume of response, between the RC/NZ BC/NZ conditions. The significant difference in Transfer-Place noted under (1, a) above appears to have been contributed to by both the RC and BC poems.

Conclusion:

The finding, under (1, a), that there was no special response to the Canadian poems (where those poems were not identified as such), applies equally to the RC and BC poems.
(b) **Quantity of Writing**

(i) The Canadian and New Zealand Poem Groups as Wholes

**Question:**

Did the frequencies of Quantity scores in any category differ significantly (between the national poem groups) thereby denoting a difference in response to the Canadian, as opposed to the New Zealand, poems?
Data:  

No significant difference occurred. The trend favoured the Canadian poems.

Conclusion:

The data under Quantity was in concordance with the general findings to this point: under Denied Knowledge there was no special response to the Canadian poems as a body.

(ii) The RC/NZ and BC/NZ Conditions

Question:

Did the scores under the RC/NZ and BC/NZ conditions differ to the extent that the two conditions could be regarded as influencing response?

Data and Conclusion:

A significant difference occurred under BC/NZ, favouring the BC poems. No such difference occurred under RC/NZ. Thus the trend favouring the Canadian poems noted under (i) above was due to the BC/NZ stimulus and response.

(c) Free Response: Inherent Differences; General Conclusion and Discussion

There were no general trends suggesting that the students responded differently to the Canadian and New Zealand poem samples or to the Rest-of-Canada and BC poems.

Two isolated differences in response occurred. That favouring the Canadian poems under Quantity of Writing was significant only in the BC/NZ condition. (In no other respects
were the RC/NZ and BC/NZ conditions associated with response differences.) The other difference, that which favoured the Canadian poems under Transfer-Place raises a new question of the Transfer principle: does full Transfer depend upon something more than simple Recognition? After all, the particular effect seen here was isolated; other response categories did not exhibit differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE VII FREE RESPONSE, QUANTITY OF WRITING</th>
<th>DENIED KNOWLEDGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) THE CAN/NZ COMPARISON</td>
<td>(B) THE RC/NZ, BC/NZ CONDITIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(% of: 236)</td>
<td>(% of RC/NZ 118; BC/NZ 118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN NZ 41% 35%</td>
<td>RC/NZ CAN NZ 36% 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN NZ 36% 39#</td>
<td>CAN NZ 46% 30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 3.6^* \]
\[ x^2 = 2.74^* \]

SPECIFIC FINDINGS (3, A) FREE RESPONSE: DIFFERENCES ASSOCIATED WITH GIVEN KNOWLEDGE

This section (3) deals with Research Question (3):

to what extent do differences in response depend upon the students being told of the Origins of the poetry?

It finds that:

there was considerable evidence that students responded differently to the Canadian and New Zealand poem samples when they were told of
the Origins of the samples. They favoured the Canadian poems, often strongly, in almost every response category.

A fuller conclusion can be found below, p. 133.

(a) **Comparative Scores**

(i) The Canadian and New Zealand Poem Groups as Wholes.

**Question:**

Did the patterns of scores under Denied Knowledge and Given Knowledge differ sufficiently to suggest that the condition Given Knowledge affected the students' responses to the Canadian or New Zealand poems?

**Data and Discussion:** (Table VIII)

Under Given Knowledge, frequencies tended to favour the Canadian poems. The trend was significant in four cases: Transfer-Place, Transfer-Special, Depth, and Interpretation. It may also have been present in Evaluation.

Where there appeared to be a trend under Denied Knowledge (as in Transfer-Place and Visualisation) it also favoured the Canadian poems. However only in one case (Transfer-Place) was it significant and the difference there was smaller than the difference under Given Knowledge.

**Conclusion:**

The pattern of responses under Given Knowledge was
sufficiently different from that under Denied Knowledge to suggest a difference in the effect of the two conditions. The condition Given Knowledge was associated with responses that favoured the Canadian poems. The students were apparently influenced positively by the labels "A Canadian Poem" and "A B.C. Poem" or negatively by the label "Non-Canadian," as those labels were applied to the poems given the students.

### TABLE VIII

FREE RESPONSE, COMPARATIVE DATA OBTAINED FOR GIVEN TERMINATION (* of K- of 236; K+ of 241)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CAN</th>
<th>NZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
<td>19*</td>
<td>18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPREHENSION</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER FLAIR</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER SPECIAL</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISUALIZATION</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENHANCEMENT</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPRETATION</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>7*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illustrating the effects, in the pattern of responses for poems associated with Given Knowledge.

---

**Note:** The table and chart data indicate comparisons and statistical significance levels (e.g., *p < 0.05*, **p < 0.01**, ***p < 0.001***).
(ii) The RC/NZ and BC/NZ Conditions

Question:

Did the patterns of scores under Denied Knowledge and Given Knowledge differ sufficiently to suggest that the condition Given Knowledge affected the students' responses to the Rest-of-Canada poems differently than their responses to the BC poems?

The RC/NZ Condition

Data: (Table IX)

There was a tendency under Given Knowledge for students to favour the Canadian poems. Significance was reached in 2 categories, Evaluation and Transfer-Place, and the trend was present to a greater or lesser degree in all categories except Comprehension.

Under Denied Knowledge the same trend existed only in 5 categories: Description, Transfer-Place, Transfer-Special, Visualisation, and Interpretation. In none was it significant. In two, Comprehension and Involvement, it was reversed.

Discussion and Conclusion:

There appeared to exist sufficient difference between response patterns under Given and Denied Knowledge and sufficient likeness of pattern across categories to conclude that
the difference in Knowledge effects already observed with the broader Canadian New Zealand comparison was also found under the RC/NZ condition.

On the other hand the CAN/NZ and RC/NZ patterns were not identical: the significant differences under RC/NZ (2 categories) did not fully coincide with those (4 categories) under CAN/NZ.
It remains, however, that in both the CAN/NZ and RC/NZ conditions, Given Knowledge was associated with responses favouring the Canadian poem.

The BC/NZ Condition

Data: (Table IX)

There were 2 tendencies under Given Knowledge. One was to give more attention to the BC poems than to the New Zealand poems. Significance was reached in 3 categories (Transfer-Place, Transfer-Special, and Interpretation) and the trend was present in Comprehension.

Against that trend was one giving less attention to the BC poems in 4 categories: Evaluation, Description, Visualisation, and Involvement. It did not reach significance in any category. Two significant 2 x 2 Chi-Squares could be calculated between RC/NZ and BC/NZ (in Evaluation and Interpretation).

Discussion and Conclusion:

There existed some similarity in pattern to that found under the RC/NZ condition. Under Given Knowledge the BC poems were also favoured in Transfer-Place and Transfer-Special.

In other respects, however, the response patterns under BC/NZ differed from those under RC/NZ. Significance occurred in, largely, different categories. And there were the two significant 2 x 2 Chi-Squares.
Therefore there was apparently a difference between the effects associated with the RC/NZ and BC/NZ conditions—or with the labels "A Canadian Poem" and "A B.C. Poem" in concert with their respective poem sets.

(b) **Quantity of Writing**

(i) The Canadian and New Zealand Poem Groups as Wholes

**Question:**

Did the patterns of scores under Denied Knowledge and Given Knowledge differ sufficiently to suggest that the condition Given Knowledge affected the students' responses to the Canadian or New Zealand poems?

**Data:** 

Under Given Knowledge the Canadian poems were significantly favoured. The 2 x 2 Chi-Square was not significant.

**Conclusion:**

If, but only if, chance distributions were assumed, the label "A Canadian Poem" or "A B.C. Poem," in concert with its respective poem sets, was associated with more writing about the Canadian poems under Given Knowledge.
(ii) The RC/NZ and BC/NZ Conditions

Question:

Did the patterns of scores under Denied Knowledge and Given Knowledge differ sufficiently to suggest that the condition Given Knowledge affected the students' responses to the Rest-of-Canada poems differently than their responses to the BC poems?
Data: (Table X, B)

In the RC/NZ condition, under Given Knowledge, and compared with Denied Knowledge, there was a significantly greater Quantity of Writing.

In the BC/NZ condition there was a decrease, under Given Knowledge, in Quantity of Writing on BC poems (under Denied Knowledge there was a significant difference favouring the BC poems, under Given Knowledge there was no difference).

Conclusion:

The label "A Canadian Poem," in concert with its poem set and under Given Knowledge, was associated with greater Quantity of Writing. There existed a trend in the opposite direction with the label "A B.C. Poem."

(c) Free Response: Given Knowledge: General Conclusion and Discussion

The Given Knowledge condition was associated with different responses between the Canadian and New Zealand poems, both in terms of response patterns and the amount of writing upon each poem. The patterns suggested a richer response to the Canadian poems.

The Given Knowledge condition was also associated with different responses between the two poetry sub-conditions (RC/NZ and BC/NZ). Again, the differences occurred in both
response patterns and the amount of writing upon each poem. The nature of the patterns suggested that the response to the RC poems was a relatively simple, positive, response to the labels. Response to the BC poems combined negative evaluational effects with positive effects in other categories, thus appearing more complex.

SPECIFIC FINDINGS (3, B) FREE RESPONSE: DIFFERENCES ASSOCIATED WITH POSSESSED KNOWLEDGE

Question:

This sub-section applies Research Question 3 to the two extreme groups under Possessed Knowledge, as foreshadowed in section (1) Recognition.

It finds that:

the Response differences detected under (3,A) were even greater when a comparison was made between those two groups of students who, beyond being told of poem Origins, actually possessed and did not possess a Knowledge of what those Origins were.

A fuller conclusion can be found below, p. 138.

(a) Comparative Scores

(i) The Canadian and New Zealand Poem Groups as Wholes

Question:

Did the patterns of scores under Correctly Possessed Knowledge (PK+) and Incorrectly Possessed Knowledge (PK-)
differ sufficiently to suggest that the two conditions affected the students' responses to the Canadian or New Zealand poems?

Data: (Table XI)

Under PK+ the Canadian poems were favoured, significantly, in 6 categories: Evaluation, Transfer-Place, Transfer-Special, Visualisation, Depth, and Involvement. The trend existed in all other categories except Description.

Under Incorrectly Possessed Knowledge the New Zealand poems (thought to be Canadian) were significantly favoured in 2 categories: Evaluation and Comprehension. The trend was present in 3 others: Description, Visualisation, and Interpretation.

Significant 2 x 2 Chi-Squares could be calculated in 3 categories: Evaluation, Comprehension, and Visualisation.

Conclusion and Discussion:

The patterns of response under Correctly and Incorrectly Possessed Knowledge were sufficiently different for a difference in the effect of the two conditions to be concluded. The condition PK+ was strongly associated with responses that favoured the Canadian poems. The condition PK- was strongly associated with responses that favoured the New Zealand (thought to be Canadian) poems. This finding confirmed, strengthened, and extended the finding under Given Knowledge. It suggested that where the students believed a poem to be Canadian they
Illustrating the effects, on the patterns of response to the two poem groups, associated with the two Possessed Knowledge conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>COMPREHENSION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TRANSFER</th>
<th>VISUALIZATION</th>
<th>INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>DEPTH</th>
<th>INTERPRETATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>CAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strength of this trend was indicated by the Chi-Squares. Under the Given Knowledge/Denied Knowledge comparison, where many students apparently did not fully Possess Knowledge, significance was reached only in 4 cases—compared with 8 under the PK+ /PK- comparison. As well, 5 of the latter were significant at .05 compared with the single case under Knowledge.

Similarly, the single significant interaction under Knowledge.
was met by 3 under Possessed Knowledge.

Considering the strength of the effects under Possessed Knowledge and remembering that most students under PK+ were also Given Knowledge students, the former group must have largely accounted for the variance exhibited under Given Knowledge.

(ii) The RC/NZ and BC/NZ Conditions (not Tabled)

The small size of the PK sample, especially under PK-, rendered interpretation too hazardous when the samples were halved under the RC/NZ and BC/NZ groupings.

(b) Quantity of Writing

(i) The Canadian and New Zealand Poem Groups as Wholes

Data: (Table XII)

Under PK-, significantly more students produced most writing with the Canadian poem (which they thought to be New Zealand) than with the New Zealand poem. Under PK+ there was a non-significant trend also favouring the Canadian poem. The 2 x 2 Chi-Square was non-significant.

Conclusion:

While the Canadian poem (thought to be New Zealand) was favoured under PK-, the non-significant interaction suggested that this result be viewed very cautiously.
(ii) The RC/NZ and BC/NZ Conditions (not Tabled)

The numbers were too small for reliable testing. The patterns that did exist revealed no differences between the two conditions.

(c) Free Response: Possessed Knowledge: General Conclusion and Discussion

The Possessed Knowledge condition was associated with differences between the Canadian and New Zealand poems in terms
of response patterns.

The Possessed Knowledge analysis clarified the "effects" of Knowledge. Because PK- students, while mistakenly thinking that they were dealing with Canadian poems, favoured the New Zealand poems in the way Given Knowledge and PK+ students did, and because the Canadian poems weren't favoured under Denied Knowledge, the differences in response pattern must be attributed to the labelling of the poems or to the students' conceptions of their Origins, not to the fact of their Origins.

The Possessed Knowledge analysis also suggested that Knowledge effects can be more powerful than was demonstrated under Given Knowledge. Under Correctly Possessed Knowledge the Canadian poems were more or less favoured in all categories except Description-Recapitulation (this category contains the "mere paraphrase": the response-type of the most dubious value from the viewpoint of literary criticism). So the students' responses, when they knew they were dealing with Canadian poems, were more numerous in all the areas that teachers might value. In particular, Correctly Possessed Knowledge students appear to have valued more highly, comprehended better, and been more involved in, the Canadian poems.
SPECIFIC FINDINGS (2), (3\text{a}), (3, B): FREE RESPONSE: GENERAL DISCUSSION OVER ALL KNOWLEDGE CONDITIONS

(a) Some Categories Examined Separately

The free response results can be seen more clearly if some important categories are traced through the different conditions.

Transfer Place

Discussion:

This was the category most often exhibiting significant differences. Under Denied, Given, and Possessed Knowledge (except in PK- where responses were too few to test) the Canadian poems were favoured. Differences were greater in the latter two conditions. In the poem sub-group analyses, both the RC and BC poems were favoured over the NZ poems.

Conclusion:

Transfer, as the simple recognition of place, did occur with the Canadian poems. It was increased under Given or Possessed Knowledge.

Evaluation

Discussion:

Under this category, Canadian poems were favoured significantly only under Given and Possessed Knowledge. The
Given Knowledge results suggested that the RC poems were the source of these differences.

Conclusion:

Positive Evaluation of the Canadian (the RC) poems was associated with Given and Possessed Knowledge.

Comprehension, Visualisation, Involvement

Discussion and Conclusion:

Under these categories, Canadian poems were favoured significantly only under Possessed Knowledge.

Transfer Special

Discussion and Conclusion:

In this category, Canadian poems were favoured only under Given and Possessed Knowledge. The Given Knowledge results suggest that the BC poems were the major source of difference. Response patterns in this category did not fully coincide with those in Transfer-Place; they seem more closely linked to Knowledge.

(b) Quantity of Writing

Discussion:

Under Denied Knowledge, students wrote more on the BC poems than on the RC poems but this difference disappeared
Under Given and Possessed Knowledge. Under Given or Correctly Possessed Knowledge the students tended to write more on the Canadian poems. The Given Knowledge analysis suggests that the RC poems were the source of the difference. Although the PK-students wrote more on the Canadian poems, they thought them to be foreign. They wrote less on what they thought were Canadian poems.

Conclusion:

Given Knowledge was associated with more writing on RC poems and less on BC poems. The pattern was similar to that found in such categories as Evaluation, Visualisation and Involvement. However, the findings in other areas were not clear-cut: the PK-students wrote more on what they thought to be foreign poems, thus reversing the trend under Given Knowledge; two important 2 x 2 Chi-Squares (see above, pp. 131, 137) were not significant; and 3 poem pairs (see above, p. 105) produced a disproportionate amount of variance under Quantity of Writing.

(c) The RC/NZ and BC/NZ Conditions

The labels "A Canadian Poem" and "A B.C. Poem" were associated with different effects. Differences between the RC and BC poem groupings occurred under Given Knowledge but not under Denied Knowledge (they could not be measured under Possessed Knowledge). The differences, therefore, appear to have depended upon the labels given, in concert with the poem pairs, rather than upon any inherent differences in the poems.
OVERALL CONCLUSIONS: THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Research Question (1)

The students were unable to distinguish a Canadian or BC landscape poem from a New Zealand landscape poem read beside it.

Research Question (2)

There were no general trends suggesting that the students responded differently to the Canadian and New Zealand poem samples when they were not told of the Origins of the samples.

Research Question (3)

There was considerable evidence that students responded differently to the Canadian and New Zealand poem samples when they were told of the Origins of the samples. They favoured the Canadian poems, often strongly, in almost every response category. Response differences were even greater with those students who, beyond being told of poem Origins, actually retained a Knowledge of what those Origins were.

SPECIFIC FINDINGS (4): FREE RESPONSE: SIGNIFICANT ADJECTIVALS

In this analysis (like Quantity of Writing, a product of supplementary Content Analysis) I made an effort to capture the interpretative/affective colour of responses. (I use the term "adjectivals" not grammatically but to cover words and
phrases that students used to describe their emotional responses to the whole poem.) The adjectivals carry one beyond the somewhat colourless objectivity of content analysis categories.

My method was to take, out of the free response protocols, any adjectivals that appeared to encapsulate the total effect, upon the student, of the landscape-in-the-poem. Such adjectivals were then placed in their pairs—one set per student—under the respective poem heads and Knowledge conditions (see Table XIII and Appendix IV, B). My aim was to establish whether patterns of affective interpretation were present between poems and between Knowledge conditions.

The following patterns emerged:

1. Most students, of those who did use adjectivals in the manner described, did differentiate between poems by them.
2. Differentiation did follow patterns, among students, for each poem pair. The likeness of interpretation between poems was clear. As double-class groups, students tended to see each poem in a similar light and to differentiate poems in similar ways. For example, 5 different students applied the word sad to "To An Expatriate." The words depressing, depression, barren, morbid, and lifeless were used by 5 different students to characterize "Hill Country."
3. The differentiation can be highlighted by the application of the semantic differential principle. I used the "Evaluative" polarity-cluster offered by Osgood. It contains such
adjective pairs as: good-bad, beautiful-ugly, and clean-dirty. I called each pole "positive" and "negative." I scored only negatives, since they were more clear-cut, and I scored only where the student provided a complete adjec­tival pair by which to judge. The example of such scoring (Table XIII) comes from condensing the adjec­tival polarities for poem pair 1 ("In the Valley of Wenkchemna"/"Hill Country").

Those poem pairs in which the scores for each poem were separated by at least 3 points generated the pattern of negatives shown in Table XIV.

Six New Zealand poems scored negative but only 1 Canadian. The pattern may suggest that Canadian students do have a different, "brighter," feeling for their own literature. If pursued in future research this possibility might offer a substantial commentary upon the supposedly Canadian themes referred to earlier, especially those dealing with hardship, garrisons, survival, and the like. Further enquiry, which does seem warranted, might employ conventional semantic differential techniques, using the adjectivals offered by these students.
### TABLE XIII

**SIGNIFICANT ADJECTIVALS**

"IN THE VALLEY OF WENKCHEMNA"/"HILL COUNTRY"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denied Knowledge</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Zealand</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disturbing</td>
<td>disturbing, bleak, depressing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freedom</td>
<td>died, never to be free again</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel really good</td>
<td>nothing beautiful things wiped out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>cold, lonely, older, not nearly so beautiful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Given Knowledge</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Zealand</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life, freedom, love, happiness</td>
<td>death, sad depression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summer, alone [ + ]</td>
<td>barren, empty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summer, lighter</td>
<td>morbid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy, alive, free</td>
<td>suspense, lifeless, dead, robbed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy, responsive, flush fresh</td>
<td>cold and undecided, dry, hot, stuffy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm, happy, glad content, peaceful</td>
<td>unsettles/horrible trivial [ - ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alive</td>
<td>sad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XIV

SCORES (NEGATIVES) PER POST HOC SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poems</th>
<th>1,2</th>
<th>3,4</th>
<th>9,10</th>
<th>11,12</th>
<th>15,16</th>
<th>17,18</th>
<th>23,24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant Origin</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>NZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The two Knowledge conditions might have influenced which adjectival adjectives were chosen. Over all poem pairs there was, under Given Knowledge, an increase in the number of negatives from 35 to 42 with the New Zealand poems. The Canadian figures were stable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Poem</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such a movement, albeit slight, might indicate that Given Knowledge strengthened any sensed "brightness" in the Canadian poems—or its converse in the New Zealand poems. Notice this student's remark:
Reading poem one, and not knowing the poem is referring to a Non-Canadian opinion, you can tell the way he only brings out the ugly part of the prairies. [Given Knowledge]

And this:

The way it describes the beautiful wonders of our country . . . . like our country many poems are created with feeling and beauty that is awe-inspiring. [Given Knowledge]

The possibility of a Knowledge effect suggests, at least, a more rigorous experimental enquiry.

Conclusion:

The number of negatively seen New Zealand poems exceeded the Canadian by 6 poems to 1. The trend against the New Zealand poems may have been strengthened under the Given Knowledge condition. Both findings should be regarded as departure points for further research rather than as "results."

SPECIFIC FINDINGS (5): FREE RESPONSE: TRANSFER

(a) Direct Statements

Some students offered, in their free responses, what might be called set-pieces on the transfer issue:

Perhaps the reason it doesn't give me much feeling is because I'm not familiar to the place the poet is talking about. [Denied Knowledge]

I found both poems enjoyable but I found that I could relate to the Canadian poem easier as perhaps I have experienced the
same feelings as the others. I find it hard to interpret or relate to poems that are from other countries or talk about something that I have not experienced.

[Given Knowledge]

I feel it was a good poem to some people but to me it was a bore because this type of thing does not appeal to me due to I have never experienced anything like it.

[Denied Knowledge]

I can relate to this poem because often I have been in that situation camping during the summer. Maybe that is why it seems to be very personal to me. I really like this poem; mostly I can feel the atmosphere it puts around the person....

[Given Knowledge]

He seems to express the way I feel sometimes when I'm alone by myself very well. I enjoyed this poem I guess because I could relate it too me own life.

[Denied Knowledge]

Clearly these students place considerable store by transfer to the familiar. But the statements were isolated cases. Transfer-Special received few scores. Only 15 students made comments as clear-cut as the ones just quoted; 10 under Given Knowledge and 5 under Denied. They are interesting; but not sufficiently common for generalizations to be safely made from them.

(b) The Strength of Transfer

Many students shaped the landscape-in-the-poem according to their personal experiences. The following examples were written in response to "A View of Rangitoto" (presented as the excerpt "A View of the Mountain").
Harshness of gorse darkens the yellow cliff-edge,
And scarlet-flowered trees lean out to drop
Their shadows on the bay below, searching
The water for an image always broken
Between the inward and returning swells.
Farther, beyond the rocks, cuff'd by pert waves
Launches tug at their moorings; and in the channel
Yachts that sprint elegantly down the breeze
And earnest liners driving for the north.

Some responses:

This poem seems to suggest that mountains
are rather frighteningly powerful. The mountains and the sea together become almost as one filled with strength and dignity.

The second poem creates visions of a very windy hill top where few things grow on the rocky ground. And the trees that do manage to survive are very twisted. One can see quite far from this hill, other mountains in the distance and boats on the water. Rather like places in Howe Sound.

It reminds me of a harbour up the coast of B.C. when they talk about the high cliff and tall trees with the bay below.

To my (New Zealand) eyes, none of these descriptions was accurate. The scene in the poem is not as the students described it. That, of course, may be understandable and even acceptable; a poem can, legitimately, be different things in different eyes. But the students' descriptions cannot be supported by the poem itself, by the artifact. The "mountains and the sea together" do not, in the poem, become "filled with
strength and dignity" as the first BC student's interpretation has it; the "mountains in the distance" of the second description (and as there would be "in Howe Sound") are not found in the poem; and the tall trees of the third description are not the leaning trees portrayed in the poem (the "very twisted" trees of the second description). Just how strong, then, might be the effects of transfer? I will take the question up in future research (see below, p. 170).

(c) Some "Foreign" Students and Transfer

If generalization from a tiny sample (29) is avoided, several points are worth making about the foreign students' responses.

The (six) Hong Kong Chinese exhibited language difficulties. All except two responded weakly. The two better responses were markedly "distanced." One responded against the Given Knowledge label:

Although he is not a Canadian his description of the Prairie is far more worth than the first poem.

[Given Knowledge]

The other interpreted the simple descriptive poem "The Stream" in clear-cut mythic terms:

He is grown-ups now. He step into the society like everyone did. On his journey, He met a lot of troubles temptation etc. He maybe lost and fall into a evil track ... .

[Given Knowledge]

This student's certainty in response suggests a deep cultural
transfer different from that made by Canadian students to their landscape.

Three students from Britain responded strongly to the suggestion of homesickness in "To An Expatriate." The strength of their responses suggests another form of transfer, but the responses were also nicely distanced:

I think that if I was presented such a poem about my homeland, it would give me this feeling too. [Denied Knowledge]

Perhaps the reason it doesn't give me much feeling is because I'm not familiar to the place the poet is talking about . . . . though . . . . you can feel the way the guy longs for home, remembering every scene of his homeland. [Denied Knowledge]

I enjoy this poem because it reminds me that I too, am living away from my native land, and thus the poem has meaning for me. It reminds me of . . . . [Given Knowledge]

A student from Rhodesia saw the poem excerpt "Elements" as portraying a "country somewhere with miles of open land covered with grass." The poem in fact presents a landscape that is enclosing rather than open; grass is never mentioned on its "clay," "dust," and "blue veins" of ranges. The student appears to have treated the poem in the way the Canadians, reported above, treated "A View of Rangitoto."

Finally, what struck me as a peculiarly strong response to "Canterbury" (a NZ poem) when I was coding response protocols
turned out to be written by the one student who had lived in New Zealand.

If these responses were found to be of a common type in a broader study, and if teachers were made fully aware of them, then the teachers might be more able to see the difficulties and meet the needs of the immigrant student.
CHAPTER V

SOME IMPLICATIONS AND SOME FUTURE RESEARCH

SOME IMPLICATIONS

Findings from this study, insofar as they apply to pedagogical issues, must be weighed against the many other considerations that bear upon educational decision-making. Even more important, the present line of study must be extended and deepened before results are acted upon by educational planners. In particular, an effort should be made to obtain findings from beyond that group of students who differentiated between poems under a particular category and so produced data (Comparative scores) from which I could draw conclusions for that category. Such a research effort will not be without dangers of falsification—the truth about any poetry reading may be that only a proportion of readers will have the capacity or desire to differentiate between poems in all facets of their expressed responses.

For the present, every caution and delimitation kept in mind, the present results do demand that English educators, especially in Canada, question some of their assumptions and pursue some new questions. The promotional rhetoric reviewed in Chapter 1 must be refined. My results suggest that Canadian students might respond to labels, or to a national feeling called forth by labels, rather than from any identity inherent in the students' relationship with Canadian poems. It is
possible, then, that a deeper identity has still to be discovered by secondary school students; that, for them, little or no distinctively Canadian literature exists; and that those teachers who report immediate enthusiasm for Canadian literature are reporting the enthusiasm of student patriots learning of their land and its culture rather than of Canadians readily recognizing and responding to their own experiences and nostalgias.

Transfer, to move into the theory, is not readily purchased. When it was obtained in this study, if responses under Transfer-Place signified that it was, it did not necessarily lead to richer response. If, on the other hand, transfer was set up only by the labelling of the poems (and was thus based upon patriotic feelings or perhaps on an increased consciousness of place) then transfer, since it was then associated with richer response profiles, may very well lead to those secondary effects (interest, engagement, involvement, and enthusiasm) reviewed in Chapter I.

The argument for regional locality as a literary starting point was not supported in any clear-cut manner. There was partial support in the special response to BC poems: but the cross-current apparently set up by the greater prestige of the label "A Canadian Poem" (or, conversely, by the BC label's calling out a "low self-image") suggests that Bowering, Crawford and others (above, p. 12) should re-cast their arguments. The
best Canadian "locality" with which to initially engage BC students may well be Canada itself.

Not, however, if the student is of foreign birth or experience. While the sample of foreign students examined in this study was too small for any generalization to be made, the students' responses under "transfer" were sufficiently at variance with those of the main student sample to demand that teachers look closely at their own immigrant students, possibly even employing the free response technique to examine student responses. The immigrant student may need special material and guidance to meet the problems of, first, adjustment and literary engagement, then of critical tempering. Problems with simple landscape poems (and the mythologies they carry) may be compounded in poetry of social and spiritual experience.

The results of this study are also salutary as they apply to the frequent complaints that Canadian students have little knowledge of Canadian authors.¹ Such complaints often carry overtones suggesting that literary standards themselves, not just the interests of nationalism, suffer by this ignorance. If, however, Canadian literature is not inherently distinctive in the students' eyes, if they cannot even recognize it as being Canadian, then their failure to know much about Canadian authors is less the literary crime that innuendo has it to be, and more the cultural misdemeanour that it might properly remain. Perhaps students will have to be shown how to look at Canadian literature before they are expected to be familiar with writers and titles.
The Canadian Literature promotion aside, the results of the present study should challenge teachers, as has Barnes in more general terms, to ask how they would exploit initial-response patterns like those exhibited here or how they would reconcile such patterns with their present approaches. They should consider whether the judicious labelling of poems might enable some students to reach quickly and by themselves some of the response goals they direct their students to. Further, Richards found his students to lose their critical bearings without a poet's name to direct them; I begin to ask how well Canadian students would recognize and how appropriately they would respond to, say, Wordsworth if they were denied knowledge of his authorship. Would transfer metamorphose the Lake District into a pine-clad BC mountain locale? How much would it matter if it did?

More surely, the labelling of poems in class would seem to call forth higher initial discrimination between poems, if that is sought for any reason. (Of course to label or group poems in texts is to eliminate teacher choice and, possibly, response freedom.) The lack of labelling, on the other hand, might require more student discussion or more teacher-directed attention to the poem in order that students reach a conscious critical position. However, those who argue that "Introducing external evidence such as author biography . . . does not lead to a critical reading of a poem" may be missing the point if they apply their dictum too rigorously to high school students.
The richest responses in this study support and extend Squire's findings:

Association of the elements in a story with the personal experiences of the reader is dangerous to interpretation only when uncontrolled. In most cases readers seem to perceive far too few of these relationships.

The results pose new, finer, questions (see below, Some Future Research) rather than provide answers. But they do not threaten the place of Canadian literature in the schools—they strengthen it. When the present students knew or thought they knew that certain poems were Canadian, those students who made any differentiation between poems favoured the Canadian poems, often strongly, in almost every facet of measured response. Such initial response patterns must suggest that Canadian poems, presented as Canadian, would serve well as a base for cultural education in this country and would offer, for some students, an attractive starting point for wider literary exploration and growth.

SOME FUTURE RESEARCH

Introduction

Asking, as it did, Talbert's "grand tour questions," this study found its justification as much in the lines of enquiry it promised to open, as in any certain findings it seemed likely to produce. Future research will be discussed in two sections: the first deals with the specific post doctoral
analyses and enquiries which were built into the present design; the second deals with directions and methods not yet so closely mapped.

Future Research Already in Train: "Additional Instruments and Procedures"

The response material generated in this study is open to much more analysis than was possible or desirable in the primary pursuit of the research questions through the free-response technique. In the following list the earliest analyses mentioned are those most likely to bear upon the established research questions.

"How Much Do You Like These Poems?" (Appendix IV, I)

This Likert-type scale was used to gauge students' preferences between poems. Some findings are already available. Some of special interest follow.

The two estimations of preference—content analysis Category 1 (Evaluation) and the Likert Scale—were highly and positively correlated (see above, p. 61).

There was no real difference in the popularity of the Canadian and New Zealand poem groups under Denied Knowledge (see above, p. 105).

There was a significant, but slight, relationship whereby the poems Recognized were the poems most liked.
There was a significant, but slight, relationship whereby the PK- students preferred the New Zealand poems (thought to be Canadian) and the PK+ students preferred the Canadian poems ($r = .25***$).

There was a significant, but slight, order effect whereby the first poem presented to the students was the one they preferred ($r = .17***$).

There was a significant, but slight, relationship whereby the poem first treated in free response was the one preferred ($r = .27***$).

There was a significant relationship whereby the poem about which most was written was the poem most liked ($r = .35***$).

There were significant relationships (ranging from strong to moderate correlations) between preference and many content analysis categories—whereby the poems responded to in each category were the poems most liked (Evaluation, $r = .67***$; Comprehension, $r = .51***$; Transfer-Special, $r = .51***$; Visualisation, $r = .45***$; Involvement, $r = .60***$; Depth, $r = .58***$). The categories in which there was no significant relationship were Interpretation, Form, and Dictums.

There was a significant, and moderate, relationship
whereby the poem students selected to discuss with friends was the poem most liked by them ($\lambda = .5^{***}$).

There was a significant, but slight, relationship whereby the girls rated the Canadian poems higher than the New Zealand poems while the boys rated the New Zealand poems higher ($\lambda = .11^{***}$).

"Which Poem Would You Prefer to Discuss?" (Appendix IV, J)

This questionnaire assessed the students' desire to discuss either poem with friends, and their stated reasons.

Tentative findings include a significant difference between PK+ and PK- ($2 \times 2 \chi^2 = 6.62^{**}$) whereby students preferred to discuss the Canadian poem or the poem thought to be Canadian. This finding cross-validates and extends the findings under the content analysis categories. To respond positively under the categories may also have been to feel positively about the poem as a piece for classroom discussion.

"Your Opinions" (Appendix IV, M)

This instrument partly ascertained students' attitudes towards Canadian Literature as a whole and students' assessments of adult attitudes.

Indications are that the students believed professors and teachers to hold a higher opinion of Canadian literature than other adults ($\chi^2 = 26.71^{***}$) and that they, the students,
held the higher opinion also \( (X^2 = 11.79^{**}) \).

The Nature of Possessed Knowledge

The Possessed Knowledge phenomenon raises an important question: why did all Given Knowledge students not correctly Possess Knowledge? It is probable that reasons apart from the semantic content of the labels explain this—I have suggested question flaws, poor "reading," fatigue, distrust, and so on. Still, it seems important to find out whether the PK group or some students excluded from the PK analysis did in fact reject the labels because they disagreed with them or because they did not think them important. Such might be the case where students did not possess a strong sense of place or feel strongly "pro-Canadian." Compare the latter possibilities, for example, with the response of this student:

The first poem represented the people of B.C. No, not because it said B.C. poem, although that triggered me taking a look. But because of our mountains. . . .

[italics mine]

An indirect approach to this question, but one which might relate closely to classroom practices, would be to replicate the present study using different means of alerting students to Origins. A teacher's pointing out of Origins, if that could be done without violating controls, might create a much higher degree of Correctly Possessed Knowledge than in this study. Instruments could be designed to monitor any student rejection of the information on Origins.
Another explanation for the students' reversal of the labels is that some students might have preferred to think that the poem they favoured was Canadian. Ways might be devised in which to test this fascinating possibility.

As a part of ongoing research, I am at present seeking more information of the Possessed Knowledge groups. I introduce some tentative findings in view of the groups' special interest.

There was a fairly equal balance, in both groups, between the sexes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PK-</th>
<th>PK+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 0.76. \]

(\(X^2\), testing for any differences, = 0.76--non-significant).

To the extent that there was a slight edge between the sexes, the males were more often correct. The balance is noteworthy in that most studies show females to be superior "performers" in most facets of literary study and discrimination at school levels.

There was a significant difference (\(X^2 = 5.70^{**}\)) between the two groups in the amount of Canadian reading each
claimed to have done—in its response to the Questionnaire: "How Much Canadian Literature . . . Have You Read on Your Own?" (Appendix II, K).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Reading</th>
<th>PK-</th>
<th>PK+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Reading</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Reading</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 5.70^{**} \]

Of the PK- students, 60% claimed to have done "Less" reading; 58% of the PK+ students to have done "More." The association of PK+ with more Canadian reading suggests, among rival hypotheses, that past reading experience in Canadian literature rendered students more alert to the Canadian labels.

There was a significant difference \( (X^2 = 10.32^{***}) \) between the two groups in terms of the poem preferences they indicated on the Likert scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefer</th>
<th>PK-</th>
<th>PK+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the N.Z. poem</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Canadian poem</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 10.32^{***} \]
The PK- students generally preferred the New Zealand poem (which they thought to be Canadian), the PK+ students generally preferred the Canadian.

There was a significant difference \( (X^2 = 6.62**) \) between the two groups in terms of the poems they said they would prefer to discuss with friends (assessed by the Questionnaire: "Which Poem Would You Prefer to Discuss?"):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PK-</th>
<th>PK+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discuss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Canadian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poem first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The N.Z.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poem first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60% of the PK- students stated that they would prefer to discuss the NZ poem (which they thought to be Canadian) and 59% of the PK+ students stated they would prefer to discuss the Canadian poem.

The Poems Analyzed

In the future, the poem pairs might be examined in light of the responses given by the present students. This examination might include, especially, an analysis of the poem pairs which students discriminated least and most under Recognition. Poem pairs of the latter type might extend Rankin's findings re "queerness" or "difference" (see above, p. 14).
Sex as a Variable

The design provided that class groups be randomly blocked by sex in order that any differential effects of sex on response patterns might be later assessed.

Relationships Between the Content Analysis Categories

A factor analysis might be made, examining the relationship between responses in the various categories.

"Your Opinions" (Appendix IV, M)

This instrument ascertained something of the students' past experience with Canadian literature and their desire for more. (The instrument served also to check Extensive Canadian Reading.) Indications are, among other things, that these students would like more Canadian literature in class ($x^2 = 59.15^{***}$):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>More</th>
<th>Less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can Lit in Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had in the past</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired in the future</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 59.15^{***}$

Comparison with Teachers

Teachers or others might act as subjects in a "repli-
cation" of the present study; and teachers might attempt to anticipate (ex post facto) the students' responses, preference ratings, and adjectival polarities as those were discovered in the present study.

Poem Origins Outside Canada

The attribution, by students, of Origins to the poems where the latter were not thought to be Canadian is worth describing. Such description might examine, especially, the image of England and Scotland that many students presented through their placements. The relatively few geographical areas in which Origins were suggested might also be examined.

Order Effects

A detailed examination of order effects could be made.

Critical Qualities

The quality of free-response writing might be examined. A study might include analysis of: typical response patterns, the misuse of formal terms, and style.

Stock Responses: "Ecology"

A further description and analysis might be made of the many responses in which the present students' interpretations were heavily coloured by the current concern with environmental damage. Examples of such responses include:
of "Hill Country"

"Gouged out, gaping clay." Clay symbolizes what man has done. The once "white sky" and "yellow broom" shall be no more. Man has used up all of the beauty and to replace it he has only left barrenness, destruction.

of "A View of Rangitoto"

The yacht just seems to spoil the picture. It just seems to me a place like that will not last too much longer if yachts are already going by it. Pretty soon they'll be making stops there and the place will never be the same.

The effects of such preoccupations on literary response and criticism should be reviewed.

Other Directions

These suggestions involve separate studies. They can be seen partly as further areas for enquiry, partly as methodological alternatives.

Areas for Enquiry

Replications

There is much scope for the near-replication of the present study. To involve more students in the final analyses these might use different methods of providing the students with Given Knowledge and might direct students to point up the differences they feel in their responses to the poems.

There are many possibilities worth considering:
using a similar student sample with the same poems (to verify present results), with different poems (landscape and non-landscape), with prose extracts, with labels supplied at different stages in a reading, and with even more information on the poem provided, etc.; using students sampled from different age levels; using students sampled from an exclusively rural, or some other, area; using students sampled from other Canadian regions or sub-regions; and using New Zealand students with the same poems as in the present study.

The latter replication would be valuable in balancing the design. It might give an indication of the relative parts played by the students (including their school backgrounds) and poems in response patterns. It would fill out the study along the lines valued by Early, by Wainer and Berg, and by Purves and Beach (see above, p. 17).

Another near-replication might explore the Canadian Studies idea by replacing the Denied Knowledge condition with one in which students are provided with information like that given when literature is taught as part of a social studies or history course. Many other "replications," substituting students and/or poems, are possible. A USA/Canadian comparison is just one example.

Longitudinal Studies

Studies could be made of Canadian student responses to Canadian literature over time. These might include, especi-
ally, studies of the students' own book selections.

Case Studies

There could be studies of individual reading experiences with Canadian literature. Those studies might employ less selective methodologies than extant studies.

The Strength of Transfer

To investigate the issue raised under Results (see above, p. 149), students might be called upon to describe a setting remembered from a poem. Qualified people from Canada and New Zealand might then be asked to comment upon the appropriateness of the description. (For another method by which to probe the ways in which the Canadian labels affect response see below, p. 173.)

A Typology of Literary Works

Teachers might use the study poems in class and compare their experiences with the study findings. A small anthology of the paired poems with a summary of the findings might best serve this end.

Methodological alternatives

There are other methods by which to approach questions like those asked in the present study. Some alternatives have already been suggested in this chapter; three more deserve mention.
The tape recording of student discussions in response to poetry should be undertaken, furthering the work of Barnes and the extremely promising pilot work for this study. I present one example from the latter. The (grade 12) students are freely discussing "Hill Country":

A I can't stand that type of poetry.
B I really liked . . .
C Sort of jagged and . . . uh . . .
B That's what it was supposed to be I think. It was supposed to be a jagged poem. That's what the image of the hill country is; something that's jagged and . . .
A Well to me that's not what hill country is. Did you see hill country?
D I saw . . . uh . . . I couldn't see hills. I can't see sunbaked clay on top of a hill.
E Well I can see hills of sunbaked clay but I c . . . . This isn't what hill country is.
D Not hills of . . . hills of sunbaked clay that have yellow broom blooming. If you've got hills of sunbaked clay there's not much on them. They're dry, they're . . . windswept.
? Do you know what yellow broom is?
D Yeah, I know what broom is.
? And you don't think it goes with . . . clay?
D Oh yeah, I think it does but I don't think the whole thing puts together. I think part of it is where there is more . . .
B There's kind of a progression though, it goes from where the, you got . . .
Transcript break: B moves through text showing progression. E interpolates, at one point:

I couldn't I couldn't see bees and flowers and sunbaked earth. I just couldn't see it . . .

D Then it sort of bothered me—"wind strums over plain, same dry high plain"—I thought, you know, plain? I want a mountain. Ha.

E What happened to the hill country?

D Yeah that's precisely it. What happened to the hill country? Because you don't get plains being in the middle of the hill country.

B You've got plateaus, you've got hills and plateaus.

D That's more of mountain though. But hill country's just sort of . . . hills . . . you know . . . not mountains and not flat.

? Yeah right.

? Then that bothered me too—"sallow flat, yellow flat, willow flat."

A Boy, you've got a real stereotyped hill country.

[Laughter and agreement "yeah, yeah"]

B Yeah I guess if you do you just get an image of a hill country and what you . . . what hill country is and then its hard to imagine that different things are happening.

The commentary upon transfer is obvious and important. The pilot transcripts relate to many other issues too. This oral approach might be the one best suited to research with younger students. It also offers a means by which to probe the effects of transfer on response. And there would be value in a comparison between free response of the type elicited in this study and group discussion.
Semantic Differentials

The semantic differential has general promise (where its findings can be safely interpreted) as a probe into the attitudinal crevices opened up by literary response. It appears highly suited to pursuing the questions discovered under "Significant Adjectivals."

Projective Techniques

Projective techniques possess speculative freedom and mesh well with the creative aspects of English Literature studies. This may compensate for their analytical looseness.

Concluding Statement

Almost inevitably with a pioneering study, future research possibilities begin to overwhelm that which is initially discovered. So it should be in the present case. The findings are tentative, they are beginnings, they depend upon extensive future research for their verification and development. But we do now know enough to replace loosely held assumptions with considered questions. We know, to take up Hansson's point, a little better where some of our Canadian students are.
NOTES

CHAPTER I

1 The periodicals giving most attention to the question have been *The English Quarterly* ([Canada]: CCTE), and *Monday Morning* (Toronto: Saturday Night Publications).

2 George Crawford, *Barometer Rising* ([Canada]: CCTE 1973); and Sandra Stewart, *Course Countdown* (Toronto: CANLIT, 1974). Crawford also notes opposition to increased Canadian content, e.g. pp. 4, 10, 35. A third major survey was conducted by A. B. Hodgetts—*What Culture? What Heritage?* (Toronto: OISE, 1968)—but, as a study of "Civic Education," it did not yield much data on literature teaching or curricula.


E.g. Clement Moisan, "L'enseignement de la littérature Canadienne," Humphreys, pp. 69-80; and Rea, p. 94.


For the first part of this sentence, see "Canadian Literature: The Necessary Revolution," TS, London, Ont.: Laurier High School (1972): "We teach it because it is us, it is ours, it is there, it is excellent."

Cf. Hodgetts, p. 119; and Brita Mickleburgh, "This Class Probed Our Literature All Through the Year," Monday Morning, 6, No. 2 (1971), p. 17.


Rea, p. 94.

Gray, p. 46.

Hugh Loughran, cited by Crawford, p. 60.


Dudek and Layton, p. 17.

Mathews, "Canadian Literature: The Necessary Revolution," p. 7; and see Rea, p. 94.

See Hodgetts, p. 74.

Secondary School Curriculum Material, Grade 12, Province of New Brunswick; and Rea, p. 93.


Cf. Livesay, "On Teaching Our Own," p. 76.
Crawford acknowledges weaknesses in his survey, e.g. p. 14. Stewart draws heavily on Crawford.

Though sometimes writers do acknowledge that more needs to be known, e.g. Crawford, p. 53; and Livesay, "On Teaching Our Own," p. 77. Perhaps the study coming closest to examining assumptions is that undertaken by Darlene Harris, "Canadapoems," TS, British Columbia (1974):

Because I believe adults make too many decisions for children, and because I make no pretense to think or speak as a child; over 200 elementary school students, from grades 4 to 7, in 4 locations in North Vancouver, were asked to voluntarily assist in the evaluation of these poems.

[Introduction]

However, the study lacks objectivity. There are few experimental controls and Harris is committed to a particular cause:

This Booklet, then, offers a small sampling of the quality and variety of Canadian poems that teachers can bring to their students to encourage a feeling of pride in and a sense of identification with poetry written by and for Canadians.

[Preface]

The Alberta Provincial Curriculum Guide (Modules, Grade X or XI, 7, Canadian Poetry) does make the point re cultures:

It is difficult to define the Canadian culture as something that is distinctive because cultural backgrounds differ from region to region.

Notice also Tomkins, p. 7:

Unity is national in reference, international or comparative in perspective and rooted in a political feeling. Identity is a cultural and imaginative concept, local and regional in nature. In Frye's words, "The tension between this political sense of unity and the imaginative sense of locality is the essence of whatever the word 'Canadian' means."


"The Responses of Adolescents to Literature."

Alan C. Purves with Victoria Rippere, Elements of Writing About a Literary Work (Champaign, III.: NCTE, 1968); and Squire, "The Responses of Adolescents to Literature."

Following their lead are, e.g. Hansson, pp. 260-84; Purves, Arthur W. Foshay and Hansson, Literature Education in Ten Countries
(New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973); National Assessment of Educational Progress, *Highlights of the First National Assessment of Literature* :([USA]: Education Commission of the States, 1972); National Assessment of Educational Progress, *Responding to Literature: Theme 2, Literature* (Denver, Col.: National Assessment of Educational Progress, 1973); and many doctoral candidates employing the Purves-Rippere content analysis scheme in their dissertations.


34 Muller, p. 49.
35 Barnes et al., p. 76, et passim.
36 Purves, "Literary Criticism and Educational Measurement," p. 75.
37 Notice Hansson, p. 276:

If we do not think of "better" as right or wrong, but as expected interpretations and responses, we can always define what the expected response is, and why we expect it. Our expectations will vary with different teaching goals and different teaching situations, but if we know what we are aiming at, we can always define and defend them."


45 See Purves and Beach, pp. 105-6.
47 Purves et al., pp. 314-5, et passim; and Purves, "Indoctrination in Literature," p. 70, et passim.

Bowering, p. 2.

p. 52. See also p. 3 above; Livesay, "On Teaching Canadian Literature," p. 7; and Bill Bissett, "On What Secondary English Should be About," Update (BCETA), 15, No. 5 (1974), p. 2:

first what i wud say cud b dun is for the teechrs to ordr buks actually printid in b.c. by living b.c. authors for ther classes

ths wud make it possibul for peopul in classes (th word 'student' is kniduv dumb) to reed nd discuss poetry as its being written today nd within an environment they ar alredy familiar with or concern nd undrstanding cud b achievd mor redily

But cf. Egoff, p. 12:

Some, however, feel an obligation to purchase every Canadian novel, especially if it has an identifiable locale, the theory being that, even if a story is not well written, a child might learn, for instance, that Vancouver is on the west coast of Canada.


58 E.g. Loban, citing White, p. 201; and Purves and Beach, p. 73.


61 Marie Rankin, Children's Interests in Library Books of Fiction (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1944), pp. 132-3, 135. See also J.L. Evans "Two Aspects of Literary
Appreciation Among High School Students, Judgement of Prose Quality and Emotional Response to Literature, and Selected Aspects of Their Reading Interests," Diss. Minnesota, 1968, p. 32, citing Heilman (1956); Purves and Beach, p. 18; and Bridge, pp. 42, 63.

62 Loban, pp. 250, 251; Purves and Beach, pp. 18, 28; Ring, p. 23; and Squire, The Responses of Adolescents While Reading Four Short Stories, p. 56.

63 Purves, "IEA Literature," Chap. 1, p. 9; Ch. 3, p.5.

64 p. 75; John C. Gerber, "Explosion in English," The Shape of English, (Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1967), p. 11; Purves and Beach, p. 163; and Vine, pp. 34-5.

65 Barnes et al., pp. 66-7.

66 Sherrill. See also Menchise; Purves and Beach, pp. 105-6; and Woodward.


In addition to analysis and interpretation, the application of knowledge of other texts, of literary history and other contextual information, and of cultural information to specific texts plays a part in all the curricula. The information surrounding texts seems not to be meant to be learned merely for its own sake but for its usefulness in the reading and discussion of other texts. The reports from Chile, England, Finland, Italy, Iran, New Zealand, and the United States all express concern about the
tendency for such information to usurp the place of reading of texts.


71 See above, pp. 10-11; and Purves, "An Examination of the Varieties of Criticism," p. 94.


73 Purves and Beach, p. 163.
Accordingly, it partly answered the question Purves and Beach (p. 147) tag to another statement on ethnic literature: "One wonders what form the research might take."

See Faggiani, pp. 10-11, and Cooper and Purves, p. 22. Of course such an approach to cultural questions has its own limitations. Notice the IEA's qualified position:

The attitudes and approaches are often those which shape the cultural life of a nation or group, and an attempt to measure those approaches gives one some idea of that cultural life.

The patterns of response display a tendency of how people think of what they read; they do not inform one of the larger "Weltanschauungen".

Purves et al., pp. 15, 314. Cf. also Sheila Egoff, pp. 3-4:

A study of Canadian children's books, therefore, can throw some light on the nation itself. I have in no way made an explicit study in this area, but the books whose literary qualities are here discussed reveal more than content and style. They show what Canada and Canadians are like, what values we respect, how we look at ourselves today and at our past. Just as Alice in Wonderland tells us much about Victorian England, so children's books in Canada reflect many of the forces in our own society; it is a reflection in miniature, of course, but accurate and indicative.

Notice Muller, p. 80, re literary heritage:

this heritage "is not a packet to be transmitted inert," but is alive and fluid. "Each generation takes from it what it needs and adds to it in its turn."

"In a significant sense, works of art exist as perceived, or as a constantly growing and developing body of perceptions (Squire, 1968, p. 23)." It is awareness of this fact toward which many teachers would lead their students, and they would do so by asking their students to consider their own responses and to seek the causes of those responses in the work and in themselves.

See also Mary H. Beaven, "Responses of Adolescents to Feminine Character in Literature," Res Teach Engl, 6, No. 1 (1972), p. 63.


The relative absence of experimental studies in recognized research, despite the prominence of the genre generally, underscores the fact that good experimental designs are simply harder to build than other types. The experimental study—usually involving the effects of teaching methods, curricular arrangements, or materials—have been dogged with especial problems which may or may not be insurmountable in research in the teaching of English.


Hansson, p. 263.

Hansson, p. 263.

See Joll, 184; and notice Purves, in Cooper and Purves, p. 37;
"Start where they are!" You have read and heard that injunction many times. But . . . where are they?


83 Purves and Beach, p. 163.


CHAPTER II

1 Purves, "The Nature of Achievement in Literature," pp. 65-70, p. 68. See also Purves and Beach, p. 178.


3 Purves et al., p. 36.


5 Purves and Beach, pp. 180-1.


8 Cooper, "Research Roundup," p. 1056.


12 Purves et al., p. 36. See also Purves, "Literary Criticism and Educational Measurement," p. 76.


16 Burton, "The IEA Study: Two Reviews (The First Review)," p. 16.


19 See Forehand, p. 369.

20 Forehand, p. 369. See also Squire, "What Does Research in Reading Reveal About Attitudes Towards Reading?" p. 528.


23 Notice Cooper, *Measuring Growth in Appreciation of Literature*, pp. 6-7 and p. 17:

A measure that would satisfy all the conditions of validity can probably never be constructed. The task of the test-maker is to put together the most convincingly valid test he can manage. We can do much better than we have.

and Purves, "The Nature of Achievement in Literature," p. 69:

The important goals of education in literature are those about which there is no certainty: the engagement of a student, his taste, his judgment, his private response, his capacity for response, and his attitudes towards literature and the literary experience.

24 Stability of initial response over time cannot be measured using the same students. Also the first experimental
session in the present study would have destroyed the conditions necessary for replication.


29 Cf. Purves and Beach, pp. 16-17; and Eugene R. Smith


There can be little question as to the emotional and practical significance of free verbal expression. The freer it is—i.e., the less it is determined by what the speaker thinks the listener wants to hear—the more valid it is likely to be as an index of the speaker's own genuine emotional needs.


32 The better known schemes of Richards, Smith, Tyler et al.; Taba; Squire, and Purves (see n. 51 below) provide only a tiny sampling of the available schemes.


35 Smith, Tyler et al., pp. 308-9.

36 Loban, p. 254.

37 See B. C. Luchsinger, "Responses of Tenth-Grade Readers to Paired Complex and Less Complex Short Stories," Diss. Iowa 1969, p. 22, citing Irion and Thorndike; and Purves and Beach, p. 12.


41 E.g., Hansson, p. 283; Lemen, pp. 166-7; and Squire, "What Does Research in Reading Reveal About Attitudes Towards Reading?" p. 528, citing Forman. Notice also the many free response studies using content analysis schemes like that by Purves (n. 62 below).

42 See Purves, "An Examination of the Varieties of Criticism," pp. 94-5; and "Literary Criticism and Educational Measurement," p. 75.

43 E.g., Desmond Lawrence Cook, "An Investigation of Three Aspects of Free Response and Choice Type Tests at the College Level," Dissertation Abstracts, 15, No. 8 (1955), p. 1351 (Iowa); Hansson, pp. 263-4, 271; Lemen, p. 8, citing Taba; National Assessment of Educational Progress, pp. xiii-xiv; Purves, "Indoctrination in Literature," p. 66; Purves et al., pp. 9-10, 40; Sister Mary Justine Sabourin, "An Analysis of the Semantic Dimensions of the Aesthetic Response of College Students


45 Notice Sussams, p. 24:

such is the constitution of children that it is difficult to persuade them to remain in a state of suspended judgment; their final verdict is often indistinguishable from their first reaction.

46 See Bernard Berelson, Content Analysis in Communication Research (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1952), pp. 13, 14-18; Lemen, pp. 70-1; Loban, pp. 200-1; and Ralph White, pp. 351-3.

47 Cooper, "Measuring Appreciation of Literature," p. 19. Notice also Berelson, p. 114:

As a matter of fact, a broad definition of "content analysis" would of course include a large part of the work in literary criticism and intellectual and cultural history generally, as well as a sizable amount of writings in political history, political and social philosophy, rhetoric, and indeed any field in which the close reading of texts is followed by summary and interpretation of what appears therein. Such a definition, however, is far too broad for our purposes.


49 See Berelson, p. 125.


51 I.A. Richards, Practical Criticism (New York: Harcourt


53 Taba, p. vii.

54 Purves and Beach, pp. 32-3.

55 Notice Berelson, p. 115; re:

the selection of quotations and illustrations from the content to be used in enlivening and humanizing the report of frequencies by various categories. This is sometimes called "adding the qualitative dimension to a quantitative analysis." All it adds, of course, are exemplifications of the categories.


57 Cf. Lemen, p. 75.

58 Berelson, pp. 130, 147.

59 See, e.g., Berelson, p. 115; Luchsinger, p. 57; Purves, "Evaluation of Learning in Literature," p. 714; Scribner, p. 147; and above, pp. 34-6.

60 See, e.g., Berelson, p. 148; and Scribner, p. 148, citing Good, Barr and Scates.
61 See, e.g., Berelson, p. 148; and Purves with Rippere, pp. 1-5.

62 For an example of researcher enthusiasm, see Cooper, Measuring Growth in Appreciation of Literature, p. 20. Dissertation Abstracts to May 1975 lists at least 14 dissertations employing the Purves-Rippere scheme.


64 As one example, Purves himself found Squire's scheme wanting, Purves with Rippere, p. 3.


A serious question is the extent to which the judgment of the responses is actually a judgment
of writing. To a certain extent it is, and must necessarily be so in this highly verbal society we have. However, you must also consider the responses apart from their expression, to be concerned with whether a connection has been formulated and whether a connection has been made between the work and the response. This is the intellectual aspect of the task. It may well be that superior responses will appear in unorthodox forms—for example, as interpretation of a poem through a highly developed picture or an epigram.

67 Cf. Gibbons, pp. 28-9; Hoffman, p. 309; Krathwohl et al., passim; National Assessment of Educational Progress, Responding to Literature: Theme 2, Literature, p. xiv; Purves, "An Examination of the Varieties of Criticism," pp. 98-9; Purves and Beach, p. viii; Purves et al., Literature Education in Ten Countries, p. 36; and Tomkins, "Testing in English Literature: Toward a Better Rationale," pp. 44-5, et passim.

68 Cf. Cooper and Purves, p. 12.

69 For an example of a scheme which does, see National Assessment of Educational Progress, Responding to Literature, pp. xv-xvi, 1-3, 7. Also, see above, p. 41; and Hansson, quoted in Chap. 1, n. 37.

70 p. 146.

71 Validation by definition I take to be subsumed by "agreement."
72 See Purves; "An Examination of the Varieties of Criticism," pp. 95, 97.
73 pp. 2, 41.
75 p. 357.
76 p. 248.
77 p. 282.
78 pp. 113, 130-8, 145-7.
80 p. 84.
81 p. 277.
82 Berelson, p. 169.
83 For an explanation of the statistical notation, see below, pp. 101-2.
84 Lemen, p. 75; Loban, p. 205; and Squire, "The Responses of Adolescents to Literature," p. 101.

CHAPTER III

1 Cf. James Hoetker, Students as Audiences (Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1971), p. 90.
3 Cf. Lemen, p. 166; Squire, "English Literature," p. 467;
and Squire, "What Does Research in Reading Reveal?" p. 523.

4 Purves, "Indoctrination in Literature," p. 67; Purves et al., pp. 313-4; and Squire, "What Does Research in Reading Reveal?" pp. 523-5.


6 Reports of student dislike of class-taught poetry are legion. See, e.g., Norvell, The Reading Interests of Young People, pp. 52-3, 66; and Purves and Beach, pp. 78-9, 82, 88.

7 Cooper, Measuring Growth in Appreciation of Literature, p. 20; Early, "Literature and the Development of Reading Skills," p. 8; and Purves and Beach, p. 15, reporting Squire.

8 Richard Braddock, Selecting Novels for Group Reading (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1955), pp. 43, 45, 47, 52, 55; Loban, p. 250; Norvell, The Reading Interests of Young People, pp. 52, 64-6, 85; Purves and Beach, pp. 195-6, 202; Sussams, p. 46; and J.R. Wilson, p. 20.

9 See above, p. 17, n. 75.


In general, high scores for attitudes and comprehension that were achieved by the students at all three ability levels is probably the result of giving reading material at or below the students' ability levels. Unfortunately, students are often assigned material that is too difficult for the level of their skills development, and their post-reading responses are disappointing.
See also: Purves, "IEA Literature," p. 21; Purves et al., p. 38; Purves and Beach, pp. 5, 202-3; and Vine, p. 162. There are no readability formulas that cope adequately with poetry. See also, Faggiani, p. 300; and Purves and Beach, p. 88.

11 See Smith, Tyler et al., pp. 268-9; and J.R. Wilson, p. 40.

12 Bridge, p. 73.


14 For the power of content relative to form see Cooper, "Research Roundup," p. 1056; Norvell, The Reading Interests of Young People, pp. 52-3, 64; Purves and Beach, pp. 68, 79, 108, 202; and Sussams, p. 47.


16 See e.g. Purves and Beach, pp. 82, 202; and School and College Conference on English, p. 53.

17 E.g. H.A. Carroll, "A Standardized Test of Prose Appreciation for Senior High School Pupils," Journal of Educational Psychology, 23, No. 6 (1932); Evans, p. 15; Meckel, "An Exploratory Study of Responses of Adolescent Pupils," p. 36;

18 pp. 8-12.

19 Purves, et al., p. 51; and Stewart, pp. 8-11.

20 Norvell, *The Reading Interests of Young People*, p. 45; Purves and Beach, p. 198; and Sussams, p. 40.

21 Purves, "Indoctrination in Literature," pp. 67, 70; and Purves et al., pp. 26, 53.

22 Purves, "Indoctrination in Literature," pp. 69-70; and Purves and Beach, pp. 10, 93.

23 Cf. n. 4 above. Purves and Beach, p. 177.


25 See above, p. 72; and Smith, Tyler et al., pp. 271, 290.

26 Andrews, "Author Biography and Poetry Study," p. 44; and Purves and Beach, p. 20.

27 E.g. Hoffman, p. 19; Richards, p. 3; and Ring, p. 93.

28 Purves and Beach, pp. 147-8, 180.


See above, p. 17.


"Talk by Professor J.P. Matthews," TS, Canadian Studies Foundation (c. 1971), pp. 1, 5.
CHAPTER IV

1 Most invalid answers were those giving geographical types (e.g. marshland, sea-coast) instead of specific locations, or those stating "nation" or "region" in direct response to the question cue. (See "What Do You Know of These Poems?" Appendix II, H.) For speculation on the incorrect but valid answers offered under Given Knowledge see below, pp. 112, 162.

2 See also above, p. 103.


4 As they seem also to have been in many studies. See Barnes et al., p. 67; and Squire, "The Responses of Adolescents to Literature," p. 45.

CHAPTER V

1 See, e.g. Crawford, p. 47; Moisan p. 71; and Stewart, pp. 26-7.

2 Andrews, "Author Biography and Poetry Study," pp. 37-8, reviewing the work of Spingarn, Richards, Wimsatt, and Ciardi. Notice also p. 38:

An overemphasis on author biography misleads the student because . . . he will read into poetry the raw facts of a poet's life, not realizing that biographical elements are often so transformed that their personal meaning is no longer personal, merely human.

3 "The Responses of Adolescents," p. 45.
See above, p. 19.

Significance is best understood as an estimation of freedom from chance effects, correlation as a power of prediction. A relationship which is significant (i.e. is probably not produced by chance) does not necessarily give a high power of prediction.

Cf. Purves, "Indoctrination in Literature," p. 69:

We found that in general, the preferences of the students and teachers are more similar than different.

See above, p. 112; and Chap. 4, n. 1.

There may be a parallel between the effects of labelling in this study and Andrews' finding that biographical information about a poet increased student appreciation of that poet's works. See Andrews, "Author Biography and Poetry Study," p. 44.


See Beach, "The Literary Response Process."
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX I

THE POETRY SAMPLE
A

SOME POEM PAIRS

Six poem pairs are displayed as examples; three each from the RC/NZ and BC/NZ poem sub-groups. A full list of the sample poems appears under Introduction to Teachers (Appendix II, A).

Samples are shown as they were presented in the Given Knowledge condition and in Order 1 (except that they have been reduced from 14" sheets. The glossaries appeared at the bottom of the 14" sheets). Changes that were made for the Denied Knowledge condition are shown in square brackets.
from: TO HOLD IN A POEM
(A Canadian Poem)

I would take words
As crisp and as white
As our snow; as our birds.
Swift and sure in their flight; [DK: "our" = "the"]

As clear and as cold
As our ice; as strong as a jack pine;
As young as a trillium, and old
As Laurentia's long undulant line; [DK: "As the mountains"]

Sweet-smelling and bright
As new rain; as hard
And as smooth and as white
As a brook pebble cold and unmarred:

To hold in a poem of words
Like water in colourless glass
The spirit of mountains like birds,
Of forests as pointed as grass...

Possibly Difficult Words:

(Of course the poet may intend the words to convey much more than their simple meanings or even intend something different from them.)

austere—stern; severely simple.
undulant—wavy
from: TO AN EXPATRIATE
(Non-Canadian)

Pine for the needles brown and warm,
think of your nameless native hills,
the seagulls landward blown by storm,
the rabbit that the black dog kills.

Swing with the kelp the ocean sucks,
call to the winds and hear them roar,
the westerly that rips the flax,
the madman at the northeast door.

Dream of the mountain creek that spills
among the stones and cools your feet,
the breeze that sags on smoky hills,
the bubble of the noonday heat...

Possibly Difficult Word:

(Of course the poet may intend the word to convey
much more than its simple meaning or even intend
something different from it.)

expatriate -- one living away from his native land
kelp -- a seaweed
Mornings
before the sun's liquid
spilled gradually, flooding
the island's cool cellar,
there was the boat
and the still lagoons,
with the sound of my oars
the only intrusion
over cries of birds
in the marshy shallows
or the loud thrashing
of the startled crane
rushing the air.

And in one strange
dark, tree-hung entrance,
I followed the sound
of my heart all the way
to the reed-blocked ending,
with the pads of the lily
thick as green-shining film
covering the water.

And in another
where the sun came
to probe the depths
through a shaft of branches,
I saw the skeletons
of brown ships rotting
far below in their burial-ground,
and wondered what strange fish
with what strange colours
swam through these palaces
under the water...

A small boy
with a flat-bottomed punt
and an old pair of oars
moving with wonder
through the antechamber
of a waking world.

Possible Difficult Words:

(Of course the poet may intend these words to convey much more than their simple meanings, or even intend something different from them.)

antechamber — room leading to a main room.
2.

The Anchorage

(Non-Canadian)

Fifteen or twenty feet below,
The little fish come creeping round the anchor chain.
I could not have it quieter now,
Not anywhere; nor could there be less movement
Anywhere at all, than here.

The bay moves on into night.
The shadows come to watch and wait in every hollow
Till they have gathered-in all.
But moon comes over the rocks; she lights the little fall
And rise and fall at the beach.

Deep water, deep bay
So still and calm for one whole night in the south-east
That day has never come,
And I am still upon my knees out on the stern,
And you and I still watch
Down twenty, thirty feet below.
PRAIRIE BRED

(A Canadian Poem)

Caged by the small and fertile garden plot
That fits too tightly on his giant frame,
He turns his back upon the prisoning hills
And rests old prairie eyes upon the sea:
Searching for space to free his captive thought,
Stretching his gaze upon the bigness there.

He fancies on its restless, changing face
The shadowy light and dark of rippling green
That fit the prairie contours that he loved,
Willing the wheeling seagulls' plaintive mew
To be above a new-ploughed field in Spring.
Or, if the dying sun has gilt the waves, sees there
The restless, shimmering gold of ripening wheat.

Eyes that have looked unhindered down the miles,
Or searched the mounting cloudbanks for the rain,
Feast in an aching freedom on the sea.
A salt breeze licks the weatherbeaten face
Parched by a prairie wind, bitten by frost,
Offering kinship from the briny fields
To prairie schooner come at last to port.

Possibly Difficult Word:

(Of course the poet may intend the word to convey
much more than its simple meaning or even intend
something different from it.)

gilt -- cover with thin layer of gold laid on as gold leaf;
colour with gold
2.

CANTERBURY
(Non-Canadian)

\[\text{DK: THE PLAINS}\]

On this great plain the eye
Sees less of land than sky,
And men seem to inhabit here
As much the cloud-crossed hemisphere
As the flat earth. Trains travel fast and straight,
And travellers early or late
Think of their destination
More than of pasture, wheatfield, wayside station.
Here birds and winds fly free,
And tree is miles from tree
Except where in dark ranks they muster
Against the gales or cluster
Befriending lonely farms.
Tired tramps and trampers fare
Sadly along the endless roads, but the hare
Is lucky, and the magpie, black and white
Highwayman with his shout,
Sounds are soon dead being echoless
In the vast emptiness,
Though thunder and the ocean roar
Carry, on calm days, far:
And some sounds hardly ever rest:
The sound of wind from nor'east or nor'west
And three great rivers with proud Maori names
Chafing worn shingle till the ocean tames
Their wildness. This is my holy land
Of childhood. Trying to comprehend
And learn it like the features of a friend,
Sight rides on power-poles and tops of trees
From the long eastern beaches and loud seas
League after league
Till definition fades in bluish vague
Distance: then dreams begin
To see in vision colourless and thin
Beyond the western foothills lost
The huge and desolate ranges of the Coast.

Possibly Difficult Word:

(Of course the poet may intend the word to convey
much more than its simple meaning or even intend
something different from it.)

Chafing -- rubbing against
MOONDANCE

(A B.C. Poem)

moonrise moon
mossdance
dance in the moonlight
lightcedar fringed and
hewn to cross
cross logs
  in benched
  in rock
  in rockflakes
of micachips
flashing in dancelight

a light slope down
to a greytide grey
cold black cedarback right
back to splayhills

hillcliffedge
in moontime
in moonshells
from a suncold time
age under moonclouds
in moontime daedalion
spirit waits to
test unwithered
veinwings veinwings
wingveindance
wingrise vein
windance

Possibly Difficult Word:

(Of course the poet may intend the word to convey
much more than its simple meaning or even intend
something different from it.)

splayed -- spread or turned out

daedalion cf. Daedalian -- in the manner of Daedalus,
the Greek inventor who built the Labyrinth
(a maze)
2.

HILL-COUNTRY

(Non-Canadian)

White sky, mountains mount
High; near, terraced, clear
Groined, shouldered
Black-bouldered. Sallow flats lie
Dry.
Yellow broom blooming
Pollen-heavy. Bees hum
Come from air there--
Bare, bleak, blue-beak
Towers over mountain flower--
Bees come, hum home
Home to hive in house-wall
Fall.
All heard, small bird;
Wind strums over plain:
Thin grass sounds in winds
As winds pass.

Rock-face, clay fallen away
Gravel sluices loose for gold
Travels down, silts over
Old boulders. Land-lover
Here stand, stay.

Sallow flat, yellow flat, willow-flat
Pass. Let pass hill-wind, hill-grass:
Here stay: lay aside
Dry brick, sun dried.
Here stay, deep in clay
Sun-clay, water-clay
Gouged out, gaping clay
Clay.

Possibly Difficult Word:

(Of course the poet may intend the word to convey much more than its simple meaning or even intend something different from it.)

sallow -- pale yellow or brown
NOON: VANCOUVER HARBOUR
(A B.C. Poem)

shellfish bubble
panting sea-worms bake
when sunlight glaring on uncovered mud
keeps the harbour-bed awake.
and then the sounds of oceans
bedded underground
and noises from the secret stores of clams
are heard along the shore.

monotonously
the crabs push stones.
the seaweeds turn to brown
and from their whitened cones
sad barnacles let saltiness slowly down.

along the shore
where silt is deep
salt water is sprawled out—asleep...

...a seagull with a leg upon a post
stands replete, contented, and almost
uninquisitive—waiting for the tide to flood.
half-wondering whether anything's asleep
beneath the coolness of a deep shadow
where an old scow rides
hard-over on a tide
of baking mud.

Possibly Difficult Word:
(Or course the poet may intend this word to convey
much more than its simple meaning, or even intend
something different from it.)
replete — filled (e.g., with food)
A ghost the tide moves in and out.
Unreal the far plantations pass.
Low cloud hovers above, devout,
And rock flourishes among the grass.

The impudent yacht avoids the mud
And tacks upon the farther bank;
And still the remorseless ebb and flood
Uncovers and covers shoals and the rank
Green weeds the seabirds wade among,
And tins and tires. The skies
Yawn blankly over the unhung
Landscape. The soft wind dies,
And dies with it the sea beyond.
The electric sunset glows
Unpaid upon this changing pond.
We hurry past and the slow tide flows.

Possibly Difficult Words:
(Of course the poet may intend these words to convey much more than their simple meanings, or even intend something different from them.)

- plantations -- area of growing plants (especially trees) planted by men
- devout -- prayerful, pious, genuine
- impudent -- disrespectful, cheeky
NIGHT POEM, VANCOUVER ISLAND

(A B.C. Poem)

The wind's in the west tonight,
heavy with tidal sound;
the hush and rattle of trees,
the indrawn breath of the shore,
do what they must; waves slap
at the tip and stagger of stones,
and the night tonight is black;
blackness without intent
moves over the globe
as waters move. The shoals
are nosing into the storm.

Blackness moves over the globe.
Will this wind never drop?
The house, awash with air,
swings into the dark,
and, all its lamps ablaze,
challenges time and fear.
I see a wall of ice.
Newspapers fall like flowers.

Turn to me, my Love.
Reach out. We almost touch
but, swimmers pulled apart
by arbitrary tides,
are swept out on the night.
Somewhere a hand will find
that delicacy of bone
locked in a glacial year.
We label history now.
Fossils, our smiles extend
the frontiers of the past.
Our kisses breed new terms.

Possibly Difficult Words:

(Of course the poet may intend these words to convey
much more than their simple meanings, or even intend
something different from them.)

- shoals -- shallow sandbanks; mass of fish swimming
- arbitrary -- according to no rule; from mere whim or opinion
- delicacy of bone -- skeletons
The wind has died, no motion now
in the summer's sleepy breath. Silver the sea-grass,
the shells and the driftwood, fixed in the moon's vast crystal.
Think: long after, when the walls of the small house have collapsed upon us, each alone,
far gone the earth's invasion the slow earth bedding and filling the bone,
this water will still be crawling up the estuary, fingering its way among the channels, licking the stones; and the floating shells, minute argosies under the giant moon, still shoreward glide among the mangroves on the creeping tide.

The noise of gulls comes through the shining darkness over the dunes and the sea. Now the clouded moon is warm in her nest of light. The world's a shell where distant waves are murmuring of a time beyond this time. "Give me the ghost of your hand: unreal, unreal the dunes, the sea, the mangroves, and the moon's white light, unreal, beneath our naked feet, the sand."

Possibly Difficult Words:
(Of course the poet may intend these words to convey much more than their simple meanings, or even intend something different from them.)
estuary -- tidal mouth of a river
minute -- tiny
argosies -- large merchant ships
mangroves -- shrubby tree growing in swamp and estuary
THE IEA MATCHING PROBLEM

The recent, well-announced, IEA difficulty in matching poems should not be thought an obstacle to this study. The IEA team tried to assemble, from different countries, a set of poems so comparable that when national student-groups each responded to their own nation's poem (i.e. each group to a different poem) response differences might be attributed solely to differences between the student-groups. By contrast, this study followed a procedure which the IEA experience recommended.\(^1\) It assumed that the internationally matched poems would differ and had all students reading both poems.

This study, then, depended upon national differences between poems as reflected in like-student responses to them. It might even offer the best chance of finding, if it is later replicated in the control country, the "comparable" or "compatible" works sought by the IEA researchers.\(^2\)


APPENDIX II

THE TESTING BATTERY

(Copies reduced in size.)
A

Introduction to Teachers

From: Campbell Ross
Doctoral Candidate, English Education, U.B.C.
Ph. 2280476 (day or evening)

Thank you for considering your class/es for this experiment. It centres upon response to Canadian (including local) poetry. The student's main task is to freely respond to a poem pair which has been read to him or her.

In return for your class's time (one hour) in late March or early April, I would be happy to discuss follow-up work for the class. Also, my analysis of free-responses includes a computer sorting into, and printing out of, response elements under categories like "evaluation-enjoyment", "re-creation of the experience portrayed in the literature", "discussion of form" and "transfer to familiar experiences". While maintaining students' anonymity (the print-out does not show names) these summaries would provide you with an exceedingly valuable diagnostic device. The hour is well enough spent in other ways—especially as students can later be informed of the purpose of the study and its results.

It is imperative that students do not know anything of the study or be prepared in any way—a slight slip in this connection rendered useless the work done by several pilot study classes. If, by accident, the class does find out the experiment's concerns, I would rather be told and withdraw the group than discover the fact later (or even not discover it). Even if you decide not to allow your classes to participate, please do not
discuss the study.

What follows need only concern teachers who are willing to have their classes participate.

Since the experimental work in schools through the city will cover about three weeks, I would be grateful if no class discussion were held following class-testing and if any student questions were dampened for that period—so that other classes, especially in your school, do not become aware of the questions and procedures. The atmosphere, in other words, should be low-key. After the three-week period there need be no restriction.

As you will see from the "Introduction to Students" form, I am attempting to establish a relaxed, non-examination atmosphere. The free-response technique being used has greater validity and gathers more information in proportion as the students are free to say what they really feel about the poems. I am not looking for right answers; in my terms there are none. (Nor, for that matter, is your "competence" as their teacher in any way at stake. The fact that only two classes respond to any one poem set should assure you of that. If you are concerned, however, you are welcome to consult further with me about the experimental proposal—perhaps you might wish to out of interest. Just phone.)
The experiment, then, needs no pre-introduction or preparation vis a vis the class. (It depends upon there being none). However I would be grateful for assistance from you on four points. I ask:

(1) Whether your class has read much Canadian Literature (I prefer classes which have not).

(2) For a class list showing:
(a) sex where name does not indicate that.
(b) students who (whether out of habit! or for some special reason) are not likely to attend on the day of "testing" (See (3), below).
(c) students who (to your knowledge) have not lived in B.C. during their secondary school years.
(If there are a great many such students the class may have to be eliminated.) Don't ask the students if you are unsure. I can find out later (through the questionnaire "Places You Have Lived").

(3) For a morning timetable showing what class period (in late March or early April) it would suit you best that I use or what periods I could choose from.

(4) To indicate which, of a list of 24 poems, your students (more than, say, two) are likely to have read.

Sincerely,
Cross the poem thus:<br>if you think more<br>than 1 or 2 in the<br>class know it.<br>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem #</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Title and First Line</th>
<th>Poet and Anthology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Can.</td>
<td>In the Valley of Wenkchemna&lt;br&gt;&quot;Spunsilkengreen,&lt;br&gt;It hovered...&quot;</td>
<td>Ralph Gustafson,&lt;br&gt;in Dudek, Louis, ed.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Poetry of Our Time</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>N.Z.</td>
<td>Hill Country&lt;br&gt;&quot;White sky, mountains&lt;br&gt;mount&lt;br&gt;High...&quot;</td>
<td>James K. Baxter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Can.</td>
<td>To Hold in a Poem&lt;br&gt;&quot;I would take words&lt;br&gt;As crisp and as white...&quot;</td>
<td>A.J.M. Smith,&lt;br&gt;in Gillanders, Carol, ed.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Theme and Image</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>N.Z.</td>
<td>To An Expatriate&lt;br&gt;&quot;Pine for the needles&lt;br&gt;brown and warm...&quot;</td>
<td>A.R.D. Fairburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Can.</td>
<td>Canoe Trip&lt;br&gt;&quot;What of this fabulous&lt;br&gt;coun...&quot;</td>
<td>Douglas Le Pan,&lt;br&gt;in Dover, K. Phyllis, ed.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Poetry: An Anthology for High Schools</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>N.Z.</td>
<td>Elements&lt;br&gt;&quot;In the summer we rode&lt;br&gt;in the clay country...&quot;</td>
<td>A.R.D. Fairburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Can.</td>
<td>Death&lt;br&gt;&quot;I ask you how can it be&lt;br&gt;thought...&quot;</td>
<td>Margaret Avison,&lt;br&gt;in Mandel, Eli, ed.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Eight More Canadian Poets</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>N.Z.</td>
<td>Frost at Night&lt;br&gt;&quot;Pierce and crackle of&lt;br&gt;stars...&quot;</td>
<td>Ruth Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Can.</td>
<td>Lagoons, Hanlan's Point&lt;br&gt;&quot;Mornings&lt;br&gt;Before the sun's liquid...&quot;</td>
<td>Irving Layton,&lt;br&gt;in Dudek, Louis, ed.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Poetry of Our Time</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>N.Z.</td>
<td>The Anchorage&lt;br&gt;&quot;Fifteen or twenty feet&lt;br&gt;below...&quot;</td>
<td>Pat Wilson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Can. Prairie Bred
"Caged by the small and fertile garden plot..."

12. N.Z. Canterbury
"On this great plain the eye..."
Basil Dowling

13. B.C. Moondance
"moonrise moon mossdance..."
Dana Fraser, in West Coast Review

14. N.Z. Hill Country
"White sky, mountains mount High..."
James K. Baxter

15. B.C. Booming Grounds, February
"Under the baffling of snow cover Logs reel into darkness..."

16. N.Z. A View of Rangitoto
"Harshness of gorse darkens the yellow cliff-edge..."
Charles Brasch

17. B.C. Noon: Vancouver Harbour
"shellfish bubble panting sea-worms bake..."

18. N.Z. Estuary
"A Ghost the tide moves in and out..."
Denis Glover

19. B.C. Night Poem, Vancouver Island
"The wind's in the west tonight..."

20. N.Z. The Estuary
"The Wind has died, no motion now..."
A.R.D. Fairburn

21. B.C. The Stream
"On the flat bulk of the mountain..."

22. N.Z. Arawata Bill: The Scene
"Mountains nuzzle mountains..."
Denis Glover
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>The Sleeping Beauty</td>
<td>Isabel Ecclestone Mackay,</td>
<td>in Watters, R. E., ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>British Columbia, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Centennial Anthology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;So has she lain for</td>
<td></td>
<td>centuries unguessed...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>centuries unguessed...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>N.Z.</td>
<td>A View of Rangitoto</td>
<td>Charles Brasch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Finally, holding all</td>
<td></td>
<td>eyes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eyes, the long-limbed</td>
<td></td>
<td>mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mountain ...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am making a large-scale doctoral study which may lead to changes in the literature school-students read in future. The study depends entirely on your help. Thank you for participating.

This is what I will ask you to do:

1. Write down your reaction to two poems;
2. Give your opinions on several issues I raise.

Express exactly what you really feel in your responses to the poems and to the questions. In both cases it is your personal opinion that is important. There are no "test" questions to see how well you have "understood" the poems; there are no "right" answers to mark by.

You will be anonymous; do not write your name on your papers. The numbers are only to help divide the class equally and to enable me to interview (if she/he agrees) any student who has said something of particular importance for my work. No one else will ever know what you, personally, have said on these forms.

If you have any questions during the study write them on the back of this sheet if they can wait; raise your hand if they can't. Please do not just call them out—they may influence others' responses.

I will now arrange the class into two parts and hand out the first set of forms. The seating works this way:
If you are given an odd number go to your left of me. If you are given an even number go to your right.

(See placards on the front wall.)

When you are seated I will hand out the experimental forms. When you receive your form simply wait. Do not open the booklet. When all are ready we will begin.
N.B. Do not open until instructed to do so.

In this booklet are two poems which will be read to you by two different readers (the experiment is not about the readers; there are two merely to give you variety). After the readings you should re-read the poems yourself and "absorb" them before talking about them. The booklet contains a sheet on which to write what you feel and think about the poems.

There is no hurry. Booklet I contains the main part of this study; Booklet II will not take many minutes to complete and will not be handed out until later in the period.
At this point the poem pairs were placed

(For poems, see above pp. 229-241.)
FREE RESPONSE

Respond freely. Say what the poems do to you -- what you feel and think about them or what things they suggest to you. What you say may relate to one poem or both poems; that's up to you (though make it clear which one you are talking about at any time). Re-read the poems as often as you like. Take up to 20 minutes, if you wish, to finish this section.

(Carry on over to back of this sheet if you wish.)
Booklet II

Work through the question forms in this booklet one page at a time. Don't go forward until each page is complete.
How Much Do You Like The Poems?

1. I would like to know how you personally would compare this poem to other poems you usually read in class. If you think it is one of the best such poems, rate it +3. If you think it is one of the worst such poems, rate it -3.

(a) ".................."
Circle the number of the rating you would give this poem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>one of the best</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>fairly good</th>
<th>fairly poor</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>one of the worst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) ".................."
Circle the number of the rating you would give this poem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>one of the best</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>fairly good</th>
<th>fairly poor</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>one of the worst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which Poem Would You Prefer to Discuss

2. Which of these two poems would you prefer to discuss with your friends (i.e., not necessarily with an adult present)?

..............................................................

Why? ..............................................................
What Do You Know of These Poems?

1. "...................."
   (a) Have you seen or heard this poem before today? Yes/No ...
   (b) Where (nation or region) do you think this poem was written? .........................
   (c) Do you know for sure? Yes/No ...
      How do you know? ........................
      .................................
   II Are you guessing? Yes/No ...
      What makes you guess that place?
      .................................
      .................................
   (d) Did you know (where the poem was written) before today? Yes/No ...
   II Did you find out during poem readings and when you were writing your free response? Yes/No ...
      How did you find out? .........................
      .................................
   III Did you think of the place just now? Yes/No ...

2. "...... ...................."
   (a) Have you seen or heard this poem before today? Yes/No ...
   (b) Where (nation or region) do you think this poem was written? .........................
   (c) Do you know for sure? Yes/No ...
      How do you know? ........................
      .................................
   II Are you guessing? Yes/No ...
      What makes you guess that place?
      .................................
      .................................
   (d) Did you know (where the poem was written) before today? Yes/No ...
   II Did you find out during poem readings and when you were writing your free response? Yes/No ...
      How did you find out? .........................
      .................................
   III Did you think of the place just now? Yes/No ...
Places You Have Lived

Give approximate dates in the brackets

Where have you lived besides the Vancouver area?

(1) Elsewhere in B.C., (where?), .................. ( )

(2) Other Canadian Provinces or Major Cities

................................. ( )

................................. ( )

................................. ( )

(3) Other Countries or Areas or States ........... ( )

................................. ( )

................................. ( )

................................. ( )

HUNCHES

(1) Do you think you know what this study is about? YES/NO............

(2) If you have an idea, what is it?

.................................

.................................

.................................

(3) At what stage did you begin to have that idea?
Before today? YES/NO............
During today's experiment? YES/NO............
At what stage today?

.................................

.................................

.................................
Your Opinions

Circle the number of the rating that fits your opinion best.

1. How much Canadian literature (novels, plays, stories or poems) have you read on your own (compared with your other reading)?
   - almost all Canadian
   - a lot
   - a little
   - not much
   - no Canadian at all
   - 5
   - 4
   - 3
   - 2
   - 1

2. How much time do you think has been given to reading or studying Canadian literature during your secondary school years?
   - almost all time
   - a lot
   - a little
   - not much
   - no time at all
   - 5
   - 4
   - 3
   - 2
   - 1

3. How much time would you like to have for studying Canadian literature in literature classes?
   - almost all
   - a lot
   - a little
   - not much
   - no time at all
   - 5
   - 4
   - 3
   - 2
   - 1

4. How highly do you think teachers and professors regard Canadian literature? They think Canadian literature is:
   - extremely good
   - good
   - fairly good
   - fairly poor
   - poor
   - very poor
   - 3
   - 2
   - 1
   - -1
   - -2
   - -3

5. How highly do you think other adults regard Canadian literature? They think Canadian literature is:
   - extremely good
   - good
   - fairly good
   - fairly poor
   - poor
   - very poor
   - 3
   - 2
   - 1
   - -1
   - -2
   - -?

6. If you have read any Canadian literature, how much did you like it compared with other literature you have read. I think Canadian literature is:
   - extremely good
   - good
   - fairly good
   - fairly poor
   - poor
   - very poor
   - 3
   - 2
   - 1
   - -1
   - -2
   - -3

Put up your hand when you have finished.

Thank you very much.
APPENDIX III

THE EXPERIMENTAL CHRONOLOGY
THE EXPERIMENTAL CHRONOLOGY

I Classroom Preparation:

1. Divide room by separating desks.
2. Lay out "Introduction to Students" on desks.
3. Stack forms (Booklet I, Booklet II, Poem Pairs) under odd and even numbers in alphabetical (class) lists.
4. Place placards on wall.
5. Set up (a) tape recorder (b) 2 cassettes.
6. Check pronunciation of names.

II The Experimental Period:

(Mins.)
00 1. Class entry.
03 2. Class settled.
3. Introduction to students, Personal:
   "My name is Campbell Ross. I study at U.B.C.
   . . . ."
4. Introduction to students, Experimental
   I read from form "Introduction to Students."
04 5. Check "Awareness"
   I ask if any students know of this study:
   "Please do not answer the following question directly. Just raise your hand if appropriate. Have any of you spoken about this study to students who have participated in it? Do you know what it is about?"
   I place those students who do know into the GK condition, if they are not already there, by allotting them an even number on the class list--swapped with the even number nearest to them on the list.
05 6. Assign numbers and seating:
   "I have divided the class evenly using the class list. I would like to seat each division as a group for possible later work. I will read out the names of all people with odd numbers (cards are clipped to these booklets). When I have finished the list, pick up your papers from me then go to the left of the room. People whose names are not read out go to the right. I will hand your papers to you where you are seated."

07 7. I read the odd #s then hand out Booklet I to them.

10 8. I hand out Booklet I to even numbers.

12 9. Class settled.

   I play according to pre-set order.

19 11. Readings finished.

12. Students encouraged to reflect before writing:
   "Please take up to five minutes to re-read and reflect upon the poems before writing."

13. Discourage talking:
   "Please do not talk. It is your personal response that interests me."

24 14. Five minutes elapsed; reminder to respond in writing:
   "Those who have not yet started writing down their thoughts should begin to soon."

15. Arrange Booklet II in seating order to facilitate handing out.

16. Individuals restless?
   If so, I hand them Booklet II in advance.

39 17. Written response complete.

18. Check poem references:
   I read from the back of the Free Response form:
   "Please check that it is always clear which poem you are referring to."
19. Hand out Booklet II.
   I hand out booklets by student seating order.
   (numbers arranged under 15 above):
   "I will hand out Booklet II. Move through it
   one page at a time. Begin it as soon as you
   have read the instruction sheet on its front.
   I will pick up Booklet I when I have handed
   these out."

20. Pick up Booklet I, leaving poems.

21. Arrange to interview "Aware" Students (see Step 5).

50 22. Booklet II complete, student raises his hand.

23. Pick up Booklet II and Poems.
   I do this as each student finishes.

24. Interview "Aware" students if not already done (see
    Step 21).
APPENDIX IV

SOME RESPONSES
SOME CODED FREE-RESPONSE PROTOCOLS

The reading of poem #1 was easier to read because of the rhymes added throughout. The #2 poem had an interesting sentence structure which could be read in such a way that made me feel more involved. #1 poem seemed easier to understand overall. The second poem also seems to take me into a deeper space of thinking and it takes more to understand the ideas behind it. It also has a feeling of more movement by the type of action words used (example——"a few drops melting now from here...
now...")

Overall I found #2 the most enjoyable because there was a challenge beyond the face words.

1st Poem:  2  10

2nd Poem:  1  7  8  10

Poem #2 gives me more of a picture of a scene than Poem #1 does. I think Poem #1 is not clear, it doesn't get the message across. With Poem #2 I feel like I'm at a stream. I feel that poem #1 is too descriptive, it has not real meaning to me. Poem #2 is also easier to read.
I liked both poems, but I liked the first poem better. I can really feel what the author must feel. The poem is not so hard to understand. It can really mean something to me. How he describes different things, like "the road before us trembling in the heat" is really good. He makes it easy to visualize what he means without having hidden meanings. I really thought the poem was well written. It really had a meaning.

The second poem was not as good. It had good ideas and feelings in it too, but I didn't like the descriptions he used. I don't like how he sees the land. He looks at the land in a completely different way that I do. "The flames of sunset" just doesn't seem beautiful like a sunset is. And the last two lines don't describe land like it is. He makes the land seem ugly with no real beauty anywhere.

Both poems were pretty good though.
The first poem affects me in a neat way. It seems to describe the country so beautifully. I can picture trees, lakes and all kind of wilderness. It's as though I was standing on a mountain looking down. When I read it I felt like I was in an imaginary world, far removed from everyone. I didn't like the way the second tape read it, the voice seemed so dull, because this poem is so full of mystery and energy.

The second poem is nice but it doesn't grab me the way the first one does. I think because of the changing of seasons, I don't like it when I read about summer and then go onto winter, it's depressing for me. It's a very descriptive poem but I can't picture any of it in my mind like they way I could with the first one.

I think the reasons I prefer the first poem is because I can use my own imagination and get a really clear picture. With the second poem everything, like the scenery is put right before me, I don't have to reach for it. I also prefer the first poem because I happen to love trees and mountains, lakes etc. and I paint them all the time. So I guess when reading this poem I am just painting another picture, because it really turns me on.

1st Poem: ! 6 7
2nd Poem: -6 -7 -8
The first that I respond to when read a poem to is the voice. The first man way of reading and voicing the poem sound harsh and agitated to me ear. I seemed to me as if he want to arouse some hidden response from me as a person and came up blank. I felt nothing. However when the seconded man came onto the tape with his low, soft' spoken voice I right away picked the poem up. This time I enjoyed the easy flowing rhythm of the two unknown (or one) authors.

Comments on the Scene: The first stanza introduces the scene that the author talks about and to me it reminds me of our mountains the morning after a super hot day. I can actually visualize the pale morning fog-like cloud that usually hangs about until the noon sun burns it off. That's just how I feel after I had a particular "downer" of a day when the world seems all wet and miserable. The next stanza seems to emphasize this feeling.

As in the line "the rivers swell and twist" that how everything seems to grow. Everything one says or does is wrong. The third and fourth stanza just continues to portray how things go from bad to worse. The last stanza seems to say that when things seem extremely bad something happens to make is all right again.

Comments on The Stream: This poem somehow talks to me about people being born, living, and dieing. The
first stanza has "on the edge of the cirque wall we formed" and that's just how we come about growing a few cells at a time. Then we are born full of eagerness to learn and live and each day as we live we gather knowledge "talus blocks to collect in pools, growing". The forth stanza talks to me about the road of life until we die and then are spread with deprivis on the sea floor having only left the memories behind.

Poem 1--I liked the poem. The poem kind of gives me a good feeling of beauty, cleanness and peacefulness. It's like being alone away from city people and being in the wilderness up in the mountains. It creates a picture in my mind of summer, autumn, winter, and spring showing the beauty of each season and in the back of my mind knowing that many people never get a chance to see this type of beauty.

Poem 2--I also liked this poem as well as Poem 1. It seems to tell about earth's environment. Explaining about the sun's warmth and colour of gold and red, the sea having many islands, the glaciers as giants which formed lakes & rivers, the wilderness of the pinelands in an uninhabited northern region, the clouds and how you can vision imaginary figures, and with all these things life began.
I seem to be able to understand the first poem better. I think it is the style in which it is written. It gives me a clearer picture than poem number two. The first poem makes me feel like I'm looking over a large mountain range, I can relate better to it.

The first reader, I thought, had an accent; I love accents and so I enjoyed his version of the poem. The second reader didn't seem to put as much enthusiasm into his poem.
**Significant Adjectivals**

(The poems separated by at least 3 negatives)

Poem Pair: 1 "In the Valley of Wenkchemna"/ 2 "Hill Country"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Denied Knowledge</strong></th>
<th><strong>New Zealand</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Zealand</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inexperienced, young, alive</td>
<td>experience, lust, desire, depth, dry, warmth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disturbing</td>
<td>disturbing, bleak, depressing - died, never to be free again - nothing beautiful, things wiped out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freedom</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel really good</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft, mellow, relaxing</td>
<td>soft, mellow, relaxing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vastness, unending</td>
<td>vastness, unending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>cold, lonely/older, not nearly so beautiful [mixed] -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Given Knowledge</strong></th>
<th><strong>New Zealand</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Zealand</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life, freedom, love, happiness</td>
<td>death, sad depression -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summer, alone [+]</td>
<td>barren, empty -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summer, lighter</td>
<td>morbid -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy, alive, free</td>
<td>suspense/lifless, dead robbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy, responsive, flush,</td>
<td>cold and undecided, dry,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fresh</td>
<td>hot, stuffy -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freedom, carelessness</td>
<td>freedom, carelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm, happy, glad, content,</td>
<td>unsettles/horrible,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peaceful</td>
<td>trivial -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aloneness, beauty, peacefulness</td>
<td>aloneness, beauty, peacefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joyful?</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alive</td>
<td>sad -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 0                      | 7 |
Poem Pair: 3 "To Hold in a Poem"/ 4 "To An Expatriate"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Denied Knowledge</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honesty</td>
<td>hate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sad, startled</td>
<td>mysterious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straightforward</td>
<td>cold/cold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fresh, clean, beautiful</td>
<td>cold and dead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>something beautiful</td>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>pretty, beautiful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more free</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tingling joy, evil</td>
<td>rugged, beautiful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful [but doubt?]</td>
<td>sadly, happiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beauty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Given Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freedom</td>
<td>free, easy-going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy (and feel, taste, small)</td>
<td>forlorn, sad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relaxing, free</td>
<td>relaxing, free</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beauty, joys, freedom</td>
<td>beauty, joys, freedom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fresh, beautiful</td>
<td>beautiful, bad, sad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beauty free</td>
<td>beauty, rough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm, happy</td>
<td>night, dark, sad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more colourful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happiness, beauty</td>
<td>sad, lonely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>color and spirit</td>
<td>not very colourful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft, light</td>
<td>violence, peace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mellow, easiness, an easy flowing feeling</td>
<td>beauty, harshness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peace, bright, sweet smelling</td>
<td>peace, summer, homesickness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Poem Pair:  9 "Lagoons, Hanlans' Point/ 10 "The Anchorage"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denied Knowledge</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian</strong></td>
<td><strong>beauty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beauty</td>
<td>beauty, peace, lonely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beauty, peace, mysterious (+)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peaceful, quiet</td>
<td>silence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relaxing, fantastic, beautifully</td>
<td>(bothered) [less peaceful]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peaceful, tranquil, mystery</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eerie</td>
<td>mysterious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful, mysterious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peaceful, mystery</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>still</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relaxing, freedom, tranquility</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peacefulness, calm, stillness, remote feeling, mysterious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peace, quiet</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stillness, not beautiful</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not beautiful</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peace, quiet</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Giving Knowledge</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian</strong></td>
<td><strong>beauty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soothing, calm, peaceful, alone</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peaceful, tranquil, glorious</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful, adventure</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peaceful, wakening</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colorful, excitement</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quiet, soft</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relaxing</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peacefulness</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serenity, beauty</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quiet, soft, sometimes rough</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quiet, soft, alone, lonely</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Poem Pair: 11 "Prairie Bred"/ 12 "Canterbury"

**Denied Knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canadian</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more emotional</td>
<td>almost impassionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colourful</td>
<td>dull, doesn't have much colour to it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadness</td>
<td>[sadness]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretty [brightness, dreams]</td>
<td>emptiness, loneliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerful, unhappy</td>
<td>dead, lifeless, emptiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>childhood</td>
<td>beauty, happiness, hopes, dreams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful, to the very fullest</td>
<td>lack of hope, peaceful noise,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sad air, emptiness</td>
<td>beautiful cold feeling, emptiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1

**Given Knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canadian</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beautifully, beautiful prison, praise</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freedom, timelessness vastness, emptiness, evil-ness, really enjoyed</td>
<td>beauty, praising freedom, timelessness, truth vastness, emptiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lonely, deserted peaceful [love of land] [nostalgia]</td>
<td>lonely, deserted, sad peaceful desolate, isolation loneliness, lost barren, desolate beautiful ugly beautiful sad vast freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peaceful, beautiful sad closed in</td>
<td>graced, peaceful, mysterious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 4
Poem Pair: 15 "Booming Grounds, February"/16"A View of Rangitoto"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denied Knowledge</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Zealand</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold, harsh, uninviting, sad, depressed</td>
<td>beauty, happy, warm, alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sad, lonely</td>
<td>powerful, frightening, dignity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loneliness, distance</td>
<td>calm, quiet, free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evil beautiful</td>
<td>calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>death, sad, remorse</td>
<td>loneliness, sadness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silent</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dismal, dreary</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loneliness, peace, tranquility</td>
<td>cosy, gentle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold, lonely, dark, forbidding</td>
<td>(isolation, peaceful, alone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(isolation, peacefulness, loneliness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loneliness</td>
<td>happiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4 | 0 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Given Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful ended, depressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold, sad, ugliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lonely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eerieness, desolate, secludedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quiet, still, untouched, freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gloomy, dark, empty, death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vivid, quietness [noise]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loneliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold, heartless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eery, cold, alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lonely, harsh, natural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5 | 3 |
Poem Pair: 17 "Noon"/ 18 "Estuary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denied Knowledge</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mystery, loneliness)</td>
<td>(mystery, loneliness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mystery, loneliness)</td>
<td>(mystery, loneliness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carefree</td>
<td>lonely, time drags on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleepy, relaxed</td>
<td>sleepy, contaminated, rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sad</td>
<td>dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slow-moving, never-hurried</td>
<td>depressed, dull, sluggish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heat, discomfort, lazy, tense, sadness</td>
<td>cooler, &quot;edgy tranquility&quot;, uneasiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>still, desolate, motionless silent</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(peacefulness, mystery, disturbance)</td>
<td>eternity, more relaxed, uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calmness, peace, lifeless</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all things are as they are meant to be</td>
<td>free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trapped</td>
<td>free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bright, lighthearted</td>
<td>depressing, dismal, dark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(peaceful)</td>
<td>(peaceful)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sadden)</td>
<td>(sadden)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Given Knowledge</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peaceful, beautiful</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restful, pretty</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>peace, serenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slow-moving, lazy</td>
<td>pretty, wish I was on the boat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quiet, except life</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peaceful</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quiet, easy</td>
<td>quiet, rude and trampling beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pleasant)</td>
<td>(pleasant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(serene)</td>
<td>(serene)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>freedom/trapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peaceful, lighter</td>
<td>peaceful, clash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peaceful, less bothering</td>
<td>less peaceful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 0 | 3 | 4 |
Poem Pair: 23 "The Sleeping Beauty"/ 24 "A View of Rangitoto"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denied Knowledge</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Zealand</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>defeat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerful, majestic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive, admiring</td>
<td>futile, short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dramatic, basic</td>
<td>[less basic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young, living</td>
<td>old, dying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agelessness, solidarity, more inspiration</td>
<td>[less inspiration]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peaceful, beautiful</td>
<td>strong, powerful, cold, ugly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>untouched</td>
<td>anger, old, worn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beauty</td>
<td>powerful — killing ourselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serene, beauty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tranquil mood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mystery) pleasant</td>
<td>mystery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(gloomy)</td>
<td>(gloomy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calm and cold</td>
<td>graceful and peaceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vastness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Given Knowledge</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Zealand</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>lost dignity, losing all its beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy, comfortable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quiet, clean, crisp</td>
<td>eruption, destroyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sad)</td>
<td>(sad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power, dormant strength</td>
<td>no power or lordliness, depressing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(calm, powerless) beautiful</td>
<td>(calm, powerless), [not beautiful], ugly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[feel] insignificant</td>
<td>[feel like] little kid or blind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eerie, creepy</td>
<td>weird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>darkness, death</td>
<td>content, stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft, gentle, peaceful, subdued, wondering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold and strong</td>
<td>cold, rugged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft, light</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>living, elegant, silent majestic, grace, beauty</td>
<td>dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td>pessimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>