

Developing Independent Readers of Poetry

An approach to teaching poetry in the high school

The last issue of the Journal was devoted to "English Studies." Not inappropriately, no reports of research such as our issues normally contain appeared, for the climate of freedom of action recognised by all our contributors to be essential for the development of good language hardly lends itself to the constraints a researcher must customarily impose — least of all in the study of literature. The study below is interesting not only because it advocates for high school students a process in poetry much freer of constraints than what (in spite of the views of the academic leadership) is still the rule in English classrooms; it also offers a means of obtaining a quantitative estimate of the consequences. Patrick Dias' model here has the merit of being scaled both to the values and to the resources of the enterprising high-school English teacher; in its own modest terms, which admittedly are not those of the research purist, it will nevertheless convince the sceptical teacher that there is nothing to lose, and everything to gain, in genuine teacher-free discussion.

To what extent is current teaching practice consistent with current understanding of the process of apprehending a poem? Until recently, the teaching of poetry both at university and in the schools has been dominated by the conception of the poem as an object that can be analysed. The objective, neo-critical, formalist view, as it has been variously called, sees the apprehension of a poem as a process of close reading, a careful attending to the words on the page. The approach has filtered down to the high school classroom through teachers themselves trained in the close analysis of text. We have poetry classes where the objective is essentially one of training pupils to read poetry closely by examining as many aspects as will explain its inner workings. It is expected that a student can develop a strategy of inquiry which if judiciously employed will reveal the hidden meanings and complex ambiguities of most poems. The 1965 report of the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board offers a list of questions "that provoke answers essential to understanding

and judging a literary work. . . the fundamental questions the teacher must face as he prepares for class and then must teach his students to face as they study the work with him.”¹ An obvious advantage of this approach is that the results should be easy to test. Given a new poem, is the reader able to ask the right questions? It is only after some reflection that one realizes that the process is not as simple as it looks; or else it would be only a matter of every teacher supplying each pupil with a list of these fundamental questions.

And that essentially is the problem. Questioning, in the study of poetry, is not the tool of analysis it may well be in observing a textbook physics experiment. The questions intended to lead to the apprehension of a poem are in themselves signs of an apprehension of that poem. To ask these questions is to articulate one's previous realization of the poem. The process of bringing an arsenal of set questions to a poem is a hit-and-miss affair that can lead to pointless and often misleading inquiry, or to what becomes, in time, a sterile formalism that imposes on every poem a rigid and lifeless structure.

The Commission on English report (entitled *Freedom and Discipline in English*) suggests, in advancing its argument, that the good teacher of literature has practised criticism “both by reading and writing” and has studied its practice in the work of other critics. “That study and practice should have given him not only a methodology but, quite as important, *some freedom from a simply impulsive response.*”² (italics added) It is that last phrase that, inadvertently as it seems to me, points up the difference between the neo-critical approach and the process- or student-centred approach now more persuasively advocated. The view expounded in the Commission on English report suggests that a teacher question his initial response, that in fact he make it a habit of doing so, and that he discourage in his pupils any sign of simply “responding impulsively.” But some apparently impulsive responses are not that simple and cannot be ignored. It is my major argument that asking questions in the usual classroom manner short-circuits the initial response of a student — not necessarily an impulsive, but certainly an insistent one — and ultimately stifles it.

Many initial responses are probably stock or irrelevant responses (in the sense that I. A. Richards has made familiar);³ but that does not alter the fact that the process by which the teacher asks questions (the usual critical ones) cannot but bring the reader to distrust his own response (however stock or irrelevant) and ultimately to deny its existence — in effect, not to respond consciously at all. I am not speaking of the mature reader of poetry, who can accommodate any question to his own developing response. Consider how the initial question of the teacher, addressed at the end of a number of readings (usually not more than two is the norm), asks the pupils to set aside the responses that are uppermost in their own consciousness in order to attend to that aspect of the poem their teacher directs them to. It shouldn't be long before they learn to withhold a

response until the teacher has asked the question; and then, in effect not having responded, they must guess at what the teacher wants them to say. Soon they must acquire a facility at scrambling mentally to come up with the 'right' answer. It doesn't take long before the teacher's questions and expectations become fairly predictable.

The questioning process is not in itself a deterrent to learning how to read poetry. There *are* questions that respect the integrity of the individual response. The students who have a sure sense of their own response, in fact, should acquire a repertoire of questions, a structure of inquiry. How our pupils may acquire a sure sense of their own responses is one of the questions that has directed a recent inquiry of mine.

An approach and a pilot study

I wish to suggest that within the classroom context (the presence of a teacher, a large group of students, set periods of study) the realization of a poem should involve a process whereby each student has the opportunity to confirm and develop his or her own experience of the work in a collaborative sharing of responses. Together the group attempts to recreate the experience of the poem.

One way of satisfying this requirement is to have the students in small groups (5 - 7) working out their interpretation of the poem, which is then brought to the large group for further discussion and development. The small group is encouraged to engage its task seriously because it recognizes a responsibility to the large group and generates a pervading emphasis on collaboration. An interest in the work of other groups in the class (in other words a mutual respect and a willingness to listen) arises from the desire of a group to confirm their own experience of the poem and, where experiences diverge, to modify their own version or to understand why they differ. The small group format allows each student the opportunity to speak from his or her own experience of the poem and to recognize that

the validity of one's reading and response can be confirmed by the responses of others and by attending to the text,

divergent responses most often turn out to be responses to different aspects of the poem,

a formulating of one's response however tentatively can lead to insight, and

the presence of a teacher is not essential to reaching a satisfactory account of the poem.

It was my intention to confirm that small group work in the form I suggest is at least as productive as, if not more productive than, teacher-led and teacher-dominated instruction in a large group. If it turned out that the small-group approach was merely *as* productive (in terms of identifiable gains in the ability of

the students to read and interpret poetry) as the teacher-directed approach, I could then point to the gains that occur in other directions in most successful small group experiences: a growing willingness to articulate responses, and a willingness to listen to and take account of the opinions of others. Teachers to whom I have described the experiment would acknowledge the benefits that derive from the small group process, but were sure that to have the pupils depend almost entirely on the resources of the group would deny them the technical terminology that would make them more aware of the formal aspects of the poem. There is no question that teacher-directed discussion does provide for the introduction of terminology and attention to the formal characteristics of the poem, considerations that seem unlikely to arise in undirected small-group work.

My insistence on keeping teacher intervention to the minimum was directed by three considerations:

1. A recognition that the objective of developing independent readers of poetry has priority over any concern for teaching *about* poetry

(Most classroom practice assumes that students can independently read novels and short stories, but not poetry. I am sure that the reading of fiction outside the classroom would become rare among our students if, as is done with poetry, teachers were to deal with fiction as though most students could not read it unaided. I am not equating reading fiction with reading poetry; I am insisting rather that it is not the poetry that defeats the reading as much as it is the prevailing notion that poetry is difficult and foreign, and if not comprehended at first or second reading will reveal its mysteries only through the medium of the initiate, the teacher. Again, the reading of poetry, unlike the reading of fiction, has been attended by close analytic questioning. One comes to depend on questions to guide one's reading of poetry, and one continues to associate reading poetry with being taught.)

2. A belief that teacher direction could only hinder any growth in student confidence towards independent reading and undirected response

3. A desire to confirm the notion that if one allows students to speak from their own response and to believe that understanding poetry is a matter of attention and collaboration, they can read unassisted far into the poem

To gauge the reaction to self-directed, independent discussion of poetry and to prepare for it, I conducted a pilot study using a Grade Nine class at a private school in Montreal. With almost no exception the students were English-speaking, well-read, and from upper middle-class families. The objective of the week-long study was to discover how a group of thirteen success-oriented, intelligent, and articulate fifteen-year olds would function in relatively undirected small groups.

A group of seven worked with me, a group of six with the regular teacher. At each session two poems were discussed. The students were instructed to read each poem several times and to make notes as they read, their notes reflecting their feeling, interpretation, and evaluation. In the discussion that followed, they were expected to share their responses. The teacher or myself intervened only to provide information on background, meanings of words, and an explanation of allusions. Near the end of the session, the two groups got together to hear each other's accounts of the poems.

It turned out after four meetings that these pupils were too dependent on teacher questions to initiate discussion and keep it going. They were resistant to interacting with each other, and directed their comments primarily to the teacher or myself. The results of a test at the conclusion of the experiment suggested, however, that these students had not suffered from having had a reduction in teacher-directed learning. Compared with a similar group of twelve who had been taught the poems, by the same teacher, the experimental group performed better in the test. The pilot study showed how hard it would be to dislodge the pupils' conviction that any serious attention to the poem must be mediated by a teacher. Only with increased opportunities to function independently would pupils begin to respond with some confidence.

The study

For the actual study I chose a class of 24 students in the final year of the Secondary English program. This large comprehensive high school drew its students from a lower middle-class and working-class population of English- and French-speaking Canadians and recent immigrants to Canada. The teacher considered the class to be of average ability.

Fourteen poems were to be read and discussed in eleven class periods spread over three weeks. The poems, traditional and modern, British, Canadian, and American, were of varying difficulty, with poets as different as E. E. Cummings and Shakespeare, Hopkins and Margaret Atwood. The poems were, however, thematically linked.

Having worked informally with them for two sessions prior to the start of the experiment, I was by no means an unfamiliar figure to the experimental group. The class was divided into two. On the basis of their English grades and by their teacher's account, the divisions were equally representative of the range of abilities in the class. A group of ten (A) functioned under my supervision, while the regular teacher supervised the group of fourteen.

The group of fourteen (B) split into three independent groups with the teacher moving from group to group to monitor the discussion. Near the end of each session these three groups got together to share their versions of the poem and query each other and the teacher.

The group of ten (A) functioned at most times as one group. In a typical ses-

sion I read the poem, cleared up difficulties in diction, abnormal syntax, and remote allusions, had one student read the poem aloud, and asked the group to reread it silently until they were ready to talk about it. My role was primarily to facilitate discussion, to help it arise from *their* responses and perceptions, and not direct it in any way to particular aspects of the poem. At times when the discussion had bogged down or had veered hopelessly off course, I intervened to ask a member of the group to read the poem out aloud. This rereading almost always led to a synthesising of previous observations, new perceptions, and some illumination. If, near the end of the period, the group appeared to have closed off discussion, I directed their attention when necessary to aspects of the poem that might have been profitably explored. Both groups A and B were asked to record their impressions of the poem in a journal that was handed in at the next meeting. Group A's discussions were tape-recorded.

Two classes (C and D) at the same grade level and of average ability were taught the same poems by their regular teacher in the traditional, teacher-directed, large-group format. In terms of their English grades and by their teachers' accounts the four groups (A,B,C,D) were of roughly equal ability, and no attempt was made to match them on the basis of reading ability and I.Q.

Pre-test and post-test

I had found the available objective tests on poetry unacceptable for several reasons. One of my major concerns was to determine how these students responded to a poem (as far as this response could register in writing) and to what extent their response and their ability to articulate that response could be enhanced by the instructional procedures I have described. At the same time, aware that most teachers of literature were concerned about the students' ability to recognize how the poem worked, I hoped to discover whether the absence of any formal direct instruction would in any way hamper their growth in this direction.

Thus in the pre-test and in the post-test the students in each of the four groups were asked to write as follows on Roethke's "My Papa's Waltz" (pre-test) and Pomeroy's "Corner" (post-test):

1. Write down your response and reactions.
2. Write an interpretation of the poem.
3. Say how the language and form of the poem work to develop your response and interpretation.

Two extra questions, both directing attention to the language of the poem and its force, were added to the post-test.

4. What do the images in the first stanza suggest about the way the speaker sees the cops?

5. List two or three of the speaker's 'actions' that indicate *his true state of mind* and two or three that indicate *the face he wishes to present to the cop*.

I hoped to discover by these questions how well the students were able to handle the specific questions that appear in examinations and that are the staple of teacher-directed lessons and of many poetry text books. So that these questions would not in any way direct their response to questions 1 - 3, they were given out only after the students had completed writing their answers to questions 1 - 3.

Pre-test

My Papa's Waltz

The whiskey on your breath
Could make a small boy dizzy;
But I hung on like death:
Such waltzing was not easy.

We romped until the pans
Slid from the kitchen shelf;
My mother's countenance
Could not unfrown itself.

The hand that held my wrist
Was battered on one knuckle;
At every step you missed
My right ear scraped a buckle.

You beat time on my head
With a palm caked hard by dirt,
Then waltzed me off to bed
Still clinging to your shirt.

Theodore Roethke

Post-test

Corner

The cop slumps alertly on his motorcycle,
Supported by one leg like a leather stork,
His glance accuses me of loitering.
I can see his eyes moving like fish
In the green depths of his green goggles.

His ease is fake. I can tell.
My ease is fake. And he can tell.
The fingers armoured by his gloves,
Splay and clench, itching to change something.
As if he were my enemy or my death,
I just stand there watching.

I spit out my gum which has gone stale.
I knock out a new cigarette —
Which is my bravery/
It is all imperceptible
The way I shift my weight,
The way he creaks in his saddle.

The traffic is specific though constant.
The sun surrounds me, divides the street between us
His crash helmet is white in the shade.
It is like a bull ring as they say it is just before the fighting
I cannot back down. I am there.

Everything holds me back/
I am in danger of disappearing into the sunny dust.
My levis bake and my T shirt sweats.

My cigarette makes my eyes burn
But I don't dare drop it.
Who made him my enemy?
Prince of coolness. King of Fear
Why do I lean here waiting?
Why does he lounge there watching?

I am becoming sunlight
My hair is on fire, my boots run like tar.
I am hung-up by the bright air.

Something breaks through all of a sudden,
And he blasts off, quick as a craver,
Smug is his power; watching me watch.

Ralph Pomeroy

Test Samples (unedited)

Pre-Test
(Roethke's "My Papa's Waltz")

Student: Claire

Immediate Response

This poem gives me the impression that it takes place in the old west.

- The first two lines remind me of a New Year's eve party I went when I was about five years old at our great grandmothers.
- The third line gives me a feeling of fear, as if your life depends on the hanging on.
- The word romp and the sliding of the pans from the kitchen shelf makes one picture playful dogs going through and messing a kitchen.
- The last two lines of the second stanza tells me that not everything is all-right and playful, that something is going wrong.
- The father is pictured to me as one that comes home drunk every night and getting into fights is quite common for him. The third stanza makes me think they are fighting. At the end of the poem I feel relieved for the boy that the father lets him go to bed. (*Graded 3*)

Interpretation

I think the poem is about a father coming home drunk one night and play fighting with his son. But he is being a little too rough with his son and the mother doesn't approve. Finally he lets the boy go to bed. (*Graded 1.5*)

Technique

Words such as whiskey and dizzy triggered a memory.

- With the word romp I automatically thought of playful dogs.

Post-Test
(Pomeroy's "Corner")

Immediate Response

Reading the poem I feel an atmosphere of tension building. They are both waiting and watching, neither of them trusting each other. When I read it the first time I felt suspense. (*Graded 3*)

Interpretation

The poem is about a policeman on a motorcycle at a street corner watching. I picture the policeman as being big and tough and looking confident. There is someone else at the corner, tough looking guy about seventeen or eighteen. The policeman is there, looking tough and cool watching to see that everything is alright. The guy, to look even tougher and cool stays where he is and lights himself a cigarette. Suddenly the cop takes off. (*Graded 2.5*)

Technique

He calls the policeman as a cop and not a policeman. When the poet says "His ease is fake, I can tell, My ease is fake. And he can tell," and the shifting of weight, this helps to create the atmosphere of tension. (*Graded 2*)

— The kind of father the boy has makes me think it is the old west and also the fact that his palms are caked hard by dirt, probably means to me he works hard on his land. (*Graded 2*)

Pre-Test
(Roethke's "My Papa's Waltz")

Student: Luigi

Immediate Response

After having read this poem a series of times I can gather a few vague ideas. My first reaction in reading this poem was a most obvious one. I thought the little boy and the father were waltzing. According to me this was the idea that first occurred in my mind.

- the hand that held my wrist
- at every step you missed

These two lines made me think the father and the boy were dancing. Another convincing point is the title — My Papa's Waltz. (*Graded 2*)

Interpretation

I then re-read the poem several times again because I knew that my first reaction was not right. I then thought that the father was beating up the little boy. This may be shown by these lines:

But I hung on like death.
The hand that held my wrist
My right ear scraped a buckle
You beat time on my head.

(*Graded 1*)

Technique

Also these lines show how the author created my response. (*Graded 1*)

Post-Test
(Pomeroy's "Corner")

Immediate Response

After reading this poem once, my first reaction was of a gangster speeding on his motorcycle. The police then stops the gangster for speeding too fast. (*Graded 0*)

Interpretation

This poem is about two people; a cop and a gangster. The gangster was strolling in the streets (probably looking suspicious) of the city. The cop accused the gangster of loitering (hanging around an area where he was not supposed to be). The fact that the gangster threw his gum and lit his cigarette to show how brave and cool he was. (*Graded 1*)

Technique

"I knock out a new cigarette which is my bravery."

The cigarette symbolizes a sense of bravery and coolness for the gangster.

"His ease is fake. I can tell. My ease is fake and he can tell."

Cop: insecure of what he is about to accuse the young man.

Gangster: he is feeling insecure because he is not really sure if his superficial aspect gives the cop that the gangster is tough. (*Graded 2*)

Pre-Test
(Roethke's "My Papa's Waltz")

Student: Joe

Immediate Response

The first stanza reminds me of then I was small and had waited till my parents came home, I can still smell the alcoholic fumes of my father's breath after hearing him say, "get to bed." The second half of the stanza reminds me of taking a chance, by riding on a skate board that you know has a wheel ready to fall off. The second stanza reminds me of a wife looking at her husband while he goes through with some silly antics.

The third stanza makes me think of an inconsiderate man who is rough and crude and treats his child cruelly.

The fourth stanza shows me that even though the man is a rough with his child, he still cares enough to bring him to bed at the right time. (*Graded 2*)

Interpretation

The poem is about a boy who's father would waltz with him when his father was drunk. The poem also shows the feelings that the mother shows towards the antics of the father. (*Graded 1.5*)

Technique

The author has created this response by showing us the things that are happening through the eyes of the boy. (*Graded 1.5*)

Post-Test
(Pomeroy's "Corner")

Immediate Response

I feel like I am there myself. It is as if I am the boy himself. This is probably because I have had the same experience as the boy in the poem. This poem reminds me of the movie *West Side Story*. It makes me see the kids in block C who think they are tough just because they have cigarettes in their mouths. It describes the feeling you get just before a fight perfectly. (*Graded 4*)

Interpretation

The poem is about a street kid loitering on a highway corner. A motor-cycle cop is looking at the boy from the other side of the highway. To the boy it is a battle of nerves. The boy tries to act cool and calm in front of the cop by spitting out his gum and putting a cigarette in his mouth. To the cop it may be nothing more than an identity he is seeking. But to the boy it is almost a matter of Life or Death. (*Graded 3*)

Technique

By using the word cop instead of policeman, the boy sees the policeman as something to be despised. But the poet shows that the boy fears the policeman by saying that his glove is like a piece of armour, and by showing his hand clenches and splay in and out of fist form. (*Graded 3*)

Evaluation and Results

I can make no claim to objectivity and precision in grading. I offer as illustration, however, some of the written responses from both pre- and post-tests, and the grades they were assigned. The reader should decide whether my expectations are reasonable, whether they have been applied even-handedly in both pre- and post-test performance, and, where a difference in grading appears, whether there is evidence in the student responses to support that judgment. If the reader disagrees with a particular assessment, he will concede, I hope, that

the standards and judgment implicit in the assessment were applied equitably to both the experimental and other groups.

Each of the three parts of the tests was evaluated on a five-point scale, with 4 indicating a reasonably complete reading of the poem and 0 indicating a total failure to make out the plain sense of the poem and/or to realize the intent of the question.

I do not wish to jeopardize the case for the pedagogical approach I advocate by defending what are no doubt questionable testing procedures. I have said that no attempt was made to confirm the teachers' contention that the groups were of about equal ability; neither could it be said with any conviction that both the pre-test poem and the post-test poem were equally difficult. In my judgment and the judgment of the teachers involved there appeared to be no significant difference in the level of difficulty presented by the two poems. Again, the experimental groups and the other groups were taught by different teachers (I considered both of them professionally competent). The tables below indicate the degree of difference between experimental and other groups in their post-test performance. Whether these differences should be attributed to any difference in collective ability between the two groups, to some possibly arguable difference in levels of difficulty between the two poems, to the methods of evaluation used or the bias of the assessor, or to the methods of teaching, must remain a moot point. What cannot be dismissed, however, is that the experimental group's successful performance in the post-test supports the conviction that the pedagogy employed is at least not detrimental to their ability to read and respond to poetry.

Table 1
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

			Pre-Test	Post-Test	Adjusted Post-Test	Questions Four & Five
Experimental n = 21	(Groups A & B)	Mean	2.89	6.97	6.97	4.36
		Standard Deviation	1.27	1.89		1.68
Other n = 30	(Groups C & D)	Mean	2.99	5.12	5.20	3.41
		Standard Deviation	1.75	2.13		1.79

Pre-Test.

The mean scores of both categories on the pre-test reveal very little difference between them collectively. An examination of the responses for the pre-

test explains the low scores (on a possible score of 12) received by both categories. Almost all the responses suggest an inability to proceed unless directed by specific questions. Those who write at any length make quick judgments based on a superficial acquaintance with the text.

Post-Test.

Unlike the mean scores on the pre-test, the mean scores on the post-test (adjusted for independents and covariates) show the clear superiority of the experimental group. That the difference is statistically significant is confirmed by an analysis of covariance (see Table 2).

Table 2
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE (QUESTIONS ONE TO THREE)

Source	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between groups	1	38.61	9.90	.003
Within groups	48	3.90		

Questions Four and Five.

I had mentioned earlier the inclusion of two additional questions on the post-test that were intended to test the students' ability to answer specific questions on poetic method. The mean scores for the two groups on questions four and five indicate that both groups performed reasonably well (Table 1). This would seem to indicate that in the ability to respond to specific textual questions, the experimental group have not suffered because of the absence of direct teacher instruction. As the analysis of covariance on the results of questions four and five indicates (Table 3), the superiority of the experimental group in this regard is marginally significant at the .05 level.

Table 3
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE (QUESTIONS FOUR AND FIVE)

Source	D.F.	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between groups	1	11.96	3.91	.0532
Within groups	52	3.05		

Conclusions

While I have been at some pains in the last pages to argue from the results of the post-test for the success of instructional procedures adopted for the experimental group, I must insist that in my mind the success of the study was not tied to the performance of the students in the post-test. I had intended to develop a teaching approach and confirm its usefulness primarily by observation and the reports of the students involved. For instance, the daily journals maintained at my request by the students in the experimental group indicate their growing confidence (and their realization of this confidence) in their ability to articulate their response to a poem. Tape recordings of their discussions attest to a steady growth in their ability to realize a greater part of the meaning of the poem without assistance from the teacher. It is also clearly evident that they are increasingly picking up from one another's observations.

A video-tape produced at the Faculty of Education at McGill a month after the completion of the study dramatically demonstrates that their abilities have not declined. A representative selection of five students (no more could fit into the teacher's car) overcame the glare of studio lights, the awkwardness of a semicircular seating arrangement (they had become used to facing each other in speech), and the presence of the camera, to carry on a reasonably comprehensive examination of three poems in approximately 40 minutes. The video-tape provides much-needed testimony for jaded teachers and unsure student-teachers as to the real abilities of high school pupils.

Much of the improvement in performance must be attributed to the working in groups. I was often told by the students how much they welcomed the opportunity to articulate their responses in the tentative fashion permitted by the small-group format. Practice in such formulating, a willingness to reconsider, has a direct bearing on improved performance in the post-test. Most evident is a respect for the text of the poem — a reluctance to leap into interpretation unless a reasonable number of readings have been done.

Some directions for further study have suggested themselves:

1. There is much evidence to be sifted from the audio-tapes. Which areas of response do emerge in undirected group discussion (to take the categories established by Purves and Rippere,⁴ for instance: involvement, perception, interpretation, and judgment)?

2. To test the approach in a situation that many teachers of English face, I used a class in a large urban comprehensive school where no more than 5% of the population have English as their mother tongue. Unfortunately this occurred during a wave of teacher walk-outs, and the program had to be curtailed. The majority of the pupils had problems in making out the plain sense of the

words on the page, and were all the more dependent on teacher direction. Despite these countervailing factors, results of the pre- and post-tests (unchanged from those administered in the earlier experiment) indicate an improvement in performance of the order of 70%, and support the need for implementation of such a program.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Commission on English, *Freedom and Discipline in English* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965), pp. 57-8.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 57.
3. I. A. Richards, *Practical Criticism* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1929).
4. Alan C. Purves with Victoria Rippere, *Elements of Writing about a Literary Work* (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1968).

The Poems

"My Papa's Waltz," *Collected Poems of Theodore Roethke* (Doubleday and Company, Inc. 1942).

"Corner," Ralph Pomeroy, *In the Financial District* (The Macmillan Company, 1961).

