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This study examined the written responses of seven adolescents to three novels. During the course of two school years, the students recorded their ongoing responses to small sections (ten to fifteen pages) of each novel in a response log. These responses were examined for evidence of patterns, typical responses, individual variations, and the effects of narrative structure. The Purves and Rippere instrument was used to determine response patterns while a new instrument developed by the researcher to accommodate the nature of the preliminary, ongoing responses was implemented to address the remaining three questions. The following general observations were made:

1. No predictable, sequential pattern of response could be found in student response writings.

2. Certain responses predominated: namely, narrational retelling, tentative frameworking of the content, and analysis of characters and events.

3. The written responses were generally characterized by considerable variation in individual responses.

4. Texts bearing distinct narrative features prompted different responses both for individuals and the group as a whole.

Conclusions: The effects of writing during the reading of literary texts appears to bring response to a clear, conscious level. Writing in the response log encourages a conscious transaction with the literary text and consequently, readers
can engage more actively and knowledgeably in the reading experience. Some broad conclusions and implications emerged from the study:

1. Particularly as they encounter complex literary works, adolescents should be encouraged to engage actively and consciously in their reading of literature by recording their ongoing responses in a log.

2. Teachers ought to promote the development of personal literary responses that require active thinking through testing hypotheses, making connections and interpreting the literary content.

3. By purposefully structuring active meaning-making in the study of literature, teachers can determine the student needs and create the context for meaningful discussion. Moreover, by publicly sharing the contents of the response logs, all class members can contribute to and enhance their responses.

Using writing to gauge the ongoing literary response allows both students and their teachers to be consciously aware of the "sense-making" strategies employed. As the medium for critical reading, writing promotes tentative, flexible construction of meaning. Furthermore, the instrument developed for analyzing the ongoing student responses in this study provides both a way to consciously examine the content of written responses and exposes alternative responses in order to extend understanding and appreciation of literature.
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CHAPTER 1

THE NATURE OF THE STUDY

I. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to examine the written responses of adolescents recorded during the reading of literary texts. These written responses will be examined for four distinct features: patterns of response; predominance of specific responses; the individual variations in written responses to the literary text; the effects of narrative structure on reading response. The study aims to increase understanding of the ongoing literary responses of adolescents.

II. BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

This inquiry arose from an increasing awareness that the traditional model of responding to literary texts by writing essays or answering prescribed comprehension questions after the reading limited the adolescents' overall experience of literature. Moreover, teaching about the text - the background, the author, the literary devices - created students who became increasingly better memorizers of facts about the text, but not perceptibly more able readers of it. The personal experience of literature seemed restrained by the frequently diagnostic and analytical teaching methods commonly used.
III. CONTEXT FOR THE STUDY

Although New Criticism held that all meaning resided in the literary text, a growing body of research into the reading process suggests that the reader must assume an active role in making meaning. Nonetheless, many English classrooms continue to hold to the traditional model that took root during the early 1940's. The prestige and increasing influence of the movement motivated teachers to instill in students the formal, well-disciplined techniques for literary interpretation through detailed analysis of the literary elements. Although originating at the universities, this methodology eventually filtered into secondary school classrooms. Heavy emphasis on text dissection remains firmly entrenched in actual classroom practice both at the university and high school levels (Purves, 1981; Farrell, 1981; Squire, 1984). Consequently, students often learn a great deal about a literary text without necessarily reading or experiencing it for themselves.

Convictions about the reader's response as essential to effective literary study surfaced as early as 1929. I.A. Richards conducted a study to determine the abilities of university students to interpret literature based on the principles currently referred to as the New Criticism. To his dismay, Richards found that in spite of prescribed interpretations of
literary works, students still responded in personal, distinct ways. Capitalizing on that finding, Downey (1929), and Harding (1937) explored individual response further. In 1938, Rosenblatt proposed that "the experience of literature, far from being for the reader a passive process of absorption, is a form of intense personal activity " (1938, p. v.). She encouraged acknowledging and incorporating student responses in the literature class.

Subsequent research in reading, psycholinguistics, response theory and schema theory by Rosenblatt (1938, 1978), Smith (1971), Purves and Beach (1973), Bleich (1975), Squire (1978), Cooper and Odell (1978) and Applebee, et al., (1981) affirms the influence of the reader's frame of reference. Two readers reading the same literary text will respond to different elements of that text; that is, one may recall different events, be moved by the poetic language or reminded of personal experiences while another may respond more clinically or be unmoved by the reading. All the reader's previous life experiences, personality traits and reading experiences come together to determine the reader's comprehensive experience of the text. In short, "A novel or poem or play remains merely inkspots on paper until a reader transforms them into a set of meaningful symbols" (Rosenblatt, 1938, p. 25).

Interested in learning more about personal response to literature, James Squire (1964) conducted a seminal study in 1956
monitoring the responses of fifty-two adolescents during the reading of four short stories. His study aimed to provide an overall description of responses, the development of the response during the reading, the relationship of the responses to socio-economic background, reading abilities, and other personal characteristics of readers, and an analysis of the factors that limited effective interpretations of literature.

Squire divided each story into six pre-determined sections. The students read the story segment and stopped to respond at specifically-designated points. Squire recorded the oral responses of the students that described their opinions, reactions, ideas and feelings to the stories at each stage. An entire story was completed in interview sessions ranging from thirty to eighty minutes. He transcribed the recordings and, using his taxonomy of seven categories, analyzed the data for patterns based on sex, intelligence, reading ability, socio-economic status, and personality predispositions. He found that certain patterns emerged: for instance, after the first reading segment students made quick generalizations concerning stylistic matters and after the final segment, assessed the total selection (p.31). Although some patterns were common to all, unique individual characteristics due to individual background experiences and personal predispositions, remained. In addition, Squire identified six general areas of difficulty for adolescent readers such as reliance on stock responses and a determination
"to achieve certainty in interpretation" (p. 37).

Although Squire had gathered valuable data about the nature of adolescent readers' responses, he recommended that more work be done. Different ages and genres and 'breakage points' selected for each story as an oral responding point could be re-examined (1964, p. 52). If, as Squire found, "adolescent readers clearly need assistance in learning to interpret literature" (p. 54), increasing awareness of the nature of student responses could inform teaching practice.

Drawing on the significance of Squire's work, the present study attempts to characterize reader response by replicating some dimensions of the Squire study. Both studies demonstrate concern for the developing, ongoing response to literature. His categories of response were applied to the students' responses. To expand understanding of the ongoing response, however, this study differs from Squire's in a number of significant ways:

1. The number of participants in the study was considerably smaller (seven as opposed to thirteen case studies).

2. While Squire's students responded orally, students participating in the present study recorded their responses in a Reading Response Log.
3. Since written response requires more time, the quantity of data collected was more limited than data collected using oral responses.

4. Although a general suggestion of every ten to fifteen pages was given, the students in this study determined the actual responding points in the novels.

5. Students read three stylistically distinct novels rather than short stories, thus experiencing longer fictional works requiring more time for formulating the overall response.

6. Students received a general "responding guide" (Appendix A) as a tool to direct their thoughts about their reading of the literary text. However, students could freely pursue personal reflections about the literature.

Few studies have attempted to replicate the work done by Squire although many subsequent studies have examined response to literature. Purves and Rippere's (1968) study examined adolescents' responses to selected literary readings. Their study led to the creation of an extensive analytical instrument. Hansson's (1973) work at describing the nature of response through bipolar verbal scales yielded insights that nevertheless still led him recently to reflect that "we know shockingly little of what constitutes response to literature" (1985, p. 226). In
an extensive study designed to describe typical literary essays of adolescents, Purves (1981) concluded that patterns of response to literature appeared to be learned. As students progressed in school, their approach to literature increasingly aligned with that of their teachers. Monson's (1984) study summarized the research done in literary response (1972-1983) and found that small ethnographic studies of elementary students that explored response to literature within the classroom context were becoming more prevalent. Social dimensions of response received the bulk of attention.

The current research interest in the processes of reading and writing reflects the belief that the development of the process of reading response is similar to the process of writing and could, in fact, expand the knowledge about the nature of literary response (Purves, 1982; Pierson and Tierney, 1983; Harmon, 1980; Britton, 1982; Petrosky, 1982; Horner, 1983; Marshall, 1984). Comparing the reading and writing processes raises interesting possibilities about the benefits of writing for the development of personal response to literature.

The writing act itself, moreover, offers a powerful heuristic for learning (Britton, 1970; Martin, 1971; Emig, 1977; Odell, 1980; Moffett, 1981; Berthoff, 1981; Applebee, 1982; Langer and Applebee, in progress). Composing to make meaning in the development of initial literary response encourages active
engagement with the text and offers potential for growth in appreciation and understanding. In a recent article Buckler posits:

Louise Rosénbllatt's model for the process of reading literature and James Moffett's concept of the process of writing are both grounded in the perception of the human intellect as an active entity which collects, synthesizes, organizes, assimilates, and reconstructs experience according to predictable, recursive patterns. (1984, p. 22)

Personal writing in response to literature is beginning to gain acceptance (Cookston, 1982; Flynn, 1983; Buckler, 1985). Generally, however, such writing tends to focus on a personal response that turns inward; the reading becomes a springboard for associated links to previous personal experiences. Although this represents a major shift away from New Criticism, the text now recedes into the distant background. The present study, rather than use the reading response log for introspective response, aims to keep the literary text central through guided, reflective written responses that occur at regular intervals during the reading of the three novels.
IV. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. Do identifiable patterns emerge when adolescents respond in writing at regular intervals during the reading of literary texts?

2. Do certain types of responses predominate when adolescents respond in writing during the reading of literary texts?

3. What individual variations in the responses of adolescents are evident in these written response logs?

4. Do narrative structural features of literary texts affect the responses of adolescent readers?

V. DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. **Response:** unlike literary response limited to the traditional formal essay, this concept signifies a broader, more comprehensive understanding of the reading experience. Research suggests that response to literature varies, changes in the individual over time, is unique to the individual and emerges in relation to various background and contextual factors. Response reveals the reader's 'experience' with the text.

2. **Aesthetic Transaction:** the relationship between a reader and
the literary work that incorporates the reader's experiences into the process of reading the literary text. Transaction is defined by Rosenblatt as "an ongoing process in which the elements or factors are, one might say, aspects of a total situation, each conditioned by and conditioning the other" (1978, p. 17). The stance the reader assumes makes the difference. The mission is not to extract data ("efferent reading") but to personally experience the work ("aesthetic transaction").

3. **Reading Response Log**: a written record of immediate reactions to a personally selected section of the text, ranging from the personal-emotional to the impersonal-analytical. Students respond using either a general 'response guide' (Appendix A) and/or supply their own personal reflections about the text.

4. **Elements**: Purves (1968) used the term 'elements' to describe the sub-categories or characteristic features of each element described below.

5. **Categories**: Four general headings of engagement-involvement, perception, interpretation and evaluation used by Purves (1968) to describe response to a literary work. Squire developed seven general 'categories' that provided a "reliable, systematic, quantitative description" of the process of reading; for instance, literary judgments and interpretational responses (1964, pp. 16,17).
6. **Response Descriptors:** in this study, response descriptors identify the nature of the response statement without implying an hierarchical or preferential order. The list of response descriptors was developed from the written response logs themselves and although some such as 'personal response' and 'textual structure' are similar to those found in other instruments, many are not. To avoid identification with other instruments, these categories will be termed 'response descriptors.'

VI. THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

A. The Selection of the Novels

The three novels cited below were chosen for their use of adolescent characters, appropriate complexity for capable readers, distinguishing characteristics and potential for eliciting a variety of responses.

1. **I Am the Cheese** - Robert Cormier

**Genre:** Contemporary Realism  
**Content:** The distortion of government authority and misaligned justice as they affect the lives of one American family.  
**Style:** An interweaving of four different strands of events
combine to create a complete picture of the hero's life. The text makes use of a variety of sophisticated literary techniques.

2. **A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich** - Alice Childress

*Genre*: Contemporary Realism

*Content*: A boy's struggle with drug addiction profoundly affects his immediate family and friends.

*Style*: In brief, interspersed chapters, the hero's struggles are seen from numerous contextual perspectives through ten different first person 'voices' (family, friends, school). Interesting use of dialect varies with the different speakers.

3. **A Wizard of Earthsea** - Ursula LeGuin

*Genre*: Fantasy

*Content*: A fantasy dealing with the concept of good and evil, this third person tale chronicles the adventures of Sparrowhawk who defends his village against powerful enemies through his mystical powers. Sent to a school for wizards, he releases the evil shadow-beast who pursues him to the farthest corners of Earthsea.

*Style*: This adventure fantasy, written in traditional narrative style, features particularly rich, powerful language.
B. Organization of the Study

This study classifies the responses recorded in reading response logs during the reading of these three novels over a period of two school years (three academic semesters) by seven adolescents. The responses to the first novel occurred during the winter semester of the 1984-1985 school year; the remaining two during the fall and winter of the 1985-1986 school year. The students had been members of the researcher's English classes during the first school year of the study.

For a period of two weeks during the 1984-1985 school year, two of the researcher's English 9 classes read Robert Cormier's *I Am the Cheese*. The students recorded their reflections in a reading response log approximately every ten to fifteen pages of the novel. Although a general guide (Appendix A) was available, the students themselves determined the length, content and style of each response. When all the students had completed their reading, the response logs were collected and responded to in the margins. The responses indicated active engagement with the text. The students subsequently used the contents of their response logs to stimulate class discussions about the novel.

To find a group of students to continue the work started in the previous school year, volunteers were drawn from the original English classes. The researcher explained the aim of the study
and the reading schedule for the subsequent two novels. Of the twelve
volunteers, seven capable, experienced readers were selected.

Each statement in the seven *I Am the Cheese* response logs was
transcribed into individually numbered statements to facilitate
analysis. Using the three analytic schemes of Purves and Rippere
(Appendix B), Squire (Appendix C), and Fillion (Appendix D), the
written responses were analyzed and coded. The expressive,
exploratory nature of the written responses made analysis
difficult. None of the three instruments adequately accommodated
the nature of the written responses; consequently, a new set of
response descriptors was created. The new instrument was applied
to the response logs by the researcher. An independent rater
applied the new instrument to portions of each *I Am the Cheese*
response log. An interrater reliability of .80 confirmed the
suitability of the new response descriptors.

The students read the two subsequent novels over a period of five
weeks. Since they read independently outside of a structured
classroom environment, collecting the response logs once during
the reading was deemed necessary for keeping students on task and
encouraging them toward completion. The response logs for both
novels were subsequently transcribed, analyzed and coded.

In preparation for an interview about their reading experiences
after the two novels had been read, the students were asked to reread their response logs. Asked to respond to questions written on the interview questionnaire (Appendix M), the students had opportunities to make additional comments about the texts, their reading and their experiences with writing the response logs. Responses were recorded by the researcher on individual interview questionnaires.

C. The Students

From the original group of forty-five students in the researcher's English classes (1984-1985), twelve students volunteered to participate in the study. Seven participants, five girls and two boys, were selected on the basis of reading ability and experience as established by the researcher through working with the students regularly over the course of the previous school year. All seven participating students had been selected for the top "stream" of the Grade 9 classes and were considered strong academic students by staff and peers. They earned A's and B's on their Grade 9 English work.

During the following 1985-1986 school year, six of the students, two boys and four girls, were enrolled in Grade 10 at a small independent high school in the Fraser Valley; one student was enrolled in Grade 10 at another independent high school in the Fraser Valley.
VII. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. A limitation may well be the writing act itself. Writing both interrupts and influences the flow of response. Since thoughts travel faster than the hand, responses may have been only partially recorded.

2. Since the subjects possess strong reading abilities, the findings may not apply to adolescent readers displaying less competence.

3. The response guide given to each student may have influenced the content of the response log. Although designed to keep the text at the center, it may have prevented students from accurately recording their ongoing impressions.

4. The teacher response in the reading logs focused largely on asking questions, acknowledging 'findings,' and stating acceptance of their response to the work. Since the researcher collected the reading response logs once during the second phase of the study to maintain continued interest, students may have been influenced by the researcher's comments in the margins.
VIII. CONCLUSION

Using seven experienced, capable readers, this study attempted to examine written responses recorded during the reading of three structurally distinct novels. Since research indicates that literature offers students opportunities for "lived-through" experiences not available in other disciplines, the need to promote active engagement with the literature would prove beneficial. Moreover, a growing awareness of what constitutes response becomes important for effective, meaningful literature teaching.

Substantial research corroborates the value of analyzing the personal response of readers of literary text. Chapter Two aims to clarify that background in a thorough review of the literature in reading, reader response and writing in response to literature.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In conducting a review of the literature of increasing engagement with literature through writing, a number of issues need to be explored. The term "literature" implies a canon of literary texts, a process of reading and a methodology for connecting the literary text and the student. Writing, the second major feature of the study, implies both the nature and purpose of writing, particularly as reflected in engagement with the literary text in the present study. This review of the literature will examine the research and findings in reading, reader response criticism, writing in response to literature, and analyzing written responses to literature that lead to increased understanding of the complex processes involved in reading and transacting with the literary text.

I. READING

A commonly-held notion of reading acquisition depicts the learning reader progressing from letter to word to meaning. Reading, then, relies on a series of mechanical skills that, if absorbed properly, will automatically provide readers both with the skills required in learning to read and the ability to execute the quantum leap into 'reading to learn.' But reading as a 'decoding' function faced opposition by theorists as far back
as Edmund Burke (1908), who asserted that meaning, not words and phrases, dominated reading. Later linguists such as Noam Chomsky (1965) explored the "surface" and "deep" structures of language. Concurrently, cognitive psychology found that learners use "selective attention" in processing information; that much depends on the learner's mental landscape of background knowledge and experience. The two disciplines of linguistics and psychology have, in part, joined forces as psycholinguistics to examine a more comprehensive view of reading that takes into account individual readers and the impact of their unique experiences on the reading process. Researchers such as Smith (1973, 1982, 1985), Cooper and Petrosky (1976), the Goodmans (1977), Lederer (1978), Applebee (1978), and Scholes (1985) have validated Burke's notion of reading as a meaning-making activity.

Current theory pertaining more particularly to literature teaching tends to diverge in two directions: the first into psycholinguistics; the second into 'reader response' theory. The tenets of psycholinguists can be characterized in nine general statements:

1. Reading can best be learned in the context of a language-steeped environment that capitalizes on the language skills of listening, speaking, and writing that the child already possesses (Meek, 1983; Smith, 1983, 1985; Strong, 1987) as an entry into reading.
2. Beginning readers require many visual clues; fluent readers a minimum (Goodman, 1973; Smith, 1973).


4. The framework of reading and learning to read is characterized by feature analysis (what is distinctive), schema, and redundancy (Goodman, 1973; Smith, 1973).

5. Since the visual system is easily overloaded, 'brain to eye' (schema) transfer is more important than the 'eye to brain' transfer. These schemata are 'scripts' or mental outlines that help readers organize information. Old information is linked with new in order to expand the 'scripts.' This kind of 'inside-out' reading assumes the reader brings a great deal to the text (Purves, 1974).

6. These syntactic rules, moreover, operate below the reader's level of awareness; the more skilled the reader, the more implicit the "rules" (Chomsky, 1965).

7. The fluent reader reads a lot, makes mistakes, takes risks, and tests hypotheses (Cooper, Petrosky, 1976; Goodman, 1973).
8. Reading is an active, meaning-making construction (Goodman, 1973; Scholes, 1985; Rosenblatt, 1978).


The work of the Goodmans (1973) represents a dramatic veering away from the phonetic (letter to word to sentence) notion of learning to read and focuses instead on meaning-making. They distinguish between a "miscue" ("house," instead of "home," for instance, still indicates comprehension) and "error," which reveals lack of comprehension ("should," instead of "house").

Moreover, psycholinguists accept the reader's personal background experiences and previous reading as influential in the reading process. Central to the theoretical framework of psycholinguistics, then, lies the crucial distinction between reading from the "outside in," (the text to the mind) and from the "inside out" (the mind to the text). The processing of text becomes a meaning-making activity.

II. READER RESPONSE CRITICISM

The second direction, bridged by the concept of "schema," is
"reader response" theory. In his text, *The Mirror and the Lamp*, M.H. Abrams drew a model of the reading process that included the text, author, universe (the subject and world in which the work exists) and the reader (1953, p. 6). Historically, the study of literature has tended to focus on one particular element at a time, generally either the text or the author, leaving the other components in literary limbo. The reader has rarely been accepted as an integral dimension in literary study.

New Criticism, for instance, still predominant in English classrooms, views the text as the locus of meaning and disregards the role of the reader. Influential literary critics such as Brooks and Warren, Wellek, Abrams, Heilman and Booth resisted literary response outside of the text itself. During the early 1940's, the ever-increasing enrolments at universities compounded by the prestige bestowed on such criticism, set the stage for instilling in students careful designs for textual analysis. New Criticism, focusing primarily on extracting details and literary elements of the text, frequently failed to put the parts back together again. Taken to the extreme, the New Critic position encourages students to be knowledgeable about a text, without necessarily experiencing it.

Unless the reader, however, becomes an active rather than receptive agent in the process, literature becomes another informational hurdle for students; "almost a spectator sport for
many readers satisfied to passively watch the critics at their elite literary games" (Rosenblatt, 1978. p. 140). Although the work of Rosenblatt, Downing and Harding urging the inclusion of the reader in the literary experience emerged almost simultaneously, the text as the primary source of "meaning" for the reader has kept tenacious hold on English departments at all levels.

Yet, as early as 1938 Rosenblatt's Literature as Exploration challenged the notions of textual supremacy, asserting the reader's integral place in the process of reading literary text. Rosenblatt carefully explored the relationship between reader and text. Virtually ignored for a number of years, Rosenblatt's reader-response theory eventually achieved credibility and recognition through the research of a diverse group of theorists who advanced radically new conceptions about reading (Smith, 1971; Goodman, 1973), writing as thinking (Berthoff, 1981, 1984; Emig, 1983; Barr, 1985), language (Vygotsky, 1962), educational processes (Bruner, 1975) and reader response theory (Rosenblatt, 1978; Cooper, Michelak, 1981; Purves, 1968, 1985; Scholes, 1985).

Rosenblatt expressed concern that raising a generation of readers who are content to digest information will indeed create incapacitated, responseless readers. She urged, rather, a recognition of the fact that no one can read a literary text for another reader; that the experience of reader meeting text bears
a unique, individual stamp. Such a recognition affects pedagogy, often turning generally accepted teaching practices inside out. No longer can teachers alone expound on the meaning of the text. Rather, student perceptions of the literature through the reading experience, abetted by activities that encourage engagement and transaction with the literature, provide the basis for the literature curriculum.

Two more of Rosenblatt's concepts deserve attention: first, her position on the reader's stance to the literary work, and second, her view on "transaction" between the reader and the text. Rosenblatt distinguished clearly between two possible predominant positions in dealing with the text: the "efferent" and the "aesthetic" stance. The efferent stance requires readers to act upon, to "carry away" from what they have read, as in a recipe or instructional manual. The reader is "disengaged." The aesthetic stance, on the other hand, focuses on what happens during the reading. "In aesthetic reading, the reader's attention is centered directly on what he is living through during his relationship with that particular text" (1938, p. 25).

Rosenblatt (1938, 1978) also forces a closer look at the "transaction" between reader and text and opens the way for acknowledging and incorporating student response. Essentially, the reader, rather than being a "passive decoder," carries on an active transaction with the literary work; a relationship is
established. The text "brings into the reader's consciousness certain concepts, certain sensuous experiences, certain images of things, people, action, scenes" (Rosenblatt, 1938, p. 30). The reader contributes a host of individual experiences and knowledge to the reading. These, combined with the circumstances of the reading event, make up the reader's personal, unique response. Rosenblatt describes the transaction between text and reader, the new experience arising out of the union between a reader and the text, as a "poem" and that "the reader's creation of a poem out of a text must be an active, self-ordering and self-corrective process" (1978, p. 11).

In surveying trends in theoretical approaches to literature, the personal response of readers now appears, at least to a number of researchers, to play an accepted role in the reading of literary text. In fact, asserts Suleiman, readers have "acceded to a starring role" (p. 3). Research by Smith (1973, 1982), Petrosky (1977), Cooper (1976), Hansson (1973), Purves and Beach (1972), Purves and Rippere (1968), and Squire (1964), expanded on Rosenblatt's theoretical base. Albeit no general agreement exists on the precise parameters of the reader's role (see Suleiman and Crossman (1980) for further notes, pp. 7-45), nevertheless, readers have assumed their rightful place, if not in the classroom, then surely in the research.

In 1956, Squire (1964) conducted one of the first studies that
examined the nature of the developing response. He examined the
responses of adolescents and, in gathering oral protocols during
the reading of four short stories, noted that although some
patterns of response emerged, individual characteristics created
a variety of response (See chapter one, pp. 4 - 5 for elaborated
discussion). Squire also noted six areas of difficulty for most
adolescent readers: failure to grasp the most obvious meaning of
the author; a reliance on "stock responses" when faced with
seemingly familiar situations; commitment to be "happiness
bound" (all stories should end happily); often held inflexible
"critical dispositions;" made irrelevant associations and
insisted on certainty even without evidence in the story; would
not withhold judgment until the whole work had been read.
Findings such as these indicate some areas needing remediation
(1964, p. 39).

Purves and Beach (1972) undertook an international study of
achievement in literature; that is, response to literature,
reading interests, and the teaching of literature. Briefly, in
literary response Purves and Beach found that students respond
academically with good comprehension, independent of selection,
to any literary work. Interestingly, students "apparently learn
to read fiction and simultaneously to acquire a response set that
cconcerns itself with thematic interpretations rather than
literary analysis or literary history" (Purves and Beach, p. 96).
Thematic and moralistic responses are learned, corresponding to
the patterns set by academically-oriented teachers. The study also raised the next question, "Are these the responses the kind that we want the children to learn?" (Purves and Beach, 1982, p. 103). The work of Purves and Beach proved significant in raising crucial questions concerning the purpose of literature teaching and urging a re-evaluation of current practices in the traditional literature classroom.

Purves' extensive, descriptive study summarized in "Evaluation of Learning in Literature" (1979), identified three representative literature curricula - the imitative, analytic, and generative. Purves measured the knowledge, understanding, and expressed response to the literary work by using samples from each of the views to clarify pedagogical techniques for learning in literature. While the imitative and analytic relies heavily on a "right or wrong" answers, the generative attempts to focus on "the appropriateness of the student description of the literary experience" (p. 104). Again, the generative approach appears to acknowledge student perceptions of the literature as a valid starting point.

Gunnar Hansson (1973) examined response to literature, the effects of teaching literature and the problems of evaluation in Swedish schools using polar scales as a device for assessing the responses of students, experts and workers to the same poem. Using unipolar scales encouraged growth in literary response.
Hansson stated, however, that although numerous books of literary theory exist, much research will be needed before we know even the gross outlines of what goes into the reading process where the latent meanings, qualities, and structures of works of literature are realized in the minds of the readers. (p. 226)

Hansson, too, saw the need to continue probing and conducting research in response to literature.

Considering the time and effort that are spent in teaching how to interpret and appreciate literature, we know shockingly little of what constitutes response to literature (p. 226).

Two ethnographic studies by Jack Thomson (1979) and Janet Hickman (1981) produced some interesting results. Thomson used interview techniques to uncover the reading response of one fourteen-year old; Hickman entered classrooms and became an observer with "descriptive notes and anecdotal records kept in a daily log" (p. 345). Thomson's work in applying the response models of Blunt and Harding led him to recommend that students be encouraged to read and respond to literature frequently in order to develop "a genuine critical sense" (1979, p. 10). Hickman spent over four months working with ninety children in three
elementary classroom spanning Kindergarten through grade five. Attempting to assess response to literature, she found that children who frequently heard stories read aloud and were surrounded with books demonstrated significant developmental cognitive growth in literary response. By limiting reading experiences, teachers work contrary to the increasing abilities in literary response.

Using the years 1974-1983 as a base, Diane Monson (1984) conducted a survey of dissertations dealing with literary response and concluded that "a major trend during the past decade has been toward studies with fairly small samples that rely on observation of response based on ethnographic techniques" (p. 2). This method takes into account the social context of response to literature as well as the context of classrooms, teachers and other curricular factors.

Although knowledge about the nature of literary response is on the rise, the theoretical domain predominates. Studies conducted have generally been theoretical (Rosenblatt), descriptive (Purves), and more recently, ethnographic (Hickman). If our knowledge of the responding reader is to become meaningful for classroom practice, however, much work remains.
Responding to literature through writing has long been an established tradition in the English classroom. Writing that explores the experience of the literature, however, remains relatively scant in classroom practice in spite of a growing body of research confirming the benefits. Traditionally writing has been used chiefly to examine student knowledge rather than a means of helping them experience or examine the literature. Newkirk states:

Because this type of writing [critical analysis paper] does not exist outside the academic community, its justification presumably is that it helps the student engage with the text. But the constraints of this form seem to preclude the muddling that occurs when readers confront difficult texts for the first time.

I feel that the traditional critical analysis paper may discourage students from dealing with reactions that are not easily resolved into a thesis, that they may discourage the students from dealing with the more puzzling (and very likely more complex) issues of meaning and change, that, in sum, they encourage the student to play it safe. (Newkirk, 1985, p. 757)
Another perspective on literary response can be gained through studies examining the effects of genre or literary type on response. Research indicates that different texts elicit different responses (Purves, 1981). Bleich (1978) asserts that the response lies primarily within the individual. Cornaby (1975) believes that meaning lies primarily in the text. Applebee (1976) suggests that the tone of the work determines the type of response. Few studies, however, seek to define the literary characteristics that determine the nature of response to any given genre.

Recently, however, Zaharias (1985) studied the effects of tone and genre on student response preferences using a modified version of the Response Preference Measure (Purves, 1973, 1981). Students rated each item from 1.0 (very important) to 5.0 (very unimportant). Zaharias found that students preferred expressing personal response to short stories more than to poems. In a subsequent study, Zaharias confirmed earlier findings by Cornaby (1975) and Corcoran (1979) that "students' preferred patterns of response are strongly influenced by the nature of the texts they read" (p. 64) and that "tone and genre appear to be two specific textual attributes which affect response" (1986, p. 64).

The role of writing in response to literature needs to be examined in light of what is currently known about the process of writing. The work of Barr (1985), Emig (1983), Berthoff (1981,
1984), Applebee (1982), Odell (1980), Martin (1975), Britton (1970), and Moffett (1968), for instance, not only came to grips with writing as a process but also attempted to synthesize the research in language (Vygotsky, 1962), literacy (Meek, 1983), philosophy (Polanyi, 1969), educational theory (Bruner, 1960), and developmental psychology (Piaget, 1965) to develop a theory that recognizes writing as a powerful, unique pedagogical learning tool in the schools.

Janet Emig's essay, "Writing as a Mode of Learning" opened dramatically with the statement: "Writing represents a unique model of learning - not merely valuable, not merely special, but unique" (1983, p. 123). Writing being slower than speaking, allows for "the shuttling of the past, present and future. Writing, in other words, connects the three major tenses of our experience to make meaning" (1983, p.129). Through writing the learner can make connections, establish relationships and construct what Vygotsky termed a "web of meaning." Distinct from speaking in numerous other ways, "writing," as Vygotsky claims, centrally represents an expansion of inner speech, that mode whereby we talk to ourselves, which is "maximally compact" and "almost entirely predicative"; written speech is a mode which is "maximally detailed" and which requires explicitly supplied subjects and topics.

(Quoted in Emig, 1983, p. 127)
Learning flourishes, posits Jerome Bruner (1975), in three distinct ways; through the enactive (doing), the iconic (image), and the representational or symbolic ("restatement in words"). Writing becomes a valuable vehicle for learning because it employs, almost simultaneously, all three dimensions.

But learning must prove useful to the development of the student. Forster's adage of "How can I know what I think until I see what I've written?" helps to place the complexities of short memory overload into perspective, allowing students to perceive, organize, and restructure information within the context of their own schemas. Writing develops critical thinking, "the capacity to see relationships methodically." Writing then, becomes a way of "making meaning" (Berthoff, 1981, p.114).

Studies comparing the use of writing as a tool for learning with the use of writing as a 'product' confirm the benefits. Learning through writing about literature concerned Purves and Ripper. Through a thorough analysis of student writing, they devised categories of response; namely, engagement-involvement, perception, interpretation and evaluation. Response began with an initial personal response (engagement-involvement) and moved toward increasing distancing and a more global perception (evaluation). Purves does not intend an hierarchical order, however, but rather described "significantly discrete procedures used by writers" (Purves, Ripper, 1968, p.4).
A national study conducted by Applebee (1982) consisted of "data drawn from a recent study of writing in ninth and eleventh grade classrooms in six subject areas" (Applebee, p. 369). Two high schools participated in one strand of the study for one year. Researchers spent 13,293 minutes observing classroom procedures, interviewing teachers and students, and collecting writing samples. Applebee found that language skills at the word and sentence level and "recall" tasks addressed to highly-informed teacher audiences were most prevalent. Applebee recommended:

> We have to broaden the range of rhetorical situations to ask students to share information that they possess with others who need to be persuaded of its interest and importance. And at that point we will have altered the nature of subject-area learning as well as broadened our teaching of writing. (Applebee, p. 380)

In a study entitled, "Language and Learning: From Research into Secondary School Practice," Barr found:

> When students wrote or talked in order to be understood they used language that was clear, substantive, and, at times, eloquent. When students expected to be judged by the pattern of their language, however, they produced not only formulaic, sometimes nonsensical language but also...
poorly patterned, often nonstandard language. (1985, p.2)

This experimental study confirmed that the teaching practices recommended by current research in language development and writing resulted in higher student achievement. Using writing to learn in all content areas has become a defensible, indeed, essential tool for effective learning.


In an article entitled, "From Story to Essay: Reading and Writing," Petrosky calls for assimilating the composing and responding acts.

Essentially, my argument is that our comprehension of texts, whether they are literary or not, is more an act of composition - for understanding is composing - than of information retrieval. (Petrosky, 1982, p. 19)

In his 1984 study, Marshall asserts that "very little empirical work has focused on how the act of composing itself may be instrumental in shaping a writer's understanding of concepts or
contexts" (Marshall, 1984, p.1). Marshall examined the contrastive effects of different kinds of writing (short answer, extended personal response, formal writing and no writing) on test performance and understanding of literature. Students who had written extensively in either the personal or formal mode made significantly better scores than those who had written only in the restricted mode (short answer); in fact, the short answer and no writing groups fared about equally well. He added, moreover, that writing offers an heuristic to continue thinking about the literature, represents a powerful learning strategy and may well be conducive to forms of thinking.

Rosenblatt recommended: "The interplay between writing and reading - and the hypothesis is that the influence tends to be reciprocal - offers another area of research, especially for those interested in the teaching of literature" (1985, p. 50). Essentially, then, since both composing and responding to literature are creative, active processes designed to construct a "web of meaning" (Vygotsky's term), assimilating the research to examine the connections as they relate to the developing literary response appears necessary.

Where does the research in the teaching of literature appear to be headed? From all appearances, into the larger framework of language and literacy. Connecting reading to writing continues to stimulate considerable research (Anson, 1986; Sternglass,
1986; Britton, 1987; Buckley, 1986; Salvatori, 1986). Petersen and Newkirk, for instance, both edited texts on connecting writing and reading in 1986. Although the effects have been filtering into some elementary classrooms, secondary English classes remain less receptive.

Much of the research continues to build on established research and theory to describe and define empowerment through literacy and language development (Freire, 1968; Vygotsky, 1962; Greene, 1986; Scholes, 1987). In literature, as in other disciplines, language remains the central activity. 'Making meaning' in the literature class has been described as the development of literacy in literature (Greene, 1986; Strong, 1987; Sanders, 1987; Hall and Duffy, 1987; Meek, 1983). The focus of personal empowerment has led to a growing interest in establishing communities of learning. Collaborative learning and writing have become frequent topics of journal articles (Lunsford and Ede, 1985; Ady, 1986; Freeman and Sanders, 1987; Fine, 1987; Lindfors, 1988). The research activity seeks to examine language development not on the basis of what children do not know about literature, in this instance, but rather on the varied language experiences of children as the starting point for literature learning.

Incorporating the findings of various fields (research in reading, writing, response to literature, for instance) to extend
growth in literature learning through writing offers exciting potential. Writing as the medium for critical reading allows for tentative, plan-altering construction of meaning in a concrete way.

IV. ANALYZING WRITTEN RESPONSE TO LITERATURE

Numerous instruments to analyze written responses of adolescents have been developed. Initially, this study used three instruments developed by Squire, Purves and Rippere and an informal one by Fillion to categorize the written responses of the students in the present study. Each will be described in some detail.

A. Categories of Response: Squire

In an attempt to understand more fully the literary response of adolescents, Squire chose to monitor the ongoing, developing response of adolescents by using four short stories divided into six segments. After reading each segment, students responded orally to the story to express their "feelings, ideas, opinions or reactions" (1968, p. 16). Interviewers encouraged response through nondirective techniques. Each response was duly recorded and transcribed. A thorough analysis of the protocols led Squire to identify seven general categories of responses: Literary Judgment, Interpretational Response, Narrational Reactions,
Associational Response, Self-Involvement, Prescriptive Judgments and Miscellaneous.

In analyzing the oral protocols, Squire attempted to provide an overall description of response, trace the development of the responses as they occurred, "relate these responses to intelligence, socio-economic backgrounds, reading abilities, and other personal characteristics of the readers" (p. 2) and identify the barriers to sound interpretation of literature.

Squire found that although group tendencies in response were found, considerable individual variation existed, perhaps indicating that "readers respond to literature in unique and selective ways and that the nature of an individual's reactions is conditioned by the dynamic interplay of a constellation of factors rather than by a single cause" (p. 51). Two other interesting findings emerged: a strong tie was found between literary judgment ("It's good") and self-involvement, and stereotypical reactions proved equally common among all participants regardless of ability according to the reading tests administered.

Squire's work merits attention since he attempted to carefully examine the psychological event of reading a short story. He recommended that more work be done through the use of different literary genres, different breaking points in the stories and the
use of different age groups.

B. Elements of Response: Purves and Rippere

Unlike Squire's attempt to monitor the developing response, Purves and Rippere (1968) analyzed the written responses of adolescents recorded after the reading of the literary text. Acknowledging that the written response reveals merely the "tip of the iceberg," they set out to develop a categorization scheme for content analysis that would describe the nature of the response statement.

Purves undertook an international study of written responses to literature that encompassed numerous literary traditions. He examined numerous existing instruments of analysis and found them either too broad or, as in Squire's case, overlapping. The instrument required enough detail to adequately describe the written responses. Consequently, Purves and Rippere identified four main categories of response: engagement-involvement (surrender to the work), perception (understanding), interpretation (finding meaning) and evaluation (assessing the work) that served as a skeleton. Each of the categories was further divided into specific elements. Neither the categories nor the elements were intended to be used hierarchically or as an indication of superior response to the literature.
How do Purves and Rippere suggest that the categories and elements apply to teaching literature? If, as is generally accepted, teachers desire that students gain a growing ability to read and develop response to literature, they can "help a teacher find ways to lead his student through the difficult process of attaining a responsible attitude towards himself and literature. Further, they can serve as one of the points of departure for curriculum experimentation" (1968, pp. 63,64).

C. The Response Matrix: Fillion

Fillion's (1981) informal response matrix attempts to describe the range of literary response evident in the writing of adolescents. Using the open-ended "comment on the poem" approach, Fillion's matrix identified the areas of response used by students in order to both acknowledge and expand the diversity. Fillion attempted to use the matrix in the context of students as "interrogators and discussants" of the text in the literature classroom (p. 41).

Using the four Purves categories of engagement-involvement (personal association, significance), perception (factual), interpretation (interpretive), and evaluation as the horizontal axis, Fillion listed the elements of (a) events, plot, (b) characters, relationships (c) setting, mood, atmosphere, (d) images (e) ideas, themes, (f) language, style and structure along
the vertical axis of the matrix. In analyzing the written responses of students, teachers could tally each of the responses in the appropriate matrix boxes to determine the focus of the writing, and through a series of writings to determine the areas needing development. Fillion posited that students who actively engage in the literature can be encouraged to diversify their responses if they see evidence of their response range on the matrix.

Each of the three methods of analysis described above functioned for a distinct purpose. Only one monitored ongoing response as in the current study. The work of Squire and Purves and Rippere contributed significantly to understanding the literary response, while Fillion's matrix offers a practical pedagogical tool. The present study, too, examines the literary response of adolescents. Unlike Squire's oral protocols and Purves' analysis of writing after the reading, this study examines the developing literary response recorded during the reading.

VI. SUMMARY

In summary, reading actively relies on "the reader's contribution in the two-way, 'transactional' relationship with the text" (Rosenblatt, 1978, p. ix). Only when the reader is engaged in the process can meaningful learning take place. Research in the areas of reader response and writing with the related areas of
learning and reading, have opened possibilities for extending a more global, dynamic learning process for students. Although most of the research has been directed to exploring the effects of reading on writing, the reverse may well prove beneficial. Through writing, students can explore and actively reconstruct their reading experience. In a practical way, reading and writing processes can be joined to create unique learning and reading experiences. "Commitment, whether to the process of writing or to the process of reading the literary text, begins with the students' finding and expressing their own ideas" (Butler, 1984, p. 24).

Finally, the work already done provides a strong direction in which to continue. Exemplary studies done by Britton, Squire, Applebee, Beach, Purves, et al., need to be replicated using different age groups and different literary genres in order to expand knowledge about the nature of literary response. More studies are needed that draw widely on related disciplines in order to understand more clearly the nature of the developing response and strengthen the links now as yet tentatively established.
CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

This chapter describes the background and procedures used to conduct the present study. The selection of students, literary texts, procedures and instruments used to analyze the written response logs are described. Although beginning with three established instruments, analysis of the response logs led to the development of a new instrument designed to describe the ongoing nature of the literary response.

I. BACKGROUND

Examining the circumstance that framed the study itself will help establish an appropriate context. During the 1984-1985 school year, the researcher taught English at a small, independent high school in the Fraser Valley. To assist two classes of Grade 9 students in reading Cormier's complex I Am the Cheese, the following method was introduced. With no information about the text, students were asked to read approximately ten to fifteen pages and then respond in writing to the reading. Sentence lead-ins were offered to guide the students: 'I wonder', 'I have a question about', 'I don't understand', 'I like.' The thrust of the response needed to focus on the text itself. No length limits or specific questions were prescribed. The students used about ten one-hour classes as well as homework time to read and
write. No discussion of the novel took place at this time. Due to minimum page limits set for each day, all students had completed the reading by the due date which allowed them to participate in the ensuing class discussions.

A. The Text: I Am the Cheese

I Am the Cheese by Robert Cormier tells the gripping tale of a teenage boy's conflict with society. The story is told in three separate but tightly interwoven strands. In one strand, a first-person present tense narrative, recounts Adam Farmer's imaginary bicycle ride from his home in Massachusetts to an institution in Rutterburg, Vermont to visit his father. The second strand consists of transcripts of the taped conversations between Adam and Brint, who appears to be a psychiatrist. The third strand arises out of the taped conversations with Brint and moves into a third person past tense narrative describing Adam's early life. Generally, the text presents a present tense segment followed by either one or two segments consisting of transcripts interspersed with past tense narratives. Cormier uses the three strands to reveal Adam's story. The complex structure both confuses and grips the reader who must read closely, drawing many inferences to understand the plot. Even then, the chilling implications of the last three pages are not easily grasped.
B. The Reading Response Logs

The students responded to *I Am the Cheese* in their reading logs using the sentence lead-ins provided or their personal reflections about the text. All the students kept the text central to the response. It can be assumed, therefore, that students understood the nature of the task, albeit they interpreted it in varied ways.

When all students had completed reading *I Am the Cheese*, the teacher collected the logs and responded to the content in the margins; that is, she attempted to dialogue with each student by asking questions, making encouraging comments and making references to the mechanics or writing style. Representative comments were: "I never thought of that," "I wonder, too," "Wow," "interesting comment," "Really?" "I can see you are puzzled."

The response logs revealed diverse insights into the novel. While one student became absorbed with the structure of the novel, another focused on the relationship between Adam and his father. Others tried to probe the 'real' story. One student spent seven pages asking questions. Some questions surfaced in a number of the response logs ("Who is Adam Farmer?" "Where is he going?" "What are these tapes?"). Each individual interpreted the text in a personal, often unique way. These forty-five
students raised 1,296 questions and on the average produced seven pages of writing. Moreover, seventeen of these students unraveled the 'solution' to the complex plot in their first reading.

In the response log openings, the students often expressed frustration with the style and unknowns in the text. As the response logs progressed, however, frustration often grew into curiosity and eventually into dogged determination to solve the mystery. One student ended his log this way:

I've finished the book. It's driving me crazy. I can't figure out if the bike riding was present or past. If its present it doesn't make sense. This book is interesting, I would like to look into it more. I have to find the answer.

Approximately eight sessions were devoted to both small group and class discussions about the novel. The discussion topics were drawn from the response logs. Having the response logs proved helpful for stimulating discussion. The students had questions that remained unanswered and theories about the endings that were tentative. These discussions led to some interesting observations:

. the number of students actively participating
An extensive questionnaire (Appendix Q) completed by all the students after the literature unit generally confirmed the accuracy of these observations. As the following observations indicate, students found the log to be helpful:

It helped in the reading of the book because I would look back and find answers to questions. This helped me piece the story together.

It served as something to extend my thinking. It was a way of writing down things I didn't understand. It was almost like a place where I could put my frustrations on paper.

The log served as a thing to ask questions from, or tell answers to, almost like telling someone what I thought of the book.

In addition, the students expressed the benefits of writing
during the reading for complex books such as *I Am the Cheese*.

For books that are more detailed and complicated, yes. Because you can "pick it apart" while you write.

For some books I could see because they are difficult to read and understand. If it is a novel that's easy to read, I would not want to do a log.

Nevertheless, most students raised the concern that stopping to write interrupted the reading flow:

The log was a bit of a pain at times because I'm used to reading a book at one/two shots & usually in bed!

I liked the log writing except of course for the constant interruptions it caused. It was different and better than just answering essay questions.

The response logs provided a valid starting point for the subsequent discussions. Students had a record of their observations, impressions and questions that could be shared with the class; consequently, students learned from each other. The logs proved valuable as a vehicle to fuller understanding of the novel:
I got to hear other people's point of view and ideas. It also put in some of the missing pieces I just couldn't get by myself.

Some points, ideas and situations came up that I hadn't even thought of.

It made you think over what you first thought the book was about, and listening to other people's thoughts. I like the way this puzzle came together when doing I AM THE CHEESE.

Although the logs appeared to stimulate active engagement with the text and productive discussion, questions arose out of the experience: Why was the response log effective for understanding I Am the Cheese? Would the recording of ongoing response enhance the reading of all novels? Were strategies invoked that would or could be used in other literary experiences?

What began as informal teacher reflections on the texts the students had produced led to the formulation of four research questions:

1. Do identifiable patterns emerge when adolescents respond in writing at regular intervals during the reading of literary texts?
2. Do certain types of response statements predominate when adolescents respond in writing during the reading of literary texts?

3. What individual variations in the responses of adolescents are evident in these written response logs?

4. Do narrative structural features of literary texts affect the written responses of adolescent readers?

II. THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY: PHASE ONE

Of the twelve volunteer students from the researcher's original English classes, seven were selected both for their reading ability, reading experience and responses revealed in their *I Am the Cheese* logs. Thus seven capable readers participated in the study.

A. The Students

The seven students, five girls and two boys, were students in the researcher's Grade 9 English class at a small, independent high school in the Fraser Valley during the 1984-1985 school year. All the participants had been placed in the top academic Grade 9
These students had demonstrated promptness and reliability, important factors since the required task had to be completed in their leisure time.

Six of the students entered Grade 10 at the same high school for the 1985-1986 school year; one student transferred to another local independent high school. All remained in academic, college-bound programs.

Besides being experienced readers, the student volunteers were selected for their individual differences. Some students were very reserved (Gordon, Annette), some openly gregarious (Tracey, Marleen), some more even-tempered (Grant, Jessica, Miranda). Marleen and Grant tended to become personally involved in the reading; others, like Miranda and Gordon, maintained a more objective, distanced approach. Grant, Jessica and Miranda openly disliked fantasy; Gordon and Tracey often chose it for personal reading. While strong academic qualities characterized all of the students, variation in their individual strategies existed.

B. The Instruments: Application and Description

Statements in the seven *I Am the Cheese* reading response logs were numbered, transcribed and analyzed using the three different instruments of response analysis described below.
1. **Squire's categories of response:**

Squire's categories of Literary Judgment, Interpretation, Narration, Association, Self-involvement and Prescriptive Judgment (Appendix C) were applied to classify each response statement for *I Am the Cheese*.

2. **Purves and Rippere's Elements of Literary Response:**

A much more extensive instrument of analysis, the Purves and Rippere instrument incorporates four general categories of response: namely, engagement-involvement, perception, interpretation and evaluation (Appendix D). Each category is further divided into elements. A total of 133 possible elements are listed under the four general categories. Although originally designed to describe the written response to literature after the completed reading of the literary work, the elements provided a wide range of possible choices for describing the response statements used in this study.

3. **Fillion's Literary Response Grid:**

Fillion's response grid provided an opportunity for indicating the range and variety of responses visually. Simple to apply, it categorizes the scope of response written after the completed reading of the literary text (Appendix D).
Using the instruments developed by Squire, Fillion and Purves and Rippere allowed for cross-checking of general similarities and for viewing the response logs from a slightly different perspective in each case. Since none of the analytical grids used an hierarchical approach to response, they seemed appropriate for examining preliminary response to the novel.

C. Analyzing the I Am the Cheese Reading Response Logs

Analyzing the I Am the Cheese reading response logs with the Squire, Purves and Rippere and Fillion instruments allowed for numerous clarifications. The general categories of the Purves and Rippere instrument seemed most suitable for addressing the first research question (response patterns) since general trends of response could be identified through a few comprehensive categories such as engagement-involvement or interpretation, for example.

None of the three established instruments adequately captured the essence of the forming, ongoing responses in the reading logs. Squire developed his categories from monitoring oral responses. The other two instruments were designed to account for the characteristics of responses written after the completed reading of the literary text. Thus, the first phase of the study proved useful in applying the instruments, recognizing their limitations
and determining the need to develop a new instrument.

D. Developing the Response Descriptors

Using the response statements in the students' logs as well as the original response 'guide,' a new instrument of twenty-five response descriptors was developed that attempted to characterize both the nature of the response and the textual characteristics of the novels. Not hierarchical in order, each descriptor tried to capture the nature of the statement: for instance, Questions - simple, direct (E); Tentative Frameworking/ "Sense-making" (J). Many statement descriptors found in the other instruments (personal response, for instance) were used again. This new instrument, described below, was subsequently applied to all seven I Am the Cheese response logs (Appendix E).

E. The Literary Response Descriptors

A. PERSONAL RESPONSE/ENGAGEMENT ("I love this book...")
B. NARRATION/ RETELLING - plot, events
C. KNOWLEDGE GAPS - ("I don't understand")
D. CONFUSION ("This is confusing...")
E. QUESTIONS - simple, direct ("What were the pills...")
F. QUESTIONS - implicit hypothesis ("Is that why he...")
G. REFLECTION - ("I wonder...." "I hope...")
H. PREDICTION ("I think Ged will defeat the shadow")
F. The Reliability of the Instrument

In addition to the researcher's analysis, an independent rater applied the twenty-five response descriptors to three or four pages taken from different sections of each of the seven I Am the Cheese logs. Comparisons revealed an eighty percent agreement. Differences, moreover, occurred in the same general area: while one rater may have designated a question as simple, direct (E),
the other may have designated it as a question implying an hypothesis (F). Sufficient evidence of agreement existed to warrant using the response descriptors for classifying the written responses in the subsequent reading response logs.

III. THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY: PHASE TWO

Two additional novels were chosen for this study since the study had begun with response to a novel. Moreover, novels require longer reading time than poems and short stories and consequently, the ongoing responses could develop, grow and change. *A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich* by Alice Childress and Ursula LeGuin's *A Wizard of Earthsea* also offered distinctive literary features: appeal to adolescents, literary techniques, topics, and adolescent protagonists.

A. The Novels

1. *A Hero Ain't Nothin' But A Sandwich* by Alice Childress exposes the inner city world of slums and drug abuse. Having problems adjusting to a fragmented family, poor housing and schooling, Benjie succumbs to the pressures by trying drugs. Benjie's vulnerability becomes a prime target for local drug dealers. To support his habit, he steals even from his own family. In spite of consistent efforts to reach out and help him, Benjie feels that neither the teachers and counselors at school nor his family
can meet his needs. The ending leaves the reader unsure of Benjie's future.

The world of slums and black dialect pervades the text. Benjie's story comes together through ten first-person 'voices.'

2. *A Wizard of Earthsea* by Ursula LeGuin, the first book in a fantasy trilogy, tells the story of young Sparrowhawk, son of a bronzesmith, who receives the gift of wizardry and the true name Ged from the Great Wizard. Anxious to test his new gift, Ged accepts the challenge to call someone back from the dead, ignoring the full implications of the deed. Consequently, a nameless "shadow" haunts him. Determining the shadow's name in order to gain mastery over it takes Ged to the farthest reaches of Earthsea. He completes the dangerous journey and confronts the shadow. Ged matures by conquering his youthful desires. Stark symbolism of good and evil predominates the text. Although traditional in structure, LeGuin's novel combines both the complex and poetic in language.

B. Procedure

For the two novels described above, students received a typed 'guide sheet' (Appendix A). About ten months had passed since the first response log and the students, no longer in the researcher's English class, could not be directly supervised.
Consequently, each participant received a cover letter (Appendix F) outlining a reading/writing schedule, a folder for the written responses, a copy of the novel to be read and a reading response guide.

While the students read *I Am the Cheese* in a structured classroom setting, the remaining two novels had to be read in their leisure time. To encourage students to continue, each log was collected and responded to once during the reading. Again, comments such as "interesting," "wow!" and "I never thought of this before" were made by the researcher. A positive comment at the end of the writing was intended to encourage readers to continue. No comments attempted to redirect students or to elicit preferred responses.

C. Analyzing the Results

To provide a full picture of the written response and to account for the different nature of the literary texts, the responses to *A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich* and *A Wizard of Earthsea* were first analyzed using the Squire, Purves and Rippere and Fillion instruments. Again, the Purves and Rippere's four categories were used to address the first research question. For questions two, three and four, however, the newly-developed instrument was again applied.
Since response statements sometimes encompassed more than one specific response, two and sometimes even three response descriptors were assigned to a single statement. All response descriptors were then totalled and calculated into percentages based on the total number of response statements. Generally, fifteen to twenty percent of the response statements received more than one response descriptor; consequently, chart headings depict both the number of response statements (statements = ) and the number of response descriptors (n = ).

D. Interviewing The Students

The interviews took place about five months after the completion of the second two novels and fourteen months after the completion of *I Am the Cheese*. The students reread their response logs before responding. They elaborated on anything that appeared relevant, unclear or of particular interest to the researcher. All student responses to the interview questions (Appendix M) were recorded on the questionnaire sheets by the researcher. Interview material is included in the discussion of the findings (Chapter Four) and interpretations of the study (Chapter Five).

The findings presented in Chapter Four focus on four areas of response to the literary work: (1) patterns of response (2) predominant responses, (3) individual response variations, and (4) the effects of distinct literary structures on response.
This chapter focuses on a discussion of the findings for each of the four research questions. The first question focuses on patterns in the responses of the seven adolescents in the study to three novels. The second question concerns the predominant responses of the group to each of the three novels. Discussion of question three focuses on the individual responses of the seven students to each novel. Finally, the fourth question discusses the effects of narrative structure on response.

I. DISCUSSION OF QUESTION # 1: IDENTIFIABLE RESPONSE PATTERNS

QUESTION # 1: Do identifiable patterns emerge when adolescents respond in writing at regular intervals during the reading of literary texts?

No pattern consisting of an identifiable, predictable process of response that applies generally to readers of literary texts could be identified. The reading logs were examined to identify the general tone and content of the responses. The Squire, Fillion, and Purves and Rippere instruments were applied to each response statement in all the readings logs. Subsequently, the Purves and Rippere categories of perception, engagement-involvement, interpretation and evaluation, general
enough to identify a possible pattern of response, were selected. Three of the four categories emerged in all of the responses but no pattern was evident. [See Appendix S: Response Patterns]

A. *I Am the Cheese*

Although no general pattern of response could be established, numerous expressions of uncertainty about the text emerged. Several students began their responses with questions. Grant opened his reading log with: "What are these tapes? What happened to his father?" Marleen also opened her response log tentatively: [the numbers following the quote identify the statement in the student's log]

I don't understand why the boy is leaving and where from? [perception] I think the tapes were of Adam talking to a psychiatrist about his life. [perception] What were the pills that he threw away? [perception] I noticed that this boy is weird. [engagement] I wonder what the package to his father is? [perception] What year is the story written in? [perception] [1-6]

However, not all students expressed their initial responses in that way. Annette began interpreting the text early in her *I Am the Cheese* response. She stated:
This chapter answered my questions about his name which is Adam. [perception] Now I also understand why it is called "I Am the Cheese." it has to do with the song The Farmer in the Dell. [interpretation] [9-11]

A tentativeness about the content of the text generally appeared in the introductions and interpretive responses increased as the logs progressed. No predictable pattern, however, could be identified. [See Appendix N: one student's response log and Appendix S: Responses to I Am the Cheese]

B. A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich and A Wizard of Earthsea

Responses to A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich and A Wizard of Earthsea varied. Generally, engagement-involvement responses increased from 13.8% for I Am the Cheese to 24.5% for A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich and 37.8% for A Wizard of Earthsea. On the other hand, Annette expressed considerable engagement-involvement with the novel (21 of 52 response statements for I Am the Cheese) and moved toward more interpretive responses. [See Appendix S: Responses to A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich and A Wizard of Earthsea]

The individual responses moved in an unpredictable, recursive fashion, making identification of a pattern, particularly one that applied to all three novels, impossible. Jessica, for
instance, incorporated the elements of engagement-involvement and perception in her *I Am the Cheese* and *A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich* response logs, but also expressed a number of interpretive responses.

This book seems pretty strange because it starts in slang and black language and it gets more normal. [perception, engagement-involvement] It must be strange for the author to write. [engagement-involvement] The language makes it easier to understand Benjie's point of view. [interpretation] The way he tells things you can almost understand why he started drugs when his life is the way it is. [engagement-involvement] I wonder if he OD's or if he "kicks?" [perception] I think if he kicks he would probably get a job helping other kids quit drugs. [interpretation] [1-6]

Generally, interpretation and engagement-involvement responses surfaced more frequently in response to these novels.

In Miranda's *A Wizard of Earthsea* reading log, she wrote:

Ged has decided to go to the Island of Roke. [perception] I think this was a dumb decision because Ogion seemed so wise, ex. "to hear one must be silent." [engagement/interpretation] This sounds profound. [interpretation]
"Shadow" was in a major storm and the ship master asked Ged to do something and he wouldn't go to Roke.

[perception] Ged didn't know what to do but then he saw a light (eventually led them there) but this is light that led them. [perception/ interpretation] another coincidence? [perception] this book maybe plays with symbols/ foreshadowing etc. [interpretation] [9-18]

Already at this early stage of her response, Miranda began to interpret the events of the novel.

Three of the four categories - engagement-involvement, perception, and interpretation - were woven throughout the responses. The fourth category, evaluation, appeared only minimally. Since responses were recorded during the reading of the text, most reading logs ended when the reading did. Some students expressed evaluation of the novel at the end of their reading. Of the twenty-one reading logs, eight incorporated evaluations of the novel. [See Appendix O and P: student response logs]

If a 'pattern' suggests predictable, sequential steps then no pattern could be identified. Of the four categories, only engagement-involvement typically increased for most students as the responses progressed. Furthermore, the individual responses revealed that perception, engagement-involvement, and
interpretation recurred throughout and in no particular pattern that could be identified as present in all three novel responses.

DISCUSSION OF QUESTION # 2: PREDOMINANT RESPONSE STATEMENTS

Question # 2: Do certain types of responses predominate when adolescents respond in writing during the reading of literary texts?

To address this question, a list of descriptors was developed to classify the response log statements. Each response statement was subsequently labelled with the appropriate response descriptor(s). Simply stated, a response descriptor identifies the nature, intent or character of the response statement; for example, question, prediction, insight, confusion or unexpected finding. To determine predominant responses, tallies of each response descriptor were calculated for the responses to each novel; for example, character/event analysis (N) may have been used twenty-three times in one response log. For each reader, the response descriptor totals were tallied for all of the three novels. Totals for all the readers were then calculated. Each response log varied in length; consequently, the totals of each response descriptor are reported in percentages in order to identify clusters of response and predominant responses.

At times more than one response descriptor proved to be
appropriate for a single response statement; for instance, a question with an implicit hypothesis (F) could also be an attempt at Tentative Frameworking/"Sense-making" (J) of the content. On the average, one-fifth of the response statements warranted more than one descriptor; consequently, the total number of descriptors assigned exceeded the number of response statements. The percentage was derived from the total number of descriptors assigned rather than the total number of statements in the response logs. If fifty statements in a response log received sixty-two descriptors, the percentages were based on the sixty-two descriptors.

Of the twenty-five types of responses, five predominated when calculating the average of all the student responses to the three novels (J,N,B,A,E; see Table 1). A different picture emerged when identifying the average responses for the individual novels, however. Questions (E), for instance, did not emerge predominantly in the responses to A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich. The remaining four types of responses, however, also figured predominantly in the averages calculated for all the students to each of the three novels (J, N,B,A; see Table 2). Other types of responses, not evident in the calculations for all students to the three novels (Table 1), appeared in the responses to the individual novels (Table 2).

A. Predominant Responses Across the Three Novels
Averaging all the response revealed that five scored above 5% of the total responses recorded: Personal Response/ Engagement (A); Character/ Event - analysis (N); Tentative Frameworking/ "Sense-making" (J); Narration/ Retelling (B); and Questions - simple, direct (E). In the tables below, the remaining types of response scoring below 5% are combined into a single percentage. Table 1 demonstrates the averages of all the responses to the three novels:

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response/ Engagement</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/ Event - analysis</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/ Sense making</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Narration/ Retelling</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions - simple, direct</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Response</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix I for detailed analysis of average
On the average, Personal Response/Engagement (A), Character/Event - analysis (N), Tentative Frameworking/Sense-making (J), Narration/Retelling (B) and Questions (E) responses proved most common.

B. Predominant Responses to Individual Novels

Calculating the average of each type of response for the three novels individually revealed four scored above 5%: Personal Response/Engagement (A), Narration/Retelling (B), Character/Event - analysis (N), and Tentative Frameworking/Sense-making (J).

All twenty-five descriptors were represented in the responses to the three novels, most only nominally (see Appendix I). The greatest variety of response occurred in A Wizard of Earthsea (an average of 15.4 response types per reader as opposed to 13.3 in I Am the Cheese and 12.2 in A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich). In the responses to A Wizard of Earthsea, all twenty-five of the designated response types were represented (see Appendix L). For both the remaining novels, Confirmation (I), Unexpected Finding (M), Textual Content (S), Textual Concepts, Ideas, Themes (T), and Viewing the Novel's Literary World (U) received minimal attention (see Appendix J and Appendix K). Table 2 compares the predominant responses for the three novels. The dashes signify an average response of less than 5% of the total responses.
Table 2

PREDOMINANT RESPONSES: THREE NOVELS

1. *I AM THE CHEESE*  \( n = 685 \)  \( \text{[statements} = 540] \)
2. *A HERO AIN'T NOTHIN' BUT A SANDWICH*  \( n = 610 \)  \( \text{[statements} = 426] \)
3. *A WIZARD OF EARTHSEA*  \( N = 736 \)  \( \text{[statements} = 572] \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. n = 685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/Sense-making</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions - simple, direct</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Questions - implicit hypothesis</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/ Event - analysis</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Narration/ Retelling</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Insight/ Understanding</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response/Engagement</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Character/ Events - judgment, evaluation</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Responses</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the twenty-five, four responses emerged for each of the three novels: Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making (J), Character/ Event - analysis (N), Narration/ Retelling (B), and Personal
Response/ Engagement (A). Narration/ Retelling (B) proved most consistent in range; Personal Response/ Engagement (A), the widest in range.

Table 2 also reveals the predominant focus for each novel response. A different single predominant response characterized each novel response: Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making (J) in I Am the Cheese, Character/Event - analysis (N) in A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich and Personal Response/ Engagement (A) in A Wizard of Earthsea. Moreover, the predominant responses emerged in a different order for each of the novels.

As Table 2 indicates, each novel elicited specific predominant responses. Tentative Frameworking/Sense-making, (J, 16.5%) and Questions (E, 15.5%; F, 11.6%) characterized the responses to I Am the Cheese since the readers tried to deal with the novel's complex structure. In the A Hero Ain't Nothing but a Sandwich responses, however, Character/ Event - analysis (N, 20.3%) and Personal Response/ Engagement (A, 17.8%) proved more dominant. Personal Response/ Engagement (A, 22.1%) and Character/ Event - analysis (N, 11.9%) characterized the responses to A Wizard of Earthsea. Specific types of responses predominated when the adolescents in this study responded in writing during the reading of literary texts.
III. DISCUSSION OF QUESTION 3: INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES TO THREE LITERARY TEXTS

QUESTION # 3: What individual variations in the responses of adolescents are evident in these written response logs?

Considerable variation existed in the individual responses to the same novel. Questions (E) in individual *I Am the Cheese* responses, for instance, constituted 6.1%, 12.2%, 14.4%, 18.0%, 18.8%, 18.8% and 20.3% of the total response, an average of 13.5%. Those asking fewer questions responded alternately; for example, Tentative Frameworking/Sense-making (J), Knowledge Gaps (C), Ongoing Reflection (G) and Confusion (D).

The individual response logs were examined to identify the predominant responses to each novel. This allowed locating similarities and differences in the responses of the students to the same novel. A comparison of each student's response to the three novels is presented as a summary after the discussion of the responses to *A Wizard of Earthsea*. Where relevant, similarities and differences among the students are discussed. Tables 3 - 23 present the predominant responses of each reader to each novel.
A. *I Am the Cheese*

Analyses of the seven individual responses to *I Am the Cheese* follows.

1. **Grant**

Grant responded to the novel as a questioner seeking answers, with two types of questions (E, simple; F, implicit hypothesis) constituting 29.4% of the expressed responses (see Table 3). Frequently, he began with questions and then stopped to consider them.

**pp. 77-90**

I wonder how he felt spying on his parents, listening in on calls, etc. Are the tapes from the past, present? Are the clues, clues to his real history? He must feel bad, knowing that his parents lied to him. Are they his real parents? Is Brint a real doctor? [31 - 36]

**pp. 91-107**

The gray man? I am sure he is telling a story and not living it at the same time. I think the "clues" are to his real history. That's what Brint is trying to find out, Adam's real history. He goes to Brint when he needs help. I think he's in a mental hospital while telling
Table 3 presents Grant’s seven dominant types of responses:

Table 3

Grant: Predominant Responses: *I Am the Cheese*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/Event – analysis</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions – simple, direct</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/Sense-making</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Insight/ Understanding</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Questions – implicit hypothesis</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response/ Engagement</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Textual Structure</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Responses</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As did some of the others, Grant asked numerous questions. He also analyzed the characters and events (N, 20%) and expressed
insight and understanding (K, 14.1%). His responses were predominantly limited to seven types of responses (91.7% of the total responses).

Grant's active question asking led him to conclude:

It is all very clear now. I have no questions on the basic story. I know he was put in the institution 3 years ago after the family part of the story. His mom and dad were killed by Grey who was suspended, then let go again. The whole bicycle trip was a dream. He was daydreaming while riding around the institute. All the people in his dream were all residents or workers at the institute (except his parents). Grey was never helping them. He was always against them. [54 - 62]

Even in a novel that required close reading, Grant consistently analyzed the characters. He dealt with the complexity of the novel by posing his own questions and seeking answers to construct meaning.

2. Jessica

Jessica's reading response log can best be described through the image of a pulley. She consistently moved between "I don't know" and "I think," "I suppose" and "maybe." She frequently asked
questions (E, 18.8%) and attempted to make sense of the novel (J, 17.6%) as Table 4 presents.

Table 4

Jessica: Predominant Responses: I Am the Cheese
n = 85 [statements = 72]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions - simple, direct</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Knowledge Gaps</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Insight/ Understanding</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Questions - implicit hypothesis</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response/Engagement</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Ongoing Reflection</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Responses</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jessica openly acknowledged the gaps in her understanding (C). Fourteen of the seventy-two responses expressed her uncertainty; "I don't know" or "maybe." At the end, however, like Grant, she tried to make sense of the novel.

I understand what happened in the end. Adam never went on
a trip. He just went crazy when his parents died. He lived in a loony bin and he pretended he was going on a trip but he just rode around the grounds and when he met someone from the hospital he pretended to meet them on the trip. [65 - 69]

Jessica's responses moved between asking questions (E, 18.8% and F, 5.9%) and posing tentative interpretations (J, 17.6%). She openly acknowledged uncertainty (C, 12.9%), withheld judgment and at various points attempted to construct the meaning of the text (K, 7.1%).

3. Annette

Annette's strategy for this novel consisted of "taking stock." She asked questions or made observations and at regular intervals stopped to assess her position.

The first chapter leaves me with lots of questions like: Why is the father in the hospital? How old is he, and what's his name? What do the tapes mean and why are they used? It gives me the idea that maybe his parents were in an accident or left him and now he is seeing a psychiatrist (however you spell it!) because a mental problem it gave him. [1 - 5]
Table 5 presents Annette's predominant responses to *I Am the Cheese*.

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annette: Predominant Responses: <em>I Am the Cheese</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[statements = 49]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions - simple, direct</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/Sense-making</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Insight/ Understanding</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Confusion</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Questions - implicit hypothesis</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response/ Engagement</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Response</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Her reading log differed from the others; it included no significant analysis of characters or events (N) and frequent expression of confusion (D, 8.7%). Like Grant, she placed considerable emphasis on asking questions (E, 20.3%; F, 7.2%) and on expressing insights and understanding (K, 14.5%). Over half of her responses expressed uncertainty (E, J, D, F, 53.6%). More than the others, she regularly stopped to 'take stock' before
Who is Paul Delmont? It's confusing when it tells about where he's going right now. (his journey to Rutterburg) and then comes the tape, and in between another person talks about the boy. What is happening now? What is he thinking or remembering? This chapter answered my question about his name which is Adam (Farmer). Now I also understand why it is called, "I am the Cheese," it has to do with the song the Farmer in the Dell. [6 - 11]

Annette revealed her tenuous grasp of the meaning of the novel in her closing impressions:

It's confusing how (they) the author writes about his travelling to Rutterburg and how he seems to be in the past and then tells what happened the first time that he went to that hotel. Who are the men who kill them? Why did they do it? Now as Adam (Paul) gets to Rutterburg all the people in the hospital are the people he met riding to Rutterburg, like the "wise guys" and fat man and dog. [44 - 47]

At the end of her reading, Annette appeared less confident of the meaning of the novel than did either Grant or Jessica.
Nevertheless, she consistently attempted to construct meaning from the novel.

4. Tracey

Tracey frequently narrated and retold the events of the novel (B, 35.6%). Usually she clustered these responses to retell an incident:

Finds clues. Gets rid of dogs with dad. Background information about Amy. Tries to call her. [18 – 21]

Table 6 presents the five types of response representing 5% or more of Tracey's total responses.
### Table 6

Tracey: Predominant Responses: *I Am the Cheese*

\[n = 104 \quad \text{[statements} = 94]\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Narration/ Retelling</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions - simple, direct</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/ Event - analysis</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Framewoking/ Sense-making</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Questions - implicit hypothesis</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Responses</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Tracey, like Marleen, asked fewer questions than the other students, an apparent urge to make sense of the text was evident:

> I think he's dreaming up this whole story. [67]. . . . I think Adam is dreaming. The second time I read it I discovered this. [75, 76]. . . . I notice that there are people in Adam's trip that he speaks about in the room to Brint. He must be dreaming this b/c the dog, silver, appears there too! [79, 80]
Tracey retold the events (B, 35.6%) and asked fewer questions than the other students; 21.1% as opposed to the 28.1% average for the group.

5. Marleen

Marleen's responses to I Am the Cheese revealed a sense of frustration and urgency. She responded emotionally to the world of the novel.

That doctor sure is pushy. He doesn't sound like a normal doctor. [27, 28]. . . . I was getting so impatient with him b/c he kept denying everything. [33]. . . . Those three boys are pretty low to do something like that - running Adam off the road. I feel sorry for him b/c all he's doing is bringing a simple gift to his dad & he has all these problems along the way. [39, 40]

Her concern with the doctor grew:

The doctor is very pushy! [54]. . . . Brint is a jerk! [58]. . . . I hope I find out who the doctor is because it really bothers me. [65]. . . . Who's the doctor? [76]

Frustrated by having to stop reading to write, she lamented:
I am getting sick of writing responses in this reading log. I just want to keep on reading. At times you get so involved with the story that you don't want to put it down. [49 - 51]

Table 7 presents the distribution of Marleen's responses.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marleen: Predominant Responses: I Am the Cheese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[statements = 81]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response/ Engagement</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/Event - analysis</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Questions - implicit hypothesis</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Insight/ Understanding</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions - simple, direct</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Projection/ Application</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Responses</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like Miranda, Marleen asked more questions with implicit hypotheses (F, 12.2%) than simple questions (E, 6.1%). Moreover, she did not narrate or retell (B) any part of the story, but
rather responded personally (15.3%) and analyzed the characters and events of the novel (14.3%).

At one point, she referred to the textual structure:

The story is coming together, slowly and slowly. As Adam finds clues, you then find the clues as the story is pieced together. Maybe that's what the author wants to happen? [29 - 31]

Like Annette and Tracey, Marleen sensed the key to the story:

Did Adam dream all this? That's the only explanation I can think of because it just doesn't otherwise make sense. [79, 80]

Unlike the others, Marleen primarily responded personally to the novel. At the same time, she analyzed characters and events (N), asked questions (E,F) and attempted to make sense of the text (J).

6. Miranda

In her ongoing response, Miranda openly expressed her frustration with the uncertainty in the novel. She posed short, searching comments and questions:
I don't get these tapes. Is this a flashback? It talked about Amy Hertz. Is he leaving a hospital? What about the pills/medication? They both match up! He is somehow sick - from what? How? This puzzles me. Is he a zombie? [13 - 22]

Table 8 presents Miranda's predominant responses to the novel.

Table 8

Miranda: Predominant Responses: *I Am the Cheese*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Questions - implicit hypothesis</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Narration/ Retelling</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions - simple, direct</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/ Event - analysis</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Confusion</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Response</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Miranda responded differently to the novel from most other readers in several ways. First, she did not significantly express personal engagement with the text (A, 1%). Secondly, like Tracey, Miranda narrated and retold (B) parts of the story frequently; 13.8% compared to the 9.2% overall average. Unlike Tracey, however, Miranda retold the events incidentally among her other responses, rather than in clusters. Thirdly, Miranda ended each entry with "Nothing else." Such entries were classified as miscellaneous (Y, 9.8%).

Miranda openly acknowledged difficulty in putting the parts of the novel together. She concluded:

I still don't understand everything. He (after mom and dad's death?) goes into a hospital and finally comes around (at least 3 years) and then goes for a trip. Says/ recalls visiting Amy etc. but she's not there - must be recalling (proof: phone #) and then (proof: motel). He returns to hospital and condition has deteriorated. I don't get it but it sure was a different book. [97 - 101]

Questions (E,F, 26.8%) and Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making (J, 19.5%) characterized Miranda's response. She also stopped frequently to retell the story to herself (B, 13.8%) in an
attempt to create meaning from the text.

7. Gordon

Gordon responded largely through asking questions. Combining the two question responses (E, F) resulted in a 42% total. He frequently asked questions continuously - ten without interruption at one point. Occasionally he interrupted his questions with a statement:

I noticed that he is giving a present to his dad. What is it? Something like a thing he used to have? What I wonder about is why is he talking on a tape? Is he having counselling? Why did he and his parents have to run away? What impressed me in this chapter was that he does not want to give up. [3 - 9]
Table 9 indicates Gordon's four predominant responses:

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. Questions - implicit hypothesis</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions - simple, direct</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/Event - analysis</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Response</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four types of responses, representing almost three-fourths of his responses, characterized Gordon's response log. Asking questions (E,F) and making some attempt to answer them (J) constituted almost two-thirds of Gordon's response (65.1%). Almost one-fourth of the questions were characterized by having both a Question - implicit hypothesis (F) and Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making (J) classification. Gordon wove interpretive responses into his questions throughout his response.

Why is Adam so suspicious and cautious? How does Amy Hertz fit in with all these clues? Why does the
newspaper editor who has lived in Rawlings all his life not remember the family called the Farmers? I admire Adam's determination not to go back home. Was it just a simple mistake or is it because of something quite bad? How come he is so scared when he finds out he has 2 birth certificates? Does he have certain really bad memories from childhood? [23 - 29]

Gordon's response focused primarily on asking questions and attempting to answer them.

In summary, then, I Am the Cheese elicited a variety of individual responses. As could be expected, common factual information surfaced; for example, virtually all the students mentioned the tapes, two birth certificates and "clues" in the novel. Each did so, however, in different ways and at different points in their response. They asked questions frequently, but again in varying degrees. They attempted to make sense of the material (J) and analyzed the characters and events (N). Discussion of the findings, response examples, and Tables 3 - 9 demonstrate how students dealt with the novel in individual ways.

B. A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich

Childress' novel reveals Benjie's increasingly despairing predicament through eleven 'voices' that offer a prismatic
perspective of Benjie's growing drug dependency. Through its use of black dialect and its presentation of a world unfamiliar to these particular readers, this novel offers a distinctive literary experience.

1. Grant

Intensely involved in the literary world of the novel, Grant frequently judged the characters and events in his response.

When I found out that the boy was a real drug addict, it upset me. I hate kids who ruin their lives like that. The kid doesn't even notice that he has a problem. His step-father seems to be a nice, concerned, loving man who sees that his stepson has a problem. The grandmother seems to be a hyper, religious fanatic. [2 - 6]
Table 10 details his involvement with the novel.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response/ Engagement</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/ Event - analysis</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Character/Event - evaluation, judgment</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions - simple, direct</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Responses</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grant revealed not only considerable personal response and engagement (A, 24.7%) but focused that involvement on the characters and events of the novel (N,O). Taken together, these three types of responses (A,N,O) accounted for almost two-thirds (63.4%) of Grant's response. As the following responses indicate, Grant involved himself in the lives and events of the characters:

I'm beginning to feel a little bit of hate for each character except Benjie's family. [26]. . . . The drug
dealer is a very sick person in my mind. [30]

In time, however, he softened his judgmental feelings.

When he was in the hospital I felt relieved. I thought maybe he'd quit for good. But when he said he was going to try it again it really made me sad. [43-45]

Suddenly, he expressed anger again:

I wouldn't be surprised if this last dose kills him. He would almost deserve it. He's too confident. He thinks he can do anything. [46 - 49]

He appeared to struggle to balance his feelings once again:

I'm feeling mixed hate and compassion for Benjie. [59] . . . I feel sorry for Benjie's mom. [64] . . . Now I'm beginning to feel some respect for the father and Benjie. Something like that almost needed to happen to bring them together. [67, 68] . . . It sounds like the family will be a better one now. Things seem to be going smooth. Benjie's off heroin and all the family's getting along well. [70 - 72]

Generally, Grant personally and empathetically expressed his
feelings toward the characters and their actions.

2. Jessica

In her response, Jessica assimilated the world of the novel into the real world as she understands it and interpreted the content of the novel accordingly: "Benjie probably started drugs because of his negative situation. Lots of people live in ghettos and make the best of it." [7, 8] Personal response (A) figured predominantly in her response as Table 11 indicates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jessica: Predominant Responses:</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Ongoing Reflection</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/ Event - analysis</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Projection/ Application to Larger World</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Character/ Event - judgment, evaluation</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Responses</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jessica's response could be distinguished from the responses of the others in two ways: Ongoing Reflection (G, 11.1%) and Application to the Larger World (W, 11.1%). She consistently reflected (G) on Benjie's predicament:

I wonder if he OD's or if he "kicks." [5]. . . I also sort of wonder about his real father and where he went and if he was doing drugs too. [9]. . . I wonder about the first time Benjie shot heroin what made him come back for more. [16]. . . I wonder when Nigeria Greene rattled on Benjie. [20]. . . In this section I wondered where Benjie got his money for drugs. [31]

Secondly, in the process of synthesizing her views, Jessica linked the circumstances of the novel to the outside world (W):

It seems hard to believe that people live this way because I guess just that I live in a clean town and know about 5 blacks and I barely see bums. [18]. . . I know the problem is there, but I don't know any drug addicts. If I had to, I could probably find some around but basically I'm just glad I don't live in New York. [29, 30]

A final interesting note about Jessica's response concerned her
judgment of character (0). She never judged Benjie or condemned him as did some of the others; rather, she accepted his circumstance as the unquestioned, inevitable result of ghetto living.

3. **Annette**

Annette appeared to engage intensely with the novel. Of her forty-five response statements, seventeen began with "I." She opened her response with: "I feel sorry for Benjie even though he wishes people wouldn't." Frequently, she analyzed (N) and judged (O) the characters:

I feel sorry for Bernard Cohen, the white teacher. Maybe it's because I'm white too, but it seems that he just tries to mind his own business, but other teachers still hassle him. I think Nigeria Greene is too strong. His ideas to end black segregation are good but he pushes too hard. He shoves it down his students' throats. [15 - 18]
Table 12 reveals Annette's predominant responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/Event - analysis</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Framworking/Sense-making</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Insight/Understanding</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Character/Event - judgment, evaluation</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Ongoing Reflection</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Response</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annette attempted to make sense of the novel (J, 19.4%) more frequently than the other students. Again, as in her reading of *I Am the Cheese*, she frequently stopped to assess the situation before continuing:

I'm wondering who the "hero" is going to be, if there is one, in this story and will he save Benjie before it's too late. I don't think Bernard Cohen or Nigeria Green will be the hero. [19, 20]
Annette was the only reader who incorporated the insight and understanding (K) types of response, accounting for 11.3% of her total response. Particularly at the end of her response, she revealed several insights into the novel:

Benjie is going to be all right because someone believes in him and he believes in himself. I also understand the title better now. Heroes or celebrities are sandwiches or nothing special. People like Butler, straightforward, hard-working in real life, are the real heroes. [42 - 45]

Unlike the others, Annette maintained her strategy of regular stock-taking through Tentative Frameworking/Sense-making (J). But Annette, like Grant, also analyzed characters and events (N) and engaged personally (A) with the novel.

4. Tracey

Tracey characteristically analyzed characters (N) in her reading response log:

"Africa"

I sense that he's insecure always accusing others. He thinks that all white people are bad. He generalizes. I feel also that he admired his dad. I wonder why he's so worried about fitting in if he's black anyway? Thinks
that God doesn't care. I found out why he tries to fit in: because he wants to be the "savior of the classroom." [35 - 41]

Because she headed each writing segment with the name of the 'voice' (the character) in the section, perhaps focusing on the character followed naturally.

Table 13 indicates her focus on Character/ Event analysis (N):

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/Event - analysis</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Character/ Event - judgment, evaluation</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Narration/ Retelling</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Prediction</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions - simple, direct</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Responses</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken together, analysis and judgment of characters constituted almost half of Tracey's response (N,0, 44%). Unlike Grant,
Jessica and Annette, Tracey responded only minimally in a personal (A) way to the text. Moreover, while Narration/Retelling (B) provided the bulk of her response to *I Am the Cheese* (35.6%), it constituted only 6% of the response to *A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich*. Only two of the 140 responses reflected direct personal engagement with the text. Generally, Tracey appeared to remain objective and analyzed the characters and events in the novel.

5. **Marleen**

Unlike Tracey, Marleen analyzed the characters in this novel in a personal way. "It doesn't sound like Benjie is improving very much," she wrote, "He acts like such a jerk towards his family and he doesn't even feel guilty." [24,25] Her *I Am the Cheese* response log emphasized four responses (A, N, F, and J). Two responses — A and N — characterize her response as presented in Table 14:
Marleen reflected about the structure of the novel. She thought about the language (black dialect) of the text and decided that "that all just is part of the "structure" of the novel." [5] She tried to 'structure' the story for herself: "......it's sort of hard to understand so far, there isn't a 'real story' to the novel." [4] Marleen demonstrated her strong concept of 'story' several times during her response:

This story is starting off pretty good but it's sort of
hard to understand because so far, there isn't a real "story" to the novel. [3,4]

There still isn't much of a "story" but rather, in fact, it's like separate sections from an interview put together. [16]

This is sort of starting to look like a soap opera:

- happy marriage, then
- bad kid
- father moves out
- another lady is going after the father
- but the father still wants his wife
- etc.

It doesn't have "...and they lived happily ever after..." It's like you have to give your own thoughts & impressions of the end of the novel. I thought it was a strange but good book. [57 - 59]

Only Marleen compared this novel to *I Am the Cheese*:

"A Hero Ain't Nothin' but a Sandwich" is similar to "I Am the Cheese" in that there are other point of views. [8] ... maybe it will have something to do with the ending (just like "I am the Cheese") [11]. ... but maybe there's
not really going to be an ending (similar to "I Am the Cheese") [32, 33]. . . It's similar & very frustratingly like "I Am the Cheese" in the way that explained itself. [56]

Moreover, she was the only reader to refer directly to a personal, emotional memory. During a telephone conversation about the reading, she recounted her emotional response to the funeral scene in the text as she had recorded it in her reading response log:

After reading the description of the funeral of Benjie's friend, it reminded me of my grandpa's funeral so much that I started to cry. I mean literally tears were sliding down my cheeks. But it's strange why because there was nothing similar between the 2 people. It sort of made me think about it more. [49 - 53]

During the interview, Marleen explained some possible reasons for her emotional involvement with the novel:

My friends even tell me I'm emotional. Maybe I always see the point of view of the story - how people feel in the story and how that reflects on me.

As in her I Am the Cheese response, Marleen responded personally
to the characters in the novel.

6. **Miranda**

Miranda shifted between simple narration of the content (B) and examination of the characters (N). Although the greatest emphasis again fell on retelling the narrative (B), she frequently analyzed (N, 18%) and judged (O, 17%) the characters of the story.

Jimmy-Lee was Benjie's friend & was the one that introduced drugs to Ben. But he's sorry he did. He said he didn't get a good high off drugs - so he didn't do them. He also said it was getting pretty bad w/ Ben. The grandmother didn't say much about Benjie, but talked about everything else. She told her whole life story & made a long (quite syrupy speech about how Jesus Christ was Lord and her personal Savior in this cruel, evil world. Cohen (teacher) doesn't know what he wants and doesn't really care or do much about Benjie. [9 - 15]

Miranda, like Grant, spared no words in assessing the worth of the characters:

The principal is useless. He doesn't do much - just stands by and lets the world go by. He's waiting for his
pension and that's about all. [19 - 22]

Walter is different. He's a pusher. He sells drugs but doesn't take them. He doesn't think it's wrong - something about "free enterprise" he says. Also, he says, that if he would quit dealing then junkies would go to someone else (probably true - but not an excuse!) [23-28]

Table 15 present Miranda's predominant responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miranda: Predominant Responses:</th>
<th>A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 100</td>
<td>[statements = 88]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Narration/ Retelling</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/ Event - analysis</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response/ Engagement</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Character/ Event - judgment</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Response</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most frequently, Miranda retold the story (B). When interviewed, she explained that retelling the events allowed her to "get the
writing going, to respond."

At the end of her response, Miranda evaluated the story at length. In the final sixteen response statements, she pulled the novel together for herself.

I liked this book, but I'm not sure why - does that make sense? I found it very slow moving sometimes. But I guess it was all necessary to show all the sides of the story. The unconcerned principal to the Black vs. White people - like Nigeria Green etc. to the people close to Benjie - Butler was important & I admired him in the book because he cared & tried his best (providing for the family, step-dad, caring etc.) The book showed a life (& life style) that is totally different to me - ghettos and Black vs. White & drug pushers. The title "A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich" is also hard to figure out??? Benjie doesn't like people who try to be big shots because its for their own glory??????????? They (heros) just get stuck in the middle - they don't know what's happening - really?? I don't know. The book is real - with down-to-earth language, to whatever, no fake stuff. It makes an impression on the reader which is hard to explain. In the end, though, there is some hope; for Benjie, Blacks, people with problems. (Maybe I'm reading too much into this??????) [73 - 88]
In the interview, Miranda remembered this novel as "just a story - only one-and-a-half dimensions. At the end I thought, 'There. That was nice.' But it was gone when I knew it ended up with a fuzzy warm happy ever after." Although she enjoyed the book, she felt it provided little challenge for subsequent reflection.

7. Gordon

In his response, Gordon posed as the reader listening to the 'voices' of the literary text. He retold the narrative events frequently (B, 38%), often prefacing his remarks with "we hear from," "we listen to," and "we get," as though several readers participated with him in the reading event.

I noticed in this section we get 2 different observations of Benjie. first, his stepfather tells of how he tries to take care of the boy and love him and how mad he is that Benjie is 'shooting up' all the time. Then we learn more about Benjie by his friend Jimmy-Lee who also talks about how much Benjie has changed since using drugs.
Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Narration/ Retelling</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/ Event - analysis</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Textual Language</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response/ Engagement</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions - simple, direct</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Textual Structure</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Response</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gordon noted interesting features about the language of the novel:

One thing I don't really understand in this book so far, is the language which is quite difficult to read and figure out. [3]. . . This book's language is quite neat for it makes you feel like you're talking directly to the person. [9, 10]. . . Many interesting phrases popped out in this section. The language that is used in the book is the language of the ghetto and can often be quite
crude. A couple of phrases that were 'interesting' and made me laugh because of the language and the thought behind the phrase were: "looked like any minute her knockers was gonna pop out and sing Glory Hallelujah" and "he and Nigeria got so close they can piss through the same straw together." Benjie also talks about "jography" teacher who's voice is like middle 'c' played over and over again. [35 - 38]

Although the ending mystified a number of the other readers, Gordon seemed to grasp the fragile, obscure ending:

Benjie is slowly trying to give up his habit but the book does not sound hopeful in the end because Benjie has not shown up at the drug rehabilitation centre. [56 - 57]

Like Miranda, he took the time to assess his reading experience:

This book leaves you with a lot and the language is quite difficult to understand. I learned a lot about the life in the ghetto and its many problems. Overall this book was quite interesting and pleasant to read. [58 - 60]

In summary, Gordon altered his strategy to this novel considerably. He asked fewer questions (E, 7%) than in the I Am the Cheese novel response (E, 18%; F, 24%) focusing instead on
retelling the narrative (B, 38%).

On the average, personal response (A) to this novel increased; an average of 7.83% for *I Am the Cheese*, 20.4% for *A Hero Ain't Nothin' but a Sandwich*. Questions (E,F), on the other hand, fell from 20.3% (E) and 15.3% (F) to 3.6% (E) and 1.6% (F). A similar decline occurred for Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making (J). Analysis and judgment of characters and events increased appreciably (N, 13.8% to 26%; O, 3.2% to 11.6%). Shifts in the responses were reflected in the reading logs.

C. *A Wizard of Earthsea*

This novel, a fantasy, chronicles the tale of Ged, a wizard in training. Because he abuses his magic powers, he must pay the consequences by confronting a nameless shadow and defeat it to be free once again. The traditionally structured, rich narrative explores the theme of good versus evil.

1. **Grant**

Grant initially expressed hesitancy about the appeal of the text. Before long, however, he surrendered to the story through personal involvement with the characters and events. He opened his response log with an expression of doubt:
As a rule, I don't like science fiction. I'm still not sure what to think of this one, it's not as way out as I thought it might be. It takes some getting into the book. [1 - 4]

The following table illustrates the nature of Grant's response:

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response/ Engagement</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/ Event - analysis</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Ongoing Reflection</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions - simple, direct</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Character/ Event - judgment, evaluation</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Response</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although hesitant about this unfamiliar literary genre, Grant soon expressed personal engagement: "I'm getting into the book and starting to get used to the style of writing." He expressed his increasing engagement:
When the shadow came all-of-a-sudden into the clear, I felt like it was me being in the wild storm, then quickly into the quiet. It felt strange. [14, 15]. . . I get the feeling that everything Jasper does, he does just to spite Ged. I feel the same way about those little tricks. Why do them? [23 - 25]. . . When he first awoke he must have felt like dying, but I'm glad he didn't. [32]. . . In a way, Ged has become my hero. [37]. . . I really like and get into these visions he has. [39]. . . I really could picture the part when he meets the dragons. I found myself saying the dragon's part out loud. I'm beginning to really like this book. it is getting pretty interesting. [44 - 47]. . . I find this book easy to picture in my head. [59]. . . I really liked this book. (but I would rather read a Cormier.) [83, 84]

Like Gordon and Miranda, Grant responded to the structure and language of the text:

I never really noticed he wasn't telling his own story in this book. It is in the first person. [20, 21]

The author described the spell of the Summoning very well. [26]
I think this book (without missing a detail) so far would make a good movie. [39]

So far every place he has gone to has had a purpose. This place must have one also. [53, 54]

I realized that in this book almost all, if not all things done have meaning. [78]

During the interview, Grant articulated his openness to all types of literature.

I wouldn't say "science fiction. Oh no!" I try to get into it and think in the mode of what's happening, accepting it as normal so I can get into the book. I don't enjoy any book until I'm really into it. I read slowly but I notice a lot of details.

Grant's response revealed his growing engagement, a fact he affirmed during the subsequent interview. In spite of initial reluctance, he immersed himself in the literary experience; thirty-five of the one hundred and five statements revealed his personal response.

Although Grant responded personally (A) to *I Am the Cheese* (0.2%), his Personal Response/Engagement (A) increased
substantially for the subsequent two novels (24.7%, 33.3%). Four types of responses could be found in all three of his three novel responses: Character/Event-analysis (N), Questions - simple (E), Tentative Frameworthing/Sense-making (J) and Personal Response/Engagement (A), albeit with varying emphasis. *I Am the Cheese* response focused on questions (E,F); *A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich*, the judgment of characters and events (O); *A Wizard of Earthsea*, personal response and engagement (A).

2. Jessica

Jessica declared her attitude to the novel in the introductory response statements:

> I think I won't like this book probably. It's very complicated and hard to get into. I hate science fiction. [1 - 3]

As her reading progressed, however, she expressed some growing appreciation of the characters and events in the novel. Her involvement with the narrative resulted in considerable Personal Response/Engagement (A) as shown in Table 18.
Jessica: Predominant Responses  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response/ Engagement</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Author's Method and Style</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Ongoing Reflection</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Prediction</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Textual Structure</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Response</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jessica's hesitancy about the novel was revealed in her attention to Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making (J), Ongoing Reflection (G) and Prediction (H); one-fourth (25.3%) of her response focused on these three. Concern with the Author's Method and Style (X) and Textual Structure (R) constituted 13.7% of the response. She appeared to resist committing herself to the novel. Almost to assure herself, she repeatedly reasserted her position on "science fiction:"

This book is sure boring. I can't wait to put it down.
This book is boring. ZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZ. So far it is very boring with very little action. Maybe the author likes to go at a slow pace. Maybe she thinks it's interesting reading. But it's better than at the beginning.

Having now made some commitment to the text at last, Jessica responded more openly to the characters and events.

I like Vetch a lot. He seems so happy-go-lucky and simple. I like the way they described Ged going into a world to save the spirit of the young boy. I like the way the author wrote about the fight between Ged and the dragons. It kind of makes you cheer for Ged even though you know the rest of the book is already written. This book isn't as bad as before.

Nevertheless, she restated her position on "science fiction" once more:

I don't really like the way this book uses magic, because it makes magic seem like a bunch of bull which just happens to be part of the story. I think magic should be presented by realistic people in realistic surroundings. Then again, maybe the magic is not significant in the
message of the story. [52 - 54]

Soon after, she expressed her engagement again:

The author is really bugging me by stretching out the killing of the shadow. She's making me very impatient. [57, 58]

Jessica offered insights into the novel in her closing response:

I really like the ending of this book, the way they controlled the shadow instead of killing it. That's sort of the way it is in real life too, with evil. You can't totally destroy it but you can control it to a point. This story sort of reminds me of the story of a teenage boy in search of himself. At the end his personality totally changes from at the beginning. This is sort of the same young adult novel presented in a different setting. [61 - 67]

As with Grant, Jessica's personal response increased for A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich and A Wizard of Earthsea. Her predominant types of response to each of the novels shifted: the I Am the Cheese response was primarily Questions (E), Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making (J), and Knowledge Gaps (C); the A Hero Ain't Nothin' but a Sandwich, Personal Response/Engagement
(A), Ongoing Reflection (G), Character/Event - analysis (N) and Projection/ Application to Larger World (W); the A Wizard of Earthsea, Tentative Frameworiking/ Sense-making (J) and Personal Response/ Engagement (A). Only three types of response occurred for all three novels; Tentative Frameworiking/ Sense-making (J), Personal Response/ Engagement (A) and Ongoing Reflection (G). The remaining ten types of response receiving more than 5% appeared in only one of the novel responses; that is, they either emerged for all three or only one of the novel responses.

In the follow-up interview, Jessica repeated her preliminary dislike of the novel:

I hated Wizard when I first had to read it. I didn't mind it too much at the end - at least it was short.

Once you get used to the language, you get right into it.

Albeit less than did the rest, she acknowledged some unexpected, growing enjoyment of the novel.

3. Annette

As presented in Table 19, Annette primarily retold the narrative (B) and analyzed the characters and events (N).
Table 19

Annette: Predominant Responses  
A Wizard of Earthsea
n = 78  
[Statements = 59]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/ Event - analysis</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Narration/ Retelling</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response/ Engagement</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Character/ Event - judgment, analysis</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Ongoing Reflection</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions - simple, direct</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Insight/ Understanding</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Response</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annette responded in three distinct ways. First, unlike the other readers, Annette waited until about half-way through her response before revealing her own personal response (A) to the text.

I thought Skiorh, the oarman on the boat, was a little strange and I didn't like him. [31]... Ged is still very confused about how to defeat the shadow (so am I)
but he is hunting the shadow now. To my surprise the shadow is frightened that Ged is chasing it. [43, 44]

... I think everyone involved in this story (including me) feels better that Vetch is accompanying Ged. [52]

Second, she expressed a wider variety of responses in her response log. Of the twenty-five, Annette incorporated twenty types of response. Eight of them constituted 91% of the total response; twelve others, the remaining 9%.

Finally, Annette prefaced numerous statements with "I am glad" or "I was a little scared," revealing her active engagement with the novel.

Questions (E), dominant in her response to I Am the Cheese, proved scant in her responses to the remaining two novels. Personal Response/ Engagement (A) and Character/ Event - analysis (N), however, increased markedly for these. Narration/ Retelling (B) proved predominant only in her response to A Wizard of Earthsea.

4. Tracey

Tracey expressed her attitude toward the novel in her opening response: "This book seems very interesting." [1] Unlike her responses to the other two novels, Tracey engaged more personally
with this novel as Table 20 indicates.

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response/ Engagement</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Narration/ Retelling</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Character/ Event - judgment, evaluation</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/ Event - analysis</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Ongoing Reflection</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Prediction</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Response</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal Response/ Engagement (A), decidedly absent in her response to the other two novels, proved predominant. She engaged personally and empathetically with the characters in the novel.

This girl seems dangerous, maybe she is some type of witch or something. Yes, she is a witch or almost a
I hope Ged gets this Jasper guy. I don't like him. I still don't like Jasper & I feel sorry for Ged because his friend is studying with Jasper in that meadow and he's not allowed in there. [28 - 31]

Now he's [Ged] extremely sick. I hope he's satisfied. [36, 37]

She expressed deep emotional involvement in the events several times:

This is scary. [38]. I'd never read this in the dark. [47]. This language bit and the dragon (large) being able to lie is scary. [63]

In one substantial section (65 - 85) revealing personal involvement (A), her fears and tension crescendoed:

I've not started the chapter yet but I predict that he'll be hunted and conquer this beast he'll let loose. This shadow has a grudge. It won't even let him sail in a boat. It sounds mighty scary. Now he probably HAS to fight his shadow. I think that he will defeat it with knowledge and not sorcery. It says, "It (the waiting)
was past bearing" for him and also for me! MENTAL NOTE – don't read this book at nite, it's scary. I think that this guy "dressed in grey who carried a staff THAT WAS NOT A WIZARD'S STAFF" I think he's just met his shadow. Oh great! As I said before, this book 'keeps you on edge for 4 chapters. I bet the shadow thing is a lie. This guy in grey is driving me nuts. Ew, gross, the guy's face shifted. HE HAS FINALLY MET THIS SHADOW. I knew it. It was the guy in the grey! Ha. He beat that thing. Every time I read about it I hate it more.

[65-85]

Openly responsive to fantasy, Tracey diverged from her responses to the other two novels by noticeably reducing the amount of Narration/Retelling (B) and increasing Personal Response/Engagement (A). Character/Event – analysis (N) characterized 43% of the response to A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich and 35.6% of response to I Am the Cheese consisted of Narration/Retelling. Tracey responded differently to each novel.

5. Marleen

As in her response to the other two novels, Marleen again responded personally (A) and analyzed the characters and events (N). These two responses emerged in forty-five of the seventy-four statements. Twenty-seven responses began with "I;"
some as "I wonder," "I think," "I personally feel."

Marleen's predominant responses are presented in Table 21:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/ Event - analysis</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response/ Engagement</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Character/ Event - judgment, evaluation</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Narration/ Retelling</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions - simple, direct</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Response</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tentatively and with an open mind, Marleen began her response with "I didn't really know how I was going to respond to this novel because I have never read a book like this." [1] Like Grant, she moved quickly toward acceptance.

But as I continued reading some more pages, it all seemed
easier. [2] . . . This is the first fantasy book I've read. I usually read novels where the stories are more "real." This novel is starting (well, it's been for a while already) to sound interesting. [17]

Before long she began identifying with the characters and events.

Vetch sounds like a nice guy. someone you can become close friends to. But Jasper is another story. He acts like a stuck-up snob. He always seems to want to get the better of Ged. [20-24]. . . I don't like the way Jasper is always challenging Ged. It's just going to lead to trouble. [27,28]. . . I think that thing/spirit is haunting Ged. I myself would be freaked out if I had dreams like Ged. [38,39]. . . I feel sorry for Ged because he has to run all the time. The shadow seems to persecute him. It follows Ged everywhere, but Ged doesn't know where it is. Ged is all alone right now with no friends; it sort of wants you to put down the book and go join a group of people so that Ged's loneliness doesn't affect you. [41-45]

At the end of the reading, Marleen summed up her experience with the novel:

I'm glad everything turned out OK because after all the
trouble Ged went through to get rid of the shadow he deserved to win. [68] Now Ged can continue on with his life. [74]

Again, Marleen became personally involved in the reading. She stated in her interview that "it felt good writing down some of the things because you could get it all out."

Although similarities existed, each novel response was characterized by one or more predominant types of response not evident in the responses to the other two novels, F,K,W in the response to *I Am the Cheese*, for instance. Of the seven students, however, Marleen responded most consistently; Personal Response/Engagement (A) and Character/Event-analysis (N) proved predominant in her response to each of the novels. Tentative Frameworking/Sense-making (J) rated above 5% for all three novel responses.

6. **Miranda**

Miranda grew to accept fantasy as a worthwhile form of literature. She stated her initial impression early in her response:

One thing I don't like about fantasies is that they are so unrealistic - even the places & wizards are fine - but
some actions don't click. When Duny (Ged) is asked to leave to become a wizard. There are not questions asked - he just hops up & leaves - no prob. If I did that my parents etc. would freak! [5-8]

Miranda's reflections, as Table 22 indicates, reveal a broader range of responses than was evident in her other two response logs.

Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miranda: Predominant Responses</th>
<th>A Wizard of Earthsea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 147</td>
<td>[Statements = 112]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response/ Engagement</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Narration/ Retelling</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/ Event - analysis</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Textual Structure</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Textual Concepts/ Ideas/ Themes</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Knowledge Gaps</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Textual Language</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Response</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Miranda responded personally (A, 19.7%) to this novel and continued to retell parts of the narrative (B, 14.3%). Three textual elements (R, T and Q) drew her attention:

Ged didn't know what to do but then he saw a light (eventually led them there) but this is a light that led them. Another coincidence?? This book maybe play's with symbols and foreshadowing etc. Ogion's statement (earlier) says/talks about light, dark, power, danger, shadows - all of which are (becoming) elements of the story (?) Light - keeps coming back- when one of Ged's instructors was talking to him he said, "to light a candle is to cast a shadow." (he was talking about a balance etc.) When Ged first was looking for the school everyone was teasing him. ex. "The wise don't need to ask, the fools ask in vain." There are many hidden, quiet little hints, small inserts of little symbols, etc. [16-24]

In at least eight other instances, Miranda referred to the literary elements of this novel.

The ideas and concepts of the novel also interested Miranda:

When he (Ged) does get better the new archmage (old was killed in the evil ordeal) talks shadows/ evil/
ignorance/power—all of these things/ideas return again and again. [42-43]

The wizard killed some dragons and made a deal with the old one to not fight the people b/c he had his name—the name—this is so important—life-worthy and it is way beyond me—why should a name (Joe, Jane, Mary etc.) be so important? It seems the whole being rests on this (different!) [58-62]

Many concepts—ideas of this book were inexplicable & maybe that I didn't like (ie. directions, end of the world, etc.) They aren't familiar I guess. [104-105] The writings were original—ideas and stuff that never came to my mind before. [111]

In spite of initial resistance, Miranda acknowledged being intrigued with the language, ideas, and characters in the book. She expressed her increasing involvement:

Chapter was very interesting. I'm beginning to like the book more. [31,32]. . . The chapter got more interesting as it went on—getting quite suspenseful [36]. . . This was intriguing and I was really into it but right in the middle somewhere I thought—"this is so unrealistic" but I am still engrossed by what's happening
- & I can't figure out why. [55-58]. . . When Ged found out what was really beside him (with no face anymore) it reminded me of some kind of horror - blind running not knowing where to go - but never stopping. The feeling (terror/ panic/ instinct, never to stop) my spine started crawling. [63,64]

Like Jessica, she reflected on the novel's unexpected ending:

He neither lost nor won! He had completed himself! It wasn't black - white pat answer. He made himself whole. He was fighting the bad side of himself which came in him but was joined with the good (this makes sense but it also doesn't - I never have physical battles with my good side and bad I guess I do have spiritual and mental battles against good and bad. [93-99]

During the interview she noted that in thinking about the three novels, she found *A Wizard of Earthsea* to be the most interesting; it had altered her concept of fantasy. She enjoyed the "imagination," the concepts of "good and evil," and the fact that "it makes you think while you read."

Retelling the narrative (B) constituted a significant portion of all three of Miranda's novel responses. As with most of the other students, personal response increased substantially for A
hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich and A Wizard of Earthsea.

Questions (E,F) predominated only in her I Am the Cheese response; judgment and evaluation of characters and events (O) only in A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich.

7. Gordon

Gordon expressed his response through asking numerous questions. Of the forty-five response statements, twenty-seven were questions, most simple and direct (E), as Table 23 indicates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gordon: Predominant Responses</th>
<th>A Wizard of Earthsea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 60</td>
<td>[Statements = 45]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions - simple, direct</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Author's Method and Style</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Questions - implicit hypothesis</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/ Event -analysis</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Textual Language</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Response</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More than half of Gordon's response log revealed uncertainty (E, F, J, 53.3%). He also expressed awareness and appreciation of the author's way with language (Q) and the author's method and style (X):

I really like the way Mr. LeGuin describes the situation when Ogion catches Ged looking at some old spell books he was not supposed to see. [7] The author continues to describe the story very well. [12] On p. 69 the author's description of the party is great. [16] The author continues to describe the book well such as on page 151 - "the boat creaked, the waves lisped, the wind hissed." [37]

He varied his response by alternating questions (E, F) with personal response (A). Like Annette, Gordon stopped to reflect before continuing.

This story has a lot of fantasy in it which makes it quite interesting. Why does the dragon fear so much when Ged knows his name? What is the thing that is following Ged? How come Ged could not heal the child? I predict the 'creature' will follow Ged wherever he goes and that Ged will have to destroy it. How did the gebbeth transform into Skiorh? Must Ged fight this thing to its death now? The author makes this book sound very
exciting by using phrases such as "night thickened about
the hunter and the hunted." [21-28]

Gordon's response resembled a combination of Annette's personal
reflections and Miranda's observations of LeGuin's textual
language.

Gordon proved to be the only student who consistently asked
questions (E) in response to all three novels, albeit in varying
degrees. Moreover, like Miranda, Gordon spent considerable time
retelling the narrative (B) of _A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a
Sandwich_. The language (Q) and author's style (X) drew Gordon's
attention in both _A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich_ and _A
Wizard of Earthsea_. Each of the novel responses elicited a
different predominant type of response.

In summary, individual variations of response were clearly
evident for each of the seven readers. Each reader appeared to
invoke different response strategies for dealing with the novels.
The students generally focused on different types of responses,
using them in varying proportions and for seemingly different
reasons. Moreover, the seven students in this study demonstrated
individual variations in their responses to the three novels.
IV. DISCUSSION OF QUESTION # 4: EFFECTS OF NARRATIVE STRUCTURE ON RESPONSE

QUESTION # 4: Do narrative structural features of literary texts affect the responses of adolescent readers?

Narrative structural features appeared to affect responses of the adolescents both as a group and individually. Each selected novel contains particular features: *I Am the Cheese*, a complex structure; *A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich*, black dialect and eleven voices that reflect on the main character's condition; *A Wizard of Earthsea*, a traditionally structured narrative, rich in symbolism and poetic language.

A. Individual Novels: All Readers

In order to determine the effects of narrative structural features on literary response, the predominant focus of response across the seven response logs for each novel was calculated. The tallied response types were converted into percentages and tables created to demonstrate the predominant types of response. In this way, any variations in response to the three novels could be identified. Comparisons of individual student responses to the average group response can be found in Appendix R. Table 2 presents the predominant responses to each of the three novels.
Table 2

PREDOMINANT RESPONSES: THREE NOVELS

1. **I AM THE CHEESE**  
   \( n = 685 \)  
   [statements = 540]

2. **A HERO AIN'T NOTHIN' BUT A SANDWICH**  
   \( n = 610 \)  
   [statements = 426]

3. **A WIZARD OF EARTHSEA**  
   \( n = 736 \)  
   [statements = 572]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Tentative Frameworking/Sense-making</td>
<td>16.5% 7.8% 9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Questions - simple, direct</td>
<td>15.5% -- 8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Questions - implicit hypothesis</td>
<td>11.6% -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Character/ Event - analysis</td>
<td>10.8% 20.3% 11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Narration/ Retelling</td>
<td>8.1% 12.1% 8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Insight/ Understanding</td>
<td>7.9% -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Response/Engagement</td>
<td>6.1% 17.8% 22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Character/ Events - judgment, evaluation</td>
<td>-- 9.2% --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Types of Responses</td>
<td>23.5% 32.8% 39.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identifying the predominant responses for each novel highlighted some characteristic features of the responses. **I Am the Cheese** responses demonstrated the greatest number of predominant
responses constituting over 5% of the total response (seven as compared to five in the other two novel responses). Table 2 demonstrates the emphasis in response to *I Am the Cheese* on question asking (E,F) and trying to make sense of the text (J); on the average, 43% of the responses focused on these response types. In the subsequent two novel responses, these figures drop to 7.8% and 20.2%. Both the *A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich* and *A Wizard of Earthsea* responses focused primarily on Character/Event - analysis (N) and Personal Response/Engagement (A). Nevertheless, each of the three novels elicited a different single predominant type of response: Tentative Frameworking/Sense-making (J) for *I Am the Cheese*; Character/Event - analysis (N) for *A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich*; Personal Response/Engagement (A) for *A Wizard of Earthsea*.

A different hierarchy of predominant responses emerged for each of the three novels. These differences appear to be attributable to the narrative structural features of the novels. *I Am the Cheese* responses, for instance, revealed two that proved inconsequential for the other two novels; Questions - implicit hypothesis (F, 10.1%) and Insight/Understanding (K, 5.9%):

As Adam finds clues, you then find the clues as the story is pieced together. [K, 30, Marleen]

How come he's so scared when he finds he has two birth
certificates? Does he have certain really bad memories from childhood? [F, 28-29, Gordon]

Response to *A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich* proved distinct from the *I Am the Cheese* response in the shift toward more personal response (A); 17.8% compared to 6.1%. Judgment of characters and events (O) proved predominant only in response to this novel.

His step-father seems to be nice, concerned, loving man who sees that his stepson has a problem. The grandmother seems to be a hyper religious fanatic. [N, 5-6, Grant]

His teacher Nigeria is really hung up about 'whiteys.' He is all for black liberation and is anti-white. [N, 21-22, Gordon]

The greatest levels of personal engagement and response (A) occurred in response to *A Wizard of Earthsea*. Almost one-fourth of the responses (22.1%) expressed personal involvement:

This was intriguing and I was really into it but right in the middle somewhere I thought - "this is so unrealistic" but I still am engrossed by what's happening & I can't figure out why. [A, 55-57, Miranda]
I am glad that Ged has come to Iffish and met his old friend Vetch. He really needs a good friend, I think. [A, 46-47, Annette]

Narrational/Retelling (B) proved more common for these two novels whereas responses indicating confusion and puzzlement (C,D,E,F,J), proved considerably less evident.

Narrative structural features appeared to influence the responses of the students; a different order of predominant responses emerged for each novel. Generally, the variations in the responses of the seven students indicate that the different literary structures influenced their responses.

SUMMARY

This chapter discussed the findings that addressed each of the four research questions. No indication of predictable patterns of response was found in the reading response logs. Although specific types of responses predominated in the responses to the novels, individual students responded differently not only from each other but also from one novel to the other. Chapter Five examines the findings in an attempt to interpret them and posits curricular implications.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This final chapter is divided into four sections: summary of the study, interpretations of the four research questions, implications for pedagogy and research, and conclusion.

I. SUMMARY:

A. Statement of the Problem:

Traditionally, English classrooms have promoted learning about literature as a body of knowledge: identifying the structural components, graphing a plot, analyzing characters and identifying other details leading to a 'correct' reading of a work. This approach discounts the contribution of the reader in the reading experience. Substantial research indicates that the reading experience includes, in at least equal measure, the contribution of the reader: the individual background, realms of experiences, and the reading of other literary texts. The reader and the text 'transact' to create a unique, individual literary experience.

To more fully understand the reader's contribution in the reading transaction and to expand our knowledge of the nature of the reader's ongoing response, this study examined the reading response logs of seven capable adolescent readers for patterns of response, the predominance of specific types of response,
individual response differences, and the influence of literary
structure on response.

B. Overview of the Study:

1. Methodology

Seven student volunteers, all experienced and capable readers,
read three structurally distinct novels. During the reading,
they recorded their responses in a reading log at regular,
self-determined points. The study took place over two school
years, approximately three school semesters.

Squire's categories of response, Purves and Rippere's categories
and elements, and Fillion's response grid were applied to the
response logs. Due to the general nature of Research Question
One, Purves and Rippere's broad categories appeared suitable for
identifying patterns of response. None of the instruments,
however, adequately described the expressive nature of the
written, ongoing response to answer Research Questions Two, Three
and Four. Consequently, a new instrument based on the students'
responses was developed and used to analyze each of the reading
response logs.

Finally, student interviews were conducted. Responding to an
informal questionnaire (Appendix M), students elaborated both on
the process of recording literary response in their reading logs and their particular responses to the three novels.

2. The Findings

The student responses to the three novels revealed no discernable patterns. The ongoing responses were not predictable. Perception, for instance, appeared at any point in the writing; interpretation, at times, in the log openings.

Four common predominant responses emerged in the responses to each of the three novels: Personal Response/Engagement (A), Narration/Retelling (B), Tentative Frameworking/Sense-making (J) and Character/Event - analysis (N) (Table 2). *I Am the Cheese* response logs exhibited more questions with implicit hypotheses (F) and insight and understanding responses (K), while the remaining two novel responses revealed a focus on personal response (A) and the evaluation of characters and events (O).

Although averages of all the student responses determined the overall focus of response for the seven students, individual response varied considerably. The number of questions (E) in the *I Am the Cheese* response logs, for instance, ranged from 6.1% to 20.3% of the total response. Some readers focused on retelling the narrative (Tracey, Miranda, Gordon), others reflected personal, empathetic involvement (Marleen, Grant), yet others
posited questions (Gordon). Personal Response/ Engagement (A) ranged from 1.2% to 33.3% in response to A Wizard of Earthsea. Individual readers also varied in their response to each novel (Appendix R). Each reader's response was analyzed separately with the predominant responses noted in Tables 3 - 23.

The literary and structural features of the novels drew different types of response. A Wizard of Earthsea elicited the greatest amount of personal response (A); I Am the Cheese, Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making (J) and Questions (E,F); and A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich, analysis of characters and events (N). Individual responses generally revealed a different focus for each of the three novel responses. It appeared then, that literary structures influenced both the nature and content of the written responses. [see chapter 4, pp. 133-137].

II. CONCLUSIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS

A. QUESTION 1: Do identifiable patterns emerge when adolescents respond in writing at regular intervals during the reading of literary texts?

No evidence of a pattern of response emerged from the responses; rather, engagement, perception, and interpretation responses wove recursively throughout the response logs. Why was the reading process revealed in the logs seemingly recursive and
unpredictable? Three factors could suggest the absence of a response pattern: the readers' backgrounds, strategies used by able readers, and the process of recording the ongoing responses.

First, readers come to the literary text with different backgrounds, personalities and reading experiences. Individual readers filter the different features of the literary text through their own reading 'framework'; consequently, each reader attends to particular features of the text. Drawn to a passage, one reader may be led to elaborate and explore; another may find different features worth examining in detail. Different readers, situations and previous reading experiences influence response to the literary text.

Second, very little is known about the strategies employed by good readers. Literary response can be compared to a collage or mosaic due in part to the complexity of the reading act itself; many processes operate simultaneously (Ackerman, 1984; Smith, 1971, 1982; Goodman, 1977; Schank and Ableson, 1977). Whether experienced readers develop similar, common strategies or whether each one develops unique, individual strategies through wide and varied reading experiences remains unknown. Moreover, even the same reader may develop different strategies to deal with distinct literary texts. Certainly, no indication that students used similar response strategies even in response to the same novel emerged in this study.
Third, the expressive nature of recording their ongoing responses encouraged students to experiment, risk and change interpretations and information previously recorded. Having no predetermined expectations, the students did not record the often stilted and artificial responses found in the traditional five-paragraph literary essay (Barr, 1985), where students tend to assume both teachers and peers have "familiarity with the source material" and consequently, leave gaps (Sternglass, 1986). Rather, opportunity to express their responses during the reading removed many of the predetermined expectations. Both Grant and Marleen expressed the effect of recording their reading reflections in the response logs:

In the log the ideas come into your head. They're clear. You already know when you have to write what they are. It's more interesting. In an essay, there's nothing directly in front of you. You have nothing to view. (Grant)

The log is more personal, really. Not many people will see it. If I had to hand it in to be marked, I'd write it in a different way, more advanced. But in this log I could write any little thing here and there. (Marleen)

Consequently, students did not appear to be concerned about
procedural criteria and responded freely and openly to the text.

B. Question 2: Do certain types of responses predominate when adolescents respond in writing during the reading of literary texts?

Certain types of response statements dominated the reading response logs for all three novels; namely, Personal Response/Engagement (A) Character/Event - analysis (N), Tentative Frameworking/‘Sense-making’ (J), and Narration/Retelling (B). Each predominant response will be discussed separately.

1. Personal Response and Engagement

Personal Response/Engagement (A) increased in response to A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich and A Wizard of Earthsea. During the interviews students indicated that the I Am the Cheese response represented their first, experimental response log and they felt unsure of the expectations. Most students increased their personal response to the subsequent two novels. In the course of a year, the students had perhaps matured and developed enough confidence to reflect more openly and personally to the literature.

The situation of the characters and the content of the stories may also explain the increase in personal response for the second
and third novels. The drug problems evident in *A Hero Ain't Nothin' but a Sandwich* are familiar to adolescents through the media. *A Wizard of Earthsea*'s narrative structure and plot line represents the more typical structure found in literature and movies. On the other hand, the structure of *I Am the Cheese* digressed considerably from the typical adolescent's reading experience perhaps forcing attention on constructing the meaning of the content rather than being free to respond personally.

Rosenblatt's concept that the transaction with the literary work, the evocation of a 'poem,' encourages a personal response that focuses on the novel was clearly reflected in the students' responses. Jessica's involvement in *A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich*, for instance, led her to express: "The way the author wrote, the stuff he said, it seemed like a black guy was sitting right next to you and you're just listening to him." Marleen focused on characters and became deeply involved in their lives: "Maybe I always see the point of view of the story - how people feel in the story and how it reflects on me. It feels good writing down some of the things because you get it all out."

Written response recorded during the reading of literary text, like the oral protocols, encourage personal response to the literature although not in the autobiographical sense referred to by Beach (1985) and Squire (1968). Personal response and engagement appear both as a reflection on the nature of the novel
and the previous, ongoing responses.

2. **Analysis of Characters and Events (N)**

Interestingly, the analysis of characters and events (N), an interpretive response generally taught by teachers, emerged as the most common predominant response to *A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich*. Students analyzed the characters and events independently. Although Squire (1968) also found that interpretational responses predominated, the students in his study frequently relied on stock responses and insisted on happy endings. The students in this study, however, generally focused on trying to understand the nature of the characters and events of the novel. Because the response log was viewed as a repository of their ongoing reflections rather than a finished product, their interpretations could be stated, altered and refined throughout the reading.

Response to the three novels indicated that the students possessed considerable literary knowledge; analysis of characters and events (N) emerged as a predominant response to all three novels (10.8%, 20.3%, 14.3%). A study conducted by Birnbaum (1986) indicates that already at the seventh-grade level, students demonstrated attention to style, ideas and language. The readers in this study, too, already at this formulating stage, heeded the style, ideas and language of the novels.
The increase in analysis of the characters and events (N) and personal response (A) linked with the reading of the second and third novel readings may suggest a relationship. Through attending more to the actions and circumstances of the characters (N), students may also become more personally involved in the literature (A). Response to *I Am the Cheese* revealed only a total of 16.9% for personal response (A) and analysis of characters and events (N) perhaps because a focus on understanding the text (E,F,J,K) restricts attention to interpretation and opportunities for personal engagement. Responses to *A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich* and *A Wizard of Earthsea* revealed a combined total (A,N) of 38.1% and 36.4%, respectively, a marked increase. Perhaps surrender to the text allows for increased attention to interpretation and analysis. It appears that a relationship between Personal Response/Engagement (A) and Character/Event - analysis (N) may exist.

3. **Tentative Frameworking/ Sense Making (J)**

Research indicates learning involves taking risks, testing hypotheses and connecting relevant information (Berthoff, 1981; Emig, 1983; Bruner, 1975; Dewey, 1925; Vygotsky, 1962). The structure of *I Am the Cheese* confused readers (D, 15%). The text proved challenging and invited questions and efforts to make meaning; that is, risking, hypothesizing, and linking relevant
information. "In I Am the Cheese" Grant said during the interview, "I had lots of questions and I wasn't sure how to do this [reading response log] but it worked - the questions were answered." Rosenblatt called this the "active, self-ordering, self-corrective process" (1978, p. 11) of response to literature.

Literature, research in reader-response theory found, is not so much a body of information to be learned as an experience of meaning-making activity (Rosenblatt, 1938, 1978; Scholes, 1985; Thomson, 1979; Cooper, 1982; Beach, 1972; Applebee, 1977; Odell and Cooper, 1976). Writing allows the making of connections and by being concrete and accessible over time, encourages reflection and rethinking. In the I Am the Cheese response logs, for instance, questions, hypotheses, assembling of the bits of information to 'make sense' of the reading abounded.Generally students found the I Am the Cheese log most helpful. Miranda wrote in the questionnaire (Appendix M): "I realized what the questions were and could go out to solve them." Marleen stated during the interview: "At first I didn't know it was different points of view (in A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich) but as you read you figure out what's going on. You could discover it for yourself." The reading response log provided a forum for making meaning of the literary text.
4. Narration/ Retelling (B)

Squire explained the purpose of "narrational reactions" as a technique used "when the reader has difficulty in comprehending" (1968, p. 17). Gordon, Tracey and Miranda frequently used their logs to retell the narrative (B). "I write it in my own words so I can note it, like, 'Oh yeah. Note that. That's what I was talking about'," Gordon explained. Tracey said, "It's to restate your thinking. If you write it in your own words, you can understand." Miranda reasoned: "I guess I do that to get my writing going. To concentrate on the story." Although these students used the same strategy, their reasons for doing so varied, highlighting another dimension of the complexity of reading and responding.

On the whole, considerable attention was given to Character/Event - analysis (N), Personal Response/ Engagement (A), Tentative Frameworking/ Sense-making (J) and Narration/ Retelling (B). The scarcity of specific identifications of literary terms and devices may indicate a lack of previous formal literary training. Purves (1972) found that students become increasingly like their teachers in their response to literature as they progress through high school. Since these students had completed fewer than two high school years at the onset of the study, many may not have possessed the vocabulary to reflect on the more technical aspects of the novels. Since the responses reflected
only an 'ongoing dialogue' with the novels, the response log could serve as the basis for moving beyond the informal response of the reading log to the more structured literary response.

Generally, the predominant responses of the students reflected their active engagement with the novels. The reading logs provided a forum for 'making meaning.' Reflecting about the reading through writing gave students entry to the novel and provided a purposeful context for reading.

C. QUESTION 3: What individual variations in the responses of adolescents are evident in these written response logs?

Research in reading indicates that the reader's schema or 'scripts' that make up the reader's perceptions of the world bear directly on his literary experience (Cooper, Petrosky, 1976; Smith, 1982). Purves defined schemata as the "perceptual bases for reading texts" (1986, p. 60). Schemata consist largely of previous experiences, readings and spoken discourse in the world of the individual. Evidence of individual variations in response clearly emerged in the response logs (Table 2, Chapter 4, p. 70). Some responses, however, predominated in each of the reading logs: Questions - simple (E) in *I Am the Cheese*; analysis of Characters/Events - analysis (N) in *A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich*; Personal Response/ Engagement (A) in *A Wizard of Earthsea*. Examining the individual responses (Tables 3 - 23,
Chapter 4, pp. 74-130) clearly reveals the variations of focus in the responses manifested both individually and among the seven students. Squire also found that "readers respond to literature in unique and selective ways and that the nature of an individual's reactions is conditioned by the dynamic interplay of a constellation of factors rather than by single causes" (1964, p.50).

Another indication of individual response could be seen in the reading logs through examples of what Drucker termed 'selective attention' (Drucker, 1979). The reader attends to some details while ignoring others. In these reading logs, too, some students attended to the protagonist's plight (Marleen), some to the language of the text (Gordon), some to connecting the novel's world to their own (Jessica). Each reader selected, as it were, different dimensions of the novel's world to reflect on to a lesser or greater degree.

The variety in individual response may also be attributable to the act of recording the response in writing. Perhaps once students reflected in writing on a particular character, event or element of the text, it became easier to resume the train of thought begun earlier.

On the other hand, the act of writing itself may have constrained response. Given that writing progresses far less quickly than
thought, readers could not record all their responses; consequently, only a partial response to the text could be recorded. Individuality in response may be related to the fact that the writing constrained a recounting of the complete literary response.

Even when readers applied the same strategy - narration or retelling for instance - they stated in their interviews that they did so for different reasons. But students respond similarly. Four types of response statements emerged most frequently: response to *I Am the Cheese* revealed more questions (E,F) on the whole; *A Hero Ain't nothing but a Sandwich*, more analysis and judgment of characters (N,O), and *A Wizard of Earthsea*, more personal involvement by the readers (A).

Finally, in the same way that individuals respond differently to the same event - an accident or hockey game, for instance - so adolescent readers left their individual stamps on the reading response logs. Each adolescent in this study appeared to apply different strategies to assemble, organize and make sense of the reading.

**D. QUESTION 4:** Do narrative structural features of literary texts affect the responses of adolescent readers?

Structurally distinct, each novel invited and received different
responses. Rosenblatt holds that distinct literary texts call upon different knowledge and sensitivity. The differences in approach to the novels emerged for the group most clearly in the averages of predominant responses for the three novels:

Tentative Frameworking/Sense-making (16.5%) for I Am the Cheese, Character/Event-analysis (20.3%) for A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich, and Personal Response/Engagement (22.1%) for A Wizard of Earthsea.

Two studies confirm that different texts prompted different responses (Purves, 1981; Zaharias, 1986). Significant differences in personal response, description, and interpretation were attributable to genre in a recent study conducted by Zaharias (1986). Interestingly, a Jacobsen study that found "some texts provide more 'reader cues' and invite more engagement and response than the less accessible texts" (cited in Beach, 1986, p. 123) seems to be confirmed in this study. Since I Am the Cheese appeared to provide fewer reader cues, less personal response emerged; 6.1% as compared to 17.8% and 22.1% for the subsequent two novels respectively.

"Differences in the text's difficulty, complexity, depth, quality, predictability, evocativeness, subject matter, tone, attitude and historical period," states Beach (1986, p.123), "all influence response" (1986, p. 123). I Am the Cheese responses were frequently characterized by questions (E,F), expressions of
uncertainty (C,D) and attempts to make sense of the novel (J). Concern for Benjie and evidence of the reader's personal involvement in Benjie's predicament characterized responses to *A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich*. Personal response (A) characterized almost one-fourth (22.1%) of the responses to *A Wizard of Earthsea*. It appears that the different narrative structures of the three novels affected the literary experiences of the readers in this study.

In summary then, examining student response to literature generally corroborated the work done in previous research. Patterns of process in reading the literary text could not be found. Some responses emerged more frequently than others. In examining individual responses, considerable variations existed. Moreover, readers responded differently to structurally distinct literary texts both as a group and as individuals.

**III. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY**

**A. Implications for Teaching**

1. **A Rationale for Using the Reading Response Log**

(a) Response to literature requires active reading that teaches us how to think, lets us read without the
pressure of recall, and then, when we are finished, it begs us to speak our minds about what we have read and, in the process, it asks us to substantiate our interpretation and opinions—our readings—with evidence from our lives and the texts. (Petrosky, p.21)

Langer (1984) distinguished between objective and subjective response; objective deals with the external, subjective with the recreation of the experience for the reader, an important element in the literary reading experience.

(b) Since reading and writing appear to reflect upon each other, writing during the reading actively promotes dependence and influence of the one upon the other. Both Salvatori (1983) and Flynn (1983) view expressive writing as the reading/writing link.

(c) Writing during the reading of literary text capitalizes on a powerful heuristic for thinking that captures the potential of reflecting and actively transacting with the text.

(d) The reading response log provides purpose for the writing, a strong motivator for meaningful language (Barr, 1985). Moreover, using writing actively to construct a "web of meaning" avoids the often stilted and artificial writing found in the traditional English essay.
(e) Students learn not only what to think, but how to think during the reading and writing "by asking questions that demand not just recall but higher-level reasoning and predicting and by sometimes demonstrating reflective reading and writing behaviors" (Rosenblatt, 1986, p. 42). Active learning requires taking risks, testing hypotheses and formulating and altering the meaning of the text for the reader.

(f) The recording of response allows a conscious awareness of the developing, pre-critical response.

Just as readers of literature become spectators while they follow and evaluate the unraveling action of a novel, student writers become spectators of their own thought processes while they use expressive discourse. The writing they produce embodies their developing responses to the literature they are reading, and the very act of writing for themselves allows them to monitor and objectify that response. Both expressive and literary discourses demand a self-conscious "looking back" at the text so far, at both the story and the student's responses, in order to discover meaning, and a looking forward to devise expectations of what is to come. Such reflection allows students the freedom to explore and explain their purpose to themselves before going public. (Ronald, 1986, p. 234)
(g) Since no one can have a literary work read for them, responding through writing requires students to express their personal response. Used appropriately, this could establish both the value of and confidence in their own response achieved through active transaction with the literary work.

2. Functions of the Reading Response Log in the Classroom

(a) Readers required to record ongoing reflections will read and formulate their own personal response to the whole literary text.

(b) Reading response logs provide particularly purposeful activity for dealing with complex, extended literary texts by encouraging a conscious, personal "lived-through" experience with the literature.

(c) Response logs provide evidence of the students' level of involvement and understanding and serve as a 'starting point' for extending the literary experience in the literature classroom.

(d) Reading and responding to the student response logs provides the teacher with an 'agenda' for individual, group and classroom discussion and activities.

(e) Students equipped with a written record of their
reflections, questions and hypotheses are more likely to contribute to a class discussion. The reading log allows students not only to share their own reading experiences aloud but also to extend the reading experience of others.

(f) The reading response log may provide a valuable resource for more formal writing topics of personal interest to the reader. In the interviews students confirmed that they could locate a topic and gather enough information for an extended piece of formal writing from their response logs.

A philosophy of teaching based on a balanced recognition of the many complex elements that make up the literary experience can foster the development of more fruitful understanding and appreciation of literature.

(Rosenblatt, 1938, p. 24)

B. Implications for Further Research

1. This represents the first study to examine the responses of adolescents to longer pieces of literature; hence, replication on a larger scale would prove valuable. Research needs to monitor ongoing response for lengthier literary texts (novels) since these responses occur over longer periods of time.

2. The urgency of Rosenblatt's recent directive that "we need
more studies centered on the actual literary transaction or reading event" (1986, p. 44) remains. Comparative analysis of the response of readers at various levels of reading ability, in different age groups, using different response strategies and with a broader variety of genres may cast new light on the complex phenomenon of the aesthetic transaction between reader and the text.

3. A symbiotic relationship appears to exist between reading and writing. More ought to be known about the exact nature of the relationship in order to maximize learning in literature.

4. Little research has been conducted on the effects of specific literary texts on readers' responses. What about the effects of recording the ongoing responses to other types of novels, dramas and poetry? Identifying reading strategies could prove useful for developing effective approaches to the teaching of diverse range literary genres.

5. The effects of writing during the reading of literary text appeared to raise response to a clearer, more conscious level. If students recorded their ongoing responses in reading logs, what effect would that have on other subsequent formal writing such as the traditional essay?

6. The content of classroom discussion appears to be affected and
enhanced when students record their ongoing reflections in a reading response log. More research needs to be conducted to determine, define and explain the relationship and the effects.

7. If one of the aims of literary study is to develop capable, critical, appreciative readers, what processes and skills need to be mastered? How do these readers read? What strategies do they employ? How can these skills be defined to make them accessible and allow all students to attain some level of effective response ability? The complexity of assimilating numerous skills required in the reading of literary texts makes definitions difficult.

8. In the *I Am the Cheese* responses, learning was evident. What differences would occur if response would be limited to questions after each chapter, formal essays and lectures about the literature? What effect does posing and answering personally generated questions have on learning and transaction with the literary work?

9. This study selected seven capable readers. Would similar responses occur for less competent readers?

10. Only seven students participated in this study. In order to establish more generally what happens when students respond to literature by recording their ongoing response, the study could be replicated on a larger scale.
IV. SUMMARY

Adolescent readers, recording their ongoing response to literary texts while they read, appeared to engage more fully and knowledgeably in the experience. Although all seven students in the present study read the same three novels, no pattern of response emerged. While some predominant types of response occurred for the seven students, individual responses varied considerably. The structure of the novel appeared to affect the students' responses.

If the major force of the questions above appears to focus on the reader, the state of current research in the areas of writing and reader response may be a likely cause. To expand understanding of response to literature, more research addressing questions regarding the complex process of reading and experiencing literary texts needs to be conducted. The students in this study, through recording their ongoing responses, contributed appreciably to their literature learning and enhanced their abilities as capable, critical readers of literary text.
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A response journal is one effective way to keep a log of your reading responses. It offers a chance to ask questions, to wonder ALOUD, so to speak, about the literature. In reading the text, take some time every 10 – 15 pages to record your observations. This is not a time to "tell" what happens in the story, but a time to ponder on how what happens STRIKES you.

Your responses will almost certainly vary in length. Sometimes you may want to write half a page, other times three or four lines. Neatness is limited only to readability. Do not rewrite or revise your responses. The main idea is to record your first impressions.

The following "thoughts" offer possibilities for responding. Don't try to answer all of them in each response. Use the ones that most apply to what you've uncovered in your latest reading.

**SUGGESTIONS FOR READING RESPONSE TO LITERATURE**

1. In this section, I was impressed or struck by.....
2. I noticed .........
3. I wonder about .........
4. I predict .........
5. Some questions I have .............
6. I don't understand .............
7. Something that I now understand .............
8. Now I sense why .............
9. An interesting word, sentence, thought from the text is .............
10. Something I appreciate/don't appreciate about a character or event .............

If there are other striking things about your reading, include them. **Do not limit yourself to the suggestions listed above.** Each person responds to a text in different ways. The purpose of this journal is not to test your knowledge, but to help you deal with the literature in a personal way, to ask your own questions.
APPENDIX B

PURVES AND RIPPERE: ELEMENTS OF WRITING ABOUT A LITERARY WORK

100 — ENGAGEMENT/ INVOLVEMENT

110 — Reaction to literature
111 — Reaction to author
112 — Assent to the work
113 — Moral taste
120 — Reaction to form
121 — Recreation of the effect of the work
123 — Retelling the work in a different form from the author
130 — Reaction to content
131 — Moral reaction to characters/ incidents
132 — Conjecture
133 — Identification of the writer with the work
134 — The relation of incidents to those in the writer's life

200 — THE ELEMENTS OF PERCEPTION

202 — Objective perception
203 — Reading comprehension
210 — The perception of parts
212 — Syntax and syntactic patterns
214 — Diction
220 — Literary devices
224 — Allusion
225 — Conventional symbols
226 — Larger literary devices
230 — Content
231 — Subject matter
232 — The action of a work
233 — Character identification and description
234 — Character relationships
235 — Setting or milieu
240 — Perception of the whole
250 — Structure
251 — Relation of parts to parts
252 — Relation of parts to whole
253 — Plot or structure
254 — Gestalt
260 — Tone
261 — Description of tone
262 — Effect
263 — Mood
264 — Pace
265 — Point of View
268 — Image patterns
270 — Literary classification
271 — Generic classification
300 - THE ELEMENTS OF INTERPRETATION

302 - Interpretive context
303 - The use of part as key to interpretation of the whole
310 - Interpretation of style
313 - Inferred Allusion
315 - The derivation of specific symbols
316 - Inferred logic
321 - Inference about the past or present
322 - Character analysis
323 - Inference about the setting
324 - Inference about the author
330 - Mimetic interpretation
331 - Psychological mimetic interpretation
332 - Social mimetic interpretation
335 - Ethical or theological interpretation
346 - Ethical/ theological typological interpretation

400 - ELEMENTS OF EVALUATION

401 - Citation of criteria
410 - Affective evaluation
420 - Evaluation of author's method
422 - Rhetorical evaluation
423 - Typological rhetoric
424 - Generic evaluation
426 - Originality
430 - Evaluation of author's vision
431 - Mimetic plausibility
432 - Imagination
433 - Thematic importance
434 - Sincerity
436 - Moral significance
437 - Moral acceptability

500 - MISCELLANEOUS

501 - Divergent responses
502 - Rhetorical filler
504 - Comparison with other works
505 - Digression
506 - Unclassifiable
APPENDIX C

SQUIRE CATEGORIES    READING LOGS    STUDY    M. KOOY

I. Literary Judgments

II. Interpretational Responses
   A. Interp. of Character, Plot
   B. Interp. of Ideas, Themes
   C. Visual Reconstr. of Scenes that seem to repr. visual interp. of specific facts

III. Narrational Reactions

IV. Associational Responses

V. Self-Involvement

VI. Prescriptive Judgments

VII. Miscellaneous
# APPENDIX D

BRYANT FILLION  LITERARY ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Events, Plot:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Assoc., Sign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Characters, Relationships:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Assoc., Sign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Setting, Mood, Atmosphere:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Assoc., Sign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Images:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Assoc., Sign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Ideas, Themes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Assoc., Sign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Language - Style, Structure:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Assoc., Sign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

RESPONSE DESCRIPTORS FOR WRITTEN RESPONSES

TITLE: ___________________________________  NAME: ___________________________________

A. PERSONAL RESPONSE/ENGAGEMENT  ("I love this book...")
B. NARRATION/ RETELLING - plot, events
C. KNOWLEDGE GAPS - ("I don't understand")
D. CONFUSION ("This is confusing...")
E. QUESTIONS - simple, direct ("What were the pills...")
F. QUESTIONS - implicit hypothesis ("Is that why he...")
G. REFLECTION - ("I wonder...."  "I hope...")
H. PREDICTION ("I think Ged will defeat the shadow")
I. CONFIRMATION ("I knew..., I thought so, I thought so")
J. TENTATIVE FRAMEWORKING/ "SENSE MAKING" ("seems like")
K. INSIGHT/ UNDERSTANDING ("is")
L. STRIKING IMPRESSION/ VIEW/ PICTURE/ EVENT
M. UNEXPECTED FINDING ("I never thought...")
N. CHARACTER/ EVENT - analysis ("He seems shy...")
O. CHARACTER/ EVENT - judgment/evaluation ("How dumb...")
P. CHARACTER/ EVENT - prescription/ advice ("She should")
Q. TEXTUAL LANGUAGE - words, phrases, quotes
R. TEXTUAL STRUCTURE - literary elements
S. TEXTUAL CONTENT
T. TEXTUAL CONCEPTS/ IDEAS/ THEMES ("good vs. evil")
U. VIEWING THE NOVEL'S LITERARY "WORLD"
V. COMPARISON TO OTHER LITERARY TEXTS ("This is like...")
W. PROJECTION/ APPLICATION - to larger, outside world
X. AUTHOR'S METHOD/ STYLE/ PROCESS
Y. MISCELLANEOUS
APPENDIX G

ORDER OF PREDOMINANT RESPONSES: THREE NOVELS

2 A. PERSONAL RESPONSE/ENGAGEMENT ("I love this book...")
4 B. NARRATION/RETELLING - plot, events
11 C. KNOWLEDGE GAPS - ("I don't understand")
16 D. CONFUSION ("This is confusing...")
5 E. QUESTIONS - simple, direct ("What were the pills...")
7 F. QUESTIONS - implicit hypothesis ("Is that why he...")
10 G. REFLECTION - ("I wonder...." "I hope...")
14 H. PREDICTION ("I think Ged will defeat the shadow")
19 I. CONFIRMATION ("I knew..., I thought so, I thought so")
3 J. TENTATIVE FRAMEWORKING/"SENSE MAKING" ("seems like")
8 K. INSIGHT/UNDERSTANDING ("is")
18 L. STRIKING IMPRESSION/VIEW/PICTURE/EVENT
21 M. UNEXPECTED FINDING ("I never thought...")
1 N. CHARACTER/EVENT - analysis ("He seems shy...")
6 O. CHARACTER/EVENT - judgment/evaluation ("How dumb...")
20 P. CHARACTER/EVENT - prescription/advice ("She should")
12 Q. TEXTUAL LANGUAGE - words, phrases, quotes
9 R. TEXTUAL STRUCTURE - literary elements
22 S. TEXTUAL CONTENT
20 T. TEXTUAL CONCEPTS/IDEAS/THEMES ("good vs. evil")
21 U. VIEWING THE NOVEL'S LITERARY "WORLD"
17 V. COMPARISON TO OTHER LITERARY TEXTS ("This is like...")
15 W. PROJECTION/APPLICATION - to larger, outside world
13 X. AUTHOR'S METHOD/STYLE/PROCESS
17 Y. MISCELLANEOUS
APPENDIX H

ORDER OF GROUP RESPONSE PREFERENCES: INDIVIDUAL NOVELS

1. 2. 3.*

7, 2, 1  A. PERSONAL RESPONSE/ENGAGEMENT
6, 3, 3  B. NARRATION/ RETELLING - plot, events
9, 13, 12 C. KNOWLEDGE GAPS - ("I don't understand")
8, 16, 17 D. CONFUSION ("This is confusing...")
2, 11, 5  E. QUESTIONS - simple, direct
3, 15, 9  F. QUESTIONS - implicit hypothesis
13, 10, 6 G. REFLECTION - ("I wonder...." "I hope...")
18, 12, 13 H. PREDICTION
25, 25, 16 I. CONFIRMATION ("I knew..., I thought so
1, 5, 4  J. TENTATIVE FRAMEWORKING/ "SENSE MAKING"
5, 8, 10  K. INSIGHT/ UNDERSTANDING
16, 18, 23 L. STRIKING IMPRESSION/ VIEW/ PICTURE/ EVENT
25, 25, 24 M. UNEXPECTED FINDING ("I never thought..."
4, 1, 2  N. CHARACTER/ EVENT - analysis ("He seems shy...")
11, 4, 7  O. CHARACTER/ EVENT - judgment/evaluation
19, 19, 21 P. CHARACTER/ EVENT - prescription/ advice
15, 6, 4  Q. TEXTUAL LANGUAGE - words, phrases, quotes
10, 7, 8  R. TEXTUAL STRUCTURE - literary elements
25, 25, 25** S. TEXTUAL CONTENT
25, 25, 18 T. TEXTUAL CONCEPTS/ IDEAS/ THEMES
* 1. *I Am the Cheese*
  2. *A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich*
  3. *A Wizard of Earthsea*

** .34 — All other position 25 denotes 0
APPENDIX I

AVERAGE OF RESPONSE PREFERENCES: THREE NOVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Response Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>A. PERSONAL RESPONSE/ ENGAGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>N. CHARACTER/ EVENT - analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>J. TENTATIVE FRAMEWORKING/ &quot;SENSE MAKING&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>B. NARRATION/ RETELLING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>E. QUESTIONS - SIMPLE, DIRECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>O. CHARACTER/ EVENT - JUDGMENT, EVALUATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>F. QUESTIONS - IMPLICIT HYPOTHESIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>K. INSIGHT/ UNDERSTANDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>R. TEXTUAL STRUCTURE - LITERARY ELEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>G. REFLECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>C. KNOWLEDGE GAPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>Q. TEXTUAL LANGUAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>W. PROJECTION/ APPLICATION TO OUTSIDE WORLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>H. PREDICTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>D. CONFUSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>X. AUTHOR'S METHOD, STYLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

PREDOMINANT RESPONSES: I AM THE CHEESE

16.5%  J. TENTATIVE FRAMEWORKING/ "SENSE MAKING"
15.5%  E. QUESTIONS - SIMPLE, DIRECT
11.6%  F. QUESTIONS - IMPLICIT HYPOTHESIS
10.8%  N. CHARACTER/ EVENT - ANALYSIS
  7.9%  K. INSIGHT/ UNDERSTANDING
  8.1%  B. NARRATION/ RETELLING
  6.1%  A. PERSONAL RESPONSE/ ENGAGEMENT
  4.0%  D. CONFUSION
  3.7%  C. KNOWLEDGE GAPS
  2.7%  R. TEXTUAL STRUCTURE
  2.5%  O. CHARACTER/ EVENT - JUDGMENT, ANALYSIS
  2.4%  Y. MISCELLANEOUS
  2.1%  G. REFLECTION
  1.9%  W. PROJECTION/ APPLICATION
  1.1%  Q. TEXTUAL LANGUAGE
### APPENDIX K

**PREDOMINANT RESPONSES: A HERO AIN'T NOTHIN' BUT A SANDWICH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>N. CHARACTER/ EVENT - ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>A. PERSONAL RESPONSE/ ENGAGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>B. NARRATION/ RETELLING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>O. CHARACTER/ EVENT - JUDGMENT, EVALUATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>J. TENTATIVE FRAMEWORKING/ &quot;SENSE MAKING&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>Q. TEXTUAL LANGUAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>R. TEXTUAL STRUCTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>K. INSIGHT/ UNDERSTANDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>W. PROJECTION/ APPLICATION TO OUTSIDE WORLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>G. REFLECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>E. QUESTIONS - SIMPLE, DIRECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>H. PREDICTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>C. KNOWLEDGE GAPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>X. AUTHOR'S METHOD/ STYLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>F. QUESTIONS - IMPLICIT HYPOTHESIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>D. CONFUSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>V. COMPARISON TO OTHER LITERARY TEXTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>L. STRIKING IMPRESSION/ VIEW/ PICTURE/ EVENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>P. CHARACTER/ EVENT - PRESCRIPTION, ADVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>Y. MISCELLANEOUS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I = CONFIRMATION = 0  
M = UNEXPECTEDED FINDING = 0  
S = TEXTUAL CONTENT = 0  
T = TEXTUAL CONCEPTS/IDEAS = 0  
U = VIEWING THE NOVEL'S LITERARY WORLD = 0
APPENDIX L

PREDOMINANT RESPONSES: A WIZARD OF EARTHSEA

22.1%  A. PERSONAL RESPONSE/ ENGAGEMENT
11.9%  N. CHARACTER/ EVENT - ANALYSIS
 9.6%  J. TENTATIVE FRAMEWORKING/ "SENSE MAKING"
 8.9%  B. NARRATION/ RETELLING
 8.3%  E. QUESTIONS - SIMPLE, DIRECT
 5.3%  O. CHARACTER/ EVENT - JUDGMENT, EVALUATION
 4.3%  G. REFLECTION
 3.8%  R. TEXTUAL STRUCTURE
 3.2%  F. QUESTIONS - IMPLICIT HYPOTHESIS
 3.1%  H. PREDICTION
 3.0%  X. AUTHOR'S METHOD, STYLE
 2.9%  K. INSIGHT/ UNDERSTANDING
 2.2%  C. KNOWLEDGE GAPS
 2.2%  Q. TEXTUAL LANGUAGE
 1.9%  W. PROJECTION/ APPLICATION TO OUTSIDE WORLD
 1.5%  I. CONFIRMATION
 1.2%  D. CONFUSION
 1.1%  T. TEXTUAL CONCEPTS/IDEAS/THMES
 1.0%  V. COMPARISON TO OTHER LITERARY TEXTS
APPENDIX M

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS: READING RESPONSE LOG NAME: ____________

1. When writing in your reading response log, how did you go about deciding what to write? Just write? Think and write? Check the sheet?

2. How do you feel about writing out your thoughts in the log?

3. What effect did the writing have on your "response"?

4. Did you record all your thoughts? Why? Why not?

5. Did you go back and read your log before you wrote? At any time during the reading of the novel?
6. If you didn't have to finish a book, how would you decide to stop or continue reading it? What are some of the criteria of a GOOD book? A BAD book?

7. Which of the three books did you enjoy most? Least? Why?

8. In I Am the Cheese you asked lots of questions (25) compared to 1 in Sandwich and 3 in Wizard. Why do you think that happened?

9. Often in your writing you just "retell" bits of the story. Is there a reason for that?

10. Do you have a certain set way of reading a novel? An approach that you use? Could you describe it?
11. If you think about the three texts you read, do you think you "read" or approached them all in the same way? Why or why not?

12. How would you decide when you picked up a book on the kind of reading you could expect from it? What kinds of things do you look for?

13. How would you describe yourself as a reader?

14. How does the writing in the reading log compare to other writing that you do in school?

15. Which one of the response logs proved most useful to you in the reading. Why?
16. In *Wizard* you make no bones about "fantasy" literature, yet as the log progresses, you are lured into the story. You make lots of comments about the language, for instance, and the concepts or ideas. Can you explain that?

17. What stands out in your mind about *Sandwich*? You reacted _______________ right from the start? Can you explain how the response log affected your reading here?

18. You've just re-read all your journals. How do you respond to your response? If you had to write an essay on one of the books, which would you choose? Would the writing help?

GRANT: In *I Am the Cheese* you made very few personal response statements. In the other two novels you made a significant number. Why do you think that happened?

ANNETTE: (1) as Grant (same question)
ANNETTE: The judgment and evaluation of characters was insignificant in Cheese, important in the other two. Why?

TRACEY: The least tentative frameworking, the greatest character analysis in Hero. Why?

Why relate you response by re-telling? Why in one, much less in others?

Very personal involvement in Wizard. Why is that?

MARLEEN: Very personally involved in the reading. Explain why that happens as you read. Does it happen in history texts? Why/why not?
Personal response and analysis of characters and events important in all 3. Is there a connection between the two?

GORDON: You asked far more questions in Wizard than any other reader (.45) Can you explain that?

Of the 3 novels, which one do you think you analyzed characters most? Why?

Retelling became an important dimension of Hero. Explain.

JESSICA: Very high personal response in Hero and Wizard. Why not Cheese?
Reacted strongly to LeGuin's fantasy. Why is that? You deliberately state your feelings openly. Yet, you do become intrigued. What happened there?

Can you tell me if you respond similarly to all books. Do you use the same approach? Why? How?
APPENDIX N

READING RESPONSE LOG       I AM THE CHEESE       MARLEEN

pp. 11-21

1. I don't understand why the boy is leaving & where from?
2. I think the tapes were of Adam talking to a phyciatrist about his life.
3. What were the pills that he threw away?
4. I noticed that this boy is quite weird.
5. I wonder what the package to his father is?

pp. 22-32

6. What year is the story written in?
7. Because the gas station-man said that "there were a lot of assasinations in those days" but there really isn't.
8. I wonder is Adam's last name is really "Farmer" as it says in the song?
9. This guy is afraid of all animals.
10. (STUPID)

pp. 33-38

11. What is the special medicine that he has to take?
12. I think Adam's father is in a mental hospital.
13. But what about his mom?

pp. 39-48

14. I noticed that Adam is confused about the doctor.
15. A mental hospital?
16. Does he have two dads?
17. In the beginning, I predict that Adam & his father were running away from someone they knew or the police.
18. Why didn't they tell the mom about the dog attack?

pp. 49-65

19. I'm starting to like the book better now because it's starting to sound like a book.
20. Amy Hertz sounds like a pretty nice girl.
21. But she acts strange also.
22. Someday, I'd like to fill shopping carts & leave like they did.

pp. 66-76

23. The story's coming together in pieces now.
24. Why is he so calm about all of this?
25. Two documents, quickly moving in the middle of the night, secretive parents etc. would make anyone suspicious.
26. But Adam always disagrees with it.
27. That doctor sure is pushy.
28. He doesn't sound like a normal doctor.

pp. 77-90

29. The story is coming together, slowly and slowly.
30. As Adam finds clues, you then find the clues as the story is pieced together.
31. Maybe, that's what the author wants to happen?
32. Adam is finally making some moves.
33. I was getting so impatient with him b/c he kept denying everything.
34. I wonder what the parents would do if they knew what Adam knew?

pp. 91-101

35. the tape on these pgs. was very confusing.
36. Was it just coincidental that Adam had been waiting all day to speak to Amy & when he finally can, he gets the wrong number?
37. The shots & pills - what do they do to Adam?
38. Do they make him relaxed?

pp. 102-115

39. Those three boys are pretty low to do something like that - running Adam off the road.
40. I feel sorry for him b/c all he's doing is bringing
41. Why does Adam always sing that stupid song?

pp. 116-127

42. I can tell something's going to happen!
43. I think Adam sings that 'Farmer in the Dell' b/c his last name is Farmer and it reminds him of his family.

pp. 128-144

44. I liked this chapter the best in the book.
45. It explained basically all my questions that I had before.
46. I think Adam was relieved to know.
47. But will this hinder & be a burden to him later on in his life?
48. I really think that this doctor that Adam talks to is a fake!

pp. 145-150

49. I am getting sick of writing in this response journal.
50. I just want to keep on reading.
51. At times you get so involved with the story that you don't want to put it down to write.
52. Anyways, the more I read, the better I understand.
53. But I've got to say that this is a very confusing author.

pp. 151-160

54. This doctor is very pushy!
55. I understand just about everything I've read except for the doctor business.
56. The family was sure restricted in what they could do.
57. I bet the dad wishes he had never come across those records and files.
58. Brint is a jerk.

pp. 161-171

59. This chapter was basically like all the other ones.
60. I think that Adam is becoming suspicious of the doctor.
61. The doctor won't tell Adam anything but Adam has to tell him everything.

pp. 172-191

62. Here Adam just about uncovers who or what the doctor is.
63. It is getting more exciting now.
64. "THE PLOT THICKENS"
65. I hope to find out who the doctor is because it really bothers me.

pp. 192-210

66. Adam must feel really lonely.
67. If I was to do what he does, I think I would prepare more and at least take a friend or something.
68. It must have been disappointing to not find the motel there.
69. I think what happened was strange but maybe Adam has been drugged & unconscious by the doctor in those couple of years.
70. There is something very strange about "Grey."
71. I don't think he is who he says he is!
72. It must have been sad to see his mother die.
73. But what about Adam?
74. Gray killed them.
75. I'm almost positive, that that's the voice he heard!
76. Who's the doctor?

pp. 211-220

77. Adam didn't actually go to see his father because his father wasn't at the hospital.
78. This is totally confusing!
79. Did Adam dream all this?
80. That's the only explanation I can think of b/c it just doesn't otherwise make sense.
81. The last couple of pages are confusing too.
APPENDIX 0

READING RESPONSE LOG A HERO AIN'T NOTHIN' BUT A SANDWICH ANNETTE

pp. 9-15

1. I feel sorry for Benjie, even though he wishes people wouldn't.
2. He says he's not hooked on drugs but because he says that I know he is for sure.
3. I like the way Benjie talks, his slang, mixed up words, but sometimes it can be hard to understand.

pp. 16-33

4. It seems that at one time Benjie was a real good kid, bright, with a loving family.
5. Now he has a "broken" home and has gotten into drugs maybe because his life seems so bad he can't face it.
6. His friend Jimmy-Lee is really the lucky one.
7. He gets good grades, has his family and doesn't care for the high, fuzzy-headed feeling of pot.
8. Benjie's bad life just seems to go more downhill as he gets into drugs.
9. An innocent child lured (pushed) into it.
10. the Grandmother seemed like just an old person who doesn't really hear, see or think.
11. But in this chapter you find out more about her.
12. She can and does think.
13. She is wise in her old age.
14. Too bad people don't listen to her a little more.

pp. 34-50

15. I feel sorry for Bernard Cohen, the white teacher.
16. Maybe it's because I'm white too, but it seems that he just tries to mind his own business, but other teachers still hassle him.
17. I think Nigeria Greene is too strong.
18. His ideas to end black segregation are good but he pushes too hard.
19. He shoves it down his students' throats.
20. I'm wondering who the "hero" is going to be, if there is one, in this story and will he save Benjie before it's too late?
21. I don't thing Bernard Cohen or Nigeria Green will be the hero.
21. Benjie seems to be more mixed up than anyone thought, even me.
23. He "falls asleep" in class even.
24. I think the principal could do a little more for his school/students, at least be more interested in them instead of wishing so badly for retirement.
25. I predict that Butler (step father) will be Benjie's hero.

26. Benjie mentions in this section that "in this world hero's are nothin' but sandwiches."
27. It makes me wonder what he means by it and how it is related to the title.
28. It seems that Butler Craig has given up and moved out, but I think he'll be back.
29. I'm confused about what's happening with Benjie, he stole Butler's suit.
30. I suppose he ran away from home.

31. I found out Benjie still lives at home.
32. The fortune teller that Mrs. Johnson (Craig) took Benjie to was interesting.
33. I wonder if that really works or not, the things this fortune teller does.
34. I kind of doubt it.
35. Benjie's friend, Jimmy-Lee Powell, does seem to have everything going for him, except wanting to leave his family.
36. At least Jimmy Lee knows what he wants and doesn't want.
37. Benjie keeps saying he's not hooked, that just makes one more sure that he is hooked.

38. I wonder why Benjie tried to steal that toaster from Emma Dudley, maybe just to get some attention from Butler.
39. I knew Butler would be the one to save Benjie, but I don't figure that Benjie would try to kill himself.
40. Actually it was a good thing he tried in a way because Butler saved him and knows the pieces of all their lives.
41. (Benjie, Butler, Rose) are coming together.

42. I think Jimmy-Lee's father is a nut, a very crazy person.
43. This last chapter is really the "tear-jerker."
44. Benjie is going to be all right because someone believes in him and he believes in himself.
45. I also understand the title better now.
46. Heroes or celebrities are sandwiches or nothing special.
47. People like Butler, straightforward, hard-working and real life, are the REAL heroes.
APPENDIX P

READING RESPONSE JOURNAL  A WIZARD OF EARTHSEA  TRACEY

Section 1 - "Warriors in the Mist"

1. The book seems very interesting.
2. Ged is only a child when he discovers his power, which must have been hard for others in the town to believe.
3. He could have been afraid of this power but seems to be excited.
4. I like the way the author says that she/he? is going to tell about the time before all the songs, poems, stories, etc.
5. I think that sometime Ged will return to the town now that he's been taken away by his teacher of wizardry.

Section II - The Shadow

6. I think that Ged gets frustrated with Ogion because he doesn't learn anything right away.
7. This girl seems dangerous.
8. maybe she is some type of witch or something.
9. yes, she is a witch or almost a witch.
10. Her mother is.
11. When he has to go on the ship, I think he is going to miss Ogion, even though he seems excited to further his knowledge.
12. He is on the ship for such a long time.
13. I expected about two weeks or so, and he's on it for a couple of years.

Section III - "School for Wizards"

15. I wonder why he couldn't pass through the door to the school on the first try.
16. I noticed that when he gets through, he understands the language of the bird and water.
17. Now he meets someone his own age.
18. Good for him.
19. He must be nervous because he doesn't know anyone but Jasper.
20. I think the older men that sat in pairs must be teachers or wizards for the boys to learn from.
21. I wonder if there's a girl there!
22. What does this fat guy mean about the food actually sticking to your ribs, and it not being an illusion?
23. How come they're not allowed in "Imanent Grove?"
24. Why can't Ged do these things like make water from nothing, or bees from dirt?
25. Yes, those men with the grey cloaks are teachers, sort of.
26. This old language bit is confusing about foam, seafoam, inner sea, etc.
27. Extremely confusing, p. 60-61
28. I hope Ged gets back at this Jasper guy.
29. I don't like him.

SECTION IV

30. I still don't like Jasper.
31. & I feel sorry for Ged because his friend is studying with Jasper in that meadow and he's not allowed in there.
32. Finally, he's progressed to be regarded as above the other boys.
33. I predict something will happen bad because it says "This he did without knowledge of the archmage, and unwisely, yet he meant no harm."
34. Now he's done it.
35. He just made a black thing appear and attack him just to prove something to this Jasper character.
36. Now he's extremely sick.
37. I hope he's satisfied.
38. "This is scary!"
39. He's finally getting better now but now I find out that he can't leave Roke because that shadow is out in the light and it'll be looking for him.
40. It's nice that Vetch told him his real name.
41. I think that, that is a big positive thing to happen to Ged.
42. The only way Ged can get rid of the shadow beast is to do it himself.
43. He seems afraid but not enough to quit.
44. I don't know how he's gonna guess the mage's name (Master Doorkeeper).
45. He doesn't guess his name.
46. He gives up and the mage tells him, but now he's going out to the world and isn't that shadow beast going to possess him?
47. I'd never read this book in the dark!

SECTION IV - "THE DRAGON OF PENDOR"

48. These people on Roke actually believe in dragons.
49. I guess they really exist in the story.
50. I got the impression they didn't.
51. I really wonder about his shadow - is it coming after him or what?
52. Here comes the beast.
53. It's reaching out.
54. This reminds me of nightmare's I've had sitting up all nite.
55. He's going to Pendor, where all the dragons are!
56. What stupidity!
57. These wizards seem indestructible.
58. They have a spell for everything.
59. He destroys 5 dragons by looking at them.
60. He must be brave.
61. I couldn't handle any.
62. This huge one "jokes" around with Ged and pretends to be his
friend.
63. This language bit and the dragon (large) being able to lie is scary.
64. I'm also glad that "G" made this dragon swear and keep his oath.

SECTION VI - "HUNTED"

65. I've not started the chapter yet but I predict that he'll be hunted and conquer this beast he's let loose.
66. This shadow has a grudge.
67. It won't even let him sail in a boat.
68. It sounds mighty scary.
69. Now he probably HAS to fight his shadow.
70. I think that he will defeat it with knowledge and not sorcery.
71. It says, "It (the waiting) was past bearing" for him and also for me!
72. [MENTAL NOTE - don't read this book at nite, it's scary!]
73. I think that this guy "dressed in grey who carried a staff THAT WAS NOT A WIZARD'S STAFF."
74. I think he's just met his shadow.
75. Oh, great!
76. As I said before, this book keeps you on edge for four chapters.
77. I bet the shadow thing is a lie.
78. This guy in grey is driving me nuts.
79. Ew, gross the guy's face shifted.
80. HE HAS FINALLY MET THIS SHADOW!
81. I knew it.
82. It was this guy in the grey!
83. Ha.
84. He beat that thing.
85. Every time I read about it, I hate it more.
86. He lost his little pet.
87. I hate that beast for making him lose his little otak.
88. I don't trust this rock or this tower or this lady.
89. I wonder if he lost his power.
90. He seems very weak.
91. I HATE this lady.
92. that STUPID SHADOW killed his pet.
93. I HATE it.
94. I'm glad that he went back to his island.
95. This Ogion guy gives him the facts, true facts and he goes for it.
96. He's gonna see the thing.
97. He'll be the challenger now.
98. (Good)

SECTION VIII

99. I don't think in this book he will ever get this shadow.
100. I'm bored waiting.
101. Good nite.
102. I wonder why these 2 people live alone on this island?
103. I don't think L.G. (author) would do that for no reason.
104. That ring has something to do with his shadow.
105. It's running from his now.
106. I hope he kills it.
107. The island seems scary.
108. I'm glad he turned or
109. oh no the shadow is there.
110. I hope he kills it.
111. He didn't realize that a shadow like smoke, cannot be grasped.
112. But how would it mutilate him if it was only a shadow?
113. The chicken never evkr got rid of the thing.
114. He should call it up and speak to it.
115. Maybe ask it what its problem is?

SECTION IX - "IFFISH"

116. I'm glad he met his friend again.
117. I think I said somewhere he would.
118. It's great that he's met his friend.
119. Maybe this will keep that thing away now because he's happy.
120. He won't have dread in his heart so he won't be afraid.
121. I'm glad that Vetch is going with Ged to get rid of the shadow.
122. The last 7-8 pages have not been very exciting.
123. But now they are seeing an illusion of land or something.
124. Now I wish the author would make him get rid of his shadow.
125. I understand the descending order now

1. Jasper  
2. Dechuarry 
3. Skiorh 
   & the shadow
126. I wonder if they are the same person? thing?
127. He did it.
128. I'm now done this book.
129. Observation: The shadow was Ged's own death which he would fill in when he died.
130. & he (the shadow) was called up early and was therefore angry so it wanted to fill Ged's body and kill his true soul.
APPENDIX Q

I AM THE CHEESE (CORMIER) GRADE 9 UNIT QUESTIONNAIRE M. KOOY

Please look at the following questions and answer them CAREFULLY and as FULLY as you can. It will help me in not only examining what we have done with I Am the Cheese, but will also help me make improvements where necessary. Thank you for your help.

1. What is your general, OVERALL impression of (a) the book (b) discussions (c) activities

2. Did you appreciate this way of teaching a novel? This approach? EXPLAIN.

3. What was your first impression of I Am the Cheese? That is, how did you like the book when you first started reading it?

4. Explain how you respond to the book now. How do you feel about it?

5. We used the "Response Journal" as an activity WHILE you were reading the book. EXPLAIN the "Response Journal" from your point of view.

(a) How did you go about responding? What did you DO as you made an entry into the journal?

(b) How did it help/not help your reading?

(c) What function did the journal serve for you in reading the book?

(d) Did the journal help/not help your learning about the book?
(e) Did you ever go back and read what you had written earlier?  
Why?  Why not?

(f) Would the journal be a good way to read all books for English classes?  Why?  Why not?

(g) Did you learn/not learn from the journal?  Explain.

6. What did you learn about reading LITERATURE through this unit?

7. Did our approach differ from other ways of reading a classroom novel?  Explain carefully.

8. Were our classroom discussions helpful to your understanding?  How?  Why?

9. Did the film version of the book extend your understanding?  Was it helpful?  Would you recommend it for the next time this book is taught?

10. What was your favourite part in the I Am the Cheese unit?

11. What was your LEAST favourite part.  What should we have done instead?

12. Did the classroom work prepare you for the exam?  Explain.


14. Do you have any other suggestions, comments or helpful hints for this unit?
APPENDIX R

RESPONSE COMPARISONS: AVERAGE TO INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Total responses</th>
<th>I Am the Cheese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All students 1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. 16.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. 15.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. 11.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. 10.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 8.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. 7.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 6.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<p>| A Hero Ain't Nothin' But a Sandwich |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All students 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. 20.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 17.8</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 12.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. 9.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. 7.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| A Wizard of Earthsea |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All students 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. 22.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. 11.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. 9.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 8.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. 8.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX S

#### RESEARCH QUESTION ONE: RESPONSE PATTERNS

**PURVES AND RIPPERE CATEGORIES: OVERVIEW OF RESPONSE**

- 100 - engagement-involvement
- 200 - Perception
- 300 - Interpretation
- 400 - Evaluation
- 500 - Miscellaneous

#### RESPONSES TO I AM THE CHEESE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annette</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marleen</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total   |           | 540 | 75  | 313 | 120 | 12  |
| Percentages | 13.8% | 58% | 22.2% | 2.2% | 3.5% |

#### RESPONSES TO A HERO AIN'T NOTHIN' BUT A SANDWICH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marleen</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total   |           | 525 | 129 | 205 | 163 | 26  |
| Percentages | 24.5% | 39% | 31% | 5%  | .4% |
RESPONSE TO A WIZARD OF EARTHSEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marleen</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>576</th>
<th>216</th>
<th>222</th>
<th>110</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>