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ABSTRACT

A STUDY TO DETERMINE WHETHER ORAL DELIVERY STYLE, IN PRESENTING POETRY TO STUDENTS, SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECTS THE LEVEL OF RESPONSIVENESS TO THE POETRY

William H. Goff II
Old Dominion University, 1994
Director: Dr. Mark Fravel, Jr.

Concerns about the lack of intrinsic motivation among students has been associated with behaviorism's emphasis on extrinsic rewards and with a general societal trend toward materialism. Teachers frequently comment that many students seem to have little interest in learning. This research examined one factor in student motivation, lesson delivery style.

Four 7th grade classes, two different classes from two different schools, were used, resulting in 69 subjects. Poetry was read to classes with either an aesthetic or a bland delivery style. The behavioral response of the students was noted as to whether or not they were indicative of physiological arousal. The students' written responses were rated in the domains of composition and style and the subdomains of vividness of language, voice and tone using the Virginia Literacy Passport Test (LPT) scoring procedures.

Background information obtained included student sixth grade scores on the Composition and Style Domains of the LPT Writing test, scores on the Bett’s Questionnaire of Mental Imagery (QMI), scores on the Affective Orientation (AO) Scale,
gender, and school of attendance. The data was analyzed using factor analysis, canonical correlation and multiple regressions.

Relationships were found between AO and performance on the subdomains, which may have been modified by lesson delivery style. QMI was found to be related to performance on the composition and style domains. Lesson delivery style was related to the behavioral response of students and both were related to only one writing postmeasure, a negative relationship to vividness of language.
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

There has been a growing interest in helping students to develop a passion for reading. To be sure, this is not a new notion. It was in 1938 that Louise Rosenblatt first discussed the difference between aesthetic reading (living through the experience presented in the literature) and efferent reading (reading the material analytically). In a 1966 paper, Benjamin Bloom stated:

Ideally the child should get his rewards from the task itself or from improving his own performance. Competition among children should not be a primary motivational force if learning is to become a major drive in its own right. (p.109)

Bloom (1966) differentiated two styles of learning. He described procedural learning as involvement in following classroom procedures, i.e., learning to get a grade. Substantive learning he described as learning because of genuine interest in the subject matter and a desire to solve a problem.

Development of intrinsic motivation appears to be gaining renewed attention. Kohn (1991) and Curwing and Mendler (1988) argued that the model of behaviorism has had
serious negative consequences on students. Kohn admitted
that extrinsic rewards do motivate students, but these
rewards only motivate students to get more rewards. Kohn
stated that rewards give children "no reason to continue
acting in the desired way when there is no longer any goody
to be gained" (p. 500).

The 1989 version of the Silver, Burdett and Ginn
Reading Series, which is used in several cities in the
Hampton Roads area, is described by its editors as
literature based. It does include basic skills such as
phonics, but clearly describes phonics as a means to an end.
Throughout the edition there are references to using reading
and writing instruction to help students become active,
strategic learners. The main emphasis is on involving
students with great literature. In the teacher's edition
for the series the editors argue that, to be considered
literature, the stories must capture the reader's heart and
lead the reader to develop a life-long love of reading.

One of the tactics frequently mentioned to help
students become active learners is oral reading of stories
and poems by the teacher. Many recommended lessons in the
Silver, Burdett and Ginn Reading Series involve the teacher
reading a passage aloud. In their presentations of
material, teachers can, themselves, model either an
aesthetic or an efferent approach to the literature.
English teachers vary widely in the degree of dramatic interpretation they provide when reading poems and other passages aloud to students. Some teachers are quite dramatic, reading with distinctive pacing, appropriate gesticulation, voice modulation, and emotional conviction. These teachers model the aesthetic stance to literature described by Rosenblatt (1938). Rosenblatt described the experience of someone reading material as if he or she were living through the experience. These teachers read literature aloud to a class as if they are living through the experience, as if they are the characters speaking.

An example of this stance is often demonstrated on Selected Shorts, a radio program for which various authors and celebrities read short stories. The host of the program, Isaiah Sheffel, sometimes reads stories himself. However, he describes his presentation as his incarnation of the story (program presented on September 2, 1993 on the American Public Radio Network).

At the other extreme, teachers can be seen sitting behind a desk delivering passages with flat affect, little voice modulation, and no gesticulation. Their presentations are a clear reflection of the efferent stance described by Rosenblatt. The literature does not come alive, it is there only to be analyzed.
It is possible that the two styles of delivery can have distinctively different types of impacts on student learning and on how students cognitively mediate the information in the poems.

Most of the commentaries on different approaches to learning appear to be based on opinions, reflections by successful learners on their own enjoyment of the learning process. Still, there has been some research which relates to the differences in processing of information between the two learning stances. Investigations related to this issue have come from the areas of educational research, research on folklore and storytelling, communication research, and cognitive psychology.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine whether oral delivery style, in presenting poetry to students, significantly affected the level of responsiveness to the poetry. Further, did such a difference in presentations affect the written compositions which were generated immediately after the presentations. Poetry is one of the most encapsulated and concise forms of literary expression. As such, response to a poem allowed for study of students’
responses to a complete literary work over the course of one class period.

Students were observed to determine if they exhibited behaviors indicative of involvement. Further, their writing samples were assessed to determine if the writing samples of the students who heard the more aesthetic delivery had more vivid language, showed more tone and demonstrated more distinctive voice. All of these characteristics are representative of tasks requiring students to be actively involved in their writing in order to achieve.

Questions to be Explored

1. The main question explored was the effect of the two treatment conditions on students' writing. Each student received a rating of the degree to which he or she demonstrated behavioral indicators of immediacy and altercentrism during the presentation.

2. If there was strong support that student involvement increased when that student heard a poem delivered in an aesthetic style as opposed to an efferent style, did this then lead to some change in the student’s written production? If so, did this change demonstrate itself in terms of vivid language, clearer voice and more vibrant tone, or all three? To determine this, the writing samples were assessed in the subdomains of vividness of
language, tone, and voice as well as the domains of composing and style.

3. In addition to the teacher’s delivery style, other factors were expected to impact on student responses. Five possible background factors were considered in this research. First, individual differences in students’ tendency to create vivid mental images was considered. The student completed a questionnaire which rated how vivid their imagery was. A correlation was made between their scores on this questionnaire and the ratings of the vividness they used in their writing sample. Secondly, each student’s orientation toward using affect in making judgements was considered. Again, a questionnaire developed to assess affective orientation was used. A correlation was determined between how students rated their own tendency to use affect in making judgements and the rating of their writing in regards to tone.

Writing skills was a third issue which will be considered. Student scores on the Literacy Passport Test Writing Test, taken while the students were in sixth grade, was used as the pre-measure of general writing skills.

Fourth, there has been research indicating that gender has a strong influence on the quality of written productions, so student gender was treated as a separate variable. Correlations of gender and writing skills to the
domains of composing and style were obtained.

Another question was whether the race of the student was a factor in student response to the different lesson delivery styles. There is little data in the research addressing the relationship of race to differences in how information is processed.

4. One of the questions addressed in this research is whether students were more likely to perceive literature as a legitimate consideration to become part of their own negotiation process with culture when the instructor presented literature as an experience to live through. Because this would be difficult to assess directly an indirect assessment was used, the level of voice the students were rated to have in their written responses. Voice, in the scoring procedures, was the degree to which a composition communicated a sense of the person writing the paper.

Significance of the Study

In carrying out this investigation an attempt was made to determine if some of the predictions from educational research, cognitive psychology and communication research apply in this particular classroom situation.
Teacher Effectiveness Training

Analysis of effective teaching has generally investigated teacher communication skills on a theoretical level. Empirical research done by Nystrand and Gamoran (1991) found that a teacher’s responsiveness and the authenticity of questions the teacher asks of students directly impacts on student engagement to literature. Mikkelsen (1990) exposed fifth grade children classified as underachievers to poetry and fiction and had the children develop their own stories. She noted that the students used literary modes as the "springboard for story creation" (p. 3). Mikkelsen did not address the effects of the qualitative aspects of storytelling itself on student performance. The relationship of oral language experience to reading comprehension was studied by Leu (1981). He suggests that reading comprehension improves as familiarity with written language structures increases.

Folklore and Storytelling Research

Research in the area of folklore and storytelling has addressed performance on what Fine and Speer (1992) refer to as the molar level. In their research on folklore, they describe performance as a mode of communication which works to build a narrative with which an audience can identify. Feezel (1987) stated that teachers now use rhetoric to explain information and to interpret an author’s work.
The field of communication research has yielded many investigations into the significance of how a message is delivered. Badzinski (1989) demonstrated with written passages that high intensity texts activate mental representations more readily than do texts which are low in intensity. Mood congruence has been shown to effect learning (Mayer and Bower, 1986 and Rinck, Glowalla, and Schneider, 1987). Booth-Butterfield and Booth-Butterfield (1990) have proposed that individuals have an affective orientation which can also effect the types of information most readily encoded and how different individuals might learn most effectively.

Burgoon, Birk and Pfau (1990) suggest that, since it has been shown that nonverbal behaviors carry significant import on managing judgements about impressions, these cues may be linked only indirectly to persuasion, through the mediation of credibility. An article by Coker and Burgoon (1987) identifies four different perspectives in the realm of conversational involvement: a behavioral perspective, a functional approach, the stylistic approach, and the competency approach. From the research in these areas, they argued that the key concepts for representing conversational involvement are immediacy, expressiveness, conversational management, and altercentrism.
Narrative

Narrative is an emerging concept of how social and cultural factors effect the ways individuals organize information. Bruner (1990) has developed this theory extensively. He argues that narrative is the form which is used to negotiate meaning, to determine what is acceptable and what is not, and to assimilate the unusual into the canon. The stories we create, hear, and tell about our lives and our actions are part and parcel with culture. These narratives must meet what Bruner refers to as "felicity conditions" (p. 63) rather than truth conditions. That is, the narrative must be judged to be life-like, sincere, and appropriate in context as opposed to being factually accurate.

Mediating Mechanisms

Research has been done on the effects of a number of mediating mechanisms which could have import on how students may process differently the information received via the two lesson delivery styles.

Some research has pointed to the importance of active student engagement in a learning activity for the implementation of learning strategies. Active learning strategies are described as work intensive and are usually
not employed by students unless their commitment to the learning activity is sufficient for them to justify devoting energy to the effort (Bransford and Vye, 1989).

**Imagery Vividness**

Use of imagery is a strong component of poetry. Vividness of imagery during reading has been studied by Long, Winograd, and Bridge (1989). They found that students rated as high visualizers reported more images while reading than students rated as low visualizers. However, high visualizers did not report significantly more images after reading. Apparently, imagery after reading was more directly oriented toward organizing text features.

**Learning**

Paivio (1986) described dual coding theory as an empirically developed model of the operation of the brain. His main contention was that information is processed through one of two subsystems. One subsystem is synchronous in nature and specialized for nonverbal information such as visual images, whereas the other is sequential in nature and is particularly capable of processing language information. These subsystems can operate independently, in parallel, or additively. He noted that empirical research has shown that when both systems are engaged, such as when mnemonic memory
techniques are used, the resulting improvement in subjects' performance is greater than the sum of the subjects' performances with each subsystem working independently.

Summary

Throughout reviews of the communication research, authors make critiques that research to date has been piecemeal, carried out in laboratory settings, and has stressed the passive aspects of involvement or interactions. Research in folklore and storytelling usually does not address ways an audience’s engagement in a presentation may effect a generative effort. Beyond these critiques which exist in the literature, another concern is that much of the cognitive psychology and communication research projects have been conducted on college students, which raises numerous questions as to how much and whether these concepts apply in a public school setting.

The present research attempts to extend these concepts to the classroom setting, look at them in molar form, and assess the effects on how students actively respond (generate writing) when substantively engaged in learning. As related to literature from the disparate fields of study, the concepts of involvement, aesthetic response, substantive learning and active engagement are nearly synonymous for the purposes of this study.
In other areas of educational research, teacher delivery style is not often considered as an issue. That is, if the teacher follows the script of the experimental variable, whether it be a manipulation of the curriculum, a behavior management tactic, or a difference in teaching strategies, the differences in the quality of delivery of the script is rarely considered. This variable, when it is addressed, is often discussed as an insight on a qualitative aspect of teaching which became apparent during the course of the experiment.

If all or most of the variance in student performance was accounted for by pre-existing student characteristics, then there would be little reason to address teachers about their lesson delivery style. If, on the other hand, teacher presentation style accounted for much of the variance, then working with teachers on their delivery styles could be an important part of teacher training. Personal connection to the literature may be particularly important for subcultures, such as the inner city poor, who perceive themselves to be disenfranchised from the mainstream culture which school represents to them.
In his review of the paradigms of research programs in the study of teaching, Shulman (1986) noted that the most vigorous and productive research programs in the past two decades have followed the process-product paradigm. However, Shulman also noted that this paradigm appears to be losing intellectual vigor within the research community, in part because it is so direct that the results may result in artificial conglomerates which have no real world analogue.

Shulman (1986) described the paradigms which have grown in prominence more recently as efforts either to repair some flaw or to attend to phenomena ignored in the process-product paradigm. He argues that the social sciences may require "theoretical pluralism" (p. 5) because no single conceptual framework may ever be sufficiently explanatory to truly dominate research.

One paradigm gaining in prominence as defined by Shulman (1986) is "Pupil Cognition and Mediation of Teaching" (p. 15). This paradigm represents the influence of social cognition research, cognitive psychology, personality theory, and studies of self-concept. The question posed in this paradigm is, "How do students make sense of the instruction they encounter in the classroom?" (p. 16). This paradigm is described as comprising the
potential bridge between quantitative process-product studies and the qualitative strategies of classroom ecology research. The model for this paradigm can be presented as:

**Figure 1. Pupil Cognition and Mediation of Teaching Model**

```
TEACHING -> Social Mediation -> Cognitive Mediation -> LEARNING
```

Within this paradigm, it is not sufficient to establish that there is an impact from an intervention, it is also necessary to investigate how the change occurred. This paradigm allows for investigations into the ways by which students mediate the information they get from a teacher.

Waldron and Cegala (1992) proposed a set of six general principles for conversational cognition research, two of which are pertinent to the present research. They first recommended studying situated cognition; that is, cognition as it is used under conversational conditions. Secondly, they recommended studying cognition in conditions which preserve task complexity. The authors admitted that it is difficult to gather data in such settings. They did discuss numerous self-report methods that can be used. Although each was flawed in some way, these methods did allow for investigations into cognition in complex, interactive, realistic settings.
Hypotheses

The research hypotheses can be stated as:

1. Students who listen to an oral presentation of poetry which models an aesthetic stance to literature will associate with the affective components of the poems, consider the narrative features in the context of their own personal narrative, respond to the imagery evoked, and provide written responses which represent substantive engagement in their work when compared to students who listened to a presentation of poetry which models the efferent stance.

2. There will be positive correlations of the exogenous variables of affective orientation to tone of written response; a positive correlation between tendency to imagine vividly and language vividness in written response; and these two exogenous variables, along with the exogenous variables of gender and general writing skills, will be positively correlated to the quality of the students' performance on the composing and style domains of their written compositions.
Methodology

The methods for obtaining and analyzing data have both quantitative and qualitative aspects. The analysis of the impact of the treatments involved assessing whether the treatment affected the students' level of involvement (a mediating mechanism with cognitive and social aspects). Video cameras taped the student responses during the presentations. Their behaviors were rated based on previous research (Coker and Burgoon, 1987) which has shown strong correlations between particular behaviors and levels of involvement and altercentrism.

Involvement ratings were compared to aspects of the students' written production, an output variable. Also, the effects of exogenous variables which were predicted, based on the review of research, to impact on students' written productions were assessed. It was predicted that students' tendency to image vividly would correlate positively to language vividness in writing and that the students' orientation toward valuing affect in decision making would correlate positively to the quality of the tone in their writing. Correlation coefficients were determined for the relationships of gender and general writing skills to student performance on the domains of composing and style.
Limitations

Because this research attempted to address cognitive processing in a naturally situated environment there were limitations inherent to the type of investigation. Some of the data was collected in order to make inferences about cognitive operations happening in working memory for the students. Although the inferences in this research were based on the findings of previous research and attempted to limit the number of inferred cognitive architectures, there always remained a question of the soundness of inferences since direct measures were not possible.

Waldron and Cegala (1992) listed some of the complexities to be considered in analyzing the cognitive requirements of the conversational environment as including:

(a) processing of large amounts of information from both internal and external sources; (b) performance of multiple cognitive tasks simultaneously (or at least in rapid succession); (c) processing of ambiguous or conflicting verbal or nonverbal information; (d) processing information within variable but relatively restrictive time limits (e.g., imposed by normative limits on pause length); (e) projection of future events from current information (e.g., anticipating partner moves); (f) selection or construction of complex behavior sequences. (p. 603)
Most of these concerns were reflected in the classroom setting. Pause lengths were not a variable in this research, but the students did have time limits imposed on their efforts. Also, in the case of this research, the complex behavior sequences constructed by the students were not conversations, but written productions.

Although a number of variables were being considered in this research, there were others which had not been addressed. Because of the complexity of the environment, it was prohibitive to include all of the pertinent variables. For example, students' goals for school, their previous attitudes toward and exposure to poetry, their skills at interpreting prosodic cues, how well they parse complex sentences, and their socio-economic background may all have been pertinent factors.

Because the processes being examined likely operate simultaneously or in rapid succession, the variables measured could have had fairly high partial correlations. Even though it is doubtful that pure measures of such constructs as affective orientation and vividness of imagery can be made, these constructs did appear to be distinct enough to provide unique information.

The self-report questionnaires to be used did have acceptable reliability for use in research. However, they
each may have been susceptible to variation based on changes in students' moods.

It may have been invalid to use written responses to make inferences about cognitive processing during the presentations. Written productions may call into effect a fatigue factor. Further, the students may not always have been describing their response during the presentation, but a reconstructed description of that response. So, the writing analysis was done as a direct measure to determine how the cognitive processes affected the production of written responses itself.

Definition of Terms

Active Learning: A psychological stance toward learning which entails increased arousal, attentiveness, alertness, scanning of the environment and involvement in learning the information or process.

Aesthetic Delivery: A psychological stance toward presenting literature as an experience to live through.

Altercentrism: The tendency to be interested in, attentive to, and adaptive to the other person in an interpersonal interaction.

Attentiveness: Awareness of the relevant environmental factors that affect interactions.
Credibility: A multidimensional construct which includes judgements one person in an interaction makes about the other person's competence, character, sociability, composure, and dynamism.

Efferent Delivery: A psychological stance toward presenting literature solely in order to convey information from the text.

Felicity Conditions: The condition that a narrative is judged to be life-like, sincere, and appropriate in context as opposed to being factually accurate.

Immediacy: A state of interpersonal relating which embodies the three dimensions of intensity of involvement, affection-hostility, and exclusion-inclusion

Involvement: A psychological stance indicating personal investment in communication or learning consisting of the dimensions of responsiveness, perceptiveness, and attentiveness.

Kinesic Cues: Interactional cues based on body movements such as gestures, facial expression, eye contact, and body lean.

Ludic Reading: Reading for enjoyment.

Narrative: The stories we create, hear, and tell about our lives and our actions capitalizing on the brain's capacity for organizing information which is inherently sequential and each segment of which follows logically on another.
Passive Learning: A psychological stance toward learning involving low levels of arousal, interest, attention and involvement in learning the information or process.

Perceptiveness: One’s knowledge and ability to assign appropriate attributions to one’s own or another’s behavior.

Persuasion: A communication function by which one person in an interaction convinces the other to form an impression of accuracy or veracity to what is being said.

Procedural Learning: Engagement in classroom procedures such as paying attention, following rules, and completing assignments in a timely fashion.

Proxemic Cues: Interactional cues based on body position and physical distance.

Reader Response Theory: A theory first developed by Louise Rosenblatt (1938) which addresses the ways in which readers respond to reading literature.

Receptivity: A relational message dimension reflecting degrees of openness, accessibility, intensity of involvement, interest and rapport.

Schema: A hypothesized mental construct representing a learned, established format for organizing information.

Sequential Processing: A system the brain uses for organizing information which, because of the system’s capacity to deal simultaneously with rapid articulatory
transformations and acoustic transitions, specializes in processing language.

**Substantive Learning:** Sustained commitment to a lesson and interest in the content and problems under consideration

**Synchronous processing:** A system the brain uses for processing information as whole objects, holistic parts of objects, and natural groupings of objects in a simultaneous manner.

**Vocalic Cues:** Nonverbal vocal cues such as pitch, tempo, loudness, clarity, voice quality and variety.
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The reading process can be viewed from a variety of perspectives. One perspective involves viewing reading as a response to literature. Much research in this area has been done under the rubric of Reader Response Theory. Reading can also be viewed from the perspective of the strategies employed to comprehend the text. Much of the research in this area has been done by cognitive psychologists. Both realms address a difference in learner styles based on how much energy the learner commits to learning. Oral delivery of literature has been studied by investigators in the area of folklore and storytelling as well as the area of communication research.

To understand how these perspectives intersect at the juncture of student engagement and involvement in the learning task, several areas will be reviewed. An outline of Reader Response theory is provided. Some of the physiological changes that have been found to occur during the reading process are also discussed. How the brain processes information will be discussed based primarily on Paivio's Dual Coding Theory. The concept of context, in this case the personal and cultural context of the
individual reader, will be developed further with frequent reference to Bruner's concept of personal narrative. The research reviewed in the area of folklore and storytelling tends to address information transmittal at a molar level whereas the communication research reviewed tends to look at interpersonal interaction more atomistically.

Reader Response Theory

Research in the realm of Reader Response Theory focusses on reading for comprehension and for pleasure. Anderson and Rubano (1991) provided a concise review of the research in this area in Enhancing Aesthetic Reading and Response, a part of the Theory and Research Into Practice series developed by the National Council of Teachers of English. Some of the more salient points Anderson and Rubano brought out are discussed below.

They cited Purves and Niles (1984) report that students in the United States are quite competent at literal level comprehension skills, but lack inferential and higher order reading and thinking skills. According to Purves and Niles, a 1982 report from the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement stated that U.S students tend to take a "moralistic interpretive stance" (Galda, 1982, p. 119) when reading literature. Purves, Harnisch, Quirk and Bauer (1981) commented that this
moralistic stance probably resulted from students being taught that only certain, specific responses are right answers.

Rosenblatt (1938) is often referred to as the founder of the Reader Response Theory movement. She identified "efferent" and "aesthetic" (p. 27) psychological stances that students take to reading. The efferent stance involves reading to get information from the text. The aesthetic stance refers to reading as living through the experience of the text. From the perspective of Reader Response Theory, a text can be enjoyed even if the theme or main idea is not understood, or at least not understood in the sense that it can be clearly stated verbally. Rosenblatt also asserted that "reason should arise in a matrix of meaning" (pp. 226-227) and that students should respond to literature on a personal level.

Continuing in their analysis, Anderson and Rubano (1991) noted, "analytical ability does not antedate creative ability developmentally" (p. 4). To support this observation they cited Gardner (1982) who found in his research that children will use metaphors earlier in their development than they comprehend them. Reader response theorists use this information to support their assertion that it is not necessary for efferent reading skills to precede aesthetic reading.
Readers will often read the same text at an efferent level at times and an aesthetic level at other times. The issue is which takes primary importance. Rosenblatt (1978) stated that, since any text can be read efferently or aesthetically, the sociophysical setting can be a determining factor on which stance is taken. In particular, she notes that instructions for reading and the questions asked of the material can have an effect on which stance the students are likely to take.

Anderson and Rubano (1991) state that the two critical points of Rosenblatt's theory are:

(1) the reader and the text together create the literary experience and (2) the aesthetic experience occurs during the reading of the text, but only through an aesthetic stance toward the text. Literary texts do not produce the literary experience; they merely guide the constructive reader who has adopted an aesthetic stance toward the text. Simply providing a literary text does not guarantee that students will read it aesthetically. (p. 9)

They then note that Rosenblatt's (1938) crucial theoretical insight regarding the efferent stance and the aesthetic stance has been given little attention in research literature.
In reviewing research on responses to reading, Anderson and Rubano (1991) cited Davidson (1988) who found that there has been much stress in mainstream reading research on constructing meaning, which requires some sort of aesthetic and creative response from the readers. Applebee (1985) argued that, in the classroom setting, there is a conflict in orientation of many English teachers. He asserted that many teachers have adopted process oriented approaches to writing. A part of the reliance on process oriented approaches, he argued, is that there are too few models and inadequate vocabulary for teachers to sharpen the skills and debate about instruction based on the process of literary understanding.

The question addressed in this research was whether oral delivery style, in presenting poetry to students, significantly effects the level of responsiveness to the poetry. The research did attempt to address the differences between the aesthetic and efferent stances in that the presentations did model one or the other of the stances. From the aesthetic stance, the presenter delivered the poems as if living through the experience. From the efferent stance, the presenter essentially presented the poems solely as language to be analyzed. The model involved suggested that seeing the more aesthetic style would result in students using more active learning strategies which would,
in turn, result in improved written responses to questions about the poems.

The Physiology of Reading

Nell (1988) reported on a series of studies he had done, one of which involved physiological assessments of subjects involved in ludic reading. He defined ludic reading essentially as reading for pleasure.

In regard to the physiological responses, he used Berlyne's (1971) two factor theory of hedonic value. This theory asserts that pleasure derives from arousal boosts, involving moderate arousal increments, and arousal jags, which occur from relief when a state of arousal is reversed (such as, laying down an exciting book and falling fast asleep). In his own research, Nell (1988) assessed occipitofrontalis (forehead) muscle movement, levator and depressor anguli oris muscle movement (the smiling and pouting muscles), the platysma muscle movement (muscle between the chin and larynx), respiration rate, skin potential, heart rate, and heart period.

Physiological assessments were made during situations intended to produce boredom, ludic reading, relaxation, observations of affectively neutral pictures, and hard reading (reading to complete arithmetic tasks or to report on what was read). He discovered that, although ludic
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reading was described by his subjects as effortless and relaxing, the subjects were physiologically aroused during reading. Nell (1988) reported surprise to discover that the level of physiological arousal was not higher during hard reading activities than it was during ludic reading. Nell refers to Sokolov’s (1963) determination that a decelerative heart rate compared to a baseline suggests relatively more attention is being allocated to external stimuli over cognitive processes; and an accelerating heart rate suggests the reverse. He then noted that attention appears to be directed toward external stimuli during ludic reading (toward the printed page) and, conversely, that attention appears to be directed toward cognitive processes during hard reading. He noted that this suggests that ludic reading elicits a non-habituating orienting response in readers. Nell’s metaphor for ludic reading was:

The page thus stands to the reader as a flower to a bee, and not, as one might argue, as a picture of a flower to a bee: flat, odorless, and hopelessly unchanging. (p. 38)

In another section of this same set of experiments, Nell (1988) had established that readers consistently slowed their rate of reading while reading the pages they most enjoyed. Nell also found that heart rate increased during reading of most liked pages (the pages subjects read most
slowly), suggesting that cognitive processing took precedence over stimulus detection. However, his findings generally did not show statistically significant differences between physiological measures attained during reading of most-liked pages when compared to other pages (the one exception was a statistically significant decrease in the lability of movement in the platysma muscle).

Cognitive Processes

Main Hypotheses of Dual Coding Theory

Paivio (1986) described Dual Coding theory in detail. He presents his theory as representative of the empiricist view of cognitive processing and noted that his theory must and will change in its particulars in response to advances in research. He noted:

The most general assumption in dual coding theory is that there are two classes of phenomena handled cognitively by separate subsystems, one specialized for the representation and processing of information concerning nonverbal objects and events, the other specialized for dealing with language. (p. 53)

Paivio (1986) argues that the sequential subsystem is especially adept at processing language information. He refers to the perceptual representations from which language
units are formed as logogens. The specific hypothesis for the verbal system is:

the verbal system is specialized for sequential (including sequential memory) processing because of its simultaneous capacity for dealing with rapid articulatory transformations and acoustic (tonal and rhythmic) transitions. If nonverbal auditory sequences (e.g. music) contain similar transitions or can be similarly processed (e.g. by humming) they can be effectively remembered as well. The same generalization may be applicable to visual sequences. (p. 175)

The synchronous subsystem is described as structurally distinct from the sequential system. Imagens is Paivio’s (1986) term for the perceptual representations from which mental images are generated. For the synchronous system, he states:

Thus, imagens correspond to natural objects, holistic parts of objects, and natural groupings of objects. The represented information includes not only static appearance but dynamic and variable properties as well. The structural information is characteristically organized in a synchronous or simultaneous manner into perceptual hierarchies or nested sets. (p. 59)
An example of a synchronously stored nested image would be the human face, which can be imagined as a whole or imagined in smaller units, such as a nose or eyes. Also, the image of a face can be mentally rotated as if it is being seen from different perspectives. Furthermore, it can be described just as adequately starting at the top, the bottom, the right side or the left side. In contrast, the sequentially stored alphabet can usually be stated readily by adults in its normal sequence, but much difficulty is exhibited in saying it in reverse sequence.

Most of Paivio's (1986) own research and the research he cites compares cognitive processing of language as contrasted to the cognitive processing of visual images. He argues that input from other sensory systems, such as tactile and non-language auditory information, are analogous to the types of processing which occur for visual information, but he did not develop this line of argument comprehensively.

**Cognitive Operations**

Based on Dual Coding theory, the two subsystems are functionally independent of each other. However, activity in one system can trigger activity in the other. As such, one subsystem can operate on information without involving
the other, or the two subsystems can work in parallel. When working in parallel, the effects are often additive.

There is much empirical evidence that the mnemonic value of the two subsystems is unequal, with a two to one ratio favoring the image code. Also, with mnemonics, the gain in using both systems is greater than the sum of the gains achieved by each system operating independently. So, in some cases, the gains from using the systems in parallel is greater than an additive effect.

He described operations of different levels and forms, all of which can operate under conscious control or operate automatically. The subsystems can operate on three levels. The representational level is when modality-specific analogues of the perceptual event are created. So that, for example, a person sees the image in his mind. Another way each subsystem operates is through associations within the subsystem. Word association tests using abstract words would be an example of this. The third level at which the subsystems operate is referentially. This is when the synchronous system activates connections in the sequential system or vice versa.

All connections are assumed to be probabilistic. That is, if an image is evoked by a word, the probability is high that the image will be associated with the word in the future. This is because it is likely that the original
association was a high probability connection. Each connection then makes it even more probable that the same connection will occur in the future.

Interconnections are assumed to be one-to-many as opposed to one-to-one. Stimulus context, interacting with relative functional strength (probabilities of connection) of the different referential interconnections, determine which images or descriptions are activated.

Organizational Processes

Along with the three levels of processing he also refers to organizational processes. For example, he states that empirical evidence clearly indicates that storage of verbal information in memory and production of verbal expression (particularly syntactic structure) both require some sort of constructive process. Thus, some type of organizational constructive activity exists for both the input and the output of information.

The two subsystems each transform information, and each does so in different ways. Verbal transformations involve changes in temporal order or the substitution of new elements into temporal slots. Transformations of imaginal information include changes in spatial relationships and sensory properties.

Each modality is also described to have its own set of
associations. So that, for example, language received and language expressed have to be specified as to modalities used. Input is usually through hearing or reading language. Output is usually through speaking or writing. Differences in organization of perception and construction of output may vary simply based on the modalities used.

**Imagery and Verbal Information**

Images are aroused as a function of the concreteness or image arousing value (its probability of arousing an image) of a stimulus. Contextual variables, such as instructions to image to target stimuli or to use imagery, also effect the probability that imagery will be used. Individual differences also play a role because some people tend to use visual imagery more than others. Analogously, abstractness of the stimulus, instructions to respond verbally, and individual differences effect the probability that the verbal system will be used.

**Motivation and emotion**

According to Paivio (1986), dual coding theory "implies" (p. 79) that learned emotional and motivational functions are mediated by prior activation of nonverbal or verbal cognitive representations. Paivio noted that, though problematic to his theory, there is compelling empirical
evidence that affective reactions can be elicited by low imagery words. Paivio states:

Such direct access from logogens to the affective system would be analogous to referential processing, in which the nonverbal referential reaction is a feeling or an emotion, presumably resulting from learning experiences in which particular words are reliably associated with a variety of affective situations, so that the words acquire generalized affect-arousing qualities. (p. 79)

In one experiment Paivio (1986) describes, subjects rated their composite images to related abstract pairs to be more vivid than their images to unrelated concrete pairs, though they still recalled more concrete than abstract words. The emotional value of the abstract pairs (such as "freedom-independence") was hypothesized to be a possible factor in effecting the reported vividness of the associations.

Meaning

Paivio (1986) describes meaning in terms of probabilities. The meaning of a stimulus "is defined by the total set of reactions typically evoked by it" (p. 120). This reaction potential is a characteristic of the responding individual based on that individual’s
experiential history. So, activated meaning is probabilistic and varies based on the individual and the situation.

**Priming**

To contrast his view of priming to that of schema he refers to well-known research by Anderson and Pichert (1978) in which subjects were asked to read a story from different perspectives. Some were asked to read it from the perspective of a thief and others were asked to read it from the perspective of the home buyer. The results indicated that the different perspectives did affect the way the story was comprehended. The researchers suggested that a schema was established based on the perspective taken and that information was processed through that schema. Paivio (1986) argues that comprehension was effected by prior experiences which primed certain stimuli for comprehension. Different patterns of verbal activation also induced different patterns of imagery. Different items would then be more salient for one pattern of images than to another. Paivio admits that his explanation may sound like nothing more than a paraphrase of the schema theory. He differentiates his own perspective by saying that he does not use the steps in the process to hypothesize the existence of an abstract structure. Paivio stated that
priming effects will vary systematically with established associative relationships and item attributes.

Since Paivio's review of this research, Sammons and Whitney (1991) have elaborated on the original research by considering the contaminating effects of individual differences in Working Memory Spans (WMS). They suggest that Working Memory Span entails two aspects; holding recently processed text to make connections to the last input, and maintaining gist information needed for construction of an overall model of the passage. The researchers noted that tests which require both memory manipulation and retrieval are highly correlated to reading comprehension while tests of simple recall of a word span do not show a correlation.

Earlier research cited by Sammons and Whitney (1991) had reported conflicting results as to whether there is a difference in the kind of information recalled when subjects are asked to switch perspectives. An example of switching a perspective is asking a student to read a story about a house from the perspective of a home buyer, and later asking the student to answer questions from the perspective of a burglar. They hypothesized that the differences in results of the previous studies could have been the effects of the contaminating influence of the subjects' differences in working memory span. They argued that students with more
limited working spans can establish local coherence (comprehension of the gist of phrases and sentences) better than global coherence (comprehension of the gist of paragraphs or texts). Their subjects were undergraduate students ranked into groups described as having high, moderate, and low levels of working memory span. From the results of their own study they found that subjects with high working memory spans were not significantly effected by a switch in perspective. It was presumed that this was because these students were more facile with manipulating data in memory and, so, were less bound by their original perspective.

There was a difference in the type of information recalled by low working memory span students when they were asked to recall information from a switched perspective, but this difference resulted from loosing information relevant to the first perspective, not from gaining information relevant to the second perspective. Sammons and Whitney (1991) inferred that, when asked to read material from a certain perspective, students with low Working Memory Spans tend to develop a goal-based global representation of the reading material at the expense of information not relevant to their perspective. So, they surmised that when asked to recall information from a different perspective than the one used while actually reading the material, these students did
not have a clear global representation to draw upon. That is, individual sentences may have all been understood adequately, but the global representation was perspective bound and did not allow for flexible reorganization.

Although Sammons and Whitney (1991) did not hypothesize two subsystems for representations, their analysis could easily be translated into the terms of Dual Coding theory. That is, the global representation could be developed in the synchronous system based on information provided from the sequential system through the referential process.

**Comprehension**

Paivio reports that the ways imagery effects reading comprehension ranges from positive to negative. Task variables and the way imagery is defined account for much of the experimental differences. Eddy and Glass (1981) showed that there are negative effects of imagery on a task requiring verification of the veracity of statements. It took longer for the subjects in this experiment to respond to high imagery sentences than to abstract sentences when the sentences were presented visually, but not when the sentences were presented orally. Denis (1982) found that subjects who were high imagers took longer to read texts considered to be high in imagible material than material considered to be abstract, while subjects who were low
imagers showed no difference in reading speed with the two kinds of materials. He also found that low imagers would use imagery when instructed to do so.

Marschark (1978, 1979) conducted an experiment for which subjects were able to control the rate at which they heard the words of passages. He found that subjects spent more time on content words of high imagery passages, and more time on syntactic aspects of low imagery passages. A strategy questionnaire the subjects completed after the experiment also indicated that they tended to visualize high imagery material, but understood low-imagery material in terms of intraverbal patterning.

In his summary of his review of the research, Paivio (1986) states:

Imaginal encoding would be favored when the target sentences are concrete, when pictures are used and expected as comparison stimuli, and when the subject is predisposed to use imagery. Verbal coding would be more likely when the sentences are abstract, other sentences are expected as referents, and the subject is predisposed to use verbal strategies. (p. 223)
Contrast to Structural Theories

Paivio's (1986) contrast of priming (a process) to schema (a structure) was discussed earlier. He also presents arguments against two common aspects of those language theories which propose that language is learned according to abstract, internalized generative rules. He referred to Chomsky's (1953) theory of language development as prototypical of this class of theories. First, he notes that the theories tend to be unimodal, paying little heed to "the possibility that language is influenced by a separate, nonlinguistic representational system consisting of knowledge structures and processes that differ fundamentally from linguistic (or propositional) representations and processes" (p. 214).

He also argues that propositions and transformational rules may be useful in categorizing behaviors, but such abstractions play no explanatory role in how information is processed. He agrees that it is not possible to explain language phenomena by simply relying on associative principles being applied within the language subsystem. However, he does argue that when other components, such as changing situational contexts, changes in attentional focus, and use of imagery are included, then linguistic creativity can be explained without reliance on the generative-
linguists' claim of abstract entities corresponding to grammatical classes.

In reference to memory traces, he indicated that the trace has no structural schema. Still, it is assumed to function schematically because 1) it is incomplete because of inherent structural limitations; and 2) it is systematically altered because representational information from long-term memory is added to the composite trace. When there is a cue to recall a trace, the cue will access and activate that part of the trace containing identical or similar information, and redintegrate a portion of the remainder of the trace sufficient to mediate a correct response.

Theoretical Limitations

Paivio (1986) admits to several areas where information is lacking in regard to his theory. Dual Coding theory does little more than hypothesize that perceptual systems other than the visual operate on similar principles as the visual. He indicated, himself, that little is known about synchronous organization in other modalities than the visual or about synchronous organization across sensory modalities.

He also stated that Dual Coding theory is lacking information on how context (cultural and situational) modifies the probabilities that referential reactions will
occur. Information was also noted to be lacking on conceptually more remote associative reactions requiring making judgments or generating complex responses.

In addition to these limitations, most of the research he conducted or cited were laboratory based and used tightly controlled stimuli, which does not reflect how information is received or processed in the real world. Paivio (1986) related, for example, that the embedded nature of most memories makes the study of real world memories very difficult to conduct empirically.

Sternberg's Triarchic Theory

An alternative to this theory comes from information processing theory. Sternberg (1985) has proposed a triarchic view of intelligence from the perspective of information processing theory. He sees the same basic processes operating across different realms of intellectual endeavor (such as linguistic, musical and mathematical).

The first aspect he considers are the mechanics of intelligent functioning. These include metacomponents (or executive procedures), performance components (used to implement a strategy), and knowledge acquisition components. From this perspective, the present research is concerned with how students use metacomponents to decide 1). whether
to become intellectually aroused, and, if they do, 2). which active learning strategies to select.

The second aspect he considers is determining when intelligence is employed. Sternberg (1985) suggests that intelligence can best be assessed when a person is involved either with tasks which are novel or else tasks so customary that they are performed nearly automatically. The present research provides a task in a somewhat novel circumstance (a guest speaker) but uses the kind of information which, in an English class, would be customary.

The third aspect of the triarchy he considers is the relation of intelligence to the external world. In this regard he discusses adaptation to, selection of, or shaping of people’s real world environment. Adaptation is attempting to achieve a good fit with the environment, selection occurs when a person decides to find a new environment, and shaping occurs when a person makes changes in the environment in order to improve its fit to his or her aptitudes. With poetry reading, students are challenged to shape the concepts and tone of the poem to fit into their sense of the world.

**Information processing and race**

There has been little research investigating the possibility of differences in how information is processed
as related to differences to race. Racial differences in performance on most IQ and achievement tests have been well documented (see, for example, Humphreys, 1988, and Montie and Fagan, 1988). Among others, Montie and Fagan found from their item analyses that racial differences were large for some items and negligible for others.

Oakland and Glutting (1990) had white administrators of an IQ test rate their subjects in the areas of cooperation, attention and self-confidence. Oakland and Glutting also found that Whites and middle socioeconomic class subjects in their study had higher average IQ scores on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised than did Black, Mexican, and lower socioeconomic class subjects. There were no statistically significant differences in the slopes of the regression lines for any of the groups. The examiners did rate the Black and Mexican American subjects higher on the scales assessing cooperation, attention, and self-confidence.

Recent Research on Mediating Mechanisms

Research has been done on the effects of a number of mediating mechanisms which could have import on how students may process differently the information received via the two coding methods. Some research has pointed to the importance of active student engagement in a learning activity for the
implementation of learning strategies. Active learning strategies are described as work intensive and are usually not employed by students unless their commitment to the learning activity is sufficient for them to justify devoting energy to the effort (Bransford and Vye, 1989).

Mood and Learning

The effects of mood on learning and memory have been studied, but still are not clearly understood. The studies in this area have usually involved recall of word lists of different emotional valences. It has been found that subjects tended to recall mood-congruent words more readily than mood-incongruent words. Mayer and Bower (1986) found evidence that subjects recalled mood-congruent material better when the material was considered to be the cause of the mood. The authors also made it a point to note that the relationship between mood states and memory is not well understood and that similar experiments in this area oftentimes have dissimilar results.

Rinck, Glowalla, and Schneider (1987) noted that enhanced memory of mood-incongruent words has also been found in some experiments. In their research, they found mood-congruent enhancement of recall of words with high emotional valence. In contrast, the mood-incongruent enhancement of recall occurred with words which were more
marginal in their valence. They argued that a mood state will shift the valence of low valence words toward the mood state. With mood-congruent low valence words, the shift is in the direction of the valence. With mood-incongruent words, however, the shift is in the direction opposite to the word’s valence. Their contention is that the latter activity is more cognitively demanding and, therefore, more fixed in memory.

It was expected that a more interpretive oral delivery style would be more effective in conveying the mood of a set of poems. Since poems are often written to evoke emotions, it was considered to be possible that mood-congruent learning would be exhibited more readily when the presenter used a more dramatic delivery style.

**Parsing of sentences**

Another much researched topic in cognition is the relationship of comprehension to how subjects parse sentences. Syntactically ambiguous phrases, usually prepositional phrases or reduced relative clauses, have been studied in efforts to determine how ambiguity is resolved. It has been found (Rayner, Garrod, and Perfetti, 1992) that subjects often parse ambiguous sentences while reading in a garden path way, based on structural principles. Pragmatic or semantic information was found to be used after the
initial parsing decision was made. For example, the sentence, "The racing horse tripped," may imply that the horse was running when it tripped. However, the sentence may be completed, "The racing horse tripped while walking to the starting gate." This sentence shows that "racing" identifies a kind of horse and need not be used as an elaboration of the verb.

Since poems often structure sentences differently than is typical of narrative, the parsing of sentences in poetry is often difficult for students. Interpretive reading of poems could enhance the accuracy with which students parse the sentences of the poems.

**Prosidic Cues**

Paivio (1986) had noted that rhythm and cadence aspects of how language is perceived can effect how it is processed. It has been argued by Grosjean and Gee (1987) that prosidic structure is essential for understanding oral language. These authors argue that strong syllables tend to stress salient aspects of words, those aspects which separate them from similar sounding words. Cutler and Butterfield (1992) researched aspects of strong and weak syllables in spoken language which supported the contention that prosidic cues are essential to segmentation of continuous streams of sounds into words.
The more dramatic reading of the poems, through greater modulation of speech, would emphasize prosodic cues. The greater distinctiveness of prosodic cues with the more dramatic reading may have been used by students to aid in their interpretation of the poems.

Overview of Cognitive Processes

Information in the brain can be stored either synchronously or sequentially. Whether this is done by two different subsystems, several different subsystems, or by modification within one system has not been definitively established empirically. However, the ways that synchronously stored visual information and sequentially stored language information interact has been studied extensively. The processes described by Paivio (1986), representational, associative, and referential, appear to describe the phenomena of interactions between the two types of information, even if the two sets of phenomena simply represent two different schema within the same system. Because of this, his description of cognitive processing will be adhered to in the rest of this paper.

Folklore and Storytelling

Research in the area of folklore and storytelling has addressed performance on what Fine and Speer (1992) refer to
as the molar level. Performance is described as "a process by which we construct and negotiate culture and identity" (p. 17). Usually, the research involves case studies of individual storytellers or well defined subcultures using participant interpretation techniques.

Fine and Speer (1992) noted, "Studying performance, then, is a critical way for grasping how persons choose to present themselves, how they construct their identity, and, ultimately, how they embody, reflect, and construct their culture" (p. 10). The authors describe performance as a mode of communication in which aesthetic features are foregrounded. Placing aesthetic features in the foreground works to build a narrative with which an audience can identify. Within this perspective, context is as important as text in communicating sense of identity and cultural concepts. As Fine and Speer state, "In performance, the aesthetic dimension comes to the fore as performers become responsible not only for what they do, but also for how they do it" (p. 2).

Some research does suggest an influence of storytelling on student performance. Mikkelsen (1990) addressed the impact of storytelling on a more molecular level than Fine and Speer (1992). Mikkelsen exposed fifth grade children classified as underachievers to poetry and fiction and had the children develop their own stories. She noted that the
students used stylistic, functional, and thematic borrowing to develop their own stories. The literary modes that children were noted to use to imitate were: retelling, borrowing, recreation, blending, and transformation. Each of these modes involves using the literature as the "springboard for story creation" (p. 3). Mikkelsen did not address the effects of the qualitative aspects of storytelling itself on student performance.

Communication Research

Feezel (1987) noted that the field of communication has been around since Isocrates taught speech in Athens in the fifth century B.C. Isocrates stressed persuasive discourse through logic or argument. As Feezel stated, teachers now use rhetoric in the additional roles of explaining information and orally interpreting an author's work.

Some research on effective teaching has investigated teacher communication skills. Feezel reviewed several models which have been proposed for conceptualizing teacher communication. Most include competencies regarding a teacher's skill with interpreting literature. For example, a Speech and Communication Association/American Theatre Association Joint Task Force on Teacher Preparation (1978) listed six main competency areas, one of which was Delivering Messages Appropriate to Various Contexts. Allen
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and Brown (1976) included Expressing Feelings and Imagining as two of their competencies. MacBath and Jeffrey (1978) included Oral interpretation of Literature through Performance as one of nine major competencies.

The relationship of oral language experience to reading comprehension was studied by Leu (1981). He cited numerous research studies which have suggested that prediction of upcoming text is an important factor in reading comprehension. Leu asserted that, "this prediction is accomplished by bringing to bear one’s knowledge of how language is typically organized on the graphic and contextual information available in the text" (p. 10). He suggested that immature readers may not have adequate previous oral language experience to provide for linguistic organization, which would result in inefficient anticipation of written language. He investigated the reading errors made by students in retelling stories as these errors related to the syntactic differences between oral and written language. He found that many reading comprehension errors made by second graders were related to these syntactic differences, but that there was no evidence that such a relationship existed for the fifth graders he studied. He also found that younger students made fewer errors as they became more familiar with the syntactic structures of written language. Leu suggests from his
research that reading comprehension improves as familiarity with written language structures increases.

**Message Intensity**

The effects of message intensity has been studied as it relates to written text. In Badzinski’s (1989) research, she uses Bower’s description of intensity—the quality of language which indicates the degree to which the speaker’s attitude toward a concept deviates from neutrality. She proposed that high intensity texts activate mental representations more readily than do those texts low in intensity. Since constructing these mental representations often involves inference making, then, Badzinski proposed, there should be a higher probability of inference making with high intensity texts. Her research generally supported her proposals.

Because both treatments in this research were exposed to exactly the same words, the difference in intensity was not in the wording, as it was for Badzinski (1989). Instead, the intensity which was varied was the delivery style of the presenter. This research attempted to determine if the same differences in activation of mental representations Badzinski found would also exist based on the delivery style of the presenter.
Affective Orientation

Booth-Butterfield and Booth-Butterfield (1990) have proposed that an individual’s affective orientation can effect the types of information most readily encoded and how different individuals might learn most effectively. They noted that some people consider emotions as legitimate factors in decision making, while others see emotions simply as distractors to be screened out of sound decision making. They developed the Affective Orientation Scale to assess the degree to which individuals consider emotions to be legitimate considerations in their decision making. The Affective Orientation scale was used in this research to determine if the affective orientation trait had an independent affect on student responses to poetry reading.

Persuasion

Burgoon, Birk and Pfau (1990) suggest that, since it has been shown that nonverbal behaviors carry significant import on managing judgements about impressions, these cues may be linked only indirectly to persuasion, through the mediation of credibility. They use factor analytic dimensions of credibility which include the dimensions of competence, character, sociability, composure and dynamism.
Conversational Involvement

One area of related research has been the study of conversational involvement. An article by Coker and Burgoon (1987) identifies four different perspectives in this realm of research: a behavioral perspective, a functional approach, the stylistic approach, and the competency approach. From the research in these areas, they argued that the key concepts for representing conversational involvement are immediacy, expressiveness, conversational management, and altercentrism. Immediacy includes the dimensions of intensity of involvement, interest and rapport. Expressiveness has to do with style of delivery of messages and signals indicating active, rather than passive, listening. Conversational management represents techniques for controlling interactions. Altercentrism refers to the ability to view things from another’s perspective. It is argued that altercentrism includes the dimensions of involvement, attentiveness, perceptiveness, and receptiveness. Based on their review of numerous research articles they established behavioral cues for each of these constructs.

1. Immediacy:

Direct body and facial orientation, direct eye contact, closer conversational distance, forward lean, positive reinforcers (head nods and smiling), more frequent use
of illustrators, and more gestural animation. (p. 472)

2. Expressiveness:
   Facial expressiveness and animation, appropriate loudness, more vocal pitch and volume range or variety, smiling and laughing, and gestural and bodily animation/activity. (p. 473)

3. Conversational Management:
   Shorter response latencies, fewer silences, limited nonfluencies, and stutter starts, and overall coordination in speech and body movements. (p. 474)

4. Altercentrism (Involvement; attentiveness, perceptiveness, and receptiveness):
   Overall kinesic and proxemic patterns which convey gestalt perceptions of interest, attention, focus, alertness, and overall involvement, and vocal behaviors that create impressions of warmth, appeal, interest, involvement, pleasantness, and friendliness. (p. 474)

For this research on poetry reading, video tape machines were used in the classrooms. Students' behavior was observed and rated for indicators of immediacy and altercentrism. Use of the behavioral cues allowed for an estimate of whether students were involved without the possibly contaminating effects of introducing questionnaires between when the students heard the presentation and when they began to write.
Narrative

There has been much research in the area of narrative as a way of conceptualizing the mind. Research in this area is evolving and there is still much debate over what narrative is and how it influences an individual.

Bruner

The idea that learning occurs in the context of a personal narrative has a growing number of proponents. Bruner (1990) is one of the strongest. He notes that there is compelling evidence for a biological predisposition for children to learn language. He extends this in two ways. First of all, he argues that there may actually be a predisposition for the narrative form. That is, children will prefer to learn and organize their worlds in the narrative format. He cited one experiment which suggests that, when something is not framed in narrative form, it suffers loss in memory.

The narrative format has several components. First is its "inherent sequentiaility" (p. 43). The biological predisposition for language to which he refers is based on this sequentiaility and the brain’s capacity for processing sequential information. He does not agree with Chomsky’s (1953) concept of genetically programmed transformational rules of grammar.
Sequentiality allows for each segment of a narrative to follow logically on another, so that a chain of events is established. These events can be remembered as part of a chain, even though they may or may not be recalled when someone is asked about the event out of context or out of sequence.

A second component is that it can be real or imagined without loss of its power as a story. It has a "factual indifference" (p. 50). He notes that a story must make sense in regards to keeping with an expected pattern. The facts may be altered in order to maintain adherence to an expected form. This altered form may then seem more real than the factual representation.

In regard to the actual structure of narrative, he refers frequently to the Burkean pentad (Burke, 1945) in his discussion. That is, well formed stories contain an Actor, an Action, a Goal, a Scene, and an Instrument--plus Trouble. If a story has no trouble, it is not worth telling. Trouble usually means somehow running awry of a personal understanding of the cultural canon.

This canon is based on what he and others refer to as a "folk psychology" (p. 33). Folk psychology is akin to the concept of "ethnomethodology" (p. 37) first outlined by Garfinkel (1967). Bruner noted that Garfinkel proposed rules for "creating a social science by reference to the
social and political and human distinctions that people under study made in their everyday lives" (p. 37). Bruner noted that the positivists' attempt to develop a psychology without reference to culture has been an effort at describing personality, "in Thomas Nagel's deft phrase as a 'view from nowhere'" (p. 14).

The constituents of our own folk psychology, Bruner (1990) noted (without describing whom he was including in the possessive our), include the premises 1). people have beliefs and desires, 2). people hold beliefs about the past, present, and the future utilizing an agreed upon conceptualization of time, 3). beliefs should cohere in some way and, 4). with sufficient coherence, beliefs result in commitments, a way of life, dispositions, and a sense of Personhood.

He described the principle of "coherence" of beliefs as "fuzzy" (p. 39). Also, the idea of Personhood within a culture is attributed selectively and not necessarily granted to people in an outgroup. Folk psychology, then, results in a canon which delineates not only how things are, but also how they should be.

The four grammatical constituents required of good narrative, Bruner (1990) argues, are 1). agentivity (character action directed toward a goal), 2.) the establishment and maintenance of sequential order, 3).
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sensitivity to what is canonical and to what violates canonicality, and 4). something approximating a narrator’s perspective (voice). He further argues that narrative specializes in forming links, in a comprehensible form, between the exceptional or the unusual to the cultural canon.

The meanings of these exceptional instances are entered into the canon through negotiated meanings. Bruner (1990) further argued that these negotiations take place in the dual landscape where events and actions in the real world occur concurrently with mental events in the consciousness of the protagonist. He also indicated that these negotiations must meet "felicity conditions" (p. 63), having to do with interpreting the unusual in an acceptable way taking into account mitigating circumstances, more than conditions of being absolutely factual.

For his second extension of cognitive psychology toward a theory of mind he argues that it is a drive toward meaning that motivates the learning of language mechanics, the inverse of Chomsky’s (1953) arguments for a bioprogram which unfolds more or less on its own. Bruner’s (1990) definition is also different than Paivio’s (1986) description of meaning as probabilistic reaction potentials to a stimulus. However, Bruner’s definition is close to Paivio’s descriptions of organizational constructive activity which,
Paivio asserted, operate on both the input and the output of information. Bruner (1990) noted that children will often use gesticulation to make their wants known before they have the semantic and grammatical competency to express themselves verbally. He argued that they then search for the appropriate grammatical format to convey the meaning they want to communicate.

The development of a personal narrative and the drive toward meaning, according to Bruner (1990), is part and parcel with culture. Culture helps determine which aspects of the world are most meaningful and determines which grammatical structures are used. Not only is a child searching for ways to express meaning, the child is doing so while interacting with a culture that drives the development of language and the development of self. So, knowledge must be understood as being both situated in a culture and distributed between members of the culture. Bruner even described the personal concept of self as a narrative. New chapters for this narrative of self are always being written while previous chapters are frequently being revised. The components of the narrative are the same for everyone. However, the relative significance of various characters, settings or other aspects are individualistic and idiosyncratic.
He discussed three usual cases of breakdown of a culture, including microcultures such as a family or a classroom. The first breakdown he noted was a deep disagreement about what is canon and what is exceptional. The second occurs when there is "rhetorical overspecialization of narrative" (p. 96). That is, the narrative becomes ideological or self-serving and loses its negotiation function. A question which arises from these first two examples is whether these types of breakdowns often occur between students and teachers. The third breakdown he noted was cultural impoverishment, such as in ghettos, where "worst scenarios" (p. 96) so dominate that variation on the poverty theme seems impossible.

Narrative and Pedagogy

A description of teaching knowledge as narrative is provided by Gudmundsdottir (1991). He described teacher knowledge of subject matter as qualitatively different from an understanding of the facts of a subject area and referred to this way of understanding as pedagogical content knowledge. He elaborated on this concept by saying, "Pedagogical content knowledge is, in Shulman's words, 'that special amalgam of pedagogy and content that is uniquely the province of teachers'" (p. 210). In other words, accomplished teachers understand subject matter content in
the context of what it would take to communicate the concepts to students. He asserted that pedagogical content knowledge is a narrative way of knowing.

In his description, Gudmundsdottir (1991) described a novice teacher as perhaps having content knowledge (knowing the facts), but having little pedagogical content knowledge (knowing the facts in terms of how to teach those facts). He suggested that the experienced teacher has organized content knowledge into a narrative. This narrative contains two types of stories. Curriculum stories provide continuity and supply structure to content. These stories begin with the opening of school, continue through the semesters, and end at the close of school. Shorter stories are then used to provide illustrations and explanations within the context of the curriculum story.

He suggested that teachers start by learning "recipe knowledge" (p. 211). If they become effective, they then construct narratives through reflection and use of the story schema, a mental structure with sets of expectations. However, he also noted that teachers are probably unaware of the curriculum stories they use. He added that they become aware of their story when they have to explain their curriculum to another person. Good curriculum takes several years to develop and the process continues as long as the teacher continues to develop professionally. He complained
that training programs usually separate content knowledge and pedagogy into separate study units.

He noted that teachers select events for inclusion in their narratives based on certain principles. The four criterion for significance are 1.) an event may have pragmatic significance if the subject is of moral interest to the teacher, 2.) an event may have theoretical significance if it is seen as an evidential or illustrative example for the general theory, 3.) an event may have consequential significance (it resulted in significant consequences) or 4.) an event may have revelatory significance.

Gudmundsdottir (1991) described building a curriculum story in terms of the development of a set of teaching strategies which are sequenced and made cohesive by use of narrative. Further, individuals may call on a number of story lines (scientific, political, and religious, for example) to make sense of a single issue. He also indicated that this narrative develops over time. The importance of culture and subcultures in establishing narratives is then discussed in some detail. He reflects on how children seem to be predisposed toward language use and toward a struggle to find meaning in their worlds. Mental institutions and prisons are seen as responses to people who have allowed
their personal narratives to become too divergent from the cultural norms to be acceptable.

In his conclusion, he noted that lives become meaningful when someone sees himself or herself as an actor within the context of a story. It is in understanding the various genres of personal narratives where understanding of human thought lies.

Joseph Campbell

A different approach to the perspective of the effects of culture on individual choices regarding actions and perspectives chosen is provided by Joseph Campbell (1988) in his studies on myth. From his perspective, we all use myths from our culture. These myths serve four functions; a mystical function, a cosmological function, a sociological function, and a pedagogical function. The pedagogical function has to do with finding expression of individual maturation in symbolic form: from dependency through adulthood, through maturity and to death. This pedagogy is then related to the society in which the individual matures.

At the level of social groups, he noted that many myths are no longer used for guiding principles and that a new, modern myth needs to develop. For example, he noted that youth gangs are "doing the best that they can" (p. 8) at forming their own initiations and their own morality.
Further, he noted that brotherhood, in most myths, is confined to a bounded community and aggression is projected outward from this community. At the level of the individual, he noted:

If your private myth, your dream, happens to coincide with that of society, you are in good accord with your group. If it isn’t, you’ve got an adventure in the dark forest ahead of you. (p. 40)

Campbell's (1988) description of myth often resonates with Bruner’s (1990) description of narrative, especially Bruner’s references to folk psychology, the cultural canon, cultural influence on the development of a narrative of self, and an individual’s drive for meaning. Both indicate that the way in which a person conceptualizes self influences their actions and believes in regard to the everyday and the mundane, not only in regard to a metaphysical context. Also, both indicate that the concept of self cannot be understood when removed from the context of culture. Further, they both suggest that understanding of self is often at a symbolic level rather than the concrete level. Each of them argues that some type of cognitive prototype or model of the self exists which is reliant on both cultural and idiosyncratic factors. This model serves to prime our responses to everyday concerns in particular directions.
Research on the Interaction of Imagery, Affect, and Text

Long, Winograd and Bridge (1989) conducted research on imagery (involving vividness, frequency and types) and its relation to reading comprehension. They used fifth grade students for their research and grouped them as high visualizers and low visualizers. They had students read passages which had red dots at particular points. The students were to stop at each red dot and describe any imagery they were using. Also, after reading passages, students were asked to describe the images they recalled.

Long et al. (1989) found that imagery reported during reading at "think aloud" (p. 358) stops was different than the imagery reported after reading. During reading, a main effect was found for group (high visualizers and low visualizers). Also, an interaction effect was found showing that high visualizers reported significantly more imagery than low visualizers for four of the eleven text features: direct sensory descriptor, indirect sensory descriptor, literal analogy, and climactic point.

For the after reading reports on imagery, there was no main effect found for the groups, but there was a main effect found for text feature. Significantly more of these images related to the text features of literal analogies and personification than to the text features of direct or
indirect emotional descriptors, direct sensory descriptors, or onomatopoeia.

Long et al. (1989) suggested that imagery is an ongoing process during reading and that images may be continually constructed in working memory as new information is assimilated. This would allow for efficient assimilation of spatial, sensory and emotive information. Images also allow for parallel or simultaneous storage of information and, thus, the matching of new information to prior knowledge. Long et al. argue that schematic and text information may be carried forward from previous propositions, freeing verbal and short-term memory capacity for decoding and logical reasoning. The types of imagery recalled after reading were consistent with previous findings that imagery is involved with the organization and storage of information since the recalled images often represented synthesized information from longer units of the text. Long et al. (1989) suggested that this may represent what Sadoski (1983, 1984, 1985) refers to as organized "chunks" (p. 369) of thematic meaning.

One difference they found in regard to genre was that images produced by low visualizers during the reading of a narrative dealing with character affect and goals were apparently more memorable than the images produced to an expository type of text. They found a significant
correlation between the interest rating of material and the three imagery measures they used: vividness of imagery, imagery reported while reading and imagery reported after reading. However, they found no correlation between four verbal measures and three imaginal variables. The verbal measures included a prior knowledge test of specific vocabulary, a multiple-choice passage comprehension posttest, and two standardized tests, one of reading comprehension and one of general vocabulary.

Previous research cited by Long et al. (1989) demonstrated that giving instructions to generate images does increase comprehension, at least by some measures of comprehension. However, vividness of imagery has not been found to be related to reading comprehension as measured by standardized tests. Previous research has also shown little or no correlation between imagery and comprehension as measured by a multiple choice test.

It was suggested by Long et al. (1989) that imagery generated spontaneously may be different than imagery used purposefully as a metacognitive strategy in response to specific instructions. They suggest that the verbal measures they used were not sensitive to the imaginal mode. Further, they suggested that the multiple choice tests assess the product of reading comprehension while their imaginal measures were assessing the process of reading
comprehension. In looking at the process, they noted that their subjects often generated analogies to their personal experience and included them as part of their imagery reports. The possibility that spontaneous imagery represents an elaboration of the text that is interesting but unnecessary for answering multiple choice questions was also considered. Spontaneous imagery may increase the wonder of reading, but not the comprehension of what is read. Aspects of imagery ability they saw as possibly fruitful in future studies include imagery control, preferred imagery modality, and production of different imagery types.

Sadoski, Goetz and Kangiser (1988) conducted research with college students regarding the relationship of their imaging and affective responses to the plot importance ratings they gave to parts of the stories. Both scales and written responses were used. Sadoski et al. noted that scales have been found to be important in "eliminating the effects of variation in the ability of individuals to verbalize responses, interpretations and feelings adequately" (p. 324). They had the subjects read three different short stories and respond at different times during their readings. They noted that there were moderate to high correlations of all three variables for all three stories.
Sadoski et al. (1988) found that the variables effected each other differently. When affect rating was held constant, the relationships between imagery and rating of plot importance dropped to insignificance. A smaller, but still sizeable, drop in degree of relationship between affect and importance was noted when imagery was held constant. The smallest effect of partialling out occurred when importance was held constant. Then, the relationship between affect and imagery dropped only slightly. They indicated that their results support the assertions that 1) imagery has a relationship to affect independent of importance, 2) affect has a relationship to importance partially mediated by imagery, and 3) imagery has a relationship to importance strongly mediated by affect. Sadoski et al. noted that the written responses they obtained reflected this type of relationship. Subject reports on imagery often included affective material. To a lesser degree, their reports on affect also included images. The importance reports contained some affective references, but no references to imagery. Reports on imagery and affect rarely contained references to importance.

Sadoski et al. (1988) suggested that these findings indicated that imagery and affect are related constructs and that they mediate each other's relationships to other constructs. They describe this relationship as consistent
with Paivio's (1986) Dual Coding theory. In this case, the concrete textual material and the emotion evoking material result in images and affective responses which interact in an associated, overlapping way.

Engagement and Learning

Nystrand and Gamoran (1991) researched the effects of student engagement on literature achievement. In their research, they studied fifty-eight eighth grade English classes. They used Bloom's (1966) contrast of procedural engagement (engagement in classroom procedures such as paying attention, following rules, and completing assignments in a timely fashion) to substantive engagement (sustained commitment to a lesson and interest in the content and problems under consideration). In their studies, they used teacher differences in instruction to determine if students were substantively engaged in lessons. They rated teachers on several criteria having to do with discourse features in the classroom, writing assignments and reading lessons.

When looking at discourse, it was noted whether teacher's developed thematic coherence in their instruction. Three techniques were described as enhancing substantive engagement and the development of thematic coherence. First, teachers could react to student responses with high-level evaluations. A low level teacher reaction to a
student’s response might be a perfunctory indication of whether the answer is right or wrong. High level evaluation involves recognition of responses and the use of follow-up questions to enter the student’s response into the ongoing classroom exchange about the topic. Teachers use of authentic questions also enhances thematic coherence. These are open-ended questions which often have no definite right or wrong answer. Another teacher tactic is the use of uptake, that is, taking the student’s response to a question and using it to formulate a new question.

Whether teachers used substantively engaging writing assignments was also noted. Substantive writing assignments were seen as those which allow students to express their own thoughts and allow flexibility in how they respond. They noted research by Cohen and Riehl (1989) for which students were asked to write two compositions on the same topic. They were told that one composition would be an important factor in their final grades, and that the other one was being sent to peers in another country. The students’ compositions for unknown peers were consistently rated to be higher than the composition written for a grade. It was noted that, when writing in school, students are often put in the situation of writing information to someone who does not need to know it. The idea of audience is, thereby, removed from most school writing assignments.
Reading assignments were seen to be substantively engaging if they addressed questions the students deemed to be important, taught them things they valued, and were integrated into their personal experiences with the help of the teacher.

Based on their results, disengagement in a task negatively affected learning. Procedural engagement had a positive effect on learning, but to a limited degree. Increasing the amount of time spent on homework resulted in little improvement in achievement and no positive correlation was found between asking the teacher questions and achievement. The strongest effects were shown by substantive engagement. Further, the effects of procedural and substantive engagement were found to be largely independent of each other. Also, substantive engagement appeared to reduce the effects of demographic background factors such as race and socioeconomic status. The only demographic factor not reduced in impact was gender, girls consistently performed better on tests of achievement in literature.

Nystrand and Gamoran (1991) argued that research on student engagement must go beyond defining engagement as being compliant and well motivated. They argue that it is necessary to look beyond the students' behavior comportment
and examine the content and characteristics of their responses.

**Writing and Writing Assessment**

Anderson and Rubano (1991) assert that there has been little research into discourse conventions. Beach (1973) found that written responses to literature resulted in more interpretative responses while taped oral formats resulted in more engagement/autobiographical responses. Kenneth Koch (1990) had elementary students respond to poetry by writing poetry and respond to literature by writing literature. He found that students could respond to literature with aesthetic language.

Britton et al. (Britton, 1970; Britton, Burgess, Martin, McLeod, & Rosen, 1975) found three categories of written responses; expressive, transactional, and poetic. Expressive writing is primarily a means of generating and recording thought, such as a personal narrative directed at a trusted friend. Transactional discourse involves writing to an audience. The goal is to communicate an idea or accomplish a task. Transactional discourse in Britton’s sense is not analogous to Rosenblatt’s concept of transaction. Poetic discourse involves a reflection on an experience or a picture of the experience. Emphasis is placed on shaping the verbal object, the writer takes the
psychological stance of a spectator to his or her own experience. Written responses are not purely one form or another. Rather, these forms represent three poles which triangulate a continuum within which written responses fall.

Anderson and Rubano (1991) noted that most reader response research using protocols has relied on expressive or transactional responses. Questions asking for these types of responses may predispose students to take an efferent stance when they read. Asking them to read for the main idea of a story, according to Anderson and Rubano, could encourage students to take an aesthetic stance.

Expressive discourse, since it is concerned with personal response, may more directly reveal initial cognitive and emotive response. Expressive discourse does not even need to acknowledge the text, it is simply a student's personal responses while reading the text.

Langer (1990) promoted the cognitive concept of envisionment as a necessary first step in response to writing. Anderson and Purbano (1991) argued that the cognitive concept of imagery is implicit in the idea of the spectator role in poetic discourse. They described this process in terms of Paivio's (1986) Dual Coding theory. Poetic discourse is assumed, according to Anderson and Purbano, to involve establishing a "dominant image which can sustain and attenuate a general imagery context which is
thus continuously or repeatedly evoked as the text is read" (pp. 17-18).

Purves (1979) extended this concept and argued that imagery helps to establish a "central tendency" (p. 809) which constrains idiosyncratic responding. The central imagery and the emotional meaning subordinates reader responses to a total pattern established by the text.

Purves and Rippere (1968) identified four general headings for the elements in adolescent articulated responses to literature. The headings were 1) Engagement-Involvement, 2) Perception, 3) Interpretation, and 4) Evaluation. Another category had to do with miscellaneous responses for digressions extraneous to the text.

Purves (1992), after extensive international involvement in research on writing over many years, reflected on the status of research on writing assessment. He indicated that both performance assessment and objective testing are flawed. He said that he has been furiously involved in the debate over the merits of different schemes for assessing writing samples and making international comparisons. However, his efforts and research have led him to the conclusion that, since most finished writing products in the real world go through several drafts, most writing assessments address how well students develop a draft of what they want to say. Also, he asserted that, no matter
how carefully developed the scoring criteria or how thoroughly raters are trained, writing assessment remains very subjective. He compared the assessment of writing to the rating of sports such as diving and gymnastics, valid only for that particular competitive event. He noted that rankings in sports sometimes accumulate over a year, but even those rankings are not absolute. He did not recommend abandoning writing research. He did insist that any claims made should be modest ones.

Engelhard, Gordon, and Gabrielson (1992) reviewed the results of the eighth grade writing assessments done in the state of Georgia. Different assessments had required the mode of discourse to be narrative, descriptive or expository. The experiential demands were recall of direct experience, use of imagined experience, or use of outside knowledge. They noted that they only looked at the task demanded of the students, not whether or not students responded in the expected way for each task.

In Georgia, writing samples were scored on five domains. The first domain, Content/Organization, addressed how well the student organizes the material and the quality of the material. The second domain, Style, had to do with such matters as how well the student develops tone and voice. The other three domains were more related to technical skills of writing. These domains were Sentence
Formation, Language Usage, and Language Mechanics.

When the mode of required discourse was reviewed, it was found that narratives were generally rated highest, followed by descriptive writing, with tasks asking for expository writing receiving the lowest scores. The effect was strongest on the content/organizational domain. Experiential demand was found to have a small but significant effect on all three domains.

Gender differences, favoring the females, were found to have a stronger impact on scores than either mode of discourse or experiential demands. These differences became greater as discourse demands moved from expository to descriptive to narrative. The differences also became greater as experiential demands moved from use of outside knowledge to reports on real or imagined experiences.

The students for this research were asked to write about how they reacted to the poetry presentation rather than being asked to analyze the poems in any way. This could have allowed students to use what Anderson and Rubano (1991) referred to as expressive discourse. The students' writing was analyzed based on their performance in the Composition and Style domains, since these two domains appear to be the ones most readily affected by variations in tasks demands.
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SUMMARY

The model for this research involved several levels of perspective of the student and drew from several research arenas. This model represented a generalization rather than fast and hard divisions. Cross referencing among the arenas is common in the research. Researchers in the areas of Narrative and Reader Response Theory often cite Paivio’s (1986) dual coding theory and the arena of cognitive psychology is often cited in communication research. Each arena does refer to a particular phenomena that is pertinent to this research, that there are qualitatively different responses to interactions based on arousal level.

To look at how the information is actually processed, dual coding theory provides much empirical evidence and is frequently referenced by reader response theory proponents and narrative proponents alike. In particular, Paivio (1986) noted that there are two subsystems within the brain. One processes and stores information sequentially and one processes and stores information synchronously. A person sees a picture as a unit. Language is heard or read one unit at a time and in order. The two subsystems can operate independently or in parallel. The interaction of the two subsystems can interfere with performance or enhance performance, depending on the types of tasks and how performance is measured.
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Cognitive psychology and communication research address when and how decisions, conscious or not, are made to allocate energy, to initiate arousal, to maintain attention, to develop other perspective, or to restructure information. In conversations, it has been found that the level of involvement of the participants effects how they process information. Research in the area of persuasion indicates that behavior can effect the credibility granted a speaker. This credibility appears to be based on judgements of a speaker's competence, character, sociability, composure and dynamism.

In Reader Response Theory, two different approaches to reading are delineated, the efferent and the aesthetic. The aesthetic involves reading for pleasure, reading to live through the experience described in the text. Nell (1988) has demonstrated that there are definite physiological changes when someone is reading for pleasure. Attention appears to be directed toward the reading material during pleasurable reading and more toward internal mental processes when reading less interesting material.

Much of the research in reader response theory describes and contrasts the aesthetic and efferent stances and suggests instructional practices that might encourage students to take the aesthetic stance. It seems to be less concerned with student characteristics or even with students...
who have particular difficulty with reading mechanics. For example, Long et al. (1989) eliminated six students from their subject pool because they had scored below the twenty-fifth percentile in reading on a group achievement test. Also, when studying engagement, Nystrand and Gamoran (1991) did not use student responses to determine if students were "substantively engaged" (p. 262), a term when applied to language arts is akin to the aesthetic stance. They used teacher characteristics and assumed that students responded either procedurally or substantively based on those characteristics. Neither does the research in reader response theory direct itself extensively to differences in students who take the aesthetic stance and those who do not. It seems that most researchers in this area assume that, if instruction is done appropriately, students will automatically switch to an aesthetic stance.

Descriptions of aesthetic stance suggest that readers may be accessing imagery information while reading. Long et al.'s (1989) fifth grade students often described image formation or emotional responses to what was being read. Nell's (1988) ludic readers often slowed down when reading most-liked pages.

There do seem to be individual differences in the probability that imagery will be used. However, it appears that all readers may use imagery to some extent. In Long et
al.’s study, those students rated as low imagers still reported using imagery about half of the time they were questioned. Paivio (1986) stated that whether or not imagery is used, indeed what determines how an individual will process information, is determined by situational factors, individual differences, and how cultural factors have impacted the individual. Rosenblatt (1938), the acknowledged founder of the Reader Response Theory movement, also noted that whether an aesthetic stance is taken depends, in part, on sociophysical factors. Race is one potential social factor that could affect how students respond to literature. Data was collected on the race of students who participated in this research to determine if it was related to how the students responded to the different lesson delivery styles.

The way culture effects where we derive our pleasures and to what we are willing to allocate our personal energies was discussed by Bruner (1991). In his conceptualization, culture effects each person’s personal narrative. A story of one’s self which is continuously being written as previous chapters are being revised. Information is processed in terms of how well it fits with the cultural canon and how well it serves a negotiation function. Two of the ways this process can break down are 1) when there is disagreement over what is canon, and 2) when there is
rhetorical overspecialization, so that the canon loses its negotiation function.

Adolescents and adults often disagree on what is the cultural canon. The adolescent may assert that it is expected and usual for a thirteen year old to be allowed to stay out of the home until one o’clock in the morning, while the adult believes that such behavior is exceptional and unacceptable. The differences in what teachers see as accepted, usual and expected often contrast sharply with their students’ folk psychology.

What was of particular concern in this research was whether presenting literature, as a part of the canon, in a rhetorically overspecialized manner inhibits the possibility of the literature being used for negotiation. That is, a bland delivery and a requirement for right answers as responses may have inhibited the students from taking an aesthetic stance because the information was not perceived by the students as worthy of consideration for being interwoven into their own personal narratives. If the teacher modelled an aesthetic stance in the presentation (reading the poem as if he was living through the experience) it may have been perceived as information of a more personal form. If it was perceived as representing a part of someone else’s personal narrative it may have, thereby, been judged worthy of consideration for being
entered into the students' own personal narratives. If the presenter met felicity conditions (the literature was perceived as real), the students may have been more prepared to grant him, from their perspective, a sense of Personhood. Teachers may not be able to change differences in how teachers and students perceive the cultural canon, but they can make efforts to improve their skills at negotiating with students.

It was expected from a review of the research that the difference in presentations would affect the extent to which information was processed referentially (utilizing the synchronous and the simultaneous subsystems of dual coding theory). From the efferent stance, the presentation may have been perceived as poorly connected pieces of input. With this stance, without a desire to live through the literature, coding activity may have involved allocating energy to form representations, make associations, and little else. Even if local coherence was maintained for the lines or couplets of poetry, there may have been little energy devoted to forming global comprehension of the poems.

From the aesthetic stance, it was expected that information would be processed by greater activation of referential processes, transformational process, and synchronous organization across sensory modalities.
Further, it was expected that there would be differences in the written performances of students who had been exposed to the different presentation styles. Reader response theory indicates that students may organize information differently based on which stance they take because of the qualitative differences in how the literature is read. Although this difference in organization may not be apparent on multiple choice tests, it was expected to be more apparent when students were asked to structure their own responses in writing. It was expected that the students exposed to the aesthetic delivery would use more vivid language, present more distinctive voice, and establish clearer tone in their written responses.
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

This study was to determine whether oral delivery style significantly affects the level of responsiveness in written reactions to poetry.

Subjects

Two seventh grade language arts classes from each of two different schools, four classes in all, were selected from within a single school system. The seventh grade students within each school in the system were divided into regular and honors English and then assigned randomly to classes by computer before the school year started. One school draws from middle to upper middle class neighborhoods. It has a small minority population, mostly Asian. The other school draws from middle to lower middle class neighborhoods and has a 43% African-American population, 47% white population with 10% representing a variety of ethnic groups. School 1 had 27 White students, 3 Black students, and 2 Oriental students participating in this research. School 2 had 16 White students, 19 Black students, and 1 Hispanic student participating.

Within each school the two classes both had the same language arts teacher. All classes were regular English
classes. The two classes from each school were randomly assigned to one of the two treatment conditions. Since students were randomly assigned to classes within each school, differential selection threats were less of a concern. Since the classes within each school were different classes taught by the same language arts teacher, differences based on the effect of the regular education teacher were minimized.

Instrumentation

Writing Subtest of the Virginia Literacy Passport Test

The scoring procedures for this test address the domains of composing, style, sentence formation, usage, and mechanics. In the scoring procedures used by the Virginia State Department of Education the scores on the first two domains are weighted when obtaining the overall score, reflecting the relative importance the state places on the development of higher order skills. The Composing Domain is multiplied by three and the Style Domain is multiplied by two. The other three domains are Sentence Formation, Language Usage, and Language Mechanics. Appendix A provides a more detailed description of the domains and scoring procedures.

The domains are congruous with the domains established for the literacy test in the state of Georgia except that,
in Georgia, the first domain is referred to as Content/Organization. Engelhard, Gordon, and Gabrielson (1992) conducted research on the Georgia test using data obtained from across the state. Their results indicated that the first two domains (Conduct/Organization and Style) are sensitive to factors such as mode of discourse demanded (narrative, descriptive or expository) and experiential demands (direct experience, imagined experience, or use of outside knowledge). Also, there was a consistent gender difference in favor of the girls.

Because the other three domains do not seem to be as sensitive to changes in task demands, it is the first two domains of the Virginia Literacy Passport Test (LPT), Composing and Style, which will be used to assess writing skills for the purposes of this research.

The Virginia Department of Education developed a draft of the technical characteristics of the LPT (1992). This paper asserted, "The scoring rubrics for these domains are based on theory and research in the development of children’s writing ability, which lends to the test’s validity" (p. 2). It was also noted in this paper that a factor analysis of responses to ten writing prompts strongly suggested that the five different domains did measure different aspects of student writing. Further, the first two domains, Composition and Style, "accounted for over half
of the variability of the scores out of the total of 95% variability accounted for in the analysis" (p. 2).

The draft report indicated that interrater reliabilities were determined for the February 1992 administration of the test in Virginia. Two readers were used for each composition. With a scoring range of 1 to 4 for each domain, the two readers agreed on the total score within one point in 97% of the compositions with exact agreement in 61% of the cases.

Bett’s Questionnaire of Mental Imagery (QMI)

A 35 item version of the Bett’s Questionnaire on Mental Imagery, a shortened version of the original form (Sheehan, 1967) has been used in other studies (Long, Winograd and Bridge, 1989 who also cited Cramer, 1980; Irwin, 1979; White, Sheehan and Ashton, 1977). For this questionnaire, subjects are asked to imagine five instances from the sensory modality categories of visual, auditory, cutaneous, kinesthetic, gustatory, olfactory, and organic. Subjects use a 7 point scale to rate their images. A test-retest reliability of .76 after a seven month interval was reported by Sheehan (1967). Juhasz (1972) reported a split-half reliability of .95.

Lorenz and Neisser (1985) studied the relationship of various measures of imagery. In their factor analytic study
they confirmed the existence of two factors which had been established many times in other research (Vividness and Control of Imagery, and Spatial Manipulation) and found evidence for a third factor, which they referred to as Spontaneous Elaboration of Imagery. The QMI had the strongest loading of any measure studied on the Vividness of Imagery and Control Factor (rotated factor loading of .78). The QMI had low factor loadings of .11 and below on the other two factors of the rotated factor matrix. The factor for which the QMI had a strong factor loading, the Vividness of Imagery and Control Factor, was described by Lorenz and Neisser as "the readiness to describe one's own experienced images as clear and vivid" (p. 494).

**Affective Orientation Scale**

This 20 item scale was developed by Booth-Butterfield and Booth-Butterfield (1990). Based on their conceptualization, people differ widely on how they weigh affect as information. The authors suggest that people's affective orientation (AO) has implications for the types of information they are likely to encode, the characteristics they favor in interaction partners, and how they might learn most effectively. The two dimensions of affective orientation are 1.) awareness of emotions and 2.) acting upon affect. They stated that the concept of affective
orientation is used to explain how people are differentially aware of even low levels of emotion and the extent to which emotion is used to guide communication. It refers to "an information processing approach in which the associative networks developing around emotions are weighed as valid and important" (p. 455).

They found that their scale had good factor structure and internal reliability. A Spearman-Brown coefficient of .85 and a Cronbach’s alpha of .81 were obtained in a study with 277 undergraduate students. A single factor solution to the factor analysis of this same study produced 15 items with loadings above .40, 3 above .35, and 2 above .28. Comparing it to other scales, they found that AO was related positively to conversational sensitivity, femininity, and communication production. AO was unrelated to communication apprehension, masculinity, self-monitoring, and need for cognition.

Behavioral Response

In the classroom setting three behavioral markers were used to rate the students’ responses to the presentations: looking at the presenter, head supported by neck (as opposed to having head down, resting on arms, or slumped forward), and low random activity level. Students were each rated on these behavioral indicators of arousal based on Burgoon,
Birk, and Pfau (1990) and Coker and Burgoon (1987) research on the relationship of nonverbal behavior to communication. Their research provided support for the use of nonverbal behaviors as "useful overt manifestations of internally experienced arousal" (p. 244). Burgoon et al.'s researched numerous arousal measures, including measures such as the indicators used in this research. They used a seven interval scale for 62 items in an experiment where subjects were given mock job interviews. Two trained coders completed the scales while viewing videotaped recordings of the interviews. Burgoon et al. obtained interrater reliabilities of .75 for Orientation/Gaze, .91 for Random Movement, and .82 for Body Lean. Interitem reliabilities of .78 for Orientation/Gaze and .69 for Random Movement were obtained. No interitem reliability was obtained for Body Lean since it was a single item dimension.

Students in the present experiment were simply rated by two different observers to be exhibiting behavior indicative of arousal or not. Students who exhibited at least two of the three indicators for arousal were rated as aroused while students who did not exhibit at least two of the indicators received a rating of non-aroused.
Writing Samples

Writing samples were assessed by two raters. Each of these raters had been trained in the scoring procedures for the Virginia Literacy Passport Test. In addition to scoring the writing samples in the domains of composition and style, three subdomains of style were separately rated; vividness of language, tone, and voice. The raters were trained to rate each of these components separately. For the purposes of this research each scorer rated each component on a four point scale which corresponded to the four point scale used for the domains.

The most direct measure of personal involvement in a writing sample may well be an assessment of the voice in the production. Similarly, the most direct measure of emotional involvement may be an assessment of the tone of the paper. The quality of imagery in a response would be reflected in the vividness of language a student uses. Interrater reliabilities were obtained using the Spearman R for both of the domains and each of the subdomains.

Procedure

Prior to the treatment, students who participated in the study were given the Bett’s QMI and the AO Scale. The students’ scores on the Composing and Style Domains of the Virginia LPT Test, which they had taken while in sixth
grade, were obtained. The gender of each student was also noted.

The same presenter was used for all treatments. The presenter was introduced as a guest speaker who came to read poems to the class.

The students were asked to listen attentively. They were told that, after the presentation, they would be asked to write about their response to the poems. After the poems were read, the students were told that they could write about what they thought about, how they felt, and whether they believed the poems were interesting or relevant to their own lives. Further, they were told that their response could take any written form they would like. As examples, they were told that they could write a poem themselves, write in story form, write an essay, or write as if they were writing for their personal journal or writing a letter to a friend.

Also, the students were told that the content did not have to be only about what a poem said. They could also write about how it made them feel, something it reminded them of, or what they imagined as they heard a poem. Poems were then read to the class. The script for the presentation is attached in Appendix B.
Students were then given 30 minutes to write. Their papers were collected immediately after the 30 minutes had expired.

Two treatments were compared. For two classes, one in each school, poems were read to students using little voice inflection and no gesticulation. Essentially, the presenter was taking what Rosenblatt (1938) referred to as an efferent stance to poetry interpretation. In the other treatment, two classes were presented the same poems by the same presenter. For this treatment, the presenter modulated his voice, used gesticulatory cues and facial expressiveness, and paced his delivery to augment his interpretation of the poems. For this presentation style, the presenter was modelling what Rosenblatt referred to as the aesthetic stance to literature. From the perspective of Communication Research, the presenter was exhibiting behaviors which are associated with greater immediacy and involvement. Both delivery styles were practiced before the research was conducted to assure as much consistency as possible within each treatment condition. Using the same person to give both deliveries helped to control for effects which could result from such factors as the physical appearance, race and gender of the presenter. The use of the same school system helped to control for effects which could occur from differences resulting from exposure to different curricula.
Because the treatments consisted of single lessons and all the treatments were conducted within a one week time frame, threats from attrition, history and maturation were reduced.

The effects of differences established from exposure to different teachers during the school year are still of some concern. For example, whether or not the regular teacher used an aesthetic style may have impacted on the students’ response to the particular treatment they received. However, it is hoped that this concern was minimized by using the same teacher within each school.
CHAPTER IV. DATA ANALYSIS

The data was analyzed using several measures of relationships. First, the information was factor analyzed to determine if factors exist to support the model. Secondly, two canonical analyses were done to determine how sets of independent variables related to sets of dependent variables. Two analyses were run because the behavioral response of students can be seen as a dependent variable (in response to the lesson delivery style) or as an independent variable (in that it may impact on the students’ written responses).

Finally, five multiple regressions were run on three different groups to determine the relationship of the independent variables to each of the dependent variables. First, the five regression equations were run using eight independent variables: LPT Composing score, LPT Style score, Bett’s Questionnaire of Mental Imagery (QMI) score, Affective Orientation Scale (AO) score, gender, school of attendance, lesson delivery style, and behavioral response. Then, to look at the students’ responses under each condition, two other sets of regressions were run. The regression equations were run on each of the writing post-
measures using only the sample of students who received the more dramatic (aesthetic) delivery and then only the sample of students who received the more bland (efferent) delivery. For these two equations there were seven independent variables since the variable of lesson delivery style was eliminated.

In the analyses, the post-measure composition and style variables were representative of higher order writing skills. Of the subdomains, vividness of language rated how well students communicated imagery; tone represented communication of affect; and voice was a rating of how well a sense of self was communicated.

Sampling Concerns

A number of events conspired to greatly reduce the original sample size of 89 students involved in this experiment. Six parents refused permission to have their children participate and another 4 students never returned the forms, despite attempts to reach the parents by telephone to talk with them about any concerns they may have had. Ten students with permission to participate were absent on the day of the presentations. Sixty-nine students were in attendance on the day of the presentations. Complete data was collected on 41 of these 69 subjects. Three students had not taken the LPT tests in sixth grade because they were attending school in another state at the
time. Five students did not complete the questionnaires appropriately. Data was lost on an additional 19 students due to a technical error with one of the video tape cameras. This loss of sample size is a serious concern for this research.

Behavior Rating

This was a straightforward rating of behavior done by two different raters. Students were rated as aroused if they exhibited two out of three of the behaviors: extended gaze at the presenter, support of head by neck (as opposed to resting their heads on the table or on their hands), and low level of random movement. Because of the concreteness of the observation criteria, the two raters were in 100% agreement on how to rate each student.

Post-Measures of Writing

The correlations of the scores from the two raters on each of the five postmeasures were consistently high, ranging from a low of .80 to a high of .93 (Table 1).

Along with the high correlations, the two different raters did not score any variable of any student’s writing sample more than 1 point differently than the other rater.
Table 1

*Interrater correlation scores for domains and subdomains.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vividness of Language</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Postmeasures**

The five writing postmeasures were each based on a four point scale. Their averages ranged from a low of 1.70 for vividness of language to a high of 2.51 for voice. All of the variables had a standard deviation of .70 or below except for vividness of language which had a standard deviation of .92 (Table 2). So, the vividness of language variable demonstrated the most variability and also had the lowest mean score.
Table 2

Means and standard deviations of domain and subdomain writing sample scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vividness of Language</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation Matrix

This matrix demonstrates that the two LPT scores, the Composing and Style domains, were highly correlated with each other (correlation coefficient of .82). Each of these domains also had a low correlation to gender (.46 for LPT Composition and .33 for LPT Style). The correlation matrix for the thirteen variables is shown in Table 3.

Lesson delivery style and behavioral response had a moderate level of correlation (.70) with each other, but neither variable correlated above .30 with any other variable. Also, neither of the questionnaires, the QMI nor
Table 3

**Correlation matrix of thirteen variables used in the research.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LPTC</th>
<th>LPTS</th>
<th>QMI</th>
<th>AO</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>SCH</th>
<th>LES</th>
<th>RESP</th>
<th>COMP</th>
<th>STYL</th>
<th>VIV</th>
<th>VOIC</th>
<th>TONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPTC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPTS</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESP</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYL</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIV</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOIC</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONE</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**

LPTC = Literacy Passport Test Composition Domain  
LPTS = Literacy Passport Test Style Domain  
QMI = Betts Questionnaire of Mental Imagery  
AO = Affective Orientation Questionnaire  
GEN = Gender  
LESS = Lesson Delivery Style  
COMP = Postmeasure Composition Score  
STYL = Postmeasure Style Score  
VIV = Vividness of Imagery Score  
VOIC = Voice Score  
TONE = Tone Score  
SCH = School of Attendance  
RESP = Behavioral Response
the AO, correlated above .30 with each other or any other variable.

Along with its low correlations with the LPT domains, gender also correlated to a low degree to the postmeasure of vividness of language (.30). School of attendance had a correlation of .31 with the postmeasure of vividness of language but had correlations below .30 with all of the other variables.

Of the writing postmeasures, voice and tone had a high correlation with each other of .83. The postmeasures of composing and style were correlated to each other to a low degree (.49). Vividness of language had low correlations with both tone and voice (.34 and .40, respectively). The postmeasure of composing had correlations below .30 to both vividness of language and tone. The postmeasure of style had correlations below .30 with all three of the subdomains; vividness of language, tone and voice.

The postmeasure of composition had correlations below .30 with all of the premeasures. The postmeasure of style had a correlation of .30 to the premeasure of LPT Composition and .34 to the premeasure of LPT Style. The style postmeasure had correlations below .30 with all of the other premeasures.

Each of the postmeasure subdomains had correlations of .30 or above with only one premeasure. Vividness of
language had a correlation of .30 with gender; voice had a correlation of .31 with school of attendance; and tone had a correlation of .37 with LPT Composition score.

Overall the correlations tended to be less than would be expected by the hypotheses. Even the premeasures of writing skills, LPT Composition and LPT Style scores, had low to very low correlations with the writing postmeasures.

Factor Analysis

With thirteen variables being used, a factor analysis was done to detect structure in the relationships between the variables. If the relationships discussed in the hypotheses were demonstrated in this research they would be reflected in the factor structure. The thirteen variables were factor analyzed based on their variances. A varimax (variance maximizing) rotation was used. This procedure maximizes the amount of remaining variability explained by each new factor.

When all of the variables were analyzed (Condition 1) there were 41 subjects. Five factors with eigenvalues over 1.0 were identified. To increase the number of subjects to 60, all of the variables except for behavioral response (Condition 2) were investigated through a separate factor analysis. In this condition four distinct factors with eigenvalues over 1.0 were apparent. Table 4 shows the eigenvalues for each factor under each condition.
Table 4

**Eigenvalues for factors found in each condition.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Condition 1</th>
<th>Condition 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the factors in each condition met the Kaiser criteria for consideration (eigenvalues above 1.0). Since the fifth factor was not demonstrated with the larger sample (and the variable of behavioral response did not load significantly on this factor with the smaller sample) the possibility that this factor was a spurious result was considered. Because of this, only four factors were further analyzed in both conditions.

When the variables were put through varimax rotation the first four factors of the first condition and the four factors of the second condition were highly similar (except that factors two and three were in reverse order to each other).
Four factor varimax rotation

Factor 1

The factor analysis for Condition 1 is shown in Table 5 and the factor analysis of Condition 2 is shown in Table 6. The first factor of each condition was represented by strong to moderate loadings from the cluster of all of the post-measure scores of writing except for style. This suggests that, except for the style variable, the post-measures of the written responses did tend to operate as a single factor. When behavioral response was included as a variable (Condition 1) in the factor analysis, then the variable of school of attendance had a weak loading on the first factor. Since school of attendance did not load as strongly when behavioral response was not included as a variable (Condition 2), the strength of its relationship to the other variables in this factor is questionable.

Factor 2

In the condition where behavioral response was included the second factor had a strong loading from lesson delivery style; moderate loadings from the AO scale and behavioral response; and weak loadings from school of attendance and the post-measure variable vividness of language. This is similar to the third factor in the condition without behavioral response as a variable. In this condition, the AO scale, school of attendance, and lesson delivery style...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>FACTOR 3</th>
<th>FACTOR 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Delivery Style</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vividness of Language</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Factor structure of twelve variables under Condition 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>FACTOR 3</th>
<th>FACTOR 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Delivery Style</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vividness of Language</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
loaded moderately to the factor and the post-measure vividness of language loaded weakly. In both conditions vividness of language loaded in the opposite direction of all of the other variables.

A lower score on the AO scale is indicative of stronger affective orientation. The negative correlation of this measure to the students' level of written responses in the area of vividness of language suggests that the strength of the trait of affective orientation is positively correlated with this post-measure.

The pattern suggests that students with relatively strong general writing skills (as assessed by the LPT) used less vivid language in their writing when 1). they received the more dramatic lesson delivery, 2). they responded with behavior indicating attentiveness, and/or 3). had relatively weaker affective orientation (as assessed by the AO scale).

**Factor 3**

When behavioral response was included as a variable (Condition 1), the third factor had strong loadings from the pre-measure scores on the LPT Composition and Style domains along with moderate loadings from gender and a weak loading from the post-measure style domain. When behavioral response was not included as a variable (Condition 2), the same variables loaded in like manner on the second factor of the condition.
This suggests that the quality of a student’s use of style in his or her written response was strongly related to the student’s general writing skills (as assessed by the LPT Composition and Style domains) and to gender.

Factor 4

The fourth factor in each condition had moderate loadings from three variables: score on the QMI and the post-measure domain scores of Composition and Style. The consistently moderate loadings on this factor suggest that how vividly students’ reported to perceive images was related to how well they demonstrated their skills with composing and style.

Factor analysis with race as a variable

A separate factor analysis was done under Condition 2 (all of the variables except for behavioral response) with race included as a variable. In the correlation matrix for this analysis race correlated -.27 with gender and -.28 with school of attendance. The absolute values of the correlations of race with all other variables were each below .18. In the factor analysis (Table 7) a fifth factor was created with race included as a variable. However, the only variables to load on this factor were race, gender and school of attendance. More Black students attended one school than the other. Also, there were more male Black
Table 7

Factor structure with race as a variable under Condition 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>FACTOR 3</th>
<th>FACTOR 4</th>
<th>FACTOR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Delivery Style</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vividness of Language</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
students than female Black students represented. Since race was found to relate only to demographic variables, it was not included in further analyses.

**Review of factor analysis**

The factor structure does suggest that there are a number of relationships between the post-measures of writing and the other measures. Overall, these relationships were weaker and less consistent than was predicted by the hypotheses. For example, affective orientation was related to vividness of language on one factor, but did not have a strong relationship with tone on any of the factors. Lesson delivery style and behavioral response demonstrated a strong relationship to only one post-measure, vividness of language, and this relationship was in the opposite direction of what was predicted. Students' responses to the QMI were related to how well a student demonstrated skills with composition and style, but was not related to the vividness of language used by the student.

**Canonical Analysis**

In order to investigate the relationship of the pre-measures and treatment condition to the post-measures, canonical analyses were run on all thirteen variables. The canonical analyses assessed the relationship of the
premeasures as a set of variables to the postmeasures as a set of variables. The hypotheses of this experiment suggested that there would be sets of variables in the premeasures correlating with sets of variables in the postmeasures.

Since the behavioral response of students can be viewed as a dependent variable (in response to presentation style), or as an independent variable (in its effects on written responses), two canonical analyses were done. In the first, behavioral response was treated as an independent variable and in the second it was treated as a dependent variable. With behavioral response treated as an independent variable none of the canonical roots reached a level of significance. With behavioral response as a dependent variable, one canonical root reached a level of significance.

**The Nonsignificant Canonical Equation**

The nonsignificant canonical analysis had a Canonical R of .63 with a probability of .25 that the correlation was by chance. The overall equation extracted 69.52% of the variance of the independent variables (left set) and 100% of the variance for the dependent variables (right set). None of the roots for this equation reached a level of statistical significance. This suggests that the premeasures, taken as a set of variables, did not impact
significantly to the postmeasures when taken as a set of variables. The factor structure and canonical weights of the first root of this equation are provided in Appendix C.

**Factor Structure of Canonical Root in Significant Equation**

For this equation, behavioral response was considered as a dependent variable, as a response to lesson delivery style. This equation had a Canonical R of .82 with a probability below .01 (p=.004) that the correlation was chance. The overall equation extracted 89.68% of the variance of the independent variables (left set) and 100% of the variance of the right set. One canonical root did reach significance. This root extracted 18% of the variance for the independent variables and 17% of the variance for the dependent variables. The factor weights and the canonical weights of the variables for the one significant canonical root are provided in Table 8.

The strongest loadings on the statistically significant canonical root were the lesson delivery style and behavioral response. As the hypotheses predicted, the more aesthetic delivery style did correlate with a behavioral response associated with arousal. Weakly loading to this factor were the LPT Style score, the AO scale, and the post-measure writing assessment of vividness of language.
Table 8

Factor structure and Canonical Weights for Independent and Dependent Variables of the Canonical Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor Structure</th>
<th>Canonical Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT Style</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Delivery Style</td>
<td>-.91</td>
<td>-.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>-.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vividness of Language</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Vividness of language loaded in the opposite direction of lesson delivery style and behavioral response. This suggests that a more aesthetic delivery and a more aroused behavioral response to the presentation was related to less vivid use of language in student responses. That is, a more dramatic delivery may have had the effect of suppressing use of vivid language in the writing of some students.

Loading to a low degree and in a negative direction were the pre-measure LPT Style score and scores on the AO scale. Since the AO scale is an inverse scale, the negative correlation indicates a positive relationship between the trait of affective orientation and students’ scores on vividness of language. This suggests that the more likely a student is to consider affect in decision making, the more vividly the student used language in a written response. Also, a low score on the LPT Style domain was related to higher ratings of how vividly the students used language in their responses to the poetry reading.

Canonical Weights

The canonical weights show the unique contributions of each of the variables. As with the factor structure, lesson delivery style and behavioral response both had large contributions while vividness of language had a low contribution in the opposite direction. This supports the
possibility that a more dramatic lesson delivery and a more aroused response by the students may be related to a suppression of the vividness of language used in the responses of some students.

The unique contributions of the variables LPT Style domain and AO questionnaire were both less than would be suggested by the factor structure. The canonical weights of QMI scores and gender were both higher than their factor weights. This suggests that the contribution of AO scores and LPT Style scores to the factor structure may have been shared with the two variables QMI scores and gender.

Among the post-measures, the unique contribution of the style variable was less than would be expected based on the factor structure weight, suggesting that this variable shared much of its variance with the other post-measures. The other postmeasures had canonical weights which were nearly equal to or higher than their factor structure weights, suggesting that each variable’s contribution to the factor structure was largely unique to itself. The postmeasure variable of tone had a moderate level of unique contribution. Further, the contribution of tone was in the same direction as lesson delivery style and behavioral response.
Review of Canonical Analyses

The canonical analyses confirmed the strong relationship between lesson delivery style and behavioral response. Although its contribution was not largely unique, score on the AO questionnaire did demonstrate a weak relationship with postmeasures. Vividness of language had a low relationship to the premeasures and most of the variance accounted for by this relationship appears to be largely unique to the variable vividness of language itself. Taking the premeasures as a set of variables and the postmeasures as a set of variables, most other relationships were found to be relatively weak.

Multiple Regression

The hypotheses suggested that each of the postmeasure variables would be effected differently by the premeasures and by the treatment conditions. To look separately at the relationship of the pre-measures and the treatment conditions to each of the post-measures, multiple regressions were run on each of the five post-measures. This was done with the entire sample first. Then, to look at the students’ responses under each condition, two other sets of regressions were run. The regression equations were run on each of the writing post-measures using only the sample of students who received the more dramatic
(aesthetic) delivery and then only the sample of students who received the more bland (efferent) delivery.

For the sample of all students, eight variables (LPT Composing score, LPT Style score, QMI score, AO score, gender, school of attendance, lesson delivery style, and behavioral response) were regressed against each of the five writing assessment post-measure scores. For the other two samples of students, seven variables (the same as with the sample of all students except that lesson delivery style was excluded) were regressed against each of the five writing assessment post-measure scores.

**Regressions for the sample of all students**

For the overall sample, only the regression equation for the post-measure vividness of language reached a statistically significant level. This equation had a Multiple R of .61 and a probability below .05 that the correlation was chance (p=.04). Three variables were loaded to a significant degree in this equation (Table 9): the pre-measure LPT Style scores, AO scores, and gender. For this regression, the absolute values of the four highest partial correlations fell into a narrow range from .34 to .36. These four variables included the three variables which had statistically significant Beta weights along with the variable of lesson delivery style. Thus, the variance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>Partial Correl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Delivery Style</td>
<td>-.78</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which the three variables with the statistically significant Beta weights shared with the dependent variable, vividness of language, appeared to be largely unique to each of the independent variables. In addition, the lesson delivery style variable shared variance unique to itself with the vividness of language postmeasure.

These four variables also had the four highest canonical weights in the canonical analysis discussed above. Also, the vividness of language variable was the dependent variable with the largest canonical weight in the canonical analysis.

The pre-measure LPT Style score and the lesson delivery style variables were both negatively correlated in this regression equation to the students' score on the post-measure vividness of language. The AO correlation score was also negative. However, since a lower score on this test represents stronger affective orientation, the trait itself is positively correlated to the students' scores in Vividness of Language.

This is contrary to what was expected in the hypotheses. The QMI score was not a significant predictor of vividness of language while AO score, which was hypothesized to be a predictor of tone, was a predictor of vividness of language. Also, the AO score was not a predictor of the tone of the students' written responses and
behavioral response did not predict the voice used. As expected from the review of the research, girls tended to get higher scores than boys.

Regressions for the group receiving the dramatic delivery

Five regression equations were run for this group, one on each of the post-measure writing scores. Only the regression on the post-measure of Style reached statistical significance. This equation had a Multiple R of .73 with a probability of less than .05 that the correlation was by chance (p=.048). For this regression, three variables had statistically significant Beta weights (Table 10); the two writing pre-measures (LPT Composition score and LPT Style score) and the gender of the student. Gender had the largest partial correlation. General writing skills and gender were also found to be related to the post-measure of Style through factor analysis (Factor 3). For this group, the premeasure variable of LPT Style was a strong predictor of the postmeasure variable style. The pre-measure of LPT Composition was negatively correlated to the postmeasure variable of style, which strongly suggests that it does represent a separate domain from the LPT Style domain. Both of these variables had much lower partial correlations than Beta weights, suggesting that their variance in relation to the dependent variable was largely shared.
Table 10

Multiple regression on sample who received the aesthetic delivery with the style post-measure as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Partial Correl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As with previous research (Engelhard, Gordon, and Gabrielson, 1992), gender was a factor in the writing assessments, in favor of the girls. This variable had a slightly lower partial correlation than Beta weight, suggesting that some of its variance in relation to the postmeasure of style was shared with other variables. The other variables had partial correlations equivalent to or higher than their Beta weights, suggesting that their contributions to the variance were unique. Even though the hypotheses predicted that the premeasure of students use of style, the LPT Style score, would be a strong predictor of the postmeasure of style in all conditions, it was only for this sample, those students who received the dramatic delivery, that this relationship was both statistically significant and in a positive direction.

Regressions for the group receiving the bland (efferent) delivery

A distinctly different pattern emerged for this group. Neither of the regression equations on the Composition and Style domains attained statistical significance, but each of the three regression equations on the subdomains did reach statistical significance (p<0.5).
Regression on the vividness of language postmeasure

A Multiple R of .95 was attained for the regression on the post-measure of vividness of language (Table 11). The probability was below .01 that the correlation was by chance (p=.0005). The Beta weights for four variables were at a statistically significant level. These variables were the pre-measures of LPT Composing and LPT Style, the AO score, and gender.

Both the AO score and vividness of language loaded onto Factor 2 in the factor analysis also. The largest partial correlation in this multiple regression was from the pre-measure LPT Style score and was in a negative direction. All of the other partial correlations suggested a positive relationship (since a lower score on the AO scale suggests higher levels of the AO trait). Although it did not have a significantly high Beta weight, the behavioral response variable did have a moderate partial correlation (.59).

The hypotheses suggested that the QMI score (representing the vividness of imagery which the students reported) would be a strong predictor of the vividness of language used. However, it did not predict vividness of language scores while the students' scores on the AO scale (affective orientation) and the premeasures of writing skills (LPT Composition score and LPT Style score) were predictive.
Table 11

Multiple regression for students who received the efferent delivery with vividness of language as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Partial Correl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>-.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.91</td>
<td>-.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regressions on the tone and voice postmeasures

The Beta scores for the same three independent variables (both LPT pre-measures and the AO scale) reached statistical significance in each of the regression equations on the post-measures of voice and tone (Table 12 and Table 13). For the regression equation on voice, a Multiple R of .85 was attained, which has a probability below .05 of occurring by chance (p=.047). A Multiple R of .86 was attained on the regression equation for tone, with less than a .05 probability that this correlation is by chance (p=.04). The pre-measure LPT Style score had a negative partial correlation in each of these regressions.

In both equations, the two LPT domain scores along with the AO scores had the highest partial correlations. The QMI had a low partial correlation in each equation as did the school of attendance variable.

The negative correlation of the LPT Style variable relative to the LPT Composition variable supports the uniqueness of each of these two domains even though they are highly correlated with each other. The other variables with statistically significant relationships are as would be expected by the hypotheses. However, behavioral response did not correlate with either tone or voice, which runs counter to what was suggested by the hypotheses.
Table 12

Multiple regression for students who received the efferent lesson delivery with voice as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Partial Correl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.94</td>
<td>-.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Multiple Regression for students who received the efferent delivery with tone as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Partial Correl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>-.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review of regressions

The multiple regressions for the whole group did result in one significant equation, the regression on the post-measure of vividness of language. Gender, score on the AO scale, and score on the pre-measure LPT Style were all related to a statistically significant level to vividness of language in this equation. Lesson delivery style was negatively correlated to this post-measure. The relationships in this equation are similar to the ones discussed for the one statistically significant canonical root.

When regression equations were run only on students who had received the dramatic delivery a significant equation was obtained for only one variable, the post-measure of Style. Only the pre-measures of writing skills (LPT Composition score and LPT Style score) and gender contributed to a significant level to this equation. Based on the review of the research, gender was expected to be a factor in performance on writing tests.

For the group who received the dramatic delivery, the variable style was the only postmeasure to which the pre-measures of writing skills had statistically significant correlations, and the premeasure LPT Style variable was correlated in a negative direction.
Regression equations for the group that received the efferent delivery yielded significant equations for each of the three subdomains. For each of these regressions, the stronger the Affective Orientation trait, the higher the student's score on the subdomain. The pre-measures of writing skills were also shown to be correlated to a statistically significant degree. However, the pre-measure variable of LPT Style score was negatively correlated each time. This suggests that among students who received a bland lesson delivery, those who had been assessed to have relatively high composition skills (as compared to skills for developing style in writing) and/or had relatively higher affective orientation performed better in each of the subdomains assessed.

Except for the regression run on the sample which received a dramatic lesson delivery, affective orientation had a Beta weight which was at a statistically significant level for each equation to reach statistical significance. Overall, the effect of the pre-measures was most apparent within the sample of students receiving a bland delivery.

Summary

The factor analysis suggested that there are at least four distinct factors with the variables measured. This was apparent in the sample of 60 students as well as the smaller
sample of 41 students. The structure of these factors did not demonstrate the number nor strength of relationships predicted from the hypotheses. A separate factor analysis which included race as a variable revealed that race was related only to demographic factors, so race was not included in further analyses.

The factor structure did indicate that four of the five writing postmeasures loaded on the same factor along with school of attendance. The style variable was the exception and it loaded on a factor which included the two LPT domain variables and gender. For students who received the dramatic delivery, a regression equation indicated that the postmeasure of style was related to the same premeasures identified in this factor: the LPT domain scores and gender. Also, for the regression equations run on the sample of students who received the more dramatic delivery, style was found to be related to the same three variables.

The results suggest that the LPT Composition and Style scores share variance in their relationship to the postmeasure of style. The LPT Style score was positively related to the postmeasure of style while the LPT Composition score relationship was in a negative direction. Gender was also a factor with girls scoring higher than boys.
The variables of school of attendance, lesson delivery style, behavioral response and vividness of language all loaded onto one of the factors. Except for school of attendance, these same variables were shown to be related in one of the canonical correlations, the one which treated behavioral response as a dependent variable. The relationships found in this canonical correlation were also apparent when regression equations were run for the entire sample of students.

The pattern suggests that students who scored high in regard to affective orientation tended to use more vivid imagery in their written responses. Also, a more dramatic lesson delivery style and a behavioral response indicating arousal were related to less vivid imagery in the written responses.

The canonical correlation for the equation in which behavioral response was treated as an independent variable was not statistically significant. Further, only one statistically significant canonical root was established under the condition for which behavioral response was treated as a dependent variable. The canonical correlation suggests that, except for a strong relationship between the lesson delivery style and behavioral response, the overall relationships between pre-measures and post-measures was relatively low. In the sample using all of the students and
with the sample of students receiving the more dramatic delivery, only one of the five regression equations was found to reach a level of statistical significance for each group.

Regression equations run on each of the three writing subdomains (vividness of language, voice and tone) reached significance for the sample of students who received the bland (efferent) delivery. The pattern suggests that students who had been assessed to have relatively higher composition skills, as compared to skills with developing style in their writing, and had relatively higher assessed levels of the affective orientation trait, provided more vividness of language, more voice and more tone in their writing.

This may be related to the factor in the factor analysis on which the three subdomains and the domain of composition, loaded together moderately. However, no premeasure loaded significantly on this factor. This suggests either that the affects of pre-measures were masked in the larger samples of the factor analysis by the affects of the other variables, or that the relationships found in the smaller sample were spurious.

The factor from the factor analysis on which the Bett’s QMI score and the postmeasure variables of composition and style all loaded was not further explained by any of the
subsequent statistical analyses. Overall, the strength of the relationships was less than predicted by the hypotheses and the number of relationships was fewer.
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

Louise Rosenblatt (1938) described two ways to read. She described aesthetic reading as living through the experience of the literature while she described efferent reading as a disinterested, detached analysis of the material. In 1966 Benjamin Bloom expanded these concepts beyond reading to learning in general. He described substantive learning as learning based on a genuine interest in the subject and a desire to solve the problem. He contrasted this to procedural learning, or involvement in following classroom procedures and getting a good grade. More recently, arguments have been made that there has been too much focus on external rewards in education, asserting that intrinsic motivation is essential if students are to become sophisticated learners (Kohn, 1991 and Curwin and Mendler, 1988).

Just as students can respond to the same material in different ways, so, too, can teachers vary widely in the amount of energy, sincerity, and enthusiasm they put into their lesson delivery. Some have flat affect, use little
voice modulation, and employ few gesticulations. This type of lesson delivery reflects the efferent style. Others deliver lessons on the same material conveying emotional conviction by using distinctive pacing, good voice modulation, and appropriate gestures. This lesson delivery style would reflect an aesthetic approach to literary material.

The question addressed in this research was whether the short-term impact of a difference in delivery style would be evident in students’ behavioral reactions and written responses to the lessons. It was hypothesized that students would be engaged in substantive learning in response to an aesthetic lesson delivery style and that students would respond in a procedural manner to an efferent (bland) delivery style. Poetry was used because it represents an encapsulated and concise form of literary expression conducive for use within a single class period.

Fine and Speer (1992) stated that the aesthetic dimension comes to the fore in performance when performers are responsible for how they present the material. This performance, they argue, is a process by which culture and identity are constructed and negotiated. The poetry selected for this research contained enough imagery and emotive content that it readily allowed for the performance dimension described by Fine and Speer.
Four seventh grade classes were used in this study, two each from two different schools. All classes were presented the same scripted lesson on several poems. However, one class in each school saw a dramatic, aesthetic delivery while the other class saw an efferent, bland delivery.

Five background factors were also considered. Gender was included because it has been shown to be a significant factor on writing tests, usually in favor of the girls (Engelhard, Gordon, and Gabrielson, 1992). The tendency of the students to use visual imagery was also considered. This characteristic was assessed by using a shortened version of the QMI, Bett’s Questionnaire of Mental Imagery (Sheehan, 1967). Whether or not students tended to consider affect in decision making was assessed using the Affective Orientation (AO) Scale (Booth-Butterfield and Booth-Butterfield, 1990). The students’ scores on the Composition and Style Domains of the Virginia Literacy Passport Test (LPT) were used as an assessment of higher order writing skills. Finally, the possibility that the race of the students may have affected their responses to the presentations was considered.

Students’ written responses to the presentations were assessed using the procedures for assessing the LPT Writing subtest Domains of Composition and Style. The domains of composition and style along with the three subdomains of
vividness of language, tone and voice were rated using these procedures. Two raters were used for each written response and acceptable interrater correlations were obtained.

The students’ behavioral responses were assessed by two raters who observed videotapes of the students during the presentations. This was a basic assessment of whether the students gazed steadily at the presenter, whether they supported their heads on their necks (as opposed to resting their heads on their hands, arms or the desk), and whether they exhibited a low level of random activity. Such behaviors have been described by Coker and Burgoon (1987) as indicators in conversation of immediacy and altercentrism (intensity of involvement in the activity and perception of another person’s perspective). For the purposes of the immediate experiment, the students were rated to be mentally aroused when they exhibited two of the three marker behaviors. There was 100% agreement between the two raters. The perfect correlation probably resulted because of two factors. First, each of these behaviors requires little subjective judgement, and, secondly, the behavioral differences between students judged to be aroused and those judged not to be aroused was usually striking.

Of particular concern in this study was loss of sample size. With four classes, a few parents did not give permission for their children to participate in the study,
some students had recently moved from another state and had not taken the LPT test the previous year, several were absent on the day of the presentation, a few did not complete the questionnaires correctly, and some were not picked up by the video cameras in the rooms. Complete data was obtained for 41 students with most data collected on 60 subjects. Two factor analyses were done, one with 41 subjects and one with 60 subjects. The four factors with the highest eigenvalues for the smaller sample were also found to exist in the larger sample, supporting the validity that they represented actual factors rather than spurious results due to reduced sample size.

General Conclusions

The data collected was analyzed by use of factor analysis, canonical analysis, and multiple regressions equations. The limited sample size greatly reduced the power of the results of the multiple regression equations. Although generalizations based solely on these equations would be inappropriate, their results did provide elaboration on the factors found through factor analysis.

A clear and strong relationship was established between lesson delivery style and the behavioral response of students. Most of the students who saw the more aesthetic delivery did appear to be aroused while most of the students
who saw the bland delivery did not. However, most of the other relationships established between the premeasures and the postmeasures were relatively low. Also, many of the relationships established were not necessarily the ones that were predicted from the hypotheses. A factor analysis showed that race was significantly related only to demographic variables in this study so it was not included in further analyses.

Composition and Style Postmeasures

Although the premeasures of LPT Composition and Style Domains were highly correlated with each other (correlation coefficient of .82), the students’ composition and style scores for their written responses to the lessons was lower (correlation coefficient of .49).

The composition postmeasure variable did load on two of the factors in the factor analysis. In the first factor it was related to school of attendance and the three writing subdomains; vividness of language, voice, and tone. This factor appears to indicate that most of the postmeasures of writing (all except style) tended to operate as a single factor to some degree.

In the other factor on which it loaded, the postmeasure composition variable was related to student scores on the Bett’s QMI and to the postmeasure of style. The higher a
student’s score on the QMI, the higher the student’s scores on the postmeasures of composition and style. The more students reported their imagery to be vivid, the better they were rated to have used composition skills and style in their written responses. This factor was not further illuminated by canonical analysis nor by the multiple regression equations, though.

The premeasures of LPT Composition and Style both loaded onto the same factor as the postmeasure of style on one factor. Gender was the only other variable to load on this factor, with girls performing better than boys. Neither of the writing premeasures loaded on a factor with the postmeasure variable of composition.

Engelhard, Gordon, and Gabrielson (1992) indicated that written responses were sensitive to such variables as mode of discourse demanded and the experiential experiences called upon. Mode of discourse and experiential demands asked of the students for the immediate research may have been distinctively different from what was asked of the students when they took the LPT test. The findings of Engelhard et al. and the results of the immediate research support Purves’ (1992) contention that, with careful scoring criteria and training of scorers, writing assessments may be valid in each circumstance, but that the assessments do not allow for comparisons between circumstances.
Vividness of Language

The vividness of language used in the students’ written responses indicated the extent to which they used imagery in their writing. The hypotheses suggested that this variable would be related to students’ responses to the Bett’s QMI. That is, the more vividly a students’ imagery tends to be, the more vivid the imagery they would use in their written responses to the presentations. However, the QMI was not related to vividness of language used on any of the factors in the factor analysis nor to any of the independent variables in either the canonical analysis or the multiple regression equations.

Students’ scores on the QMI were related to their scores on the composition and style domains of their written responses in one of the factors in the factor analysis. Long, Winograd, and Bridge (1989) had found that high visualizers did report more imagery during reading than did low visualizers, but that there was no difference between the two groups in number of images reported after reading. Long et al. suggested that imagery after reading was apparently directed toward organizing text features.

The factor on which the QMI scores and the scores on the postmeasures of composition and style all loaded may be related to the differences Long et al. (1989) described. Students with high and low levels of vividness in their
imagery may have organized text features for generation of a written response in different ways. However, the way this factor operates is unclear since the relationships were not explained further by any significant relationships found through canonical analysis nor through the multiple regression equations.

Vividness of language was related to student scores on the Affective Orientation Scale (AO) and to the behavioral response of the students in one of the factors. However, the relationship to behavioral response was in a negative direction. Those students who exhibited indicators of arousal were assessed to use less vivid language in their written responses than students who did not exhibit indicators of arousal.

The same relationship of AO to vividness of language was found in the canonical analysis in which behavioral response was treated as a dependent variable. In addition, both the premeasure variable LPT Style score and the lesson delivery style were negatively correlated to vividness of language. The higher the students' scores on the Style domain of the LPT, the less vividly they used language in their written responses to the lessons. Further, those students who received the more aesthetic delivery used less vivid language in their responses.
With the multiple regression equations for the entire sample of students, the vividness of language the subjects used was again found to be related to AO and to the LPT Style score in the same manner. Gender was also found to have a statistically significant Beta Weight in this equation, with girls performing better than boys. One other variable, the students scores on the LPT Composition Domain, was positively correlated to the vividness of language score.

With the multiple regression equations for only those students who received the aesthetic delivery, vividness of language was not found to have a statistically significant relationship with any of the premeasures.

Vividness of language, then, did not have a relationship to the variable predicted to be strongly related to it, the students' scores on the QMI. It was related to the LPT Style Domain premeasure, but in a negative direction. It was also related to the lesson delivery style and the behavioral response of students, again in a negative direction. The trait that consistently rated in a positive direction with vividness of language was the affective orientation of the students.

Paivio (1986) stated that research has consistently shown that subjects report more vivid imagery in response to concrete words than to abstract words. He reported one
experiment, though, when subjects rated their images to related abstract pairs of words to be more vivid than their images to unrelated concrete pairs of words. It was hypothesized that the emotional value of the abstract pairs was a possible factor in affecting the vividness of the imagery reported. The subjects in this experiment still remembered the concrete words better, however. So, Paivio saw a possible relationship between vividness of imagery evoked and the emotional response to the stimulus.

This study also suggests that there may be a relationship between the emotional response of students and the imagery evoked. Students with strong affective orientation who received the bland delivery may have responded more readily to the emotional and imaginal content in the poetry than students with lower affective orientation. These students may then have responded with more vivid language in their written responses. Students who received the aesthetic delivery may have been oriented toward affective considerations by the emotional content of the poems regardless of their typical affective orientation (as measured by the AO scale). This may have served to level any differences that would have otherwise occurred based on differences in affective orientation.

That is, those students rated higher in the affective orientation trait may have been sensitive to the emotional
content of the poems in either condition. The effects of the trait of affective orientation may have been masked for those students who received the aesthetic delivery because those students with low ratings on the affective orientation trait were sensitized to the emotional content of the poems as a result of the lesson delivery style.

**Voice and Tone**

Voice and tone were the two postmeasures that were most highly correlated to each other (correlation coefficient of .83). They both loaded onto one factor of the factor analysis. This factor included loadings from two other postmeasures, composition and vividness of language, suggesting that all of the postmeasures except style tended to operate as a single factor to some degree.

When multiple regression equations were run for the group of students who received the bland lesson delivery, both of the postmeasures had statistically significant relationships with several premeasures. For the tone variable, the LPT Style premeasure was correlated in a negative direction. So, the higher the students performance on the LPT Style Domain, the less tone they were rated to have put into their written responses.

Tone was positively correlated to the premeasure variable LPT Composition score. This positive correlation
was as expected. It was also predicted from the hypotheses that students scores on the AO scale would correlate with student scores on the tone subdomain and this prediction was supported for this group of students. However, the correlation was not statistically significant when the entire group or the group of students who received the aesthetic delivery were analyzed.

The same pattern of relationships was demonstrated with the voice variable. With voice as the dependent variable, two additional variables reached a level of statistical significance in the multiple regression equation using only the sample of students who received the bland presentation. The students from the more middle class school performed better in this situation. Also, students with higher scores on the Bett's QMI attained higher scores on the voice variable when they received the bland delivery.

Neither of these variables, voice nor tone, was significantly correlated to any of the premeasures with the other two samples used (the whole group and only the students who received the aesthetic lesson delivery). As with the vividness of language variable, it may be that the impact of preconditions were modified when students heard the more aesthetic delivery.

So, students who may not have had strong tendencies to imagine vividly or to consider affect in making decisions as
personality traits could have been more sensitized to affect and to imagery while listening to the poems when they received an aesthetic lesson delivery. Students who already had a tendency to imagine vividly and to consider affect in decision making may have been little affected by the delivery style and reacted to the inherent imagery and emotion of the poems, no matter how they were presented. As a result, the differences that existed as personality traits may have been levelled when the students received the aesthetic delivery.

Implications for Further Research

This research explored the potential relationships of several concepts taken from different fields of research. Some of these relationships appear to warrant further, more focused study.

The affective orientation of students appeared to have more of a relationship to their written responses to the poetry presentations than did their tendency to imagine vividly. It may be that a more dramatic lesson delivery style can serve to sensitize students who do not tend to consider affect in decision making to their emotional responses. Questions about how students with different levels of affective orientation process information and
generate responses in a variety of circumstances could be explored in further research.

The premeasures of writing skills taken from the Literacy Passport Test given in the previous school year were not found to be strongly correlated to postmeasures of the same skills. The composition and style domains may be so sensitive to task demands that using one set of scores for a student is an inappropriate predictor for how a student will perform in the same domains under different circumstances.

The possibility that there is a relationship between a student's tendency to imagine vividly and how the student organizes information suggested by Long et al. (1989) may have been reflected in the factor analyses. Scores on the QMI were related to the composition and style domains on the postmeasures of writing on one factor. However, additional analysis did not explain this relationship further. The relationship between imagery and cognitive organization processes could be explored more directly in future research.

Although the lesson delivery style did have a strong relationship to the behavioral response of students, neither variable was found to have a strong relationship to how the students scored on most of the postmeasures. These two variables did have a negative relationship to the vividness
of language variable. It may be that being aroused to information can negatively impact some of the ways which information is processed and then organized to generate a written product.

Conclusions

This research attempted to converge research concepts from several different related fields at an intersection where they would each come into play. This was done because research in each area was limited for several reasons. Shulman (1986) stated that the process-product paradigm has been losing its intellectual vigor. He noted that studying individual traits in isolation can lead to artificial conglomerates that have no real world analogue. For example, if all of the characteristics identified as positive traits through teacher effectiveness research were combined they could result in a personality configuration that would be impossible to attain. He recommended a theoretical pluralism because no single conceptual framework for research may be adequate to provide sufficient explanatory power. He recommended investigating not only what changes occur during research, but also how those changes occur.

Researchers from diverse fields such as cognitive psychology, communication research, and reader response
theory have commented on the limitations of much of the research which has been done. Paivio (1986), a cognitive psychologist, stated that research in the realm of cognitive processing theory was limited in its studies of remote associative reactions requiring making judgements or generating complex responses. He also stated that his dual coding theory lacks information about how cultural and situational context modify probabilities that referential reactions (reactions involving both synchronous and sequential processing) will occur.

Waldron and Cegala (1992), researchers in the area of communication, recommended studying cognition in naturally situated circumstances which preserve task complexity. Anderson and Rubano (1991) commented that little attention in research has been paid to Reader Response Theory’s distinction between aesthetic and efferent reading. Nystrand and Gamoran (1991) noted that research on learning needs to go beyond defining engagement as being compliant and well motivated to examining the content and characteristics of student responses.

Researching the writing process can be a humbling experience. Purves (1992), after a lifetime of studying writing and participation in international studies of writing, stated that research into writing should continue despite the difficulty of the task. He also said that any
claims made from research on the writing process should be modest ones.

The differences between substantive and procedural learning, or aesthetic and efferent reading in language arts, have been described in some detail in the literature. They have proven to be difficult to investigate in ways which lead to definitive conclusions. There remain many questions about how these qualitative differences in learning relate to actual cognitive processes and generative activities. Innovative and incisive research strategies will need to be developed if they are to be understood further.
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Hello Everyone. My name is Mr. _______. I am here to talk to you today about poetry. I will be talking with you for a while and then I'm going to ask you to write about your response to the poetry you hear today. You don't necessarily have to write about what the poems mean or what I said about them. You can write about how you reacted to them, how you felt as you heard them, or what they reminded you of. Each person reacts differently to poems, I just want you to write about how you reacted. You will have about thirty minutes to write on the papers you've been given. By the way, after you use the pencil at your desk, feel free to keep it if you want.

Now, there are a lot of different ways to think about poetry. For instance, you can study the symbols, the references to mythology, and the different word patterns. Today, though, I want you to think about poetry in another way. You can think of poetry as an awareness of sounds, rhythms, and images to tell us something about ourselves.

Let's start with looking at sounds. In the first poem, Maya Angelou uses the song of a bird to represent a human longing. She calls this poem Caged Bird.

A free bird leaps
on the back of the wind
and floats downstream
till the current ends
and dips his wing
in the orange sun rays
and dares to claim the sky.

But a bird that stalks
down his narrow cage
can seldom see through
his bars of rage
his wings are clipped
and his feet are tied
so he opens his throat to sing.

The caged bird sings
with a fearful trill
of things unknown
but longed for still
and his song is heard
on the distant hill
for the caged bird
sings of freedom.
The free bird thinks of another breeze
and the trade winds soft through the sighing trees
and the fat worms waiting on a dawn-bright lawn
and he names the sky his own.

But a caged bird stands on the grave of dreams
his shadow shouts on a nightmare scream
his wings are clipped and his feet are tied
so he opens his throat to sing.

The caged bird sings
with a fearful trill
of things unknown
but longed for still
and his tune is heard
on the distant hill
for the caged bird
sings of freedom.

Although referring to the African-American struggle for freedom, Maya Angelou's poem can have meaning for anyone who has felt trapped.

Poets often refer to the sounds around them. For example, listen to this poem by Walt Whitman. It comes from a long set of poems entitled Song of Myself. This is poem 26 of that collection.

Now I will do nothing but listen,
To accrue what I hear into this song, to let sounds contribute toward it.
I hear bravuras of birds, bustle of growing wheat, gossip of flames, clack of sticks cooking my meals.
I hear the sound I love, the sound of the human voice,
I hear all sounds running together, combined, fused or following,
Sounds of the city and sounds out of the city, sounds of the day and night,
Talkative young ones to those that like them, the loud laugh of work people at their meals,
The angry base of disjointed friendship, the faint tones of the sick,
The judge with hands tight to the desk, his pallid lips pronouncing a death sentence,
The heave'e'yo of stevedores unloading ships by the wharves, the refrain of the anchor lifters,
The ring of alarm bells, the cry of fire, the whirlr of swift-streaking engines and hose carts with premonitory tinkles and colored lights,
The steam whistle, the solid roll of the train of
approaching cars,
The slow march played at the head of the association
marching two and two,
(They go to guard some corpse, the flag tops are draped with
black muslin.)
I hear the violincello ('tis the young man’s heart’s
complaint),
I hear the keyed cornet, it glides quickly in through my
ears,
It shakes mad-sweet pangs through my belly and breast.
I hear the chorus, it is a grand opera,
Ah this indeed is music--this suits me,
A tenor large and fresh as the creation fills me,
The orbic flex of his mouth is pouring and filling me full.
I hear the trained soprano (what work with hers is this?)
The orchestra whirls me wider the Uranus flies,
It wrenches such ardors from me I did not know I possessed
them,
It sails me, I dab with bare feet, they are licked by the
indolent waves,
I am cut by bitter and angry hail, I lose my breath,
Steeped amid honeyed morphine, my windpipe throttled in
fakes of death,
At length let up again to feel the puzzle of puzzles,
And that we call Being.

In the poem I just read, Whitman is explaining how the
sounds around him actually become a part of who he is.

Poets also try to capture rhythms or to use rhythms to
express a feeling. Listen to a poem called Dream Boogie by
Langston Hughes. Langston Hughes was an African American
poet who tried to capture the rhythms of his time. This
poem comes from a collection of his entitled Montage of a
Dream Deferred. Who here knows what "deferred" means?
That’s right, it means to put off until a later time, to
postpone something. Now, listen to how Langston Hughes uses
different rhythms in this poem.

Good morning, Daddy!
Ain’t you heard
The boogie woogie rumble
Of a dream deferred?

Listen closely:
You’ll hear their feet
Beating out and beating out a--

You think
It’s a happy beat?
Listen to it closely
Ain't you heard
Something underneath
like a--

What did I say?

Sure,
I'm happy!
Take it away!

Hey, Pop!
Re-bop!
Mop!

Y-e-a-h!

By its use of rhythm, this poem can communicate more of how it feels when your dreams are always deferred than could be done with a hundred words of explanation.

Now, listen to the rhythm in Nikki Giovanni's poem as she talks about using parts of poems to "capture" someone.

Kidnap Poem

ever been kidnapped
by a poet
if i were a poet
i'd kidnap you
put you in my phrases and meter
you to jones beach
or coney island
or maybe just to my house
lyric you in lilacs
dash you in the rain
blend into the beach
to complement my see
play the lyre for you
ode you with my love song
anything to win you
wrap you in the red Black green
show you off to mama
yeah if i were a poet i'd kid
nap you

In this poem, she does attempt to kidnap the reader, to lure you into her writing. An interesting rhythm is one of the lures she uses.

Another tactic poets use is to recall or to create an image that somehow makes us see things a little differently.
You have all heard of the poet Edgar Allan Poe. Considers how he uses images in the poem *Annabel Lee*.

It was many and many a year ago,
   In a kingdom by the sea,
That a maiden there lived whom you may know
   By the name of Annabel Lee;--

And this maiden she lived with no other thought
   Than to love and be loved by me.

She was a child and I was a child,
   In this kingdom by the sea,
But we loved with a love that was more than love--
   I and my Annabel Lee--
With a love that winged seraphs of heaven
   Coveted her and me.

And this was the reason that, long ago,
   In this kingdom by the sea,
A wind blew out of a cloud by night,
   Chilling my Annabel Lee;
So that her highborn kinsmen came
   And bore her away from me,
To shut her up in a sepulcher
   In this kingdom by the sea.

The angels, not half so happy in heaven,
   Went envying her and me:--
Yes! that was the reason (as all men know,
   In this kingdom by the sea)
That the wind came out of the cloud, chilling
   And killing my Annabel Lee.

But our love it was stronger by far than the love
   Of those who were older than we--
Of many far wiser than we--
And neither the angels in heaven above
   Nor the demons down under the sea,
Can ever dissever my soul from the soul
   Of the beautiful Annabel Lee:--

For the moon never beams without bringing me dreams
   Of the beautiful Annabel Lee;
And the stars never rise but I see the bright eyes
   Of the beautiful Annabel Lee;
And so, all the nighttide, I lie down by the side
   Of my darling, my darling, my life and my bride,
   In her sepulcher there by the sea--
   In her tomb by the side of the sea.
As you can see, Poe often called up images to amaze and shock people. Sometimes, a poet calls up an image to slow us down and to have us reflect, as with D.H. Lawrence’s brief poem *The White Horse*.

The youth walks up to the white horse, to put its halter on
and the horse looks at him in silence.
They are so silent, they are in another world.

Though brief, the poem does cause us to think of times when we have been so involved in something or with someone that we were "in another world".

In other poems, the poet attempts to create a scene where people’s perceptions are changed by an incident. For example, consider the image you have of the bear in the poem, *My Mother Saw a Dancing Bear* by Charles Causley.

My mother saw a dancing bear
By the schoolyard, a day in June.
The keeper stood with chain and bar
And whistle-pipe, and played a tune.

And bruin lifted up its head
And lifted up its dusty feet,
And all the children laughed to see
It caper in the summer heat.

They watched as for the Queen it died.
They watched it march. They watched it halt.
They heard the keeper as he cried,
‘Now, roly-poly!’ ‘Somersault!’

And then, my mother said, there came
The keeper with a begging-cup,
The bear with burning coat of fur,
Shaming the laughter to a step.

They paid a penny for the dance,
But what they saw was not the show;
Only, in bruin’s aching eyes,
Far distant forests, and the snow.

Here, the whole mood of the poem is changed by an image, the image of the bear’s eyes.

You have heard some examples of how sound, rhythm and images are used in poems to open avenues for looking at the world around us and reflecting on who we are. Now, I would like for you to take some time to write your own impressions.
of what you heard today. Remember, you don’t have to write
down what I said. Instead, you can write your own reactions
to what you heard: how you felt, what you thought about, or
what you imagined. You can write as if you are writing to a
friend or writing to yourself in a journal if you like.
Leave your paper on your desk at the end of the bell and we
will collect them for you. You will have about thirty
minutes. Go ahead and start now and—thank you for having
me here today.
### APPENDIX B

LITERACY PASSPORT WRITING TEST DOMAIN DESCRIPTIONS (Virginia Department of Education, 1993):

DOMAINS AND SKILLS ASSESSED ON VIRGINIA’S WRITING LITERACY TEST, AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL SCORE FOR EACH DOMAIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain/Skill</th>
<th>Percentage of Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSING</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The student</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-presents a central idea (or feeling) and stays with it throughout the paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-has a clear structure which helps present the central idea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-uses an adequate number of specific, relevant details that support general statements and help develop major ideas of the paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYLE</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The student</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-selects and uses vocabulary to support the central idea and purpose of writing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-selects and uses information to support the central idea and purpose of writing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-uses a tone which fits the purpose and shows an awareness of audience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-uses real voice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-uses a variety of sentences that interest the audience and suit the nature and purpose of the message.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LITERACY PASSPORT WRITING TEST DOMAIN DESCRIPTIONS AND STATISTICAL DATA (Virginia Department of Education, 1992):

Description of Writing

Writing

The writing test was developed for the VDOE (Virginia Department of Education) to measure relevant SOL (Standards of Learning) Objectives in Language Arts. The test requires students to write a composition in response to an extended topic called a prompt. The test models the writing process by suggesting to students that they plan, prewrite, proofread, edit, and revise their work. Essays are scored on each of five domains: composing, style, formation, usage, and mechanics. The scoring rubrics for these domains are based on theory and research in the development of children's writing ability, which lends to the test's validity. Based on this research, composing is weighted three times, style is weighted two times, and formation, usage, and mechanics are each weighted one time in determining the final score on the test.

Additional evidence of the validity of the writing test comes from a factor analysis of scores on ten writing prompts. The results of the analysis strongly suggested that the scores in the five different domains did indeed measure different aspects of student writing. The factor analysis supported the curricular decision to more strongly weight the composing and style domains in computing the overall score. The factor identified by these two domains accounted for over half (55%) of the variability of the scores out of the total of 95% variability accounted for in the analysis.

An important aspect of score reliability for tests which require human judgment in the scoring process is the agreement between raters on a test score (interrater reliability). On the writing test, the overall score is the sum of the scores on each domain assigned to the composition by two independent readers, with appropriate weights used. Each domain is scored on a four-point scale, with 4 being the highest score on a domain. Thus the scores on a composition can range from a low of 16, when both raters give a 1 to all domains, to a high of 64, when both raters give all 4's.

Potential readers are carefully trained through the use of anchor papers with predetermined scores and thorough discussion of each of the five domains. Before being accepted as scorers, potential readers must meet specified
criteria of accuracy in scoring. The accuracy of scoring is monitored throughout the scoring process. Periodically, sets of papers that have been discussed and scored by experts are sent through the scoring procedures. Readers who do not meet accuracy criteria on papers are pulled and retrained. All compositions previously scored by the readers who are found to be insufficiently accurate are scored again by readers who have met accuracy criteria.

The interrater reliability of the scores on the writing test is typical of reliability coefficients found for other tests requiring judgement in the scoring. For the most recent administration of the test (February 1992) the two readers agreed on the total score within one point on 97% of the compositions (61% exact agreements). In 3% of the cases, the readers scores differed by more than one point: in these cases, the compositions were read by a third reader and received the sum of the two highest scores.
### Table 4-7
Factor structure and Canonical Weights for Independent and Dependent Variables of the Canonical Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Structure</th>
<th>Canonical Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT Style</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Delivery Style</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vividness of Language</td>
<td>-.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

NONSIGNIFICANT MULTIPLE REGRESSION EQUATIONS

Multiple regressions for the both groups with composition as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Delivery Style</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple regressions for students from both groups with Style as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Delivery Style</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple regression for both groups with voice as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Delivery Style</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple regression for both groups with tone as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Delivery Style</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple regression students who received the efferent lesson delivery with composition as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple regression for students who received the efferent lesson delivery with vividness of language as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple regression for students who received the aesthetic lesson delivery with composition as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple regression for students who received the aesthetic lesson delivery with vividness of language as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple regression for students who received the aesthetic lesson delivery with voice as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple regression for students who received the aesthetic lesson delivery with voice as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPT Composition Score</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPT STYLE Score</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMI Score</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO Questionnaire Score</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Attendance</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Response</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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