READING AND TALKING ABOUT NOVELS:

A CONSIDERATION OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF PEER DISCUSSIONS

OF NOVELS TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTER-PERSONAL

UNDERSTANDING IN UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL CHILDREN

Geoff Williams, B.Ed.

A thesis submitted to
The University of Sydney
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the honours degree of
Master of Arts

1977

READING AND TALKING ABOUT NOVELS:

A CONSIDERATION OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF PEER DISCUSSIONS

OF NOVELS TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTER-PERSONAL

UNDERSTANDING IN UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL CHILDREN

Geoff Williams, B.Ed.

An Abstract of
a thesis submitted to
The University of Sydney
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the honours degree of
Master of Arts

1977

ABSTRACT

Though educational theorists have frequently claimed that literature makes an important educational contribution to the development of means of understanding other people, the results of previous research are equivocal. Uncertainty surrounds both the measures employed in many studies and the influence of classroom conditions such as the quality of teacher-led discussions of novels. Recent argument for the role of English in furthering the 'personal growth' of children gives added significance to the task of understanding what classroom strategies and conditions affect the impact literature may have.

Using D.W. Harding's argument for important similarities between spectatorship to both imagined and actual experience, it was hypothesised that talking about literature in an exploratory way with peers may help children in the upper primary school to develop more elaborated and differentiated means for understanding other people. The question was approached from the viewpoint of G. Kelly's personal construct theory and this author's repertory grid technique was used to establish outcome measures.

Twenty one children, seven in each of three classes, participated in a series of small group peer discussions, each of which focussed on a novel read by the children during the previous two weeks. Novels were recommended by experienced teachers and teacher-librarians in response to a survey by the writer. Pre and posttest scores on the primary analysis of use of 'personality' constructs were significantly different for one experimental sub-group but not for the other two when these were compared with measures obtained from control groups within the same classes. A substantial difference was nevertheless apparent in one of these classes but the degree of individual variance prevented the difference reaching significance. Significant differences were not found on two subsidiary analyses in any of the experimental groups. These results are interpreted as resulting from the relatively short period of the study.

An analysis of the peer group conversations using a specially developed category system suggests, in a post hoc interpretation, that some dimensions of the peer talk may be of particular importance in interpreting the varying outcome measures for classes and individuals. The extent to which the children talk as spectators to specific events, and to which they imagine personal consequences of being involved in similar situations, appears to be associated with elaborations of inter-personal construct subsystems. The finding is argued to be consistent with 'spectator role' theory of response.

Some implications for teaching and further research have been discussed. In particular, the teacher's role in establishing and maintaining peer discussion groups has been examined. The adequacy of the experimental design adopted for the study has been considered and suggestions made for the employment of more exploratory methods, using repertory grid technique, to analyse factors contributing to individual variation in response to literature and peer exploratory discussions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>LIST OF TABLES</u>

Page

Page

ABSTRACT

Though educational theorists have frequently claimed
that literature makes an important educational contribution
to the development of means of understanding other people,
the results of previous research are equivocal.
Uncertainty surrounds both the measures employed in many
studies and the influence of classroom conditions such
as the quality of teacher-led discussions of novels.
Recent argument for the role of English in furthering the
'personal growth' of children gives added significance to
the task of understanding what classroom strategies and
conditions affect the impact literature may have.

Using D.W. Harding's argument for important similari-
ties between spectatorship to both imagined and actual
experience, it was hypothesised that talking about
literature in an exploratory way with peers may help
children in the upper primary school to develop more
elaborated and differentiated means for understanding other
people. The question was approached from the viewpoint of
G. Kelly's personal construct theory and this author's
repertory grid technique was used to establish outcome
measures.

Twenty one children, seven in each of three classes, participated in a series of small group peer discussions, each of which focussed on a novel read by the children during the previous two weeks. Novels were recommended by experienced teachers and teacher-librarians in response to a survey by the writer. Pre and posttest scores on the primary analysis of use of 'personality' constructs were significantly different for one experimental sub-group but not for the other two when these were compared with measures obtained from control groups within the same classes. A substantial difference was nevertheless apparent in one of these classes but the degree of individual variance prevented the difference reaching significance. Significant differences were not found on two subsidiary analyses in any of the experimental groups. These results are interpreted as resulting from the relatively short period of the study.

An analysis of the peer group conversations using a specially developed category system suggests, in a post hoc interpretation, that some dimensions of the peer talk may be of particular importance in interpreting the varying outcome measures for classes and individuals. The extent to which the children talk as spectators to specific events, and to which they imagine personal consequences of being involved in similar situations, appears to be associated with elaborations of inter-personal construct subsystems. The finding is argued to be consistent with 'spectator role' theory of response.

Some implications for teaching and further research have been discussed. In particular, the teacher's role in establishing and maintaining peer discussion groups has been examined. The adequacy of the experimental design adopted for the study has been considered and suggestions made for the employment of more exploratory methods, using repertory grid technique, to analyse factors contributing to individual variation in response to literature and peer exploratory discussions.

CHAPTER ONE

RESPONDING TO LITERATURE IN CLASSROOM CONTEXTS

The reading of literature in schools has for a long time enjoyed a high status as a means for developing inter-personal understanding. Though some of the curriculum practices which have accompanied the reading and discussion of literature in classrooms have come to be at least questioned, if not widely abandoned, the value of reading literature itself has been consistently maintained (Squire (ed.), 1968). In considering the role of literature in the primary curriculum, the Plowden committee stated:

> We are convinced of the value of stories for children....It is through story as well as through drama and other forms of creative work that children grope for the meaning of the experiences that have already overtaken them....It is also through literature that children feel forward to the experiences, the hopes and fears that await them in adult life. (1967, p. 216)

The statement is an eloquent echo of views which have gained wide currency in thought about primary curricula. It also reflects, of course, a broader view in the teaching of English advocated for a century and beyond (Mathieson, 1975) that personal sensitivity and inter-personal under-standing[1] can be developed through reading something of the

---

[1] This term is used here in the sense of 'the ability to anticipate others' ways of construing experience', a concept elaborated in chapter two.

best that has been thought and said in the world.

Opposition to claims for the value of literature in increasing inter-personal understanding has, however, been equally forceful. The most famous of all is George Steiner's dark assertion:

> In our own day the high places of literacy...became the setting for Belsen. We come after. We now know that a man can read Goethe or Rilke in the evening...and go to his day's work at Auschwitz in the morning. (1967, p. 15)

Despite the strength and importance of these competing claims and recent intensive re-consideration of English curricula which has argued for an emphasis on 'personal growth' through English (Dixon, 1975), there is a lack of definitive studies of the effect of literature on the development of social understanding. The Bullock Report, in fact, quotes an unnamed educationist as stating that there is no evidence that the reading of literature in schools achieves the social or emotional effects claimed for it (1976, p. 124).

This is saying rather too much. There is, firstly, evidence from children themselves that they believe literature affects their development of social understanding. For example, Yarlott and Harpin (1971) in a survey of 1,000 'O' and 'A' level candidates for the G.C.E. examination in Britain found that almost three-quarters believed their reading of novels gave insight into the problems faced by other people, three out of five believed reading contributed insights into the behaviour of others

and almost half acknowledged that reading provided insight into their own peculiarities. There has also been evidence gathered over a lengthy period that neurotic and delinquent children have been enabled to reconstruct views of the self and others through carefully designed reading programmes (Fader and McNeil, 1969; Kelly, 1955, p. 162; Shrodes, 1949). Such case study data have, however, achieved only minimal impact on curriculum theory because they derive from therapeutic rather than educational settings. Much of it is not readily seen as having extensive theoretical or methodological implications for teachers.[1] Though stress is placed in bibliotherapy on the 'dynamic interaction between the personality of the reader and literature as a psychological field' (Shroder, 1949, quoted in Purves and Beach, 1972, p. 28) an important variable not given prominence is the influence of the social relationships between the patient, therapist and significant others. It may not only be the reading experience which is involved in producing desired change but also the quality of social relationships which allow the patient to experiment with alternative ways of interacting.

Studies of attitude changes resulting from reading literature, whilst extensive, have yielded very ambiguous and inconclusive evidence. In a careful review of research over forty years Purves and Beach concluded:

---

[1] Fader and McNeil's study is an exception to this statement. The issue of encouraging a wide range of reading, so highly complex in itself, will not be pursued at this point.

> ...the case should be considered not
> proved, at least not generally proved,
> and such factors as length of time of
> exposure, recurrent exposure and
> situation should be investigated. (1972,
> p. 27)

Reports of attitude change through reading have tended to be received skeptically because of the uncertain quality of the measures used in many studies (for example, Brisbin, 1971), the short-term nature of the changes effected and the didactic procedures which have sometimes accompanied the use of stories, procedures which conflict with deep theoretical commitments to valuing children's creative responses to literature.

As Purves and Beach point out, the classroom or social situation influencing response deserves closer attention. A study which did examine a social condition for response showed that discussions following reading of short stories influenced value judgements. Lewis (1967) presented eleven stories to two groups of children, one of which only read the stories and the other followed reading with discussion sessions. A third group discussed values similar to those portrayed in the stories, and a fourth received no special treatment. The reading treatment only procedure produced some undesired changes in the direction of increased aggressive feeling and decreased nurturant feelings whereas, for the reading plus discussion group, aggressiveness aroused by the reading was reduced to the pretest level and nurturant feelings were increased. Unfortunately Lewis does not give details of the precise nature of the discussions but her study is suggestive of

an issue worth pursuing.

A theory of literary response of particular educational interest because it emphasises the social nature of response has been advanced by D.W. Harding. He rejected arguments which rigidly distinguished literary from other forms of experience in considering ways in which personal and social understanding are developed. He assumed individuals to be actively involved in constructing interpretations of, and in anticipating, experience (Britton, 1970; Kelly, 1955) and was interested in the effect of experience in the role of 'onlooker' as distinct from that in the role of 'participant'. He held that:

> ...if we could obliterate the effects
> on a man of all the occasions when he
> was 'merely a spectator' it would be
> profoundly to alter his character and
> outlook. (1937, p. 253)

Harding argued that responding to literature is a social process in which author and reader share their views of socially significant issues. Arguing against loose use of the term 'identification', he held that the reader ordinarily knows himself not to be a participant in the plot in the sense of making any contribution to the outcome; rather, he is like a spectator at a sporting event who may feel excited or apprehensive about the action but who knows himself to be distanced from that action.

Literature achieves its effect in two major ways in Harding's view. First, it increases the range of possible experiences available to the person. Through literature the individual is able to 'observe' a vastly increased

array of human action beyond the limits of his current

social, physical and intellectual environment.

Further, being distanced from the action of the novel

allows the reader to evaluate events in a way not possible

for a participant. As a spectator he is able to gain a

greater perspective on events because he is not bound by the

particular demands of decision-making about a subsequent

course of action. Thus

> Detached evaluative responses, though less
> intense, tend to be more widely comprehensive
> than the evaluation which precedes participation.
> One views the event in a more distant
> perspective and relates it to a more extensive
> system of information, beliefs and values. And
> this detached evaluative response undoubtedly
> possesses the utmost importance in building
> up, confirming and modifying all but the very
> simplest of our values. (1937, p. 252).[1]

Though Harding argued for the significance in social

development of experience as a 'spectator' he was well

aware of the many possible limitations development might

encounter. In particular, on this view of the similarity

of various kinds of spectatorship experiences, the reader's

---

[1] A qualification is important here. Harding has not
suggested, of course, that there is a simple didactic
relationship between author and reader. Much of what the
reader responds to arises from an implicit recognition of
complex structural relationships between elements of the
imagined experience. It is also not impossible for the
reader's evaluative insight into a work to go beyond that
of the author. Further, readers may also construct quite
idiosyncratic and sophisticated responses to a work
because of the complex relationships evoked between
imagined and actual experience. Harding's sensitive
reading of Eliot's poetry indicates the facility with which
his theory is relevant to the making of the most erudite
of responses.

apprehension of the complexity of a work can be limited
by those same factors which limit his apprehension of the
complexity of his social relationships. Further, the
quality of experience as a spectator is partly limited by
the quality of the presented experience; much of literature
will only serve to confirm what is already known or put
forward views which have been personally discarded as
unsatisfactory.

The social relationship of reading is not confined,
he suggested, to a shared interest between reader and
author. A regular contributor to 'Scrutiny', he was well
aware of the interest of exploratory discussions of
literature with other people. But they could not be
just any others:

> ...we want the sense of shared interest and
> sympathy, and we want it ideally from
> someone who not only agrees with us but
> whose own perception and evaluation are as
> sensitive and skilled as our own.
> (1963, p. 164)

Harding is here stressing the importance of symmetrical
relationships in discussions of literature. The agreement
he desires is not the passive agreement of others who are
only marginally interested, but of those who share one's
frame of reference sufficiently to be able to contribute
actively to furthering responses without destroying one's
enjoyment.

His arguments have important implications for education.
It cannot easily be assumed that classroom relationships
in discussions of literature are symmetrical, for example,
or that the development of a sense of shared interest and
sympathy through discussions of literature is a generally

accepted curriculum goal. In any taking up of Purves'
and Beach's suggestion of the importance of examining
general classroom conditions for response to literature,
it will be particularly important to examine qualitative
aspects of different conditions for talk about literature
in classrooms.

Though work has only recently begun on analysing
processes involved in exploratory talk in small groups of
children, it is possible to contrast some potential values
of such talk with voluminous and rather consistent evidence
about qualities of teacher-led classroom discussions in
their most commonly observed forms. The purpose of drawing
such a contrast is not, of course, to develop a general
argument in favour of one curriculum strategy: rather, it
is to examine different conditions for classroom talk as
these appear relevant to considering how discussions of
literature might contribute to the development of inter-
personal understanding. On theoretical grounds, there is a
strong case for making such a contrast. From Harding's
theory of the nature of response it is to be expected that
grossly asymmetrical relationships of knowledge and power
between group members may negatively influence both the
elaboration of personal responses and the refinement of
initial perceptions of meaning. The central question is to
consider whether, in analysing the possible contribution
of spectator role experience to the development of inter-
personal understanding, differing consequences may be
expected from the contrasting curriculum strategies.

Many years ago Taba and Elkins argued for the value
of diminishing the teacher's verbal presence in discussions
of literature. Though these authors were not at that time
considering the value of small group peer talk about
literature, they have provided an interesting anecdotal
account of how a teacher learned the value of not partici-
pating as fully in discussions of literature in which
imagined and actual experiences were discussed, as she would
have done in discussions for other curriculum purposes.
The teacher noted that:

> ...it took me some time to realise that I was
> interfering with the children's discussion.
> Anxious that they form conclusions, I was
> stifling their spontaneity...it grew on me
> gradually that some procedures yield better
> results if children are left to work things
> out for themselves, the teacher serving
> merely as a guide.   (1950, p. 45)

More recently, the general significance of the
teacher's removal of himself from a central decision-
making role in leading discussions has been indicated by
Barnes and Todd (1977) in a study of adolescent peer group
conversations. These authors use the notion of 'frames'
to conceptualise dimensions on which particular structural
changes in conversational roles might be expected to occur.
The term 'content frame' is used to refer to a participant's
idiosyncratic and tacit knowledge employed in making sense
of utterances, as distinct from the formal, explicit
definition of words used (see also, for example, Wootton,
1975). An 'interaction frame' occurs simultaneously with a
content frame, they suggest, and implies expectations about
the interactive relationship between group members. Thus,

for example, an interaction frame may imply an expectation
that a particular group member should reply, that the topic
of conversation should be terminated, or that an utterance
is only tentatively contributed. Barnes and Todd argue
that in peer discussions both content and interaction
frames are necessarily negotiated by participants rather
than assumed as a right by any one person. The result may
be, though it will obviously not be true of all cases,
that meanings attributed to utterances will be more blurred,
fluid and personally significant than in more formal,
structured contexts such as teacher-led discussions. In
exploratory talk in small groups, for example, children
often move between discussion of a particular problem at an
abstract level and quite concrete elements of their own
experience as they relate new knowledge to existing forms
of thought. The content frame for each individual child
is highly mobile in these conditions, allowing for rapid
shifts between different levels of abstraction. From the
viewpoint of spectator role theory, such a condition is a
great advantage. Ready movement between reflection on
imagined and actual experience means that the individual is
able to follow through the implications of new experience
as a spectator so that comprehensive relationships are
formed with existing structures of understanding. If such
a condition does not exist, there is a danger that
reflection on response to imagined experience will result
in forms of understanding irrelevant to actual life.[1]

---

[1] See also Barnes, 1976, chapter three.

Experience from one source is a resource for correcting and extending interpretations of experience from the other. Critical to the utilisation of these resources are opportunities to share reflections on both kinds of experience.

In considering structural relationships between what children talk about at different points in a conversation, James Britton (in Barnes et al., 1971) has pointed to the way a topic or issue may be returned to on several occasions in a spiralling development of thought about that topic. Though a strong first impression of a reading of a transcript of a peer conversation may be of its inconsequentiality, more detailed analysis will often reveal a considerable development in meaning as a discussion has proceeded. Part of the reason for this appears to be that the children are free to establish their own criteria for talk. They can return to issues as more ideas are developed because, in Barnes' and Todd's terms, the control of the content frame is in their own hands.

Some qualities of the interaction frame have also been advanced as of particular significance. For peer conversations to support successfully the attainment of agreed-upon goals, it is necessary for the children to collaborate in their talk. The facility with which adolescents can establish collaborative talk with peers in classrooms has been demonstrated clearly by several researchers (for example, Barnes et al., 1971; Barnes, 1976; Dixon, 1974; Grugeon and Grugeon, 1973; Martin et al., 1976). Two qualities of collaborative talk about literature have

emerged from this work as of particular significance: these are tentativeness of expression and reciprocity of response.

Tentativeness of expression conveys to a listener that meanings are open to negotiation and that collaborative responses are valued. It also indicates that attention to an issue can be sustained and is not pre-empted by the speaker's attitude to that issue. Similarly, through reciprocal response to utterances, group members indicate a good deal about their valuing of others' utterances, their acceptance of the relevance of content frames, and that content frames are sufficiently similar to enable discourse to be worthwhile. Having the use of a content frame accepted is important, not least because it opens the way for reciprocal modification of meanings through the sharing of new insights.

A strong argument for the value of conversations directly between peers which arises from a different theoretical background has been advanced by Piaget.[1] The child, he holds, only ever has a partial understanding of his interactions with adults and so is more accepting of disharmony between his own views and those of adults. It is the 'shock' of thought meeting the contrasting ideas of

---

[1]Piaget's views of the relationship between thought and some forms of language in young children have been the source of considerable controversy (for example, Vygotsky, 1962, chapter two). Here, only the more general aspect of the significance, for elaboration of thought, of language interaction between peers in middle childhood and adolescence will be discussed.

peers which produces first doubt and subsequently a desire
for verification and objectivity. In the case of social
understanding, peer discussions are of great significance
because

> we have no other criterion of objectivity
> than the agreement of different minds.
> (1928, p. 245)

Piaget regards peer interaction as a primary source of
reflection and logical reasoning. Through arguments, the
forms of debate are internalised and out of these arises
the ability to reason logically. Similarly, social
conversation provides the basis for reflective thought in
that both are

> act(s) by which we unify our various
> tendencies and beliefs.   (1928, p. 204)

He does not, however, consistently differentiate
between various forms of peer interaction and their
differential effects on forms of thought about other people.
'Shock' of disagreement, in whatever social and emotional
context the disagreement takes place, is regarded as
sufficient to begin processes leading to more equilibrated
understanding of others. This is a doubtful conclusion as
Feffer (1970) has pointed out. Though conflict between
different views of another person, for example, may begin
the process of an attempt to develop a more elaborated
understanding, it might be anticipated that, over time, the
modal conditions of interaction will have an influence on
the nature and organisation of constructs used in under-
standing other people. Piaget does himself stress the
particular outcomes from social conversation for the

development of reflective thought.

From Piagetian theory, then, there is general, strong support for the value of peer discussions for developing more elaborated thinking. From recent work which has analysed the potential of small group peer discussions for a variety of curriculum work, including discussion of literature, there is clear evidence that children can collaborate in talk in classrooms. This form of talk has certain structural features which may be of particular significance for furthering the contribution literature may make to the development of inter-personal understanding. The structural features of tentativeness, reciprocity of response, and ready movement between existing forms of understanding (including highly specific personal experiences) and new insights are likely to be of particular significance. It is instructive to compare these features with the results of research on qualities of teacher-led classroom discussion in its most frequently occurring form.

Teacher-led classroom talk has been the subject of research for the greater part of this century. Though it is obviously a useful resource for many educational purposes, by its particular structuring of relationships it may work against more exploratory sharing and evaluation of experience. Hoetker and Ahlbrand, in an extensive review of studies of teachers' questioning behaviour, conclude that there is

> remarkable stability of classroom verbal
> behaviour patterns over the last half
> century, despite the fact that each
> successive generation of educational
> thinkers, no matter how else they differed,
> has condemned the rapid-fire question-
> answer pattern of instruction.
> (1969, p. 163)

One of the most outstandingly consistent features of teacher-led discussions is that pupils talk for only approximately one third of lesson time. Since the third represents the total talking time of <u>all</u> the pupils in a class, the time available to individual children is very limited. Added to this limitation is the finding that teachers consistently occupy a key role in deciding what is talked about, for how long and to what ends (Barnes <u>et al</u>., 1971; Bellack <u>et al</u>., 1966).

Classroom dialogue, even with the most sensitive of teachers, is often not a genuine exploration of a problem or experience because the teacher already knows the 'answer'. As long ago as 1940, Stephen Corey remarked that one of the first questions likely to be raised by a disinterested observer of discussion lessons would be

> ...why the mature persons (presumably
> the teachers) had to ask the immature
> persons (presumably the pupils) so many
> questions. There is some basis for
> expecting the learners to be the
> interrogators, Socrates to the contrary
> notwithstanding. (1940, p. 752)

James Britton (1976) has recently suggested that participation in classroom dialogue is made much less meaningful for pupils by their sense of this artificiality. Knowing the 'answer' may give the teacher a highly important sense of security in maintaining a discussion with a group of

lively children. But it can also be seen, through an analysis of lesson transcripts, to lead to subtle but unjustified shifts of meaning by the teacher's partial paraphrasing of pupil answers, to the too ready acceptance of apparent evidence of pupil learning and to the construction of a pace of question-answer interchange which precludes the participation of many children. Examples of these phenomena can be seen in the following excerpt from the transcript of a lesson in which twelve year-old children are discussing Yevtushenko's poem 'The Companion' (Martin et al., 1976, pp. 96-97):

Teacher:	Now what did this person <u>think</u> about Katya to start with? Can you find me any lines in the poem that tell you something about what he thinks about Katya? Christine.
Christine:	...Mm...
Teacher:	No? No...er...Lyn.
Lyn:	...Mm...he thought he ought to do something about her...
Teacher:	he ought...
Lyn:	...she looked hopeless
Teacher:	She looked helpless. Can you find one word that he uses in the poem to describe the girl, one adjective which he uses of Katya which the storyteller tells of...uses about Katya? Yes?
-----:	...Mm...He says that she's human.
Teacher:	She was human. There's <u>another</u> word. Can you tell me another word? Sharon.

Sharon:	Feeble.
Teacher:	Feeble. That's the word. Now if he thought she was feeble why did he think he ought to <u>help</u> her? Why did he...why was this important?
----:	Because...'m...she wouldn't have been able to do anything for herself and she would have got killed.
Teacher:	She wouldn't have been able to do anything for herself.

In fact the word 'hopelessness' is used and that the girl is remarked to be a 'human' is a very significant comment in the structural development of the poem.

The linguistic register used by teachers may also be highly inappropriate for building pupils' ability to reflect on experience. Whilst a register used by a teacher may arise from thought forms and employ words distinctive to a particular subject or intellectual discipline and therefore be apparently justifiable as appropriate for classroom talk, such a register may be remote from that regularly used by pupils and inaccessible to them. They may be prevented from actively participating in classroom dialogue not only because of the limited opportunities for talk but also by the form the teacher's talk takes. This will be particu- larly true where the teacher is considering a work as a literary construct and is using the devices of literary criticism for its analysis while the pupils are making a more direct, perhaps more personal, response to the characters and plot.

A danger of this kind of talk of relevance to Steiner's criticism is that it may contribute to children's belief that what they are learning in school is irrelevant to _their_ perception of their lives. Success is defined in terms of how well the teacher's game is played rather than whether or not new, personally relevant meanings are constructed by the individual. Though this criticism has often enough been made of curriculum content in the past, it is only relatively recently that more awareness of the results of the pervasiveness of the teacher's decision-making and assessment roles in classroom discussions has been built up.

Research, then, has consistently indicated important structural features of teacher-led whole class talk which are relevant to understanding why the treatment of literature in schools may have had less influence on the development of inter-personal understanding than has been desired. One alternative, from the limited research so far conducted, is the use of small group peer exploratory discussions of novels, which express a complex and enjoyable portrayal of some aspects of human experience. This is, of course, only one alternative from a very large range of curriculum strategies which have recently been suggested (Stratta et al., 1973; Field and Hamley, 1975). Nevertheless, it is especially consonant with Harding's theory of spectator role response (see also Britton, 1970, chapter two). Such a close relationship with the more general theory makes the idea a very attractive one to test in analysing the contribution of reading literature to the development of

inter-personal understanding.

Middle childhood is a particularly relevant age to study in relation to this question. On the one hand it is a period when children are particularly interested in the reading of novels. Whitehead et al. (1974) have found in a British survey of children's reading interests that fifty-nine percent of the ten year-olds in their sample had read three or more books in the previous month. The percentage declined quite rapidly after this age. Friedlander (1958) pointed out that intense interest in reading at this age seems to accompany the child's attempts to resolve developmentally significant issues in personal relation-ships; one need not share her psycholoanalytic interpre-tation to appreciate her more general point.

On the other hand, the results of recent research in developmental psychology suggest that this is a period of life when basically important advances are being made in social understanding. Flavell, for example, has observed:

> Although the data are really not yet ample
> to justify it, one is tempted to predict
> that middle-childhood will turn out to be
> the developmental epoch so far as basic
> role-taking and allied skills are concerned,
> with the pre-school period contributing the
> prologue and adolescence the epilogue.
> (1970, p. 1030)

If one is to look for children's development in inter-personal understanding through reading and exploratory talk, it is particularly appropriate to consider changes during the later years of primary school.

CHAPTER TWO

DEVELOPING AN UNDERSTANDING OF OTHER PERSONS:
SOME THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

The development of inter-personal understanding during childhood and adolescence has only rather recently become the subject of extensive research, despite the early pioneering work of, for example, Piaget (1932) and Watts (1944). The situation is in marked contrast with the quantity of research available on the development of the child's understanding of the physical world.

The reasons for this situation are fairly clear. Whereas a high degree of consensus exists about what constitutes understanding of the physical world, there is much less consensus on what constitute desirable forms of inter-personal understanding. The question of 'development' is further compounded by the extent to which adults vary in understanding of other persons. Though it is true that adults also vary in the adequacy of understanding of the physical world, at least in this field the general desired direction of development is clear. When inter-adult variation is added to ambiguity about desirable goals, the task of making assessments of developmental gains during middle-childhood is a particularly difficult one.

Basically differing philosophical assumptions in psychological research about what constitutes a person add further complexity to the issue. A clear theoretical position is of particular importance for research in this area in order that central assumptions are made as explicit as possible and that any measurement techniques adopted are consistent with those assumptions. This is of added importance in considering a complex curriculum issue such as the contribution of peer talk about novels since inexplicitness about central assumptions and measurement procedures may mask other important, implicit assumptions about educational goals.

In the following discussion the central question to be considered is <u>the increasing capacity of the child to represent to himself the experience of another</u>. A consideration of both structure and content features of inter-personal understanding in children is important in seeking evidence of such increased capacity.

There are two centrally significant, general concepts which have been widely used in cognitive research on the development of inter-personal understanding. 'Development' is commonly viewed in terms of increased differentiation and hierarchical integration of concepts, so that the individual is viewed as becoming progressively more able to distinguish between elements of a phenomenon and is also more able effectively to synthesise elements to achieve a more co-ordinated and complex viewpoint (Werner, 1948; Crockett, 1965; Flavell, 1974). Piaget's familiar analysis of conservation in relation to physical phenomena

provides a clear, economical analogy. At an early stage, failure to differentiate, say, the length and width of two glass jars and to integrate the compensating size of each measurement results in the child assuming that a quantity of liquid is transformed when poured from one jar to another. At a later stage of development the child is easily able to differentiate and integrate these visual percepts to form a more complex, accurate concept of the conservation of quantity.

The fruitfulness of the concepts of increased differentiation and hierarchical integration for developmental research on understandings of physical phenomena has clearly been considerable. Though a simple transfer of such findings to social phenomena is unwise for the reasons previously noted, they can at least be employed in initial considerations of structural features of cognitive development during middle childhood. Some researchers, in fact, have been so impressed with the value of analyses of structural features of inter-personal cognition that they have specifically excluded consideration of the content, or meaning, of constructs of other persons (Selman and Byrne, 1974; cf. Livesley and Bromley, 1973). In the subsequent discussion, consideration will be given to the question of structural developments as these are defined by Piagetian theory, prior to an analysis of theoretical ways of interpreting increased differentiation and hierarchical integration which give attention to both content and structural features.

Piagetian theory has been most commonly employed for analyses of structural changes, largely because of the success with which the theory has precisely specified logical operations required in forming more differentiated, hierarchically organised views. Researchers using a Piagetian theoretical basis argue that similar development in facility with logical operations is involved in understanding both social and physical phenomena. Flavell, for example, has argued that:

> The mind of the child at any given level
> of its development would hardly be
> expected to change its basic design
> features when turning from logical-
> mathematical or physical to social
> content. (1970, pp. 1025-1026)

Egocentrism has been the most central concept used from Piagetian theory. Minimally, 'egocentrism' refers to the child's inability consistently to differentiate his own view from that of others and to recognise that others have a different perspective from the one he holds. In social relations, the young child 'reads off' his own view of a situation in interpreting the behaviour of others because he is unable to utilise any alternative views. Judgements of others are likely to be made primarily in terms of the other's effect on the child, for example, 'nice', or, more extremely, 'gives me things'.

There are three closely associated Piagetian concepts of relevance to thinking about the development of under-standing of other persons: syncretism, the loose associa-tion of very diverse impressions linked only by membership of a broadly defined class; juxtaposition, the ordering of

differing concepts by simple addition with no attempt to reconcile obvious conflicts; and centration, attending too exclusively to one aspect of a phenomenon with a resultant loss of perspective on other compensating phenomena. Each of the three illustrates a failure both to differentiate and to hierarchically integrate aspects of experience sufficiently to form a well co-ordinated view.

Livesley and Bromley (1973) quote an example of a seven year-old girl's written description of a man she dislikes which illustrates well the Piagetian concepts:

> He is tall. He isn't very well dressed.
> He has two sons, Peter and William. They
> can afford a car. Peter and William got a
> tractor each for Christmas. William has
> two bicycles. Their dad has blue eyes,
> black trousers, green jumper. They have
> hens and a cat and a dog and a budgie.
> Their telephone is... (pp. 213-214)

In gathering their data, Livesley and Bromley had asked children to avoid physical descriptions. In her dislike of the man this child, however, has apparently centred on his unattractive dress and has been unable to differentiate this aspect from psychological characteristics. Much attention has similarly been paid to another surface characteristic, the man's possessions. Syncretism has been evidenced by the simple aggregation of a wide range of observations to the broadly defined class which is perhaps best represented as 'things I dislike about this man'. Though the child may have been using implicit linking concepts, these were so implicit as to result in a description which does not represent an effectively integrated view of the stimulus person.

From a Piagetian viewpoint a decline in egocentrism
in social settings is evidenced by increased 'role-taking
ability', a term which has been used both for research on
the development of understanding of the visual perspective
of another and inter-personal understanding. For example,
in a recent extensive review of research in both fields,
Shantz defines role-taking ability as

> the covert, cognitive action of assuming
> the perspective of another person.
> (1975, p. 265)

When research goals are primarily those of locating and
analysing common structural features of mental operations,
such a definition is very fruitful.

Evidence for similar structural developments has been
found by Feffer (1959, 1970; Feffer and Gourevitch, 1960),
using a projective role-taking task. Subjects were
presented with pictures involving at least three people and
asked to <u>create</u> a story. Ability to decentre was inferred
from the subject's re-telling of the created plot from the
viewpoint of each character. Feffer defined three levels
of role-taking ability which correlated positively both
with developmental levels on Rorschach tests and with
logical operations inferred from Piagetian conservation
tasks. Evidence for the first level has been found
typically in six year-olds, for the second in seven and
eight year-olds and the third was said to become clearly
evident at about nine years (Feffer, 1970, p. 211).

While Feffer _et al_. have offered interesting evidence of a close association between decentering in personal and impersonal settings it is important to note that in these studies events and characters' reactions are _created_ by the subject. The subject's task is not to infer or predict characters' reactions or even to represent them to himself but, presumably on the basis of recalled experience of some kind, to imagine them. Decentration is only involved in differentiating and elaborating possible responses (Feffer, 1959, p. 158), a condition which allows for considerably more range for error and simplification than social interaction usually does.

Excluding a consideration of the _content_ of the child's means of 'construing' other people from research has some important consequences for analysing a child's increased capacity to represent to himself the experience of another. Some of these consequences may be observed particularly clearly in a study by Selman and Byrne (1974) who, like Feffer, were interested in analysing general, structural features of cognition concerned with understanding another's point of view. Even more exclusively than Feffer, these researchers concentrated on the form taken by a created response to some questions. Thus, they stated their concern to be

> ...not with content, not with accuracy of
> perception of other or behavioural choice,
> but with the form in which conceptions of
> others emerge. (p. 804)

In this study the child was told a brief story in which there were several characters one of whom faced a dilemma

over future action. The child was a spectator to the 'relevant' action and the nature of the characters as they were selected and specified by the researcher. It was, of course, a very different task from those the child would encounter in inter-personal situations. In the latter, the child constructs others' points of view from the range of information available about the other's background, typical ways of responding, inferred intentions, and through selective attention to some aspects of the social inter-action.

Role-taking was operationalized by Selman and Byrne as the comprehension of a hierarchically arranged set of questions and the ability to reason at more differentiated levels. But the child's task appears to have been to recall the given information and to reproduce it on the relevant occasion rather than to discriminate and independently construct the elements of the other's view-point.

More seriously, some questions[1] required responses for which no information was given so that the child was required to create arbitrarily another's point of view rather than to articulate what were, for him, its distinctive features.

Selman and Byrne interpret comprehension of these questions as evidence that, for example,

> the child is now aware that people think
> or feel differently because each person
> has his own uniquely ordered set of values
> or purposes. (p. 804)

---

[1] For example, Level Two, questions a and b.

But from the test on which the conclusion was based there was no real evidence that the child had any consistent awareness of this causal relationship.

Some consequences of presenting minimal information to children and requiring them to infer another's situation, or perspective, are directly illustrated by the results of a study by Chandler, Greenspan and Barenboim (1973). Children's responses to video-taped and verbally presented moral dilemmas were analysed in terms of ability to differentiate intention from consequence in attributing guilt. When presented with information-rich film of a dilemma situation, significantly more seven year-old children were able to make use of information about intention than when presented with relatively sparse verbal materials.[1] Fuller information about another's situation appears to influence ability to differentiate and integrate elements of the other's situation.

The dilemma over content arises from the use of the Piagetian model of cognitive operations for understanding social interaction while attempting to avoid the vexed question of accuracy of social perception (e.g. Cronbach, 1955). The child's successful construction of his physical environment is verifiable in a qualitatively different way to that of his construction of another's social 'perspective'. Qualitative differences arise because of, amongst other things, the far greater instability of the other's states

---

[1] Verbal materials need not, of course, be informationally sparse, but presentation of film conveys a much wider range of linguistic and non-verbal information in a short time for children of this age.

of consciousness and the covert nature of these states. To question the accuracy of the child's 'view through the eyes of the other' is to ask an unanswerable question. Not to consider the content of his view is to lack real evidence of his knowledge of the other's view and hence whether or not it is, for example, a 'decentered' understanding.

One way of avoiding the dilemma is to relinquish the possibility of there being veridical knowledge of another's state of consciousness equivalent to veridical knowledge of a physical referent. 'Development' of inter-personal understanding might be conceived instead as a person's continuing attempt to develop means of anticipating experience, using the resource of reconstructions of previous experience, which give him maximal functional capacity in interactions. Such a view would not deny the central importance of the acquisition of cognitive structures of the kind suggested by Feffer, Selman and Byrne and others, but it would give much greater significance to both the structure and content of an individual's inter-personal understanding. The view would then allow the researcher to attend to questions of content without involving questions of accuracy because of an insistence on the necessary relativity of inter-personal understanding. Personal construct theory (Kelly, 1955) provides such a general theoretical position.

The explicitly held view of man in personal construct theory is of an anticipating being, perpetually modifying

and reformulating his constructs of the social world in order to gain better predictive accuracy or, equivalently, understanding. In this aspect the theory contrasts sharply with many other psychological theories in that a potential for rapid, fundamental change, rather than stability, is posited as a basic feature of human understanding of social environments. It is argued that meaning is given to events by the individual through his selection of certain aspects of events as similar to each other - that is, his construing of those events. The individual orders the perpetual flow of events by developing and constantly modifying personal constructs.

Constructs are considered to be bi-polar in nature and to involve three elements, two of which must be similar to each other and in contrast with a third. Kelly argued that such a contrast was essential to the meaningful definition of a construct:

> A construct which implied similarity
> without contrast would represent just as
> much of a chaotic undifferentiated
> homogeneity as a construct which implied
> contrast without similarity would represent
> a chaotic particularized heterogeneity.
> The former would leave the person engulfed
> in a sea with no landmarks to relieve the
> monotony; the latter would confront him
> with an interminable series of kaleidoscopic
> changes in which nothing would ever appear
> familiar.   (1955, p. 51)

The contrast is not that of classical logic in which redness, for example, would be contrasted with non-redness. Rather, the bi-polarity of a construct is constructed by individuals: thus, 'kindness' might be contrasted with

'stinginess' by one person and with 'hostility' by another.[1] Constructs will therefore show marked variation between individuals and will only be interpretable in terms of the way they are used by people to anticipate events. Kelly's 'basic postulate' is an economical summary of these points:

> A person's processes are psychologically channelized by the ways in which he anticipates events.   (1955, p. 46)

In relation to the specific question of inter-personal understanding, Kelly proposed as a corollary to his general theory:

> To the extent that one person construes the construction processes of another, he may play a role in a social process involving the other person.   (1955, p. 95)

Social interaction is only possible, that is, to the extent to which a person can subsume in his own system another person's system of constructs which is relevant to a particular situation. Particularity of the situation is important because it allows for a relative, rather than general, notion of understanding social interaction.

Though the terms 'differentiation' and 'hierarchical integration' are not used in personal construct theory, the concepts themselves are fully consonant with the theory (Crockett, 1965). Kelly himself argued that constructs may be viewed as similar to each other to the extent that they are used similarly in sorting a representative range of

---

[1] Kelly called the pole which specified the similarity between two elements the emergent pole and that specifying the contrast, the implicit pole.

people in an individual's environment.[1] One form of
differentiation, then, is between constructs themselves:
more complex construing of others' experience will be
possible if finer discriminations are made between the
constructs used to interpret experience of both the self
and others (1955, p. 131).

Hierarchical integration may be observed in systems of
implications of constructs (Bannister (ed.), 1970). In the
terminology of personal construct theory, constructs are
hierarchically related in ordinal systems so that a
superordinate construct may imply more subordinate
constructs, though not necessarily directly across all
interpersonal situations (Kelly, 1955, pp. 55-56). Though
the question of superordinancy is a very involved one and
the implications for measurement are at best only partially
understood, it can be argued generally that the less
concretistic the ordinal relationships between constructs
are, the more possible it will be for the individual to
subsume another's construct system.

Personal construct theory also helps to elucidate
several other aspects of the present discussion. At a
basic level, when the individual is viewed as attempting to
anticipate events in ways which allow him maximal
functional facility, then the provision of more spectator
role experience through literature is of potential signifi-
cance for changing ways of construing other persons. If,

---

[1] The representativeness of the range of persons, or
construct elements, is of significance because some con-
structs may be so specifically defined as to be only ever
used in a very limited area of social interaction.

through reading and talking, an individual experiences
disconfirmation of his existing 'hypotheses' he may find a
need to elaborate his system of constructs; the critical
factor is whether or not the individual does experience
disconfirmation. Mere similarity of experience is not
regarded as a sufficient condition for similar change in
two individuals: as Kelly has pointed out, the theory
does not imply that

> ...if one person has experienced the same
> events as another he will duplicate the
> other's psychological processes.
> (1955, p. 90)

The nature of the literature a person reads will also
clearly be of importance. To illustrate, if a novel merely
presents situations and responses the individual is already
able to anticipate, if it merely confirms existing ways of
construing, then more elaborated construing could not be
expected.   Similarly, if the novel presents social
situations so remote from the individual that he is not able
to subsume sufficient aspects of it to be able to experience
conflict with existing modes of construing, then no change
would be anticipated. A reader's lack of enjoyment of a
novel may also distance him so far from the imagined
situation as not to allow him to relate it easily to his
current constructs of experience. Personal construct
theory, then, suggests the inadvisability of a simple
expectation that the aggregation of reading of a large
number of novels, for example, will of itself lead to
developments in inter-personal understanding. A critical

element will be the idiosyncratically constructed relation-
ship between imagined and actual experience, a point which
permits a useful perspective on equivocal evidence from
studies of literature's effect on attitude change (Purves
and Beach, 1972; v. supra, p. 4).

From the viewpoint of personal construct theory some
conditions of personal interaction are more likely to
assist individuals to elaborate personal constructs than
others. Exploratory talk in groups can be viewed as such a
condition. If the individual is temporarily freed from the
requirement to maintain his anticipatory system as a
coherent basis for immediate action, it is much more likely
that he will be able to explore the implications of changes
in that system. Further, exploratory talk can be seen as
one means through which the implications of changes can be
clearly considered in that the resources of the peer group
can be used for mutual elaboration of implications. This
is not to suggest, of course, that the implications will
themselves be the topic of conversations. Exploratory
talk about literature potentially provides an interestingly
similar set of conditions to those suggested by Kelly for
reconstructing of the personal construct system in some
therapeutic settings: key amongst these is stabilising of
the individual's general, personal situation in order to
allow working through of the implications of changes prior
to his need to act on the basis of them (1955, pp. 161-166).

Personal construct theory, then, appears to provide a
valuable basis of psychological theory from which to address

questions about the value for primary curriculum of explor-
atory peer discussions of novels. The question then
becomes one of finding viable methods for assessing inter-
personal understanding and of adequate measures of
desirable developments. Personal construct theory is also
of some assistance with these issues in that specific kinds
of structural and content changes in construct sub-systems
can be defined and tested through theoretically consistent
measurement procedures.

Unfortunately, however, there is a dearth of research
evidence concerning children's development of inter-
personal construct syb-systems against which measures can
be tested. Though Kelly himself worked extensively with
children in therapeutic settings and clearly believed his
theory was relevant to questions of human development
(1955, pp.503ff.), he did not publish any thorough-going
analyses of the issue. The difficulty is further compounded
by lack of unequivocal data from development studies in
the related fields of person perception and impression
formation. After recently reviewing studies of person
perception in both adults and children Livesley and Bromley
concluded:

> ...the processes and variables in person
> perception are obscure and complicated, to
> say the least, and we have scarcely begun
> to appreciate how fundamental the problem
> is. (1973, p. 52)

A variety of measures has been used to assess develop-
ments in inter-personal understanding. Studies which have
employed Piagetian concepts (for example, Peevers and

Secord, 1973; Selman and Byrne, 1974; and Flapan, 1968)
have yielded measures expressed in terms of progressive
differentiation of the self and others. It is assumed,
for example, that as egocentrism declines the individual
is more able to infer the thoughts and feelings of others
as distinct from his own, or to make less self-referenced
statements ('he likes me') in describing the other. Such
measures are not specifically useful for the present purpose
because they do not yield sufficiently fine-grained
information about the 'content' of constructs and inter-
relationships between them.

Several studies have used children's free descriptions
of others, communicated by writing or orally (for example,
Richardson, Dornbusch and Hastorf, 1961; Yarrow and
Campbell, 1963; Livesley and Bromley, 1973). Descriptions
are content-analysed to assess the contribution of factors
of interest to the researcher such as age, sex, general
intellectual ability and the effect of 'stimulus' persons
of both inter-individual and intra-individual variance.
The approach offers many advantages and is therefore
analysed subsequently in some detail.

Free description method has the particular advantage
of placing minimal constraint on the form a description may
take and therefore allows a child to express his views in
terms he commonly uses in everyday life. It also minimises
the risk of unconscious experimenter bias, employs tasks

familiar to children,[1] and is rich in detail which can be subjected to a variety of analyses.

The critical disadvantage of the approach is in the difficulty of defining a unit of analysis. Many studies present neither definitions of units nor inter-judge reliability data on the distinguishing of units. An exception is the careful study by Livesley and Bromley (1973) who used a 'statement' as a fundamental unit: this was defined as

> one element or idea referring directly
> or indirectly to the stimulus person, or
> some other person. ((p. 98)

Inter-judge reliability was high, ranging from +.89 to +.98. Nevertheless, there are some compelling reasons for questioning the use of this unit.

Livesley and Bromley provide examples of written descriptions by a nine year-old girl, one of which includes the sentence:

> Joan Hall is Sidney's sister but she
> is not as nice as I thought she was.
> (1973, p. 131)

The sentence is considered to contain two statements, with the division occurring after 'sister'. The first statement is classified as 'general information and identity' and the second as 'evaluation'. The second statement, however, contains more than one idea: as well as making an evaluative comment, it clearly indicates a change in the girl's

---

[1] This may, of course, sometimes be a disadvantage. For example, no evidence is usually given of what the children are told about the audience to whom they are writing or speaking, but if they are used to a primarily evaluative audience for their writing, the task may be intimidating. (Britton et al., 1975).

opinion over time and a relative rather than an absolute
judgement ('not as nice as'). Similar difficulties can
be raised in relation to other examples. Further, all of
the examples are grammatically correct. The difficulty
becomes an even greater one when children use incorrect
syntax or punctuate written descriptions ambiguously. The
assumption that the researchers and child subjects share
sufficiently similar semantic systems for this purpose is
rather tenuous (McNeill, 1970).

Repertory grid technique is a research approach which
avoids the problem of using an arbitrary unit by using a
fundamental unit derived from the more general theory of
personal constructs. Units are personal constructs
themselves, represented in part by verbal labels.
Originally developed for use with adults as a clinical
assessment tool (Kelly, 1955; Bannister and Mair, 1968),
it has been used increasingly during the last ten years with
children in both clinical and research settings (for
example, Salmon, 1969 and 1976; Brierley, 1967; Wooster,
1970; Little, 1968; and Ravanette, 1975).

Grid method has similar advantages to that of free
description in studies of children. A child is able to
employ terms he would normally use in everyday life in
relation to persons he knows well. This simple conversa-
tional style is exemplified by a child's response in a
study conducted by the writer. She contrasted 'energetic'
with 'likes talking and sipping tea'. In discussion, she
revealed that she did not want to say 'lazy', but didn't
know another word. Grid method also minimises the risk of

experimenter bias effects and permits analyses of both
content and structural relationships in ways which may be
more clearly operationally defined than is the case with
free descriptions.

Grid method also has, though, some disadvantages.
Primarily, it is more difficult than are free descriptions
to construct. Results of studies using grid methods have
tended to show somewhat lower age-related abilities than
studies using other methods, though the volume of studies
is so small as to make generalisation precarious.
Especially for survey research in which subjects have
widely differing abilities and levels of confidence, the
relative difficulty of constructing a grid is a considerable
disadvantage. In more intensive work in the later primary
years with able children, however, the grid may have the
advantageous effect of accentuating individual differences
in construing which would be masked by easier tasks.

A disadvantage which is common to grid method with both
adults and children is the necessity of assuming that each
sorting task elicits only one construct and that a subject
does not shift constructs during specification of emergent
and implicit poles (Kelly, 1955, p. 271). The very nature
of personal constructs prevents the researcher having an
assurance that this has not occurred. It may nevertheless
be possible to guard against problems by the careful use
of elicitation procedures and through scanning of construct
labels for obvious shifts.

Salmon (1976, p. 25) has recently suggested that the use of repertory grids in which elements are both adults and children may cause the child to employ constructs he would not normally use in relation to one or other age group. The difficulty can be readily avoided, however, with older children by instructing subjects to omit elements where necessary from placement on a construct in a grid and through careful selection of role figures from central areas of the child's life. The constraint imposed will then only be that the child produce constructs which are sufficient to allow sorting of most elements. It is a constraint which may, again, actually be beneficial for work with able children for the reasons noted above.

The somewhat finer analyses which grids allow, the facility with which constructs centrally concerned with inter-personal understanding can be elicited, and the flexibility given to children to produce constructs in terms with which they feel comfortable, are considerable research advantages.[1]

Personal construct theory posits change as the basic 'state' of human beings. In repeated grid measures, changes are to be expected: the question is one of deciding which changes are to be construed from the theory as 'developmental' changes.

There is some consistency in findings across several studies of a developmental trend towards using more

---

[1] The issues of reliability and validity of grid measures have not been discussed here because to do so adequately would require a much more detailed description of personal construct theory. The issues are discussed, with reference to relevant research findings, by Bannister and Mair 1968, chapters five and six).

'psychological' constructs to describe persons rather than constructs concerned with more surface characteristics. For example, Brierley (1967), using a modified form of grid technique with seven, ten and thirteen year-olds found a significant increase with age in the use of personality constructs as contrasted with 'kinship', 'social role', 'appearance', 'behaviour' and 'literal' constructs. The picture was complicated by the failure to find proportionally more 'psychological' constructs and some significant sex and social-class differences. Thirteen year-old working class girls used the greatest number of 'personality' constructs. Livesley and Bromley (1973, pp. 134ff.) found a tendency for more statements about, inter alia, general personality attributes, specific behavioural consistencies and beliefs, attitudes and values to be made with increasing age. There was a related tendency to use fewer statements about possessions, routine habits and activities and family and kinship relations with increasing age. In some related, exploratory research, Bannister and Agnew (1976) have found a trend for young children to use more 'psychological', as compared with physicalistic constructs to describe themselves. Peevers and Secord (1973) also report a finding of increasing 'ability of subjects to adopt an impersonal stance in describing other persons' (p. 124) though their methods assume generally decreasing egocentrism across all aspects of the individual's cognition which makes interpretation of the finding difficult for reasons outlined earlier.

Increasing use of 'personality' constructs does not simply replace use of constructs concerned with more surface characteristics. For example, research by Livesley and Bromley, Little, and Peevers and Secord indicates that physical appearance, surely a surface characteristic, continues to play a prominent part in construing of other persons up until at least late adolescence even when, as in Livesley and Bromley's study, subjects were explicitly instructed not to include such constructs in written descriptions. In a study of friendship formation amongst female university students, Duck (1972) found that constructs concerned with physical appearance were used extensively by this age-group, though there was a significant tendency to use proportionally more 'psychological' constructs as friendships developed.

It would, though, be rather surprising if research had indicated that constructs of physical appearance faded from regular use in an individual's construct system, given the extent to which physical attractiveness is culturally valued and appears to influence the formation of adults' personal relationships (for example, Byrne, London and Reeves, 1968).

The Piagetian notion of centration is of particular value here. The point is not that a person construes such surface characteristics of another person as physical appearance, possessions and role attributes, but the degree to which his thinking about other people is centred on such constructs. If he is only able to produce (Flavell, 1974) a high proportion of constructs of surface characteristics

in describing other persons with whom he is very familiar, it can be argued that he has to some extent failed to differentiate these surface characteristics from more 'psychological' ones, particularly if he is specifically asked to produce the latter. Production deficiency in these terms is interpreted to be evidence of lack of differentiation. Bannister and Agnew (1976, p. 7) suggest that for young children, physicalistic constructs have an omnibus quality and are progressively different-iated into psychological, role and physicalist constructs. The close relationship of this interpretation to the phenomena of syncretism Piaget defined seems clear.

Given the ambiguous findings concerning the decline in frequency of use of constructs of surface character-istics, and the much more consistent finding of increased use of 'psychological' characteristics, it appears preferable to concentrate measurement of development on the latter. This will be especially meaningful under conditions in which subjects are explicitly asked to produce such constructs as much as possible.

The interpretation of development in construing in these terms relies to some extent on shared interpretations of construct 'labels' by competent adults. It is there-fore important to note carefully the dearth of evidence concerning the contribution of developments in the child's semantic system (McNeill,1970). From evidence of the key role of language in assisting the child to organise his understanding of the world (for example, Britton, 1970; Halliday, 1973; Luria and Yudovitch, 1971; Tough, 1977;

Vygotsky, 1962) it is to be expected that language development would be closely associated with the use of more 'psychological' constructs. The issue does not appear, however, to have been thoroughly investigated. Most frequently language has been attended to as an impediment for some children in the public production of their views (for example, Flavell, 1974; Shantz, 1975), though Livesley and Bromley have defined some language forms as assisting children to modify and organise views of others (1973, chapters nine and ten).

The analysis of structural changes in construing in grids minimises the need to assume interpretations of construct 'labels' which are similar for adults and children. Structural changes are assumed to occur frequently as the individual attempts to achieve more viable ways of anticipating experience. Moreover, a structural feature such as a high degree of differentiation may be evidenced by some sub-systems of constructs but not by others: the degree of differentiation will be partly at least influenced by the nature and range of events an individual has previously experienced. Differentiation, or other structural features, are not general qualities of a construct system.

In relation to inter-personal understanding the structural feature of sub-systems which has received most attention is the degree of differentiation between constructs. Kelly (1955, pp. 280ff.) argued that, to the extent that two constructs are used to sort elements similarly on a repertory grid, they may be regarded as

similar to each other. Subsequent research has considered
varying abilities of individuals with high and low levels
of construct differentiation to anticipate the responses
of other persons on a repertory grid. Bieri (1955) has
argued, for example, that:

> Inasmuch as constructs represent
> differential perceptions or discrim-
> inations of the environment, it would be
> expected that the greater the degree of
> differentiation among the constructs,
> the greater will be predictive power of
> the individual.   (p. 263)

Only partial support has been found for the hypothesis,
though Crockett (1965) suggests there is general agreement
that

> subjects high in complexity, compared
> with lows, (a) distinguish more clearly
> between other individuals in the
> impressions they form of them and (b)
> assume that others are less similar to
> themselves.   (p. 64)

Methodological reservations concerning both the valid-
ity and reliability of several measures of complexity of
construct relationships have been raised by Honess (1976).
A major difficulty concerns the interpretation of Kelly's
sociality corollary discussed earlier in this chapter.
Several researchers have required subjects to predict
a second person's responses on a set of experimenter-
supplied constructs. A more theoretically valid question
is to consider whether more cognitively complex persons
are able to distinguish more accurately the personal
constructs of another in a social situation.

Some confirmation of this hypothesis was found by
Adams-Weber (1969) in a study of university students'

ability to distinguish another person's constructs from a
set which also included an equal number of conventional,
experimenter-supplied constructs. The use of the more
theoretically rigorous question may help to resolve the
ambiguity of earlier findings concerning, for example,
differing abilities in predictive accuracy in relation to
liked or disliked persons (Bieri, 1955).

The measure used by Adams-Weber is of particular
interest. Each row in a repertory grid was compared with
every other row to provide an average match between rows
score. A high level of correlation was found between
this relatively simple computation and more complex
procedures previously used.

Evidence of development of increased complexity of
relationships between grid rows over time in children is
not available:[1] the issue appears to have remained
unresearched. While _general_ analysis of relationships may
not yield meaningful findings, the degree of association
between 'personality' constructs in a grid would provide
valuable information concerning an individual's ability
to differentiate experience and therefore his ability to
subsume another's construct sub-systems. If, as has been
argued, 'personality' constructs are more superordinate
than those concerned with surface characteristics,
analysing the degree of differentiation between them
should yield interesting information about their availa-
bility for subsuming another's construct sub-systems.

---

[1] Applebee (1976) has recently discussed some develop-
mental features of structural relationships between rows
but he was not concerned with inter-personal construing.

The argument is perhaps clearer if stated in its converse form: though 'personality' constructs are more super-ordinate, to the extent that they are used similarly in construing, they are less available for subsuming the construing process of others. The prior development is likely to be the elaboration of more 'personality' constructs: increased differentiation between these constructs may be a further refinement of the same process.

Greater differentiation between constructs can also be viewed in a different way. There is evidence from the pioneering work of Watts (1944) that children's early construing of other people tends to be univalent, with gradual development towards more multivalent construing during middle childhood and adolescence. Similarly, studies by Gollin (1958) and Yarrow and Campbell (1963) showed that the ability to relate and co-ordinate conflicting information about another person increases with age. Gollin, for example, showed film of a boy behaving in both socially desirable and undesirable ways and measured children's and adolescent's ability to employ concepts which meaningfully integrated the conflicting information. Clear developmental trends were found.

The use of a range of organising and qualifying terms and structures in children's written descriptions of others was studied by Livesley and Bromley (1973). Significant variation with age was found for all but one of the categories, which included the explicit and implicit use of 'because', the exclusion of culturally-expected trait implications and specificity of trait expressions. Age-

related trends were not found for the use of the important
'modal qualification' category, perhaps because both
intensifiers and indicators of probability of occurrence
were included in the category (1973, p. 197).

The clarity of the developmental findings is clouded
by consistent evidence from Byrne and his associates (for
example, Byrne, 1961 and 1974; Byrne, London and Reeves,
1968) of a strong association between inter-personal
attraction and attitude similarity in university students.
Strangers who are known by a subject to have similar
attitudes to himself are better liked than strangers who
are known to have dissimilar attitudes. Longitudinal
study of friendship formation in an equivalent age-group
by Duck (1972; Duck and Spencer, 1972) has shown, however,
that over time the association between liking and assumed
similarity undergoes important modification, as common-
sense would lead one to expect. An important question is
the complexity of distinctions an individual is capable of
making rather than only a question of what he does in the
early stage of acquaintance. During such an early period,
when minimal information about others is available and a
person is asked to distinguish between them in terms of
degree of liking, then attitude similarity or other
information which is initially available may necessarily be
heavily used in making predictions. But the degree of
reliance on attitude similarity is very likely to diminish
for most adults as increasing information becomes available.
Especially, it is to be expected that adults will make some
distinctions in liking according to another's placement on

their core role constructs (Kelly, 1955, pp. 482-483).
The central developmental question is really whether a
child becomes progressively more capable of making more
complex distinctions between other people well known to
him. Here Livesley and Bromley's evidence is of particular
interest because they have controlled for extent of
previous acquaintance in gathering written descriptions.

It does not appear that the question of the develop-
ment of more multivalent construing has been previously
studied using repertory grid technique. The technique is
a particularly helpful one for investigating the question,
however. Kelly maintained (1955, p. 302) that there is no
essential difference between rows and columns in a
repertory grid, in that both may be regarded as constructs
of previous experience (see also Bannister and Agnew,
1976). In a repertory grid in which the elements are the
self and a number of liked and disliked persons from key
areas of a child's life, it should be readily possible
to compare changes in relationships between a construct of
self and constructs of others over time to assess changes
in similarity scores. The predicted development would be
of decreased similarity between the self and liked others,
and increased similarity between self and disliked others.
Following Kelly's argument for the equivalence for
analysis purposes of rows and columns, it is to be expected
that greater differentiation might occur either because
the definition of rows had changed (perhaps through the use
of 'personality' constructs) or, alternatively, the
definition of columns had changed (through changed

construing of the persons involved).

Locating theoretically meaningful measures of developmental changes in content and structural features of children's understanding of other persons adds further difficulty to the complex question of assessing how literature and peer discussions might contribute to developmental changes. It is obviously not possible to find a neat way of making a critical test of claims for the value of peer discussions of literature!

It has been argued that the two general concepts of increased differentiation and hierarchical integration provide useful guidance towards operationalising tests of development. The theories of both Piaget and Kelly support the use of these concepts. Personal construct theory is particularly consonant with claims for the value of spectator role experience. The theory has been suggested as a sound basis from which questions of the content and structure of means of understanding other persons can be addressed.

Working from this theory, there are reasonable grounds for expecting a developmental trend towards using more 'psychological' constructs, rather than those concerned with more surface characteristics. Development may also be associated with increased differentiation between 'psychological' constructs, and increased complexity of relationships between the self and well-known liked and disliked others, though the grounds for anticipating these changes are somewhat less secure because of the lack of corroborating research evidence. The incidence of these

changes may be assessed through changes in the super-ordinancy of constructs as this is evidenced by terms used to denote 'psychological' characteristics and in structural features of grids.

In the following chapter, an attempt to develop a program of reading of novels and exploratory talk about them with upper primary children is described. Repertory grids were employed to measure changes in inter-personal understanding; the results of grid analyses are reported in chapter four.

CHAPTER   THREE

DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

In previous chapters some claims for the contribu-
tion of reading and talking about literature to the
development of understanding of other people have been
advanced, and some evidence concerning the general course
of changes in inter-personal understanding during middle
childhood has been reviewed. The present study is an
attempt to make a first test of the hypothesis that read-
ing of literature, accompanied by small group peer
discussions, contributes to the growth of inter-personal
understanding along three specific dimensions: increased
use of 'personality' constructs, increased differentiation
between these constructs, and increased complexity of
comparison between self and others. The dearth of
evidence about the facility with which children of this
age could sustain talk in peer groups, and with which they
could construct a repertory grid of the form required,
necessitated extensive pilot work prior to the commence-
ment of the study itself.

Pilot work on small group peer discussions was carried out with a sixth grade class parallel to that used in the actual study. Some of the first questions to be answered were whether children of this age could sustain meaningful discussion about literature in small peer groups, whether they enjoyed the experience and what conditions seemed mainly to influence the quality of their conversations. Two groups of four children, selected by the class teachers as relatively high volume readers participated in discussions once every two weeks from March until July, 1976. The discussions were tape-recorded for subsequent analysis. Further information was obtained through informal conversations about the experience with the children in their groups and individually while the writer worked as an assistant teacher in their classroom.

The results of the pilot work suggested several important strategies. Of primary importance was the need for the children to be very familiar with the person conducting the study, and to understand that interest was focussed on the process of their talk rather than on their ability to achieve correct 'answers'. At first the children in both pilot groups turned the tape recorder off while they talked over their answers, and then formally recorded the answers as if they were completing a comprehension exercise. Through minimal participation in two subsequent discussions the writer encouraged the children to value the process of the group talk rather

than to consider the tape-recordings as products
addressed to an unknown audience. During these sessions
the children also began to ask more questions of each
other, to accept silence with less embarrassment and to
'share the floor' by taking turns in talking. The
obvious implication for the main study was that time would
need to be spent in clarifying the children's understand-
ing of what they were expected to do in the discussion
groups: minimal adult participation[1] appeared to be a
successful means to use.

Predictably, the children's enjoyment of the novel or
poem substantially influenced the nature of the conversa-
tion. When several children in a group disliked the
literary work, the group seemed unable to make much
progress in analyzing the reasons for their reservations.
One strategy adopted, asking a group to read a novel one
of its members had intensely enjoyed and which met the
writer's criteria for selection, proved to be very
unsuccessful, perhaps because failure to obtain a positive
response from peers was very difficult for the original
child to accept. The alternative strategy of using books
recommended by several experienced teachers and teacher-
librarians was chosen and a survey developed to gather
these recommendations. The experience also suggested the
need to differentiate in subsequent analyses of conversa-
tions between occasions when the children strongly liked
or disliked a book.

---

[1] The precise form this took for the study is
described below on pp. 76-77.

In much of the work on small group talk so far
published, participants have been guided by sets of
teacher-prepared questions printed on cards. The
procedure enables the teacher to focus the group's
attention without limiting the time they might spend on
a question or their approach to it, though for discussions
of literature it does potentially have the disadvantage of
limiting the children's freedom to ask their own questions.
A compromise arrangement was found to be fruitful in pilot
work and was employed in the study itself. This was to
use prepared questions during a group's first two or three
discussions, to encourage children to bring forward their
own questions even at the expense of not answering those
presented and eventually not to present questions as the
group gained in confidence.

An important assumption of the study is that the peer
conversations of children in school can be directly
relevant to and affect ways of construing other people.
But a critical influence on this process is likely to be
the nature of a teacher's evaluative comments on conversa-
tions. For the present purpose, evaluation of the quality
of the children's response to works as literary constructs,
no matter how supportive, may have been counter-
productive to the aim of modifying ways of construing
other people because it might have restricted more
informal 'concrete' responses to the characters and plot
(Britton, 1968). Evaluative comments were therefore made
only about the nature of the conversations, were very

brief, and always opened the possibility for replies from other children so that difficulties could be more readily analysed. Comments were of a general form such as 'You seemed to be talking easily today. Did you think so yourselves? Were you able to ask questions of each other easily?' or 'Did you have some troubles today? You didn't seem to be enjoying yourselves very much. What do you think went wrong?' Comments were never made on social or personal issues raised by the children, or alternatives that might have been discussed. The children's comments were almost always about the degree to which they liked the novel, though on two occasions the groups mentioned difficulty with a dominant member. On these occasions the writer supportively encouraged the child to listen to the others more and to raise questions everybody in the group could talk about. Under these conditions confidence in, and enjoyment of, the discussion sessions appeared to develop. The conditions were carefully replicated with the experimental groups.

Eight children from Lindfield Demonstration School participated in the pilot development of the form of the repertory grid used. Before piloting of grids was commenced, parents of these children were advised by letter of the nature and purpose of the study, were asked for permission for the children to participate, and were invited to telephone the writer to discuss the study further if they desired to do so. The latter proved to be important in gaining some parents' permission. There was

also indirect evidence of its importance for re-assuring the children of their freedom to employ constructs central to the construing of their parents in the grids. The procedure was therefore repeated in the full study.

A variety of role figures and combinations of role figures for sorting was employed until a set to which all the children could readily respond was established. Salmon's (1977, p. 25) reservations about grids using adult and child role figures were met in this way. In the selection of role figures and in the combination of role figures for sorting, care was also taken to use figures from the child's home, peer and school situations so that the constructs elicited were more likely to be central to his inter-personal construing.

Pilot experience also indicated the undesirability of asking groups of children to complete grids simultaneously. When this was done, the children often attempted to keep pace with each other, a condition which resulted in embarrassment and lack of involvement for some individuals.

SELECTION OF BOOKS AND POEMS

To ensure that the books and poems used were widely accepted as examples of good children's literature and as suitable to the age and background of the children partici-pating, a questionnaire survey of experienced teacher-librarians, college lecturers and teachers with a special interest in the field was conducted.

An initial draft of the questionnaire was reviewed by three experienced people for clarity of wording and presentation. Subsequently, following modification of the format, five lecturers and teacher-librarians known to the writer were asked both to complete the questionnaire and to suggest names of other experienced teacher-librarians who might participate. A list of thirty names was constructed, of which only two were previously known to the writer.

The questionnaire[1] was presented on six duplicated foolscap pages. The first page was an introductory letter to explain the purposes of the study and to outline the reason for the request being made. On the bottom of this page a handwritten note explaining by whom that person's name had been suggested and giving a return date two weeks after posting, was included. The second page provided a brief statement of the background of the participating children. On the third page, the criteria to be used in selecting novels were set out and were immediately followed by a fourth page for the teacher-librarians to list the title, author and publisher of the novels. The criteria for selection were:

1.   children of this age and with this background
      are likely to enjoy the book;

2.   the book is likely to appeal to both boys and
      girls;

---

[1] A copy of the questionnaire is included as Appendix A.

3. the book's plot contains a lot of action, though this action may be 'internal' rather than 'external';

4. main characters, which are either human or animal, are fully drawn, (a character may change greatly during the course of the plot);

5. the main characters are either human or animals;

6. you are satisfied that the book is an example of good children's literature.

Similarly, criteria for selection of poems were stated on page five and were followed by a page for the listing of titles, name of poet and anthology containing the poem. Criteria for the selection of poems were:

1. the poem is likely to be enjoyed by children of this age and background;

2. the imagery of, and allusions in the poem, will provide for interesting discussions but will not be so obscure as to be inaccessible to children of this age;

3. the poet is concerned with an aspect of 'personal' interaction between humans and/or animals, or between humans and/or animals and their natural environment;

4. you are satisfied that the poem is an example of good children's literature.

A stamped, addressed envelope was provided for the return of the questionnaires.

Lists of recommended novels were received from twenty-two of those surveyed, representing a rate of return of 62.9%. A total of 233 books was recommended, with the most popular book being chosen fifteen times. The twenty books most frequently chosen, in order of popularity, are listed in Table 1 below.

Table 1

FREQUENCY OF SELECTION OF NOVELS

Author	Title	No. of Choices
Wrightson, P.	I Own The Racecourse	15
Serrailer, I.	The Silver Sword	14
Norman, L.	Climb A Lonely Hill	12
Southall, I.	Let The Balloon Go	10
Armstrong, W.	Sounder	10
Taylor, T.	The Cay	10
White, E.B.	Charlotte's Web	9
Holm, A.	I Am David	8
Norman, L.	The Shape of Three	7
Konigsburg, E.L.	From the Mixed Up Files of Mrs. Basil E. Frankweiler	6
L'Engle, M.	A Wrinkle in Time	6
O'Dell, S.	Islands of the Blue Dolphins	6
Southall, I.	Ash Road	6
Stow, R.	Midnight: The Story of a Wild Colonial Boy	6
Garfield, L.	Smith	5
King, C.	Stig of the Dump	5
Lewis, C.S.	The Lion, The Witch and The Wardrobe	5
Southall, I.	Hill's End	5
Pearce, P.	Tom's Midnight Garden	5

The response rate for selection of poems was lower than that for novels. Several teacher-librarians wrote that they were unable to make satisfactory judgements because of a lack of experience with this aspect of children's literature. Some tore off pages five and six, returning only a list of recommended novels. Others who did reply noted the difficulty of the task because of a dearth of suitable poems. Others considered that poems could only be presented at suitable times in the life of a group and could not, therefore, be generally recommended with confidence for a particular age group. Despite the format of the questionnaire some anthologies, rather than specific poems, were listed.

Consensus on suitable poems was low in those questionnaires which were returned. The highest score was three for three poems: Alfred Noyes' 'The Highwayman', A.B. Paterson's 'Mulga Bill's Bicycle Band', and Vance Palmer's 'The Snake'. There were two choices of fifteen poems, which varied from T.S. Eliot's 'Prelude' to Henry Kendall's 'Bellbirds'.

It was therefore decided to restrict the children's discussions to the four most frequently recommended novels, except for the first two discussion sessions (by which time all the children could not have read the first novel). In these sessions poems which met the criteria in the opinion of two colleagues and which had been successfully used by a teacher at the school for whole-class discussion were employed.

For session one, these poems were:

John Lennon and Paul McCartney, 'When I'm Sixty-
    Four',

W.B. Yeats, 'The Old Men Admiring Themselves in
    the Water',

Paul Simon, 'Old Friends'.

For session two the poem was:

Eve Dickinson, 'Round at Pete's Place'.

STRUCTURE AND LENGTH OF THE STUDY

The study was conducted at North Sydney Demonstration
School, the co-operating school of the University of
Sydney, during the third school term of 1976 with sixteen
children from each of two parallel fifth grades and one
sixth grade. None of the children had previous experience
of peer discussion groups. Until recently teachers have
been selected and appointed to the school by district
inspectors because of the quality of their classroom work
and their willingness to participate in teacher education
programmes. Despite similar staff selection procedures,
widely different classroom practices are adopted. The
school principal's policy is to encourage the development
of programmes of work suitable to the needs and interests
of the particular group of children as these are perceived
by individual teachers. The children who participated in
the study had, therefore, experienced quite contrasting
classroom arrangements, only some of which had involved
small group work.

The intensive nature of the reading and group talk experience imposed several limitations on the structure of the study. Of first importance, the work was carried out in only one school because of the amount of time involved in establishing rapport with the children and in using the individual form of the repertory grid. An attempt to control for the biassing effects of the institutional characteristics of the school has been made by using control and experimental groups from within each of three classes. This condition has also been used to control for the effect of teacher personality.

The length of the study is rather more brief than is desirable. Children developed first grids during the last two weeks of August 1976. They read four novels and met to talk in small groups during the first eight weeks of the third school term and were re-tested at the end of November 1976. The limited time of the study does, however, make the test of the concepts more rather than less severe. Further, evidence of the rapidity of children's development of inter-personal understanding suggests that it is not naive to expect some change over two months. Reading and talking about a book every two weeks is also an intensive experience for relatively young children; it may have been unreasonable to expect work of this intensity to be sustained for longer. However, a follow-up to the present study should be one which is less intense but conducted over a longer period of time.

Originally two procedures to assess inter-personal
understanding were employed: the previously discussed
repertory grid and written descriptions of the self and
others. In the latter case, the approach adopted was
parallel to that used by Livesley and Bromley (1973),
except that the children were asked to describe them-
selves, a liked and disliked adult and a liked and
disliked peer. In the case of self-descriptions, Kelly's
procedure (1955, pp. 323-326) for obtaining self-
characterisations was used: the children were asked to
describe themselves in the third person 'as if the
description were written by a very close and sympathetic
friend'. The results of this writing have not been included
because of the reservations about close analysis of written
descriptions for this purpose which were previously noted
in chapter two, and because the approach seems unsuited
to repeated measures designs, particularly because of the
amount of writing the young children are required to
complete.

FORMATION OF CONTROL AND EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS

It has been previously noted that a control and
experimental group was drawn from each of three classes.
Two of these were parallel fifth grades with a mean age
of 10 years 8 months at the commencement of the study. The
other class was a parallel sixth grade with a mean age of
11 years 9 months.

Each of the classes was informed, prior to being asked to write personality profiles, that the class was to be involved in 'a special study of reading, writing and talking'. Care was taken to explain that different children would be asked to do different things during the study, and that selection of a person or a group for an activity did not imply that they were the 'best' in any way. The task of writing the profiles was introduced as an activity in which each member of the class was to be involved.

The degree of intrusiveness of the testing and reading-discussion programme was minimised by other factors. The wide range of extra-classroom curricular activities offered in the school, such as instrumental music groups, choir and clubs, meant that the children were used to going or seeing their classmates go, from the classroom for special purposes. Further, the writer was well-known to the children from other teaching and supervision duties in the school and was involved, together with student teachers, in teaching low-achieving readers in these and other classes. This programme also involved the removal of individuals or small groups of children from the classroom for short periods.

The three class teachers were asked to list, if possible, eighteen children in their classes who read an average of one or more novels per fortnight. In each case, the teachers were able to provide this list from their class, and the school library, records. To ensure that

the programme would not create an unpleasant burden for
the children because of their inability to read
sufficiently quickly, all children nominated were tested
for rate of reading on Form B of the Neale Analysis of
Reading Ability.

All were found to score at or above their chronological
ages for rate of reading. Thirteen children scored beyond
the test ceiling for this component of the test.[1]

A group of sixteen children was randomly selected from
the teacher's list of eighteen in each of the three
classes. Two children in each class were held as reserves
in case parental permission for some children to partici-
pate was refused. Each class group of sixteen was then
randomly divided in two, to form a control and experimental
group within the one class.

In the case of the three experimental groups, the
writer outlined the planned reading and discussion
programme to the children, and invited them to participate.
At this point several of the children raised questions
about what was expected of them, what the rest of the
class would be doing when they were in discussion groups,
and what would happen if they didn't enjoy the novels. At
the end of the invitation sessions each child was handed a

---

[1] The administration of the Neale Analysis of Reading
Ability does not represent an attempt to control for all
aspects of reading ability, since attention was focussed
in this study only on children who were relatively high-
volume readers of literature. Because the children were
to be asked to undertake a rather extensive programme of
testing in writing and grid construction, in order to
minimise boredom and anxiety, the accuracy and comprehension
components of the Neale Analysis of Reading Ability were
omitted.

letter to his parents which informed them of the broad
nature of the programme, the grid elicitation procedures,
and assured them of the confidential treatment of informa-
tion obtained from the grids. The children were asked to
discuss their participation in the programme with their
parents. Return slips and envelopes were provided for
parents' replies. At no point were either the children
or their parents told that the children's ways of construing
other people were to be examined, or anything about the
nature of the subsequent analyses of grids.

In each of the experimental groups, one child was
refused permission to participate and was replaced by one
of the children previously tested for rate of reading.
The programme was explained to each of these children
individually, the names of others who would be participat-
ing from his class given to him, and identical letters
were forwarded to parents. Permission was received in
two of these three cases but the process had to be
repeated again for one of the fifth grade groups.

For the control groups, a similar course was followed
except that only the procedure for the elicitation of
grids was outlined to the children and included in the
letter to the parents. Although parents were informed
that the study as a whole was concerned with children's
responses to literature, they were asked for permission
for children to participate in 'some early trialling of
materials' through completing grids on two occasions
during the latter half of 1976. Permission was given for
all children in each of the three groups to participate.

There were fourteen females and ten males in both the control and experimental groups. When the teachers were originally asked for a list of eighteen names of children who read a novel or more each fortnight, no additional criterion of equal numbers of boys and girls was specified. The participating classes were constructed as parallel within age and therefore encompassed a wide range of ability. It was considered by the school principal and the writer that to ask teachers to list equal numbers of boys and girls would be to run the risk of including children who did not fully meet the criterion of volume of reading at the rate required by the programme.[1]

During the fifth week of third term one of the children in a control group in fifth grade left the school unexpectedly. It was also necessary to remove one child from the experimental group in sixth grade.[2] Posttest writing and grids were obtained from all other children, but because of the requirement of equal cell sizes for the analysis of variance procedure used, some children were randomly removed from other cells. Data reported in chapter four are therefore derived from seven children in

---

[1] The results of the Neale Analysis of Reading Ability did not, of course, give any information on the child's interest in reading. Level of interest, a critical factor for the child's participation in the programme,was inferred from his volume of reading.

[2] The reasons for taking this step are discussed on p. 79.

each group in each class. The division of numbers by
class, sex and group is set out in Table 2.

Table 2

NUMBERS OF CHILDREN IN CONTROL AND EXPERIMENTAL
GROUPS BY SEX WITHIN CLASS

| | Control | | Experimental | | Total |
	girls	boys	girls	boys	
Class One: fifth grade	4	3	4	3	14
Class Two: fifth grade	5	2	4	3	14
Class Three: sixth grade	3	4	3	4	14
Total:	12	9	11	10	42

ELICITATION OF REPERTORY GRIDS

Children constructed grids individually: each child
worked with the writer until he was confident that he could
complete the task independently, and always until after
both buffer constructs had been elicited. The writer
remained in the same room as, but physically distant from,
each child during his independent work on the task to
ensure that grids were individually completed and to give
incidental assistance where required.

After an initial, brief talk to establish rapport, the
child was told that he was to be asked to sort people into

a variety of categories which were important to him. Care was taken to ensure that the child knew his parents were happy for him to make these judgements and that he understood that the task was not in any way related to school or class assessment.

NAMING AND SORTING ROLE FIGURES

Each child was provided with eleven, five cm^2 cards on which he was asked to write the names of the people who best fitted the descriptions which were to be read to him. These role figure descriptions were:

1.   Yourself (christian name only),

2.   Mum) for these two role figures, the words 'Mum'
) and 'Dad' were used, rather than actual
3.   Dad) names,[1]

4.   the brother or sister nearest your own age,

5.   your best friend,

6.   a girl (boy) of about your own age whom you dislike (same sex),

7.   a boy (girl) of about your own age whom you dislike (opposite sex),

8.   an adult other than your mum or dad or teachers whom you like very much,

---

[1] A prior check revealed that nine of the children were without fathers at home and two of the children were without mothers at home. In the case of these children, the writer suggested that an alternative might be to write the name of someone who was rather like a father or mother to them if they would prefer to do so. This course of action parallels Kelly's original method, and proved to be readily acceptable to three of the children. The remaining eight children preferred to specify their actual fathers or mothers.

9.   a teacher you like very much,

10.   a teacher you dislike very much,

11.   an adult other than your mum or dad or teachers
        whom you dislike very much.

After writing the names of role figures, the child was

asked to place card numbers five, six and seven in front

of him. He was then instructed:

> Remember that we are thinking about
> personalities. What is one way in which
> two of these people are similar to each
> other and different from the third person
> in that same way?

Children's responses were, generally, of three types.

Many children responded with a statement such as: "Those

two are bad-tempered but this one is quiet". To these,

the writer replied "Good! You have told me something

about their personalities - about the sort of people they

are".

In several cases, children said: "These two are not

nice but this one is". To these statements the writer

responded: "Good. But can you tell me something more

specific which makes two of them 'not nice' and different

from this person in that same way?". After some thought

children were always able to articulate a more specific

construct. It was hoped that this procedure would assist

the child to produce more specific personality constructs

if he did, in fact, use them.

Sometimes children began to make a lengthy description

of each person in turn. The response in these cases was:

"Fine, you've said a lot about their personalities. But

can you say one way in which two of them are the same and

different from the third in that _same_ way?". These
children frequently showed surprise at the re-statement but
in every case except one were able to articulate a specific
construct and to work independently for the remaining
sorts. In this one case, a fifth grade boy in an
experimental group, the writer remained with the child for
each sorting after he expressed difficulty in understand-
ing what was required. His early responses were all in
terms of a like/dislike construct past which he at first
seemed unable to go. After he had been shown that this
information was contained in his selection of the
particular role figures he was again asked:

> What is another way in which two of these
> people are similar to each other and
> different from the third in that same way?

His response was, on the first and each of the subsequent
occasions, to state a specific similarity between two role
figures. In an attempt to ensure a genuine contrast on
the same construct (Kelly, 1955, p. 271), the writer
responded: "Good. If these two are [repeating the
child's words], then this one is....?". This method
appeared to assist the child successfully to articulate
meaningful, significant constructs.

Following successful completion of the first sorting,
booklets in which the children were to write construct
names were presented. Each page of the booklet was ruled
with two large columns for the writing of the names of
the emergent and implicit poles and the card numbers of
role figures. A narrower centre column was included for

the writing of numbers of omitted cards. The three cards
to be used initially in each sorting were specified by
numbers written at the top of each page of the booklet.

For the elicitation of the second buffer construct,
the children were asked to take card numbers two, three
and eleven as denoted on the first page. Directions were
repeated as for the first sorting, except that the
following words were added:

> Even though two of these people are your
> parents, you may want to sort the cards
> in quite a different way. You can group
> them in any way you choose, just so long
> as it makes good sense to you.

When a construct had been elicited, the children were
shown where to write the card numbers for, and names of,
the emergent and implicit poles. Subsequently, the
writer said:

> Now, there is another thing to do each time.
> I want you to take each of the other cards
> and say whether that person is more like
> that [indicating the name of the emergent
> pole] or like that [indicating the name of
> the implicit pole]. Let's take number four.
> Is he more like that or like that?

After the child had made a judgement, the writer said:

> Good! Now I want you to do that for each
> other card, including number one, yourself.
> Sometimes you might find that a person
> cannot meaningfully be placed on one side
> or the other. If this happens, put the
> number of that card in the centre column.
> But try to use the centre column as little
> as possible. Only use it when you can't
> realistically put a person on one side or
> the other.

Most children expressed interest in continuing their work
independently at this point, but where additional support
or explanation was requested, the writer remained with the

child until the third sorting had been successfully completed.

The combinations of role figures used for sorting were:

Sort	1	(oral buffer)	best friend, opposite sex disliked peer, same sex disliked peer
	2	(written buffer)	mother, father, disliked adult
	3	-	sibling, opposite sex disliked peer, disliked teacher
	4	-	best friend, opposite sex disliked peer, liked teacher
	5	-	mother, father, liked adult
	6	-	mother, father, disliked teacher
	7	-	best friend, same sex disliked peer, liked teacher
	8	-	self, best friend, same sex disliked peer.
	9	-	self, liked teacher, disliked teacher
	10	-	self, best friend, same sex disliked peer
	11	-	self, opposite sex disliked peer, disliked adult
	12	-	self, sibling, best friend
	13	-	liked teacher, disliked teacher, disliked adult

After the last sorting, the writer checked to ensure that no cards had been accidently omitted and said:

> One last thing I would like you to do.
> Think carefully about each statement
> you've made. Write a 'p' on the side you
> would prefer to be like. It may not be
> the side you are actually on - it is the
> side you prefer.

On five occasions in the pretest session, children were unable to articulate a construct in relation to a specified sorting. Different sortings were involved on each of the five occasions, so that the difficulty appears to have been idiosyncratic. In these cases, the child was encouraged to pass on to the subsequent sorting and to return to the one causing difficulty at the end. A meaningful construct was produced by each child at the second attempt.

The information contained in the booklets was later transposed by the writer to a grid format.

In view of the unusual nature of the task and the number of children being asked to construct grids in each class, the teachers were asked whether they had detected any confusion, resentment or other difficulty. In each case, the teachers replied that they were confident the task had been taken seriously by the children. This is, of course, inconclusive and subjective evidence, but in view of the warm relationship each of the teachers had with their children it is fairly likely that they would have readily perceived any distress or lack of seriousness.

Parallel procedures were used for the posttest construction of grids, including the use of two buffer constructs. However, the same role figures originally nominated were used, so that this aspect of the elicitation was not repeated.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY

On the first day of the third term the experimental groups were re-convened in class groups. Each child in a class group was given a copy of the same novel: the novels were subsequently rotated between classes. Children were asked to be ready to discuss the novels at the beginning of the next fortnight.

Pilot work had pointed to the value for increasing confidence with the task of an initial whole-group discussion with minimal guidance from the experimenter. Later in the same week, therefore, the children met in class experimental groups to discuss the three poems on the theme 'Old People' noted above on p. 62.

Prior to reading the poems (which were also available to each child in roneoed form), the writer explained that he would not be participating in the discussion by making any comments on the poems, but would occasionally remark on how the group seemed to be progressing with their talking to each other. Some features of the cassette tape-recorder (JVC Nivico, Model 9310SH) were pointed out to the children, particularly its built-in, multi-directional microphone and its facility in recording discussions even when speakers were some distance away. The children were encouraged to relax about the presence of the tape-recorder and assured that it was unnecessary to speak specifically towards it. After reading the poems aloud, the writer asked: "Would anybody like to say something about one of these poems?". He then pushed his

chair slightly away from the table at which the group was
sitting. Subsequent intervention, which averaged four
statements per group, was aimed at reassuring and
encouraging the group particularly by pointing out the
value of pauses, of questions asked of other members, and
of responding to what other people said.

During the second week the children met to discuss
a further poem, Eve Dickinson's 'Round at Peter's Place'.
On these occasions each class group was divided into two
groups of four on the basis of the children's free choice.
The same criterion was adopted for all subsequent
discussions to ensure that strong personal incompatibilities
did not intrude. During the two months of the study the
children changed groups freely and apparently without
animosity. They quite frequently came for discussions
with groups pre-formed. In general, the first discussions
were not very successful, with the children apparently
feeling similar embarrassment and self-consciousness as
did the pilot groups. A 'de-briefing' talk about the
experience was led by the writer at a later time in the
same week in order to reassure and encourage the children
again. The two fifth grade groups had by that time read
the novels and expressed themselves ready for discussion
the next week. The sixth grade group seemed still to lack
confidence and it was decided the whole group would
discuss the poem 'The Companion'[1] during the next week,

---

[1] Martin et al. (1976, pp. 94-116)present a transcript
of a very successful peer discussion of this poem by
children of a similar age.

with the writer present, before proceeding to the novels. At this meeting a similar respondent's role was played to that adopted on the first occasion.

For each group, prepared questions were presented on cards to guide the talk during the first two discussions of the novels, but the children were assured of their freedom to talk about other questions relevant to the novels and encouraged to do so. For the final two sessions no prepared questions were used. The other general suggestions to the groups were that they might like to begin by discussing their responses to the characters they particularly liked and that during the discussion they might consider what it would be like to be in broadly similar situations to some of the characters.

Two important modifications were made during the study. After children in one of the fifth grades had read their second novel, 'Climb A Lonely Hill', which several of them did not enjoy,[1] they asked if they could read 'a book with more fantasy in it'. They were therefore given copies of 'A Wrinkle In Time' which, though not one of the four most highly recommended novels, was nevertheless chosen by six of the panel of experts. The book was also given to children in the other fifth grade class as their fourth novel. Table 3 presents the titles of the books actually read and the order in which they were read by each class.

---

[1] A dominant theme of the novel is the way children lost in the Australian outback cope with the harshness of the environment and with their, often bitter, emotions.

The other modification concerned the participation of one of the sixth grade children. This girl read the first novel and participated in the discussion of it, but she stated her lack of interest in further participation to the writer a week afterwards. As well, two children in the first discussion group talked to their class teacher about what they felt to be the destructive influence of this child on their discussions. It was therefore reluctantly decided, particularly because of the short time available and the difficulties the group was encountering, to remove the child from the experimental group. It is worth noting that there was no prior evidence of the girl's isolation within the class or of her animosity towards other participants before or after the experience. The solution was not educationally desirable, but appeared to be one which would most minimally intrude on the development of confidence in small group talk for the other children.

The sixth grade group continued to experience some difficulty in talking over the novels throughout the remaining time. This opinion was held by many of the children themselves and expressed to the writer at the conclusion of discussion sessions. Qualitative differences between their talk and that of the fifth grade groups are analysed in chapter five.

Considerable variation was found in children's enthusiasm for the novels, as had been the case during pilot work. Opinions were not, however, consistent within

class or sub-groups. All the novels were positively
regarded by a majority of the children, except for 'Climb
A Lonely Hill', about which approximately half the
children expressed distaste. The positive reception of
the other novels is indicated by requests for titles of
similar novels for vacation reading by four of the
children.

There is direct evidence from the transcripts of
discussions that some parents read some novels to their
children or else caught their children's enthusiasm for
a book and read it independently. It is therefore
possible that specific discussions about some of the books
took place at home and may have been an influencing
variable. There is, though, no recognisable evidence of
the prior preparation of questions or of the children
coming to sessions to express parental opinions.

The discussion of the novels was completed at the end
of the second week in November and all posttest data
were gathered by the end of November, prior to the
children's departure for a school camp.

At the end of the experience the class teachers were
again asked for comments on the children's involvement in
both the discussions themselves and the posttest
construction of grids. For classes one and two the
teachers reported that the general level of involvement
was high, though there were variations in interest in
novels and between children in the extent to which they
were involved in the experience as a whole. For class

Table 3

NOVELS READ BY EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS WITHIN EACH CLASS
IN THE ORDER IN WHICH THEY WERE READ

Class	Novel
1	Sounder The Silver Sword Climb A Lonely Hill A Wrinkle In Time
2	The Silver Sword Climb A Lonely Hill A Wrinkle In Time Let The Balloon Go
3	Let The Balloon Go I Own The Racecourse Sounder The Silver Sword

three, the teacher confirmed the view expressed above

that the children did not much enjoy the discussion groups,

though no ill-will was evident nor was an obvious

explanation available.

The issues of inter-class and inter-individual

variations in response will be further discussed in

subsequent chapters. Reservation about the degree to which

the children in class three talked in an exploratory way

has suggested the value of making an analysis of the

outcomes from the grids prior to an analysis of the

processes of the conversations. Any substantial differences

between the experimental groups within classes might then

be viewed post hoc, in the light of analyses of the

conversations. Though a departure from the initial design of the study, the procedure is potentially fruitful in an exploratory study of such a complex situation.

The following chapter, then, presents data from the statistical analyses of the grids and chapter five, analyses of the conversations.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSES OF GRIDS

In the earlier discussion of research evidence of
developments in inter-personal understanding during middle
childhood, it has been argued that analyses of both
content and structural features of personal construct
sub-systems should be considered in research. The
distinction is to some extent only one of convenience,
since personal construct theory assumes a change in the
'content' of a construct is in fact a structural change.
When the standard form of a repertory grid is used, how-
ever, very little information can be obtained about the
level of abstraction, or hierarchical status of, constructs.
It is in relation to this question that analysis of verbal
'labels' of constructs can be particularly helpful. The
key assumption of content analyses of constructs is that
increased use of 'personality' constructs is indicative of
an individual's construing of other people at a higher
level of abstraction. This, in turn, is interpreted to be
indicative of more differentiated and hierarchically
integrated construing than if less abstract, more super-
ficial, aspects such as 'appearance' or 'role' constructs
are employed. Previous research gives support to this
interpretation and for the purposes of the present study

content analysis of personal constructs produced in the grids is regarded as the primary analysis.

The question of increased differentiation between constructs can be approached in other ways. Most commonly, as in cognitive complexity research, the extent of matching between all combinations of rows in a grid is calculated to assess the discriminatory ability of individuals. For the present purpose, however, relationships between 'psychological' constructs are of particular interest rather than those between all constructs. It would not be meaningful to expect that, over the short period of the study, relationships between constructs of surface characteristics such as appearance and social role would be refined. 'Fair haired-dark haired' is not a construct allowing much short-term change!

More complex differentiations between the self and liked and disliked others can also be considered through grid approaches. Review of previous research suggests an ontological development towards more multivalent construing of others. In grid terms, this can be operationalised as a decrease in the similarity of placement on constructs of the self and liked others, and an increase in similarity of placement of the self and disliked others.

Analyses of grids in these terms are discussed below.

The design of the study, employing an experimental and control group in each of three classes measured before and after the treatment, lends itself to repeated measures analysis of variance procedures. The specific details of analysis of variance approaches adopted will be

presented and discussed in relation to each of the three grid outcome measures.

AN ANALYSIS OF TYPES OF CONSTRUCTS USED IN THE GRIDS

In the elicitation of grids, children were asked to sort people on the basis of similarities and differences in their <u>personalities</u>. The pattern of response is, however, consistent with results from previous research in that the constructs elicited vary considerably in the level of abstractness of the terms used and in the aspects of the child's experience of persons to which they refer. For example, a child might use the constructs 'nice-not nice', 'patient-impatient' and 'like football-don't like football' within the one grid. Given the careful specification of instructions for sorting discussed in chapter three, and deliberate attempts to encourage the child to go beyond constructs referring to surface characteristics during the elicitation of grids, it is reasonable to assume that the constructs elicited do reflect the children's levels of development rather than a failure to produce relevant,[1] superordinate constructs already developed.

Content analysis is a commonly used research procedure which offers a high degree of flexibility, and which has been used in conjunction with grid techniques by Brierley (1967) and Little (1968) to assess changes with age in

---

[1] 'Relevant' in the sense of concerned with the personality of the role figures.

types of constructs produced. Brierley defined six categories, kinship, social role, appearance, behaviour, personality, and literal. Little, however, used only three categories: psychological, role, and physical. Both these systems contrast with the thirty-three categories developed by Livesley and Bromley (1973) for their analysis of children's written descriptions of other people. While a system as extensive as this does allow more precise analyses of change, it is better suited for use with descriptive oral and written materials than repertory grids. It does, however, suggest the fruitfulness of a more rigorous analysis than that used by either Brierley or Little in overcoming the ambiguity of some results obtained by these researchers. Though in the present research, interest is centered on differences in the frequency of use of 'personality' constructs, the careful definition of other categories of constructs will help to ensure conceptual clarity in interpreting any difference in the frequency of use of 'personality' constructs.

For the present purpose, eight categories have been defined and these form an exhaustive system without the use of a residual category. The categories, with examples, are presented in Table 4 and the manual used for gathering inter-rater reliability data is included as Appendix B.

Category one has been broadly constructed to include both general and specific aspects of personal behaviour. This approach is in contrast to both Brierley and Livesley

Table 4

CATEGORIES FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS OF CHILDREN'S USE
OF PERSONAL CONSTRUCTS

ONE - 'PERSONALITY' DIMENSIONS

This category includes statements of personality traits,
ways of behaving towards other people, general abilities,
preferences in inter-personal relationships and personal
habits.

Examples:

'kind - unkind'   'tidy - untidy'

'fussy - not fussy'   'has high I.Q. - is dumb'

'gets angry easily - doesn't'

'likes working in groups - does not'

'drinks a lot - doesn't drink'

'likes children - likes adults only'

TWO - PERSONAL APPEARANCE

Examples:

'attractive - ugly'   'wears jewellery - doesn't'

THREE - INTERESTS, HOBBIES AND NON-SOCIAL PREFERENCES

This category includes all statements of preferences in
leisure and work activities.

Examples:

'likes animals - doesn't'   'likes sailing - doesn't'

'interested in gardens - interest in inside things'

'likes playing football - doesn't'

FOUR - POSSESSIONS

This category includes both particular dimensions such as
'have lots of jewellery - don't' and general ones such as
'wealthy - not very well off'.

FIVE - SPECIFIC ABILITIES

All dimensions concerned with specific aspects of
what a person is able to do such as 'can play
football - can't' or 'sails well - doesn't sail'.

SIX - GENERAL EVALUATIONS

This category includes statements of the child's
general feelings about others, such as 'nice - yuck',
'horrible - pleasant' or 'good personality - bad
personality'.

SEVEN - ROLE FIGURES RELATIONSHIP TO SUBJECT AND
        RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ROLE FIGURES

Examples:

'people I like - people I don't like'

'people who like me - people who don't'

'know each other well - don't know each other'

EIGHT - SOCIAL ROLE

Includes statements of sex, age or other aspects of
social situations such as:

'male - female'

'adult - child'

'Greek - not Greek'.

and Bromley who distinguished between general judgements such as trait names and more specific aspects of behaviour such as an individual's reactions when playing games. Brierley, however, did note some difficulties in sustaining this distinction, giving as an example the two constructs 'he is a bully' and 'he bullies other children'.[1] Similar difficulties occur in Livesley and Bromley's examples.[2] Though Brierley found significantly different age trends in the use of 'behaviour' and 'personality' constructs, Livesley and Bromley found that the use of both categories increases consistently with age. In view of these uncertain results from developmental research, and the strong likelihood that in the present case many differences result from alternate styles of expression rather than from variations in the use of more abstract terms, both types of constructs were included in category one.

Though all constructs elicited in this form of the repertory grid imply value judgements, some constructs indicate very general evaluations. A common example was 'nice-not nice', or more picturesquely in the words of one child, 'nice-yuk'. Consistent with the findings of some studies noted in chapter two, these constructs have been separated from those in category one so that change

---

[1] Brierley (1967), p. 58.

[2] Livesley & Bromley (1973), p. 130. 'He is always saying cheeky things to people' is classified as 'Specific Behavioural Consistencies'.

towards more particular construing of personality can be observed.

The situation is somewhat unclear when a construct such as 'nice-mean' or 'generous-terrible' is articulated, because one pole seems to indicate the use of a person- ality trait and the other a 'general evaluation'.[1] For the present purpose all constructs of this kind have been categorised as 'general evaluations' to avoid an artifi- cial inflation of category one. If there is a develop- mental trend with age towards the increased use of trait names, as is being assumed, this procedure also helps to minimise the danger of wrongly interpreting the children's meanings in the desired direction.

Category seven includes constructs which explicitly mention the self as in 'people I like-people I don't like' together with those which are implicitly self-referenced such as 'people who know each other-people who don't'. The latter have been regarded as self-referenced because the self was an element in the construction of the repertory grid.

While constructs in the other categories, such as social role and specific abilities, clearly play some part in the formation of views of personality, they have been distinguished because their role is limited by the surface nature of the behaviour to which they refer and their role tends to diminish in central importance with age.

---

[1] It may have been similar difficulties of interpre- tation which helped to produce the rather ambiguous finding of a curvilinear relationship with age reported by Livesley and Bromley, (1973), pp. 134ff.

All constructs were written on 5"x3" cards and the cards coded for subject, test occasion, and class. The construct statements were categorised by the writer, and then by a social worker and a graduate teacher, both of whom had extensive experience with primary-aged children. To assist with another subsequent analysis of differentiation, all 924 construct statements were sorted by each person rather than a sample taken. Using Cohen's k, coefficients of agreement were calculated for each combination of judges (Cohen, 1960; Tinsley and Weiss, 1975). For the writer and one sorter, this was .92 and, for both other combinations, .88. In view of the high level of agreement obtained, construct statements on which disagreement occurred were placed in the category indicated by two of the judges. There were no constructs for which the judges used three different categories.

Initially, a three-way repeated measures analysis of variance (class x treatment x testing) was planned. A check on the homogeneity of variance between testings within treatment x class subgroups revealed, however, that a three-way analysis of variance could not be validly employed. $F_{(max)}$ statistics on homogeneity of variance for each of the measures discussed in this chapter are, for reasons of economy, presented jointly in Tables 5 and 6.

It was possible, however, to employ two-way analyses of variance to compare treatment groups within each of the three classes, since the two variances of the testing by subjects within the treatment groups were homogeneous in each case.

Table 5

F$_{(MAX)}$ STATISTICS FOR VARIANCES OF TESTINGS BY SUBJECTS
WITHIN TREATMENTS BY CLASS SUBGROUPS ON EACH MEASURE[1]

Variable	F(max)
Personality Constructs	45.12*
Average Match Between Rows	1.89
Role Figures:	
Mother	3.03
Father	3.57
Sibling	5.05
Friend	21.00*
Same Sex Disliked Peer	4.05
Other Sex Disliked Peer	43.93*
Liked Adult	9.29
Liked Teacher	4.13
Disliked Teacher	5.45
Disliked Adult	6.18

[1] Six variances and six degrees of freedom.

* Exceeds the .99 confidence limit for assuming
homogeneity of variance for analysis of variance
procedures.

Table 6

F(MAX) STATISTICS FOR VARIANCES OF TESTINGS BY SUBJECTS
WITHIN TREATMENTS FOR EACH CLASS ON EACH MEASURE[1]

Variable	F(max)		
	Class One	Class Two	Class Three
Personality Constructs	2.70	3.11	1.65
Average Match Between Rows	1.23	1.19	1.68
Role Figures:			
Mother	1.08	2.68	1.28
Father	1.79	1.64	2.18
Sibling	1.17	2.62	1.33
Friend	2.41	2.19	1.46
Same Sex Disliked Peer	1.14	2.46	1.82
Other Sex Disliked Peer	4.69	5.98	7.45
Liked Adult	1.35	9.29	2.81
Liked Teacher	1.73	1.05	1.78
Disliked Teacher	1.32	1.37	2.00
Disliked Adult	1.42	2.51	3.89

[1] Two variances and six degrees of freedom.

All values fall within the .99 confidence limit for
assuming homogeneity of variance for analysis of
variance procedures.

For the primary analysis of frequency of use of
'personality' constructs the null hypotheses for each
within-class analysis were:

- there is no difference between the mean frequency
  of use of 'personality' constructs, averaged
  across test occasions, for treatment groups;

- there is no difference between the mean frequency
  of use of 'personality' constructs, averaged
  across treatments, on test occasions one and two;

- there is no interaction between the effects of
  treatment and test occasion on the mean frequency
  of use of 'personality' constructs.

Because of the exploratory nature of the study, and the
short length of the treatment, a significance level of
.05 was established.

Data on the actual frequency of use of categories on
occasions one and two in treatment groups within each
class are presented in Table 7 and results for three two-
way analyses of variance are presented in Table 8.

A significant interaction between treatment and
testings was found for class one, but not for classes two
and three. There was also a significant difference
between scores on test occasions in class one; it can be
seen from Table 7 that the frequency of use of 'personality'
constructs increases for the control as well as the
experimental group, but not to nearly so marked a degree.

Table 7

ACTUAL FREQUENCY OF USE OF CATEGORIES OF CONSTRUCTS ON TEST OCCASIONS WITHIN TREATMENT GROUPS WITHIN CLASSES

Category	Class One				Class Two				Class Three			
	Control		Experimental		Control		Experimental		Control		Experimental	
Occasions:	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
One	63	67	52	65	57	55	50	63	52	54	55	57
Two	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Three	2	3	2	0	3	4	12	7	13	14	10	7
Four	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Five	2	0	1	0	0	1	5	3	5	4	6	1
Six	7	2	11	4	8	12	3	2	2	2	1	8
Seven	3	4	6	5	8	5	5	1	2	1	2	2
Eight	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	2	0
Total	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	77

Table 8

TWO-WAY ANALYSES OF VARIANCE IN FREQUENCY OF USE OF 'PERSONALITY' CONSTRUCTS

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Class One		Class Two		Class Three	
		Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio
Treatment	1	7.000	1.735	0.036	0.006	1.286	0.113
Testing	1	9.143	20.757$^{\emptyset}$	4.321	0.609	0.571	0.336
Treatment x Testing	1	3.571	8.108*	8.036	1.132	0.000	0.000
Error (between)	12	0.440		7.095		1.702	
Error (within)	12	4.036		5.952		11.369	

$\emptyset$ $p < .01$

* $p < .05$

Inspection of the frequency data for classes one and two reveals that the frequency scores for the experimental groups in both classes increased by exactly the same margin. There is, though, a substantially greater variance in individual scores for the class two children, resulting in the non-significant finding. In control groups, total frequency scores for the use of category one constructs increased by only five for class one and decreased by two for the class two children.

For class three, the total frequency scores for use of category one constructs increase by two for both the control and experimental groups.

In view of the reservations expressed in chapter three concerning the equivalence of the treatment for each of the experimental groups, the pattern of results is particularly interesting. The question of inter-class and inter-individual differences will be explored later in the chapter.

AN ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN 'PERSONALITY' CONSTRUCTS

If using more 'personality' constructs represents a development towards more differentiated and hierarchically integrated construing, then a further development might be towards a greater differentiation of these constructs themselves in sorting role figures.

A valuable measure for testing this possibility is
Adams-Weber's (1969) average match between rows score
which he has found to correlate well with other widely
used but computationally more complex measures of
differentiation between constructs.

For the present analysis, constructs were first
'rotated' so that preferred poles were placed on the same
side of grids. From a common-sense interpretation of
construct relationships the procedure proved more desir-
able than rotation to effect equivalent orientation of
emergent and implicit poles (Gibson, 1975; Epting, 1975).
Each 'personality' construct was then compared with each
other 'personality' construct within each grid. Matches
between rows, or all occasions of placements of an
element at the same pole on two 'personality' constructs,
were summed and divided by the number of 'personality'
constructs. When omissions were adjacent on two constructs
they were regarded as non-matches because an omission
could indicate either that the element was outside the
range of convenience of a construct or that the child had
insufficient knowledge of the role figure to make a mean-
ingful placement on the construct. The very small number
of omissions involved could not have influenced scores
in any consistent way.

A three-way analysis of variance was statistically
valid for this measure, as may be observed from Table 5,
but the procedure would have been meaningless in view of
the prior exclusion of three-way analysis of variance
of frequency of use of 'personality'constructs. Two-way

analyses of testing and treatment effects within each
of three classes were therefore calculated.

The null hypotheses for each within-class analysis
were:

- there is no difference between mean average
  match between rows scores, averaged across test
  occasions, for treatment groups;

- there is no difference between mean average
  match between rows scores, averaged across
  treatments, on test occasions one and two;

- there is no interaction between the effects of
  treatment and test occasion.

The results of analyses for the three classes are
presented in Table 9. No significant differences between
treatments, testings or their interactions were found.
The results suggest that though there has been an increase
in the frequency of use of 'personality' constructs for
classes one and two, these constructs are not yet used
more differentially by the children. Increased different-
iation between 'personality' constructs may well be
developmentally subsequent to the use of more of such
constructs and in view of the short time-period of the
treatment the result is not surprising.

The result for class three further supports the argu-
ment of no significant change in use of 'personality'
constructs in the experimental group in this class. Prior
to the results of the analysis it was possible to hypothesise
that, even though there was no significant increase in

Table 9

TWO-WAY ANALYSES OF VARIANCE IN AVERAGE
MATCH BETWEEN ROWS SCORES

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Class One		Class Two		Class Three	
		Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio
Treatment	1	4.181	1.784	4.059	1.616	9.937	2.305
Testing	1	0.532	0.348	0.886	0.678	0.149	0.124
Treatment x Testing	1	0.268	0.175	0.796	0.609	0.922	0.769
Error (between)	12	1.529		1.305		1.198	
Error (within)	12	2.344		2.511		4.311	

frequency of use of 'personality' constructs for this group, increased differentiation between existing constructs may have occurred. The possibility is now excluded.

AN ANALYSIS OF COMPLEXITY OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE SELF AS A CONSTRUCT AND LIKED AND DISLIKED ROLE FIGURES

In the third analysis the extent of association between the self and each other role figure is considered. It has been previously argued that a high level of similarity between the self and liked role figures on the one hand, and a low level of similarity with disliked role figures on the other, is evidence of univalent construing. Some evidence of a developmental trend towards more multivalent construing has been noted, though the tendency for many adults to employ univalent construing has also been pointed out.

A strong association between liking and similarity to the self is likely to make subsuming of another's construct system more difficult, because so many of the other's distinctive 'characteristics' - much of what makes him the person he is - are not differentiated. Similarly, a strong association between disliking and dissimilarity is likely to have the same effect.

The difficulty with using these questions in considering developments in inter-personal understanding is that there do not appear to be any published data to enable

comparisons to be made. For this analysis, it was
necessary to begin from the very beginning.

In pilot studies a strong association between liking
and similarity to the self and between disliking and
dissimilarity to the self was observed in children of
equivalent age to those involved in the study. A method
of grid analysis designed to yield similarity scores,
was developed. The pattern of column one, self, was compared
with the pattern of each other column to obtain a similar-
ity score for each self-other role figure comparison.
The score for each comparison was the total number of
matchings between each combination of columns, with
matchings between omissions disregarded as in the second
analysis.

It can be seen from Table 10 that the initial grids
yielded an equivalent pattern of similarity scores with
that found in the pilot study. The potential range of
scores was from nought to eleven. For comparisons
between the self and various liked role figures, mean
similarity scores on initial grids varied from a high of
10.29 in the experimental group in class one for self-
father comparisons to a low of 7.00 for self-liked teacher
comparisons in the control group in class two. For
comparisons with disliked role figures, mean similarity
scores varied from a low of 1.42 for self-same sex
disliked peers comparisons in the experimental group in
class three to a high of 5.00 for self-opposite sex
disliked peers comparisons in the control group in class

Table 10

MEAN SIMILARITY SCORES FOR TREATMENT GROUPS WITHIN
CLASSES ON PRETEST AND POSTTEST GRIDS

		Mother	Father	Sibling	Friend	Same Sex Disliked Peer	Other Sex Disliked Peer	Liked Adult	Liked Teacher	Disliked Teacher	Disliked Adult
Class One											
Experimental	Pretest	9.71	9.71	8.29	8.14	2.29	2.29	8.57	8.43	2.29	2.43
	Posttest	8.57	7.71	7.42	7.71	3.43	2.43	7.71	7.29	3.14	3.00
Control	Pretest	9.71	10.29	8.00	9.14	1.43	3.00	8.86	8.43	1.86	1.57
	Posttest	8.57	9.00	7.71	9.00	3.14	4.71	7.14	6.43	2.14	3.14
Class Two											
Experimental	Pretest	8.43	8.71	8.00	8.57	4.14	3.57	6.86	8.00	3.14	3.57
	Posttest	9.57	8.29	5.71	8.71	2.71	4.41	7.29	8.14	3.00	3.29
Control	Pretest	7.43	9.00	6.86	9.00	3.29	3.57	7.86	7.00	2.86	3.14
	Posttest	7.86	8.14	7.00	8.57	3.00	2.57	7.86	7.71	3.00	2.71
Class Three											
Experimental	Pretest	9.29	8.14	8.14	9.00	1.42	2.86	9.14	9.43	2.71	4.14
	Posttest	9.57	7.71	7.86	8.43	1.86	4.29	8.86	9.43	3.57	4.14
Control	Pretest	9.00	8.43	6.43	8.29	3.57	5.00	8.14	8.71	2.86	2.71
	Posttest	8.86	8.86	7.42	8.29	2.71	4.43	8.57	8.14	3.57	3.14

three. Though the figure of 5.00 is rather high, it can
be seen to be atypical of the other scores for disliked
role figures.

Results of tests of homogeneity of variance reported
in Table 5 show that three-way repeated measures analysis
of variance in pretest and posttest scores were possible
for all comparisons except those between self and best
friend and between self and other sex disliked peer.
Three-way analyses of variance were computed for self-
mother, self-father, self-sibling, self-same sex disliked
peer, self-liked adult, self-liked teacher, self-
disliked teacher, and self-disliked adult comparisons.

For the three-way repeated measures analyses of
variance, the null hypotheses were, in relation to each
of the self-other role figure comparisons:

- there is no difference between mean similarity
  scores for classes, averaged over treatments and
  test occasions;

- there is no difference between mean similarity
  scores for treatment groups, averaged over classes
  and test occasions;

- there is no difference between mean similarity
  scores for test occasions, averaged over classes
  and treatment groups;

- there is no interaction between the effects of
  class and treatment, averaged over occasions;

- there is no interaction between the effects of
  class and testing, averaged over treatments;

- there is no interaction between the effects of
  treatment and testing, averaged over classes;

- there is no interaction between the effects of
  class, treatment and testing.

Results of the analyses are reported in Tables C1 to C8
of Appendix C, and are discussed below.

The inter-class variation observed in the primary
analysis pointed to the importance of checking for the
possibility of significant results within each class in
relation to the relevant hypotheses. It was therefore
decided to compute two-way analyses of variance: from
the results of tests of homogeneity of variance reported
in Table 6 it can be observed that two-way repeated
measures of analyses of variance are valid for all self-
other role figure comparisons.

For each of the two-way repeated measures analyses of
variance the null hypotheses were:

- there is no difference between mean similarity
  scores, averaged across test occasions, for
  treatment groups;

- there is no difference between mean similarity
  scores, averaged across treatments, on test
  occasions one and two;

- there is no interaction between the effects of
  treatment and test occasion.

The results of these analyses are reported in Appendix C, Tables C9 to C11.

In the three-way analyses of variance it is only in the case of the self-sibling comparison that the treatment-testing interaction reaches significance. The two-way analyses reveal that this interaction is only significant in class three. The means of treatment groups within each class reported in Table 10 reveal that a relatively sharp drop in mean similarity score for the experimental group in class two has been accompanied by an increase in mean similarity score for the control group in class three. Given the number of analyses carried out, the small number of other significant interactions obtained could occur by chance.

Some interesting differences at posttest may be seen for class one. For three comparisons, those with 'dad', 'liked teacher', and 'liked adult', there is a significant testing effect in the predicted direction. For all other comparisons, posttest results are in the predicted direction, though in some cases they are very slight. It will be recalled that there was also a significant testing effect for this class in the primary analysis. The results suggest at least the possibility of a 'leakage' of the treatment. A discussion with the class teacher revealed that there were five strong friendship links between the children in the control and experimental groups. He also remarked that on a few occasions during the term children in the experimental group had mentioned the books they had been reading in whole class discussions.

It was therefore possible that the control group children might have read some of the novels and talked about them with the experimental group friends. However, in a check with the control group children during the early part of 1977 it was found that only one of them had read a selected novel during the period of the experiment. It was therefore considered that the significant testing effect was unlikely to have arisen from a 'leakage' of the treatment. Nevertheless, a further statistical analysis, to be reported below, was employed to provide a more rigorous test of the possibility.

Repeated measures analyses of variance of mean similarity scores for each self-other role figure comparison do not exhaust the possibility of significant differences between treatment groups at posttest. It is possible that when all comparisons are considered simultaneously the posttest grids vary significantly more for the experimental group than for the control group. This is an important issue because there is no theoretical reason to expect that there will be a consistent effect in experimental groups in relation to one self-other role figure comparison. Each of the novels, for example, involves a variety of adult and child characters and there was no requirement that the children should discuss any particular character. Even more importantly, a personal construct theory approach suggests that there is likely to be considerable variation in individuals' construing of an experience.

Multivariate analysis of variance was applied to examine whether there were differences in the similarity scores of treatment and class groups when considered simultaneously across each grid. Using Finn's programme (1974) which allowed the elimination of covariates, the following three null hypotheses were tested:

- averaged over treatments, there is no difference between the mean vector over the ten criterion variables for class one and the average of the mean vectors for classes two and three;

- averaged over classes, there is no difference between the mean vector over the ten criterion variables for the experimental group and the mean vector for the control group;

- there is no difference between the mean vector of the ten differences between the experimental and control groups in class one and the mean vector of the ten averaged differences between experimental and control groups in classes two and three.

The first null hypothesis represents a test of the possibility of consistent and general class differences; the second, a test of the effect of treatments over all classes, and the third a test of between-class differences in treatment effects.

Results for the three analyses are presented in Tables 11, 12 and 13 respectively. No significant differences were found. It was therefore concluded that the treatment failed to produce statistically significant

Table 11

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN THE MEAN VECTORS OVER THE TEN CRITERION
VARIABLES FOR CLASS ONE AND THE AVERAGE OF THE
MEAN VECTORS FOR CLASSES TWO AND THREE[1]

Variable	df	Mean Square	Error Mean Square (df=26)	F ratio
Multivariate Analysis	20,34	-	-	0.344
Univariate Analyses:				
Mother	2	2.566	2.824	0.908
Father	2	0.893	4.694	0.190
Sibling	2	5.041	5.658	0.890
Friend	2	0.433	3.077	0.140
Same Sex Disliked Peer	2	2.626	6.275	0.418
Other Sex Disliked Peer	2	3.484	8.967	0.389
Liked Adult	2	2.019	3.495	0.578
Liked Teacher	2	4.175	3.628	1.151
Disliked Teacher	2	2.587	3.635	0.712
Disliked Adult	2	0.087	4.765	0.018

[1] Ten covariates have been eliminated.

Table 12

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN THE MEAN VECTOR OVER THE TEN CRITERION
VARIABLES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP AND THE
MEAN VECTOR FOR THE CONTROL GROUP[1]

Variable	df	Mean Square	Error Mean Square (df=26)	F ratio
Multivariate Analysis	10,17			0.373
Univariate Analyses:				
Mother	2	2.538	2.824	0.899
Father	2	2.377	4.694	0.506
Sibling	2	3.347	5.658	0.592
Friend	2	0.525	3.077	0.171
Same Sex Disliked Peer	2	1.542	6.275	0.246
Other Sex Disliked Peer	2	1.753	8.967	0.196
Liked Adult	2	0.003	3.495	0.001
Liked Teacher	2	1.074	3.628	0.296
Disliked Teacher	2	2.978	3.635	0.819
Disliked Adult	2	1.200	4.765	0.252

[1] Ten covariates have been eliminated.

Table 13

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN THE MEAN VECTORS OF THE TEN DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS IN
CLASS ONE AND THE TEN AVERAGED DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS IN
CLASSES TWO AND THREE[1]

Variable	df	Mean Square	Error Mean Square (df=26)	F ratio
Multivariate Analysis	20,34	-	-	0.656
Univariate Analyses:				
Mother	2	1.658	2.824	0.587
Father	2	3.760	4.694	0.801
Sibling	2	2.847	5.658	0.503
Friend	2	0.844	3.077	0.274
Same Sex Disliked Peer	2	0.996	6.275	0.159
Other Sex Disliked Peer	2	15.924	8.967	1.776
Liked Adult	2	1.833	3.495	0.525
Liked Teacher	2	1.278	3.628	0.352
Disliked Teacher	2	0.604	3.635	0.166
Disliked Adult	2	1.022	4.765	0.215

[1] Ten covariates have been eliminated.

changes even when comparisons between self and all other role figures were considered simultaneously. The result for the test of the first hypothesis is of particular interest because it confirms that there has been no statistically significant 'leakage' of the treatment in class one.

SOME TENTATIVE QUESTIONS RESULTING FROM THE ANALYSES

It has been previously argued that the analysis of differences in the frequency of use of 'personality' constructs is the most valuable first analysis of change in inter-personal construing towards increased different-iation and hierarchical integration. For this analysis there is a treatment by testing interaction approaching the .01[1] level of significance for class one; a similar extent of difference between pretest and posttest frequencies for the class two experimental group to that found in the class one experimental group, but a high level of within-group variance; and a very marginal difference between pretest and posttest frequencies for class three.

The important question which arises from the results of the primary analysis is the possibility of important between-class differences in the processes of the peer

---

[1] The p value for an F of 8.108 and one degree of freedom is .0146.

group discussions. The statistical results here suggest
a similar question to that raised from more general
observations of the groups during the conduct of the
study. That significant between-class differences were
not found in the two differentiation measures does not
lessen the significance of the question, given the failure
to find significant within-class treatment by testing
effects on these measures.

Both measures of differentiation were necessarily
subsidiary and exploratory ones. It is very probable that
the program was too brief to have achieved the kind of
elaboration of constructs necessary to effect significant
change on these measures. Some slight trend towards more
multivalent construing has been observed and the measure
is probably worth employing in subsequent longer-term
studies. Its chief deficiency is one of the strengths of
repertory grid methods: the sensitivity of the grid to
changes in intra-individual construing which result in
high levels of within-group variance.

There is evidence from the grid analyses that
individuals within experimental groups have responded very
differently to the experience. Close analysis of indiv-
idual scores for the three outcome measures, for example,
indicates that there were some children in classes one
and two for whom there was a consistent difference in
the predicted direction between pretest and posttest
scores. Such differences represent a marked degree of
change in individual grid patterns. The difficulty, of
course, is that it is not possible within the present

design unequivocally to associate the changes with the treatment.

Some anecdotal evidence, worth considering because the study is of such an exploratory nature, helps to illustrate the possibility of important inter-individual differences in the effect of the treatment. After the conclusion of the reading and discussion sessions three of the children who had consistently different posttest scores in the predicted direction came to the writer individually to ask if there were more books of this kind which they could read, and spontaneously indicated how much they had enjoyed the experience. Two of them asked if it would be continued during their next year at the school and asked the same question of the next teacher early in the following year.

There is similar, though negative, anecdotal evidence of individual differences in response for some of the class two children. Two children stated their lack of enthusiasm for the experience to the writer at its conclusion: one girl remarked on her difficulty in relating positively to two of the boys in the experimental group, and the other would have preferred to read only fantasy literature. Neither of these children have consistent differences between pretest and posttest scores in the predicted direction.

The questions of inter-class and inter-individual differences are further pursued in analyses of the children's conversations reported in chapter five.

Though the analyses must necessarily be post hoc considera-tions of factors contributing to the outcome differences found in the statistical tests, they do assist in locating process differences of much theoretical interest.

CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSES OF THE CHILDREN'S CONVERSATIONS

The analyses of the grids suggest the possibility of
some differences between classes in the effects of the
peer discussions of the novels, reflected in the different
results for the primary analysis of the frequency of
production of 'personality' constructs. It is also
likely that there are important differences between
effects for individuals within each class, a possibility
which is supported by the failure to achieve acceptable
levels of homogeneity of variance for the primary grid
analysis. The transcripts of the children's conversa-
tions are important sources of evidence for considering
these questions. Necessarily, any analyses of the
transcripts can only be used to support post hoc explana-
tions of inter-class and inter-individual differences,
with the consequence that the 'explanations' can do no
more than point to apparent correlations. It is difficult,
however, to see how it would be possible to anticipate
the occurrence of events in natural conversations
sufficiently precisely to permit experimental manipulation.

As with the pilot groups discussed in chapter three,
there was a sharp difference between conversations
according to the children's enjoyment of the novels: when

the children did not like a novel they found it very difficult to talk about the book for very long or in much depth. To make the reasons for their reactions explicit or to sustain an analysis of the novel seems to have been very difficult for all of the classes. Sometimes one group in a class talked enthusiastically and lengthily about a book while their classmates, who had begun meeting simultaneously, were not able to discuss the same novel for more than a few minutes.

Both the variation in the quality of the conversations and the complicated structure of the discussions, which required an average of twenty hours each for transcription, necessitated some selection of conversations for detailed analysis. Within each class, two groups discussed each of four novels. From the total of eight conversations there were six in class one, six in class two, and four in class three in which at least two of the children per group stated their favourable reaction to the novel and in which the discussion was sustained for at least fifteen minutes. These criteria were used to discriminate between discussions of novels which had been sufficiently enjoyed to permit meaningful talk about them. Three conversations were randomly selected from within each of these class groups for transcription and detailed analysis. In the subsequent discussion excerpts will be used from, and abstractions developed about, these basic data. The transcripts are presented in full as Appendix E.

The obtaining of relevant observations about inter-
class and inter-individual differences presents formidable
difficulties of analysis. Some features of language
interaction betwen pupils and teachers have been the
focus of much educational research during the last
fifteen years. Particular attention has been paid to
structural relationships between teachers' and pupils'
verbalisations following the early work of, for example,
Flanders (1960), Bellack et al. (1966), and, more lately Sinclair
and Coulthard (1975). This work is, though, almost
entirely concerned with interaction between teachers and
classes of children and is not appropriate for use with
peer discussions (ibid., p. 6). Further, results of such
analyses are often not very helpful for understanding how
meanings are exchanged and developed since they are
designed to reflect rather general features of inter-
action (Barnes, 1971).

An analysis of peer conversations in terms of language
moves has recently been reported by Barnes and Todd (1977).
Though their procedures and definitions are very helpful
for understanding the processes by which meanings may be
developed in peer group discussions and could readily be
used with the present data, the results of such an
analysis would not be centrally relevant to the particular
questions of inter-class and inter-individual talk about
imagined and actual experience.

Barnes and Todd (1977) were primarily concerned with
ways in which language was used by their subjects to

enhance personal understanding of new information and to maintain effective group functioning. Here, the primary focus is on what the children were talking about as spectators and to what apparent ends.

Two different approaches have been adopted in analysing the transcripts. To monitor the possibility of the three classes differing in theoretically important ways in their discussions, a category system for content analysis, designed to indicate what the children talked about as spectators, has been developed. The second analysis is a detailed discussion of excerpts of one transcript, designed to illustrate the process of a child changing his interpretation of an experience during the discussion of a novel.

CONTENT ANALYSIS OF DISCUSSIONS

Content analysis has many advantages for exploratory consideration of complex phenomena such as these transcripts. Chief of these is that it permits construing of what the children say from theoretically relevant perspectives without necessitating very rough intrusions into the 'natural' structure of the conversations. 'Natural' is used here in the sense of what a culturally competent person would understand the children to be saying if he were a member of the group.

The disadvantage of content analysis is that it is methodologically looser than formal linguistic analyses

since it relies on a reader making use of some shared,
implicit understandings of the talk as well as explicit
definitions of categories. Definitions cannot
exhaustively represent the criteria on which either units
of analysis are determined or on which units are allocated
to categories. Reliability data are of some help with
this difficulty, however, in providing evidence of the
extent to which at least two competent persons can reach
agreement when given a set of explicit criteria.

The flexibility of content analysis procedures also
means that other readers of the transcripts might favour
quite different construing of the relevance of some of
the interactions. However, personal construct theory is
here comfortingly reflexive: constructive alternativism
is a fundamental assumption of the theory (Kelly,
1955, p. 15).

Finding a suitable unit of analysis is of critical
importance for the validity of content analysis procedures.
For the present purpose, units such as time segments or
statements have proved to be unsuitable primarily because
of the fluidity and elliptical form of much of the
children's talk. Determining changes in focus of interest,
as defined by the categories, has proved to be the most
fruitful approach for this analysis. It is a unit based
on what the children are doing as spectators in the
discourse. It has the very great advantage of retaining
the most important structural relationships between
utterances though it does result in considerably more

variation in length of units than is usually the case in content analysis procedures. Units are defined in relation to a category system which was developed for this study. Specifically, a unit is a section of discourse in which the children are engaged in one kind of activity as spectators and as defined by the category system.

Adopting this approach results in some sections of the discourse being omitted from the content analysis because they are irrelevant to the task of being a spectator to a novel. For example, a child leaves the group to close a door and is reprimanded for the noise she makes by another group member; when a child expresses a wish to buy the novel she has been reading from the writer, the children briefly discuss its value per page. These are illustrative of sections of discourse which have been omitted, not because they were insignificant events for group functioning, but because they are of no direct theoretical interest to the talking over of experiences of the novels.

The category system is briefly outlined in Table 14. More details of the definitions used are supplied in Appendix D in the form of the manual given to a colleague for the collection of reliability data. Definitions of the categories have been devised after intensive work with the transcripts. Because the data base is so small it cannot be claimed that these categories will be a sufficient set for analysing other transcripts of

Table 14

NAMES OF CATEGORIES FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS
OF TRANSCRIPTS OF NINE CONVERSATIONS

Category Number	Category Name
I	Reconstructing and Considering Specific Contexts and Events
II	Noting, and Defending, General Aspects of a Character's Behaviour
III	Imagining Personal Consequences of Being in a Character's Situation
IV i ii	Contributing and Considering Personal Experiences - after an eliciting question - directly
V	Considering Causes of a Character's Behaviour
VI	Evaluating a Character Explicitly
VII i ii iii	Evaluating the Novel Explicitly - positive evaluation - negative evaluation - alternatives available to the author
VIII i ii	Commenting on Social Issues Raised by the Novel - general comments - comments suggesting causal relationships
IX o i ii iii v	Citing Other Spectatorship Experiences - general references to other novels, films or television shows - specific recounting of events from other sources - noting, and defending, general aspects of a character's behaviour in another imaginary construct - imagining personal consequences of being in a character's situation in another imaginary construct - considering causes of a character's behaviour in another imaginary construct
X	Considering the Author's General 'Message'
XI	Unclassifiable

conversations about novels for children of comparable age. It has, however, only been necessary to use a residual category for six instances over the nine transcripts, in which there are 721 instances, so the categories do exhaustively describe the present data quite well.

The first six categories are of particular theoretical interest. It has been argued in chapter one that through the children being spectators to the imagined events of novels their range and awareness of experience can be greatly extended. 'Spectator' role experience of this kind is also likely to assist the evaluation of events in ways which cannot so readily be achieved through 'participant' experience. Peer discussions of literature are potentially valuable for the development of inter-personal understanding for several reasons: the children are able to talk about the aspects of the novel they personally have found most significant, they can clarify events and interpret their implications, using the resource of differing views amongst the group members; and they can move readily between actual experience and the imagined experience to which they are spectators, both by recalling anecdotes from personal experience and by sympathetically imagining the personal consequences of events.

Categories I to VI reflect the frequency of occurrence of instances of discourse which are directly related to these arguments. For example, in reconstructing and

considering specific events, the children select some events of special significance for detailed attention and very often 'get the picture clear' by collaboratively building up an account of an event. Quite frequently this takes place through the joint construction of a sentence, as may be observed in the following excerpt from a discussion of 'Sounder':

Paul: Yeah, but the sad part was when, um...the dog got shot, and he went under the house and the boy couldn't find him and he had to

Kerry: crawl under...

Paul: Yeah...gee whiz,

Patrick: Yeah, he stayed

Paul: just had to sit around waiting.

Kerry: It's amazing how he, um

Kerry: ⌈survived.

All others: ⌊survived.

Similarly, in an excerpt which is discussed in detail below,[1] one of the children asks 'What would you do if you were in a similar situation?' and together the group attempts to understand what it would mean to be personally involved.

The extent to which the children evaluate characters and the implications of events is not fully reflected by the frequency of use of categories VI and VII. These categories group instances of discourse in which the children explicitly and rather globally evaluate characters and the novel itself. Clearly, many other categories

---

[1] vide infra, pp. 131 ff.

involve implicit evaluations. Sometimes when the children reconstructed and reflected on specific events, for example, they appeared to be 'savouring' the impact of the events. Similarly, noting general aspects of a character's behaviour usually involved an implicit evaluation, as personal construct theory would lead one to expect. In no way does a frequency count adequately represent the extent to which implicit evaluation of events may have been occurring.

The reliability with which units of analysis could be determined, and could be categorised, was tested by having a third-year university student with experience of small group discussions in primary schools analyse three transcripts. One transcript was randomly selected from each of the three classes, allowing reliability data to be gathered from one-third of the sample.[1] There was 91.31% agreement on the division of the discourse into units and a k value of .897 was obtained for allocating of units to categories (Cohen, 1960). Reliability was judged to be satisfactorily high for the purposes of the analysis.

The results of the content analysis are presented in Tables 15 and 16. Analysing the significance of differences

---

[1] This procedure, rather than the alternative of testing reliability over one-third of all nine transcripts was adopted because of the length of time involved in developing a clear understanding of what the children were talking about in each conversation.

Table 15

FREQUENCY OF CATEGORY USAGE IN DISCUSSIONS OF EACH NOVEL WITHIN EACH CLASS

Category Number	Class One				Class Two				Class Three			
	The Silver Sword	Climb a Lonely Hill	Sounder	Total	The Silver Sword	Let the Balloon Go	Climb a Lonely Hill	Total	Sounder	I Own the Racecourse	I Own the Racecourse	Total
I	20	40	32	92	38	29	30	97	17	6	10	33
II	8	6	8	22	22	16	5	43	17	5	23	45
III	3	13	5	21	11	12	7	30				
IV	3	3		6	1	3		4	1			1
i	3	1		4		2		2				1
ii		2		2	1	1		2	1			1
V	2	1	1	4	7	14		21	7		4	11
VI	7		2	9	6	4	3	13		2	4	6
VII	9	5	6	20	12	20	36	68	5	6	7	18
i	5		4	9	7	10	12	29	2	1	2	5
ii	4	5	2	11	5	6	16	27	2	5	5	12
iii						4	8	12	1			1
VIII	1		3	4	20	2		22	12	29		41
i	1		2	3	14	2		16	9	17		26
ii			1	1	6			6	3	12		15
IX	3	19	2	24	6	5	3	14	4	5	24	33
o	3	4	1	8	6	4	2	12		3	10	13
i		9	1	10		1	1	2	1	2	3	6
ii		1		1					1		10	11
iii		4		4								
v		1		1					2		1	3
X					1	4	6	11		2		2
XI			1	1	1	2	1	4			1	1
Total	56	87	60	203	125	111	91	327	63	55	73	191

Table 16

PERCENTAGE FREQUENCY OF CATEGORY USAGE IN DISCUSSIONS
OF EACH NOVEL WITHIN EACH CLASS

Category Number	Class One				Class Two				Class Three			
	The Silver Sword	Climb a Lonely Hill	Sounder	Total	The Silver Sword	Let the Balloon Go	Climb a Lonely Hill	Total	Sounder	I Own the Racecourse	I Own the Racecourse	Total
I	35.70	45.97	53.33	45.32	30.40	26.13	32.97	29.66	26.98	10.91	13.70	17.28
II	14.29	6.90	13.33	10.84	17.60	14.42	5.49	13.15	26.98	9.09	31.51	23.56
III	5.36	14.94	8.33	10.34	8.80	10.81	7.69	9.17				
IV	5.36	3.45		2.96	0.80	2.70		1.22	1.59			0.52
i	5.36	1.15		1.97		1.80		0.61				
ii		2.30		0.99	0.80	0.90		0.61	1.59			0.52
V	3.57	1.15	1.67	1.97	5.60	12.62		6.42	11.12		5.48	5.76
VI	12.50		3.33	4.43	4.80	3.60	3.30	3.98		3.64	5.48	3.14
VII	16.07	5.75	10.00	9.85	9.60	18.02	39.56	20.80	7.93	10.91	9.59	9.42
i	8.93		6.67	4.43	5.60	9.00	13.19	8.87	3.17	1.82	2.74	2.62
ii	7.14	5.75	3.33	5.42	4.00	5.42	17.58	8.26	3.17	9.09	6.85	6.28
iii						3.60	8.79	3.67	1.59			0.52
VIII	1.79		5.00	1.97	16.00	1.80		6.72	19.05	52.72		21.47
i	1.79		3.33	1.48	11.20	1.8		4.89	14.29	30.90		13.61
ii			1.67	0.49	4.80			1.83	4.76	21.82		7.86
IX	5.36	21.84	3.34	11.83	4.80	4.50	3.30	4.28	6.35	9.09	32.87	17.28
o	5.36	4.60	1.67	3.94	4.80	3.60	2.20	3.67		5.45	13.70	6.81
i		10.34	1.67	4.94		0.90	1.10	0.61	1.59	3.64	4.10	3.14
ii		1.15		0.49					1.59		13.70	5.76
iii		4.60		1.97								
v		1.15		0.49					3.17		1.37	1.57
X					0.80	3.60	6.59	3.37		3.64		1.05
XI			1.67	0.49	0.80	1.80	1.10	1.23			1.37	0.52
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

between the class statistically would involve violations of assumptions underlying the tests, particularly the independence of the measures. It is therefore necessary to consider where sharp differences in percentages of category usage occur and to discuss, tentatively, their significance educationally.

The most notable differences may be observed in the frequency of use of categories I, III and VIII. Category I links occasions on which the children reconstructed and considered specific contexts and events, category III, occasions on which some of the personal consequences of being in a character's situation are discussed; and category VIII, comments on broad social issues. The pattern of results in the use of these three categories was similar for classes one and two and in contrast to those of class three. Classes one and two engaged in a reconstruction of specific events and their contexts in forty-five and thirty percent of instances respectively. For class three, this was done in only approximately seventeen percent of the instances, and there was a very high contribution to this total from the first discussion. Though the same instructions and suggestions, which included mentioning the possibility of talking over 'what it would be like to be in similar situations', were given to each group prior to discussions, children in class three did not take up this option at all. It was taken up in each discussion in classes one and two. The method of analysis does not distinguish between occasions

on which the children returned to the consequences of a particular event in a novel, or on which they discussed the consequences of being in several different situations within the one novel. However, close inspection of the transcripts indicates that they did both.

Class three, far more than classes one and two, considered some of the broad social issues raised by the novels in two of the discussions particularly. This was done both by making general comments about social issues and by attempting to analyse reasons for specific social problems. The following example from a class three group's discussion of 'Sounder' illustrates both the level of generality of ideas expressed and of the atmosphere in which they were expressed.

Janet:	⎡Some people have,
Sarah:	⎣Discrimination.
Janet:	have less rights than white people.
Jim:	I know. No they shouldn't
Marcus:	They should have the same rights.
Marcus:	⎡They're all the same.
Janet:	⎣Let's get onto the subject.
Sarah:	But sometimes they get drunk, you know.
	Like Aborigines they get
Marcus:	Well?
Janet:	⎡Yeah, but so do white people.
Sarah:	⎣They get drunk and terrorise
Sarah:	and don't paint their place.
Marcus:	So do white people.
Janet:	So do white people.

There is a strong sense here of the children working
with old certainties rather than of attempting to
understand the significance of newly observed and deeply
felt experience. Though there is conflict, it is a
conflict about very general ideas which are distanced
from the imagined experience of the novel. In one
discussion in class three, the category accounted for
more than half the total number of units but was accompanied
by only approximately eleven percent of instances of
reconstruction of specific events in the novel.

A smaller though interesting difference occurred in
the use of category four. None of the groups talked
about personal experiences very frequently, either
directly or after an eliciting question. In class three
a remark of a very peripheral kind was contributed once.
Though the frequencies were also low for the other
classes, the category was used more extensively. The
significance of some of these occurrences will be
examined in a later, more detailed analysis of one
conversation.

The making of explicit value judgements about the
novels occurred quite frequently in all classes. It
will be recalled that discussions of novels which were
so much disliked as to prevent fruitful discussion were
excluded prior to random selection of these transcripts.
Nevertheless, all the groups made some explicit negative
evaluations of all of the novels, though there was more
of an unfavourable imbalance between positive and negative

evaluations in class three than in the other two classes.

The very strong overall impression gained from the content analysis, and one which is confirmed by a careful reading of the transcripts, is that children in classes one and two are far more engaged in considering specific imagined experiences and their implications than children in class three. Though detached in the sense of not having to make decisions about the immediate course of future action, the children in classes one and two often revealed a very close involvement with the imagined experience. It was only for short periods in the discussion of 'Sounder' that children in class three were similarly engaged. Generally they seemed to be talking in a way which distanced them from the events of the novels. If they were spectators they were very distant ones. The factors which resulted in the experience for the class three children being so qualitatively different are very difficult to determine. It is possible that some of these were extraneous to the administration of the group work by the writer and to attempt to analyse them involves the risk of groundless speculation. The general conclusion that it appears reasonable to hold on the basis of the results of the content analysis is that class three children tended to find the novels less enjoyable than children in the other two classes and that they talked far less frequently about specific imagined events, their contexts and the personal consequences of being involved in them than did children in classes one and two. Contrast on these

dimensions is theoretically significant and of interest
for interpreting differing outcomes within classes of
the primary grid analysis.

AN EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS OF CHILDREN'S PARTICIPATION IN A DISCUSSION

It has been argued that through being a spectator to
imagined events and through exploring their possible
personal consequences, a child's means of anticipating
events may change if, during this process, his existing
constructions of previous experience are not supported.
Though content analysis gives useful information about
some of the contrasting, general characteristics of the
discussions it cannot provide evidence about these more
specific, idiosyncratic changes. To illustrate how the
reading of a novel and talking about it with peers can
lead to the contradiction of existing interpretations of
experience, some extracts from a class one group's
discussion of 'The Silver Sword' have been subjected to
detailed analysis. Such an analysis can also potentially
illuminate some possible reasons for the high level of
inter-individual variation in grid scores noted in
chapter four.

Such an analysis can only be of an exploratory,
highly tentative nature. Clearly there is a danger that
the status of some utterances might be over-emphasised, or
that lines of inference may be over-stretched. However,
this form of analysis has points of similarity with

Piaget's examination of moral development in the way inferences are drawn about the child's thinking from his utterances (Piaget, 1932).   It is also similar to recent critical study of learning environments in which the educator approaches the learning situation much as a literary critic might approach a work in order to highlight aspects of particular significance (Eisner, 1974; Dixon, 1974).

Three children, Vikki, Cathy and Patrick, partici-pated in the discussion to be analysed. Vikki joined the class at the beginning of 1976 after escaping from the cyclone which destroyed Darwin in December 1975. For both Vikki and Patrick, differences were shown in grid scores in the primary grid analyses in the use of more 'personality' constructs. It is not suggested that the extracts to be discussed account for these differences, of course, but the extracts may be particularly explicit examples of a continuing process which is usually more covert.

The first extract of conversation, which is presented in Table 17, occurs forty-five seconds after commencement and immediately following an interruption. Vikki's question is a very direct one: though she is here almost certainly following the direction established by the experimenter-prepared questions used in earlier discussions, there is no sense of the conversation being artificial, or merely maintained for the sake of meeting the requirements of the task. This is particularly indicated by the musing

Table 17

FIRST EXTRACT FROM A CLASS ONE GROUP'S
DISCUSSION OF 'THE SILVER SWORD'

1	Vikki:	What would you do if you were in a similar situation?
2	Cathy:	I would...I would grab my puppy and my guinea pigs...which I don't have yet... and my mummy, I'd grab my mummy.
3	Vikki:	Dead scared. Mmm, I wouldn't know what to do.
4	Cathy:	Were you scared in the cyclone?
5	Vikki:	Umm...yeah a bit.
6	Patrick:	Were you in a cyclone?
7	Cathy:	Yeah, the Darwin one.
8	Patrick:	Oh, oh yeah...it would be different.
9	Cathy:	Oh, it isn't really different...a cyclone to a war, I mean everything gets ruined.
10	Patrick:	Yeah, people are dangerous.
11	Cathy:	Yeah, I suppose.
12	Vikki:	What the cyclone or a war?
13	Patrick:	War, I think.
14	Cathy:	War is more dangerous
15	Cathy:	than a cyclone.
	Patrick:	War, I mean war causes a greater amount of suffering.
16	Cathy:	Yeah, usually.

tone Cathy adopts in (2) and the emotional tone of Vikki
in (3).

Of particular interest is Patrick's lack of under-
standing of Vikki's experience. From (6) it can be per-
ceived that he did not previously know Vikki's background.
At this early stage of the discussion he seems to be some-
what pre-emptory about the comparability of Vikki's
experience and that of the characters of the novel. His
observation in (10) and (15) are acute ones implying that
the continuing malevolent presence of humans, as with the
Nazi soldiers in the book, makes the characters' experience
the more dangerous one. He does not, however, appear to
be very impressed by the significance of similarities
between Vikki's experience and that of the characters.
Though he is able to convince Cathy (14), it is interesting
that Vikki does not participate in this part of the conver-
sation: she gives no sign of agreeing with the view at
which the other two arrive.

The second extract, presented in Table 18, occurs
after six minutes twenty-four seconds of the conversation.
Considered together, the two extracts are a clear example of
the spiralling development of understanding which James
Britton has suggested may be a feature of children's peer
discussions (in Barnes et al., 1971, pp. 91-92). It is
noteworthy that personal losses were discussed, primarily
by Vikki and Patrick, at intervening points in the
conversation.[1] The children reconstruct the events

---

[1] See Appendix E, pp. 209-221.

Table 18

SECOND EXTRACT FROM A CLASS ONE GROUP'S
DISCUSSION OF 'THE SILVER SWORD'

17	Vikki:	Have you got anything like the silver sword ...that you know, you treasure?
18	Cathy:	No...not really.
19	Vikki:	Or that your mums' treasure or something?
20	Patrick:	No, not really...my blanket...I've had...
21	Vikki:	See, I've got a rug - I've got this rug thing and when I was a baby I used to call it a bed and I've still got it...that's dear to me.
22	Patrick:	Yeah, I've got a little...a pink blanket and I've had it since I was one and a half or something...
23	Vikki:	Mm, that'd be a bit too big to carry in a tiny little wooden box.
24	Patrick:	Yeah.
25	Cathy:	Well, I've got this teddy which is about this big...about a foot...for you people up there in recorderland (laughter) and...um ...it's brown and when you press its tummy it goes 'yeow'!...sort of like that! And I got it when I was one and a half at Christmas or something...
26	Vikki:	Yeah, I had a few things before the cyclone too...
27	Cathy:	...and its leg came off last year.
28	Vikki:	Mm, I had...before the cyclone I had these two dogs when I was a baby...singing dogs ...they used to sing. And see you pull the baby out from the mother by a cord and it goes in with singing.
29	Patrick:	Yeah?
30	Vikki:	...and this, ah, lullaby and we started since I...I think I've had it since I was born nearly but the stupid cyclone...

31	Cathy:	Yeah.
32	Patrick:	Did you lose a lot of stuff in the cyclone?
	Cathy:	Cyclone Tracy.
33	Cathy:	At least you can blame Tracy for losing it.
34	Vikki:	Mmm...
35	Patrick:	Did you lose a lot...?
		(Pause)
36	Vikki:	My friend died too.
37	Cathy:	Your friend?
38	Vikki:	Yeah.
39	Cathy:	Your girl friend...your friend...a little girl?
40	Vikki:	Mm.
41	Cathy:	Oh...er that's too bad!
42	Vikki:	Anyway, should we talk about something...
43	Patrick:	Yeah!
44	Cathy:	Oh well...
45	Patrick:	We should be talking about the book.
46	Vikki:	Mm...How long did it take you to read?

surrounding Ludwig's probable death, the disappearance of
Jan's cat and the death of the same character's pet 'cocky'.
It appears very likely that these exchanges are also part of
the spiralling development of a more elaborated understand-
ing of personal loss.

Though it is Vikki who raises the initial question,
there is no indication of her doing so with the intention
of contributing what she eventually says at (36). It is
rather the more superficial (though highly interesting)
anecdotes at (21) and (28) which she seems to have in mind
and to which the other children reciprocate. The
relatively inconsequential nature of the exchange prior to
(35) is suggested by Cathy's observation that the source of
the blame could at least be attributed externally!

The repetition of Patrick's question, (32) and (35),
indicates his seriousness about this enquiry. That he
raises such a question suggests he has become more
sensitive than earlier in the conversation to Vikki's
experience. It takes a considerable time for Vikki to
make the statement at (36). She seems very reluctant to
talk about her loss, and keen to terminate the direction
of the conversation (42).

Patrick does not want to pursue the matter further
either (43). A key issue in this interpretation is the
intonation he uses in (43). To the writer and three
experienced colleagues who have listened to the entire
conversation, it unequivocally indicates agreement that
the group should talk about something else immediately,

presumably because the conversation had become so unexpectedly personal.

The colleagues have agreed that Cathy, on the other hand, is much less emotionally engaged by the discussion. Though a statement of her enjoyment of the book is the very first utterance in the conversation, at several later points she expresses reservations about the degree of coincidence in the book[1] and even the names of the characters. In the discussion of Vikki's loss her intonations indicate surprise but also a distancing from the import for Vikki of the experience and a continuing inquisitiveness about it (44). Why this should be so is necessarily an issue for research of a different kind. The critical point is that the two children in the one group, faced with the same narrations of imagined and actual experience, make such different responses to it.

Patrick begins the conversation not knowing that one of his classmates is a refugee from a disaster area. When he first learns of this he compares her experience with that of the characters and concludes that her experience is only partially similar. Later in the conversation he becomes sufficiently involved to share a very personal aspect of his own experience in which he finds similarity to his classmate (20 and 22). He is then interested enough to raise a question about the extent of her material loss (32 - 'stuff') but is then confronted with a loss which goes well beyond what he has experienced. In the course of the

---

[1] This issue is initially raised by Patrick, but he appears happy to interpret it in terms of the characters' belief in the positive influence of the silver sword.

talk Patrick is obliged to begin restructuring his interpretation of Vikki's experience to develop a more elaborated understanding of the extent of her loss. He is quite dramatically a spectator to an experience he does not anticipate at all and experiences a radical disconfirmation of his initial interpretation.[1]

Though it is through the talk that Patrick becomes a spectator to Vikki's experience, it is also because the children are spectators to the specific events of the novel and apparently respond strongly to these that the discussion of personal loss takes place. The novel is far more than a mere backdrop to the conversation: it is the imaginative quality of the writing which causes the children to choose to discuss the particular issues they did.

In relation to the general argument of the thesis, the educative value of peer discussions of literature, it is

---

[1] Approximately twelve months after the completion of the study the writer discussed with Patrick his reactions to the experience of group talk about novels. After making a generally favourable response, Patrick specifically recalled 'The Silver Sword' as the novel he had most enjoyed. When asked, he stated that he clearly remembered discussing the book with Vikki and Cathy, and that he had been very surprised to learn that Vikki had been a refugee from Darwin. He spontaneously remarked that during the week prior to the interview, he and Philip, another child in the class one experimental group, had been talking again with Vikki about her experiences in the cyclone. It seems quite clear that the novel and the subsequent discussion had the marked impact on this child suggested in the preceding discussion.

noteworthy that the initiating moves in both of these extracts are questions raised by a child. The responses are conversational in tone; they are formulated as the talk proceeds rather than pre-structured; there is considerable hesitating; and the utterances are often grammatically incomplete in form. In both extracts additional questions are raised by the children, suggesting a reciprocal involvement in the conversation. There is no sense of the children searching for someone else's answers to the questions, or that their purposes are other than those of talking over some experiences of the novel and of their lives.

The questions to which the analyses presented in this chapter were addressed were the possibility of theoretically interesting contrasts between class three and classes one and two, of differences between individuals within classes in their responses to novels and during discussions, and of observations of changes in position by children during a discussion. It has been possible to observe some interesting differences from both analyses. The differences are similar to each other in important ways.

The key contrasts between the classes is in the degree to which the children talk over specific events, their contexts and the personal consequences of being involved in a similar situation. The children in class three are 'spectators' to relatively very few imagined events in their talk and are therefore limited in the extent to which they can explore the consequences of the

events and, even more basically, differences between group members in their reactions to the events. However, close analysis of a transcript of a discussion between class one children indicates that even when specific events and their consequences are considered in the context of shared enjoyment of a novel, there is considerable variation in personal engagement and reaction. Thus, though the administration of the 'treatment' was similar across classes and for individuals, the reception of the experience by the children in aspects seen as theoretically significant was quite dissimilar. Some implications of this result will be considered in chapter six.

CHAPTER SIX

IMPLICATIONS AND FURTHER QUESTIONS

George Kelly once remarked that a key feature of
clinical method is the 'recognition of the multivariant
structure of its problems' and that the client is seen
'simultaneously in terms of a considerable number of
dimensions' (1955, p. 193). If that is true of one-to-one
clinical encounters, it is also true of school situations
in which a number of active individuals are engaged in
developing an understanding of an issue as complex as the
way other, significant people construe their social world.
In the research reported here, it has not been possible
to consider the effect of a single, clearly isolatable
variable on unequivocally acceptable outcome measures:
rather, the development of an understanding of other
persons has been assumed to be an on-going process,
substantially influenced by the quality of the social
environment because a wide range of experiences can
contribute to it, either negatively or positively.
Assuming a close similarity between 'looking on' to
imagined and actual experience in their potential effects
on the individual's means of anticipating future
experience, it has been hypothesised that talking about

imagined and related actual experience with peers might
also contribute to this process.

Of first importance has been the finding of further
evidence that ten and eleven year-old children will
converse intelligently and extensively in peer groups
about books they have enjoyed. In the conversations
recorded for this study, some of the children have been
prepared to contribute, or more accurately, share,
highly personal responses for the purposes of the group
talk, and to respond reciprocally to other's points of view.

It does not sentimentalise the results to suggest that
occasionally the directness and sensitivity of the exchanges
have been of a kind not commonly found in adult discussions
of literature. A future, careful analysis of how children
use various functions of language in this setting (Tough,
1977) and of the role of small group peer conversations in
developing language functions would be of great pedagogical
significance. Such an analysis would not only assist
understanding of how semantic shifts are achieved by the
children but would also be of some value in analysing
variation for individuals on outcome measures.

One of the tasks posed by the significant results for
class one on the primary analysis is to suggest why such a
short-term programme should have had the effect it apparently
has had for some of the children. Though many other
psychological theories would suggest the difficulty of
establishing a desired response pattern in such a short
time, from a personal construct theoretical viewpoint

changes in individual's construing are assumed to be occurring much of the time. It is therefore a matter of considering whether changes would occur in a consistent form and be of sufficient magnitude across members of the experimental groups to cause a statistically significant difference on the defined dimensions. This is a rather different question to one which asks if it is feasible to expect any change.

For the purpose of this exploratory study, an experimental versus control group design has been employed so that occurrences of consistent and large changes in construing could be sharply highlighted. It is an unusual design to adopt when working with personal construct theory and it can be observed to have some important disadvantages. The most controversial of these is the necessity of assuming a similar treatment effect across individuals in experimental groups. Personal construct theory explicitly disavows any assumption that two individuals will respond in similar ways when faced with the same event.[1] The individuals may respond similarly, but there is no necessary relationship between an event and its effect on a person. Nevertheless, the design was not lightly chosen.

A pedagogical issue is of special importance. In considering the contribution work in English might make to the 'personal growth' of children, it is necessary to find

---

[1] v. supra, chapter two, and especially p. 33.

procedures which are general enough in their effect to
make worthwhile their use in the limited time available in
school. Further, individuality of response notwithstanding,
it is not unreasonable to expect some general change in a
group in directions which previous research has at least
suggested are fairly common in large samples of children
in primary school. Grid method is particularly helpful
here because it has the advantage of respecting idiosyncratic
variation in construing without necessarily precluding the
researcher from articulating general features of interest
in the grid patterns.

The decision in the present case was to look for an
effect in experimental groups over time as a first test of
the curriculum strategy. It was considered that more
intensive, less tightly structured work with individuals
over extended periods could more legitimately be defended
should some significant results be obtained than was possible
prior to the commencement of the study. This was especially
so because much informal case study data of a rather limited
kind was already available on the effect of reading
literature on children's attitudes to, inter alia, other
people.

Future work of a similar design conducted over a far
more extended time period will be of some importance. The
results of this study do suggest, however, the value of
employing clinical and anthropological methods to attempt
to discriminate intra-individual factors which influence
responsiveness to imaginary characters and situations and

the establishing of exploratory talk about them.
Repertory grid method is one useful resource for such an
approach because it allows ready mathematical testing of
hypotheses with individual cases (Bannister and Fransella,
1971).

It is very unlikely that differences in outcome
measures have arisen directly from reading of the novels.[1]
During the period of the study, the control group children
continued their class reading program which included the
opportunity to read novels, and continued to borrow books
from libraries. It was the same broad program which the
experimental group children had followed for at least the
previous eight months. Yet, since it can be safely assumed
that the children talked to peers about events often
enough in everyday life, why should _this_ talk have been so
important for some of them?

The transcripts provide some interesting evidence that
talk in the groups is different partly because of the extent
to which it is sustained over time. At some points in
discussions, children explicitly acknowledge their
difficulty in finding something to say but are apparently
constrained to keep talking by the requirements of the
situation and the presence of the tape recorder. A
particularly clear example occurs in a class two group's
discussion of 'Climb A Lonely Hill', when the group decided

---

[1] This statement does not in any way imply that the
quality of the literature was unimportant. It has previously
been argued to be of critical importance in chapters one
and five. The question considered here is one of the role
played by exploratory peer talk about the novels.

to return to a question concerned with the personal

consequences of being in a similar situation.[1] Talking

over of this question was then sustained for far longer and

in significantly different ways than on the first occasion.

If, as Harding argued, being a spectator has the advantage

of allowing more detached, far-reaching evaluations to be

made, it may well be that exploratory talk about events to

which the individual is a spectator further extends the

process by obliging the children to search actively for

significant ideas or events about which to converse.

Consequently, more elements of the individual's experience

may be involved than would be the case if he were reading

the novels without talking about them. In Barnes and Todd's

terms, the 'content frames' are more fluid and mobile because

the children are themselves taking responsibility for

maintaining the interaction.

Talk, too, is important because it allows ready

movement between apprehension of the imagined events and

current constructs of experience so that elaborations can

be more fully considered. The Dartmouth study group on

literature argued that responding to literature was like

listening to another person in a discussion: first, 'we

sympathetically entertain the frame of reference of our

fellow participant' and then subsequently engage in 'a

successive scanning and reorganisation' in which 'we

move between the novelties we have entertained and our

---

[1] v. supra, Appendix E, p. 286.

accepted tenets' (1968, pp. 23-24; see also L. Stratta,
1972). Close attention to the transcripts of the
children's conversations suggests that talking about the
novels provides an opportunity for scanning and reorganisa-
tion to take place in ways which are not likely to have
been possible if the child were making a response as an
individual. In these terms, talking about specific
events in a novel is of significance because these events
are the source of contrasting perceptions and the reference
point to which it is necessary to return when elaborating
on existing forms of understanding. Talking about the
events means 'getting it right', not only in the sense of
understanding the narrative but also in the sense of
confirming that others share a perception of the particular
significance of the events being talked over. The same
process is also involved in the children's strategy of
imagining the consequences of being a participant in similar
events.

It is at this point of response that <u>exploratory</u>
conditions for talk are so important. Perhaps the issue
can be most sharply expressed by contrast. If, at a time
when the individual is beginning to scan and reorganise his
constructions of situations, he is obliged to take into
account a rapid series of teacher-asked questions which he
may only partially comprehend and for which he knows there
is a specific, desired answer against which his own response
will be evaluated, then fairly clearly, his opportunities
for elaborating his own construing of the imagined experience

will be very limited. When the child is able to perceive
the intention of the learning situation to be unambiguously
the sharing of responses to a novel with his peers, and
the elaboration of those responses, then his confidence
in following through the implications of apparent dis-
confirmations of his existing constructs will be enhanced.
This will be so far more than in situations in which he is
required to conform to ambiguous or competing intentions as
these are conveyed by a teacher's questions.

It is interesting to note that when the children in
class two talk about the author's 'message' - the moral
or ethical lesson of the tale - they do so only for very
short times and apparently without much enthusiasm. If
there is development in inter-personal understanding for
individuals in this class, the development appears to come
from talking over specific situations and their conse-
quences and not from the general summing up of a didactic
message. Yet asking what a novel is about, in the sense
of what values an author is concerned with, is a question
which is not infrequently raised by teachers in the hope
of producing 'higher-level' thinking in children. The
evidence from the present study suggests that it would be
more productive to ask questions requiring inference and
interpretation about specific imagined events rather than
more general aspects of the novel.

Perceiving the intention of the peer learning
situation to be the sharing and elaboration of responses to
novels places many demands on the children. Depending on
past educational experiences and a complex range of intra-

individual factors, it may take a very long time for some children to accept such an intention as personally and educationally valuable. In the class three children's talk, there are occasional hints that they have been unable to take this step. 'It's about discrimination. Just go on about that' one child remarked in a discussion of 'Sounder'. There is more than a hint that their perception of the learning situation was one of needing to guess what the writer's hidden expectations were for their talk, despite continued assurances to the contrary. Under these conditions, it is not surprising that the children found it so difficult to talk about events and their consequences in a exploratory way. Similarly, a lack of enjoyment of novels or difficulties between group members will affect the extent to which elaborating of existing constructs can be engaged in.

Though he is not present in the discussions, the teacher has a critical role to play in establishing situations in which groups can talk in an exploratory way. In this study, groups have been removed from normal class work and situations have been structured by the writer in order to give some control over the effects of task structuring, evaluation and variation in teacher personality. The procedure has involved rather minimal interference with class work for the reasons previously discussed in chapter three. It is necessarily, however, atypical and some analysis of the use of peer discussions of literature in classroom work is required.

Initial work with the children to establish confidence in the value of their talk will be of first importance. Judging by the experience of the pilot groups and the experimental groups in classes one and two, confidence can be established quite quickly. Minimal teacher presence in early discussions proved to be very fruitful in clarifying perceptions of the intent of the work. Clear structuring of requirements and supportive evaluation of outcomes when groups have experienced difficulty are basic, if obvious, requirements. Encouraging the children to listen subsequently to the tapes of their conversation may be a way of developing greater understanding of conversational roles, though considerable care would need to be taken to avoid children becoming too self-conscious about their exploratory talk. During this study the children naturally showed great interest in listening to conversations, though they did not actually do this until after posttest grids were constructed. Several of the children were embarrassed at the 'unpolished' nature of their talk, perhaps because the exploratory talk contrasted sharply with some expectations concerning language forms in teacher-led discussions. Despite reassurance from the writer, these children remained unsure of the 'adequacy' of their work. In a class situation a teacher could do much over an extended period to alleviate such embarrassment but the ambiguous outcomes from the experience suggest that listening to conversations may be unproductive as an evaluative strategy.

The teacher will have at least some role to play in raising questions for discussion. In the present study, written questions were presented on cards for the children's first two conversations, but the children were also encouraged to ask their own questions of each other. With increasing experience and confidence, the children did raise many issues themselves, though this was frequently done through an initiating statement rather than a direct question. It was hypothesised that the procedure of encouraging maximal pupil initiation of questions would help to ensure that what the children talked about was personally interesting and relevant to them. Careful analysis of the transcripts by an experienced teacher, though, will suggest many other issues which might have been usefully talked about. Whilst it will be readily possible for a teacher to raise a question which in his view is of particular significance, it will also be necessary to avoid restricting group talk in ways which are similar to the structural limitations of whole class talk noted in chapter one. There is a critical distinction here between the teacher's role in work designed to develop comprehension of complex literary structures and in work to meet objectives specified in the present study.

The category system developed to analyse the groups' conversations may be of some assistance to classroom teachers in providing a simply administered check on where children are placing emphasis in their conversations. Judging from the results of this research, changes in

inter-personal construing are unlikely to occur unless the children sustain a considerable amount of talk about specific events and consequences of being involved in them though, of course, no simple evidence of desirable ratios of category usage is available.

In discussing the potential contribution of reading and talking about novels to the development of inter-personal understanding, it has been assumed that this strategy will be just one of many approaches to literature adopted in the classroom. The teacher will have a key role in articulating the reading programme so that interest in talking about novels is built up along with many other often more active, responses (see especially Stratta et al., 1973).

The evidence of substantial individual variation in response to both novels and peer talk has important implications for the teacher's role.

Both Harding (1968, p. 15) and Britton (1971, p. 44) have suggested some ways in which general aspects of personality, developed early in life, may prevent some children from enjoying novels or other imaginary constructs, though Fader and McNeil's work (1969) suggests how complex a task it will be to unravel what those personality factors are. If a random sample of children which included some who had no interest in reading had been arranged for the study, large variation on the outcome measures would not have been surprising. In the present study, however, it is children who are already reading widely who also show such

considerable variation in the outcome measures used. For
the teacher, the task is not only to assess which
individual pupils can learn to enjoy reading novels if
their previous experience has not made them aware of this
pleasure, but also to distinguish between pupils for whom
exploratory talk about novels can be an educationally
valuable experience at the point in their lives at which
he encounters them. To oblige all children in a class to
engage in this work may not only be unproductive for those
who do not enjoy it but result in outcomes being
qualitatively lessened for those who do. Unfortunately
there is nothing in the results of the present study which
might assist in making such decisions, though the import-
ance of the issue has been strongly indicated. A task for
future research will be to use far-ranging hypotheses from
child-rearing studies, developmental psychology and, in
the writer's view, studies of the development of language
functions in middle childhood to attempt to open up this
notoriously difficult question.

Lack of participation in discussions by the teacher
does not suggest in any way, then, a diminution of the
significance of the teacher's role. Rather, the success
of a programme of peer discussions will be heavily
dependent upon how he structures the task initially and
sustains it with enjoyable novels, relevant and supportive
evaluation, and perceptive arrangement of the groups.

Though no definitive answers have been achieved from
the results of this research, some clear implications for

further developmental work in classroom environments and
for future research have been suggested. It is possible
to go somewhat further. In a design which imposed severe
constraints of time and a testing procedure which, previous
research has suggested, tends to depress age relationships
in developmental trends, a statistically significant
result for one experimental group was found on the primary
outcome measure. A substantial, though not statistically
significant, degree of posttest difference was found in
another class. On a post hoc basis, it was possible to
associate these changes with qualities of talk in groups
which sharply distinguished them on criteria which are
theoretically significant. At least for some children,
being a spectator to imagined events and sharing responses
to those events with friends appears to be a very valuable
educational experience.

APPENDIX A

DOCUMENTS USED TO ELICIT TEACHERS' OPINIONS
OF NOVELS AND POEMS SUITABLE FOR USE IN THE STUDY

North Sydney Demonstration School
McHatton Street
NORTH SYDNEY   2060
Phone: 929-2822

Dear

    As part of work towards an M.A.(Honours) thesis
at the University of Sydney, I am attempting to analyse
upper primary children's response to literature and
the way in which, over time, the literature appears
to affect the children's perceptions of other people.

    To ensure that the literature which the children
read is widely regarded as worthwhile, I am compiling
a list of books which people knowledgeable in the field
recommend. It is for this reason that I am writing to
you.

    The project would be very much assisted if you
would write a short list of novels and poems, selected
according to the criteria set out below, which you
consider would be worthwhile using. It is estimated
that the task will take between a half and three-quarters
of an hour to complete. I will be very appreciative
of any assistance you might give.

    A set of blank response sheets and statements of
criteria are appended to this letter, together with a
stamped, addressed envelope for your reply.

    Thank you in anticipation of your help.

Geoff Williams

BACKGROUND OF THE CHILDREN

Equal numbers of boys and girls are participating in the study. They are 10 and 11 years old, and read an average of one or more novels per fortnight. They come from homes in which at least one parent is employed in a business or professional field. They have a speed of reading score at or above the mean for their age group.

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF NOVELS

1. Children of this age and with this background are likely to enjoy the book.

2. The book is likely to appeal to both boys and girls.

3. The book's plot contains a lot of action, though this action may be 'internal' rather than 'external'.

4. Main characters, which are either human or animal, are fully drawn. (A character may change greatly during the course of the plot.)

5. The main characters are either human or animals.

6. You are satisfied that the book is an example of good children's literature.

Page 3

RESPONSE SHEET -- NOVELS

Please list:

Title	Author	Publisher, if known

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF POEMS

1. The poem is likely to be enjoyed by children of this age and background.

2. The imagery of, and allusions in, the poem will provide for interesting discussions but will not be so obscure as to be inaccessible to children of this age.

3. The poet is concerned with an aspect of 'personal' interaction between humans and/or animals, or between humans and/or animals and their natural environment.

4. You are satisfied that the poem is an example of good children's literature.

Page 5

RESPONSE SHEET -- POEMS

Please list:

Title	Poet's Name	Anthology, if known

APPENDIX B

MANUAL FOR CODING PERSONAL CONSTRUCTS
IN CATEGORIES

INTRODUCTION

As part of a study of the effects of children's reading and discussion of novels on their understanding of other people, forty-eight pupils in a Sydney primary school were asked to sort people of particular significance to them along eleven "dimensions". The method adopted ensured that the dimensions the children used were their own, rather than those supplied by the experimenter, so that a large variety of dimensions has been gathered.

Your help is requested in the categorisation of the dimensions elicited from the children, in order that changes in the use of these dimensions can be more adequately analysed.

Each dimension elicited from each child on each occasion has been written on a 5" x 3" card and the cards coded with a series of numbers and letters for reference purposes.

Eight categories have been outlined below for use in classifying the dimensions. Please carefully read the definition of each category and the examples which accompany them, taking care that categories are sufficiently clearly understood to allow consistent classification.

To help overcome fatigue problems, the pupils' dimension cards have been randomly sorted into three groups. Take one of the groups of cards and, using the category labels provided, place each card in one category. Work fairly quickly from an initial impression of meaning. When sorting of the first group is completed please re-examine the cards in each category to ensure that no cards have been accidently misplaced.

These cards should then be secured with the category label ready for recording and the procedure repeated for the two remaining groups.

CATEGORIES

I.   'Personality'Dimensions:

This category includes statements of personality traits, ways of behaving towards other people, general abilities, preferences in interpersonal relationships and personal habits.

Examples:

        kind - unkind
        gets angry easily - does not
        likes working in groups - does not
        likes children - likes adults only
        drinks a lot - doesn't drink
        has a high I.Q. - is dumb
        tidy - untidy
        fussy - not fussy

II.   Personal Appearance:

Examples:

        attractive - ugly
        wears jewellery - does not

III. Interests, Hobbies and Non-Social Preferences:

This category includes all statements of preferences in leisure and work activities.

Examples:

        likes animals - does not
        likes sailing - does not
        interested in gardens - interested in inside things

IV. Possessions:

This category includes both particular dimensions such as 'have lots of jewellery' and general ones such as 'wealthy - not very well off'.

V.   Specific Abilities:

All dimensions concerned with specific aspects of what a person is able to do such as 'can play football' or 'sails well'.

VI. General Evaluations:

This category includes statements of the child's general feelings about others, such as 'nice - yuk', 'horrible - pleasant' or 'good personality - bad personality'.

When a dimension is ambiguous in that one end may be interpreted as a statement of a personality trait, such as 'nice - mean', the dimension should be classified as a general evaluation. Please note the difference between this example and one such as 'generous - mean' where statements of personality traits are clearly being used and which would therefore be placed in Category I.

VII. Role Figures, Relationship to Subject or Relationships between Role Figures:

Examples:

     people I like - people I don't like
     people who like me - people who don't
     know each other well - don't know each other

VIII. Social Role:

Includes statements of sex, age or other aspects of social situations such as:

     male - female
     adult - child
     Greek - not Greek

APPENDIX C

RESULTS OF ANALYSES OF VARIANCE OF
SIMILARITY SCORES FOR EACH ROLE FIGURE

168

Table C1

THREE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN SIMILARITY SCORES
SECOND ROLE FIGURE – MOTHER

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F ratio
Class	2	6.583	1.743
Treatment	1	8.048	2.130
Testing	1	0.190	0.131
Class x Treatment	2	3.298	0.873
Class x Testing	2	6.655	4.581*
Treatment x Testing	1	0.762	0.525
Class x Treatment x Testing	2	0.226	0.156
Error (between)	36	1.452	
Error (within)	36	3.778	

* $p < .05$

169

Table C2

THREE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN SIMILARITY SCORES
THIRD ROLE FIGURE - FATHER

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F ratio
Class	2	5.940	1.018
Treatment	1	6.857	1.175
Testing	1	12.190	5.306*
Class x Treatment	2	1.393	0.239
Class x Testing	2	4.798	2.088
Treatment x Testing	1	0.762	0.332
Class x Treatment x Testing	2	0.869	0.378
Error (between)	36	2.298	
Error (within)	36	5.837	

* $p < .05$

Table C3

THREE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN SIMILARITY SCORES
FOURTH ROLE FIGURE – SIBLING

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F ratio
Class	2	6.583	0.451
Treatment	1	2.333	0.160
Testing	1	3.857	1.493
Class x Treatment	2	2.869	0.197
Class x Testing	2	3.679	1.424
Treatment x Testing	1	10.714	4.147*
Class x Treatment x Testing	2	1.536	0.594
Error (between)	36	2.583	
Error (within)	36	14.583	

*   p < .05

Table C4

THREE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN SIMILARITY SCORES
SIXTH ROLE FIGURE – SAME SEX DISLIKED PEER

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F ratio
Class	2	6.250	1.080
Treatment	1	0.964	0.167
Testing	1	0.298	0.102
Class x Treatment	2	8.821	1.526
Class x Testing	2	9.726	3.334*
Treatment x Testing	1	0.107	0.037
Class x Treatment x Testing	2	2.821	0.967
Error (between)	36	2.917	
Error (within)	36	5.782	

* $p < .05$

Table C5

THREE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN SIMILARITY SCORES
EIGHTH ROLE FIGURE - LIKED ADULT

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F ratio
Class	2	10.321	1.343
Treatment	1	0.000	0.000
Testing	1	2.333	1.069
Class x Treatment	2	3.679	0.479
Class x Testing	2	4.798	2.198
Treatment x Testing	1	0.190	0.087
Class x Treatment x Testing	2	1.155	0.529
Error (between)	36	2.183	
Error (within)	36	7.683	

Table C6

THREE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN SIMILARITY SCORES
NINTH ROLE FIGURE - LIKED TEACHER

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F ratio
Class	2	14.619	2.391
Treatment	1	10.714	1.752
Testing	1	4.762	2.505
Class x Treatment	2	0.571	0.093
Class x Testing	2	7.190	3.783*
Treatment x Testing	1	0.429	0.225
Class x Treatment x Testing	2	1.000	0.526
Error (between)	36	1.901	
Error (within)	36	6.115	

* $p < .05$

Table C7

THREE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN SIMILARITY SCORES
TENTH ROLE FIGURE – DISLIKED TEACHER

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F ratio
Class	2	5.226	1.086
Treatment	1	1.440	0.299
Testing	1	4.298	2.145
Class x Treatment	2	1.155	0.240
Class x Testing	2	1.155	0.576
Treatment x Testing	1	0.107	0.053
Class x Treatment x Testing	2	0.321	0.160
Error (between)	36	2.004	
Error (within)	36	4.813	

Table C8

THREE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN SIMILARITY SCORES
ELEVENTH ROLE FIGURE - DISLIKED ADULT

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F ratio
Class	2	7.190	0.820
Treatment	1	10.012	1.142
Testing	1	2.012	0.904
Class x Treatment	2	1.476	0.168
Class x Testing	2	3.619	1.626
Treatment x Testing	1	0.964	0.433
Class x Treatment x Testing	2	0.571	0.257
Error (between)	36	2.226	
Error (within)	36	8.766	

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN SIMILARITY SCORES
CLASS ONE - FIRST FIVE ROLE FIGURES

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Mother		Father		Sibling		Best Friend		Same Sex Disliked Peer	
		Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio
Treatment	1	0.000	0.000	6.036	3.073	0.000	0.000	9.143	4.800*	2.286	0.373
Testing	1	9.143	4.243	18.893	6.930*	2.285	0.582	0.571	0.226	14.286	3.288
Treatment x Testing	1	0.000	0.000	0.893	0.328	0.571	0.145	0.143	0.056	0.571	0.132
Error (between)	12	2.155		2.726		3.929		2.524		4.345	
Error (within)	12	2.869		1.964		11.119		1.905		6.131	

- SECOND FIVE ROLE FIGURES

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Other Sex Disliked Peer		Liked Adult		Liked Teacher		Disliked Teacher		Disliked Adult	
		Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio
Treatment	1	15.750	1.981	0.143	0.018	1.286	0.237	3.571	2.273	0.893	0.339
Testing	1	6.036	0.731	11.571	6.271*	17.286	5.855*	2.286	0.608	8.036	2.368
Treatment x Testing	1	4.321	0.523	1.286	0.697	1.286	0.435	0.571	0.152	1.750	0.516
Error (between)	12	8.262		1.845		2.952		3.762		3.393	
Error (within)	12	7.952		7.893		5.429		1.571		2.631	

* p < .05

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN SIMILARITY SCORES
CLASS TWO - FIRST FIVE ROLE FIGURES

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Mother		Father		Sibling		Best Friend		Same Sex Disliked Peer	
		Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio
Treatment	1	12.893	3.539	0.036	0.005	0.036	0.003	0.143	0.032	0.571	0.086
Testing	1	4.321	3.184	2.893	1.110	8.036	2.824	0.143	0.099	5.143	1.838
Treatment x Testing	1	0.893	0.658	0.321	0.123	10.321	3.628	0.571	0.397	2.286	0.817
Error (between)	12	1.357		2.607		2.845		1.440		2.798	
Error (within)	12	3.643		7.202		14.179		4.464		6.679	

- SECOND FIVE ROLE FIGURES

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Other Sex Disliked Peer		Liked Adult		Liked Teacher		Disliked Teacher		Disliked Adult	
		Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio
Treatment	1	4.321	0.602	4.321	0.908	3.571	0.638	0.143	0.024	1.750	0.212
Testing	1	0.321	0.055	0.321	0.125	1.286	1.385	0.000	0.000	0.893	0.521
Treatment x Testing	1	4.321	0.742	0.321	0.125	0.571	0.615	0.143	0.133	0.036	0.021
Error (between)	12	5.821		2.571		0.929		1.071		1.714	
Error (within)	12	7.179		4.762		5.595		5.905		8.238	

Table C11

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN SIMILARITY SCORES
CLASS THREE - FIRST FIVE ROLE FIGURES

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Mother		Father		Sibling		Best Friend		Same Sex Disliked Peer	
		Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio
Treatment	1	1.750	0.363	3.571	0.428	8.036	0.435	1.286	0.128	15.750	3.472
Testing	1	0.036	0.042	0.000	0.000	0.893	0.915	0.571	0.432	0.321	0.200
Treatment x Testing	1	0.321	0.380	1.286	0.824	2.893	2.963	0.571	0.432	2.893	1.800
Error (between)	12	0.845		1.560		0.976		1.321		1.607	
Error (within)	12	4.821		8.345		18.452		10.060		4.536	

- SECOND FIVE ROLE FIGURES

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Other Sex Disliked Peer		Liked Adult		Liked Teacher		Disliked Teacher		Disliked Adult	
		Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio	Mean Square	F ratio
Treatment	1	9.143	0.472	2.893	0.278	7.000	0.956	0.036	0.005	10.321	0.669
Testing	1	1.286	0.982	0.036	0.017	0.571	0.314	4.321	3.666	0.321	0.205
Treatment x Testing	1	7.000	5.345*	0.893	0.419	0.571	0.314	0.036	0.030	0.321	0.205
Error (between)	12	1.310		2.131		1.821		1.179		1.571	
Error (within)	12	19.357		10.393		7.321		6.964		15.429	

* $p < .05$

APPENDIX D

A MANUAL FOR USE IN CATEGORISING THE CHILDREN'S
CONVERSATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The work you are being asked to assist with is part
of a project to consider the value of peer discussions of
novels for the development of inter-personal understanding
of children in primary school. The three transcripts
and tape recordings which accompany this manual are
randomly selected examples of the children's conversations:
you are asked to categorise elements of these conversations
using the category system described in this manual.

To begin, in order that you become familiar with the
nature of the discussions, would you please listen to each
of the conversations carefully while reading the relevant
transcript? You may find it necessary to listen several
times to some parts of a conversation to become clear about
what the children are meaning by particular utterances.
Try to imagine yourself to be a non-participant member of
the discussion group who is naturally expecting to make
sense of what the other participants are saying. As such
a member you will, of course, be using intonations, pauses,
hesitations, etc. as well as the literal meanings of the
words used, to understand the conversations.

When you are familiar with the conversations, please
read the descriptions of the categories. These categories
are designed to describe what the children are doing as
'spectators' to the novels - the the events, the characters,
and the way the interaction is portrayed, for example. You

will need to read the descriptions of categories a number of times to be clear about distinctions between them.

The task of this analysis is to distinguish units of the discourse and to categorise the units using the system described. A unit is defined as:

> a section of discourse in which the children are engaged in one kind of activity as spectators and as defined by the category system.

That is, the units are defined in terms of the system of categories, so it is important to be very familiar with all of the category definitions.

There are some other important issues to note. Not all of the discourse will be classifiable because the children sometimes switch their attention from talking about the novel, and related experiences, to other issues. These occasions are relatively rare. An example occurs in a transcript other than those you will be working with when a child leaves the group to close a door and is reprimanded for the noise she makes by another group member.

Sometimes an instance of one category begins before the previous instance is completed. Such overlapping occurs because the conversations are not in a narrative form. In distinguishing the boundaries of instances it will be necessary to indicate _precisely_ where one instance ends and another begins.

When you are familiar with the definitions of categories, listen to the first transcript and mark off the boundaries of instances with a vertical line after the last word in that instance. Write the number of the category (and sub-

category where necessary) above the lines of discourse forming the instance. Where overlapping occurs, indicate which words are part of the following instance by bracketing those words and drawing a line to the next instance. Work quickly through the transcript a first time, and then return to it later to check the categorisations you have made. As previously arranged, we will discuss the categorisation of the first transcript before you proceed to the remaining two.

DEFINITIONS OF CATEGORIES

Category I :   Reconstructing and Considering Specific
              Contexts and Events

Instances of this category occur when the children

talk over specific events in the novel or when they discuss

specific contexts in which events take place.

Much of the children's talk is concerned with

recalling and clarifying what happened in the novel or the

specific context in which events took place. Frequently,

several children contribute to the process of recall, thus

mutually building up a version of a particular event or its

context. An example from a transcript you will not be

working with is included to illustrate the process:

Paul: Yeah, but the sad part was when, um...the dog
               got shot, and he went under the house and the
               boy couldn't find him and he had to

Kerry: crawl under...

Paul: Yeah...gee whiz,

Patrick: Yeah, he stayed

Paul: just had to sit around waiting.

Kerry: It's amazing how he, um

Kerry: ⎡survived.
All others: ⎣survived.

Category II :   Noting, and Defending, General Aspects
                 of a Character's Behaviour

Traits or consistent features of the behaviour of a
character are often remarked on by the children. These are
often very brief observations, such as 'I reckon Ruth was
very brave' or 'She was like a mother to them'. A more
complicated form occurs through the use of the passive
voice, in which a character's behaviour is implied by
observations about how another character has been treated.
For example, the observation in a discussion of 'Let the
Balloon Go' that John 'should have been given more freedom'
directly implies that his parents were restricting him.
Similarly, defending or criticising specific aspects of a
character's behaviour is necessarily to analyse propensities
towards certain forms of behaviour.

Discussion of one character's treatment of another
which is more than a reconstruction of a specific event and
infers consistent treatment over time should be included in
this category. For example, in an utterance such as,
'Andrew was always really queer. Like when he kept on
bashing into...', the first sentence should be categorised
as an instance of this category and the next sentence as
the commencement of an instance of Category I.

Category III : <u>Imagining Personal Consequences of being</u>
              <u>in a Character's Situation</u>

This category includes parts of the discussion in which children explicitly imagine themselves to be in the situation of a character or characters in the novel.

Instances of the category should be distinguished from those in which there is talk about parallel or related previous experience. The second kind of instance would be included in Category IV. Instances of this category will often be recognisable because of the use of hypothesising and, frequently, subjunctive forms. 'I wonder what it would be like to be...' or 'What if we were in his position?' are often signals for inclusion of discourse in this category.

'What would you do if you were in that situation?', 'I'd hate to have been Jack when he had to touch Uncle Bert', 'Imagine being the parents of a handicapped kid', are examples of utterances in which the children begin to consider the consequences for themselves of having to deal with similar events to those in the novel.

Category IV :   Contributing and Considering Personal
                Experiences

Discourse in which the children mention anecdotes from
their personal experiences are included in this category.
A distinction is drawn, though, between two sub-categories:

i.   after an eliciting question,

ii.   directly.

The first is concerned with occasions when children
contribute anecdotes in response to an eliciting question
which opens the possibility for others to similarly
contribute or comment. The eliciting question may be asked
by a child who himself later contributes anecdotes in
relation to the same question. The initiating question
should be categorised as part of the instance.

The second sub-category is made up of instances where
anecdotes are directly contributed without an eliciting
question.

When a clarifying question is raised during or at the
end of the narration of a personal anecdote, the question
should not be interpreted as initiating a new instance
provided that the discussion is concerned with the same
personal experience. This is parallel to the strategy
adopted with instances of Category I where clarificatory
questions raised about a particular event are classified
as part of the reconstruction of the event.

Category V :   Considering Causes   of a Character's
                Behaviour

    Sections of the discussion in which the children talk over why a character behaved as he did are included in this category.   The key element will be attempts to understand the sources of, or reasons for, characters' actions.

    Some examples are:

        'I think John became very angry because
        his father was so cruel to the animals'.

        'No wonder he stole, 'cause he was
        starving'.

Category VI :   Evaluating a Character Explicitly

    Though many of the comments about characters will be evaluative in tone, those which explicitly evaluate a character should be included as instances in this category. They will be of a form similar to 'I liked John a lot', or 'Isn't John awful?'.

Category VII :   Evaluating the Novel Explicitly

The childrem often make general evaluative comments about the writing or the author's construction of events such as 'I really enjoyed the book', 'I thought it was silly', or 'The author didn't give enough detail'. As well, suggestions are sometimes made as to what the author ought to have done. These are a form of negative comment but are more complex than a simple, negative statement. Comments of these kinds should be classified as one of three sub-categories:

    i.   positive evaluation,

    ii.   negative evaluation,

    iii.   alternatives available to the author.

Comparisons between the novel being discussed and other novels should be included in Category IX, sub-category O.

Whereas evaluative references to specific characters should be included in Category VI, discussion of the general quality of the characterisation should be included here.

Category VIII :   Commenting on Social Issues
                   Raised by the Novel

The novels used in this study raise many contentious social issues such as, for example, the treatment of minority groups, refugees and the loss of personal freedom in contemporary society. Sometimes the children make observations about social issues in a general way, such as 'Blacks are really discriminated against in our society', or 'People treat handicapped people as though they can't do anything'. Sub-category i, general comments, groups statements of this form.

General observations are sometimes carried further when a group member makes a causal analysis of a social issue. For example, when one child observed that aborigines 'get drunk and terrorise and don't paint their place' another child remarked that 'it is because aborigines 'are under more stress'. Each occasion on which a causal analysis is attempted should be categorised in sub-category ii.

Category IX :   Citing Other Spectatorship Experiences

All references to encounters with other imagined experiences, whether novels or television or film, should be included here.   Instances will include comparisons between the novel being primarily discussed and other novels the children have read, or between filmed and printed versions of the same story.

References to experience as a spectator to actual events mediated through film, print or oral narratives should also be included in category IX.   An example is a child citing a news report of an event.   (An important distinction is drawn between this kind of discussion and that about actual personal experience which would be included in category IV.

Several sub-categories are employed.   Most of these parallel general categories previously defined for classification of discourse about the novel which is the primary focus of the discussion.   Please refer back to the relevant category description for a full definition.

The exception is sub-category O, which includes all comparisons of a simple, global kind such as 'I liked "The Silver Sword" better than "Sounder"', and 'That's like in that T.V. show "Abbott and Costello"'.

Sub-category i :   includes all instances of specific re-
    counting of events from other sources of 'spectator-
    ship' experience.

Sub-category ii :   occasions when general aspects of a
    character's behaviour in other novels, films, etc. are

noted and defended, or when <u>specific</u> comparisons between the behaviour of characters in different novels are made, should be classified in this sub-category.

<u>Sub-category iii</u> : parallels the general category of the same number and includes instances in which the personal consequences of being in a character's situation in another imaginary construct are considered.

<u>Sub-category iv</u> : groups occasions when the courses of a character's behaviour in another imaginary construct are discussed.

<u>Category X</u> : <u>Considering the Author's General 'Message'</u>

Sometimes the children raise a general question of the form 'What is the author trying to tell us?', and then attempt to 'sum up' the novel in a phrase or two, such as, 'that we should be thankful'. Discourse of this kind is classified in X.

Category XI :   Unclassifiable

Any occasions in the discourse when the children
appear to be talking as spectators but which cannot be
comprehended, or classified in any other category, should
be classified in XI.   Such instances should be distinguished
from those occasions mentioned in the introduction on which
the children are not talking as 'spectators' to the events
of the novel and related experiences.   These are not
categorised.

APPENDIX E

TRANSCRIPTS OF THE CHILDREN'S CONVERSATIONS

Class: I

Date: 6th October 1976

Novel: 'Sounder'

Participants: Kerry, Cathy, Patrick,
                Paul C.

Paul: O.K., um, we're going to talk about the book
           'Sounder'.

Cathy: And there's also a movie of it.

Patrick: Yeah, we're talking about the book.

Paul: It's about this...I thought the sad part was
           that it's true, the, this is what they used to
           do to the blacks.

Patrick: Yeah.

Paul: And they used to just do the same thing. I'd
           hate...to be...a black.

Paul: ⎡Yeah (inaudible)

Patrick: ⎣How he was hiding from the people.

Paul: Yeah, in those times.

Patrick: There was a big lamp there, and he was hiding
           so he wouldn't...show up on the land.

Paul: Yeah.

Kerry: Yeah, what about how Sounder looked up after
           they shot him

Paul: Yeah.

Kerry: And after two months when he came home. God
           ...one eye...

Patrick: And slammed across the face.

Paul: Yeah, the man, yeah, the man, um, accused him
           of stealing something, so they

Patrick: Oh, is that what they...

Paul: He tripped over

Patrick: is that why they

Paul: He tripped over, and he they thought he was
           trying to get away so they got a chain and
           smashed through Sounder's face

Patrick: Is that why they, oh I didn't know why they put
           him in.

Paul: See, it says here, there's nothing I can't
            stand but a thieving nigger.

Patrick: Oh, what's oh...

Cathy: There's one thing I can smell a mile off and
            that's...

Patrick: Yeah.

Cathy: There's two things, there's two things. One's
            home cooking and the other's a thieving nigger.

Paul: Yeah, and what gets me is that there's a man
            and his wife and, four kids to look after
            without any money, that must have been real hard.

Kerry: I think it wasn't fair that, oh, I mean, all
            the white people seemed to have enough money...

Paul: Yeah, yeah.

Kerry: to buy everything, but

Cathy: Yeah blacks are outcasts.

Paul: In those days, they used to think blacks as
            not human.

Kerry: I know.

Patrick: They were just animals.

Kerry: They were more not human.

Paul: They're treated like that, what do you expect.

Paul: It's true.

Kerry: Yeah (inaudible).

Paul: If they put on, if they're given...raggy
            clothes and stuff like that...but they should
            have more respect for the blacks.

Patrick: And when the man was in jail, he didn't even
            know, um, his dog was shot. He just heard a
            shot, and he didn't look up.

Paul: Yeah, but in, in one of the parts, when the boy
            goes in and he was going to give a cake to his
            dad in jail, the man just rips it up, and you
            know, just ruins it, that's, that's bad, but if
            a white did that, he'd just get something and
            pluck it in...

(murmers of agreement)

Paul: He wouldn't smash it up.

Kerry: Yeah, I think that it was really stupid.

Patrick: Or, he'd just look under the layer.

Cathy: Um, but he didn't have to smash it up.

Paul: But the sad part

Paul: is that woman has to look after, um...

Cathy: Four kids all by herself.

Paul: Yeah...without anyone to

Patrick: How about when he found that book in the...
          in the

Paul: And I wonder what will happen when the boy
          grows up and dies, that'll be bad.

Cathy: The teacher was nice.

          (general agreement)

Kerry: That was the nicest thing that happened to him
          in the book.

Paul: Yeah, but it was sad when he had to go and
          leave.

Patrick: No but he went to school in the end.

Kerry: Yeah, but what about when he was watching, um,
          these men, um, washing something and in the...

Cathy: Yeah whitewashing something.

Kerry: yeah, whitewashing something and then this
          jailer came up and smashed his fingers.

Paul: No,...Yeah...he...There's a guard, and he's
          says he's a bit...The boy he's watching him,
          he's leaning on this fence and um, looking for
          his da, but he um...the guard throws a piece
          of corrugated iron and, um, cuts his fingers
          to pieces and it just drips blood.

Cathy: It doesn't cut it, it bruises it. It's that

Paul: It just bruises it, yeah.

Patrick: ⌐Oh - cuts it, cuts it.

Kerry: ⌐Yes, cuts...,

Kerry: not right off.

Paul: No, not right off, just cuts it bad, and...um...
          he just walked off with dripping blood. Then
          the soldiers threw another piece of it, laughing
          his head off,...thought it was fun.

Kerry: Yeah.

Paul: Too. I'd like to do that to the soldier.

Patrick: Yeah, get a taste of their own medicine.

          (Pause)

Kerry: Um, mm, wish I could buy this book off him.

Paul: Yeah, um, I told my mum to read it, but she
          said it was too sad.

Patrick: My mum read it, she was crying.

Cathy: It costs ninety-five cents.

Paul: Was she?

Kerry: One cent a page, that must mean.

Patrick: Is it? Does this cost ninety-five cents?

Paul: Yeah. It's pretty good.

Cathy: Oh yeah, oh ha! (inaudible)

Paul: That dog looks so adorable, I wish he didn't
          die.

Cathy: That's how half bulldog and half...whatever it
          was.

Paul: Yeah, mm. But...Yeah, but the sad part was when,
          um, the dog got shot, and he went under the house
          and the boy couldn't find him and he had to

Kerry: crawl under

Paul: Yeah...gee whiz,

Patrick: Yeah, he stayed

Paul: just had to sit round waiting.

Kerry: It's amazing how he, um

Kerry: ⌈survived.

Patrick: ⌊survived.

Patrick: Yeah, sure is good.

Kerry: I think, that just looks the, the sort of dog
            that...

Paul: It's good how he just pulled through the hard
            times. In there

Patrick: Yeah, like that song...um

Cathy: Yeah.

Patrick: ⌈Yeah, if you're going to walk that valley by
            yourself

Paul: ⌊If you're going to walk that valley by yourself.

Paul: It's somewhere in there.

Patrick: Ain't nobody going to walk it for you,
            ain't no-one else gonna walk

Paul: Here it is...gonna walk. Ooh...no...that
            was part...

Patrick: Nobody's going to walk that valley for you, oh,
            ain't no-one, oh...

Cathy: You gotta walk that lonesome valley, you gotta
            walk it by yourself, ain't nobody gonna walk
            it for you.

Paul: Yeah.

Patrick: That's right, yeah, mm.

Kerry: Yeah,...Yeah...but that was...There's another
            one like that somewhere.

Patrick: Yeah, there's lots of them.

Kerry: I like the end here...

Cathy: His mother's always singing...

Paul: I thought it was...

Cathy: But that isn't it...

200

Patrick and Paul start to speak simultaneously.

Paul: O.K. you go first.

Patrick: How about, he had to go to school in the
             beginning, had to walk eight miles or ten
             miles.

Paul: Yeah.

Patrick: He couldn't get there.

Paul: But, it was good how he learnt all the signposts
             and roadposts.

Patrick: Yeah.

Cathy: He seemed to like, um...bible stories.

Paul: Yeah, but he thought it was very easy, but when
             he got right down to it he couldn't understand
             it.   That was quite bad.   That was sad...you
             know he just seems...write...reading is...
             reading as easy as looking at letters and easy
             words like 'cat' and 'dog' but when he opened
             that book, he couldn't understand some of the
             words.

Kerry: It's just like looking at a foreign language
             I suppose.

Paul: Mm.

Patrick: Yeah.

             (Pause)

Paul: Poor kid.

             (Murmurs of agreement)

Paul: I wonder if this book is true.   Sometimes they
             say this book is...sometimes they say this book
             is based on a true story.

Patrick: Yeah.

Paul: If it was true I'd really feel bad.

             (Simultaneous beginning by three children)

Patrick: A tragic...compelling...tale...

Cathy:	A tragic compelling tale of fortitude and courage in the face of apalling odds.
Patrick:	That's us.
Cathy:	That's us, yeah.
Kerry:	That's not us!
Paul:	Come on, say something.
	(Giggling by someone)
Paul:	Don't put it off.
Kerry:	I don't think that the dog looks really the sort of dog that Sounder would be in some ways.
Paul:	No...it's a mongrel and it's all different types of animals. It's a bulldog...and...
Cathy:	⌈It's half bulldog, half hound.
Patrick:	⌊It's half bulldog, half hound.
Paul:	Yeah, Yeah. Commutations.
Cathy:	But it looks good I reckon.
Patrick:	⌈Yeah.
Paul:	⌊Yeah.
Paul:	It looks quite tough.
Kerry:	I think the worst, or you know...um...one of the most dreadful parts is when the father got blown up in that dynamite thing, you know.
Paul:	Yeah, he got wounded on the rocks...he got squashed.
Patrick:	It said, and they read in the paper, someone read to her, that um, you know, he didn't die, just twelve other people did.
Kerry:	⌈(Inaudible)
Paul:	⌊Slavery was abolished in 1835, that's not long ago really.
Cathy:	What? In 1875.
Paul:	⌈Yeah, 1875.
Cathy:	⌊What?

Paul: Yeah, that's not bad, oh, no, that's not very
            long ago...

Patrick: About a hundred years, I think.

Cathy: A hundred years isn't long ago.

Paul: No...You know, well think about it, you know,
            cause they...well...

            (Laughter)

Patrick: Um, 1875, and today is 1975. No 1976.

Paul: Yeah,...and...That's not bad, because if you
            think about it...

Patrick: One hundred and one years.

Paul: So, it stopped already ago...oh you can't get
            my point...It doesn't matter.

            (Pause)

Patrick: (Unintelligible aside)

Paul: But I would've liked it if it was stopped in
            about the sixteenth century, that would have
            been better but...

Cathy: ⌈It wasn't in the 1960s...

Paul: ⌊eighteenth century's not...

Paul: But the eighteenth century isn't good enough.
            It should have been the sixteenth or fourteenth
            century.

Cathy: Did Lincoln stop it?

Paul: No, it's a man called um, um...what's his name?
            William Wilberforce.

Cathy: Oh, yeah. That's right.

Patrick: He was the one...

Paul: And he was the one who stopped the English,
            and the children? That was, um...

Patrick: Yeah, that was...

Cathy: Yeah.

Paul: Yeah, that was Lord Shaftsbury.

Kerry: Yeah, that was...um

Cathy: Lord Shaftsbury.

Kerry: ⌈Yeah.

Patrick: ⌊Yeah.

Cathy: Probably Anthony Ashton Cooper

Kerry: Yeah, yeah.

Cathy: before he became Lord Shaftsbury.

           (Pause)

Cathy: 'Sounder wasn't much to look at half bulldog,
           half hound'.

Paul: Oh yeah, what got me, the boy didn't know his
           age...in part of the story.

Cathy: Yeah, I know.

Patrick: Yeah, I know.

Paul: In part of the story it says 'The boy didn't
           know his age, but he knew he had lived for a
           long time'.

Kerry: Yeah that's right...Gee...

Paul: Yeah I know.

Kerry: It must have seemed a long time to him.

Paul: Must have meant - he couldn't celebrate his
           birthday that must have meant. His birthday
           must have passed without knowing it, you know.

Kerry: Mm.

Cathy: ⌈One day he wakes up

Patrick: ⌊His mother would I guess.

Cathy: with the usual routine then one day he wakes
           up 'It's my birthday whee!'

Paul: It must have been so boring just sitting in an
           old cabin.

Patrick: ⌈Yeah.

Kerry: ⌊Yeah.

Patrick: He, he said it...

Paul: Yeah, but this author made it come alive.

Patrick: Listening to his mother, say it.

Paul: Yeah...talking to the children.

           (Murmurs)

Kerry: Yeah, and you know, the sort of way...they say it.

Paul: I was...Look, I just read the first two chapters
           and I was almost crying.

Patrick: Yeah.

Kerry: I wasn't crying.

Paul: Well, you didn't read it good enough.

Kerry: Yes I did, my mum read it to me.

Cathy: Storytime.

Paul: Yeah.

Kerry: Yeah, cause I like having storytime.

Paul: You just sit there, and you think that this was
           true. They really used to do it to them. If
           you just pick a page, it'd probably just be full
           of sadness.

Patrick: Yeah.

Paul: Yeah, here's about...I've picked the page and
           it's about this dog with only one eye and half
           a leg...and it looks bad.

Patrick: Yuk, Er...He lost an ear didn't he?

Kerry: Yeah, he picked it up, and he picked up the ear.

Paul: Yeah, and lost it under the house.

Kerry: Yeah.

Paul: Yeah, he was looking for it. But...I think it
           was bad how he couldn't..win...and then when...
           the father came back he barked as loud as ever
           ...you know?

Kerry: Yeah. But I don't see how his voice could really be very different from really any other dog. I mean...there's...you know, not a cave so it would echo, you know and sort of shoot out everywhere...

Paul: Mm.

(Pause)

Paul: And in a part they say, some people are born lucky and I suppose we're the people that are born with bad luck. Did you read that part?

Kerry: Yeah.

Patrick: Yeah, some people are winners

Paul: Yeah

Patrick: and some losers

Patrick: ⌈and I suppose we're the losers.

Paul: ⌊and I suppose we're the losers.

Paul: Yeah, that was bad. And when their mother sees her husband...her husband...she almost cries.

Cathy: Mm.

Paul: Oh, here's a picture of the cake.

Patrick: She didn't...

Paul: See?

Patrick: Yeah, that's right.

Paul: Mm...Just drops it on the ground, crumbles all the cake up everywhere.

Patrick: Into one of those...

Cathy: Yeah, and he's always thinking, he'd love to see that...guy...um,...um drop...drop dead.

Paul: Strangle the coward (inaudible)

Patrick: The poor woman.

Cathy: And he's like to see him crumbled on the floor like the crumbs.

Paul: Yeah.

Patrick: Yeah.

Paul:	So would I.
Kerry:	Yeah.
Paul:	I'd kick him in you know where...
	(Laughter)
Kerry:	I'd, I'd do more than that, I'd chop his head off or...try...
	(Murmurs)
Cathy:	Oh, yeah.
Paul:	I'd really be...I wouldn't just let him...like that soldier I just, I know but...
Kerry:	I don't think he'd dare.
Paul:	This kid was quite smart he was...he...he knew that if he threw that piece of corrugated iron back at the...um...soldier, the soldier would have really got mad, and got him, and put him in jail.
Kerry:	It didn't fool me.
	(Pause)
Patrick:	What didn't fool you?
	(pause)
Patrick:	Mm?
Paul:	Yeah.
Kerry:	I think that they were all really rather brave ...not to cry...'cause if my, my father was put in jail, you know, I'd
Paul:	Yeah.
Kerry:	um...everybody'd probably cry their head off.
Patrick:	Yeah!
	(Laughter)
Paul:	⌈These people were poor.
Patrick:	⌊And the dog was.
Patrick:	go on

Kerry: Oh.

Cathy: ⌈What would I do if my dog went away?

Kerry: ⌊If my dog went away

Kerry: I'd go spastic.

            (Laughter)

Paul: And what got me, it said here that, that they
            said if Sounder did get away, the mother said,
            we couldn't afford a new dog.

Patrick: Yeah. To feed

Paul: Yeah.

Patrick: 'cause they just found that dog.

Paul: Yeah, no...it was a puppy and...

Patrick: Yeah and they found it on that road.

Paul: Yeah, It came up to the...uh...

Patrick: Yeah...but, well, they didn't buy it.

Paul: Mm.

            (Pause)

Paul: ⌈And this picture...

Kerry: ⌊That's what Sounder looked like

Paul: Yeah.

Kerry: without his eye and without his ear.

Paul: Yeah.

Patrick: And he had enough money to get some sour belly.
            It's really fattening.

Paul: Yeah that's right...I didn't know what sour
            belly was...

Patrick: It's really fattening meat.

Paul: Or kernels...or stuff like that.

Cathy: He just looked awful.

Paul:	These American words, some of them I couldn't understand...stuff...like that kernels, and um sour belly, I, I just couldn't understand some of the food....And mush.
Cathy:	And mush.
	(Laughter)
Kerry:	I think that's a potato or something.
Cathy:	Mush...mush-mash.
Cathy:	Mish, Mash, Mush.
Kerry:	Mush.
Paul:	And they always had that same meal, excepting when they had that garlic sausages and...
Kerry:	Yeah.
Paul:	And when that man stole the...um,...thing, he was quite poor, you know, cause he couldn't afford it.
Patrick:	Stole what?
Kerry:	Yeah.
Paul:	I think we've said enough about this book.
Cathy:	Yeah, but...What about that, how I'd hate to see that dog in real life when...he um...had no eye on one side, and...
Paul:	Oh, yeah.
Cathy:	And there was no eye on that side, only a dark socket with a splinter of bone showing above it.
Others:	Oh, er!
Cathy:	That'd be revolting.
Paul:	I think,um,
Cathy:	I couldn't look at it.
Paul:	we're, we're starting to bore Mr. Williams if he's listening to this so...um, do you think we'd better stop it now?
Cathy:	Yes.
Kerry:	All right, yeah.
Cathy:	Bye-bye Mr. Williams.
Chorus:	Bye.

209

Class: I

Date: 1st November 1976

Novel: 'The Silver Sword'

Participants: Patrick, Cathy, Vikki

Vikki: Well, I think...

Cathy: I think it was a good book.

Vikki: The characters were good...I liked Jan.

Cathy: Jan, yeah, he was funny...pickpocket...yeah.

Patrick: I like...at least they got the silver sword
            back in the end.

Vikki: Yeah, and they met their parents.

Cathy: I liked um...

Patrick: I liked the dog...I wish they'd kept...Jan
            went to get, um

Cathy: Ludwig...or whatever his name was...

Patrick: Yeah, Ludwig instead of...um...What was the
            boy's name?

Cathy: ⌈Edek.

Vikki: ⌊Edek.

Patrick: Edek, yeah.

            (Interruption by a teacher)

Vikki: What would you do if you were in a similar
            situation?

Cathy: I would...I would grab my puppy and my guinea
            pigs...which I don't have yet...(laughter) and
            my mummy, I'd grab my mummy.

Vikki: Dead scared. Mmn, I wouldn't know what to do.

Cathy: Were you scared in the cyclone?

Vikki: Umm...yeah a bit.

Patrick: Were you in a cyclone?

Cathy: Yeah, the Darwin one.

Patrick: Oh, Oh yeah...it would be different.

Cathy: Oh, it isn't really different...a cyclone to
            a war, I mean everything gets ruined.

Patrick: Yeah, people are dangerous.

Cathy: Yeah, I suppose.

Vikki: What the cyclone or a war?

Patrick: War, I think.

Cathy: War is more dangerous

Cathy: ⌈than a cyclone

Patrick: ⌊War, I mean war causes

Patrick: a greater amount of suffering.

Cathy: Yeah, usually.

        (Pause)

Cathy: I reckon Ruth was pretty brave.

Vikki: Yeah.

Cathy: Ruth.

Cathy: ⌈I liked Boronia.

Patrick: ⌊There's a lot of coincidence.

Vikki: Yeah, I know.

Patrick: Like they met Jan again. Mm.

Cathy: Yeah.

Patrick: And they were talking about he's got a bear in
            America, he had a bear and a...

Vikki: Yeah.

Cathy: a hyena...

Patrick: Yeah, a hyena.

Cathy: Yeah, two years and a hyena.

Cathy: ⌈Mm.

Patrick: ⌊Mm.

Vikki: Who...Who has two bears? Jan, I suppose?

Patrick: Mm, just Jan and...

Cathy: Jan would be, be the two bears and the hyena
            was just...

Patrick: No, there was only one bear and a hyena...
             hyena was the dog. I think that's right.

Patrick: How they made those canoes.

Cathy: (inaudible)

             (Laughing)

Vikki: How they made what?

Patrick: Those canoes, to go down the rivers...and then
             a...they lost their paddle by that.

Vikki: Yeah.

Patrick: And that man was on...except they got away.
             And Ludwig...was, was in the canoe.

Cathy: Yeah.

Vikki: In the storm, Ludwig died I think...you know...
             the end of the canoe...

Patrick: Ludwig died?

Vikki: ⌈Near the end...

Patrick: ⌊Didn't they just...

Patrick: left him there?

Cathy: oh, yeah...left him.

Vikki: He must have died.

Patrick: I imagined he went back to...hm. Probably did.

Vikki: You know how, um Joseph escaped?...

Patrick: Yeah.

Vikki: (inaudible)

Patrick: What?

Vikki: That's common.

Patrick: Yeah.

Patrick: ⌈I knew he would escape.

Cathy: ⌊He's lucky he made it.

Vikki: Yeah, I know...

Cathy:	That was pretty brave of him...being in the cooler.
Vikki:	Yeah it's really the most practical angle.
Cathy:	Yes.
Patrick:	What did he make...um he made...
Vikki:	I don't know, but, um, he threw a paper plane at the officer or one of the troopers.
Patrick:	Yeah.
Vikki:	And, um, they put him in the cooler, or whatever...cooling room and when the officer came in to give him his lunch
Vikki:	⌈he knocked him out.
Patrick:	⌊He knocked him out.
Patrick:	Mm, yeah...and escaped.
Vikki:	And he pulled him off.
Cathy:	That's gratitude!...
Vikki:	And let him go again.
Patrick:	He changed clothes again.
Vikki:	Mn.
Cathy:	And he...the whole reason he was in that camp because he turned a picture of Hitler's face to the wall.
Vikki:	⌈Mm.
Patrick:	⌊Mm.
Cathy:	And somebody blabbed.
Vikki:	Yeah!
	(Pause)
Cathy:	It's really a good book.
Vikki:	Was this in World War Two or One?
Cathy:	I think it was Two.
Vikki:	Two, yeah.

Patrick: Two I think, yeah.

Vikki: I thought it would be one of those boring war stories, you know.

Cathy: Yeah.

Vikki: But it was really

Patrick: I thought it was going to be all about um armies and stuff...because 'The Silver Sword'.

Vikki: Yeah.

Cathy: (inaudible) knights...knights, knights or something.

Vikki: I thought it would be...you know how, well, there's that story, 'The Sword in the Stone'?

Patrick: Yeah.

Vikki: I thought it would be something related to that.

Cathy: Yeah, yeah...me too.

(Pause)

Patrick: They are pretty small chapters too...all about two or three pages.

Cathy: What about in the court, when Jan was in court?

Vikki: Oh yeah!

Cathy: And he...

Patrick: Cause he was stealing.

Cathy: Yeah, after he went in the railways.

Patrick: And...and what happened to um...to Jan's cat?

Vikki: Jan's cat?

Cathy: It ran away or something.

Patrick: ⌈Mm...but you couldn't tell...

Vikki: ⌊Yeah...at the beginning

Vikki: after a couple or three chapters.

Cathy: It just disappeared out of the whole story.

Patrick: I know...but you just...and then he got um...

Vikki: That cocky and it died.

Patrick: That cocky, yeah.

Vikki: And then it died.

Cathy: That was pretty coincidental how she grabbed
            onto (inaudible).

Patrick: Yeah, there's a lot of lucky things because of
            the...Jan said it was because of the silver
            sword.

Cathy: Yeah.

Patrick: Yeah.

Vikki: Have any of you got anything like the silver
            sword...that you know, you treasure?

Cathy: No...not really.

Vikki: Or that you mums' treasure or something?

Patrick: No, not really...my blanket...I've had...

Vikki: See, I've got a rug - I've got this rug thing
            and when I was a baby I used to call it a bed
            and I've still got it...that's dear to me.

Patrick: Yeah, I've got a little...a pink blanket and
            I've had it since I was one and a half or
            something...

Vikki: Mm, that'd be a bit too big to carry in a tiny
            little wooden box.

Cathy: Yeah.

Cathy: Well, I've got this teddy which is about this
            big...about a foot...for you people up there in
            recorderland (laughter) and...um...its brown
            and when you press its tummy it goes 'yeow'!
            ...sort of like that! And I got it when I was
            one and a half at Christmas or something...
            and it's really nice...

Vikki: Yeah, I had a few things before the cyclone
            too...

Cathy: and its leg came off last year.

Vikki:	Mm, I had...before the cyclone I had these two dogs when I was a baby...singing dogs...they used to sing. And see you pull the baby out from the mother by a cord and it goes in with singing
Patrick:	Yeah?
Vikki:	and this, ah, lullaby and we started since I ...I think I've had it since I was born nearly but the stupid cyclone...
Cathy:	Yeah.
Patrick:	Did you lose a lot of stuff in the cyclone?
Cathy:	Cyclone Tracy.
Cathy:	At least you can blame Tracy for losing it.
Vikki:	Mm.
Patrick:	Did you lose a lot...?
	(Pause)
Vikki:	My friend died too.
Cathy:	Your friend?
Vikki:	Yeah.
Cathy:	Your girl friend...your friend...a little girl?
Vikki:	Mm.
Cathy:	Oh...er that's too bad!
Vikki:	Anyway, should we talk about something...
Patrick:	Yeah!
Cathy:	Oh well...
Patrick:	We should be talking about the book.
Vikki:	Mm...How long did it take you to read?
Patrick:	Took me about...
Cathy:	Took me about three weeks.
Vikki:	Three weeks!

Cathy: I don't know why.

Patrick: Took me about six days...seven days.

Vikki: Oh, I read it quickly.

Cathy: Usually I, usually I read a book in one day.

Vikki: Yeah...I read that...

Cathy: Usually...but I don't know what happened.

Patrick: I read...

Cathy: I'm so slow...I read pretty fast but...

Vikki: I used to be able to read books about...I used
            to read about three books a week...thick ones.

Cathy: Yeah me too.

Vikki: Then T.V. takes up all my time now...

Cathy: Ha...yeah!

Vikki: watching T.V.

            (Pause)

Cathy: It was a good book.

            (Pause)

Patrick: I liked Ludwig and Jan...I liked how he pick-
            pocketed people all the time.

Cathy: Pretty smart.

Patrick: Mmm.

Vikki: Yeah...especially when...remember that um...
            Ivan I think his name was...

Patrick: Oh yeah...that nice man.

Vikki: Yeah. He bought...yeah, he bought some chocolate
            and he said..."I was gonna give you some
            chocolate but..." and Jan lifted it out of his
            pocket.

            (Laughter and "Yeah" together)

Vikki: I don't think I would allow him.

Cathy: Yeah.

Patrick: He was nice, giving them some shoes and all
            that.

Vikki: Yeah.

Patrick: And then how Jan came back with all the lobsters
            and everything. He was stealing food off the
            train.

Vikki: ⌈Yeah.

Cathy: ⌊Yeah.

Patrick: That's when he went to court.

Vikki: That's right, mm.

            (Pause)

Vikki: I, I liked the story about Edik when the...he
            um...rode under that carriage or whatever it
            was.

Patrick: Oh yeah.

Cathy: Oh yeah...no...oh yeah, that was Edik.

Patrick: And, um...Jan didn't believe him.

Cathy: Yeah.

Vikki: No one did.

Cathy: That was the first time he talked for about a
            week.

Vikki: Yeah.

Cathy: How did he get taken away in the first place?

            (Pause)

Vikki: Well he was sick I think. No, um, remember at
            the start of the book it said that...I think
            he was taken away...not for shooting the
            troopers but because he was old enough to go
            in the camp?

Patrick: Oh that's right, yeah, they got him when he
            was um smuggling um...

Vikki: Was he smuggling things?

Cathy: Yeah.

Patrick: He was smuggling a lot of things.

Vikki: Oh.

Vikki: ⌈Oh that's right, yeah.

Cathy: ⌊(inaudible) was it?

Patrick: Yeah there's a picture of him.

Vikki: Yeah, he's smuggling all these things um in a
            coat.

Patrick: Thank you.

Vikki: All this food...in the coat...in the coat or
            something...

Patrick: Yeah. There.

Cathy: Yeah. And then they catch him.

Vikki: ...and then they book him.

Cathy: Is that Edik? I thought it was Jan.

Patrick: No, Jan wasn't there...oh yes he was...but he
            wasn't there then, oh, yes he was. He might
            have been.

Vikki: I don't blame Jan for robbing...all the...
            Germans! I hate Germans!

Cathy: Oh...I hate them too.

Patrick: What do they call them again...um. Nazi.

Vikki: Nazos or...Nazzis.

Patrick: Yeah the Nazis.

Cathy: Nazis. Nazis.

Vikki: Hey there's Jan!

Cathy: Yeah I know. I know there's a picture of him.
            Hello Jan.

Vikki: Mm, gee.

Vikki: ⌈They grew up pretty quickly.

Cathy: ⌊Jan. That's a funny name for a boy...uh!

Patrick: They grew up pretty quickly.

Vikki: Oh well...you know...the book, the book couldn't
            go on for a...

| Cathy: | ⌈Years and years. |
| Vikki: | ⌊Years and years. |

(Laughter)

Vikki:	We'll be living for years and years too.
Cathy:	Yeah.
Vikki:	Yeah I like that kind of book that does...that has a bit of detail but not too much. You know that one we're reading now um...what's it called..."Climb a Lonely Hill", that's got a bit too much detail.
Patrick:	I think it's too boring.
Patrick:	⌈Yeah.
Vikki:	⌊Yeah.
Patrick:	Because I think they stay on one thing.
Vikki:	Yeah, and it gets too boring.
Vikki:	Yeah, too much detail. That's what I don't have in my stories.
Patrick:	I think 'The Silver Sword's'better than 'Sounder'.
Cathy:	I reckon the names in this book are a bit funny.
Vikki:	Well they're um...
Cathy:	I mean (inaudiable) is a bit funny.
Vikki:	Well they are Polish names.
Cathy:	I know...but made up because it says:

'Note:. Imag...Imaginary names have been given
to a few of the places mentioned in this book.
They are the villages of...the villages of
Boding and Kolina, the River Falken and the
town of Falkenburg and the prison camp of
Zakyna. All other places names are real and
can be found on the map of Europe. The
description...the description of the Red Army
on the march is based on eye-witness accounts
in J. Stransky's 'East Wind Over Prague'.

Patrick: I'll give you fifty seconds and then we're
           gonna go...Are we finished?

Vikki: Not much else to say.

Patrick: I'll go get him.

Vikki: Pardon?

Patrick: Shall I go get him? Tell him that we've
           finished?

Vikki: O.K....we better turn it off first.

Class: I

Date   3rd November 1976

Novel: 'Climb A Lonely Hill'

Participants: Anna, Paul Vogel,
                          Philip, Kerry

Anna: I don't think...I don't think that um, oh I
                don't think children would act that way
                really because oh, it's oh, I just don't think
                so because well they sort of do so much and
                besides a big um waterbag and things would be
                simply awfully heavy. You couldn't do that
                much every day. I mean that the author's
                sort of put in more than really could have
                happened.

Philip: No...yes.

Paul: And Jack...

Paul: But they went a mile in about four hours.
                That's good.

Anna: Yes.

Paul: They must've been pretty weak...

Philip: Yeah.

Paul: they must've been pretty weak because Jack
                had to use a bullet, you know, to kill one
                lizard,

Paul: so you know,

Kerry: Oh, I didn't like that bit much.

Paul: He didn't want to use a stone or squash it
                because all the guts sort of got, yuh!

Anna: Well what did he kill?

Paul: The um, a lizard.

Philip: A lizard.

Kerry: A lizard,

Kerry: a little lizard.

Anna: Well. We'd have to survive somehow.

Kerry: It would be better...Oh well, it depends how
                hard he would have hit the lizard because if
                he hit it only very softly then it would have
                just died in agony instead of its being
                certainly dead.

Anna: Still with a bullet there's always a mess but
                like if it's one of these really, I mean I
                suppose they had to survive but still they
                didn't have all that many cartridges and
                also, um...

Philip: They did have that many cartridges.

Paul: It had a very strange ending, ending like,
              'Let's have a, um, swim to celebrate'.
              They are going to get help to swim to
              celebrate. Didn't tell you if they're
              really going to get rescued...or not.

Anna: I didn't think that way.

Philip: But they would've.

Paul: Mm.

Paul: And also...

Philip: They could have just kept on living there for
              years and years if they didn't.

Kerry: (inaudible aside in background).

Paul: That was bad also because um...they just left
              Uncle Bert to rot in a car. In his car got
              (inaudible). Just imagine if you walked and
              looked in the window and here's this all
              rotted thing

Kerry: Oh, er!

Paul: in the front of the steering wheel.

Kerry: That'd be really awful.

Anna: Yeah, yuk!

Kerry: The way the boy had to put his hand on the,

Kerry: ⌈on the

Anna: ⌊Yeah.

Kerry: the, um...Oh, don't you know that part?

Paul: Mm?

Kerry: Do you know when the man...? That was when
              Uncle Bert's hand just went under the car and
              he had to touch it and picked it up and put
              it on their leg.

Anna: Oh, yuk. Hate doing that.

              (inaudible murmur).

Kerry: He didn't feel all that bad

Kerry:	⌈after he touched it.
Paul:	⌊The beginning sort of tells
Paul:	a bit of the story which is coming later on.
Anna:	What's that?
Kerry:	What's that?
Paul:	Well like...um...Jack opened his eyes, oh, he thought he saw snow and all the glass was smashed.
Anna:	Yeah.
Paul:	That's sort of telling
Kerry:	Yeah.
Paul:	what's happening a bit later on.
Kerry:	Yeah, and the last bit - got out of the car and Jack pulls, um, uncle back to the, um...
Anna:	Yeah, I know. Yuk. ...But poor Sue, imagine being in the car while she thought both of them were dead.
Paul:	And you'd only been left there all alone. You have to survive.
Anna:	And then she had to get bitten by that bull-ant and you know, she had to drag her foot all the time.
Philip:	It was swollen.
Anna:	I mean, really going to a desert is bad enough just by itself without your foot being swollen, but still
Kerry:	I couldn't...
Paul:	They were lucky that, that they found water, um...
Anna:	They did?
Philip:	They did?
Kerry:	Yeah, they did.
Anna:	Oh.
Paul:	Up in, up in the hills.

Anna:	Oh that's right. Well they said 'We're going to have a swim to celebrate', so I suppose they had to. Couldn't really swim
Anna:	if
Kerry:	No,
Kerry:	no, that wasn't it. They had to, they went to the first mountain and they went to bits of rock and then they found where it was and ducks at the other end of it...
Paul:	What about when they ran, run out of water about (inaudible), hm.
	(pause)
Paul:	Oh, I think I've run out of ideas.
Kerry:	You just look at the cover and that gives you many ideas.
Philip:	And they would've gone, they wouln't've, like you know how they, you'd sit and think usually that you'd get so scared that you wouldn't do it would you?
Paul:	Yeah.
Philip:	Yeah but they would've. You know why? 'Cause they didn't have a mother or father or anything. They just had a father but they didn't like him too much.
Others:	Yeah.
Paul:	Because of, because I think the town called him a, you know, drunk.
Philip:	He is. He was the drunk, the town drunk.
Kerry:	With the ballet.
Paul:	Drunk.
Kerry:	What a holiday they had.
Anna:	Yeah, what a holiday.
Paul:	It was just horrible.
Anna:	Hey, did they ever mention their father again? I don't think they did.
Kerry:	No they didn't say anything more about him.

Anna: It was a pest that you know, he was a
         drunkard. Wouldn't it be awful having a..

Anna: ⎡drunk father.

Kerry: ⎢drunk father.

Paul: ⎣drunk father.

Anna: Everybody would say 'Oh you, you know, you
         steal, you lie, bla bla'

Paul: Mm.

Anna: just because your father's drunk when you,
         really you're often more responsible and
         things much more than other children are
         because you've got a whole lot more things to
         worry about, haven't you?

Kerry: Yeah.

Anna: Like I mean it would have been dreadful having..
         Like I mean I suppose they could've, they must've
         done something to their father, he obviously
         wasn't, um he was sober sometimes.

· Paul: Mm.

Anna: How the devil they stopped him drinking.
         Imagine having to hide the money just to,
         you know...

Kerry: Yeah, so he wouldn't go spend it.

Paul: And also that, um, crow going to pick out
         his eyes.

Anna: Oh, yuk. Shoosh!

Kerry: No that, they were talking about

Paul: Yeah.

Kerry: Sue was thinking about lambs and they were
         lambs' eyes.

Paul: Yeah lamb's eyes and singed corpses and things
         you know and crows tapping and that so Jack
         had to wind up the windows.

Philip: Mm. But he would've looked. God that would
         be really painful carrying all that food and
         all the...

Paul:	Yeah, gun over your shoulder.
Paul:	Gun over your shoulder.
Anna:	See, um,

Anna: yeah because not only like if, if they had plenty of water and they just had to get there, they still had plenty of water and of food and stuff well then it wouldn't have been so bad because they could've taken a year if they'd liked but they didn't, you know, they had to get there.

Paul: When they got to the water hole they could've survived there for a long time like, they probably had lots of cartridges but then the head, Jack made a sling to, um, to kill some, um...to kill some birds. Once he shot a duck I think it was and they ate, they ate that and just chopped it up. ... It must have been a big job to keep the fire going all the time.

Anna: Imagine fourteen matches.

Paul: Mm.

Philip: Yeah.

Anna: Still you don't think that

Paul: It would be bad, you know, taking it in turns to watch the fire and if it goes out you've got no more chances, you can't have any more, you know, water and stuff. I mean hotted tea or cook anything.

Anna: Remember, you know, when they had their last big meal and they just took everything they wouldn't take with them and ate most of it or ate quite a bit.

Philip: Yeah, it was bad that they had to drink his, he was going to drink his, you know

Kerry: Yeah.

Paul: his own water?

Philip: Yeah.

Anna: What water?

Kerry: No, Jack

(Laughter).

Anna:	What?
Kerry:	Finish it off.
Anna:	Oh, yes.
Kerry:	I think
Paul:	He sniffed it and, er
Anna:	What? He smelled his
Kerry:	He (inaudible)
Anna:	What?
Kerry:	...poured it onto the ground.
Anna:	What?
Paul:	His own water.
Anna:	Eh?
Kerry:	Don't you get it? Don't you know?
Anna:	I think I do get it. I haven't read it but I think I get it.
Kerry:	The aborigines used to get...the aborigines did.
Anna:	Yuk. (laughs) Do you mean his, um, well... bluck!
Paul:	Yeah.
Anna:	Yuk.
Kerry:	I wouldn't.
Anna:	No, I wouldn't. They had to drink...um.
Paul:	It would be hard to survive 'cause all the heat and they had no sort of hats on so they could probably get headaches easily. (Pause) They were lucky that they found such a big cave for their
Anna:	Yes, I know, home.
Paul:	home,
Kerry:	Yeah.
Paul:	And that, um, pond, that big pool must have been very deep

Philip: Yeah.

Kerry: Yeah.

Paul: 'Cause Jack, Jack said he couldn't touch the
            bottom.

Kerry: It depends. If he's as small as that, then
            you know

Philip: Yes, small as an inch.

Anna: It depends how big Jack was.

Kerry: Yeah. How big (laughter) was Jack?

Anna: Like I mean it might have just been, it might
            have just been a few inches and one more inch
            and he just couldn't quite make it.

Kerry: Yeah.

Anna: If it's a wooden one it's not been all that
            big really. Deeper than him but, wow.

Paul: I don't think they said that the, um, pond
            had any fish in it did it?

Kerry: No...No. Well, it wouldn't because fish
            wouldn't live that far out.

Paul: Well, I don't think they wanted to jump in
            the water with any fish.

Kerry: Oh, well, I mean it wouldn't really matter.
            If there was a whole crowd then I'm not sure
            that you'd even get in.

Anna: It seems as if

Paul: A lot of that story

Paul: sort of takes place in Australia.

Kerry: Yeah. It does say it. It says it on the
            back. Oh there..

Paul: Mm...Must of been sort of bush inland because
            its pretty, you know

Philip: Yeah, it was pretty bushy but

Paul: But you get pretty bush places down here I
            guess.

Philip: Yeah. It was...like...they didn't get any
            illusions did they?

Anna: No. Usually that's one thing.

Kerry: I know 'cause the heat.

Anna: That's one thing that's sort of made up a bit because usually, practically always in the desert you get illusions if you've been out.

Paul: ⌈Yeah,

Philip: ⌊Yeah, mm.

Paul: kind of in a T.V. program Abbott and Costello...

Anna: ⌈Yeah, 'The Evil Eye'. In this thing called 'the Evil Eye'

Paul: ⌊All the great, um, cheap restaurants and a,

Paul: um cans out there and he'd go out and pick up all the sand and he'd go...and he'd go, blaa!

Anna: Oh yuk. But also it was lucky that their mountains weren't an illusion because often, very very often, people see the mountains way off and they think, 'Oh gee, well this is high up we'll get some water up there' but its just an illusion.

Paul: It'd be bad on a cliff...

Kerry: But they knew the mountains were there.

Anna: Oh that's right, yeah.

Paul: It would be bad if you were on a cliff and you see um, oh um...water...out in nowhere and you go out for it...

Anna: and jump.

Paul: Ah! Ah! Or you jump into the water.

Anna: True.

Kerry: You fall.

Anna: Oh well.

Paul: They must've sort of made a hole in their cave or something to keep the smoke out unless

Kerry: Yeah.

Paul: I don't think the fire could have been out in the open because if it rained

Philip:	Yeah, just, yeah
Paul:	Yes, that's right.
Anna:	But still if it rained that would've been better. Yeah, I mean even if the fire had gone out it still would've been pretty good though because they could've got water you know. It would have been good.
Paul:	Some parts in the story are pretty rude.
Anna:	Are they? (laughter) I'm not up to those parts yet.
Kerry:	Yes you have Anna.
Anna:	Have I? Well, what part was it?
Kerry:	Oh...in the story.
Anna:	Look I know you, you know.
Paul:	Philip knows, don't you?
Philip:	What?
Paul:	Some parts of the story were very rude.
Philip:	Yeah.
Kerry:	Oh you know.
Anna:	Ha...quiet.
Anna:	⌈No I don't honestly.
Paul:	⌊His beer all frothed,
Paul:	his beer...happened to be that.
Anna:	Oh yes I know.
Kerry:	Good.
Anna:	I just realised it. They were still...drink it...
Kerry:	They didn't drink it. They didn't drink it.
Paul:	But, no, um, ah.
Kerry:	They probably didn't even try.
Anna:	What?

Kerry:	To say well - 'I felt, I drank Len's beers'.
Paul:	No. But drinking hot beer
Kerry:	I know.
Paul:	wouldn't they have been pretty,
Paul:	⌈you know,
Philip:	⌊And,
Philip:	you know a bit drunk to..
Paul:	drunk out there walking all through the, through the bush...er.
Kerry:	(inaudible)
	(Pause)
Paul:	Umm.
Anna:	Oh, by the way, did thing-me-bob's foot get better?
Others:	Yes.
Anna:	Oh, yeah, good.
Philip:	Yes.
Paul:	You mean Jack or...
Anna:	Mm.
Paul:	Must've been, they must've had pretty good vegetation out there.
Anna:	Yeah, I know, you could never of cooked. I mean nobody can...it's O.K. But nobody can live with just anything to eat.
Kerry:	⌈eat.
Paul:	⌊Just
Paul:	practically impossible to live out there for...
Anna:	Well, the convicts when they were, um, when they were going to be hanged...Wouldn't it be awful being a convict in this place, you know, where they've all got very old, um,
Anna:	⌈cellar thing
Paul:	⌊And also had a man, um

Anna: any,anyway they used to be fed on bread.
No not bread, just something and water and
often they died just...

Paul: Yeah, like all their bones. I heard it on,
I heard it on, I watched Peach's Australia,
um, National, National Parks he talked about
and they had an island called 'The Island of
the Dead' and there were um, something like
16,000 convict graves and only 16,000 just
convict dead there and only about 100 were
ever, you know, old people.

Anna: How the devil did, how the devil did they
die?

Paul: Ah, suppose they just all fall like

Kerry: Oh yuk!

Anna: If you've ever seen 'Great Expectations' um,
I don't know some book. No, no, it's a
book by Charles Dickens.

Kerry: Oh yeah.

Anna: And anyway, um well, there's a convict and
he, smuggled a boy because he, um, he wants
food. In the graveyard the boy can go and
um, you know, just sort of trade these dead
clothes and the convict tried to make money,
smuggled him in and 'you get me food tonight
at midnight'. And anyway, finally and then
somebody um wrestles with the convict and
makes a scar on his face and the convict was,
and the convict somehow or other escapes, the
one who smuggled the boy, and they later, just
a few days later, the convict apparently got
into a strange crowd I don't know what, how

Kerry: Oh yeah.

Anna: months later and somebody knocks on the door
and says to the boy, 'Here is, ah, twelve
guineas, go and, um, you're to go into London
and become a gentleman, bla bla bla' and then
he finds out in the end that the convict had
been secretly sending 'im, him this money
because he'd got a, um,

Paul: food.

Anna: Oh, yeah, he was in Australia and he was a
very wealthy man and he had a great big sheep
station and he, you know,

Paul: The convict?

Anna:	Yeah, the convict who'd escaped and once he was off England's shore he couldn't be caught. Once he was a mile off the shore, you know, he couldn't, nobody, he couldn't be accused as a convict
Paul:	Mm.
Kerry:	Mm.
Anna:	so...
Paul:	Also this man that they were going to hang him. They gave him a choice, he could either be hanged or become the, um, person who chops off human heads.
Philip:	Yeah.
Paul:	And that would be a very bad job for someone so and he didn't want to die so he got the job.
Anna:	Oh yuk I'd rather die.
Paul:	And no one talked to him because you know he, he executed and also pulled the lever and the floor would just disappear and you'd be left to hang there dead...
Others:	(Murmers of dismay)
Paul:	So they said...
Philip:	Yeah, imagine being an executor.
Kerry:	Oh, wouldn't it be an awful job.
Paul:	They don't talk of too many wild animals in 'Climb A Lonely Hill'. I mean like...
Anna:	Yeah.
Philip:	No.
Kerry:	There wouldn't have been,
Anna:	There wouldn't have been in the middle of the desert for heaven's sakes.
Kerry:	Oh, no, it wasn't desert.
Anna:	Oh well what was it? You know out, out in the bush. O.K. well...but there wouldn't have been.
Kerry:	Wasn't bush.

Philip: Yes there was. There would have been lots of animals. 'Cause what about all the animals that...

Anna: Oh yes, I know, but there wouldn't have been, um, like

Philip: I mean like...

Paul: There would have been dingoes for example.

Anna: [There wouldn't have been.

Philip: [There was.

Philip: There were dingoes and stuff but they

Anna: Oh, yeah, but they weren't really...

Paul: They were lucky they didn't really have the (inaudible).

Philip : But there were there.

Anna: In, look in Lagos and places like that where it's lovely, it's moist and things there are many, many more animals,

Anna: [yeah, well

Kerry: [Yeah because

Kerry: there's more water and more food.

Anna: Yeah that's what I mean. Yeah, well.

Kerry: Yeah. Oh, well.

Paul: They probably could have found some sort of a plant which contained water and if the creek dried up or something.

Anna: If they had dug, probably if they'd dug and dug and dug and dug and dug they would have found something or it would have been lovely and cool just... They could've um somehow or other got a stick or something and on it they would've spent days but they could've dug a, sort of a thing in the ground and you know, you know its lovely and cool down under the sand,

Paul: Mm.

Anna: whatever it was um, you know, dry dust.

Paul: Yes you go under about on the beach when you reach the shore-lines.

Anna:	Yeah I know.
Kerry:	But it might cave in and or...
Anna:	Oh yes.
Kerry:	You'd never get out again once you fall in. It's too deep.
Anna:	Oh well.
Kerry:	Plus it wouldn't be very strong. I mean...
Paul:	Like when you dig at the beach, the walls, you know the water sort of cuts in and that's like sand.
Kerry:	Yeah, I know what he's talking about.
Anna:	Yes but don't forget they wouldn't
Kerry:	Yeah, then it goes up like that then it starts going downwards.
Anna:	Yeah.
Paul:	But if the did this with mud, the mud could've hardened.
Anna:	Yes....Oh well. Oh well, they might've, they could've put banks on top of it.
Kerry:	Oh well. As long as they were
Kerry:	⌈(inaudible)
Paul:	⌊And even if they did
Paul:	do this and they got water from the creek and they only put mud around the side it probably would've, um, just evaporated at the bottom, just gone straight, you know, disappeared.
Philip:	Trying to clean your teeth with clay in your teeth all day.
Anna:	How vile.
Kerry:	You get a finger and you put a blob of ah, you put a little
Kerry:	⌈put a bit of mud
Paul:	⌊You stick wood

Kerry: and you go, ah!

Paul: You stick wood into your fingers

Anna: and it gets, um, and (laughter) go ah.

Philip: You know what they should've ate? They should've ate the charcoal. That makes your teeth feel good. They open

Philip: ⌈open

Paul: ⌊He ate,

Paul: he ate charcoal.

Philip: and your teeth get strong.

Paul: ⌈And get a bit of charcoal and put it on your teeth and they go all black.

Kerry: ⌊Yeah, but if you eat your toast you eat charcoal.

Anna: Did you actually eat charcoal once?

Paul: Yeah.

Anna: Yuk.

Philip: You put charcoal on your teeth, you go like this, you go, you put charcoal on your teeth and you go...wash it.

Kerry: Yes, my mother's going to get me some of that spearmint stuff to get all the

Paul: Well, I'd rather sort of...um...just go and bread, bread and butter and some sort of spread going all the way out there.

            (Pause)

Anna: ⌈By the way tape recorder

Paul: ⌊That could have

Anna: all the other noise you are hearing there are not us. O.K.? (laughter)

Kerry: (inaudible)

Anna: Yeah, I know but yes, well, I had to tell Mr. Williams that all the noise

Paul: And um...um it was, also...it was sort of, it was just plain luck that that plane came.

Philip: And also when you were, it said how they got rescued.

Kerry: Yeah, a plane came. You know when...

Paul: And they raised sort of smoke and he took off his shirt and waved it and it swerved and it circled around and went back and then Jack said 'Let's celebrate', oh, 'Let's have a swim and celebrate, they're going back to get help'.

Anna: Yeah. Anyway, um but it's very lucky, you see when you know how when you eat, um, wild kangaroo and bird or something

Anna: ⌈and

Philip: ⌊It could

Philip: have grubs or something.

Anna: Well, not only that it has, um, sometimes paraginites or something, um, I don't know. It's something that if you swallow it, it I don't know, it's a germ that eats the insides of you and you just can't stop it. There isn't a drug, you just can't get

Anna: ⌈rid of it

Paul: ⌊You're large,

Paul: you're wearing a shirt and you go to bed and in the morning there's only your shirt left.

(laughter)

Anna: No, it takes about a month but still, it takes quite a long time but still you just can't get rid of it and, you know, you're going to die someday because you're half eaten.

Paul: Wouldn't it be bad if it just wouldn't eat your skin here but it would eat all inside and there'd only be you no

Paul: ⌈bone just all the skin and no eyes.

Kerry: ⌊You wouldn't be alive.

Paul: You'd just be walking.

Kerry: No, you wouldn't even be walking you wouldn't,
            you wouldn't, you wouldn't be alive if all
            your bones were gone.

Paul: Well just say you could walk, walk, then
            you'd see the strange...

Kerry: You'd be a zombie.

Philip: You couldn't, you couldn't walk if you didn't
            have any bones, you'd just collapse.

Kerry: Yeah.

Philip: You'd just sort of be a mop of skin.

Anna: Well, just say you could live.

Anna: ⌈I couldn't pick up this,

Philip: ⌊You could live,

Philip: you could live except you'd

Anna: I can't even pick up this book with my hand.

Philip: You could live except

            (laughing - inaudible)

Kerry: Let's stop now? What's the time?

Paul: And also, um

            (Pause)

Paul: Oh, what can I talk about now? And, like they
            were sort of primitive because like getting
            um, a shirt or something and putting it on
            your head and lying down, um you know, to go
            to sleep and digging a hole in...you know to
            lie down

Anna: Yeah.

Paul: for the night....You could've just covered
            yourself with dirt but if it rained, um,

Anna: Er! Oh well.

Paul: all the mud.

Philip: Yeah, you'd get all hardened. But if it did
            harden you probably wouldn't be able to get
            out. You're just lying there

Anna: Yeah. Imagine,this has happened before.
               People have, um, been in a deadly faint and
               they're put into the coffin, you know, and the
               lid's put on and nailed down and in the ground
               and um...I don't know, some people just before
               they have been put, are about to be buried, they
               sort of...oh, I don't know, knock on the
               coffin, 'Agh. Let me out of here' sometimes.

               (Laughter)

Paul: Once I read in the newspaper once the wrong
               person was cremated. A live person was
               burned.

Anna: By accident you mean?

Philip: Yeah.

Anna: Oh gee.

Paul: [alive and,

Philip: [What about this,

Philip: [listen to this, this is a story.

Paul: [and they open up another coffin

Paul: and here was the dead man and, you know, they
               found out and, oh, they were really sad.

Paul: You listen to this. There are these two guys
               and they're, they're, they're the people that,
               ah, bury the, all graves, the coffin thing.
               They're at a funeral place, and ah, one day
               they were burying someone.

Kerry: Yeah.

Philip: and the man saw a um, one of the two men one
               of the men saw the ring on it and saw it was
               really good and they buried him and that night
               he dug him up, this guy and took the ring off
               him...and then

Paul: Yeah be about the only way.

Philip: all this for a ring and the other person saw
               the ring and saw that it was from him.

Paul: So what did he do?

               (Pause)

Philip: This is what he did. He quickly he got his fingers down when the guy wasn't looking and got his, got a chisel and a hammer and the fingers, and goes shoh and goes slitting across the slippery...all the blood coming out, you know, with the finger off and then, um, he was in so much pain that the guy fainted.

Anna: Yeah.

Philip: And then he woke up and he was, he was in a coffin and he looked up and went and he looked up and went to bang but he quickly backed away because all his fingers had been, um, chopped off.

Anna: Ugh.

Philip: And he goes to yell and he, nothing comes out because he'd chopped the tongue off.

(Laughter)

Anna: But I can scream without my tongue.

Paul: But he could knock on it with his toe.

Philip: I know, but he was obviously

Paul: He could've, he could've gone like this.

Philip: O.K. he could've except it wouldn't have been loud enough or

Kerry: How can you hear under the ground, really?

Philip: You can.

Anna: How the devil. How the devil would they know? He wouldn't know whether he was in the ground or up in the crematorium. He wouldn't know if he was under the ground.

Paul: ⌈Probably...

Philip: ⌊But he found

Philip: himself in a coffin so he knew I suppose.

Anna: But how the devil did he know he was under the ground? Like I mean there is a...what a row...

Philip: O.K. that doesn't make any difference.

Anna: No. Anyway...

Philip: All this just because of a ring.

Kerry: ⌈There usually is

Paul: ⌊Wouldn't it be bad

Paul: if only head and hair, all your legs and that were chopped off and all your arms. Only your body and your head, you couldn't do anything, you could just sort of

Paul: ⌈lie there.

Anna: ⌊Well there is a man

Paul: ⌈It would be terrible, blah!

Anna: ⌊a, ah, a postman

Anna: in Waverton and he's got his legs chopped off up to there. I don't know if he was born like that or there was a car accident or something.

Paul: Is he old?

Anna: Yeah, fairly.

Paul: He could've been in the war and had them sort of blasted off.

Anna: Something like that, yeah.

Anna: ⌈But anyway

Kerry: ⌊But he's had

Kerry: his arms off too or he has one and he has

Kerry: ⌈stumps and that

Anna: ⌊He can get around really quickly.

Kerry: You walk on these little things and just walk along like that.

(laughter)

Philip: Jack must've, um, they only had one sort of pair of clothes.

Others: Yeah.

Philip: To go out and they probably would have to have a few because they would've all worn out sort of doing all the climbing and

Philip: No, but they didn't have any, they only had the one pair they bought.

Kerry: Oh.

Philip: Yeah, but they would've got worn out a bit. Too hot and (inaudible)

(Intervention by experimenter)

Class: II

Date: 3rd October 1976

Novel: 'The Silver Sword'

Participants: Madeleine, Patricia,
                      Michael, Gregor

Patricia: In this story which character appealed to you most?

Michael: Well, that's a hard topic because all the characters had good parts and it's...it's

Michael: ⌈really hard.

Gregor: ⌊I, I think

Gregor: their father had the most to do,

Gregor: ⌈I really

Michael: ⌊No,

Michael: I don't think their father because...

Patricia: Jan.

Madeleine: Jan.

Patricia: ⌈Yeah Jan.

Madeleine: ⌊Jan.

Patricia: I think, I think

Michael: No, I think.

Michael: I think it was..

Madeleine: No, Edek.

Gregor: Joseph.

Madeleine: ⌈I think it was.

Patricia: ⌊Ruth.

Michael: ⌈Yeah, I think it was Ruth.

Gregor: ⌊Yeah, I think it was Ruth.

Michael: Yeah, because Ruth was the one...because

Michael: ⌈she was a mother to them.

Gregor: ⌊she had to look after the children.

Michael: Was she the oldest?

Madeleine: Yeah.

Patricia: Yes.

Michael: ⌈(inaudible)

Patricia: ⌊What was it

Patricia: about her that appealed to you? I reckon
it's just that she played Mum to 'em, she was
kind to them, she...

Gregor: ⌈She played teacher.

Michael: ⌊Yeah, she never put herself

Michael: first, she always put the others first.

Patricia: Yeah...yeah.

· Michael: But all the others did play another part
apart from...

Patricia: ⌈Jan.

Michael: ⌊Jan

Michael: provided their food most of the time,

Michael: ⌈most of the time.

Patricia: ⌊He,

Patricia: he stole to keep them alive.

Gregor: He took it.

Michael: He, he did...he secured them, but I, I think
Ruth was the most important character.

Michael: ⌈She was about the most feeling one.

Gregor: ⌊She looked after them.

Patricia: Yeah...some of the soldiers were all right,
but oh,

Michael: Yeah.

Gregor: ⌈Ivan was all right.

Michael: ⌊I think it's...

Michael: ⌈was sad the way

Gregor: ⌊Ivan helped them.

Michael: they had to fight their way through and they
             had to go through the river just so they
             couldn't be picked up by the...

Patricia: Russians and Americans.

Michael: Yeah.

Gregor: The Yanks.

Patricia: 'Whom did you dislike?'

Michael: Ahh.

Madeleine: Captain What's-his-name.

Michael: I disliked the burgomaster.

Patricia: Yeah, yeah.

Michael: The burgo-master (laughter).

Patricia: Oh, yeah, I think that was...oh...I just, I
             know some of the characters I didn't really
             like, like when the guy people who caught
             Jan stealing you know when the railway

Michael: Oh, but oh

Madeleine: Captain Greenway.

Michael: But I don't really think it was their fault
             because Jan had to steal

Michael: ⌈to, to keep them alive

Gregor: ⌊Yeah, to keep himself alive.

Michael: because if he didn't steal, you know

Gregor: he'd die.

Michael: Yeah...and, and I think, but, Jan didn't
             really do that much because for a few years
             Edek was taken away until they found him
             again.

Patricia: Yeah. So really I reckon it's...it's the
             burgomaster...and other people. You know it's
             ...

Gregor: What's the next sentence?

Michael: 'Whom did you dislike?'...Ah. 'Let's imagine
             that Sydney was invaded in a large war'.

Patricia: Oh I

Michael: 'What things would be the most precious to us?'

Patricia: Food.

Gregor: Education.

Michael: Uh, uh, not education.

Patricia: You wouldn't.

Michael: If, if you were going to...you'd have to
              survive yourself.

Michael: ⎡You wouldn't say

Gregor: ⎣No I wouldn't say school.

Michael: you wouldn't walk right in the middle of the
              war and say 'I'm going to school', would you?
              Ah, ah I think I'd rather stay with my
              family than...

Madeleine: Yeah stick together. But see

Michael: ⎡but, but

Patricia: ⎣Yeah, yeah

Madeleine: It's hard, like in this story our parents
              might split up if there was a war.

Michael: But I think it's really his father's fault
              because he, they, he, I think he split them
              up really because he turned the photo around
              and that's when the person saw him,

Michael: ⎡and that's when he was

Gregor: ⎣Yeah! turned Hitler's face to the wall.

Patricia: Yeah, yeah, it was, it was, a dobber who put
              him in really. It wasn't actually his
              father's fault in a way, because they didn't
              like Hitler so if you don't like a person you
              don't obey all his rules.

Michael: Yes, I know, but I mean I would rather have
              done obey the rules even if I didn't like them,

Madeleine: Mm.

Michael: than had, than be split up from my family.

Madeleine: Hmm.

Patricia: Yeah. Really if Sydney was in a war I'd rather go for food.

Gregor: And water.

Michael: Yeah, well and I think shelter.

Michael: ⌈But you know

Gregor: ⌊Shelter would be pretty important.

Michael: but I, I couldn't picture a war in Sydney, because I don't think I could picture some tankers going down Pacific Highway, fir, firing away.

Patricia: Mm.

Michael: It's just hard to picture.

Patricia: Yeah, yeah, anyway we'd have people saving us.

Gregor: Two battleships coming into Sydney Harbour.

(Laughter)

Madeleine: Yeah, but...

Michael: Yeah, that would be very mad.

Patricia: No, but

Michael: You know. Can you imagine the harbour bridge flying up in the air.

Patricia: No, but...

Madeleine: And how about Australia

Madeleine: ⌈Square?

Michael: ⌊Square?

Patricia: No, but...no but if...No really if, well if any war ships come in through Sydney Harbour we could fire at them because you know

Patricia: ⌈how it's run.

Michael: ⌊We're not really

Michael: that bad off.

Patricia: Yeah. No, not really because with all the allies we've got.

Michael:	Yeah, what about China's fourteen million army, they come through bursting in Australia and...
Patricia:	No, it really is, is Swiss, the Swiss are well off.
Gregor:	There's still the remains of those things around Palm Beach, going up the Hawkesbury River.
Patricia:	Thw Swiss,
Patricia:	the Swiss are really well off.
Gregor:	(inaudible)
Gregor:	They're all camouflaged around the front of the water to keep them away.
Michael:	Yeah.
Patricia:	Yeah...All the men in Switzerland are in the army unless they're too old or too young. So Switzerland are really well off.
Michael:	The next question is 'What things would the most, what things would most, would be most precious to us?'
Gregor:	Food.
Patricia:	And water.
Michael:	Yeah, and our family.
Madeleine:	Yeah and shelter.
Gregor:	Ah, ah, shelter.
Michael:	I think it comes first even if I did be, even if I was split up
Michael:	I think I, I
Gregor:	I think food would come first.
Michael:	Yeah I would try...yeah food would come first but even if I did get split up I hope I didn't, I hope I would meet my family in the end
Patricia:	Yeah.
Michael:	like this story did.
Patricia:	Yeah, boy, even especially if you were a single child.

Michael: ⌈How could we...

Gregor: ⌊A different one.

Michael: 'What would be some of the problems be?
              How could we deal with them?'

Patricia: How could we deal with them?

Madeleine: Well, we'd have to deal with some of them
              like Ruth, Edek and Jan. Bronia did too.

Patricia: And they really dealt, dealt with them. They

Patricia: ⌈they knew what to do.

Michael: ⌊They dealt with

Michael: them not saying 'I can't do this, I can't
              do this', and give up.

Madeleine: They didn't give in.

Patricia: Yeah,

Patricia: ⌈yeah they didn't,

Michael: ⌊even if it was

Michael: very grim, especially Edek when he was so sick
              and everything and he pulled through...
              easily.

Patricia: I think in a way they were a bit, much better
              off...not much better off but they were a bit
              better off because they've got all these
              countries to go through

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: you know, and we, we've only got one big mass
              of land.

Michael: Yeah and we'd have to go through water
              really

Patricia: and Nullabor Plains and all that.

Michael: Oh, yeah.

Patricia: They're much better off for one reason because
              they can go through countries that are
              protected and they've got other people to look
              after them when they run into houses and
              things like that.

Michael:	⌈Yeah.
Gregor:	⌊Yeah.

Gregor: but they've got, they speak different languages in different places.

Michael:	⌈Yeah, but I mean...
Patricia:	⌊Yeah, but most,

Patricia: um, Europeans know how to talk in other languages.

Michael: Yeah.

Gregor: It would be strange to walk into another part of your country and they speak a different language.

(Laughter)

Michael: Yeah, yeah, that would be funny you walk into Western Australia 'Hello'. (Chinese intonation)

(Laughter)

Patricia: In Ja..ah...in some countries there's two types of peoples so...

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: Czechs and Slovacs in Czechoslovakia.

Gregor: Slovacs...(pause) 'What do you think courage is?'.

Patricia: Courage?

Michael: Well, that's a good question. I think courage is, trying er, you know er...

Gregor: Don't give up. Keep on going.

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: Keep on going like Ruth.

Michael: Nevertheless, because even though they were separated you know they didn't say 'Oh, I've lost my mother' and Ruth was very young.

Gregor: Mm (inaudible).

Michael: I don't think I would have been able to cope
             that way if I was only thirteen.

Patricia: Yeah.

Madeleine: Yeah, Ruth she decided there, if they were
             going to split up. They knew there was a war
             coming.

Michael: And, yeah.

Madeleine: And they were going to split up, they head
             for Switzerland.

Michael: And they found Edek. Yeah, if they were going
             to have a war I think we should have a meeting
             place.

Patricia: Yeah.

Michael: Because if you don't have a meeting place
             someone could be in Scandinavia while the
             others were in South America or somewhere.
             You'd never find them even if, even with the
             I.T.S., the International Tracing Service.

Patricia: Sometimes I think that wars are stupid,

Patricia: ⌈really stupid.
Michael: ⌊Yeah.

Patricia: ⌈They don't achieve nothing,
Michael: ⌊The wars

Patricia: achieve nothing.

Michael: ⌈All that happens is bloodshed.
Gregor: ⌊They just need it to,

Gregor: to get more country.

Patricia: Yeah, get more country.

Patricia: What's the use of getting

Patricia: ⌈more country?
Michael: ⌊more country?

Michael: It, it, look, why would anybody else want more
             country? I think the only country which would
             want more land would be China.

Patricia: Japan.

Michael: China and Japan, yeah because China has eighty million and increasing rapidly.

Patricia: Yeah, I think it's reall...war, war doesn't solve anything. Like Hitler he didn't, he just wanted good for his country and he turned out to be bad.

Michael: And he died in the end.

Patricia: Yeah, he died and he was wanted for many things.

Gregor: I think he got shot in the end.

Michael: No, he wasn't...

Michael: ⌈Oh, well,

Gregor: ⌊Yeah.

Michael: I heard the story that...

Patricia: I'm glad he's dead anyway.

Michael: Yeah. Well he would be alive now.

Patricia: Well, I'm still glad he's dead.

Gregor: Well, actually I think he got shot. He went mad.

Michael: I wish that, mm, some places like Russia and that...I wish countries could all be friends instead of arguing and that.

Patricia: Yeah, argue, argue, like the

Patricia: ⌈Americans and Russians.

Michael: ⌊And it's not as if

Michael: the people of the countries argue, it's the main presidents. They're like babies.

Patricia: Mm.

Michael: Presidents, chairmen and that.

Patricia: Like in the newspaper, um, someone said I hear, I hear in parliament they're playing musical chairs because

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: people going to other countries, you know, if one goes to another country then someone else takes over and then he goes to the country. It's just, just like that. I think its mad.

Michael: Yeah. What about some of our own questions?

(Pause)

Madeleine: What's next?

Michael: That's the last question.

Michael: Ahh, what about.

(Pause)

Madeleine: What I did like, like about this book was where

Gregor: ⌈What you didn't like.

Madeleine: ⌊Joseph escaped when

Madeleine: he killed that soldier.

Michael: Yeah, I liked the way he escaped.

Patricia: Yes.

Michael: ⌈I,...I, yes I liked his plan.

Gregor: ⌊I liked the plan he had.

Gregor: It was all figured out.

Michael: But I didn't like one thing about the book. When, as soon as his father escaped and got to Switzerland and they didn't say anything about the mother, oh, well apart from the beginning and they told all about the children. Now I didn't like that because you didn't know what was happening to the parents in the meanwhile.

Gregor: ⌈Yeah.

Patricia: ⌊I liked

Patricia: I liked the part near the end when they stall

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: and Ruth says,

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: 'You didn't care for any of us, you

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: do such and such, such and such'when Jan,
              and then he really and his mind starts free-
              thinking.

Madeleine: Yeah, that's sad that part.   But it was really
              a matter of life and death for Edek because
              ...

Patricia: Well, all of them actually.

Madeleine: Yeah.

Michael: Yeah.

Madeleine: In all of it I felt really sorry for that dog.

Patricia: Yeah for...Jan really liked that dog

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: and Ruth said 'It's you or it's either the
              dog or us'.

Gregor: Actually, wasn't it the hen?

Patricia: No it was the dog.

Michael: The hen died in that big rush.

Michael: Yeah.

Gregor: Oh, yeah, in the big rush.   He broke his neck.

Michael: at...that place.   Yeah.

Patricia: Simpy.

Michael: At the soup kitchen.

Gregor: I don't think it was their fault that they
              wounded it.   It was that they didn't get
              enough food.

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: No, it's not really, yeah, except, because
              most people can't provide all the food.   But I
              think Americans sometimes are a bit selfish.

Michael: ⌈Yeah.

Gregor: ⌊Yeah.

Gregor: This is true.

Michael: What about the time when he was nearly going
               to shoot him when he was on the railway line
               and Edek had went to protect Jan and then he
               got into trouble for it.

Madeleine: Yeah, well, that was the court case then.

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: But I

Madeleine: Ruth cautioned Jan and then it was all over.

Gregor: Yes, see...

Michael: What happened, Edek was going to go to gaol
               for seven days, wasn't he?

Patricia: Yeah.

Madeleine: Yeah.

Michael: Well then did he escape or something?

Madeleine: No,

Madeleine: ⌈no Jan

Michael: ⌊Or did

Michael: Jan came to be a witness.

Madeleine: No, and it was all called off.

Patricia: ⌈No he went

Madeleine: ⌊No, he let Jan in

Madeleine: and when, um Edek told about a, what Jan had
               been doing and then Jan was something there,
               in there for a week or something.

Patricia: I think Ruth's very clever to keep Jan under
               control

Michael: ⌈Yeah.

Madeleine: ⌊Yeah.

Patricia: because not even the soldiers can keep him under control, it's only her.

Michael: And I liked the way that Jan, he always did his...he wouldn't be kind to anybody else, he'd be selfish to anybody else but he'd be kind to animals. His friendship came through animals.

Patricia: Yeah.

Madeleine: Yeah.

Michael: Like the chimpanzee. Now the chimpanzee... nearly, you know, got really, really threw metal in the, that soldier's...

Gregor: car.

Michael: You know, that little tool kit and he threw it. Well, he didn't do anything to Jan.

Gregor: That was the, that was the thing that, that was the chimpanzee that escaped.

Madeleine: I think that when um...

Patricia: Bozo. Bozo, his name was.

Michael: No.

Patricia: No, I don't

Patricia: I don't remember that part. I don't remember that part.

Michael: Well his name was...and he came into that place where they were all sleeping.

Michael: That's where

Gregor: Yeah.

Michael: they first saw him.

Patricia: Oh, you mean down under the house,

Michael: Yeah,

Patricia: houses I think.

Gregor: Yeah.

Madeleine: Bistro.

Michael: Yeah, bistro, that's right.

Patricia: Oh yeah, I remember him now.

Michael: I think it's sad the way, that you know, the
            soldiers had no heart, they just...

Gregor: Ivan did.

Michael: Who?...Well, yeah he did but

Michael: ⌈the others didn't. Yeah.

Gregor: ⌊He helped them out.

Gregor: He gave them shoes.

Madeleine: Ivan, Ivan was good to help them.

Michael: Yeah, I think that it was really mean the way
            that some people they were begging for a lift
            and they didn't even stop. I mean...

Patricia: Well, the thing, the thing is some people are
            selfish.

Michael: Yeah.

            (Pause)

Michael: No, looks as if we better...

            (Pause)

Gregor: Well, what are we going to do?

Michael: ⌈We are not going to

Gregor: ⌊What about just let the tape run out?

Michael: I, I didn't like the way he started off.

Patricia: Yeah, Jan.

Michael: I think, yeah, I think, I think it's a bit,
            I didn't like the way he just brought, he just
            brought Jan into the picture just like that.

Patricia: He didn't really, no Jan was supposed to be
            some mystery boy or something.

Madeleine: No, Jan was sick, ah.

Patricia: No, that was Edek.

Madeleine: Yes, Jan was sick. He was on the mound and he
            was fairly sick and ah, one of the two children

Patricia: Yeah.

Madeleine: children found him and Ruth brought in and ah...

Patricia: Yeah, but the first part was

Patricia: ⌈when he just met Joseph.

Gregor: ⌊No, the first part was

Gregor: when he was with Joseph, yeah, and Joseph gave him the silver sword.

Patricia: And he gave him the silver sword.

Gregor: ⌈(inaudible) the silver sword.

Madeleine: ⌊But Jan was hiding in a corner.

Michael: ⌈Yeah.

Patricia: ⌊No, er

Michael: No, er Joe found...er

Patricia: Joseph.

Michael: Yeah, Joseph found...

Patricia: And Joseph gave him the instructions.

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: I think er, I know why, er I really think I know why he brought him in. He's supposed to be this mysterious

Patricia: ⌈boy.

Michael: ⌊Yeah,

Michael: character, yeah.

Patricia: And he's, and he's got a very good character to play in and he's, he's just a very good character I think.

Michael: Yeah. Um...that was good that book. I liked it a lot.

Madeleine: Yeah, yeah.

Michael: But I er, I didn't like the topic a lot but I like the

Patricia:	Yeah.
Michael:	way he set it out.
Patricia:	Yeah, I liked, I didn't like the topic but I liked the book.
Michael:	Yeah.
Patricia:	That's funny.
Michael:	Some parts nearly made you cry.
Patricia:	Yeah.
Michael:	[They were so sad.
Madeleine:	[I reckon the end was quite sad.
Michael:	Sad, yeah.
Patricia:	I'm reading a book now and it's just got tension in it. I hate books with tension.
Michael:	Yeah.
Patricia:	They give me the creeps. I'm a chicken,see.
Michael:	Ah, in some...I liked the part when, when, he said that er, oh when Jan...decides that oh 'I'm going to give up'
Gregor:	Speak up sonny, Speak up.
Michael:	'I'm going to give up Ludwig and I'd rather go with them' because they, they were his real family. I thought the sad part was when Jan gave um, Ruth's, Edek's and Bronia's mother the silver sword and he said 'Will you become my mother?'.
Patricia:	Yeah, instead of her adopting him
Patricia:	[he adopted her
Michael:	[he adopted her.
Michael:	Yeah.
Patricia:	That's like, that's like animals sometimes they adopt you instead of you adopting them.

       (Pause)

Michael: Ah, well I'm glad the ending came out that way,
              but it would have been very sad. I, I hate the
              way that all the stories finish with happy
              endings.

Michael: No, er,

Gregor: Yeah,

Gregor: there's never a sad ending.

Patricia: Yeah, I know, I...

Madeleine: Can be.

Michael: In some books, yeah.

Patricia: I don't like sad endings for some reason. I
              just hate it.

Patricia: I like people when it's happy.

Michael: Yeah, but,

Patricia: I just...

Michael: Yeah, well

Michael: you always know that the end is going to be sad
              or....Some, well, a bit of it sad.

Gregor: All fairy tales end up or

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: Or in the movies, in the movies, right, they end
              up happy but, um, I saw, oh, 'Pardon Me But
              Your Teeth are in my Neck' alias that (inaud-
              ible) that was very good. I, I liked it
              because it had a sad ending it had an ending
              that he spread the vampires instead of killing
              all of them. So, it was actually a sad ending.

Michael: Oh. Did anybody else like or dislike anything
              about the book? What about the part, what about

Michael: I didn't, didn't

Gregor: The tape's off.

Michael: I liked the part where...

Gregor: The tape's off.

Michael: What?

Gregor: The tape's off.

Madeleine: It is not.

Michael: I liked the part where the people, the, oh,
              the couple, they gave him shelter and food and
              I liked the way that...

Patricia: They...

Michael: Even though...a heart.

Gregor: Those two people, that's right

Michael: the old man, even though he was stubborn,

Michael: ⌈he did have a heart.

Gregor: ⌊looked after Joseph.

Gregor: That was the lady at the counter.

Michael: No, no, no. The one where they stay, the one
              who gave them the canoes.

Patricia: Yeah.

Michael: I liked the father because even though he was
              so mean, he was so selfish, not selfish, he
              was...

Madeleine: He wasn't, he didn't know that he'd been put
              in gaol. He was...

Patricia: I liked, I liked, the way his wife, really,
              you know, says I

Patricia: ⌈want it, you know.

Michael: ⌊Yeah. She had

Michael: she had her way.

Patricia: Yeah.

Michael: She knows, he knows when she wants it her way
              and she knows she wanted it her way then because
              she liked the kids and she wanted them for
              herself. She liked...

Michael: But I wonder what happened to the mother all
              those years meanwhile.

Patricia: Meanwhile, yeah she...

Gregor: They didn't say anything about her...was only
              the kids.

Patricia: Yeah.

Michael: ⌜That's the part I disliked about the book.

Gregor: │(inaudible)

Madeleine: ⌞The part where, um, she was

Madeleine: um, in a camp or something.

Patricia: ⌜Yeah, she was, she was in a camp. She was
              │away.

Michael: ⌞Yeah, the camp. Yeah, but that was

Michael: the last thing they said of her.

Gregor: The last was when she was taken away.

Patricia: Yeah, but what about her father?

Michael: Yeah. But I feel sorry how the way that Edek
              came back and he and he didn't, they didn't
              show pictures but you could imagine that his
              face was so wrinkled and he had such a hard
              life that I think that it was sad but I'm glad
              it ended up that way.

Patricia: ⌜Yeah, really I think...

Michael: ⌞He became an engineer.

Patricia: ⌜the best,

Michael: ⌞Yeah.

Gregor: ⌜We've got nothing to talk about.

Patricia: ⌞Ruth had a very good part in

Patricia: in the play.

Michael: Like say some parts were, I didn't like the
              part which....Well, I didn't like Bronia's
              part. I don't think she did much.

Madeleine: ⌜She did, she did.

Patricia: ⌞Yeah, she did.

Gregor: No, all she did was just sit around and cry.

Madeleine: Well, she was very young.

Michael: ⌜Yeah, she was young but...

Madeleine: ⌞She, she got used to it

Madeleine: because she drew pictures.

Michael: Yeah and I, I think it was easier for Br, Bronia because when she was separated she was only three and she didn't have any time to have....She wouldn't, she wouldn't have remembered any good times or bad times.

Patricia: Yeah, also...

Michael: So that's was the part which, which was easier for Bronia and harder for the others.

Patricia: On page 131 they've got a picture, um,

Patricia: ⌈Edek not very well.

Michael: ⌊The nurse, yeah.

Gregor: Um, it's not the nurse. Er its...

Michael: ⌈I thought that was

Madeleine: ⌊No that's, that's

Michael: Oh but she is nursing.

Patricia: Yeah, she's like a nurse to him. So really it's, um good pictures.

Michael: I liked the way they, even though they didn't have many pictures, the, the story described the pictures. You could picture them yourself. You didn't need pictures to show you what it was like. You could just picture it in your mind.

Patricia: I really liked, I liked er, I liked the part where the soldier had to put Jan in the cage,

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: I think that was funny because

Patricia: ⌈because he was such a

Madeleine: ⌊(inaudible)

Patricia: Yeah, and he...and Edek...and Edek...

Gregor: ⌈He was really tough.

Michael: ⌊Yeah, er.

Patricia: And then last but not least he let him out, he let him out.

267

Madeleine: Er, how did he win (inaudible)

Patricia: Yeah, he picked, he picked him up on the way

Patricia: ⌐going

Michael: ⌊Yeah.

Michael: I'm glad that Ruth met Jan again because the story wouldn't really have, had an ending without Jan because he was the main part.

Patricia: ⌐Yeah.

Michael: ⌊Not really the main part,

Michael: ⌐but one of the main parts.

Gregor: ⌊One of the main parts.

Patricia: Well there were two main parts, Ruth and him and

Michael: Yeah, right, but it was sad the way that Edek nearly died.

Patricia: Yeah, the co-people, co-people were actually, um, Edek and Bronia.

Michael: Yeah, but many of, many of, they were a very lucky case. Many of the families didn't get back together. And that was, you know, and there was...I wonder if that, if that story's true?

Michael: ⌐I hope it would be.

Gregor: ⌊It probably would be,

Gregor: it's based on a true story.

Gregor: ⌐I once saw it on television.

Madeleine: ⌊It says it is a true story.

Patricia: ⌐Most probably

Gregor: ⌊I once saw it on television.

Patricia: Mmm....Most probably the people, um, the people who didn't get back together one, one person of them was, was dead or something like that because there were many people killed.

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: Except I don't think...

Michael:	Why do you, in the war why do you have to kill people? You have, why do you have a war for?
Patricia:	Yeah, they start...
Michael:	Just give me one good
Michael:	⌈reason.
Patricia:	⌊Yeah.
Michael:	Why you need a war?
Patricia:	It starts with a
Patricia:	⌈big, big, big,
Madeleine:	⌊Well
Patricia:	argument and then
Michael:	No, no, it starts with two people and the people take the sides and that's how the war starts.
Michael:	⌈That's how the world wars start.
Gregor:	⌊That's how world wars
Michael:	That's how World War Two started.
Patricia:	Yes except that's just from an argument. One...
Patricia:	⌈one...
Gregor:	⌊Two people,
Gregor:	⌈all it needs is two people
Patricia:	⌊and then the parliament or whatever
Gregor:	arguing....and one persons says that's not true and the other one says and then you get reinforcements
Michael:	Yeah.
Gregor:	um, and then
Michael:	Yeah.
Gregor:	soon countries are involved and countries, you know
Patricia:	Yeah, um, I think, I don't know....When Hitler just invaded countries that didn't want war sometimes.

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: Switzerland, they were lucky, didn't want war so nobody invaded them.

Michael: ⌈Switzerland, Switzerland. It wasn't that they didn't want war.

Gregor: ⌊No they couldn't be invaded they were higher.

Michael: Switzerland just stayed neutral...

Gregor: because they are high up in the mountains

Michael: Switzerland didn't have any war.

Gregor: and they had to cross the mountains and everything to get to them.

Patricia: Yeah, and way all the, all the men all the men were in the army. So all they had was, was women to invade, you know all the women they might really get cranky. Some women do. Like in Ireland. There, the Women's Peace Movement.

Michael: No, but,...I wish that they'd say if I ever read a book like that again I wish that they, they said more about the parents because they did you know, they did spend a lot of time on the children but what, what he did spend on it was, was good

Michael: ⌈but

Patricia: ⌊Yeah

Michael: I think he should have spent just a bit more time on what the parents were doing meanwhile.

Patricia: Yeah, but what about, you

Patricia: ⌈could come across a book based, based on the

Gregor: ⌊What do you think the author's

Gregor: trying to tell us?

Patricia: based on the parents and not the kinds, so

Michael: I think, the author's trying to tell us we better

Michael: ⌈we better be thankful for what we have.

Gregor: ⌊We're better, we're better off without war.

Michael: Yeah.

Gregor: ⌈That there are more things.

Michael: ⌊Better off without war.

Patricia: Mm.   I think,

Michael: Because you know, er, when, just say that there
              was a war now, you and I wouldn't be going to,
              school anymore.

Michael: ⌈We, we wouldn't be able to go out.

Gregor: ⌊If there were a third World War.

Gregor: I think we'd all be

Michael: Yeah.

Gregor: ⌈everything would be wiped off

Michael: ⌊Yeah, I think that, yeah, the next

Gregor: because they've got nuclear weapons.

Michael: Say that after the third World War if there is
              another war it will be with bows and arrows.
              Starting up again.

Patricia: Yeah, it's just like the Americans have got
              this...

Michael: Yeah, bomb and

Patricia: ⌈Yeah, they could blow us up.

Gregor: ⌊Nuclear weapons.

Michael: I wish that every country could stay neutral
              and we could all be friends.

Gregor: Mm.

Madeleine: ⌈Yeah, but that's very hard,

Gregor: ⌊Because that's, but that's (inaudible)...

Michael: Yeah, but...

Patricia: that's very hard, really hard.

Michael: Well, it would be hard but all you need is
              co-operation.

6271

Patricia: ⌈Yeah, that's what we haven't got

Michael: ⌊Because in Russia...

Patricia: that's what we haven't got nowadays, co-operation. Lots of people, people are willing to do it but it's those few which spoil the world.

Patricia: Yeah, like the prime ministers.

Michael: ⌈Take Russia for instance.

Gregor: ⌊There's still people fighting.

Michael: Yeah, take Russia for instance. They don't even, they don't even let some tourists go in the streets. If you take a photo they ruin your camera.

Patricia: ⌈Yeah, it's like Czechoslovakia.

Michael: ⌊Unless you buy special photos

Michael: which are really very hard.

Patricia: They're communist countries, that's why.

Michael: Yeah, well, why do we need communist countries? Why can't we just all be friends?

Patricia: Czechoslovakia's a communist country.

Michael: What about the Iron Curtain?

Patricia: The Iron Curtain.

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: I think that is really stupid. Oh, I think...

Michael: That makes me sick, the way how some people say 'I'm going to be completely separated'.

Gregor: ⌈(inaudible)

Michael: ⌊The Great Wall of China

Michael: for that matter.

Gregor: If you want to climb over, you know, the wall that separates East and West Germany you get shot to pieces.

Michael: Yeah....Not shot to pieces, you just, there's just, it's very hard for one thing to get in and out and in Czechoslovakia

Michael: ⌈If you're older than sixteen and you

Gregor: ⌊You need all kinds of passports.

Michael: go into Czechoslovakia you have to stay there.

Patricia: Oh, I know,

Patricia: ⌈I know why when parents, when parents go to
               different countries...

Gregor: ⌊Unless you've got very special passports and

Gregor: and very special permission.

Patricia: Yeah, but when

Michael: But that would take a long time and a lot of
               money to...

Patricia: I know why they have the Iron Curtain in
               Czechoslovakia...er when they, when a family
               goes without their kids, the, the government
               reckons that the parents don't want their
               kids

Patricia: ⌈anymore

Gregor: ⌊(inaudible)

Patricia: But I think it's really being fair in a way
               just in case some parents don't like their
               kids.

Michael: Yeah. But if they didn't like their kids why
               wouldn't they, you know,

Michael: ⌈give them up for adoption

Gregor: ⌊give them up for instance.

Michael: if they didn't want their kids.

Madeleine: ⌈Give them up to people...

Gregor: ⌊It's sad that

Gregor: people have to, er, have to give their children
               away and other people adopt them,

Patricia: Yeah, it's sad.

Gregor: and other people adopt them.

Patricia: It's really sad if people have to, if they're
               adopted. Like Glen's

Patricia: ⌈sister, she's adopted.

Gregor: ⌊Not that they would.

Gregor: It's not that they don't want them, it's that they can't afford to have them.

Patricia: Yeah. She, she she's adopted. She's, she's nice, she's what we call spoilt though. They're both spoilt. We come from a... because we've got lots of good things that some

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: families haven't and we've got some things that we don't need but we've got them.

Michael: You know, your parents might have a car and you just say, 'Mum, drive, Mum or Dad, drive me over to the library won't you?'. But some other people they don't have these luxuries.

Patricia: No, we, I...

Michael: Like say Edek and Jan and Bronia.

Patricia: ⌈If I take the train to North Sydney

Madeleine: ⌊(inaudible)

Michael: But they didn't have cars then.

Patricia: If I take the train to North Sydney or Milson's Point mum murders me. They blast me.

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: 'Walk, Patricia'.

Madeleine: Walk.

Patricia: Yeah, for one reason there's a lot of nuts around. I...

Michael: If there was no war I think people could live much happier and much longer...'cause I think it's today's worries...

Patricia: Mm.

Michael: people's worries which kill them. Not,

Patricia: Mm.

Michael: ⌈if...

Gregor: ⌊Some people are (inaudible).

Michael: In the olden age the minimum age was at least
              a hundred whereas here people, people drop off
              at about ninety...or eighty for that matter.

Patricia: ⌈Forty-five or fifty.

Madeleine: ⌊In Russia, in Russia...

Gregor: In Switzerland up in the Alps they live a long
              time.

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: I think...

Patricia: ⌈I think...

Michael: ⌊There's no frustration.

Patricia: Australia is not a, is a lovely country

Patricia: ⌈in a way

Gregor: ⌊It's time.

Patricia: but it's not in other ways.

              (Intervention by experimenter)

Class: II

Date: 13th October 1976

Novel: 'Climb A Lonely Hill'

Participants: Madeline, Angela,
                    Michael, Peter

Michael:	C, Can I ask a question. What...Who do you think was the most important character?
Peter:	Jack.
Angela:	Jack.
Michael:	Jack.
Madeline:	Jack...He was taking the responsibility and Uncle Bert was perhaps, uh, the main character, but it wasn't too much.
Michael:	I thought, ah
Angela:	No, I think
Angela:	Jack was the main character.
Peter:	He was really a man a lot.
Michael:	Um, yesterday I was discussing this with my sister and she's read the book, well even though she read it five years ago, but she still remembers it, and she says, she still thinks that Jack is the most important character.
Angela:	Yeah.
Madeline:	Probably the two of them.
Michael:	Because...if Uncle Bert was, Jack has to do all the coping
Michael:	not Uncle Bert.
Madeline:	He dies.
Michael:	Yeah.
Peter:	Yeah.
Angela:	But I like how...
Madeline:	But Uncle Bert, um, had to take all the responsibility
Michael:	Yeah.
Madeline:	if he wasn't dead so he'd probably be the main character.
Michael:	Yeah.

Angela: But I like how, um, Jack sort of, um, in, in
             a paragraph near the end and that, he said...
             and we are, and we, and we are brave, we can
             cope along with all we've got, a drunken
             father and a mother who, who...we haven't
             got a mother, I like, but we still can cope

Michael: Yeah.

Angela: 'cause we're brave...

Madeline: ⌈Yeah.

Peter: ⌊Yeah.

Angela: but other people can't, with all...

Michael: Uh, ha. What I dislike, I dislike what the
             author did, she, she made Jack the main part,
             and even though, I, I know Uncle Bert was
             in the end, but he didn't mention so often...

Angela: No...no.

Michael: But I, I don't like the way she did that
             because I think if you have a book, if you
             bring in the character you might as well put
             them in it

Michael: ⌈instead of just having

Madeline: ⌊It's boring. Instead of just fading

Madeline: them out you can

Angela: ⌈Yeah...yeah like

Michael: ⌊Yeah, because then it's not worth,

Michael: then it's not worth having the character in
             it.

Angela: like having, like how they told the scene,
             like how Jack had to go out and shoot
             kangaroos, but they never said anything

Madeline: Yeah.

Angela: about how Sue had to

Angela: ⌈What is

Peter: ⌊You know

Madeline: ⌈Yeah.

Peter: ⌊You're not,

Peter: they said how Sue tidied up the place and made

Peter: ⌈and made a lavatory

Angela: ⌊Yeah, but they're only

Madeline: But only, only a few times.

Michael: Yeah.

Angela: Only a few times. That, they use about five paragraphs to tell how he went out and shot a kangaroo, tried to shoot a kangaroo

Angela: ⌈but only about two.

Madeline: ⌊Yeah, and caught the

Peter: And he wasted how many shots?

Michael: But what I don't understand, that in the beginning part it was, um, when Jack was thinking back, he was thinking back to the good times

Michael: ⌈when his Uncle Bert was alive.

Angela: ⌊Yeah, but he did that too much.

Madeline: Yeah.

Michael: Yeah, they do it too much, and also why... I don't know why, just in this one particular part, why, why would they want to think back to the Greek proprietor?

Angela: Yeah, in the shop.

Michael: But, because, well, my sister said that maybe it's because they had food there, and water

Peter: Yeah, it would,

Michael: But I don't think

Angela: Mm.

Michael: ⌈it would be that because

Peter: ⌊it would be,

Peter:	I think it would be.
Michael:	But they still had water left.
Angela:	Yeah, what has that got to do with, with 'Climb a Lonely Hill'?
Michael:	Yeah.
Angela:	And also, I think, um, I noticed quite often in the book that, that they don't mention about climbing the hill
Michael:	Yeah.
Angela:	until about the second last chapter
Michael:	Yeah.
Angela:	that they start climbing.
Michael:	Yeah, the title's not really into it.
Madeline:	Yeah.
Peter:	No, no.
Angela:	They should sort of, uh
Peter:	(inaudible)
Madeline:	'The Silver Sword'...
Angela:	Yeah.
Peter:	That's more, that's more of a good title.
Angela:	Yeah, 'cause it, 'cause it depended on...
Madeline:	But it wasn't much still about that sword.
Peter:	No, I don't suppose there was.
Michael:	But we're talking about this book.
Madeline:	Well, it's a couple of bunches...
Peter:	What are we, why don't we re-name the book ourselves?
Michael:	Uh, uh, I think that if it was, it was, I'd just name it 'How People Cope'.
Angela:	No, no. But that sounds a bit like a science fiction sort of thing,

Peter: Yeah.

Angela: or a book on how people, how. I'd sort of
            call that, um, 'Only Chance-Survival', or
            just 'Survival'.

Madeline: You couldn't say 'Jack and Sue', it sounds
            more like those 'Janet and John' books.

Angela: Mm.

Michael: Who?

Peter: We could say 'Lost in a Lonely Desert' or
            something like that.

Angela: Yeah that would be good. Um, who....What
            would you do if you were in that position?

            (pause)

Angela: If I was in it

Michael: Um, I don't think, I don't think

Madeline: I would, I would change so many things around

Michael: you could really say, um, what you were going
            to, what you'd do in that position unless
            you've really experienced it.

Madeline: Like they were thinking of, um, staying
            there 'til somebody found them.

Madeline: I wouldn't do that

Angela: No, um, like Sue, Sue

Michael: Yeah.

Angela: I think she was really, in the character, she
            was pretty good...

Madeline: Yeah.

Angela: Like how she thought, and Jack never did,
            didn't so...um

Peter: How about how...

Michael: And the few times...that they showed when she
            was thinking, they were good parts

Angela: Mm, but

Angela: ⌈Yeah, but only...

Michael: ⌊Jack was,

Michael: I just felt him boring, it just went pages and pages of...

Angela: but, but I like the last chapter, chapter nine, because it tells a bit more, more than it would in any other chapter. It tells how they, um...they, they got, they hear a buzzing noise, and it's a plane, and they make a fire, and but the plane doesn't see them, and then the plane comes back

Angela: ⌈and sees

Madeline: ⌊but it's a

Madeline: bit of action.

Angela: Yeah, it's a bit of action for once.

Peter: Just like all stories...

Angela: Yeah.

Peter: all stories go something like that, there's always a ship coming and rescuing them, or a plane spotting them, or a car or a truck, or something like that...

Angela: Mm.

Peter: all stories end like, like this end like that.

Angela: Which character did you like the best?

Peter: Jack.

Angela: How come?

Madeline: ⌈Um

Michael: ⌊I, er

Michael: I think...it's really hard. I like the way that that Greek proprietor felt sorry

Michael: ⌈for them.

Madeline: ⌊There weren't

Madeline: many, really any characters hardly.

Michael:	⌈Yeah.
Angela:	⌊Yeah.
Madeline:	It'd be much more interesting if there were, say
Madeline:	⌈something like maybe ten more
Michael:	⌊Um...I...I
Michael:	I think that, that the author should have left the mother alive, then
Michael:	⌈it would
Peter:	⌊Hey, yeah.
Michael:	I think the book would have been much better if the mother was still alive.
Angela:	⌈But
Peter:	⌊But
Peter:	there would be no drunk father and they wouldn't have gone
Angela:	Yeah.
Madeline:	Yeah.
Madeline:	that might have been it, um,
Angela:	Yeah, and
	(pause)
Angela:	and, um, I liked Uncle Bert, how he had sort of
Michael:	Yeah
Angela:	had the way outback talk, how he chewed on the
Michael:	Yeah.
Angela:	the real um, er
Peter:	⌈How he cleaned the plates
Michael:	⌊Yeah I think

Madeline:	Oh yeah.
Michael:	One part I did like about the thought part was when they had the er, um,
Madeline:	in a
Michael:	no, how they described...the country; like, like the mountain because they
Peter:	No.
Michael:	like how they said, like Jack had witnessed death a lot of times before, but they were always on little animals and he'd never witnessed
Michael:	it on an actual person.
Angela:	Oh, yes
Angela:	I, I like how he described the dead birds on the road.
Madeline:	I, I somehow felt guilty about it, and responsible for it.
Michael:	Yeah.
Angela:	And, and I like, um, how she describes them very well, but she puts too much detail into it.
Peter:	Yeah. Was that a girl, was that a lady who did that?
Angela:	Yeah.
Peter:	Oh, I thought that was...
Madeline:	Just about when they were going to set up just near the car the crows came.
	(Laughter)
Angela:	Yeah that was good, I liked that part.
Peter:	'Aagh, Aagh'.
Angela:	I liked the beginning 'cause they
Madeline:	they left the windows open, and they...
Angela:	Mm, I liked the beginning 'cause, because, I liked the beginning 'cause she really explained it well, but it...it was all right in the beginning. The middle

Angela: ⌈was boring. The beginning was pretty good.

Michael: ⌊Yeah, I think the middle,

Michael: if you could change the way, change the book in some way, which way would you change it? I'd change it by not having as much thought

Madeline: Yeah, that's right,

Madeline: ⌈but

Peter: ⌊Yeah. ·

Angela: But the beginning was good when he saw

Angela: ⌈the,

Michael: ⌊Yeah.

Angela: Slowly Jack opened his eyes, but I didn't like it,

Peter: Oh.

Angela: how sort of slowly Jack opened his eyes and, you know,

Angela: ⌈he saw

Peter: ⌊It's just like

Angela: um, he saw his uncle dead...

Michael: Yeah.

Madeline: ⌈No, he didn't see it, he didn't even know

Angela: ⌊and he...and he, he didn't see

Peter: ⌈It's just like (inaudible)

Angela: ⌊but he, how he like

Angela: um, how, how um they had to get um, get out of the car, and all that, and then, when they started from the beginning, way, way, way, way back at the beginning how they got in the car, um

Angela: ⌈how they got out

Peter: ⌊That was before

| Angela: | ⎡crashed, yeah |
| Michael: | ⎣I like, I like |

Michael: the way they did that.

Angela: But it took too long chapters, 'cause it leaves you in suspense, suspense, although it was pretty boring in that part

Michael: But I don't like the way that, remember that part when, um, he saw Sue, and he told her to go and wash her face....While he was going to attend to...

| Michael: | ⎡I don't like |
| Angela: | ⎣Yeah. |

Michael: the way that he just shooed her off as if it was none of her business.

| Peter: | ⎡Oh well. |
| Angela: | ⎣Mm. |

Michael: No, I don't think he should have done that, I think he should have let her stay and help, because she would have found out in the end.

Peter: Yeah, but, but he was, he, he said sorry to her afterwards.

| Angela: | ⎡Yes. |
| Madeline: | ⎣Yeah. |

Michael: But he didn't say sorry to her, he only said it in the less harsh voice.

Angela: Yeah, um, what, um, could we er name some good parts about this book? What do you reckon was pretty good about it?

Peter: The end.

Michael: The description, the

Angela: Mm.

Madeline: The description of some of the things...not, not all the

Peter: Some of 'em.

Michael:	Yeah, some things.
Angela:	Yeah.
Michael:	Like the way they describe like, like the country was never, you know...
Michael:	each...they
Angela:	Sounds like
Michael:	even though they'd been there many times, it always sounded different.
Angela:	Yeah, yeah.
Madeline:	It was much too dry a story.
Peter:	He reached a century.
	(pause)
Angela:	Mm.
Michael:	Well...now what do we do?
	(pause)
Angela:	I don't know.
Peter:	Hey, did we say 'What if we were in that position?' already?
Madeline:	Yes...
Michael:	We've done that but
Madeline:	but not much, not much about it
Michael:	I don't think,I...I,
Peter:	Let's re-do it?
Michael:	I don't think I couldn't, I could put myself in that position unless it really happened to me.
	(general murmurs of agreement)
Angela:	You sort of think I
Peter:	Yeah.
Madeline:	(inaudible)

Madeline:	I think I'd...you see, it would probably be my family, perhaps dad was dead and, and there'd be five of us left, we'd have plenty more stuff to carry.
Angela:	Yeah.
Angela:	⌈'cause we
Madeline:	⌊'cause well
Madeline:	we would be able to...
Angela:	survive...but just say the rest of them died, and just say only you and John were left...
Peter:	Oh!
Michael:	Yeah.
Madeline:	O.K.!
Angela:	or only you and Kate were left.
Madeline:	Oh, well, we'd probably carry a bit more I s'pose.
Peter:	⌈Yeah, because Kate
Angela:	⌊Or maybe if,
Angela:	if, if you were in your house, house you could get something to...
Angela:	⌈to carry them in
Michael:	⌊No, but I mean, you know
Peter:	We'd probably be in a car
Angela:	You'd have your rucksacks
Michael:	You know, we have bikes and that and we could go around....Not everybody does, but some kids have bikes, but if that happened to them now, they could just, er, just load the bike and off they go.
Madeline:	⌈Oh, yeah,
Peter:	⌊They would too
Madeline:	ride into country land, over rocks, and... that great mountain

Micahel: Yeah but you're saying, you're saying how would, you're saying how would I, what would I do, that's what I'd do, because I, because I live in a different

Angela: Yeah

Michael: a different place!

Peter: Yeah.

Michael: And it's a different situation with me.

Angela: But if you were in that situation...

Peter: ⌈Like if you were in the story

Angela: ⌊Like, um,

Michael: Oh.

Angela: if you were left out in the desert and that, and um, er...you're in a car accident and everything like that, and you only had a cer, certain amount of food...

Peter: Hey, you know, before they had no water, then they had no food.

Madeline: Yeah.

Peter: It was fun...fun.

Michael: Uh, er, I like, I like the way when they went gold panning

Michael: ⌈Sue felt

Madeline: ⌊Heavy pan.

(general murmurs of agreement)

Angela: Yeah, yeah that was good

Madeline: That was interesting. I thought they would of um, done a bit more, um, gold panning

Madeline: ⌈before

Michael: ⌊Yeah.

Peter: ⌈They wouldn't have done much more, it was late

Madeline: ⌊It would have been much more

Madeline:	interesting if it did happen.
Michael:	Yeah.
Angela:	I don't...
Madeline:	It was tomorrow, the next day and then they set off again
Michael:	Yeah.
Madeline:	⌈somewhere and did it again.
Angela:	⌊Yeah and got a bit more.
Angela:	You know that, um, I didn't like the way that Uncle Bert...died, it was pretty exciting but...I wish he'd just...just sort of, um
Madeline:	It could have been explained a bit more.
Angela:	⌈Yeah. He, he reached from
Peter:	⌊We don't even know how they got in
Angela:	He reached from unconsciousness, and he told them something then he died. That'd be even
Angela:	⌈a bit more exciting.
Michael:	⌊Yeah.
Madeline:	Of course! He couldn't drive properly on the side of the road.
Angela:	He hit a stump.
Peter:	Oh, that's right, oh yeah that's right, a stump.
Michael:	I, I like the way that, that when they started it off, they got right into the point, whereas some books you start off, there's a big introduction then
Madeline:	⌈Yeah.
Angela:	⌊Yeah.
Michael:	then they get into the point...but I like, I like the way this book goes straight into the point.
Madeline:	Yeah, Jack trying to...

Michael:	Like the last book we read, it got into the point too
Madeline:	⌈Yeah, that was very interesting,
Michael:	⌊but not as much as this one.
Madeline:	it was good in the beginning of that.
Peter:	I liked 'The Silver Sword' better than this.
Angela:	(inaudible) um, yes.
Michael:	Yeah.
Angela:	But um, um,
Peter:	Jan.
Angela:	What, what do you reckon these two books had in common?
Michael:	⌈I think
Peter:	⌊Children always
Michael:	⌈I, I, yeah, I think
Madeline:	⌊catastrophe
Michael:	I agree with Peter, I think it's, it's how children have to cope.
Madeline:	Yeah.
Peter:	I didn't say that, did I?
Michael:	Well, that's what you were just about to say.
Peter:	I was?
	(laughter)
Angela:	Yeah, I, I, I reckon they have in common how they have to sort of find a go...reach a destination.
Michael:	Yeah.
Madeline:	Yeah, a goal.
Michael:	But I don't think in this book they really did have to reach a destination, they really...

Madeline: Yes they did, they tried to get home.

Peter: They wanted to get...

Angela: to the mountains.

Madeline: to the mountains.

Peter: to the hills really, the hills.

Madeline: That, that, that was just the first part, they wanted to get home the second, didn't they?

Angela: No...no, no.

Peter: They were rescued, they...

Angela: No they weren't, wanted to, wanted to go to the, um, mountain

Peter: because there was water

Angela: to find water

Peter: and there was.

Angela: and then they were hoping there was food around.

Michael: Oh, yeah.

Michael: and they'd be found

Angela: and there'd be kangaroos

Angela: and they'd be found finally because...

Madeline: because of the school holidays.

Peter: You know that, those aborigine carvings in that, um, cave, or that thing?

Madeline: Oh yeah, that's right, on the roof of the caves.

Michael: Yeah.

Angela: I can't remember reading that.

Peter: Yeah, I remember.

Madeline: We'll just skip that.

Michael: Yeah.

Peter: Mm, mm.

Michael:	What do you think the author's trying to prove?
Madeline:	⎡Oh...stuck up for children
Peter:	⎣That children
Peter:	⎡That children can survive
Angela:	⎣I don't
Peter:	⎡in this situation
Angela:	⎣I, I don't think he,
Angela:	she's trying to prove anything. I think,
Madeline:	Yes.
Angela:	I think she's just trying to...
Madeline:	She's decided to write a book
Angela:	Yeah.
Madeline:	⎡so she wants to write it.
Michael:	⎣Oh, no, I, no.
Michael:	In fact, this book made me think that she's trying to say that we should be grateful for what we have.
Peter:	Hey, yeah.
Angela:	Maybe so, but
Madeline:	But she could have written it for many other reasons (inaudible)
Angela:	I know, but she just could have written
Peter:	I think it was for us to read
Angela:	⎡but I reckon
Michael:	⎣but what, yeah
Michael:	but I mean she just wouldn't just write a book about this, if she didn't have any intentions to appear though.
Madeline:	Yes she could,

Angela: ⌈She could write it to buy money.

Madeline: ⌊just to get money.

Michael: Well, well, she just wouldn't go right out and say, well I want to write a book about people in the early outback...it would take a lot of thought

Michael: ⌈because

Madeline: ⌊Yeah, I suppose,

Michael: ⌈the topics to write about

Madeline: ⌊War times, they'd probably write about.

Angela: Yeah I like war books,

Angela: ⌈they're pretty good.

Peter: ⌊The main subject,

Peter: that's the main subject...that's the main subject...the main highlight,

Peter: ⌈second best is

Michael: ⌊But I don't like,

Peter: something like this.

Michael: like I said before, in the last book, in the last conversation about the other book, I don't like, um, the way that...all of the endings are happy. They never

Michael: ⌈have any

Angela: ⌊I do, I like it.

Michael: Well,

Peter: Mm.

Madeline: It's that relieved.

Michael: It's good that, good that the endings are happy, but I mean, you know, you know, you find it a bit boring because you know at the end it's going to be a happy ending.

Madeline:	[But then
Peter:	[But
Peter:	just say one book comes along
Madeline:	sometimes
Peter:	it's a sad ending.
Madeline:	it makes people envious.
Peter:	Yeah, yeah I know.
Madeline:	You want to know what's going to happen next. They just ends...somebody dies or they all die or something, and then that's all. They want to know what happens about it...
Angela:	Yeah.
Madeline:	but say they...lose something, and then they've got to find it, a treasure or something, and they don't get to find it.
Angela:	Sometimes they get on my nerves, but sometimes I like it how they end, that, um, in this book, they ended, and um, the, and they, um, were celebrated by having a swim.
Michael:	Yeah, 'Let's go have a swim'.
Peter:	Yeah.
?:	Shh.
Angela:	That really, yeah, and it doesn't prove... it doesn't...you've sort of got to use your imagination that the plane came back and they found
Angela:	[his father
Michael:	[Yeah.
Angela:	and that his father didn't become, and they stopped him from being a drunk, and all that.
Peter:	Probably they wanted us to use our imagination.
Angela:	Yeah, maybe.
Michael:	Yeah um
Angela:	But sometimes it, um gets, gets me really uptight

Michael: Yeah.

Angela: because it's sort of like, I like, like in 'Silver Sword' they told us what, um, what they'd built, they built, um,

Angela: something,

Michael: and then

Angela: something for children

Peter: and then somebody got married

Madeline: I wish they'd jolly hurry up and get to their goal, instead of talking about one little snake who crosses along here and...

Michael: Yeah.

Peter: There wasn't a snake in the story.

Madeline: Yes there was.

Angela: Yes there were.

Peter: Oh, they mentioned

Madeline: They caught a couple of snakes

Peter: No.

Madeline: Yeah, they did catch a couple. He, she, she said she skipped something

Michael: Yeah.

Madeline: at least and told it briefly that she caught something, caught a snake.

Peter: Yeow!

Michael: Do you think that

Madeline: I think the cover's interesting.

Michael: Yes, but do you think that, er, the, do you think that the author should spend more time about describing other things than the thought?

Angela: Yeah.

Peter: A little, oh, yeah.

Madeline: Well, look

Michael:	What do you mean by a little?
Peter:	I haven't finished yet, I haven't finished yet.
Michael:	For about, page three
Peter:	⌈I didn't mean that, I didn't mean that.
Michael:	⌊For about chapter three to about,
Michael:	Chapter three all, you know, thoughts
Peter:	Is it? O.K. Uh, three and a half chapters spread out around the book can be of thought,
Michael:	Yeah.
Peter:	⌈and about the other half can be of describing
Madeline:	⌊No, more than that
Madeline:	'cause there's nine, round about, oh I suppose three,
Madeline:	⌈yeah.
Michael:	⌊Yeah.
Peter:	I said three and a half.
Madeline:	About four I think.
Angela:	I reckon should be only two.
Michael:	Yeah.
Peter:	About four and a half.
Angela:	I reckon there should be only two 'cause there, sometimes thoughts get really boring,
Madeline:	⌈Yeah
Michael:	⌊I, I, I
Madeline:	depends how long a chapter is.
Michael:	know what the, the thought is trying to prove, that they, uh
Angela:	Conscience.
Michael:	Yeah, no, that they, how their, how they, about their conscience and that, but I don't like the way that they, they I mean, who'd want to think about something like that.

	Some thought in there I thought was just ridiculous.
Peter:	Like what?
Michael:	It wasn't worth having.
Madeline:	⌈Yeah, just
Angela:	⌊Like what?
	(pause)
Michael:	It's really hard to describe the book because you, its...
Madeline:	too much of thought and you can't explain the thought...
Michael:	Yeah.
Madeline:	so well.
Peter:	Yeah.
	(pause)
Michael:	I think that there should be...
Peter:	a different name, a diff, a different
Peter:	⌈setting out of the story.
Michael:	⌊No I think that the
Michael:	the, the title is appropriate, but I don't think that when she means 'Climb a Lonely Hill', I don't really think that she means to climb the hill, I think she's trying to prove to
Michael:	⌈battle it out yourself,
Madeline:	⌊Why would it be lonely,
Madeline:	What's so lonely about that hill?
Peter:	⌈Yeah, there's a lot of birds
Michael:	│Yeah, they were lonely.
Angela:	⌊Yeah, they were alone.

Michael:	They were by themselves, you see, maybe when she said
Michael:	⌈climb
Madeline:	⌊but
Madeline:	⌈a lonely hill maybe
Michael:	⌊maybe, maybe when she says
Michael:	'Climb a Lonely Hill, maybe she's trying to say, well, it's their battle, how they, um, fought on, maybe, maybe it's not that, maybe it's not climbing a lonely hill, maybe it's just how they battled.
Peter:	'Crossing a Lonely Desert', that'd be better.
Angela:	Mm, I like how Lilith Norman, um, um, g, the children have problems and I like how they...
Michael:	Yeah,
Angela:	⌈sort of handled
Michael:	⌊solved them,
Michael:	solved the, yeah. I like the way they handled, I like the way she did that.
	(pause)
Michael:	Is there any part in the book which anybody thinks, um, didn't really belong to it?
Peter:	Oh, the describing of the top of the cave. Oh, no, no, no.
	(general murmurs of disagreement)
Angela:	That
Madeline:	That belonged to Australian.
Peter:	Oh, yeah, something else. Oh, yeah, I know, the um, the describing of the roof, uh, not of the cave, of the shop.
Madeline:	What did you think of, um, of the Greek proprietor?
Angela:	⌈Yeah
Michael:	⌊Yeah Greek

Michael: I don't think, that was

Peter: Flies.

Michael: I don't think that belonged there.

Peter: Yeah, that didn't belong.

Michael: And I don't think it belonged when he, when
             the uncle, when he thought back that Uncle
             Bert said 'I'll bring you back a nugget as
             big as your son's head'. I don't think
             really that that belonged. Wh...

Michael: ⌈what does that have to do

Madeline: ⌊It does with it,

Madeline: Oh, with the gold

Peter: No that goes with it, yeah, 'cause they were
             panning for gold.

Madeline: Yeah.

Angela: Yeah, they, they were going for the gold, they,
             they were going to the hills for gold or
             something like that.

             (pause)

Peter: ⌈So

Madeline: ⌊Yeah,

Madeline: death went with it I'd say, it did, because
             it was...dry and windy and...

Peter: Like (inaudible)

Madeline: Yeah

Peter: We'd better not say the rest of that.

             (pause)

Michael: And, um, I like the way that the author, um,
             tried to show you how hot it was because it
             said 'They're burning...' like his hands
             burning with blisters and,

Angela: I didn't like that...how they said it.

Michael: but I like the way that she described it

Angela:	Oh, yeah, but, um, some parts um, I didn't like, how, um, um, Jack
Peter:	Um, um, um, um, um.
Angela:	wanted to go to the toilet, yeah,
Angela:	⌈um,
Michael:	⌊Yeah.
Angela:	I don't like that part.
Peter:	Hey, hey what about the part when he says, um, about...um...hold it, I don't know the page you keep on talking, I'll try to find the page.
Michael:	⌈Yeah
Angela:	⌊Pa, page seventy eight.
Peter:	Are you sure?
Angela:	Yes.
Madeline:	Trust you to,
Michael:	What's it about?
Madeline:	you know, straight on to it.
	(laughter)
Madeline:	We shouldn't be talking about that.
Michael:	What's it about?
Angela:	Seventy nine really.
Peter:	Is that the part about? Now hold it...just a second
Madeline:	Yes it is.
Michael:	I don't remember what this is about. What's it about?
Madeline:	Sh!
Peter:	Can't say that on the tape.
	(laughter)
Peter:	Uh!

Michael:	You keep on talking, I, I want to read this.
Peter:	It's not this part.
	(laughter)
Angela:	Don't know what to say.
Peter:	Oh, they
Madeline:	No the third chapter, no, the third paragraph
Angela:	Fourth.
Madeline:	No, the third.
Peter:	No, no.
Angela:	Fourth.
Michael:	What page?
Angela:	It's a big one, it's a big one.
Michael:	'Damn, damn, damn, he swore'
Angela:	Um, yeah.
Peter:	'As he watched the thin...
Angela:	Yeah, 'as he watched'
Madeline:	Yeah.
	(laughter)
Peter:	That's the part, that's it, that's it.
Ma	(laughter)
Angela:	I don't like, like how she said that, what's it got to do with climbing a lonely hill?
	(laughter)
Peter:	I don't know...but they were drink, they wanted,
	(laughter)
Peter:	I'm going to put a little asterisk here for Mr. Williams....No, no I'd better not.

Peter:	⌈No, I'd rather hear,
Madeline:	⌊Yeah, that's terrible.

Michael: Yeah, that's the part....What does it have to do with the book?

Peter: I don't think so.

Angela: I don't think so.

Michael: O.K. Specially with what followed it.

(laughter

Peter: Oh, yeah, he, he, um, humpty, dumpty

(laughter)

Peter: By the time he finished whatever he was doing he was almost half sick. He didn't carry on. He something it carefully, some-thing something up his something

(laughter)

Peter: and down to

Michael: 'He craved for fluid, any fluid'

Peter: Err!

Michael: 'even this, but his stomach rebelled. He raised the mug closer, this, but this and sniffed cautiously. There was very little smell which surprised him. He brought the mug almost to his lips, then with a sudden gesture of disgust turned and poured it on the ground...

Madeline: Really, I don't

Madeline:	⌈think I would do that.
Michael:	⌊'where it soaked away

Michael:	⌈'without trace'.
Angela:	⌊No, I don't

Angela: think I'd put that in the book, just there.

Peter: No, that was rude.

Michael: Yeah, it's not rude

Madeline:	⌐ No, I don't think
Angela:	⌐ I wouldn't put that in the book.
Michael:	But it had nothing to do...
Angela:	⌐ But really it sort of tried to prove,
Madeline:	⌐ Sort of 'Family Robinson', that girl did

(laughter)

Angela:	but really, but...the reader, the writer's trying to prove...the writer's trying to prove how thirsty they are.
Madeline:	Yeah, that's exactly right. They were so thirsty that they wanted to do that.
Michael:	That they'd stoop so low.

(laughter)

Peter:	Hey, and what about the part when they reached the...the cave, and, um, they took all their stuff off.

(laughter)

Angela:	Clothes off.
Madeline:	No, what's wrong with that?
Michael:	Yeah, what's wrong with that?
Peter:	No, I don't know.
Madeline:	They, they had to have a swim and it was probably cooler
Madeline:	⌐ like that.
Michael:	⌐ like, like
Michael:	the part when their first stop, where, where after they had a swim they went down and stripped themselves. What's so bad about it? You'd, you'd do that if, if you, if you were in those conditions.
Peter:	Oh, it's a bit (inaudible). Anyway, it's too deep and I don't like deep water. I'd just drink and drink and...

(laughter)

Angela:	⌈But I really don't
Madeline:	⌊Why, why don't we
Madeline:	talk more about this story?
	(pause and laughter)
Michael:	I, I like the way she described it though.
Madeline:	Yeah, let's ask a question. Come on, this is disgusting.
Peter:	Mm.
	(pause)
Madeline:	⌈(inaudible)
Michael:	⌊I, I think
Michael:	that it's good, the the way that they have the back, which sort of gives you a brief description about what the book's...
Peter:	It's a good thing that they print it on the back
Michael:	Yeah.
Peter:	or else I wouldn't have given it that Uncle Bert was dead. So Jack and Sue were left to face the Australian Outback alone, their water almost gone. If only they could reach the hills they might find water there. They plodded on and rested, on and rested. The sun beat down, the wind whipped stinging particles
Michael:	⌈'against
Angela:	⌊The summer
Michael:	'against their exposed sink, skin. Jack's shoulder was rubbed raw from the r, rifle,
Angela:	Rifle!
Michael:	'rifle straps and Sue's hands were bleeding from blisters and
Michael:	⌈'splinters
Madeline:	⌊'There

Madeline: 'were no thoughts now,

Michael: Yeah

Madeline: 'just endless mechanical movement. They had
             been walking like this forever'.

Peter: Thump, thump, thump, thump, thump, thump.

Madeline: O.K., then. Somebody ask a question.

Michael: You first.

Madeline: No, I can't think of anything. Oh, here, I
             just opened at

Madeline: page

Michael: Why

Madeline: 'Jack's shoulder was rubbed raw from the
             rifle strap'.

Michael: Yeah.

Peter: Why did they mention that for?

Madeline: Well, it's just the conditions

Peter: I want to know

Angela: Just

Michael: Yeah, their conditions, the bad conditions and
             then, I think the book's trying...I don't
             really think that it's the book that's...
             It, it's the main point...I think, I think
             that they're just trying to prove how we
             should be grateful for what we have.

             (intervention by experimenter)

Class: II

Date: 12th November 1976

Novel: 'Let the Balloon Go'

Participants: Angela, Michael, Gregor, Patricia

Angela: I enjoyed the book. I reckon it was really good
            this time maybe because it was shorter than the
            last book that I read before. And I like
            children thought,

Angela: ⌈children always thought

Gregor: │He dreams

Michael: ⌊I think its

Michael: different, I think its different

Michael: ⌈than the others, cause...the others

Angela: ⌊So do I.

Gregor: It was strange, that man behind the curtain

Michael: Yeah.

Gregor: ⌈very strange.

Angela: ⌊I loved the

Angela: I love the way Ivan S...the characters

Michael: The descriptions of the...I liked the
            description of when he woke up in the morning
            whether he thought that today would be a game
            day

Gregor: Yeah.

Michael: or whether it wouldn't be and how that his
            mother always came and spoilt it...

Patricia: 'John don't do that...'

Michael: Yeah and about when he went

Michael: ⌈into the shower

Gregor: ⌊I know,

Gregor: but she cared too much for him.

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: ⌈She's she's

Angela: ⌊Yeah

308

Patricia: over, overprotective.

Patricia: Well really, I don't really blame him in a way
because um John's legs you know...they...

Angela: He stumbled and all that.

Patricia: Yeah.

Angela: But, um,...the author, Ivan Southall really
describe...explained it um...as if it was
real, but, ah, I reckon he overdid the
explaining

Angela: ⌈and
Patricia: ⌊You know

Patricia: you haven't read the sequel.

Angela: I have.

Patricia: It's very open.

Patricia: ⌈(inaudible)
Angela: ⌊Yes but

Patricia: I like how he, he got and he has one of his
attacks and that and and I like how all these
things

Patricia: ⌈really suddenly
Michael: ⌊I know

Angela: come up.

Patricia: Mm yeah. What about when....Just why did the
policeman just have to wear his boots? You
know...like...in a way

Angela: No, well, what's that, that got to do with it?

Patricia: No wait a minute wh...when he came up you know
when he came

Patricia: ⌈up the tree
Angela: ⌊Oh up the tree...

Angela: yeah...

Patricia: If the policeman's brainy enough he wouldn't
wear those big boots.

Michael: I...I like the part where, um

Angela: Mm, yeah, he took them off and he threw them down.

Michael: Yeah, I like the part where he was praying when his mother left he, she got into the car, he got her to leave and he said 'Oh please don't let her come back'.

Angela: ⌈Yeah.

Patricia: ⌊Yeah.

Patricia: 'Oh please don't...' Yeah that's the way to put it.

Michael: Yeah.

Angela: And I like how he imagined that, um, Mamie was up in a castle, the princess, and how he was going to save her putting up the ladder...

Michael: Mm,...Mmm

Patricia: Yeah, it was amaz

Angela: It was really good the way he did that.

Patricia: What about Cecil Parslow or whatever his name was?

Michael: Err...

Angela: Then she said

Gregor: Ceecil Parslow

Michael: Cecil, Cecil I thought it was Cecil.

Gregor: Ceecil...Ceeci...

Patricia: Ceecil...Ceecil Parslow.

Michael: I liked...I think that they that he had the (inaudible), Cecil Parslow or whatever his name is. I think he had the meaning maybe he was trying to prove how some people treat people handicapped cause the others just treated him normally, as if he didn't have them but,um, this one boy kept um teasing him and bugging him and...

Angela: that.

Michael: Yeah.

Angela: But, um, but I like how some people...
           handicapped people, ah...try, try to fight
           back. They sort of

Michael: Mm.

Angela: n'not fight fight bang

Angela: ⌈bang bang

Patricia: ⌊bang bang

Angela: um but um how they fight back inside in, in
           trying to be normal.

Michael: ⌈Yeah.

Patricia: ⌊Yeah.

Patricia: Like John really made it.

Michael: ⌈You know

Angela: ⌊Yeah he, he

Angela: proved to himself that he could climb the tree
           and not even the man who is normal...climbed it.

Angela: ⌈ah

Michael: ⌊Yeah.

Angela: ah, couldn't climb it very well.

Gregor: 'Cause he proved his point that he can do,
           climb the tree...instead of watching all the
           other kids climbing trees.

Patricia: Yeah. I...I reckon his mother jumped to him
           you know jumped on top of him, you know she
           always had to jump on top of him in a certain
           way.

Michael: I think the only reason John climbed the tree
           was because his mother told him not, not to
           climb trees or do anything bad but I think the
           only reason he did do it, I think he forgot what
           his mother said. I think it it was probably
           the first time that, um...he never had been
           free

Michael: ⌈and and his mother

Gregor: ⌊Yeah it was the first chance he ever had

Gregor: to do something that he wanted.

Michael: He said 'Well, I might as well do it while I
             have the chance because this will probably be

Michael: ⌈my first and last time'.

Gregor: ⌊'be my last...first time

Gregor: and last'.

Angela: And I like

Angela: how, er, the title really suits the story.

Michael: Yeah.

Angela: 'Let the Balloon Go' cause he wants to be free

Michael: Yeah.

Angela: and how it keeps saying about the, ah

Gregor: the balloon...

Angela: the handicapped old man that used oh usually
             came by and he talks to him how he says umm
             ...'A balloon isn't er, a balloon until it's
             been cut'.

Patricia: Yeah.

Angela: ⌈Ah. I really liked how he said that.

Patricia: ⌊Yeah, yeah and his mother...

Patricia: you know it's just...it's a really good title...

Michael: ⌈I wonder how he did the picture on the front.

Gregor: ⌊In one paragraph it only explains

Gregor: about the, how his mother's just telling him
             not to do things like don't don't play the
             electricity, don't climb up there don't climb
             the ladder

Gregor: ⌈don't climb up on the tree.

Angela: ⌊Eeeeh, Whee.

Patricia: Yeah, well, what...What would you do if you were...if you were a handicap like him or you know, in a certain way, I'd really hate it.

Angela: Yeah I'd really feel oh...

Angela: ⌈horrible

Michael: ⌊different.

Angela: different, yeah, you'd be noticed by

Angela: ⌈everybody.

Gregor: ⌊You'd

Gregor: You'd...you'd be sort

Gregor: ⌈of isolated and everyone would think

Michael: ⌊Everyone would stare at you and...

Gregor: They wouldn't like to play with you

Michael: Yeah.

Angela: ⌈Yeah you'd be

Patricia: ⌊And you'd be

Patricia: and you'd be over protected. 'Don't do this, don't do that'. I just

Angela: and but what do you reckon, um, your parents would do if you're at home and your handicapped?

Patricia: Oh they do the same, you know, they'd just...

Angela: 'Don't do this don't do that'.

Michael: I don't think my parents would.

Patricia: He w...he would you know I think mine would really try and let, help me let the balloon go but Glenda would force me to do it. Glen would just force me to do it. But she is very overprotective 'cause she's rich, she's all this...

Michael: Who?

Patricia: John Clements' mother you know she, they're

Patricia: a rich family.

Michael: Yeah.

Angela: Yeah but they're...mm...

Michael: I...I think the...er...the book's sort of spoiled by some of the descriptions.

Michael: ⌈I think so because

Gregor: ⌊I think so too.

Michael: also the the description of the...um how the shower, how he only had his hand in the shower, I don't think that that ah...that description spoiled it

Michael: ⌈because it had nothing to do with it.

Angela: ⌊Yeah I do too.

Gregor: I know. That had nothing to do with the whole story.

Michael: Yeah.

Angela: ⌈But um

Patricia: ⌊In a way

Angela: but the story was rather short.

Michael: Yeah.

Angela: It had too much description but the meaning was rather short but it came out clear.

Michael: Yeah.

Angela: How he...um the story was just how mum went out climed tree fell down, everybody was um, everybody found out that he wanted to be free. That...that isn't, all that is in this book but the rest is just...um explaining what had happened...

Angela: ⌈What he's doing and how it happened.

Gregor: ⌊Yeah wh...what he's doing and...

Patricia: In a way...really...really we should really know how it happened

Angela: But...but

Patricia: You see, it's just like, um, um, we fall all
over but there has to be one reason why you
fell over, why it happened so everything, you
must know how it happened and everything.

Angela: But why do you think Ivan Southall

Angela: ⌈chose this, would write about this

Gregor: │would write a book about...choose a person...
⌊about a spastic person?

Angela: Yes, why do you think he'd do that and why do
you think, why do you think he'd get a boy...
a handicapped boy to climb a tree? Why couldn't
he

Angela: ⌈have ran or...or...

Patricia: ⌊Because to prove that

Angela: No...No. Why did he choose, er, especially
choose a tree?

Patricia: Mm.

Angela: Why couldn't he have chosen to climb the roof
and why couldn't

Angela: ⌈he have chosen to...

Gregor: │climb up on top of the roof

Michael: ⌊But I mean, I think the other way

Michael: is the best way because if he ran away...you
know lots of people they, even if they're not
mm...crippled they still would run away. I
think this is one thing that, um, it gives the
real impression of letting him being released.
Cause I don't think the others would, like
running away

Gregor: Mm

Michael: or something it...I think that...

Patricia: Especially climbing a house it just doesn't
set...

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: ⌈set the pace...it just doesn't set the pace
...the tree just sets the pace in a way...

Gregor: │(inaudible)

Angela: ⌊Well...well...to ma...ma to

Angela: to make the um to make the er book a bit more
interesting we could um...Ivan Southall could
have got the boy running away from home

Gregor: Yeah.

Patricia: That wouldn't <u>let the balloon go</u>.

Angela: No...Handicapped yes he would he wanted to run
into the bush um he wanted to be free...free
from all the nagg

Angela: ⌈nagging...

Gregor: ⌊From all the talk.

Gregor: Like his mother said, free from all the words.

Patricia: No...that just doesn't set the pace I...I
don't think it sets the pace I think um a tree
you know how he described that gum tree it was
magnificent, it was

Angela: ⌈What could (inaudible) things up too

Gregor: ⌊So he (inaudible)

Gregor: Yeah, What...What did...how did...Why did...
Ivan Southall didn't mention that John Clement
Summer Summer might have run away from home
before...

Gregor: ⌈he might (inaudible)

Patricia: ⌊Yeah, he couldn't. Because

Patricia: his mother's always there protect, protect,
protect

Gregor: Yeah, yeah that was the first time that he was
allowed...he kept on

Patricia: Yeah

Patricia: ⌈Yeah, if he

Angela: ⌊He was by himself

Patricia: you know he, he, if he run away

Angela: Ran.

Patricia: it would just be...uh...it really...what would
            he do, what would he do in a way?

Angela: Well...I...h...he'd have an adventure, maybe
            going through the bush trying to survive,
            getting food, but

Patricia: No. I

Angela: I, I reckon that's

Angela: getting more onto the point of um...he would...
            'Climb a Lonely Hill' probably.

Michael: I think yeah, 'Climb a Lonely Hill'

Angela: Yeah...so...I reckon it would have been better
            if he climbed the tree 'cause then we would've
            been having practically, well, the same story.

Patricia: I think 'Climb a Lonely Hill' is sickening.

Michael: I...I...think...I think...

Michael: I think that I think that the general...ah

Gregor: point

Michael: um...yeah, the point

Angela: the point

Michael: of it it its not it's not where he did it it's
            what he did....Because he could have um he might
            have gone to climb a tree far away if...you
            know...he didn't care where he did it as long

Michael: as he could climb that tree.

Gregor: Yeah,

Gregor: so he could climb that tree.

Patricia: As I...As I said...that question what would you
            do if you were in that

Patricia: ...in his...Mmm, in, in

Gregor: Some parts aren't really needed in this book,

Gregor: like when he had the shower, he could have just put his hand in...

Michael: Mm.

Gregor: its...they're not really needed.

Patricia: Oh in a way...really it shows he how his mother's but again this point I asked before - what would you really do if you were in his place? It's just...I'd feel

Patricia: ⌈all...

Gregor: ⌊Yeah

Gregor: ⌈How would you feel if you were handicapped?

Michael: ⌊Everyone would leave you out.

Patricia: No...getting out of that...getting out of that, what would you think if you were in his position you know, how how what he did you did you know?

Gregor: Yeah, called names and everything.

Patricia: He wasn't actually called names and in this

Gregor: No you would...you wouldn't

Michael: He wasn't called names by the other, his

Michael: ⌈other friends at school...

Patricia: ⌊Sissy Parslow

Michael: Yeah

Gregor: Sissy...Ceecil it was

Patricia: I...yes Cecil I thought it was Cecil...I thought it was Cecil.

Gregor: I think in the last four or five chapters he was called I think, in six, he was called Sissy.

Patricia: You know I think that it's just that um...

Gregor: It's got Ceecil.

Patricia: If I were John...I really wouldn't have enough of um...not enough of the er courage to do it, 'cause I'm a chicken; you see I would...if he ...if I was in his position I'd be I'd just

Patricia: be nagged nagged until I really got sick of it

Michael: But that's what the whole,

Michael: but that's what the whole book was about, it teaches you how you, how you break free from his mother.

Patricia: He didn't break free from his mother he...

Angela: Yes he did.

Michael: Yes he did.

Gregor: Yes he did.

Gregor: (inaudible)

Michael: Because who was it who was the one who persuaded him...who persuaded his mother to... um...to go with...go into city without him...?

Patricia: No, he didn't really actually break free from his mother, it's just that he, he, he broke free from...the nagging and

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: and pe...and people surrounding...'Oh John... don't do this' and his father, what about his father. You know, he just...he was all right, there wasn't much about his father.

Michael: But I like the way the thing says, um, how when his father, when he was thinking back to what his father was saying 'You're, you're much luckier in other ways because you don't have to go to a special school'.

Gregor: Oh yeah

Angela: Yeah I

Angela: liked that part.

Michael: Yeah, I think that part was good because that part did show what he did have, but what he did have to John wasn't good enough for him.

Gregor: Sissy.

Michael: He wanted to be like others.

Patricia: What about um Mamie you know how she said... she reckons he's a nut.

Gregor: Sissy Parslaw, you know he didn't, he didn't
            think anything of John.

Patricia: Yes he did in the end of it he did.

Angela: Yeah but I reckon...

Angela: ⌈I reckon
Gregor: ⌊In the beginning

Gregor: but right here it says 'the day when Sissy
            Parslaw had sneered'

Gregor: ⌈and so how can he be affected
Angela: ⌊But I I reckon...

Angela: I reckon Ivan Southall should have introduced
            more characters.

Patricia: More?...no I...

Angela: ⌈Oh I do...
Michael: ⌊I think he should have

Michael: because

Angela: Yes.

Michael: there were only four main characters. Oh well
            ...Sissy Parslow was sort of one but he wasn't
            really

Gregor: John was one of them his mother father and him
            and school mates, but they weren't brought
            into it much

Michael: ⌈and he, he...
Angela: ⌊No I reckon he should have

Angela: ⌈should have
Michael: ⌊Like the policeman and...

Patricia: No, I just think that...

Angela: It got a bit boring with only one man hearing
            about, you know, one person hearing about
            John Clement Sumner, John Clement Sumner. I
            reckon it should be

Gregor: All the time

Angela: a few more, um

Michael: What happened when the baker came? I forgot
              about...

Patricia: Yeah, um, he was lying down in the bush

Angela: He...He...He was pretending

Gregor: He was lying down

Angela: He was pretending he was playing

Angela: hide and seek.

Gregor: hide and seek.

Michael: Yeah

Angela: Um, er

Gregor: Shhh...

Angela: I liked it how, um, in 'The Silver Sword' there
              were lots and lots of characters in it

Michael: I know.

Angela: um and in, er, in 'A Wrinkle in Time' there
              were quite a few characters

Michael: Yeah.

Angela: but in sort of 'Let the Balloon Go' and
              'Climb a Lonely Hill'

Patricia: Err.

Angela: They're not many...

Angela: only about three

Gregor: There's only the main

Gregor: couple of characters.

Patricia: Yeah,...like in 'Climb a Lonely Hill' there's
              only two main characters.

Angela: Oh, Uncle Bert...

Gregor: He wasn't really a main character.

Patricia: Yes he was, he was um...the co-star in other
              words.

Angela: Yeah, yes, mm.

Michael: Um...I think that the, I think that Ivan
            Southall the book didn't stand out as much
            because he um...it...because the, his
            background. I think it would be much better
            if his background, his mother, his mother and
            father weren't rich...and...

Angela: No...No

Patricia: Nooo...Nooo

Michael: it would be

Michael: much better...

Gregor: Yeah, so do I

Gregor   if the, if the parents weren't much rich and
            he

Gregor: and he

Angela: Well, why...Why?

Michael: Because I think that...I think that, um

Patricia: Yeah, but which tree would he climb really in
            a way...you know...say if they own a little
            property and there's no big trees around would
            he climb all over the streets?

Michael: But Patricia it doesn't matter which tree he
            climbed, it's the thing that he can climb
            the tree.

Gregor: Yeah.

Patricia: Yeah but I

Michael: It doesn't matter which tree he climbs even if
            it's only a small one as long as he knows
            that he has climbed the tree.

Patricia: Yeah, he wanted to climb that big gum tree
            really. No it just wouldn't set the pace if
            you...if you took one from the from the street
            you know, it just wouldn't set the pace.

Michael: Yeah but...Oh, but I mean I...I think that in a
            way um his, his parents, it's just his father
            was good because ah...he fa...I think his
            father was much better because his father
            treated him less overprotectedly than his mother,
            did 'cause she was always saying 'Don't do
            this, don't do that'.

Patricia: Getting to the subject I think that he the other subject we were saying...um richer and poorer...I think um the way they said ah he was really...it was a way, a good way because they had a good gum tree ready to climb...he doesn't have to go into the street and climb one.

Michael: I think, um, that in the story

Gregor: Three hundred

Michael: I think, that the family might have been um like they might have been less, like say they might not have been a happy family.

Patricia: No...

Gregor: It is a sad family 'cause he's like that.

Angela: Yes...really it is a

Angela: [a sad family

Patricia: [She's giving most...

Patricia: she's given him most...You know how she says 'I've given you most of my life'.

Gregor: She hasn't really.

Patricia: Yes she has in a way because, um...she's treated...you know...

Gregor: She's treated him like that and everything...

Patricia: Well she hasn't treated him like a...

Gregor: four year old.

Gregor: [Sometimes

Michael: [I like

Michael: I like the way in the beginning like say 'John Clement Sumner had a dreaming sort of feeling, a waking up sort of feeling, an in the middle sort of feeling'. I think that's a good beginning.

Gregor: [I didn't like the...

Patricia: [Here on the

Patricia: here on the, uh, whatever it is uh, the page
before the cover, after the cover - 'You must
remember that you are different from other
children'.

Gregor: He's not allowed to play any games like

Gregor: ⌈cricket...or...

Patricia: ⌊He mustn't chop wood

Patricia: or use a saw or ride a bike, get into

Gregor: ⌈No

Patricia: ⌊fights

Patricia: or climb trees

Michael: Yeah and

Michael: ⌈then there's a break...

Gregor: ⌊It's just like

Gregor: it's just like talking to a four year old and

Patricia: ⌈You mustn't

Gregor: ⌊treating

Gregor: him like

Gregor: ⌈a four year old...

Patricia: ⌊'You mustn't...'

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: Yeah I reckon...

Angela: I think his father should have treated, um,
him um more like a twelve year old...just
a little bit more.

Michael: Nothing was wrong with his brain.

Angela: Yeah, nothing was wrong...

Michael: It was something that was wrong...he got spasms
and uh.

Patricia: Yeah, that...this really in a way it does I
think, it has to do a bit with the brain
because everything's

Patricia: connected to the...

Michael: But I mean

Gregor: a blockage

Michael: When he didn't when he worr...he didn't have a spasm he was perfectly normal.

Gregor: I know

Michael: But...I...I...his mother acted, even when he didn't have the spasms, his mother acted as if,

Michael: as if...

Gregor: Yeah because

Gregor: he was only mainly crippled.

Patricia: Because the spasms could have just come any time remember

Angela: Yeah, but

Patricia: they just come up from nowhere...

Angela: Yeah but if...if if he wanted...if, um, his parents ah took a bit too much um er made him a like a twelve year old and he went horse riding say um...

Angela: and they let him go horse riding

Gregor: and he fell off

Angela: and he gets the spasms and he falls off... yeah.

Patricia: Yeah.

Angela: So they shouldn't treat him too normal but... I reckon he should have should have had a little bit of a life like for all the other um handicapped people um they I bet I wonder if if we were in their position...

Patricia: I can't really describe it now

Gregor: How would you like it?

Patricia: 'cause I really don't know.

Angela: But um but they they um wouldn't wouldn't be able to go horse riding or have little jokes or go swimming and that and it really would be horrible.

Patricia: Mm.

Michael: I suppose. What would you do if you were his parents?

Patricia: I'd be like her really, there's no kidding she was doing

Patricia: all she could.

Gregor: No I wouldn't,

Gregor: I think she was doing quite a lot.

Patricia: Yeah, she was doing

Gregor: She hardly lets him do anything just fly

Gregor: a model plane...

Angela: Yeah, I'd let him do something

Angela: I'd let him do

Angela: something.

Patricia: No if

Patricia: No no really I'm not joking. If you were his parents you know, just think of it, just think of it, say that you had a son and he was crippled, you'd most probably act like it, because...unless you haven't read this book.

Michael: I wouldn't, I wouldn't...

Michael: I think...I think...

Gregor: I wouldn't, I'd treat him quite nice.

Michael: I think that the spasms were caused by his mother being overprotective because

Patricia: They couldn't have...

Gregor: I know

Michael: No I think it was because his mother made him, made him feel so uncomfortable

Patricia: remember that, he hardly had any friends and most probably they wouldn't invite him to parties and things like that.

Gregor: Who did...who,who were his friends?

Patricia: He hardly had any friends you know

Angela: Oh well he had um...

Michael: The school friends, they were about his only friends.

Angela: Mm.

Patricia. Yeah.

Gregor: There was...no there was another guy whose... I forget...

Patricia: Harry someone.

Gregor: He was...yeah.

Patricia: Harry someone.

Gregor: and another guy who was riding on his bike as ...

Angela: Um

Gregor: dodging his handle

Patricia: Yeah...they're not...yeah...no

Gregor: [What was his name?

Patricia: [But remember how one of them

Patricia: one of those one of those people they had to ...one of those boys tried to avoid him.... See like all those people he was talking about had to avoid him because, you know, like their parents said, 'Try to avoid him'...

Michael: Cause he was...yeah...yeah

Patricia: See he had hardly any friends.

Michael: I think that was one of the reasons he didn't have any friends because all the other parents said keep away from him just because he's... a cripple.

Angela: Yeah like how Cecil...Ce

Patricia: 'Ceecil'

Angela: Par...Ce...Sissy Parslaw um...he, he...um was
             told not to go near, near him and Mamie and all
             that...they we...just because he was not
             normal.

Patricia: Oh well I just think...really um his...his
             mother, now in a way though she was over-
             protective, I don't really blame her in a way
             ...I just don't blame her in a way, in that
             way because if you were a parent and you had to
             look after, just think of it, just really think
             of it, you and you just treat

Gregor: I'd give

Gregor: ⌈I'd give him some feeling
Patricia: ⌊Because she she loved him

Patricia: she loved him, didn't she? She didn't want,
             she didn't want anything to happen to him
             because she loved him. That's why she, she
             treated him the way she did.

Patricia: ⌈Just think of that, just think of it that way
Gregor: ⌊She wanted him

Patricia: Just think of it that way. Yeah because...

Michael: Yeah well she...she rarely ever took him out,
             she never ever took him out on the beach and
             she's always been in the house.

Gregor: Be in the house just...doing nothing

Michael: Yeah...doing...

Gregor: Doing nothing.

Gregor: ⌈probably
Patricia: ⌊Yeah but

Patricia: she loved him, she...she didn't want anything
             to happen to him...

Michael: Oh yes but what could happen in the car...

Gregor: Yeah.

Michael: going out for a drive

Michael: [I bet you he was cooped up...

Patricia: [A car accident.

Michael: Yeah

Michael: [How many times

Gregor: [She didn't, she didn't

Michael: do your parents have a car accident?

Angela: When it was their fault?

Patricia: Yeah, yeah we had a drunk behind us.

Michael: But I mean...It's, it's unfair because he always
          is cooped up inside. Could you if you weren't
          crippled just being cooped up inside and you

Patricia: I'd go mad.

Michael: Yeah and then your parents would never, ever
          take you out and and you'd always be inside
          apart from when you went to school.

Gregor: You wouldn't know what everything would look
          like...

Gregor: [and if you ever did get a chance to go out
          you'd hardly know anything

Patricia: [No...no because she...because she loved him.

Patricia: She wanted nothing to happen. Just because a
          drive, you know, that, she hardly went out,
          remember that she hardly went out.

Angela: Because of him

Michael: [Yeah 'cause he...

Patricia: [She...

Patricia: it's him that got her cooped up, for one
          reason

Patricia: [because of....In a way it was

Gregor: [No not necessarily I don't think.

Patricia: In a way it was like um you know she...he, she
was scared something would happen to him so
she want...she wanted to stay with him and she
couldn't go out. You know it was just because
of him. It was partly because of him and it
was partly because of her. It was...

Michael: I think he should have been allowed to stay
home by himself before so he he could get used
to it. Like say he he said the last time he
came in with her and that was only for a few
hours into the city, but his mother's a
lecturer she, he...she would be a busy woman but
when she comes home, she'd spend all her time
with him.

Gregor: Yeah.

Michael: But I mean she, she shouldn't do that as often.
I know she loved him but I mean she should
have...do your parents stay with you every
second they can?

Angela: Yeah.

Gregor: ⌈No...No

Patricia: ⌊For only one reason

Patricia: they don't for one reason because we're not,
because we're not crippled, John was crippled,
just think of that, just think

Gregor: Well just because he's crippled it doesn't mean
that he has to be

Gregor: ⌈cooped up like that

Michael: │Yeah

Patricia: ⌊Yeah but she, she was very

Patricia: overprotective she, she didn't want anything to
happen to him.

Angela: I bet...I bet he felt like an animal, cooped
up in a cage

Angela: ⌈and these other boys

Patricia: ⌊I know...I know that but...

Angela: But I reckon he should have had a little bit
of freedom...

Patricia: You can take it from your point of view too.

Angela: ⌈'Let...Let the Balloon Go' meant...

Gregor: ⌊Just because...

Gregor: just because he's crippled doesn't mean that he can't go anywhere.

Patricia: I know it's just that it's just

Michael: ⌈I think that...

Gregor: ⌊(inaudible)

Michael: I don't think that...I think his mother is... the only reason she is o...overprotective is not about his legs, its about the spasms that he has.

Patricia: Yeah that's right...that's what

Patricia: ⌈she just didn't...

Michael: ⌊Because she

Michael: I think that if she knew when the spasms were going to occur, if there were some sort of indication, she would um

Michael: ⌈be...

Patricia: ⌊Yeah that's

Patricia: what I was try...

Michael: get prepared for it.

Patricia: I was trying to get that through to...your dear little soul...

Michael: Yeah, but I mean sh...she shouldn't have been so overprotective she I...I...

Patricia: She didn't, remember as you said just then, she did not know when the spasms were, you know

Gregor: were going to occur...

Michael: ⌈Yeah.

Patricia: ⌊Yeah.

Gregor: They could occur any moment is just that

Michael: What about the time when he woke up in the morning and, he thought that he saw that bad guy behind the curtain?

Gregor: ⌈Behind that curtain

Patricia: ⌊That was actually

Patricia: just moving in a way

Michael: I know that, but did you think that

Gregor: What was the name of the guy behind the curtain?

Patricia: Macleod.

Angela: Macleod.

Gregor: Yeah...Mr. Macleod.

Michael: Could you imagine I could you...Remember the
            description of all the things like say the
            broom which, the old stick which his mother,
            his grandmother had before she died and...the
            description of things. I think that gave him
            a very sad background. 'Cause you know he had
            nothing in his room yet the...the description
            made it sound like a few old things.

Gregor: Yeah.

Angela: I know...

Patricia: Old things, not really, no I don't think so.

Gregor: ⌈Yeah...well you don't know what it's like being
            | crippled and you're not allowed to be anywhere
            | just because he's crippled.

Michael: ⌊(inaudible) he wanted his grandmother's stick.

Patricia: In a way when you're - when som...when they
            die and you love that grandparent, if they
            gave you something you'd really actually
            treasure it like, when I, when I got some things
            from my grandparents, tons of books, you know,
            I can't read them I still keep them, I don't
            throw them away do I? I can't read them but I
            still keep them.

Michael: I...I think that

Gregor: Why can't you read them?

Patricia: Because they're Czechoslovakian, ha ha.

Michael: I don't think that...I think that if...um if it
            was taken in a different area, the book would
            have been...it depends...

Gregor: It would have been

Michael: in an area, like say...I don't think that...I
            think that one of the reasons he didn't go out
            was because of the, like say maybe if he lived
            in a country town...because it...he lived
            just out of

Patricia: He does. He does live in the country.

Michael: Yeah well if he lived in a country town where
            there weren't, where everything was country-
            like, and everything wasn't so formally
            dressed...I...I think his mother would have been
            less easier because it's much easier for
            everyone to um

Patricia: live in a country area...

Michael: Yeah.

Patricia: I know you've got a lot more space...

Angela: What do you reckon...What do you reckon um would
            happen, how would he be free if he were living
            in the city, what do you reckon he would do to
            prove...

Gregor: Yeah...

Michael: If he were living in the city, I'd say, if he
            were in the city um er as the book is taken
            near the city but if he was in the country say,
            maybe he would, his mother would let him out
            more often because.

Gregor: ⌈Even if...even if he had

Patricia: ⌊Answer, answer, Angela's question.

Patricia: Answer Angela's question 'cause I want to see
            your point of view for one reason.

Angela: Yeah, but, um he is in the country, he did climb
            a tree, but what do you reckon he'd do if he
            was in a city?

Patricia: Yeah that's...

Angela: In a city.

Patricia: What kind of tree could he climb?

Gregor: Well he could have a big backyard and muck
            around in a tree.

Patricia: ⌈No...No...in a city

Angela: ⌊In a city.

Gregor: Oh.

Angela: right in the heart of the city.

Gregor: ⌈Well nobody hardly ever lives in the heart
            │of the city

Michael: ⌊Well I think (inaudible)

Patricia: There's...you know she...you don't understand.

Gregor: Only caretakers live in the middle of the city.

Angela: In the city, just say he lived in the city.

Michael: But he does.

            (Laughter)

Angela: But no...he lives out, out of Melbourne, which
            is a city, he lives in a town, a little town.

Michael: No, I think that

Gregor: ⌈Not necessarily

Michael: ⌊I...

Michael: Ivan Southall gave the impression that he lived
            in the city even if it said that...

Angela: ⌈No.

Patricia: ⌊Noo...in a way

Patricia: In a way, but he did like he might, he lived
            near the market place.

Michael: The baker, now would the baker come in the
            country?

Angela: Yes...

Patricia: Yes he would.

Michael: A baker?

Patricia: Yes.

Gregor: No...not usually...

Gregor: ⌈like you usually

Patricia: ⌊Yes remember

Patricia: he lived in a little town he didn't live on...
he didn't live outside remember.

Michael: You'd probably, you'd probably get a baker
which came about, around once a week and
left...

Michael: ⌈it at a little shop.

Gregor: ⌊I know

Angela: But what do you think he'd climb in the city?

Angela: ⌈Not what

Patricia: ⌊Yeah not what

Patricia: ⌈Not what...

Angela: ⌊What do you think he'd

Michael: But there are still trees in the city.

Gregor: ⌈Yeah.

Angela: ⌊Yeah I know

Angela: but not as good as this...

(Experimenter intervenes to tell group time
has elapsed)

Gregor: He could climb a drainpipe.

Class: III

Date: 12th October 1976

Novel: 'I Own The Racecourse'

Participants: Jim, Suzy, Sarah

Jim: Well, I thought it was, I thought it was a bit better, I thought it was a better book than, um, 'Let the Balloon Go', because it sort of had a bit more of an ending to it and a bit more story.

Sarah: Yeah, 'Let the Balloon Go' should have been a one-page story.

Suzy: I read...one page?

Jim: ⌈Oh well, you know...

Sarah: ⌊This has more feeling in it...

Suzy: Oh, I liked 'Let the Balloon Go' better. I think that's tons better. There's a lot of expression in it....What's-a-me-call-it. What do you call it, um...No, what's it called?

Sarah: ⌈Description.

Jim: ⌊Description.

Jim: Well, this had plenty of description in it.

(interruption)

Jim: Well, um...

Sarah: I don't think that book was really all that bad, you know, for a description of the handicapped.

Jim: ⌈No, he wasn't really bad.

Suzy: ⌊It wasn't

Sarah: He had a wild imagination.

Jim: Yeah...

Suzy: I reckon this is boring...'cause nothing exciting really happens.

Sarah: In 'Let the Balloon Go' nothing exciting happens.

Suzy: Something exciting happened.

Jim: Oh, well, there was really...this was...sort of more of a story than 'Let the Balloon Go'. It had more to it.

Suzy:	It wasn't.
Sarah:	'Let the Balloon Go' was like a poem sort of.
Suzy:	No it wasn't.
Jim:	(inaudible)
Jim:	It was just like how we'd write a story, just sort of had a beginning and an and and what the boy felt.
Sarah:	No, that's rubbish
Suzy:	This is straight off...
Suzy:	it says, um...Andy...um, he did this, he did that, it doesn't say anything about
Suzy:	what he really thinks.
Sarah:	Yeah, that's true
Jim:	Yeah.
Suzy:	I...I don't like him...
Jim:	Yeah, he was...
Suzy:	Oh, wow!
	(moves away and closes door)
Jim:	Suzy, it's no use closing it again, it just opens.
	(pause)
	It's not gonna help it Suzy. Um...I don't... in a way he was apart from the other boys because they sort of wouldn't let him have a go on the skateboard.
Suzy:	No, he didn't want to, he was too scared.
Sarah:	Oh, well...right.
Jim:	No, he wasn't scared but he just didn't want to... He might have thought that he might not have been able to do it or something.
Sarah:	That's being scared.
Jim:	Yeah, I guess so.

Sarah:	Mm. I don't think his parents could have cared all that much.
Suzy:	Yes she did.
Jim:	No...in 'Let the Balloon Go' the parents
Sarah:	Yeah.
Jim:	cared for him too much.
Suzy:	too much.
Sarah:	Yeah, too much. This one too little probably.
Jim:	Well...yeah.
Suzy:	No. Well, it was just that you didn't hear much about her.
Jim:	Yeah.
	(laughter)
Sarah:	Probably hasn't had a very good education,
Jim:	Yeah
Sarah:	so he's only got his own imagination.
Suzy:	But I reckon the whole plot...I reckon the whole thing's stupid, some-one selling some-one...he'd probably be explaining that today...if he hadn't got
Jim:	No...
Suzy:	Well, he's fairly old.
Jim:	Yeah but...you know.
Sarah:	He's pretty old...only twelve but
Suzy:	Yeah, twelve.
	(laughter)
Suzy:	Oh well, well if you're a six year old you might sort of get sold...sold...whatever it is to you
Jim:	Yeah.
Suzy:	but he's eleven or twelve he should know... I'd know.

Sarah:	Yes, but he's different from you, he's a bit behind,
Jim:	Yeah, he's
Suzy:	Oh, well
Sarah:	he'd be about an eight year old I reckon.
Suzy:	But the whole thing is stupid I reckon.
Jim:	I will agree I liked 'Let the Balloon Go' sort of, there was...it had...they told you...
Sarah:	No, the boy knew what he was doing.
Suzy:	Yeah, they told you what he was thinking.
Jim:	Yeah.
Suzy:	And what he thought of everyone else.
Jim:	Yeah.
Sarah:	Oh, this one told you a bit
Suzy:	(inaudible)
Sarah:	Oh, let's get off the track...not get off the track...um...let our imagination run wild.
Jim:	Well, you know...
Suzy:	I can imagine what you'd think of...if you let your imagination...
Jim:	on the book!
	(laughter)
Suzy:	I just didn't like it and that was it.
Sarah:	Yeah, O.K., we all have different tastes.
Jim:	It wasn't much better than 'Let the Balloon Go', I just sort of went for it.
Suzy:	It was worse!
Jim:	Yeah, well that's your opinion.
Suzy:	I know it's my opinion.
Jim:	So you can't say it _was_ worse!
Suzy:	It _is_ worse!

Jim: But you can't say it is unless it you've just

Suzy: Can't say it is unless it was.

Jim: But it isn't.

         (laughter)

Jim: But it wasn't...oh!

         (pause)

Suzy: I just didn't like.

Sarah: He was pretty kind.

Suzy: It didn't appeal to me.

Jim: It's not

Suzy: We don't have to.

         (laughter)

Suzy: Sorry.

         (pause)

Suzy: I wonder...

Jim: I think 'Let the Balloon Go' if they...it
         would have been a good book if they'd have
         just cut out a few of the things.

Suzy: Mm,

Jim: ⌈Sort of

Sarah: ⌊They went on

Suzy: they went on a bit with...

Jim: the ladder.

Sarah: him climbing up the tree.

Jim: Yeah....If...I think they might have just
         done that to extend the book or something
         like that...

Suzy: Oh, no, mm.

Jim: Well, if the, made it. Say...it was a hundred
         and twelve pages. You know if they made it...
         a little bit...cut out a couple of the long
         descriptions...seems it could have been better.

Sarah:	Gee, we've got, er...wild imaginations.
Jim:	Well,I think the person in this book had more of a wild imagination.
Sarah:	Ah! yeah but they were more (inaudible). Well the other one was more...sort of more,
Jim:	Well the other one was more boyish...um...like this one's sort of in the...the other one was
Sarah:	Yeah
Jim:	the other one was...
Sarah:	the other one was paralysed in the leg, this one's paralysed in the mind.
Jim:	Yeah...
Sarah:	⌈Well, this one's
Jim:	⌊The other one was
Jim:	the other one mentally, the other person was
Jim:	⌈physically.
Sarah:	⌊physically.
Suzy:	But what's-his-name, whatever his name what was his name?
Sarah:	Andy.
Suzy:	No, the other book...ah
Jim:	John.
Sarah:	Josh.
Jim:	⌈John
Sarah:	⌊John
Jim:	something or other.
Suzy:	Well, John was...John was, um...he was pretty funny in the head too.
Sarah:	⌈Yeah, but not that hopeless
Jim:	⌊No he wasn't really, no he,

Jim: he might have been funny in the head because
           he'd been...he had to stay at home and he
           couldn't do what all the boys did,

Jim: boys did.

Sarah: He's sort of been captured

Sarah: in captivity.

Jim: Yeah.

           (laughter. Suzy goes to close door again)

Jim: Oh, Suzy, come on.

Suzy: I'm coming.

Sarah: I think you should be cut out of the group.

Suzy: I think you should be too. (inaudible)

Jim: I thought...Ivan Southall might have been a
           better writer than...

Sarah: Mm.

Jim: Patricia Wrightson.

Sarah: No, Josh is...better.

Jim: Oh, that's good.

Suzy: Oh, no, he's not necessarily a better writer,
           just...

Jim: Oh, no, but,

Suzy: different, well

Jim: different, yeah

Suzy: different ideas.

Jim: and in this book, I think...

           (pause, laughter)

Sarah: Talk about Andy.

Suzy: I didn't like Andy.

Jim: Well, Andy

Suzy: He's a bit too boyish I reckon.

Jim: Too girlish.

Suzy: A typical boy.

Sarah: 'A typical boy'....She sounded so clever.
            John Sumner was more boyish.

Suzy: No he wasn't

Jim: Oh he was in a way.

Suzy: I reckon he was...

Jim: Oh, you know

Suzy: No, he was boyish. Yeah, he was.

Suzy: ⌈But the other's a typical boy

Sarah: ⌊He wanted to climb trees and

Sarah: ride bikes and go swimming. Yeah, it was
            rather boring I suppose.

Jim: Yeah, John wanted to do everything that all
            the other boys did, and the only thing he
            ever got round to doing was climbing a tree.

Sarah: Andy wanted

Sarah: ⌈to be by himself.

Suzy: ⌊Yeah.

Suzy: Andy didn't want to do anything the other boys
            did...

Jim: Yeah

Suzy: and

Sarah: But John did.

Suzy: Yeah, John...John...John did.

Sarah: So, Andy always had people to do things with.

Jim: Yeah, John...Andy was allowed to do things

Sarah: Yeah,

Jim: normal boys did

Sarah: and

Jim: and John wasn't.

Sarah:	⎡Yeah, well John was
Suzy:	⎣Andy was allowed to
Suzy:	but he didn't want to. John wasn't allowed to but he
Suzy:	⎡did want to.
Jim:	⎣Yeah...did want to
Jim:	and he did but Andy...Andy...he didn't do anything that the other boys did... remember?
Sarah:	Oh...yeah.
Jim:	Yeah, he was hanging around with them
Suzy:	Oh, what's it called when they go off by themselves...um...alone...a loner...something like that
Sarah:	No...alone, loner.
Suzy:	Shove 'em up there. What is it?
Jim:	A loner.
Sarah:	Um (inaudible)
Suzy:	Oh well, doesn't matter, we know what we mean.
Jim:	Yeah.
Sarah:	Yeah.
	(pause)
Jim:	Now, who else was there in the book? There was...
Sarah:	He was quite kind...you know,
Jim:	Yeah.
Sarah:	helping all over the fairground, the racecourse ...whatever it's supposed to be.
Jim:	Yeah.
Sarah:	Have you got up to that?
Suzy:	No.
Sarah:	Have you been reading?

Suzy: Only unless I have to..may as well anyway.

          (pause)

Suzy: Well, I wish you'd just fix the door. I
          always have to fix it.

Sarah: You haven't tried to talk, Suzy.

Jim: The mother and father

Sarah: I think he was brought up in a poor
          neighbourhood, you know...

Jim: Yeah.

Sarah: (inaudible)

Jim: Yeah and he, oh...

Suzy: Cut...One question...is this annoying you?

Jim: Yes it is.

Suzy: Oh!...I've got to fiddle with something,
          excuse me. Can I fiddle with this?

Jim: No!

Suzy: Well! I can't sit still unless I'm fiddling
          with something.

Sarah: Suzy!

Jim: Well, what else..what else can we talk about?

Sarah: Um...everybody treated him as though he owned
          it.

Jim: ⌈Yeah, they did.

Suzy: ⌊Well, they...

Suzy: they didn't...he wouldn't understand that he
          didn't own it so they

Jim: Yeah, so they,

Suzy: went along with it

Jim: they had to,

Suzy: until they found out the other...

Jim: they had to go along with it and treat it as
          though he did.

Sarah: Most people would realise that children...
            they don't get any money for it, you know,
            because people have to pay to get in, don't
            they?

Jim: Yeah.

Suzy: I reckon that old man was really, well

Jim: He was a bit, you know

Suzy: ⌈a bit mean.

Sarah: ⌊a bit mean.

Suzy: It was a bit mean taking the three dollars...
            he was a bit...you know...he was...

Sarah: He has to. He wanted to get money to drink
            probably.

Jim: Yeah.

Suzy: But it still meant...oh, I was on the kid's
            side.

Jim: Yeah, well really, um...in,in 'Let the Balloon
            Go' no-one was really mean to him...
            (inaudible)

Sarah: Oh, some of them teased him...Well,

Jim: Well, the teacher didn't believe him...

Sarah: Yeah.

Jim: If he had gone to school and said 'I climbed
            the tree'

Jim: ⌈the teacher wouldn't have

Suzy: ⌊Yeah the teacher

Suzy: was terrible, she's really revolting.

Sarah: Like she said, 'Did you do

Sarah: ⌈(inaudible)

Jim: ⌊Yeah 'cause that

Jim: could really put John off.

Sarah: Mm.

Jim: Might make him go and jump off the cliff and come back the next morning and say 'I killed myself, now say I didn't!!'

Suzy: You're a weirdo.

Jim: Why?

Suzy: 'Cause you are.

Jim: Um, what else?

(pause)

Sarah: Keep on talking.

Jim: I could never see what that picture was? Can you pick it out?

Sarah: Upside down,

Suzy: What?

Jim: That, That picture.

Suzy: I don't know...Maybe I've got the same picture.

Sarah: I liked this one because it's got a few pictures in it as well.

Suzy: What is it?

Jim: Page ninety six.

Sarah: Look! You're always in (inaudible)

Suzy: Look at that! Gee.

(pause, laughter and inaudible talk)

Sarah: Stop it! I think the man with the bottles was an alcoholic or something.

Jim: Oh, well.

Sarah: Look, why don't you call it 'The Man With The Bottles'?

Jim: Yeah.

Suzy: What man with the bottles?

Sarah: ⌈The man who sold him

Jim: ⌊page thirty two

Suzy:	Thirty two...is 'The Man with the Bottles'. Thirty two...where's the man with the bottles?
Jim:	⎡Oh, he's the one
Suzy:	⎣He's the one
Suzy:	that sold him the ruddy thing.
Sarah:	Yes, well that's the man with the bottles.
Suzy:	Yeah.
Jim:	Yeah.
Suzy:	Well, he's probably
Jim:	He was the d-d-drunk
Suzy:	No...well.
Sarah:	alcoholic.
Jim:	Well...oh, yeah.
Suzy:	Probably gonna buy...alcohol. See it takes brains....
Sarah:	Well, he could have been just picking them up.
Jim:	No, but...he was...
	(pause)
Jim:	Um.
Suzy:	He was nasty.
Sarah:	Well, I suppose it was fun for him to believe that he um, owned the racecourse.
Jim:	Yeah...yeah.
Suzy:	Yeah.
Jim:	It was not that he owned it but, but I... you know
Suzy:	but they only acted as if they had it.
Sarah:	I think they were all a bit dumb 'cause they always used to play this game where they owned...the bridge and all that...the're, they're all a bit dumb.

Jim: Yeah. Oh.

Suzy: Oh. Did I do it again?

Jim: Yes.

Suzy: Oh, sorry.

Jim: Yeah, well...I, I wonder what the next book will be like? I wonder if it's like...

Sarah: I hope we get 'A Wrinkle in Time'.

Suzy: 'A Wrinkle in Time', oh.

Jim: What's that about?

Suzy: I read some of it before.

Jim: What's it about?

Sarah: Probably good things!

Jim: What's it about? What's it about?

Suzy: Oh, it's terrible.

Jim: What's it about?

Suzy: Mrs. Whatsit...Mrs....can't remember the other stupid names. It's terrible.

Sarah: I don't think it had a good ending...you know.

Suzy: Are we gonna read... What's that?[1] 'Nobby Goes to...'

Sarah: 'Nibble Nobby's Nuts'.

(laughter)

Suzy: No...no...'Noddy Goes to School'. Oh we had one of them in New Zealand.

Sarah: Oh did you?

Suzy: 'Noddy's New Car' or something like that.

Jim: Oh, Suzy, come on, you always...

---

[1] The children were sitting near the experimenter's bookshelves on which were a number of books for young children.

Suzy: Why? Oh well...everyone else did...someone
             started it...saying 'What we gonna read next?'

Sarah: Jim started it.

Jim: Well, I was just interested in what we're
             going to read next.

Suzy: Yeah...I was asking if we were gonna read
             them.

Jim: Oh, 'Noddy'...for about a five year old.

Suzy: Isn't that rubbing it in? Come on...

Suzy: ⌈(inaudible)

Jim: ⌊Oh, come on.

Jim: I might have started it but let's finish it
             ...Come on.

Sarah: Um...he would have got all the money for the
             bets, you know, if he owned it.

Jim: Yeah.

Suzy: ⌈I think the man

Jim: ⌊Some of the pictures in here

Jim: were sort of, helped you on a bit

Sarah: Yeah.

Jim: er, whereas in 'Let the Balloon Go' there
             weren't any pictures at all.

Sarah: Yeah, it's sort of hard to follow 'Let the
             Balloon Go'. Sort of...in another world.

Jim: Yeah.

             (pause)

Sarah: But this person was in, um, his own world.

Suzy: I was going to say something.

Jim: Yeah, come on.

Sarah: Yeah, he was in his own world...Andy was in
             his own world.

Jim:	Yeah, but John's sort of wasn't in his own world.
	(laughter)
Sarah:	He was in his own house all the time.
Suzy:	Heay, in his own room.
Jim:	Well this boy was allowed to go out and
Sarah:	Yeah, but
Jim:	around the place.
Sarah:	Yeah, but he wanted to be in his own world sort of.
Jim:	Yeah, he did. He could have done what all the other boys did.
Sarah:	(inaudible)
Suzy:	Now I can say something.
Sarah:	Yeah.
Jim:	Yeah, just say anything you want to.
Suzy:	What was I going...oh.
Sarah:	About him being on his own...
Jim:	Oh, Suzy, you just come into it.
Sizy:	No, I forgot...every time I do, Sarah butts in.
Jim:	Well, forget Sarah's here or something.
Sarah:	No don't...just butt in.
Suzy:	All right...righto.
Jim:	Or just sort of talk in time.
	(intervention by experimenter)

Class: III

Date: 12th October 1977

Novel: 'I Own The Racecourse'

Participants: Marcus, Janet, Katrina

Marcus: O.K. Now, now let me see. In what ways was Andy different?

Janet: No, first we'll discuss what the characters were like...like the tramp and Andy and... and the owners of the...

(Marcus moves chair noisily)

Janet: and the owners of the um, racecourse and that.

Marcus: Well, do you think that that tramp was a, a ratbag?

Janet: I really think he was a drunk

Katrina: ⌈Oh, he was a drunk.

Marcus: ⌊Do you think he was a drunk?

Katrina: ⌈Oh, he was, he was probably an alcoholic.

Marcus: ⌊He might have been a drunk

Marcus: because he came out of the pub.

Katrina: The people at the racecourse spoilt him 'cause they just...oh they,

Katrina: ⌈they went along with him.

Marcus: ⌊He was drunk when he took the money.

Marcus: He was drunk when he took the money...but he wasn't drunk when he sold it.

Katrina: Oh, when he um, um

Janet: In what ways, in what way was Andy different?

Katrina: Well, he was!

Janet: He was, he was, he must have...

Marcus: He had a different way of thinking.

Janet: Yeah, he (inaudible)

Katrina: Yeah, he looked on the bright side more, really...and everyone worried about him and when the racecourse was sold back to the people, everyone worried about what would happen, a, you know

Katrina: ⎡he didn't even know.

Marcus: ⎣He didn't, he didn't

Marcus: he didn't even know

Marcus: ⎡that he didn't own it.

Janet: ⎣He took everything for granted.

Marcus   He still didn't know that he didn't own it.

Katrina: I know

Janet: He took everything for granted.

Katrina: Eh...who...Andy? No he didn't.

Marcus: No he didn't.

Katrina: He made, ah, he didn't just...he cleaned up
           and did lots of things.

Janet: Yeah, but he took it that he really owned it.

Katrina: Yeah, well, that's not taking it for granted.

Katrina: ⎡He didn't

Marcus: ⎣Yeah but

Marcus: he bought it, that's why he thought he owned
           it.

Janet: I know.

Marcus: He paid money for it.

Janet: Yeah, I know, and he thought he really
           owned it.

Katrina: Yeah, but he didn't take it for granted. If
           he did take it for granted, he wouldn't have
           cleaned it up or sweeped or anything but he
           did.

Marcus: He did.

Janet: I know.

Katrina: I know. Well, he didn't take it for granted
           then.

Marcus: And he painted the seats.

Katrina: Well, he thought he was...

             (laughter)

Katrina: Yeah... Well, he thought he was doing good.
             What's the next question?

Janet: Um, was his experience of life very different
             from ours? Is his, is his experience of...

Marcus: (inaudible)

Katrina: Just go on about handicapped people, you know,
             why we should treat...yes, oh.

             (pause)

Janet: Well, handicapped people should be treasured
             more.

Marcus: But he's not handicapped.

Janet: Oh he is, he is in a way.

Katrina: Not, oh, not um demented, not really demented.

Marcus: No, not really. Nothing's wrong with him
             physically, it's in the mind.

Katrina: Mm.

Janet: Um, they should be, they should be taken care
             of, you know, they do

Katrina: No well, he was, he wasn't, umm, Andy wasn't
             very...handicapped as some, as some of
             them, um...

Janet: some handicapped people.

Marcus: There wasn't much wrong with him anyway

Katrina: No, I know but

Marcus: (inaudible) but, um, except that he looked on
             the bright side of things, he liked happy
             people, he didn't like grouches.

Katrina: Yeah, and when all his friends got angry he
             just went up to them...

Marcus: No, he got upset when people got angry.

Janet: Yeah.

Katrina: Not at him, but he tried to make them,
             um calm

Marcus: Yeah

Katrina: and happy and that...and he was

Janet: psychological

Katrina: yeah, a thoughtful person, more thoughtful
             than the rest. Oh, the rest were thoughtful
             but not as thoughtful.

Janet: They weren't, they weren't as

Katrina: He didn't care as much...ah, he cared more
             about other people. He cared more because
             they were his only real friends he had.

Janet: Yeah.

Marcus: Do you think his character was very good?
             They, he didn't seem to be with them much
             did he?

Katrina: Well, they didn't really need to...It was
             about the racecourse, you know, they didn't
             really need to relate to them. But, oh,
             she cared if...where he was.

Marcus: She didn't know...where he was.

Katrina: Oh, he thought, she always asked them if the
             boys, Joe I think, if, um, he was with them,
             and he said yes, or he's he's down playing
             with the other ones. He didn't want to get
             the mother, um, upset but um, she'd get
             worried because she thought

Marcus: Yeah.

Katrina: she trusted him more

Marcus: Yeah.

Katrina: But then they, they told...

Marcus: No they didn't.

Katrina: Oh no, oh...no.   But

Janet: They didn't say that.

Katrina: but Andy probably did

Marcus: I don't understand why Andy

Marcus: got all worried

Katrina: I don't know why

Katrina: Andy? I don't know why he didn't tell his
               parents because, you know, it was a new
               thing and he wouldn't realise that the, um,
               parents would stop him because, you know, he
               thought it was him his and I don't see why
               they didn't make him tell his parents, and
               let the parents, um

Janet: Yeah, the parents must have to know.

Katrina: Yeah, no...yeah, because Andy, in the story...
               the person that wrote it should have made
               Andy

Janet: Patricia Wrightson.

Katrina: Yes, Patricia Wrightson. She's a very good
               author. (laughter) She, ah, should have...
               said that Andy...because the parents were
               bound to found, find out.

Marcus: But they didn't.

Katrina: Oh, they probably did in the end, but...I
               don't know why they couldn't tell because he
               only thought he owned the racecourse and he
               didn't think that his parents might...

Marcus: He wanted to keep it a secret.

Katrina: Well, he didn't to the other people did he?
               To, to his friends and that.

Marcus: No, but they found out didn't they?

Katrina: No,

Katrina: he told them.

Janet: He told them.

Marcus: Oh, yeah, that's right.

Katrina: And he told everyone.

Marcus: He told, he told, he told them because they
               got upset, 'cause he kept keeping out of
               their way all the time.

Katrina: Oh no, he was just saving up all the time, but he would have told his mother too because he had to go out a lot and he usually stayed at home a bit more...and that.

Marcus: I don't think he did, I think he played with his friends more than staying at home.

Katrina: I know. Well, he didn't come home that late usually. He went to the racecourse all the time, and you know...

Marcus: His mother never knew because she went to the racecourse too.

Katrina: No she didn't.

Marcus: Yes she did, she went to the racecourse every night.

Janet: Every night it's not on.

(laughter)

Marcus: Well, every time it was on.

Katrina: Oh...oh, the parents...oh, not all the time I don't think. They stayed home sometimes because in the book they said that he came home and his parents were there.

Janet: Yeah.

Katrina: When he came home late...in 'Let the Balloon Go', oh all right then. Um, that one was... he didn't explain to his parents but they found out, um, quicker than this one...

Janet: (inaudible)

Katrina: but I think this book was much better because it didn't seem like

Janet: ⌈I don't think so.

Katrina: ⌊didn't seem that

Katrina: he was so underprivileged and it didn't seem ...it didn't have as much feeling in it, this one, because I don't know...it...

(extended inaudible asides)

Marcus: Well, um, let's talk about the life of the
            ...come on...um...

            (further extended asides and laughter)

Katrina: No, this book was much more interesting
            because he did more things in it.

Janet: Kicked the ladder.

Marcus: Yeah.

Katrina: This one got round to the um, reader better
            because the other one...he was, they stuck on
            the ladder quite a lot and he...

Janet: When he was stuck on the ladder he was having
            a fit because...Well, you said he was having
            fits. Well, John, he had, had someting wrong
            with his legs.

            (laughter - noises in background)

Marcus: See!

Katrina: Yeah, well that was still, it wasn't as,
            um, because...

Janet: They stuck, you think they stuck to the one
            picture all, too long.

Marcus: Yeah, they stuck on the, ah...the intro-
            duction from John's bedroom to (inaudible)

            (pause)

Katrina: It wasn't as good.

Katrina: I didn't have any playlunch.

Janet: Oh!

Katrina: Well, I didn't! (inaudible)

Marcus: I don't think John Clement Sumner, um, Andy
            Hoddel...was, wasn't even handicapped I don't
            think.

Katrina: Oh, he didn't seem it in the story.

Marcus: They didn't, they weren't saying anything
            about it.

Katrina: Oh, he wouldn't ride a skateboard or anything.

Janet: He didn't want...

Katrina: Oh he didn't

Marcus: I don't think

Marcus: I don't think he trusted himself.

Katrina: No, he didn't tru, he thought he was going
            to fall...and he got very hurt when the
            policeman shooed him away 'cause, oh, he um
            ...wasn't feeling too well. But he wasn't

Katrina: physically handicapped.

Janet: It was the way he'd been treated.

Marcus: No...oh...in his...

Katrina: he was only mentally handicapped.

Janet: He was scared of things that he didn't think
            he could do.

Katrina: Oh, he looked on the bright side of things
            more than other people did. He didn't even
            see the dull side all the time.

Marcus: No, he didn't.

Janet: Sometimes.

Katrina: Oh, sometimes, but...oh, no...

Janet: When he owned the racecourse nobody ever told
            him, but they should have told him.

Marcus: I think they should have. You know those

Marcus: keepers and

Katrina: But that's

Katrina: because he was handicapped that he was
            supposed to be, ah...

Janet: No, they were just having fun with him, I
            think.

Katrina: Oh, they tried to trick him because, um, oh
            they didn't trick him, they just let him
            have his own way because they didn't want to
            hurt him any more...

Janet:	Mm, hurt his feelings
Katrina:	feelings, but he wouldn't have been hurt, oh ...he would have got pretty angry but only I think that was just...there's probably a better way than just giving him ten dollars because...
Marcus:	I don't think they should have even given him ten dollars, I think they should have just told him.
Katrina:	Oh, but he would have got very hurt and wouldn't have believed them, so this way he just lost the form of it all and he just got ten dollars.
Marcus:	I know, um
Janet:	And he got ten dollars taken off him.
Katrina:	Yeah, I know.
Janet:	Ten dollars!
Marcus:	And he thought he sold it.
Katrina:	Yeah. Yeah, it was a good book, better than the other one.
Janet:	Yeah, I'll say.
	(pause)
Janet:	Well now, what, what do you think of, what do you think of, um, the people that take you in?
Katrina:	Oh...Oh, I don't think, you know handicapped people they...they, everyone treats them as if
Janet:	as if they're
Katrina:	they can't cope with anything at all...
Janet:	Yeah.
Marcus:	⎡I think they can cope.
Katrina:	⎣and they hate it.
Katrina:	I know, but they just treat them like that... oh it, it depends if it's physically...

Marcus: Most, most...

Janet: Yeah.

Marcus: most handicapped people, um, are nicer
            people than, um, other people

Janet: Yeah.

Marcus: because they know how, what it's like to
            be hurt.

Janet: Yeah.

Katrina: Mm. And they, they, they have quite a few
            friends but not everyone wants to be friends
            ...

Janet: Like the O.A.'s

Katrina: they only have handicapped friends, really,
            if they're physically handicapped, really,
            because they can't always run around kind of
            thing

Katrina: same as the other person can

Janet: No, I know, other people...

Janet: Yeah, 'cause other people

Janet: just can't be bothered.

Katrina: unless they've got a very good friend

Janet: You know, they just...well, if...yeah,
            yeah, you know if, if they

Katrina: Well, you don't really want to...

Janet: Oh, I, I...

Katrina: If they, you know...you never see anyone in
            our class playing with a, um, a handicapped
            friend.

Marcus: What the O.A.'s? The O.A.'s?

Katrina: Yeah.

Janet: I have.

Katrina: Oh...

Marcus: I have.

Katrina: I've seen...

Marcus: Yeah (inaudible)

Katrina: Yeah, well they

Katrina: don't get as many...they get quite a few
             friends but maybe not as many.

Marcus: Oh, see, oh...I...I think handicapped people
             stick together more because the O.A. stick
             to that, to their own class more, don't
             they?

Katrina: Yeah.

Janet: Yeah, because other people just can't be
             bothered with them because they think they're
             ...because if they play with them, because
             other kids'll call them names and that
             because they'll say 'Oh, you play with them'
             and that. It's not

Katrina: Yeah, that's what everyone does in our class.
             They call Peter Smith an 'O.A.' and nobody
             plays with him.

Marcus: Yeah but

Janet: Yeah, but they need company as well as we do.

Katrina: Yeah, but they have company from their own
             class, don't they?

Janet: Yeah, but...but sometimes, but um, they're
             not there or, um, when they need help and
             they're not there and then some other people
             might need to do it.

             (pause and inaudible asides)

Katrina: Oh, this is boring. Boring!

Marcus: Oh, you two! Ah, come on, let's talk. Come
             on, now, let me see, um...

Katrina: I don't think handicapped, oh I hope...I've
             already said that...but they, they have more
             close friends than us. They have usually,
             they have better friends more than other
             people, but they, they seem to play more
             games and...

Marcus: I don't think handicapped peopel have a fair
             go.

Janet:	Because, because everyone, everyone thinks they, that they can't do anything
Marcus:	They can. You get handicapped archers and
Janet:	I know! No, but, but other people think, but other people think, um, think that they can't do anything...um...

(inaudible asides and laughter)

Marcus:	Sorry Mr. Williams.

(interruption by children from another class)

Katrina:	I think it's horrible how they go through the streets and everyone stares at them.
Janet:	And they say there's
Marcus:	Yeah
Janet:	As if, as if they're stupid.
Marcus:	Yeah, as if they're dumb.
Katrina:	Lots of people try not to stare at them, you know, 'cause
Katrina:	⌈um, lots of people don't
Marcus:	⌊(inaudible)
Marcus:	But some people they don't think...yeah, but um...
Janet:	Yeah, it's true.
Katrina:	But you have to look at them at least, and you just turn around.
Janet:	Oh, soon as you see them it makes me sick.
Katrina:	Oh!
Janet:	It does, it's true. It makes me sick to look at them.
Marcus:	Why does it make you sick?
Janet:	Oh, because...I don't know, I'm just...

(intervention by experimenter)

Class: III

Date: 25th October 1976

Novel: 'Sounder'

Participants: Jim, Sarah, Katrina,
                  Marcus, Janet

Janet:	What characters did you like?
Sarah:	⌈I think...
Katrina:	⌊What?
Marcus:	I didn't, didn't like that sheriff.
Sarah:	Yeah who, who...
Marcus:	Got prejudice.
Sarah:	⌈Who messed up the cake.
Katrina:	⌊Yeah, yeah.
Katrina:	He did.
Marcus:	Oh, just because I missed.
Sarah:	Well.
Marcus:	What?
Jim:	What's the matter with you?
Marcus:	No, not that.
Sarah:	The gaolmaster.
Marcus:	The gaoler...not the sheriff.
Jim:	I like the boy because, you know. But all these books that we've read it's about
Jim:	a boy.
Katrina:	a boy.
Jim:	You know it's based around a...
Marcus:	But boys are teriffic.
Katrina:	I don't...(laughter) know why it was called 'Sounder' just because the dog was called 'Sounder'.
Katrina:	⌈And it didn't really go around the dog.
Marcus:	⌊Yeah. Yeah, I mean it...
Sarah:	⌈It went 'round the boy.
Jim:	⌊It went 'round the boy.

Jim:	Yeah.
Marcus:	And the boy and the father mainly.
Jim:	(inaudible) Sounder.
Marcus:	The boy and the
Jim:	The noise that Sounder made.
Katrina:	No.
Sarah:	I think he liked, er, the dog better than his father somehow.
Katrina:	Yeah.
Jim:	No.
Sarah:	It was a bit...
Marcus:	No, because then he would have been...because he would have been looking for his, um, dog, dog if he was, had, loved his dog more than his father.
Sarah:	He did look for his dog and he
Marcus:	Yeah but he was looking for his father more.
Jim:	Yeah.
Marcus:	He was looking for his father more. He was looking for his father more.
Katrina:	Yeah. But it's all about, um
Sarah:	(inaudible)
Katrina:	(inaudible)
Jim:	Yeah, they didn't really say much about the mother, or the, the children.
Sarah:	Or what they'd done.
Katrina:	Not much.
Jim:	I mean they didn't
Marcus:	It was a pretty long sentence for a young, stole a leg of ham or something.
Janet:	Yeah.
	(pause)

Sarah:	⌈You suppose
Marcus:	⌊What?
	(pause)
Katrina:	What was different, what was different?
	(pause)
Marcus:	Let me see what was different?
Sarah:	Um...
Janet:	Oh, gee.
Sarah:	We better concentrate.
Marcus:	I can't remember much of it.
Jim:	Come on, Marcus.
Sarah:	You haven't read the book have you?
Katrina:	What was different about it?
Marcus:	Yeah, I have!
Katrina:	Why was it different?
Katrina:	Did the father get, die, or what?
Sarah:	⌈What happened to the father in the end?
Marcus:	⌊I can't remember.
Marcus:	A lamp hit him. He died.
Jim:	He died, mm.
Marcus:	He got deaded.
	(laughter)
Jim:	He got deaded!
	(pause, inaudible talk and laughter)
Janet:	All right then, um. What was different about the book?
Marcus:	I don't know. I can't remember. I read it a long time ago.
Sarah:	It

Sarah:	⌈ was all about
Marcus:	⌊ I remember
Sarah:	discrimination of blacks.
Jim:	⌈ Yeah.
Sarah:	⌊ Of negroes.
Katrina:	⌈ Well said.
Janet:	⌊ I don't think that
Janet:	⌈ Some people have,
Sarah:	⌊ Discrimination.
Janet:	have less rights than white people.
Jim:	I know. No they shouldn't.
Marcus:	They should have the same rights.
Marcus:	⌈ They're all the same.
Janet:	⌊ Let's get onto the subject.
Sarah:	But sometimes they get drunk, you know. Like Aborigines they get
Marcus:	Well?
Janet:	⌈ Yeah, but so do white people.
Sarah:	⌊ They get drunk and terrorise
Sarah:	and don't paint their place.
Marcus:	So do white people.
Janet:	So do white people.
Sarah:	Yeah, but not as much.
Katrina:	But not as much because they're under more stress.
Jim:	Who?
Marcus:	The neg, the negroes are under more stress than the, I mean the aborigines.
Janet:	So are the negroes.

Sarah: Yeah.

Marcus: Because of the prejudice from the white
            people.

Jim: Yeah, well I think it's stupid.

Sarah: But sometimes in Australia, the Aborigines
            don't use them properly.

Sarah: ⌈They get

Janet: │Oh yeah

Jim: ⌊Yeah, but

Sarah: The land and that and then they

Jim: Australians sort of want to, they want, they
            don't really like Aborigines. They try and
            kill all of them.

Sarah: It goes against

Marcus: (inaudible)

Marcus: ⌈No they don't, they put 'em in...

Janet: ⌊(inaudible) Aborigines.

Marcus: They put them in, ah...

Katrina: But some of them are

Katrina: ⌈trying to show, er

Janet: ⌊It is, it is.

Janet: It is owned by Aborigines because the
            Aborigines were the first people here.

Marcus: They put, they put, they put, they put, they
            put um, they put it, it um, they put um..

Sarah: Oh, shut up Marcus!

Marcus: They put the Aborigines

Marcus: ⌈in um

Katrina: ⌊Look what

Katrina: was different about your film? What was
            different about the film?

Marcus:	um, in camps or something.
Jim:	Yeah, and then they had barbed wire and man-eating dogs around.
Marcus:	No they don't. Do they?
Jim:	And sharks and...
Jim:	Yeah, in some of them. They had them right on points so they couldn't swim away 'cause it was all sharks and they'd feed the sharks every day and they
Jim:	wouldn't feed the dogs.
Marcus:	But they don't
Marcus:	lock them in there, they'd put them in that.
Sarah:	Yeah.
Jim:	And they didn't feed the dogs.
Jim:	And they wouldn't feed the dogs so if an Aborigine tried to escape they put the dogs on them and then and then the dogs eat the Aborigine.
Janet:	Oh, yuk.
Jim:	You know, there were
Jim:	so many
Sarah:	But
Jim:	that tried to escape that died.
Marcus:	He put a dead possum at the doorstep.
Katrina:	Ohh!
Marcus:	He opens the door up and there's a this dead possum lying there.
Jim:	What's that got to do with it?
Sarah:	It tried to escape.
Marcus:	Because, because, they kill possums and they...
Jim:	You know, it's a funny thing about black people they seem always to be black. I mean, well, what, no...why are black people called

Jim:	black people when they're brown?
Janet:	When they're brown.
Janet:	Yeah.
Sarah:	Oh, that's stupid.
Marcus:	Because they're black not white.
Marcus:	Because, no, no.
Marcus:	Because they're, they're got different shades on them.
Sarah:	Some of them are black.
Jim:	Not all of them have.
Katrina:	Most blacks are,
Janet:	Because he, he, gets to the point that, um
Marcus:	Anyway they're not called blacks.
Janet:	That, they they're not whites and blacks.
Sarah:	Shh, Janet's talking.
Marcus:	Well, we've got white
Janet:	rights should, should be, be opposite to white rights and it's not fair because it should be,
Janet:	the blacks are people like all people are.
Sarah:	Aborigines don't use it properly.
Jim:	Yeah.
Sarah:	Yeah, they should but if they don't use them properly they shouldn't, should they?
Katrina:	Yeah, don't use their money properly.
Sarah:	Yeah, get a lot of money and spend it on beer and alcohol.
Janet:	So do
Sarah:	But I'm not against it.
Katrina:	Either am I.

Marcus:	So, so, do white people
Sarah:	I, I think
Janet:	Yeah, but not as much as Aborigines.
Sarah:	⌈lots of Aborigines they come home drunk and they
?:	⌊(inaudible)
Marcus:	It's the white people's fault.
Janet:	Yeah.
Marcus:	It's the whites because they brought
Marcus:	⌈Wi, wine to Australia.
Janet:	⌊They brought liquor.
Janet:	to the, liquor to Australia.
Marcus:	And other countries and America.
Sarah:	Yeah, but in those days even if a white person probably,
Sarah:	⌈um, stole a lamb
Marcus:	⌊No, no.
Marcus:	yeah, but black people got longer sentences usually.
Janet:	Yeah because
	(laughter, pause)
Sarah:	They can't adopt to our society. Big word there.
Jim:	A-d-a-p-t.
Marcus:	Oh, we're not in a spelling lesson.
Janet:	The only reason...
Jim:	Oh, Marcus, stop mucking about...
Janet:	The only reason that, that black people haven't got houses is because people don't employ them.
Sarah:	Uh? Yeah, because they're always drunk.

Janet:	No
Janet:	⌈ but on the other hand,
Marcus:	⌊ They're not always drunk!
Janet:	On the other hand a lot of white people are.
Katrina:	I read a good book...
Sarah:	⌈ But I know how, a lot of white people are.
Marcus:	⌊ I really wouldn't, you know
Jim:	I reckon more white people get drunk than black people.
Sarah:	Actually they prob (inaudible)
Jim:	Yeah, but I reckon that Austral, that white people drink...
Katrina:	⌈ more alcohol
Janet:	⌊ more excessive
Jim:	Yeah,
Jim:	⌈ than black people.
Janet:	⌊ than black people.
Katrina:	⌈ (inaudible)
Janet:	⌊ because the only reason that black people drink is to get their fun
Janet:	because they
Jim:	Yeah.
Janet:	⌈ can't do anything.
Jim:	⌊ They can't
Janet:	anything else 'cause they're not allowed to.
Sarah:	But if they got paid
Sarah:	⌈ all they'd probably do is
Jim:	⌊ But they'd probably stop
Sarah:	go out and spend their money.

Jim:	and they'd get too tired.
	(laughter and pause)
Jim:	Marcus!
	(pause, inaudible talk, laughter)
Marcus:	Are you ready Katrina?
Sarah:	Oh look, come on.
Janet:	All right.
Sarah:	Um, um, New Zealand, Maoris they haven't been able to adapt, um, to adapt to and they've kept separate from New Zealanders and that
Janet:	Yeah.
Jim:	Yeah.
Sarah:	which is good.
	(inaudible noises in background)
Janet:	Come on, stop it.
Jim:	Um. What other characters were there?
	The matter, um, the doggie...
Marcus:	There was the teacher.
Sarah:	Yeah, he was kind.
Jim:	Yeah.
Katrina:	Oh, he was sort of...of
Sarah:	(inaudible)
Jim:	He was sort of, um...of
Katrina:	Yeah, he was nice. And he gave him an education.
Jim:	How old was he?
Katrina:	⌈Twelve.
Marcus:	⌊Young.
Katrina:	No, thirteen.

Sarah:	I can't remember but he must have been young.
	(pause, laughter, noise)
Marcus:	Look, um, it was about discrimination.
Janet:	White people don't
Janet:	even, they don't even
Sarah:	But now
Janet:	discriminate properly
Sarah:	but now, but now, in America, the negroes...
Jim:	I've forgotten what 'discriminate' means.
Sarah:	aren't interfered with like here.
Katrina:	People who discriminate
Marcus:	But they used to...
	(in background, spelling of word 'discrimination')
Marcus:	they used to have, they used to have a negro and a white section of the city. They used to have a negro and a white section in the city.
Janet:	Did they?
Sarah:	They used to.
Marcus:	The white people in one section...
Sarah:	In 'All in the Family' there was prejudice and they've got this...
Jim:	'All in the Family'
Katrina:	'All in the Family'?
Sarah:	Yeah.
Marcus:	Oh, look, stop talking about T.V. programmes.
Katrina:	Oh, gee!
	(laughter)
Jim:	I reckon that people are, they're cruel to Aborigines and that Aborigines only get cruel to white people 'cause they do it back.

Janet: Yeah, 'cause they, yeah but, but white
            people, that's because

Sarah: They terrorise the place, they don't

Jim: But that's because

Jim: the white people terrorise them. The won't
            let them sleep in houses or anything like
            that.

Janet: They've got to, to, to get back to prove
            their right.

Jim: Yeah.

Sarah: They get remanded and everything but all they
            do is...

Sarah: Yeah,

Jim: But

Marcus: It's too late already.

Jim: on the news they had, ah, oh, millions of
            Aborigines, just sitting in the park...you
            know, at night time in tents...and the tents
            were about that far apart. Thousands of
            tents everywhere.

Katrina: Yeah, but most of them don't want to move
            into...into houses, they just want to live
            in tents.

Sarah: Not only that (inaudible)

Marcus: Oh, I don't think I'd want to...

            (inaudible)

Jim: Oh, I do. Some of them.

Sarah: You don't see much Aborigines around do you?

Janet: No because...

Sarah: Not, not like you do in Samoa or places like
            that. America you see them everywhere.

Janet: Because the Australians have driven them out
            of Australia, because this is what they do.

Sarah: They haven't (inaudible)

Jim:	But how do they drive them out of Australia?
Katrina:	With a car. Put the accelerator on.
	(laughter)
Jim:	Catch them.
Sarah:	Get a whip and round them up.
	(Noise of galloping horses and whip cracking)
Sarah:	Stop it.
Katrina:	Sound effects.
Marcus:	Sounder?
Janet:	Sound effects.
	(Noise of barking dog)
Sarah:	Shh, shh.
Jim:	Stop it Marcus. Come on.
Sarah:	I felt sorry for Sounder because he came back...
Jim:	I don't think he could have lived really.
Janet:	No.
Sarah:	He came back one-armed.
Jim:	Yeah.
Marcus:	He doesn't have arms.
Sarah:	Blood and gore and
Sarah:	Wouldn't it be terrible in colour?
Katrina:	I'm glad it wasn't in colour.
Marcus:	It was good in colour.
Katrina:	Was the, it in colour in the film?
Marcus:	Yeah. He didn't get wrecked up like that though.
Sarah:	Not very good illustrations I don't think.
Katrina:	No.

(pause and inaudible background talk)

Katrina: My cat got run over once.

Janet: Did it die?

Jim: No, it lived.

Katrina: Yes.

(pause, laughter, inaudible talk)

Jim: Come on, you're getting off the track.

Janet: Yeah.

Jim: What else can we talk about? Janet?...I
            thought that it was a good length.

Janet: Yeah.

Jim: for a book.

Katrina: I don't. It was too short.

Janet: Yeah, it was quick to read.

(child switches off tape)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADAMS-WEBER, J.R., 'Cognitive Complexity and Sociality', British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 8 (3), 1969, 211-216.

AMATO, A.J., Some Effects of Bibliotherapy on Young Adults, Unpublished dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1957.

APPLEBEE, A.N., The Spectator Role, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1974.

----, 'The Development of Children's Responses to Repertory Grids', British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 15(1), 1976, 101-102.

AMIDON, E.J. and HOUGH, J.B., Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research and Application, Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1967.

ARMSTRONG, W.H., Sounder, Harmondsworth: Puffin Books, 1973.

BANNISTER, D. (ed.), Perspectives in Personal Construct Theory, London: Academic Press, 1970.

BANNISTER, D. and AGNEW, J., The Child's Construing of Self, Unpublished manuscript, 1976.

BANNISTER, D. and FRANSELLA, F., Inquiring Man, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971.

BANNISTER, D. and MAIR, J.M.M., The Evaluation of Personal Constructs, London: Academic Press, 1968.

BARNES, D., 'Language and Learning in the Classroom', Journal of Curriculum Studies, 3(1), 1971, 29-38.

----, From Communication to Curriculum, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1976.

BARNES, D., BRITTON, J. and ROSEN, H., Language, the Learner and the School, Harmondsworth: Penguin, revised edition, 1971.

BARNES, D., CHURLEY, P. and THOMPSON, C., 'Group Talk and Literary Response', English in Education, 5(3), 1971, 63-76.

BARNES, D. and TODD, F., Communication and Learning in Small Groups, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977.

BEACH, L. and WERTHEIMER, M. 'A Free Response Approach to
        the Study of Person Cognition', Journal of
        Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62(2), 1961,
        367-374.

BELLACK, A.A. et al., The Language of the Classroom, New
        York: Teachers' College Press, 1966.

BERNDT, T.J. and BERNDT, E.G., 'Children's Use of Motives
        and Intentionality in Person Perception and Moral
        Judgement', Child Development, 46(4), 1975,
        904-912.

BIERI, J., 'Cognitive Complexity-Simplicity and
        Predictive Behaviour', Journal of Abnormal and
        Social Psychology, 51, 1955, 263-268.

BLOUNT, N.S., 'Research on Teaching Literature, Language
        and Composition', Second Handbook of Research on
        Teaching, R. Travers (ed.), Chicago: Rand McNally,
        1973.

BUBER, M., Between Man and Man, London: Routledge & Kegan
        Paul, 1947.

BONARIUS, J.C.J., 'Research in the Personal Construct Theory
        of G.A. Kelly: Role Construct Repertory Test and
        Basic Theory', Progress in Experimental Personality
        Research, B.A. Maher (ed.), New York: Academic
        Press, 1965.

BRIERLEY, D.W., The Use of Personality Constructs by
        Children of Three Different Ages, Unpublished Ph.D.
        thesis, University of London, 1967.

BRISBIN, C.D., An Experimental Application of the Galvanic
        Skin Response to the Measurement of Effects of
        Literature on Attitudes of Fifth Grade Students
        Towards Blacks, Unpublished dissertation, Wayne
        State University, 1971.

BRITTON, J.N., 'Response to Literature', Response to
        Literature, J. Squire (ed.), Champaign: National
        Council of Teachers of English, 1968.

----, Language and Learning, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books,
        1970.

----, 'Their Language and Our Teaching', English in Education,
        4(2), 1970(a), 5-13.

----, 'Language Out of School', English in Australia, 35,
        1975, 3-15.

BRITTON, J.N. et al., The Development of Writing Abilities
        (11-18), Schools Council Research Studies;
        London: Macmillan Education, 1975.

BULLOCK, A. (chairman), A Language for Life: Report of the Committee of Inquiry Appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1975.

BYRNE, D., 'Interpersonal Attraction and Attitude Similarity', Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62(3), 1961, 713-715.

----, An Introduction to Personality Research, Theory and Applications, Englewood Cliffs; Prentice-Hall, second edition, 1974.

BYRNE, D., LONDON, O. and REEVES, K., 'The Effects of Physical Attractiveness, Sex and Attitude Similarity on Interpersonal Attraction', Journal of Personality, 36(2), 1968, 259-271.

CHANDLER, M.J., GREENSPAN, S. and BARENBOIM, C., 'Judgements of Intentionality in Response to Videotaped and Verbally Presented Moral Dilemmas: The Medium is the Message', Child Development, 44(2), 1973, 315-320.

CHUKOVSKY, K., From Two to Five, M. Morton (trans. and ed.), Berkeley: California University Press, 1965.

COHEN, J.A., 'A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales', Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20(1), 1960, 37-46.

COREY, S.M., 'The Teachers Out-talk the Pupils', The School Review, 48(9), 1940, 745-752.

CROCKETT, W.H., 'Cognitive Complexity and Impression Formation', Progress in Experimental Personality Research, B.A. Maher (ed.), New York: Academic Press, 1965.

CRONBACH, L.J., 'Process Affecting Scores on "Understanding Others" and "Assumed Similarity"', Psychological Bulletin, 52(3), 177-193.

D'ARCY, P., Reading for Meaning, two volumes, London: Hutchinson Educational for the Schools Council, 1973.

DIXON, J., 'Processes of Formulation in Group Discussion', Educational Review, 26(3), 1974, 241-250.

----, Growth through English: Set in the Perspectives of the Seventies, London: Oxford University Press, third edition, 1975.

DORNBUSCH, S.M., HASTORF, A.H., RICHARDSON, S.A., MUZZY, R.E. and VREELAND, R.S., 'The Perceiver and the Perceived: Their Relative Influence on the Categories of Interpersonal Cognition', Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1(5), 1965, 434-440.

DUCK, Stephen W., 'Friendship, Similarity and the Reptest', Psychological Reports, 31(1), 1972, 231-234.

DUCK, S. and SPENCER, C., 'Personal Constructs and Friendship Formation', Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 23(1), 1972, 40-45.

EGOFF, S., STUBBS, G.T. and ASHLEY, L.F. (eds.), Only Connect: Readings on Children's Literature, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1969.

EISNER, E.W., 'Towards a More Adequate Conception of Evaluation in the Arts', Art Education, 27(7), 1974, 2-5.

EPTING, F., 'Order of Presentation of Construct Poles. What Are the Factors to be Considered?: A Reply', British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 14(4), 1975, 427-428.

FADER, D.N. and McNEIL, E.B., Hooked on Books, New York: Pergamon, 1969.

FEFFER, M., 'The Cognitive Implications of Role-Taking Behaviour', Journal of Personality, 27(2), 1959, 152-168.

----, 'A Developmental Analysis of Interpersonal Behaviour', Psychological Review, 77(3), 1970, 197-214.

FEFFER, M. and GOUREVITCH, V., 'Cognitive Aspects of Role-Taking in Children', Journal of Personality, 28(4), 1960, 383-396.

FIELD, C. and HAMLEY, D.C., Fiction in the Middle School, London: B.F. Batsford, 1975.

FINN, J., A General Model for Multivariate Analysis, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

FISHER, M., Intent upon Reading, Leicester: Brockhampton, 1964.

FLANDERS, N., Interaction Analysis in the Classroom: A Manual for Observers, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1960.

FLAPAN, D., Children's Understanding of Social Interaction, New York: Teachers College Press, 1968.

FLAVELL, J.H., The Developmental Psychology of Jean Piaget, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1963.

----, The Development of Role-taking and Communication Skills in Children, New York: Wiley, 1968.

FLAVELL, J.H., 'Concept Development', <u>Carmichael's Manual</u> of Child Psychology, P.H. Mussen (ed.), two volumes, third edition, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970.

----, 'The Development of Inferences about Others', <u>Under-standing Other Persons</u>, T. Mischel (ed.), Oxford: Blackwell, Basil, Mott, 1974.

FRIEDLANDER, K., 'Children's Books and Their Function in Latency and Prepuberty', <u>The New Era</u>, 39(4), 1958, 77-83.

GIBSON, M., 'An Illustration of the Effect of the Order of Presentation of Construct Poles on Bieri's Measure of Cognitive Complexity', <u>British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology</u>, 14(4), 1975, 425-426.

GOLLIN, E.S., 'Forming Impressions of Personality', <u>Journal of Personality</u>, 23, 1954, 65-76.

----, 'Organisational Characteristics of Social Judgements: a Developmental Investigation', <u>Journal of Personality</u>, 26, 1958, 139-154.

GRUGEON, D. and GRUGEON, E., <u>Language and Literature</u>, Bletchley: The Open University Press, 1973.

HALLIDAY, M.A.K., <u>Explorations in the Functions of Language,</u> London: Edward Arnold, 1973.

----, <u>Learning How to Mean - Explorations in the Develop-ment of Language</u>, London: Edward Arnold, 1975.

HARDING, D.W., 'The Role of the Onlooker', <u>Scrutiny</u>, 6(3), 1937, 247-258.

----, <u>Social Psychology and Individual Values</u>, London: Hutchinson, 1953.

----, 'Psychological Processes in the Reading of Fiction', <u>British Journal of Aesthetics</u>, 2(2), 1962, 133-147.

----, <u>Experience into Words</u>, London, Chatto and Windus, 1963.

----, 'Considered Experience: The Invitation of the Novel', <u>English in Education</u>, 1(2), 1967, 7-15.

HARDY, B., 'The Teaching of English: Life, Literature and Literary Criticism', <u>English in Education</u>, 2(2), 1968, 7-15.

HAZARD, P., <u>Books, Children and Men</u>, Boston: Horn Book, fourth edition, 1960.

HEIDER, F., The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations, New York: Wiley, 1958.

HINDLE, A., 'The Literature under the Desk', English in Education, 4(2), 1971, 49-47.

HOETKER, J. and AHLBRAND, W.P., 'The Persistance of the Recitation', American Educational Research Journal, 6(2), 1969, 145-167.

HOFFMAN, M., Reading, Writing and Relevance, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1976.

HONESS, T., 'Cognitive Complexity and Social Prediction', British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 15(1), 1976, 23-31.

JAN, I., On Children's Literature, London: Allen Lane, 1973.

JENKINSON, A.J., What Do Boys and Girls Read?, London: Methuen, 1940.

JONES, A. and BUTTREY, J., Children and Stories, Oxford: Blackwell, 1970.

JONES, A. and MULFORD, J. (eds.), Children Using Language, London: Oxford University Press, 1971.

KELLY, G.A., The Psychology of Personal Constructs, two volumes, New York: W.W. Norton, 1955.

----, A Theory of Personality, New York: Norton, 1963.

L'ENGLE, M., A Wrinkle in Time, Harmondsworth: Puffin Books, 1967.

LEWIS, I.R., Some Effects of the Reading and Discussion of Stories on Certain Values of Sixth Grade Pupils, Unpublished dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1967.

LITTLE, B.R., 'Age and Sex Differences in the Use of Psychological, Role and Physicalistic Constructs', Bulletin of the British Psychological Society, 21, 1968, 34.

LIVESLEY, W.J. and BROMLEY, D.B., Person Perception in Childhood and Adolescence, London: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.

LOOFT, W.R., 'Egocentrism and Social Interaction Across the Life Span', Psychological Bulletin, 78(2), 1972, 73-92.

LURIA, A.R. and YUDOVITCH, F.I., Speech and the Development of Mental Processes in the Child, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1971.

MARTIN, N.,'Children and Stories: their Own and Other People's', English in Education, 6(2), 1972, 43-54.

MARTIN, N. et al., Understanding Children Talking, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976.

MATHIESON, M., The Preachers of Culture, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1975.

McNEILL, D., 'The Development of Language', Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology, P.H. Mussen (ed.), third edition, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1970.

MECKEL, H.C., 'Research on Teaching, Composition and Literature', Handbook of Research on Teaching, N.L. Gage (ed.),Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

MEEK, M., WARLOW, A., and BARTON, G., The Cool Web: The Pattern of Children's Reading, London: The Bodley Head, 1977.

MILLER, P.H., KESSEL, F.S. and FLAVELL, J.H., 'Thinking about People Thinking about People Thinking about ...: a Study of Social Cognitive Development', Child Development, 41(3), 1970, 613-623.

MILLS, R.W., 'Small Group Discussion', English in Education, 8(2), 1974, 10-20.

NOBLE, G., 'Some Comments on the Nature of Delinquents' Identification with Television Heroes, Fathers and Best Friends', British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 10(2), 1971, 172-180.

NORMAN, L., Climb A Lonely Hill, London: Collins Lions, 1972.

PEEVERS, B.H. and SECORD, P.F, 'Developmental Changes in Attribution of Descriptive Comments to Persons', Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27(1), 1973, 120-128.

PIAGET, J., The Language and Thought of the Child, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1926.

----, Judgement and Reasoning in the Child, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1928.

----, The Moral Judgement of The Child, London: Kegan Paul, 1932.

PLOWDEN, B. (chairman), Children and Their Primary Schools - A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England), two volumes, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1967.

PURVES, A.C. and BEACH, R., Literature and the Reader: Research in Response to Literature, Reading Interests and the Teaching of Literature, Urbana-Champaign: National Council of Teachers of English, 1972.

PURVES, A.C. et al. (eds.), Literature Education in Ten Countries, International Studies in Evaluation Series, New York: Halsted, 1973.

RAVANETTE, A.T., 'Grid Techniques for Children', Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 16(1), 1975, 79-83.

RICHARDS, I.A., Practical Criticism, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1929.

RICHARDS, S.A., DORNBUSCH, S.M. and HASTORF, A.H., Children's Categories of Inter-personal Perception, National Institute of Mental Health, Research Grant 7-2480, Final Report, 1961.

ROSENBLATT, L.M., Literature as Exploration, New York: Appleton-Century, 1938.

SALMON, P., 'Differential Conforming as a Developmental Process', British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 8(1), 1969, 22-31.

----, 'Grid Measures with Child Subjects', The Measurement of Intrapersonal Space by Grid Technique, P. Slater (ed.), two volumes, London: John Wiley and Sons, 1976.

SCARLETT, H.H., PRESS, A.N. and CROCKETT, W.H., 'Children's Descriptions of Peers: a Wernerian Developmental Analysis', Child Development, 42(2), 1971, 439-453.

SEBESTA, S.L. and IVERSON, W.J., Literature for Thursday's Child, Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1975.

SECORD, P.F. and PEEVERS, B.H., 'The Development and Attribution of Person Concepts', Understanding Other Persons, T. Mischel (ed.), Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974.

SELMAN, R.L., 'The Relation of Role-taking to the Development of Moral Judgements in Children', Child Development, 42(1), 1971, 79-91.

SELMAN, R.L., 'Taking Another's Perspective: Role-taking Development in Early Childhood', Child Development, 42(6), 1971(a), 1721-1734.

----, 'Stages in Role-taking and Moral Judgements as Guides to Social Interaction', Man and Morality, T. Lickona (ed.), New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

SELMAN, R.L. and BYRNE, D.F., 'A Structural-Developmental Analysis of Levels of Role-taking in Middle Childhood', Child Development, 45(3), 1974, 803-806.

SERRAILLIER, I., The Silver Sword, Harmondsworth: Puffin Books, 1960.

SHANTZ, C.U., 'The Development of Social Cognition', Review of Child Development Research, Volume Five, E.M. Hetherington (ed.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

SHRODES, C., Bibliotherapy: a Theoretical and Clinical Experimental Study, Unpublished dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1949.

SINCLAIR, J.McH. and COULTHARD, M., Towards an Analysis of Discourse: the English Used by Teachers and Pupils, London: Oxford University Press, 1975.

SMITH, F., Understanding Reading, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

SMITH, L.H., The Unreluctant Years: a Critical Approach to Children's Literature, Boston: American Library Association, 1953.

SOUTHALL, I., Let the Balloon Go, Harmondsworth: Puffin Books, 1972.

SQUIRE, J. (ed.), Response to Literature, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1968.

STEINER, G., Language and Silence, London: Faber, 1967.

STRATTA, L., 'Language and Experience: Thoughts on a Rationale for the Teaching of English', English in Education, 6(3), 1972, 98-110.

STRATTA, L., DIXON, J. and WILKINSON, A., Patterns of Language: Explorations of the Teaching of English, London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1973.

TABA, H. and ELKINS, D., With Focus on Human Relations: A Story of an Eighth Grade, Washington: American Council on Education, 1950.

THOMPSON, D., <u>Reading and Discrimination</u>, London: Chatto and
        Windus, 1934.

TINSLEY, H.E. and WEISS, D.J., 'Interrater Reliability and
        Agreement of Subjective Judgements', <u>Journal of
        Counseling Psychology</u>, 22(4), 1975, 358-376.

TOUGH, J., <u>The Development of Meaning: A Study of Children's
        Use of Language</u>, London: George Allen and Unwin,
        1977.

TOWNSEND, J.R., <u>Written for Children: an Outline of English
        Language Children's Literature</u>, revised edition,
        London: Kestrel, 1974.

----, <u>A Sense of Story</u>, London: Longman, 1971.

TUCKER, N., 'How Children Respond to Fiction', <u>Children's
        Literature in Education</u>, 9, 1972, 48-56.

VYGOTSKY, L.S., <u>Thought and Language</u>, Cambridge: Massachus-
        etts Institute of Technology Press, 1962.

WATTS, A.F., <u>The Language and Mental Development of
        Children</u>, London: Harrap, 1944.

WERNER, H., <u>Comparative Psychology of Mental Development</u>,
        Chicago: Follett, 1948.

WHITEHEAD, F., CAPEY, A.C. and MADDREN, W., <u>Children's
        Reading Interests</u>, Schools Council Working Paper 52;
        London: Evans Brothers and Methuen Educational, 1975.

WINER, J., <u>Statistical Principles in Experimental Design</u>,
        New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

WOOSTER, A.D., 'Formation of Stable and Discrete Concepts
        of Personality by Normal and Mentally Retarded
        Boys', <u>Journal of Mental Subnormality</u>, 16(1), 1970,
        24-28.

----, <u>Dilemmas of Discourse: Controversies about the
        Sociological Interpretation of Language</u>, London:
        George Allen and Unwin, 1975.

WRIGHTSON, P., <u>I Own the Racecourse!</u>, Harmondsworth:
        Puffin Books, 1971.

YARLOTT, G. and HARPIN, W.S., '1000 Responses to English
        Literature (1)', <u>Educational Research</u>, 13(1), 1970,
        3-11.

----, '1000 Responses to English Literature (2)',
        <u>Educational Research</u>, 13(2), 1971, 87-97.

YARROW, M.R. and CAMPBELL, J.D., 'Person Perception in
        Children', <u>Merrill-Palmer Quarterly</u>, 9(1), 1963,
        57-72.