The Literary Transaction In The Undergraduate Classroom: An Interdisciplinary Approach To Reader-Response

Michael Szeszol
Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Bryan Kopp, English

ABSTRACT:
The reading process, as understood within Reader-Response criticism, orchestrates the construction of an incredibly complex product: a 'Response.' This response is a metaphysical thought-entity produced by mental activity of the reader as they engage a text. In studying the process of reading poetry, this activity naturally becomes interdisciplinary; informed by schools throughout the English and Psychology disciplines. This line of research develops a methodology for the activity of 'reading poetry in the undergraduate classroom', which is informed by Reader-Response Theory; Projective testing (psychoanalysis); cognitive psychology; and other established knowledges, in order to actively craft a process of encountering poetics that produces an uninhibited product: a fulfilled response.

INTRODUCTION:

The Literary Transaction

The 'literary transaction' is a conceptual view of the reading process that suggests there is an exchange happening through the relationality of its components. As Louise M. Rosenblatt explains:

> Reading is a transaction, a two-way process, involving a reader and a text at a particular time under particular circumstances… the words in their particular pattern stir up elements of memory, activate areas of consciousness. The reader, bringing past experience of language and the world to the task, sets up tentative notions of a subject, of some framework into which to fit ideas as the words unfurl (1982, p. 268).

It is this transaction between text and reader that produces a product – a response – and this will be the central piece of inquiry through this manuscript.

With the aim of developing a methodology that fulfills more of the potential held within this 'response', this line of research experimentally constructs a reading activity for poetry that is informed by interdisciplinary knowledges. Each of the proceeding schools of thought present an image of the reading process event (or pertinent aspect) that allows for the further crafting of a reading activity.

Reader-response Theory:

Reader-Response criticism is a contemporary school of thought within the humanities (English) directed at the theoretical image of the process of reading. The focus of its critique is to reconstruct the conceptual image of the reading process, shifting the discussion almost explicitly to the behaviors of the Reader. This is in sharp contrast to the previous lens by which the process was viewed; previously, in 'formalism' or 'new criticism', the reader's significance in 'recreating the texts meaning' was **negated.**

Arguably instituted by theorist Louise M. Rosenblatt, reader-response theory develops an image of the reading process located within and coming from the reader. Through this analytical lens, the meaning of the text is created through the reader's interaction with it. The physical text is a dormant, silent piece (crafted and important, certainly - but not active) and when an individual reads the text they bring it to life through their response. Through the process of reading the text, the reader's mind explodes with freshly activated and newly constituted thoughts. These thoughts, this mental activity, is the newly created meaning of the text. (i.e. the 'reader' and their 'response' to encountering a text).

Important to the creation of an activity of encountering poetry is Rosenblatt's delineation of the 'reader's stance' within the reading process. The mental stance of a reader determines the response they will produce. Taking an *efferent stance*, the reader takes in physical text for its direct context of the presented words: "attention focuses on accumulating what is to be carried away at the end of the reading" (p. 270). Contrastingly, in *aesthetic reading*:

> We respond to the very story or poem that we are evoking during the transaction with the text. In order to shape the work, we draw on our reservoir of past experience with people and the world, our past inner linkage of words and things, our past encounters with spoken or written texts. We listen to the sound of the words in the inner ear; we lend our sensations, our emotions, our sense of being alive, to the new experience which, we feel, corresponds to the text. We participate in the story, we identify with the characters, we share their conflicts and their feelings. (Rosenblatt, p. 270)

In the authoritative position of (re)creating the meaning of the text, the reader can either (by their stance) *repaint* the direct image given in the author's words, or, they *reinvigorate* the text with the creation of a completely idiosyncratic meaning.

In relation to an activity, the responsibility becomes instituting the aesthetic stance into the participants. This was accomplished by the multi-modal and multiple introductions to the text that the participants engaged with during my procedures paradigm (see methodology).

Phenomenology of Literature:

In Wolfgang Iser's *The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach* (1972), an early addition to the line of reader-response criticism, the actors in the activity-system of the reading process are explained through Roman Ingarden's concept of *Konkretisation*, or, how a literary text can be 'realized.' Iser provides this description of the process and its components:

> ...the 'literary work' has two poles, which we might call the artistic and the aesthetic: the artistic refers to the test created by the author, and the aesthetic to the realization accomplished by the reader. From this polarity it follows that the literary work cannot be completely identical with the text, or with the realization of the text, but in fact must lie halfway between the two. The work is more than the text, for the text only takes on life when it is realized, and furthermore the realization is by no means independent of the individual disposition of the reader - though this in turn is acted upon by the different patterns of the text. The convergence of text and reader brings the literary work into existence, and this convergence can never be precisely pinpointed, but must always remain virtual, as it is not to be identified either with the reality of the text or with the individual disposition of the reader. (Iser, p. 279)

Within the activity of reading, there are established entities defined by a collection of thought within one point of space. Following the temporal path, the text is a crystallized thought captured from and by an author; an author crafts a particular textual-image as their piece of literature. The reader - prior to introduction to the text - is a completely fluid, active amalgamation of knowledges; the reader is their mind, and their mind is all of their collected knowledges.

These two separate entities (these two collections of knowledge) come into contact. In a temporal space, the literary text is a single point that comes into contact with (enters into) the mind of the reader. (To echo the teachings of Rosenblatt) The moment the reader encounters the literary text, their resulting mental activity becomes a definable entity of its own: their 'response'. Wolfgang Iser calls this entity the *Literary Work* because it is the phenomenon resulting from the mental labor occurring during the reading process. This literary work is the newly constructed 'meaning' of the text.

It is the nature of this 'literary work' that a methodology of reading poetry must be developed around. The conceptual nature and metaphysical shape of this thought-entity are the definition of the reader's response to the literary text. Much further than a focus upon the mental activity instructed upon the participant by procedure, the key is the ability to procedurally construct an output (the physical representation of their fulfilled response). The issues of language and psychology are the natural barriers in this prospect. The limitations of language and its inability to capture mental activity's ephemeral and indistinct form cause any attempt to capture such an entity of 'literary work' inherently futile; a fulfilled, crystallized-image of this entity would be a direct translation of the total activity of the reader's mind into language.

However, this does not negate the attempt. It has been the entire goal of Psychology to create more complete physical images of an individual's mental activity. Turning to the procedures of this discipline and applying them to Reader-Response theory (the reading process) will devise the (meta)physical aspects of the entity *literary work*.

Projective Psychology:

With its origins in the oft-criticized Psychoanalysis, Projective Psychological tests have remained an activity featured within the Clinical Psychology setting if only for its stimulative methodology. These activities arose as a device for personality assessment in Psychoanalysis, a use that became heavily criticized with for its lack of empirical foundation with the fields shift to behavioral psychology.

Projective testing uses the basic dynamic of the presentation of a stimulus (inkblots; imagery; abstract drawings; etc.) which is devoid of context (ambiguous) to an individual in a controlled setting. The Individual is allowed to 'project' their thoughts unto the presented stimuli, uninhibited by outside influences. The thoughts that this individual provides are a temporal, idiosyncratic, crafted meaning for this stimulus; without any direct or concurrent sources of stimulation, the thoughts and statements provided by the individual can be considered a direct projection of the interaction between this new stimulus and their given mind.

The structural dynamic of this activity shows multiple entities at play: the crystalized stimuli; the individual's mind; and the temporally placed creation of new thought collected upon the stimuli.

In its structural dynamics, this activity is identical to the reading process presented above (Iser, 1972; Rosenblatt, 1982): an individual (unprimed) is presented with an inert, ambiguous stimulus and the meaning they craft upon it is recorded (as its own entity). This is the psychological basis of this line of research. The mirrored practices of projective testing and reader-response theory allow for a collective effort towards constructing a methodology.

Rorschach Inkblots:

While the practice will always be criticized for its naturally subjective format, contemporary projective testing has been molded into a quasi-empirical activity through the work to create a codification scheme. Hermann Rorschach created his inkblot stimuli simply by folding paper over spilt ink in order to create completely ambiguous stimuli (Rorschach, 1921). These stimuli became the centerpiece of clinical psychoanalysis in the fields prominence during the 1960's. But, as with all other practices of the school, projective testing was undercut by its qualitative foundation; for its lack of validation due to any assertions formed by the clinician being completely subjective and abstracted from loose, ungrounded responses.

But, because of its continued usefulness as an activity (if not clinically) psychologists have worked to counteract this inherent flaw. Using the Rorschach Inkblots as their stimuli, psychologists Rose, Kaser-Boyd, and Maloney, in their book *Essentials of Rorschach Assessment* (2001), present a methodology for assessment of an individual's response. Using aggregated responses of their participants, they crafted a systematic and schematized assessment strategy for defining and analyzing the responses made to the presentation of a particular inkblot stimuli. Through defining the metaphysical aspects of the participant's response, they are able to make sense of the content of the response.

The 'ethics' of this coding process originates through their foundation of John E. Exner's *The Rorschach: A Comprehensive System* (1993), from which they gather these 'coding rules':

- Overarching goal of the coding process: to understand "how the characteristics of a person merge together in a series of complex interrelationships that breeds a reasonable understanding of the person" (Exner, 1993, p. 85).
- Cardinal rule of coding: "The code or score should represent the cognitive operation at the time the subject gave the answer" (Exner, 1993, p. 85).
- Second rule of coding: "All of the components that appear in the response should appear in the coding" (Exner, 1993, p. 87). Avoid errors of omission.

(quoted in Rose, Kaser-Boyd, & Maloney, 2001, p. 38; Exner, 1993)

In beginning my line of experimentation, I have crafted my analytical activity of reading poetry as informed by the coding process developed by Tara Rose within the cited text. In chapter 3, "How to Code the Rorschach", Rose lays out the structural dynamic for constructing an empirical assessment to a given response. In this assessment strategy, the entire focus is how the response is both physically related to the stimuli as well as how it relates to the previously established spectrum of responses. Rose explains that "there are seven categories for coding each response: (1) Location and Developmental Quality, (2) Determinants, (3) Form Quality, (4) Contents, (5) Popular Responses, (6) Organizational Activity (Z score), and (7) Special scores" (Rose, p. 39). As this assessment strategy is applied to the response within projective testing, it can therefore be accommodated for assessment of the response within the reading process (in reader-response theory).

In each of these categorical discriminations, there is enlightened a specific aspect of the response. Taken in the form of Wolfgang Iser's "Literary Work", the metaphysics of this entity can be understood for how the individual constructs their meanings upon the platform of the text itself. Focusing upon the first category of this assessment - *Location and Developmental Quality* - we find the physical foundation of the literary work. "Location refers to the section or area of the inkblot being used; Location captures how the person approached the inkblot" (Rose, p. 40). This assessment involves taking each unit of the response and locating it upon the physical form of the poem. From this localization you are presented a two-dimensional, superimposed landscape from which the content of the response is located. Within this landscape, coordinates can be devised to assess the relationality of different units. Further, from this relationality (and the temporality of each unit), the aspect of *Developmental Quality* translates into an analysis of the structural thought process of the individual; "Developmental quality refers to the degree of meaningful organization or integration used in the response..." (p. 42). From simply mapping the location of the response (according to its units) the thought process or scheme can be projected, which allows for a firm

understanding of the relationality between the text's components and the response components as they were intended by the participant.

The remaining categories are likewise transferable given their relatively identical construction. Using a logic derived from this conceptualization, developing an activity that presented each of these components in the data response forms that the participants would construct, the methodology took a procedural format that sectionalized the response according to the data it would provide for particular analyses (see figures 2 and 3; see methodology for further explanation).

Cognitive Psychology:

Seeking further informative knowledges from the discipline of Psychology, an understanding of the conceptual and anatomical networking and functioning of the brain can be gathered from the school of Cognitive Psychology.

As we can understand the processing that exists in the relationship of 'sensation and perception,' we can inform the methodology of presenting the literary stimuli for its sensory information and the effect all other stimulation will have in the activity's procedure. In a simplified understanding, any provided stimulation (sensation) to the conceptual mind will produce a source of activity that will spread "predictively" through the neuronal networks devised in the brain. As language (printed text) is, in its essence, a physical stimulus that is captured by visual sensory organs, it excites a specific line of neurons orchestrated to take the sensory information and process it into a perception. In other words, each and every word in the poem is a source of activation, and as spots of activity are aroused, they influence the overall image of activation; the specific, overall pattern of activation defines the shape/form of the perception.

As we understand this relationship between sensation and perception, we further understand that our thoughts are a direct result of these patterns of activation; if neuron A and neuron B are activated, this produces a perception of 'X'; if neuron C is also activated, the perception may completely change to 'Z'. This understanding causes us to extend this logic out to the entire methodology itself. With the knowledge that all sources of stimulation will affect the perceptions produced, the activity's procedural instructions must be crafted for their influence upon the participants. Any phraseology in the instruction will craft the boundaries of mental activity in the participant. This is the science behind cultivating Rosenblatt's *aesthetic reading stance* in the participants.

This knowledge caused me to create strictly-bound, ambiguated verbal instructions for the introduction to the activity. In order to divert from major sources of 'priming' material, the main focus was in crafting an understanding of this activity in the minds of the participant without instituting the concept of "poetic analysis" in their mind. As the framework by which these students have most likely always encountered poetry, the implications of 'analyzing' poetry versus 'reading' poetry (or, further, none of these activities), drastically defines and crafts the ensuing thought process.

Cultivation of the aesthetic stance in participants was accomplished through the extreme ambiguity in instruction as well as the procedurally-induced, repetitive ingratiation to the poem (see methodology for further explanation).

METHODOLOGY:

Participants:

Participants were 31 University of Wisconsin - La Crosse students in an English 200 course: ENG 200: Literature & Sexuality (Literature & the Human Experience). Receiving permission from their professor in order to use class time for this experiment, participants were informed of the dynamics of the experiment and they read through and signed an informed consent form. The student's major area of study was varied as this is a general education course, open for all departments.

Rationale:

As it is informed by the knowledges of the acknowledged fields above, the literary transaction is defined by the construction of a 'response'. The exhibited labor of the reader's mind in creating a structure of meaning upon the stimuli, and the ways this meaning can be influenced, is the central concept by which all of this methodology will be related. As the end-product is the response, it is the responsibility of the activity's procedure to allow the potential of this product to be realized. Letting the reader's mind be the only active figure in the reader-response scenario allows for a natural flow of the minds activity into their physical response to the piece. With any other information from another force - the author, another reader, the presenter - the activity of the reader's mind will be tainted with activity from unaccounted for sources. The historical issue of transferring mental activity into the rigid shape of

language, and then even into physical form, presents such a indominable limitation to the potential shape of this response that all available hurdles should be actively removed.

By constructing an environment where the purity of the reader's thoughts can be maintained through the active establishment of complete ambiguity, then the produced 'literary work' will be allowed to attempt to reach its potential size and strength. (The fully realized potential of this literary work would be a complete transfer of the minds activity into the collected response. This is, again, a fallacy: it is impossible to obtain, but the infinite potential that must be strived towards).

Our methodology of constructing this activity is directly focused upon creating an environment of ambiguity surrounding the tasked performances of these participants in order to allow these reader's minds the most natural transfer of thought onto paper as can be possible. For this rationale, the entire activity was designed around limiting any 'priming' factors outside of the text that they received.

Procedure:

Receiving a copy of Louis MacNiece's *The Sunlight on The Garden*, participants instructions were structured around a very limited format. The first pitfall was the stereotype surrounding the 'activity of poetic analysis' which has become a completely corrosive priming factor for student's performance in this activity; this is a cultural phenomenon surrounding the teaching of poetry in the contemporary educational system (a culturally observed variable). Therefore, I strictly avoided any notion of "analytic" behaviors in the tasks of the participants.

The structure of this activity was loosely based upon a timing model, with each step being given an undetermined amount of time for its completion.

Important to the cultivation of a proper environment, the participants were walked step by step through the following format structure, completely, prior to permitting them to engage with the material. The physical sheets of the activity were separated into three different sheets, so an instruction was given immediately for the participants to strictly not look ahead through the sheets; to keep them stacked in their original order until instruction was given.

The entire structure of this activity was based upon and given through these three major steps:
1. (Read through the Poem and) Highlight what stands out.
2. (Return to what stands out and write) Why did that stand out?
3. Complete the questions on the last sheet.

(Each of these steps was given appropriate time based upon a visual and verbal query of the activity of the participants; once it was seen that the majority of participants had ceased writing, an assessment of readiness to move on was made).

After participants were properly acquainted with this overall procedure, and after they were given the opportunity to consent to the activity, the first physical step of the activity was to have the participants listen to an audio recording of the poem being read aloud. This was presented in order to provide proper introduction to this specific piece. In any proper analytical process, it is proper to establish some level of intimacy with the text prior to attempting assessments of 'meaning' or 'abstractions', this is accomplished by strictly listening to the piece (usually accomplished by reading through the piece without taking any notes). The use of playing the audio recording allows for these 'amateur' poetic analyzers to resist the natural academic anxiety to take notes immediately, before establishing any level of intimacy.

After hearing the audio recording, participants were instructed to grab only their provided highlighter, to remove the consent form off the top of the pile, and to "Simply read through the text and Highlight what stands out." They were made aware of an allotted time of roughly 5-10 minutes to accomplish this task.

After participants were all allowed to complete this task, they were asked to grab a pen and return back to the poem in order to create annotations; they were asked to, "Go back through the text and comment on why these things stood out." Again, the participants were given a rough estimate of a time frame, making them aware of the temporal field.

As students were completing this task, instruction was given to continue working straight into the questions on the final page of the activity sheets. This final section served as the only post-hoc assessment of first their experience with this particular poem and then their experience with this particular activity. The final sheet simply included space to answer the following questions:
1. What are your thoughts and feelings on this poem as a whole?
2. How was the way you read this poem like or unlike how you would generally read a poem?
3. (simple demographics section) What is your major/minor?

Participants worked on these sections for the remaining allotted time frame. As they completed their work, an instruction was given to hand in their worksheets into three separate piles (in order to establish anonymity). An example of one participant response sheet can be seen in Appendix: figure 2.

STRUCTURE OF RESPONSE SHEETS: (STRUCTURE OF RESULTS)

Through the established procedure, participants response sheets have created three main sections of response. As seen in the figure provided (Figure 3), the responses can be divided into the main sections: 1) Highlights, 2) Annotations, and 3) summarizing statements.

Each of these sections is devised to collect a different portion of the 'literary work' that each of the participants is developing. The construction, isolation, and inclusion of each section is derived from Rose, Kaser-Boyd, and Maloney (2001)**.** Effectively, each of the sections is a different modal or opportunity for the participants to assess the activity and image of the thoughts created through interaction with this poem.

The Highlights – i.e. "What stands out" – is a rudimentary image of how each of the participants localized their thoughts upon the poem. The thoughts of a participant will naturally be structured from a particular locus within the presented stimuli; whether that be a particular word, a particular section, or the poem in its whole. These highlights provide a Physical imagery of how meaning is constructed off of the original platform of the textual piece; like flags that signify locations of provoked/allocated thoughts, distinguishing the portions of the poem that initiated, represented, or summarized the elicited thoughts of the reader is the first layer of the 'literary work's' presentation; it provides form and physical structure.

The next section is the Annotations made by the participants. This section, separate from the highlighting activity, is the most prominent behavior in devising and transferring the thoughts of the participant onto the page; of painting the nuances and idiosyncrasies of the personal literary work. Through the prompt, "Comment [on what stood out]," participants were given the opportunity to provide their rationale for their previous behaviors; i.e. "Why did you think that this stood out? Why was this important to you?" The structural method of initiating this behavior, provided the opportunity to gather analytical behaviors from the participants outside of the primed, stereotypical mentality of the word 'Analysis'. This means that there were no structural restrictions to the thoughts and activity of the participants; they were not prescribed to exhibit any particular behaviors in their response strategies. Therefore, this section of responses allowed for an uninhibited construction of their personally envisioned 'Literary Work'.

These first two sections were purposefully separated through the procedure. First, the separation of these steps provided yet another level of intimacy to be created between the reader and the text; by this time they have heard the poem aloud and read through the poem at least once without the opportunity to provide their thoughts. Intimacy with the text provides more levels of activation within the conceptually neural mind's network. More importantly, having established the highlights separately, this now breaks down the poem from one total (daunting) stimulus, into smaller, personalized, bite-sized stimuli that the participant can further digest for its specific meanings. Through identifying the independent, personalized, structures of the overall image provided by the poem allows for an establishment of a spatial, physical landscape in order to directionally conceptualize the relationality of their thoughts; i.e. now they can better understand a particular identified section for its relationship with other identified pieces (even if only unconsciously).

The last section - the final two questions on the final sheet - provided yet another layer of the literary works construction. The first question, "*What are your thoughts and feelings on this poem as a whole?*" allowed a space for participants to summarize their thoughts. Rather than spelling out the individual details of their imaginary of the literary work, this question provided a space for them to take a step away from the work of annotations, and to properly assess the image of their thoughts as a whole. Again, this particular behavior was separated from previous steps through the established procedure in order to fully realize its particular function. Having highlighted their acknowledged details of this grand image, and having thought through each of these individually, the participant is left with many sections of localized thought with clear and distinct boundaries. The separation of a summarization - a melding of all these particularities - allows for a full image to be realized.

The second question, *"How was the way you read this poem like or unlike how you would generally read a poem?"* provided an opportunity to step out past the analytical processes of this activity and reflective assess their performance in its literal sense. This simple question provokes a metacognitive assessment of what exactly they have done to construct their responses; it is a reflective step outside and past their analytically framed behaviors.

RESULTS:

In order to begin the process of properly assessing the collected data, a foundation must be established. Stemming from the codification scheme presented by Rose, Kaser-Boyd, and Maloney (2001), the initial assessment constructs the first aspect of the metaphysical form of the 'response': *location.*

(The data amassed from this experiment surpassed the resources and made most assessments unviable. Therefore, an introductory assessment was performed. Extensive lines of assessment can be performed past the following, and many those can be found under the Further Extensions subheading.)

Frequency of Highlights:(see Figure 1)

This analysis was a measure of the frequency of which each word within the poem was highlighted by the aggregate participant data. By creating a tally mark score for each particular word, this constructs the physical image (in aggregate) of how the collective envisioned the metaphysical poem. As the highlights were devised by a question of personal salience, the aggregation of these data points provides a physical framework from which this group has imagined the poem. This is the physical skeleton of the collective literary work developed by the collection of participants in this session, through this procedure.

Word	Freq	Word	Freq	Word	Freq	Word	Freq
The	5	our	8	the	2	and	4
Sunlight	8	freedom	8	sky	2	not	5
on	7	as	7	was	3	expecting	5
the	7	free	7	good	2	pardon	6
garden	8	lances	9	for	2	hardened	3
hardens	13	advances	12	flying	3	in	2
and	12	towards	11	defying	6	heart	3
grows	12	its	11	the	5	anew	2
cold	12	end	12	church	5	but	15
we	14	the	1	bells	5	glad	16
cannot	14	earth	1	and	2	to	16
cage	14	compels	2	every	2	have	16
the	14	upon	3	evil	3	sat	16
minute	15	it	3	iron	3	under	17
within	5	sonnets	1	siren	3	thunder	17
its	5	and	0	and	2	and	16
nets	4	birds	0	what	2	rain	16
of	4	descend	1	it	2	with	16
gold	4	and	9	tells	2	you	16
when	1	soon	10	the	3	and	8
all	1	my	9	earth	4	grateful	10
is	1	friend	9	compels	4	too	8
told	1	we	20	we	23	for	10
we	10	shall	20	are	24	sunlight	13
cannot	12	have	20	dying	24	on	13
beg	12	no	21	egypt	18	the	12
for	10	time	21	dying	21	garden	13
pardon	11	for	21				
		dances	22				

Figure 1. Frequency tally of Highlights; separated by stanza. (Frequency is the mark of how many times, in aggregate, a word was highlighted).

DISCUSSION:

Further Extensions:

As was enlightened in Rose, Kaser-Boyd, and Maloney, in their book, "Essentials of Rorschach Assessment" (2001), the analysis given in this document is only scratching the surface of the collected data. The only given analysis of the metaphysical form of the 'response' is to construct its foundation. Through extensive analysis, the entire shape, form, and function of the response is possible. A further extension of this research will be to properly construct and analyze the form that the reading process of these participants has taken. Once it is exemplified how to properly make assertions upon this form (the collected response) an even further extension will be to actually assess the subjective stylings, quality, and function of the response itself; to delve into the participants actual provided content for its abstracted, constructed image of meaning.

For example, in order to fill out the physical shape of the constructed response, an analysis of *annotation depth* can be done whereas a tally of the annotative units presented is multiplied by a subjective assessment of 'depth' in

the annotations. This would provide a spectrum of physical size of annotations, which gives a point of analysis to reflect upon regarding further, subjective analyses.

Limitations:

    The major limitations of this research lay in the traditional conundrums of the English and Psychology disciplines. Inherent within each of these fields is the indefinite nature of the 'reading process.' The nature incalculability of mental activity derides any true empiricism to be established; it's the classic 'problem of other minds'. With its inherent ephemeral and infinite form, capturing features of an individual's thoughts – of consciousness – is a futile endeavor. With respect, however, great things are done with our available knowledges and theoretical conceptualizations in disregard to this fundamental flaw.

    Further, the scope of available resources does not support the posited methodology. The extreme depth of analysis that is available within the produced data calls for an entire team of analysts to respect the data properly.

    A further limitation is the lack of replication. As resources were limited, the ability to collect multiple sessions of this data was not viable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

REFERENCES:

Exner, J. E. Jr. *The Rorschach: A comprehensive system, Vol. 1, 3rd ed*. Oxford, England: John Wiley & Sons, 1993. Wiley series in personality processes.

Ingarden, Roman (1968). *Vom Erkennen des Literarischen Kunstwerks.* Tubingen: Niemeyer.

Iser, W. (1972). The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach. *New Literary History: A Journal Of Theory And Interpretation, 3(2), 279-299.*

MacNeice, Louis. "The Sunlight on the Garden." *The Earth Compels*, Faber and Faber, 1938.

Rorschach, Hermann. *Psychodiagnostics: A Diagnostic Test Based on Perception, 5th ed. Rev*. Grune and Stratton, 1921.

Rose T, Kaser-Boyd N, Maloney M. *Essentials of Rorschach Assessment*. Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons Inc; 2001

Rosenblatt L. M. (1982). The Literary Transaction: Evocation and Response. *Theory Into Practice, 21(4), 268-277.*

APPENDIX

Figure 2: Example of Participant Response sheets; Participant 17 Response sheets.

17

The sunlight on the garden

Hardens and grows cold,

We cannot cage the minute   This stood out to me because it's like trying to

Within its nets of gold,   capture the day by inventing time. It's like, to me,
                             saying even though we try to define sunlight and
When all is told   limit it, you can't.

We cannot beg for pardon.

Our freedom as free lances

Advances towards its end;

The earth compels, upon it

Sonnets and birds descend;

And soon, my friend,

We shall have no time for dances.   This stood out to me because it was as if
     an omen saying things will end / become bad and we won't be
The sky was good for flying   doing things that are fun - like dancing.

Defying the church bells

And every evil iron

Siren and what it tells;

The earth compels,

We are dying, Egypt, dying   This stood out because it reminded me of the
     other line above I had highlighted. It makes me think about global
And not expecting pardon,   warming and how we are killing our Earth.

Hardened in heart anew,

But glad to have sat under

Thunder and rain with you,   This seems as if we have given up and
                             accept the fact that the Earth - or parts of it -
And grateful too   are going to be gone, but we cherish the
For sunlight on the garden.   moments that we had and we are thankful
                             for those times.

Figure 2: continued.

17

What are your thoughts and feelings on this poem as a whole?

I feel like this poem is very sad. It makes me think of global warming and how we are killing the Earth. It also makes me think about how we treat the Earth and the kinds of inventions we have. In the begining, I was thinking about how we created time based on light and everyone just accepted that. When you really think about it, we have no idea why time is the way it is and no one really questioned it.

The last part of the poem made me sad because it reminds me of global warming and the end seems like we are just accepting that the Earth is dying, instead of trying to stop it. We also just say we are thankful for what time we did have, even though we could have prevented it.

How was the way you read this poem like or unlike how you would generally read a poem?

I think whenever I read poems I really try to think about whats being said. I like to focus all of my attention on it and mark what parts stand out to me, but I never listen to a recording of it or someone else reading it. I always just read it to myself – normally in my head, – and I enjoy being able to hear the poem because I feel like it gives the poem a different feel based on how it's read. I also like being able to listen to it because it allows me to just focus on the words instead of what/how to read it.

What is your major/minor?

Statistics with a concentration in Actual Science w/ Business Minor.

☒ I give my permission to use portions of my work for publication and presentation purposes (no participant will be identified by name).

☐ I DO NOT give my permission to use portions of my work for publication and presentation purposes.

Figure 3: Sections of Response Data; Participant 25 data response sheet.