ENERGETIC SPACE: THE AFFECT OF NARRATIVE LITERATURE IN A

COMPOSITION CLASSROOM

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the
North Dakota State University
of Agriculture and Applied Science

By

Heather Marie Steinmann

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major Department:
English

July 2015

Fargo, North Dakota

North Dakota State University
Graduate School

Title

ENERGETIC SPACE: THE AFFECT OF NARRATIVE

LITERATURE IN A COMPOSITION CLASSROOM

By

Heather Marie Steinmann

The Supervisory Committee certifies that this ***disquisition*** complies

with North Dakota State University's regulations and meets the

accepted standards for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

Dr. Andrew Mara

Chair

Dr. Miriam Mara

Dr. Dale Sullivan

Dr. James Council

Approved:

August 13, 2015	Dr. Gary Totten
Date	Department Chair

ABSTRACT

Rhetorical and critical theory have both prescribed and proscribed the way scholars view affect. With the exception of Reader Response Theory, literary and rhetorical theory tend to use a more long-term and permanent frame of reference when addressing the emotional relationship between reader and writer. This disquisition explores a framework where the reader and writer find emotional connection in particular and emergent times and spaces. This work extends the import of Kairos, as a rhetorical figure and theory, to contemporary research and theories like Maria Takolander's "Energetic Space" and Louise Rosenblatt's "Aesthetic Reading," theories that link writer to reader. Rather than returning to the stagnating debate regarding the societal import of literature and its inclusion in or exclusion from university course curriculum, this work will use grounded theory to qualitatively examine students' affective responses to a novel over a period of 4 years to describe how the emotional relationship between an author and audience can be located and marked in the transformative moment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

"You know, in the Scriptures it says, 'In the beginning was the word.' No! In the beginning was emotion. The Word came later, replacing emotion, like trot replaced gallop, while the natural law of the horse is gallop; it is forced to break into trot. Man was removed from emotional poetry and pushed into dialectics, in other words, splattering, isn't that so?"

--Lois-Ferdinand Céline vous parle, qtd. In Kristeva

Rhetorical and critical theory have both prescribed and proscribed the way scholars view affect. With the exception of Reader Response Theory, literary and rhetorical theory tend to use a more long-term and permanent frame of reference when addressing the emotional relationship between reader and writer. My dissertation explores a framework where the reader and writer find emotional connection in particular and emergent times and spaces. This work extends the import of Kairos, as a rhetorical figure and theory, to contemporary research and theories that link writer to reader. Rather than returning to the stagnating debate regarding the societal import of literature and its inclusion or exclusion for university course curriculum, this work will qualitatively examine students' affective responses to a novel over a period of four years to describe how the emotional relationship between an author and audience can be located and marked in the transformative moment. When we have the space to read literature and to talk about literature, what Maria Takolander marks as an "energetic space," a kairotic instance in which individual transportation or transformation, can occur. Takolander describes energetic space as "a vital realm of self-questioning, world-imbricatedness,

mutual responsibility, lifelong learning, changefulness and genuine creativity" (180). She writes that narrative provides transport for a reader to leave the self and live momentarily in a different world before returning to self a changed being. This moment of energetic space can be likened to kairos, and used to preface and ground theories of student interaction with literature.

Kairos

The gods of ancient Greece: as all gods do, they help to explain the lives and deaths of humans—they even affect our fate here or in the hereafter if we should displease them. Phillip Sipiora describes the Greek mythological view in the introduction to his book of essays with James S. Baumlin. Sipiora states that the first Olympiad included two shrines: one to Zeus, king and father of all gods, and one to Kairos, Zeus' youngest son. One can easily imagine why a shrine to the king of gods might be there; the most powerful, the father of all other gods, his prevalence in all forms of Greek art is almost expected. But the other shrine raises the question, why, of all of Zeus' many children, the divine ones and the mortal, why the youngest of the divine, the one at times ("vulgarly") called Opportunity? Though the statue no longer exists, the descriptions of the depictions of Kairos suggest a tempting but elusive being:

> . . . a young, athletic man with wings on his feet that propel him swiftly
>
> forward. He often balances on a wheel to illustrate his unpredictability and
>
> carries a razor to warn of the sharp nature of his entrances and exits. His
>
> most distinguishing feature, however, is his hair. As the god of
>
> opportunity approaches, his long forelock of hair is clearly in view,

offering a brief moment in which the god can be seized. Even the slightest

moment of hesitation and *Kairos* passes, leaving only the surprising view

of the back of his head, bald and ungraspable. (Myers 1)

In her essay on Kairos' companion, Metanoia, Kelly Myers not only presents these gods

as partners in transformation, but hints at the danger that is involved in what can be

defining moment: do you seize Opportunity, or not? Kairos has a wickedness, as

evidenced by the straight-edge razor he holds. The textual accounts of Kairos are few. In

the Latin fables of Phaedrus, Posidippus and the statue of Kairos have the following

dialogue:

Posidippus: What art thou?

Kairos: Kairos, the all-subduer.

P: Why doest thou stand on the tip of thy toes?

K: I turn forever.

P: Why hast thou double wings on either foot?

K: I fly carried by the wind.

P: In thy right hand why carriest a razor?

K: To men a sign that quicker than any edge I am…

(*Phaedrus*).

Kairos always arrives unannounced. For those individuals able to grab onto him, or better

yet, keep an echo of him there, the world opens up, the heavy march of time stills, and a

blossoming occurs. Whether a person encountering Kairos gets to choose what will come

to fruition in this moment depends on what he or she has planted. Myers writes of

Metanoia, a god often seen following Kairos to sow repent or teach from the passed,

opportune moment. This female figure, the kinder one, leaves space for the personal transformation that can occur *after* the climactic nature of Kairos. There are ethical implications involved in Kairos. Is a fleeting moment in time threatening in its presentation or its essence that it will pass? Edwin Panofsky describes Kairos as:

> [as] a man (originally nude) in fleeting movement, usually young . . . equipped with wings both at the shoulder and at the heels. His attributes were a pair of scales, originally balanced on the edge of a shaving knife, and, in a somewhat later period, one or two wheels. Moreover his head often showed the proverbial forelock by which bald-headed Opportunity can be seized . . .(qtd in Miller xii)

The depiction of Kairos with scales implies a balancing act. Though you might turn too much one way and lose, Opportunity can tip the scales at will. He is also seen in images and sculpture as moving about on a globe or wheels. He can turn in a moment or within a moment. A moment of kairos has many meanings, but what seems most important in the artistic renderings of the god of Kairos/Opportunity is that the depictions don't leave much room for deliberative or slow-moving agency on the part of the human.

Kairos can be seen as both a critical aggregation of the qualities in the mythology and psychology of ancient Greece, and, by implication, of rhetoric. Phillip Sipiora writes that kairos is a "fundamental notion in ancient Greece [that] carried a number of meanings in classical rhetorical theory and history including 'symmetry,' 'propriety,' 'occasion,' 'due measure,' 'fitness,' 'tact,' 'decorum,' 'convenience,' 'proportion,' 'fruit,' 'profit,' and 'wise moderation'" (1). As the god-figure, Kairos can be seen as a being with more power over the occasion than mere mortals; in rhetorical theory,

however, we can see that the god's name has been appropriated to include more room for the mortal to prepare for the changes in the occasion of his visit.

Dale Sullivan traces the multiplicity of meanings and implications of *kairos* in his article "*Kairos* and the rhetoric of belief." He notes that William H. Race "discusses over ten meanings of *kairos* in Greek drama," and that

> Plato uses the first meaning to describe the elements needed for a complete science of rhetoric, saying that the rhetor must be able to grasp the concept of propriety of time...good measure… proportion… opportunity… In this sense, we see that the meaning of *kairos* slides off into the meaning of *prepon*, the appropriate. (Sullivan 318)

Sullivan and others note that in the Pre-Socratic and Socratic age, *kairos* had an even more liberal meaning. Sullivan notes two distinct ways in which the idea of *kairos* has developed:

> The first, represented by Pythagoras…accepts the possibility of knowing the nature of Being…gauged appropriateness in relation to a 'cosmic-ontological order' (citing DeVogel 118). Associated with the number seven, which denoted maturity in human life and the whole cosmos (115). [In the second,] *kairos* implied an ethical system based on the belief that certain types of conduct were by nature appropriate in various relationships and for particular ages. (Sullivan 318)

What is vital for these purposes is the connection between the multiplicities of kairos and the possibilities for human agency within kairos. If a person has prepared themselves in the right ways, they might seize kairos.

Gorgias also emphasized the temporal and situational dimensions of kairos. In the *Encomium of Helen*, kairos means "poetic timing that produces connections and thus a special *logos*…an indetermined point where difference can be expressed … Although one can call this the *kairos* of invention, it is more aptly termed the *kairos* of inspiration…" (319). In Rome, Cicero and the Stoics tied *kairos* to proper conduct, *decorum*. If one was not living a in a way conducive to opportunity, e.g. able to adapt and accommodate, one would not find oneself ready for opportunity. Cicero argued that the most vital of all things in life and in oratory was propriety. If the proper order of things was not followed, the results could be "rhetorical, aesthetic, and even moral failure" (qtd in Miller xii). And so we have two very different definitions of *kairos*. One is unplanned, the other planned and waited for.

James L. Kinneavy says that kairos had two components in ancient thought: right timing and proper measure. This is the most oft-used definition, as Kinneavy is credited with bringing about a revival of the term (Kairos) in the 1990s. Kinneavy also notes that "Gorgias thought of kairotic moments as openings for the possibility of artistic creation (Crowley 161); Plato uses "kairos" in *Phaedrus* when he notes to consider the mind of the audience, and for Aristotle, the "definition of rhetoric (finding the available means) depends on kairos" (Crowley 84). And so from the ancient Greeks and Romans, and from the modern authorities on the subject, we have a variety of meaning to choose from. At times, it seems as though it might be more fruitful to define *kairos* by what it is not. It is not calculated, but not un-planned; not unasked for, but not always surprise. One thing it is surely not is uneventful. All definitions seem to agree on this one thing: it is *an occurrence of note*—even, as we will see later, if one misses the opportunity it presents.

We cannot define it in one specific and all-encompassing way. From the Greek god came the theoretical construct in Classical Rhetoric and from that we draw an even more complex picture. Kairos as theory is generally attributed more to the Sophists (like Gorgias) than those Classical rhetoricians that came after them, but James Kinneavy and Catherine Eskin claim that kairos has been overlooked in Aristotle's work. They write:

> On three particular occasions, Aristotle uses the term kairos when discussing his own act of writing…there is no need at present [*kairon]* to endeavor…as far as within the scope of the present occasion [*kairo*] . . . enough has been said for the moment [*kairon*]. (67)

And so it also means the present, the occasion, the moment. In all, Kinneavy and Eskin find 16 uses of "kairos" in Aristotle's *Rhetoric.* This idea, old and new, seems to work in all ages. Kairos, as an idea, has a transcendent explanatory capacity to represent aspects of human experience.

Where and when is kairos, and can we capture something of it?

Often kairos has been confined to a sense of timing, an opportune moment or an appropriate occasion. However, some scholars also note the importance of spatial elements. Richard Benjamin Crosby's examination of how space can hold a particular time in his essay "Cathedral of Kairos: Rhetoric and Revelation in the National House of Prayer" gives spatial and discursive strategies for stabilizing Kairos' capricious offerings. While many studies of kairos envision it as a moment, Crosby claims that "the kairotic moment can be sustained indefinitely through the sacrilization of physical space," and that ". . . rhetoric can circumvent traditional contingencies when deployed within kairotic

space" (132). The ability to transcend traditional or expected possibilities makes kairos vital for this study. Kairos as embodied by the god of opportunity was never in one place for very long, and we can hardly expect a sliver of time to be pedagogically measurable. While kairos as theory is generally understood to mean the opportune moment, Crosby claims that we can capture kairos and make a lasting physical space that can hold the moment of divine realization. A notion he calls "Spatial kairos…[can] capture and sustain the rhetorical charge of a kairotic moment" (133). This idea is quite different than what we think of when we think of the god Kairos. Kairos is notoriously hard to catch, so in order to grasp the god, we must be prepared and have everything ready in its right measure. But for Crosby, "The perforation [of Kairos] remains only temporary, but it has the power to redirect time's trajectory" (136). This redirection is similar to Sullivan's kairos of belief and the Sophists' kairos in that the kairos *creates a change*. Both Crosby and Sullivan formulate a version of kairos that is more usable in the predictable sweep of a semester without obliterating kairos' generative possibilities. Kairos, in their formulation, can be usefully invited and planned for but never caged.

The place does not need magnificent appointments; instead, the significance stems from the importance a person assigns to a place: our past falls away (or is highlighted, in some cases, as is the National Cathedral) and "What we are, in short, is *where* we are" (Crosby 149, emphasis in original). We can revisit that moment of transcendence by enshrining the past in its trappings. Stepping into an historical museum, one can feel this sort of sacred moment, a transcendence (if the exhibits are good and the children are quiet) to a simpler time, for those of us nostalgic for such things.

Nostalgia itself could be seen as a sort of internal cathedral of kairos--a moment in time that we decorated and kept sacred that produced and produces a change in us when we revisit it. Words themselves have connotations that hold nostalgia. Crosby writes, "spatial kairos…[can] capture and sustain the rhetorical charge of a kairotic moment" (133), and, "kairos may be understood as an eternal force essential to particular spaces, and by extension, spatially induced consciousness" (citing Eliade, 133). So if our surroundings can affect our consciousness, the reverse also can be true. Crosby cites Sullivan: "out of the situation itself arises something like magical power . . . [so] its power lies in its ability to transcend the rational mind and transform the soul to new belief and action" (135). The rational mind is only one part of the mind, of rhetoric, of psychology, etc. (metaphorically speaking, of course. It is not the purpose of this work to delve into neurology). The important thing is to rise above the rational, the planned— even though planning can help us get to and sustain a moment of kairos. Coming unexpectedly to a new belief might be shocking, or it might corroborate the planned evidence we already have. Most importantly, Crosby tells us, "the perforation remains only temporary, but it has the power to *redirect time's trajectory*" (136, emphasis mine). The irrational, occasional moment redirects the flow of time. On an individual level everyone has experienced this. The wrench in the plans of the day, the stillness of nature, the horror of an accident, and so on. What Crosby claims is that we can sanctuarize the moment: offer it shelter, and hold it above other moments. What this means pedagogically is that we can offer transcendent and transitional moments their own sanctuary, their own metanoia. Crosby's rhetorical examination of the National Cathedral finds elements of design that direct audience into the kairotic space. He writes: "When

one enters kairic space, one evacuates one's own... [o]ne becomes a constituent of kairic will" (137). This of course calls into question the whole argument of agency on the part of humans, which is an argument for another time. But the audience is not a dead leaf in this stream; rather, they are the water itself. For

> The kairic rhetor's intent, in this view, is not to persuade the audience to accept some claim . . . but to enact spatial differentiation—to move one's audience *out* of themselves and into a cosmically vital space that changes the way they see the world and, perhaps more importantly, their role within it. (Crosby 137)

This is just what we teachers must do—move students out of themselves and into vital, kairotic space. Like Sullivan, Crosby is linking kairos to a rhetoric of belief: "If the target audience believes there is an intrinsic supernatural quality to a given space, then that belief is all that matters" (Crosby 138). In keeping with this, in reading literature, if we take the act of reading seriously we will be in an energetic, kairotic space.

Crosby posits the notion of *kairos* as heuristic for literary texts, a theory of production, and revelation. In "Kairos as God's Time," Crosby claims that " . . . revelation—not persuasion—[is] a primary telos of the concept" ("God's Time" 261). The rhetorical call to action that we are so familiar with holds, here, and rather than capturing and making to stand still the *kairos* of Crosby's previously mentioned essay, here, "kairic conception of time can be accomplished in a three-step pattern of movement, loosely identified here as pause, recognition, and action" (261). This is similar to the sanctuarization that Crosby notes of cathedrals, but the action is more of a turn than a remembrance. The notion of time that kairos brings becomes very important

when discussing how teachers and students examine literature, for "once we understand kairos as an independent philosophical principle, we can read texts not for the way they impart kairos *into rhetoric,* but instead for the way their rhetoric enters *into kairos"* (Crosby 264, emphasis in original). This reversal of priority between the act of persuasion and the ground that shapes that act becomes increasingly important when texts are experienced and when rhetorical devices are used to talk about that experience.

In "The Sophistical Attitude and the Invention of Rhetoric," Nathan Crick claims that "the core of sophistical methods of invention grew out of this experimental attitude toward knowledge in which theory was a means for generating novel perspectives and guiding situated practices within *kairotic* moments" (31). That we can guide perspectives and practices within kairos is an interesting idea pedagogically; it has echoes of Crosby's spatial kairos in that kairos may be manipulated. But we still have to be ready for opportunity. Crick writes that "Gorgias proves . . . that any serious rhetor must have mastered all the intellectual theories of his age in order to come up with novel perspective" (39). The ideology and the psychology of *kairos* is hard to pin down to specifics that act the same in every situation, but it cannot be denied that " . . . there is something creative about kairos, but the interpretation must assume that the rhetor relies mainly on a world not of rational facts and formulae, but of *doxa* [belief/opinion] and *phsychologia* (Crosby 263).

Energetic Space

Creative writer and theorist Maria Takolander gives us a term for the arousing space where the writer and reader meet. "Energetic Space" can be seen as a sort of third

way between a planned for and an unplanned-for kairos: it is a kairos not completely surprising in its context. Takolander describes this "energetic space" as "a vital realm of self-questioning, world-imbricatedness, mutual responsibility, lifelong learning, changefulness and genuine creativity" (180). It is the decentering nature of the aesthetic experience that Takolander examines. She cites Mark Roche's description of literature as "divine possession…[an enthusiasm for beauty that] grants us a sense of what cannot be seen, objectified, or measured" (168) that transfers to real life. Elsewhere, she uses phrases like "haunting," and being "reduced to a language being" to describe the aesthetic experience. Takolander's term can be linked with other terms to make a new term for a combination of theories: kairotic, energetic space. Much like kairos, the decentering depends on the aesthetic [the stimulus, the god of opportunity] to be "capable of provoking an experience of transportation and transformation" (171). Takolander's concept invites a space for using literature in the classroom much in the same way that the cathedral or nostalgia invites particular opportunities through sacrilization. Kairotic, energetic space prioritizes aesthetic opportunities to prepare for the most benefit. Takolander notes that the aesthetic experience provides a "black hole": something we note by its absence, much like the absent Capital-A Author in theories of the author-function. By "author-function," I refer to Foucault's notion that delegates Authorship to a social fiction, claiming there is no one-person author, no original text, and everything is a remix (Lessig, LeFevre, et al).

Takolander's "energetic space" provides a link between rhetoric, theory, and literature. The decentering and the looking at the materiality of the world she writes of are arguments about literature, but they echo Adams' discussion of "The Erotics of

12

Authorship" in that the unbound, undirected experience allows those who would be "grounded in the material and unAuthorized" (Adams 30) to gain some validity. In addition, Adams cites Barthes' notion of reader agency: "The reader who takes pleasure in the text is one who accepts incongruity, who 'abolishes within himself all barriers, all classes, all exclusions'" (31). It seems as though the aesthetic experience of reading and writing share similar spaces within their practitioners, who hold authority based on individual experience.

This is similar to what Reader-Response theorist Louise M. Rosenblatt calls aesthetic reading, where "the reader's attention is centered directly on what he is living through during his relationship with that particular text." This differs from reading-for-information in that "efferent" reading, reading to take something away from the text, is outcome-centered. She writes:

> The reader performs very different activities during aesthetic and nonaesthetic [efferent] readings. The contrast derives primarily from the reader's focus of attention during the reading-event. In nonaesthetic reading, the reader's attention is focused primarily on what will remain as the residue *after* the reading—the information to be acquired. (23, emphasis in original)

This distinction between reading for external, goal-driven purposes and reading for aesthetic, emergent purposes is quite similar to what I might call an energetic, kairotic reading. For Rosenblatt, an efferent reading is a looking outside to an outcome, whereas an aesthetic reading is a living through the experience of the text; for Takolander,

"imbricatedness" means the outside and inside of an experience (the text, the reader) are overlapping. A decentering, kairotic experience occurs.

Research

When students experience through reading literary fiction, their empathetic reactions teach them about social issues by allowing them to teach themselves. The aesthetic experience in literature is the scaffolding we must look to if we are to account for experience in ourselves and others. Critical theory, especially for undergraduate students, can be seen as a form of hierarchy—a prescribed way of experiencing a text. My research seeks to answer the question of whether students' emotional responses to a novel reveal critical thinking that resembles theoretical constructs, rather than reading through a lens of critical theory in an efferent way. In the following chapters I first will situate kairotic, energetic space in a conversation with other literary and composition theories. Next, I will describe how my data collection and grounded theory method helped me analyze how four years of classes of undergraduates at a Midwestern research university experienced literature as personally transformative. The data for my study comes from students' low-stakes writing (a term coined by Peter Elbow) in response to the novel *The Bone People* by Keri Hulme. This four-year study tracked students' affective responses to this text inferentially and iteratively—that is, their responses helped to focus the study year-by-year. The notion of kairos helps to house these ideas in theory, and vice versa. Finally, I will draw conclusions on the effectiveness of creating kairotic spaces for deepening student affective experiences with particular texts, and

summarize strategies for helping students connect with texts both rhetorically and ethically.

THEORY

"Rather than being merely represented in it, the ordinary man acts out the text itself, in and by the text, and in addition he makes plausible the universal character of the particular place in which the mad discourse of a knowing wisdom is pronounced."

--Michel de Certeau

The working hypothesis for this study is that kairotic, energetic space provides opportunity and space that more effectively steer belief and thought than taking a rational, planned course around a topic. Kairotic, energetic space can be seen as the time and space in which we create; the pendulum of the monolithic "I" writer and the social constructivist view of the monolithic "we" writer have more to do with trends in the fields of literature and rhetoric than with writers and readers themselves. Time and space are constructs of the individual as well as the social; therefore, the experience of the work is the thing that connects.

Immersed in theory, one is at a distance from the world. Critics of theory want us to take a shape, a practice in the world (as in theory vs. practice). In a recent issue of *MLA Journal*, the editor writes that in going off to study literature, his grandmother asked him two questions about literature: what is it, and what does it do? Simon Gikandi writes, "I could not tell my grandmother that literature transported me to other worlds, other experiences . . ." (10). The element of *use* was not there. The best he could come up with, even after study, was that literature had a social realm—it had the power to "intervene in social life and change society" (11). We can see a kind of Kairos/Metanoia paring happening here in an intervention and change. But Gikandi was taught in literary studies

that "the best form of theory would lead one away from mysticism and toward a comprehension of 'sensuousness and practical activity'" (12). His 2012 editorial is about the journey of "coming into literature" and the model of thinking that literary studies had previously anchored in him and the "resulting blindness." That is, in thinking of literary studies as not mystical, but of something that leads us to a particular practice or set of practices, we are missing the kairotic nature of the work. If we must focus on practical activity, maybe it can be seen as use and/or internal activity on the part of the individual, or aesthetic reading, not efferent or looking-outward reading. In other words, rather than blinding the reader from mysticism, the use is internal.

It is an odd contradiction: when we talk about English studies, it has become an assumption that social issues go hand-in-hand with the studies; that if the text itself is not rooted in social issues, there will at least be something we can say or write about the issues the texts raise. We've been taught to have a focal point. Perhaps poetry can still be analyzed for its aesthetics, but still mostly in the form of formal, agreed-upon definitions. Those movements in poetry such as Avant-Garde and L-A-N-G-U-A-G-E poetry are always talked about in their social contexts because the forms themselves are difficult to define, and the products wild and wildly different. Prose genres like Magical Realism, Postcolonial Literature, American Lit, etc., tend to be linked to a particular place and time. No matter the literary genre, we have been taught that we cannot write an analysis without a thesis. We are not supposed to write what the text made us feel without shaping it into an acceptable mode of theory. Gikandi writes that his "literary education seemed to have left [him] incapable of having an affective relation with texts" (13). It has not been enough just to love literature. The answers as to the *use* of literature can be found only by

looking at literature from the inside; for when we are experiencing literature, we are not theorizing--we are doing.

In his essay "The meaning of composition," Ruskin tells us that in a good composition each part has value, but that value would be lessened if taken by itself (161-2). Based on Ruskin's claims, parts have their strongest meaning only in relation to one another. He tells us that everyone can be affected by art; however, "*power* of composition in the fine arts should be an exclusive attribute of great intellect. All men can more or less copy what they see, and, more or less, remember it" (162, emphasis in original), but not everyone is a Mozart or Cimarosa. This view resembles a Romantic view of authorship, which locates invention and the authority over that invention in the writer, and therefore confers inventiveness to a distinct group -- those of "great intellect". This Romantic view is antagonistic to contemporary composition scholarship and, in particular, pedagogy. Composition scholars are loathe to give credence to a view that sequesters inventiveness to a small group.

Often composition seeks theoretical grounding by gazing toward the social sciences, in particular a cluster of French theorists including Michel Foucault and Bruno Latour. In "What is an Author?", Foucault asserts that authorship has vulnerabilities to tendencies to categorize and authenticate. We want to know to whom we should attribute a given work.   These tendencies are what Foucault calls the "author function," an impulse to name a work after its author for classification, unification, and authentication. It assigns value, then *regulates use*. For example, a thing can be Freudian and not be written by Freud. By labeling it as such, we give it author(ity). Of course, one can argue that the canon of authorship is a direction that takes agency away from the individual, as

well. As students of literature we are told to take the agency back from the (Dead White Guy) canon, and this is just what we should do in studies of authorship. We must be allowed to reclaim use—as in, it is what I say it is, because it is happening to me.

Following Foucault in the authorship canon, Bruno Latour, an anthropologist, proposed "Actor-Network Theory," (ANT) that seeks to flatten the magnitude of importance ascribed to relations among entities, including people, objects, ideas, and institutions. This flattening transitions from the social, a web of distinct yet interacting 'actors,' toward the collective, a woven fabric wherein the actors not only interact but share indispensable links necessary for meaning making. To assert greater value to one actor over other actors effectively dissolves the collective. However, Latour is distinctive from Ruskin in that Latour seeks to raise previously overlooked elements involved in composition rather than place privilege upon a small group of geniuses. "I proposed replacing the politics of nature by the *progressive composition of one common world*" (Latour, 254, emphasis in original). The mechanism of flattening is unifying collectors, the two largest ones being nature and society. ANT seeks to unify collectors because their division feeds criticisms that seek to isolate information into specific domains, quite similar to an author function. However, whereas Foucault identifies the power invested in an author as a person, Latour wants to extend beyond the anthropomorphic and identify the collective as the site of most meaning making —e.g., the chair that I sit on is in the network of actors creating this written work, as is the computer, as is the train that rolls by outside.

The flattening of the social into the collective presumes a high degree of collaboration occurs among the identified actors inside of the one collective. Composition

studies theorists such as Karen Burke LeFevre generally insist that some kind of collaboration is taking place in composition, an important view in the history of writing studies; however, it seems as though this epistemic breakdown of the author function has resulted in a loss in the belief of the individually creative mind and its propensity for beauty. It must be remembered that for theorists such as Foucault, Latour, and LeFevre, creation is *relational.* There are moving parts involved, and not every individual creates or responds to the parts in the same way. Even every theoretical movement is a reaction to a movement before it. Industrialization, monopolies, and the like led the Romantics to fight for individualism and author ownership. Writers like T.S. Elliot, who fought for the "individual talent," focused on intelligence and education as a means to art. The Romantics valued emotion as a valid part of aesthetics: the author/artist's feeling was the defining characteristic of the work, and showed through in the finished product. Therefore, only one particular person could create a particular piece of art.

Rhetorical and critical theory have both prescribed and proscribed the way scholars view affect; that is, with the exception of Reader Response Theory, they have by and large left the most important elements of the story out: emotion, and the writer and reader as they exist in kairotic, energetic time and space. Jenefer Robinson reminds us that emotional responses have a vital role in both understanding and interpreting literature. Robinson examines emotion in her book *Deeper than Reason: Emotion and its Role in Literature, Music, and Art.* Her main ideas are that 1) Affect can precede cognition. Evaluative judgment is not necessary to having emotion, and art in visual, literary, and music forms are capable of both expressing emotion and of creating them in audiences, but 2) Not all art is simply an expression of the artist's feelings, and 3) There

is a difference between an artist expressing and arousing emotions: one makes emotions clear, one does not. A process she introduces for responding to literature is one of compassion, response to the effective appraisal of that compassion, and cognitive monitoring. This is similar to Crosby's three-step pattern of movement, his "kairic conception of time": pause, recognition, and action (261). This is also similar to Rosenblatt's aesthetic (versus efferent, or goal-oriented) reading. When they give us pause, make us feel compassion, swirl us around in their aesthetic, we are vested in stories. Troubling outcomes to stories, or things that don't go as we expect, are harder to process, as we have to fill in gaps of the illogical and this can subvert the neat processes that scholars might overlay on our experience.

As one can imagine, responding to the character is crucial to the process working. Robinson also shows how our emotional response to literature teaches us. She compares Plato's and Aristotle's views on arts and emotion, and writes that "folk psychology generalizes; *literature particularizes*" (166, emphasis mine). Again, as we've seen in Sullivan, et. al, we have a pre-cognitive evaluation of the stimulus, and we arrive at our judgments/beliefs after we finish the work. Robinson reminds us that reason can reason away and still not make us feel. She writes:

> . . . whatever the evaluations in emotion are, they are evaluations in terms of what we want, what we care about, what our interests are. If this is true, then it helps to explain why emotions are in general adaptive and why we have emotions at all in addition to dispassionate beliefs. (26)

If we were to view art from a set of "dispassionate beliefs," well, I don't know why most of us would ever be likely to pick up a book or trek to a museum again. When we read

literature, the art I am most concerned with here, it is our individual set of beliefs that are plucked like harp strings in the hands of a gifted author. If you don't believe me, ask a set of students to grammatically diagram each sentence of a chapter in their favorite novel. The emotions they felt in reading the novel will not be found on the page, for as Robinson reminds us, "a genuine poet, in his moments of genuine poetry, never mentions by name the emotion he is expressing" [e.g., "Show, don't tell."] (236). Of course rereading the words might cause a bit of a thrill, because as Robinson says, there is the "mere exposure effect," (39), which shows that people prefer stimuli to which they have been previously exposed to. But the words on the page are simply symbols, not the emotions themselves. Like Rosenblatt's efferent reading, to look outside experiential action brings us back to form and function. Robinson cites the Lazarus and McCleary "Subseption" experiments in 1950s "indicating a kind of perception that occurs below awareness" (40). In all, "…there is an *affective appraisal* that concerns those things that *matter* to the organism and that occurs very fast, automatically, and below the threshold of awareness" (41, emphasis in original). We know this on a different kind of scale as a "gut-reaction." When we intuit something or react to something and don't know why, there might be reason present, but often, like kairos, it is a moment of note beyond reason's edges.

There is no reason why any interpretation of art should not account for emotion. To return to the notion of beliefs, LeFevre writes that "[r]esonance comes about when an individual act—a 'vibration'—is intensified and prolonged by sympathetic vibrations" (65). These sympathetic vibrations might not always take the same form, the same path, or the same emotion, but they are an essential part of our response to art. Maybe we can

see the resonance in this sense as Metanoia, the goddess/teacher who arrives after Kairos.

Perhaps that is what makes Metanoia so important. Metanoia is seen in representations of

Kairos as a somewhat sorrowful woman, compared to the sharp youth that precedes her.

She follows Kairos, and sticks around after we have failed to grasp him to fill us with

remorse or some other sense of change. Myers defines the etymology of the name

Metanoia as "afterthought" (7), but "meta" can also mean something that refers to itself.

A thought that refers to itself is reflexive and in its own way, out of time, or out of

chronos (chronological time). Metanoia can so be linked to kairotic space, to be discussed

later. Myers writes: "Although she is not portrayed with the same swiftness as *Kairos*, a

closer look at the concept of *Metanoia* suggests powerful internal activity, *movement on

the level of the soul*" (Myers 7, emphasis mine). So an internal effect of Kairos/kairos is

one on a level so individual and so beautiful that we can call it by the name "soul." Myers

also notes Metanoia's rhetorical function: In rhetoric, according to a handbook by P.

Rutilus Lupus, metanoia is a "'scheme [that] customarily occurs when the person who is

speaking refutes himself and in a subsequent statement changes what he first said'…[or

according to Lanham] involves 'qualifying a statement by recalling it and expressing it in

a better way, often by using a negative… the transformation occurs as more of a

revision'" (8). A refutation or revision: in other words, *this*, not *that*. A common way to

teach the argument to students is to formulate a thesis statement in the form of *this*

because *that*. What this (not that) suggests is that at times, there is not need for the that of

external evidence, for a body of experts to provide proof. We can change direction, with

the catalyst of kairos leading to the turning of metanoia. Maybe the closest we can ever

get to our own pure reality is not in kairos, but in metanoia.

As teachers of writing we have an emotional and a social responsibility, for "teachers of writing teach more than writing *per se*: 'in teaching writing we are tacitly teaching a version of reality and the student's place and mode of operation in it'" (LeFevre 25, emphasis in original). The student's place is not an emotionless place. Literature and other art are not emotionless places. Though the collective view might remove a bit of the individual from agency, LeFevre writes that "invention, conceived broadly as the process of actively creating as well as finding what comes to be known and said in the discourse of any discipline, is, I think, best understood as occurring when individuals interact dialectically with socioculture in a distinctive way to generate something" (33). It is this interaction that breeds kairotic, energetic space, after all.

Emotion and aesthetics swirl and comingle to concentrate power. The emotional level serves as the focal point for Read/Write / R/W / Remix culture. At an emotional level, a reader experiences a text in a manner that draws the two into a commonality, which like ANT, makes the reader a part of the result of the text. Meaning derives from reader and text interaction. There is a consistency in theories rather than a contrast here. Though on different sides of the page, the author and the reader have a relationship that goes beyond writer and reader, whether or not the author writes with an audience in mind. There is an energetic space inhabited by the reader, created by the author. If nothing else, these examples from a range of author(ity) show that we have multiple ways to imagine both readers and writers. The aesthetic experience involved in reading literature gives the author a director-like authority, and the reader a writing-upon-the-text authority that is a collaboration of the Romantic-type writer and the individual's reading experience. This differs from Read/Write culture and ANT is that it brings agency back

to the individuals while allowing for variables such as intent and emotion. The dialogue

between author and reader is an emotional experience. To force a thing--a thought, an

agenda, a connection--is to take away an individual's notion of truth. We can follow a

person's truth, like Metanoia follows Kairos. Myers writes that "[w]hen people identify

the roots of 'passionate commitments'—specific moments of conversion to belief, both

their own and those of others—they create improved hope for more productive

conversation" (Myers 16). Our studies are a personal thing (hence the popular phrase

"research is me-search"). A lot goes on in our brain that is not available to others. Most

of it, despite psychology and neurology.

A psychology of reading

In their article "Psychological Processes Underlying Literary Impact," Richard J.

Gerrig and David N. Rapp counter Samuel Taylor Coleridge's idea-now-idiom of the

suspension of disbelief with their idea of the "willing construction of disbelief." These

psychologists studying literary effect claim that readers are actually more likely to start

from belief and construct disbelief, than to start from disbelief, as Coleridge claimed.

They ran experiments that led them to the conclusion that "from the standpoint of

psychology, one of the basic facts is that readers must construct disbelief: literature will

have an impact unless readers expend specific effort to forestall that consequence, [and]

the probability that readers will construct disbelief is affected by the extent to which they

are transported to narrative worlds" (280). They noted something that creative writing

scholars hold true in general: that fiction can be more true than truth. They found that

"Readers were as likely or, in some cases, more likely to be persuaded by fictional

narratives as factual narratives" (270). It is these ideas of what literary narrative can do

(their use) that interests me, despite possible criticism of overlarge claims about

psychological processes. For these purposes, before I delve into grounded theory and the

data and results from my study, I wish to point out that there is a place for affect in the

psychological view of this issue. Although it is widely agreed that affect plays a crucial

role in the reception of narrative, culturally prevalent visualization of both affect and

psychology has led to a concurrent rise in the examination of how these claims and

warrants are created and circulated. In order to differentiate my study of why affect is

important in story from claims about locating emotion or creativity in the brain, it's

important to unpack how these claims hide ambiguities in cultural understandings. It is

one thing for literary theorists to take an approach to something, quite another for people

to use data and say concrete things about it—particularly when the popular press gets a

hold of these results. For example, in Wolfgang Iser's 1972 article in *New Literary*

History, "The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach," he writes that yes, the

end product of literature is the interaction between text and reader:

> [But] the question now arises as to how far such a process can be
>
> adequately described … a phenomenological analysis recommends itself,
>
> especially since the somewhat sparse observations hitherto made of the
>
> psychology of reading tend to be psychoanalytical, and so are restricted to
>
> the illustration of predetermined ideas concerning the unconscious. (281)

Though we've seen more psychological examinations of the scientific kind, we're still

restricted to this illusion of our preconceived ideas. Where it is fine for the non-scientists

to make theory with words, when we bring hard science into it, claims are a different matter altogether.

Neurorhetorics

      Energetic Space, a theoretical concept, has been examined by way of similar concepts under different names in the field of neuroscience. That the movement, even within the brain, is constantly in flux, reminds of the figure of kairos again. We cannot currently pin down theoretical concepts in the brain. Maybe we never will. Freud taught us that

> The dynamic unconscious is guided by the pleasure principle and primary-process thinking, which is *unconstrained by logic or a sense of time and space, is comfortable with contradictions and does not tolerate delays in gratification*. This style of thought also characterizes an important component of the creative process. (Kandel 71-2, emphasis added)

Due to our current ability to view the brain and its workings, some still believe that intelligence and creativity do not operate fully at the same time. Rex Jung is an assistant professor of neurosurgery at the University of New Mexico and holds a senior advisory position in the neuroscience project at U Penn. In a 2012 interview on "On Being," with Krista Tippet, Jung said that creativity and personality are separate from intelligence. They activate and are activated by separate parts of the brain. This seems like it might be a given, given our cultural fascination with the creative savant, but we now have science to show why this phenomenon can occur. Jung tells us that the idea of left brain/right brain difference is "folk psychology," a notion that developed when doctors severed the

brain hemispheres of severe epileptics to stop seizures. Patients were left with function, but not all patients were left with the same functions, leading to the theory that different halves of the brain were responsible for different tasks and personality traits. In other words, creativity is not a left-brain thing, and intelligence a right-brain thing. Jung defines creativity as "something both novel, useful, and *unexpected*…[and that] depends on context" (see Van Gogh—his brother was his primary audience in life. His posthumous fame tells us that there was something in the individual that was not of his time). In contrast to intelligence, the creative brain needs to slow down and "meander." For intelligence, more brain activity is better. The intelligent part of the brain is engaged in inputting and receiving information. We need knowledge acquisition mode, but to create, "recess is the most important class of the day." In creating, our brains have to slow down and not receive so much information to allow a freer interplay. What Jung dubs "stove piping," or having to narrow creativity in order to allow information input, is in scientific terms called transient hypofrontality. In layman's terms, creativity and intelligence come from different parts of the brain.

Dr. Jordynn Jack argues that there is a trend in popular science writing, and sometimes even in reports of studies, to make grand claims about the results of brain scans. Her pet field of criticism is "creativity studies" that make big news, e.g., "Brain scans show that when people read poetry this area of their brain lights up; therefore poetry makes people smarter." Following the reasoning of Jack, what that scan shows is just an area of a person's brain lighting up—not any kind of proof of creativity or other complexities. The claim that a mental phenomenon is concrete and locatable is what Jack calls "Neurorealism," and its rhetorical figure, e.g., the figure that tells us something, is

metaphor. It is not real, Jack tells us; the studies "might be attractive to rhetoric scholars seeking to draw on the cultural capital of neuroscience, and to those seeking to answer the elusive question about how to study audience response" (406). Well, so response/affect itself is not biologically locatable, so we can turn again to the theory, or the metaphor, of kairotic, energetic space. Audience response has moving parts, just as the notion of authorship does. We can never pinpoint response exactly. We need metaphor. Research has its limits: it can only see a representation of the mind via image, action, or report; this is why we turn to metaphor and longing. As Nietzsche says:

> For a genuine poet, metaphor is not a rhetorical figure but a vicarious image that he actually beholds in place of a concept. A character is for him not a whole he has composed out of particular traits . . . but an obtrusively alive person before his very eyes, distinguished from the otherwise identical version of a painter only by the fact that it continually goes on living and acting. (325)

For Jack, the pop-culture rhetorical commonplace of adding the "neuro-" prefix to things is irresponsible; she believes that both rhetoricians and scientists should engage in neurorhetorics, defined as examining the neuroscience of rhetoric and the rhetoric of neuroscience. Jack and Appelbaum cite Mark Turner as writing that "If Aristotle were alive today he would be studying this [neuroscience] research and revising his work accordingly" (412). This is a bold claim, and a slippery one. For if we are to follow Jack's claim that "research findings are shaped rhetorically to fit with scientists' shared expectations" (Jack and Appelbaum 413), then is it fair for rhetoricians to use Aristotle as a symbolic figure for the popularity of brain research? Obviously, even those who would

eschew making grand claims have to make grand claims in the name of capturing our attention and making us feel something for the writing.

An example of what Jack calls Neurorealism in the vein of affect is the 2013 report of studies done by David Comer Kidd and Emanuele Castano. Reported in *Science Journal*, the five experiments looked for a psychological skill called Theory of Mind by way of participants reading different kinds of literature. "Theory of Mind" is not a new idea: coined in 1978 by researchers studying chimpanzees (Premack and Woodruff) and defined as "the ability to impute mental states to oneself and others" (Schlinger 436), since 1985 the lack of Theory of Mind has been one of the defining characteristics of autism. Certainly, the results of five experiments pointing to reading literary fiction as a precursor to higher scores on a ToM test is nothing to ignore, but popular magazines picked up the study and ran with it. As Schlinger reports, the phrase "Theory of Mind" and its acronym (ToM) are incredibly popular. As Mark Liberman retorts in *Slate Magazine*:

> Needless to say, the study has received considerable media attention. "For Better Social Skills, Scientists Recommend a Little Chekhov," reported the *New York Times* on its Well blog. "Reading Literary Fiction Improves 'Mind-Reading Skills'," said the online magazine *ScienceDaily*. "Now We Have Proof Reading Literary Fiction Makes You a Better Person," asserted the *Atlantic*.
>
> A better person. Wow. So what's the basis for all of these incredible claims? How is it that the researchers were able to conclude, as they put it, that "literary fiction, which we consider to be both writerly and

polyphonic, uniquely engages the psychological processes needed to gain

access to characters' subjective experiences"? (slate.com)

Is Liberman doing Neurorhetorics, or simply responding to attention-grabbing headlines in the popular press? I would say the latter, but the tone and attack-mode of the piece make his writing nothing more than fuel to the fire. There's a tension, here, between presenting data on literature and sharing aesthetics. It is to be expected that whenever we hold narrative literature up as something that makes us feel, those who don't read narrative literature might become insulted. What makes us feel human is untouchable by others, but can be measurable if expressed. Roya Hakakian, author and refugee from Iran, writes: "Memory is the membrane in which the past is sealed and also the blueprint of what you once [were], when you were your most clearheaded, envisioned the future" (32). Lovely, no? It's a metaphor, and it makes us feel something. But it is not what memory is, and science cannot locate the exact spot where memory is, or the experience of literature, for that matter.

 A return to the kairotic, energetic space

Is the reading transaction a kairotic, energetic space for readers to define what they believe in the moment? Kairotic space is defined by Richard Crosby as a sacred space where something kairotic has occurred. The space is made sacred by "capture[ing] and sustain[ing] the rhetorical charge of a kairotic moment" (133). The kairos, the moment, again rests in the experience of the individual. Maria Takolander uses phrases like "possession," "haunting," and "the uncanny" to talk about her notion of "energetic space." Kairos, by our definitions, can pass us like a ghost but also provide a space for us

to embody and preserve his "uncanny" passing. We might see Crosby's sacred space as a kind of possession; taken by a feeling, we commemorate the spot on which it occurred and dwell in it (perhaps a reverse possession is more apt). What happens when we read? An experience, a real occurrence, according to Robinson, is being created in our mind. In addition to a reaction in our mind, we might have a visceral reaction to literature. Takolander takes us through the mind of the reader as experiencing something qualitative and individual. The mind of the reader can be theorized and can be scientifically studied, but the experience always comes back to the individual. Karl Phillip Moritz, who has been called the first theorist to take on aesthetics in art, tells us that the work of the artist is lessened if it is created solely for the purpose of the consumer (as in, for example, commercial fiction). But it is not the ethos of the writer that the reader is responding to: Takolander writes that "[a]s cognitive psychologists have shown…the reader, in fact, takes 'an active part in the story in much the same way as we take part in a game or a social encounter'" (Takolander, citing Oatley 172). Jack might call this stretching scientific data too far, but we might call the communication between writer and reader a metaphor, or we might call on Read/Write culture to call it collaboration, or phenomenology to call it theory. Regardless, instead of being a recipient, the reader is co-creating. Takolander cites Mark Roche's description of literature "as 'divine possession . . . [it] grants us a sense of what cannot be seen, objectified, or measured'" (168). Not something unreachable, though, ". . . the feeling of possession or the sense of becoming inhabited by something 'other' is something that any enthusiastic reader would recognize" (ibid). Much like kairos, "Energetic Space" takes some circling around to get ahold of. You see, we can't define exactly what it is like for a reader to enter this space.

We know it when we feel it, as we know kairos when we see it. But it does seem like kairotic space shares some space with energetic space: both are experienced by a consumer, both can be marked, at the very least, with notice. Language, for Takolander, is not limited to "the material conditions of our existence" (169). So while we possess this set of symbols, it is not a part of us, yet it can affect us in real ways. Like chronos (chronological time, the quantitative that cannot touch kairos), language gives shape to our existence. We need both time and language to make sense of our existence. Our stories originated as ways to make sense of our origins, and we still find ourselves needing to define experience to make sense of it. Takolander writes that "language is the medium of our being. Therefore, the aesthetic exists as a latent transporting and transformative force within us" (171). So while the explanation is an external measure that cannot be quantitatively measured, the experience itself is within us. Any talk or measure of beauty is just that—it cannot be experienced but from within. Like an encounter with kairos, in literature "[t]he uncanny [aesthetic experience] is not so much *in* the text [time/space] we are reading: rather, it is like a foreign body within ourselves" (Takolander 171). What the aesthetic experience does is vital.

So, while the Romantic view of the Author creating alone has fallen out of favor, the aesthetic experience involved in reading literature gives the author a director-like authority, and the reader a writing-upon-the-text authority that is a collaboration of the Romantic-type writer (Author) and the individual's reading experience. There is not, or at least should not be, a sharp divide between the author and the reader. The dialogue between author and reader is an emotional experience. To force a thing--a thought, an agenda, a connection--is to take away an individual's notion of truth. Like kairos,

"literature, or rather the experience of literary works, consistently exceeds the limits of rational accounting" (Derek Attridge, cited in Takolander (169). If we make the locus point of the experience internal, we must be willing to question without constraint the external markings of this experience.

METHODS

"There is a story, always ahead of you. Barely existing. Only gradually do you attach yourself to it and feed it. You discover the carapace that will contain and test your character. You find in this way the path of your life."

--Michael Ondaatje

Grounded Theory: marking experience

Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss developed and were the first to teach and write about Grounded Theory, a method for conducting qualitative, inductive, and iterative research. It is a method for creating theory that is grounded in the data, rather than proving pre-existing hypotheses. One of Glaser and Strass' students, and now an authority on Grounded Theory herself, Kathy Charmaz promotes Constructivist Grounded Theory as a way to conduct qualitative research generatively; that is, the hypothesis arrives from the data, instead of a researcher looking for evidence of their theories in data. Constructivist Grounded Theory does not remove agency from the researcher, however. Charmaz writes:

> At each phase of the research journey, *your* readings of your work guide your next moves. This combination of involvement and interpretation leads you to the next step. The endpoint of your journey emerges from where you start, where you go, and with whom you interact, what you see and hear, and how you learn and think. In short, the finished work is a construction—yours. (xvi, emphasis in original)

Like Actor-Network-Theory, every player has a part in this production. The data, in many cases in qualitative research, as in this case, is data about people. The data is collected by

people. All of these people have contexts that can affect their recording and can change. Charmaz writes that "bringing any method beyond a recipe into public purview inevitably invites interpretation and reconstruction—and misunderstandings. Readers and researchers' perspectives, purposes, and practices influence how they will make sense of a method" (xvi). In Charmaz's constructivist approach,

> Researchers can use grounded theory strategies without endorsing mid-
> century assumptions of an objective external reality, a passive, neutral
> observer, or a detached, narrow empiricism. If, instead, we start with the
> assumption that social reality is multiple, processual, and constructed, then
> we must take the researcher's position, privileges, and interactions into
> account as an inherent part of the research reality. It, too, is a
> construction…the research reality arises *within a situatio*n and includes
> what researchers and participants bring to it and do within it (13, emphasis
> mine).

In other words, our reality is constructed in moments, and our research is a social construction as well—one that becomes a part of the story of the research. It is really like writing a story in some senses. Not narrative literature, but a narrative nonetheless. In *Constructing Grounded Theory*, Charmaz's first example of a researcher doing grounded theory has them listen to the subject's narrative, and they "picked up on an earlier comment that Caitlin [research subject] had made and combined it with what she gained from Caitlin's reflection" (2). Grounded Theory has been and is frequently used in health care research and settings, which can make it easier to imagine its somewhat discursive tendencies. A researcher (like a health care provider) simultaneously does research and

36

analysis, evaluating and changing their focus of the research along the way in accordance to their discoveries.

For Charmaz, grounded theorists

1. Conduct data collection and analysis simultaneously in an iterative process

2. Analyze actions and processes rather than themes and structure

3. Use comparative methods

4. Draw on data (e.g. narratives and descriptions) in service of developing new conceptual categories

5. Develop inductive abstract analytic categories through systematic data analysis

6. Emphasize theory construction rather than description or application of current theories

7. Engage in theoretical sampling

8. Search for variation in the studied categories or process

9. Pursue developing a category rather than covering a specific empirical topic

Most people using grounded theory use at least 1-5, she writes, and these can make for a grounded theory. Glaser and Straus "invited their readers to use grounded theory strategies flexibly in their own way" (Charmaz 16). Charmaz has done so, and invites her own readers to use the "guidelines" she presents just as flexibly.

Grounded Theory as kairotic

The forelock of Kairos is the only thing that comes before understanding, and in his story, we must be situated perfectly to grasp it. Sometimes, after Kairos comes Metanoia, the goddess whose name means a change of mind. Kelly Myers writes that

when Kairos passes, Metanoia is left behind, but she is not the sad woman of missed opportunity—rather, a partner in transformation. The Kairos/Metanoia pairing can be a "personal learning process, a pedagogical tool, and a rhetorical device… [that] stimulate[s] transformations of belief, large and small, that can advance personal understanding and lead to more empathetic responses" (1). In using Grounded Theory, we are relying intensely on empathetic responses. The researcher must be grounded in the data and have an empathetic response for what the data tells them. Rather than relying on external, objective systems, in Grounded Theory the researcher works on the level of experience and of emotion. Myers re-imagines the often passive, saddened Metanoia "as an active emotional state in which reflection, revelation, and transformation occur and thus expand the opportunities available in the concept of *kairos*" (2). When using Grounded Theory, we are explicitly reflecting on and expanding the opportunities/ideas in the data. Metanoia could even be translated in this context to be the time or space in which Kairos operates; the how or the use of Kairos. Because "once a decision has been made or missed, the two part ways, but before that crucial moment they stand together" (4). This is much like using Grounded Theory in that the researcher is to delay the evolution of their hypothesis for as long as possible so as not to move away from being in tune with the data, and to expand the opportunities of the data by way of reflection and revelation. Like Crosby's keeping of a moment, and like Grounded Theory, "*metanoia* is a reflexive act in which a person returns to a past event in order to see it anew. Such reflection often brings an emotional response…in *metanoia* the emotional response that comes with reflection is often a motivating force that leads to transformation" (Myers 8).

In Grounded Theory, the hypothesis comes from the data, which is the force that leads to a grounded theory.

The method of coding in Grounded Theory is similar to what writing teachers might call "sideshadowing, a conversation that takes place in the margins but is always about the text itself": in Grounded Theory coding, the researcher/coder asks of the data over and over "what's this about?" Since data collection and analysis can happen simultaneously, the researcher is always coding the text, and can do some theoretical sampling, developing understanding of the ideas as they go along. The labeling of the text is not description, but a labeling of the action being undertaken by the subject. Coding is co-creating meaning, where the constructions of the researcher are as important as the constructions of the researched. (For an example of coding generated from text in this study, see Appendix A.)

Similar studies

Examining similarities and differences to readers' (ninth-grade students) response to a short story, Golden and Guthrie studied the similarities, differences, and "inter-relationships between reader-oriented and text-oriented response categories" (410). Students responded in four categories: reader beliefs, reader empathy, text events, and text conflict. There was much agreement in reader beliefs and text events; the differences showed up in reader empathy and text conflict, specifically, when students empathized with a particular character, they placed the conflict of the story as one involving that character (further verification of Rosenblatt's idea that we like troubling outcomes). The authors position their study as important for the study of literary response, and write that

"variation in response may indicate the extent to which reading literature is an idiosyncratic process and suggest the nature of the reader-based factors that contribute to individual interpretation" (409). The takeaway from this study is that whether the reader or the text is more responsible for the response is a matter of opinion. They remind us that "because most discourse understanding involves personal beliefs, opinions, and attitude as well as knowledge, researchers must take these factors into account [and] the emotive or affective dimension should be addressed" (412). They further boil down these categories to personal beliefs and empathy. It must be noted that the authors speculate on the importance of the interpretive community on the results. They write that agreement might be in part because of the shared speech community, and "the beliefs presented [in the selected short story] do not reflect dogmas that might challenge the intellectual beliefs of the reader" (416). Notably, the variation the authors found was in the category of empathy. They attribute this both to the personal responses of the reader and to the points of view of the characters. They conclude that "affects—particularly empathy—may be highly associated with cognitive operations during reading and therefore merit further examination" (419).

Melanie Janzen studies the ways that teachers and teachers-in-training construct and perceive their identities as teachers in literary response groups. She provides evidence that literary response groups engage in what she calls "symptomatic analysis." Much like researchers who use grounded theory, she writes that " the research project is a precarious arrangement in which the researcher recognizes that 'truth' is not something to be uncovered, that knowledge is not a static and a fixed entity and that language fails to fully represent its meaning" (989-990). Literary response groups, groups she likens to

book clubs, can honor multiple meanings and identities without insisting on one truth. Janzen also looked to find moments where "discursive constitution of the subject slips" (990) and there is creative movement (what we might call kairos). Though the chosen novels don't have teachers as main characters, Janzen calls the novels "commonplaces for interpretations of identity" (990). She notes that the relationship of making meaning is "not a neutral, linear transaction" (ibid, see also Latour, et al), and that the shared history of reading a novel together creates a sense of community [or discourse community]. The discussions, she writes, were "busy, messy, circuitous, meandering, and disrupted" (992). Like my study and others of this sort, allowing participants to respond "free-range," if you will, is an important part of moving observation as close as possible to genuine reflection. She writes:

> The method of reading and discussing fiction mimics the trouble with narrative and knowing. That is, instead of seeking transparent and linear responses that propose to represent "truth," the method fosters dynamic engagements, as well as social, collaborative and contested reactions to novels. By engaging with provocations that are fictitious (that is, the novels), there is a purposeful, yet playful paradox: the method presupposes the participants' narratives as fiction, while simultaneously situating fiction as meaningful. Thus, literary response groups as a data elicitation method, consider the subject as discursively constituted, yet rely on the discussion of fiction to consider the discursive accountings of identity. (992)

As researchers, we know that readers' identities, especially as studied entities, are fictions, which makes qualitative methods like grounded theory so vital. Though Janzen doesn't cite ANT, she writes that the texts in the study were the novels, the participants, and her writing; each player plays a part in the study and the results of the study. Transcripts, as she writes, are not findings. In contrast to my study, she did not code for similarities, but looked for differences in response, what she calls categorizing the data into patterns of 'truth'" (996). While not mentioning kairos or metanoia, Janzen brings up a key idea of linking these concepts to literature here:

> Literature and the works of artists foster breaks in knowledge, allow for difference and invite discomfort. These breaks create spaces for the consideration of new possibilities. Thus, when texts are read symptomatically, data interpretation becomes an opportunity to consider larger theoretical or analytical contexts, allowing for a working through, a learning or an interpretation of something yet unthought. (996)

Aside from differing terms and data collection, Janzen's study focuses on the dialog between the participants and the text, whereas my study looks for individual emotional response. Much as Janzen writes, my study, too has results that "are speculative claims, readings that yield to other readings, malleable to contradictions and open to interpretations" (1002).

Sadoski, Goetz, and Kansinger used short stories to measure participants' responses by way of mental imagery invoked, emotion evoked, or degree of importance to the story. College students were asked to rate paragraphs within the short story by those three criteria. Again, these researchers used a "free-response reporting format."

Much like the first iteration of my study, these researchers asked "does the text contain a determinate internal structure of linguistic features that directs the response of each reader, or is every response unique and idiosyncratic?" (322). They also wonder whether meaning lies more in the text or more in the reader. In this case, the three stories were 1500 words or less, and the participants were all female. The story format is noted by the researchers as being similar, having a plot twist and surprise ending. While similar in idea, the methods, a formal packet of stories and instructions, and the type of literature differ significantly from mine. Their results are given qualitatively and quantitatively, due to the nature of the methods, and contrary to the results in my study, the researchers note that "students describing their emotions gave the briefest responses." (331). There are more reasons than not why this one variance could happen, but I suspect the length, the complexity, and the unfettered, low-stakes writing nature of my assignments might have quite a lot to do with it (select student responses are reported in subsequent sections.). Again, these researchers conclude that "empirical research in literary response must always be conditional" (335). It is worth saying, again and again, that when dealing with human emotion, the research can never be certain.

The classroom

My research did not start out as grounded theory. I had a concrete hypothesis: that students would respond emotionally in places where the novel was keenly "crafted," to use the creative writing pedagogy catchall word for technique. NDSU IRB-approved study HS12196, "The Emotional Response to Aesthetics in Literature," is a study that ran from 2012-2015. The original IRB form reads in part as such:

Purpose and goals of the research: "The purpose of the research is to analyze students' response to the language in a novel, and to compare their responses to creative writing (aesthetic) craft. The goal is to find whether students not studying creative writing will respond emotionally to craft as well as content."

Method and Procedures: The purpose of the research is to analyze students' response to the language in a novel, and to compare their responses to creative writing (aesthetic) craft. The goal is to find whether students not studying creative writing will respond emotionally to craft as well as content.

Dual relationships (researcher and instructor): Graduate student instructor Heather Steinmann is the instructor of the course, and students will be informed that they do not have to participate and their choice will not affect their grades. The particular writing assignment to be collected is graded on completion only, so research evaluation of the writing will not affect the grade.

What this study really examines is how four groups of North Dakota State University students respond to *The Bone People* in an aesthetic, rather than efferent way. The course the students read the novel in was Writing in the Humanities and Social Sciences, a course that students in those colleges take to fulfill their upper-division writing requirements at NDSU. That students talked about the novel, wrote personal responses to their reading, answered guided questions about the novel, and wrote literary analysis papers on it hit many of the course's objectives: communicating in a variety of contexts

and genres, using various communication skills; integrating knowledge; and being familiar with literatures as culturally and historically embedded practices (NDSU Upper-Division Writing Course Objectives). For each reading, usually a chapter per class period, each student posted an approximately 500-word response on Blackboard, the online learning management system used at NDSU. Responses were visible by me and by other classmates, but not visible to the public (as a non-protected blog would be). Here is an example of a student response, titled "Saying Lots, Telling Little":

> In chapters five and six Hulme dives deeper in the past of each of our main characters. However, even while providing more details about Joe, Kerewin, and Simon, she manages to make them seem more mysterious. In chapter five we learn about the rough childhood Joe had experienced. When he was a young boy his mother abandoned him, his father died, he was stricken with polio (or something like it), and his grandfather was abusive toward him. His horrible childhood makes me feel partly sorry for him. On page 277 Joe says to Kerewin, "I've often thought that maybe what happens to you as a child determines everything about you. What you are and what you do, and somehow, even the things that happen to you." It's because of statements like this that I still feel sour about Joe's relationship with Simon. If he is aware of the effects that a bad childhood can have on a person, then why has Joe been so abusive toward Simon?
>
> We end up learning a bit more about Simon's past in these two chapters, but it raises even more questions. For some reason Simon appears to understand a little bit of French. His fear of the doctor may

come from a fear of needles. Most importantly, we learn that Simon is not actually mute and that he can sing. Given that Simon has managed to keep this a secret for so long, I am curious as to what else he may be hiding. Overall, he has opened up a lot since the beginning of the book. He finally shared his real name with other people and he is no longer hiding the fact that he can sing. However, there is still much about him that remains a mystery.

Hulme did not provide too many answers about Kerewin's past in chapters five and six. On page 281, while Kerewin is talking to Joe she says, "I've known roadies who knew theirs was a high place in the scheme of things, and I've met a cabinet minister who realised he was bottom of the dung heap." There appears to be quite a few things from Kerewin's past that we did not know about and I'm sure that there is probably more to learn. Roadies and cabinet ministers belong to two completely different crowds, so it will be interesting to learn about how she managed to become friends with both. For a brief moment at the beginning of chapter six we get to meet Kerewin's brother. During his conversation with Kerewin he tries to invite her to something, however Kerewin refuses and her brother seems disappointed. Kerewin appears to be very distraught about her relationship with her family, so it was surprising to see her turn down an opportunity to reconnect.

By not summarizing, but by responding to the novel, students provided the most data in some 300 responses such as these. I used grounded theory to come to a theory of student interaction with the text by coding their responses, and informed them of and gave them the option of participating in the study only after their responses were complete, to insure non-interference.

In response to the data, students' written responses to the novel, my focus changed with time. In the first year of the study (this first iteration consisted of two sections of the course), I was fixed on proving that highly-skilled creative writers could evoke emotion through craft. So I did find that, as I will discuss in the next section. In addition to their unmediated responses, after they were finished reading the novel, they answered the following questions:

1. Identify three scenes in The Bone People that have stuck in your memory.

2. Write down particular words or phrases in those three passages that you find powerful for any reason, marking page numbers.

3. Beside those words or phrases, list the particular emotions that you feel when reading them.

4. Speculate as to why you feel that way when reading those words or passages.

5. Identify emotions that you felt when reading the book as a whole.

6. Speculate as to why the book affected you in that way.

In the second and third iterations of the study, instead of having students first study critical theory on the liminal states of post-colonialism, gender, psychoanalysis, etc., they read the novel without a critical framework in mind. They then researched areas of critical theory and presented on them in groups. In the fourth iteration, students looked

back at their writing for areas of critical theory after reading brief summaries of some of the main areas of literary theory on Purdue's Online Writing Lab website. I noticed in the third iteration that students were and had been writing remarkably little about issues of indigenousness or postcolonialism, and so added the following questionnaire after they had finished the novel:

1. What has your experience with indigenous/native culture (in the U.S. or elsewhere) been?

2. Have you studied any native literatures or postcolonial theory in other classes? Please specify classes.

3. Have either of these experiences (from #1 or #2), if applicable, informed your reading of *The Bone People*? Why or why not?

4. What issues or instances related to indigenous culture have you encountered in *The Bone People*, directly or implicitly?

5. Has reading *The Bone People* changed or informed how you see indigenous/native peoples? Why or why not?

Two of the additional handouts that were given to students are worth noting here for their involvement in grounded theory. The first, a chapter quiz, asks students to remember and reflect on language and content that struck them in the reading. They switched papers with another student who did sideshadowing on that paper. Students were then engaged in grounded theory coding, and co-developing ideas. (see example in Appendix B). The second asked students to cite passages from the book that they annotated and examine first their emotions surrounding the annotation, and the facts of the plot. Students then did

a kind of sideshadowing/coding on their own work, made easier by using the social media coding structure of hashtagging (#; see example in Appendix C).

Results will be discussed in the next chapter.

The novel

Keri Hulme's Booker-prize winning novel *The Bone People* has no shortage of liminal (transitional or boundary) space for students to bump around in. It could be classified as Magical Realism—that genre of realism in which magical things happen and they are completely realistic in their context. Takolander and others note the ties between postcolonial theory and Magical Realism. One thing in particular that Magical Realism can be said to do, and do well, is to take history out of the hegemonic history of a Western audience (one that Takolander cautions might be reading for exoticism). Mukherjee writes of Rushdie that he "seems to suggest that an aesthetic history [is] the only mode of crisis management available to the subject/writer" (61). I would argue that Magical Realism *is* the kairos of literature. Situated, certainly, in an historic time and place, arguably Latin America by way of Germany, the break in realism gives us the opportune moment to experience that leap into something from which we can return a changed being. Not that all literature can't do this, but the magic, by way of the definition of the word magic, gives us space to do so. Kairos brings us toward abstraction, much as magical realism does. Mukherjee writes that "any expression of an abstract idea can only be an analogy…A sorry lot of poets, they dim the colours of the ancient fables, and are themselves but fable gatherers. They produce white mythology" (Citing Derrida, 59). So we see that not grounding through realism won't do it—it won't bring us the

transcendental, "Energetic Space" of Takolander.   Simpkins tells us that "Reality is too subtle for realism to catch it […] It cannot be transcribed directly. But by invention, by fabulation, we may open a way toward reality that will come as close to it as human ingenuity may come" (citing Scholes, 153-4; Simpkins says this is not enough, but Scholes' claim works here). So that itching of the buds of feathers we might feel when reading could be a crack in space or time through which we can see our true selves.

The three main characters in *The Bone People* are Kerewin, Simon, and Joe. There is Kerewin, an asexual woman, part-Maori, reclusive artist, who borrows from other cultures and religions with abandon. There is Simon Pake, as his father-figure calls him (PA-kay hah,"Pakeha"=European), a child age 8, approximately, who is quite literally jetsam, a term used in the book—orphaned in a shipwreck, of unknown origins or history, mute, vandal, fighter, all-around trouble-maker. And there is Joe, Maori blue-collar worker, alcoholic, widower, who has taken on the care of Simon but beats him throughout the novel, repeatedly, and eventually severely enough to hospitalize him.

The novel deals with all of the hot topics in Critical Pedagogy: race, class, gender, substance abuse, violence, colonizing, indigenous rights, family construction, and more. Hulme sets these characters apart from the mainstream in two ways: Kerewin is alone due to family conflict and a just a desire to be alone; Simon is alone due to his muteness and being an orphan, and Joe lost his wife and son to the flu (Simon is not his biological son, but a boy whom he and his late wife took in after the shipwreck). The majority of the setting takes place, for the most part, in two main locations: both on the shore, liminal spaces, both belonging to Kerewin, a sort of female provider in the novel. Location one is a tower that Kerewin designed for solace in the form of isolation; location two is a series

of cottages on a beach, where the three go on holiday. It is in the tower where Kerewin's eclectic collection of art and general worldly stuff fascinates and draws the child Simon in.

Simon shows up unexpectedly, an injured and unwelcome visitor who spends the night out of sheer necessity. Kerewin resents the intrusion. At a loss for what to do with a child, she teaches him chess, and "Over the chessboard she is completely relaxed: the barriers of unequal intellect, and the child's dumbness, have ceased to exist. --*He is a person to whom she is teaching chess*--and the thing that matters is that he enjoys his initiation" (51, emphasis mine). The use of the passive voice here is interesting, and it mirrors Kerewin's involvement with Simon and Joe, and the rest of the world for some time. She does not take part in the outcome-centered, outward-centered, heteronormal-type relationships that readers, particularly readers who are students in their early-to mid-twenties, would expect. She does care for him physically, choosing not to send him out into the rain, bandaging his wound, and covering him when he is shivering. We get how significant this is to Simon from narrative thoughts in his point-of-view: "She saw I am cold./ She saw I am cold/[…] I am in her jacket to warm,/ he croons inside himself/ She saw I am cold/ and I am in her jacket to warm" (51). Students, as we will see, were very eager to call this sort of attention out as a "mothering" instinct that Kerewin is trying yet failing to stifle. (More than one has written a paper describing how Kerewin becomes Simon's "mother.") Enter Joe, Simon's caregiver. There is also a sort of tendency toward predestination in students' writing about the relationship between Kerewin and Joe. At first, Kerewin is happy to have someone else to play chess with. Joe's thoughts about Kerewin inevitably turn to the romantic, and although Kerewin tells him she is "a

neuter," he determines to wait it out and believes she will change her mind. So do some students: in one class I took to calling him "No-means-no, Joe" due to a student's writing that Kerewin would probably like sex if she tried it. I usually did not respond in such ways to their responses, but that line of thought seemed like a rather dangerous line to me. Regardless of how students saw the attachment between Kerewin and Joe, by the end of the novel, several students wrote that they "hate" Joe, due to the aforementioned beating. Student responses in general, we will see, were never blasé; they are almost always quite severe.

Narrative style in the novel

Students had a tendency to skip the preface to the novel, "Standards in a Non-Standard Book," and so we spent some class time talking about the content and what it implies. Hulme writes that three publishers had turned it down "on the grounds, among others, that it was too large, too unwieldy, too *different* when compared with the normal shape of the novel" (xiii). This unwieldiness did prove difficult for students at first, and brings to mind Robinson's claim that troubling outcomes are more difficult to process: when students started out reading this non-standard book, they frequently had some troubles. When they got into the rhythm of it, they were vested. Hulme's interest in language and insistence on authorial control serves the novel and served her well. Eventually the book was published by a feminist collective, and has gone on to become one of New Zealand's most famous novels. She writes:

> The editor should have ensured a uniformity? . . . I think the *shape* of
> words brings a response from the reader—a tiny, subconscious,

unacknowledged but definite response. "OK" studs a sentence. "Okay" is

a more mellow flowing word when read silently. "Bluegreen is a meld,

conveying a colour neither blue nor green but both: "blue-green" is a two-

colour mix. Maybe the editors were too gentle with my experiments and

eccentricities. Great! The voice of the writer won through. (xii-xiv)

These statements reinforce both the individual experience of the author and the individual

experience of the reader, as well as acknowledging that emotion is an important and

conversant part in the reading of the novel. Hulme ends the preface with what she calls

"An explanatory dream" that might or might not be a metaphor having something to do

with postcolonialism, and invites the reader to "make of it what you will" (xiv),

seemingly knowing full well that the reader's will is as much a part of the writing as hers

is.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

"Passive thought is nothing until it is activated by an object; it is pure potentiality. It becomes objects over and over again, as they present themselves, and thus it is intermittent by nature. Passive nous *can think everything, and the same characteristic that makes it capable of thinking everything renders it functionally analogous to perception."*

--Paul North

The IRB-approved study was divided into the aforementioned four iterations. The first focused on the language and craft of the novel, hypothesizing that students would respond emotionally to places where elements of craft were keenly used, showing evidence of entering that kairotic, energetic space at the hands of a skilled author. The second and third focused on allowing students to find their own area of interest by way of the energetic, kairotic space created by students' emotional reactions to the text. The fourth iteration expanded the focus of the third by adding activities in which students could participate in grounded theory themselves, and an additional inquiry about whether students picked up on indigenous issues in the text. A pattern that emerged across phases is one similar to both Robinson's process she defines for responding to literature (compassion, response to the effective appraisal of that compassion, and cognitive monitoring) and Crosby's three-step pattern of movement, his "kairic conception of time" (pause, recognition, and action). The three steps in these two ideas, compassion/pause, response/recognition, and monitoring/action, became evident as categories emerged from student writing during the coding process. These two categories, empathy and evaluation, work much in the same way as Robinson's and Crosby's processes, where compassion,

pause, and recognition are empathetic responses, and response, monitoring, and action are evaluative responses. When categorized as such, we can use Kairos as a metaphor for empathy, that in-the-moment engagement with kairotic, energetic space, and Metanoia as a metaphor for evaluation, the looking back, learning experience that comes after the emotion that still holds the possibility of transformation.

Year One

The first version or iteration of the study had some notable responses to craft. Language that students responded to emotionally included such things as juxtaposition, alliteration, brevity of language, rhyme, and parallel structure. After we finished reading the novel, I posed the previously-mentioned series of questions asking students to write about their emotional reactions to *The Bone People*, questions that included "Write down particular words or phrases in those three passages that you find powerful for any reason, marking page numbers," and "Beside those words or phrases, list the particular emotions that you feel when reading them."As I noted before, I was very focused on craft, and Hulme's skill as a writer, and hypothesizing that in places where Hulme was using those concrete, significant details we talk so much about in creative writing, or in places where the language is densely poetic, that those would be the scenes by which students would be most affected. And though I hypothesized that students would react to writing craft rather than simply reacting to content, I found that in my method of asking pointed questions, one of which asked about particular words, writing students were focusing the most on writing. Asking pointed questions did not gather the same type of responses that the unfettered Blackboard Discussion Board posts did. But my initial purpose in this first

year was to analyze students' response <u>to the language</u> in a novel, and to compare their responses to creative writing (aesthetic) craft. The goal was to find whether students not studying creative writing would respond emotionally to craft as well as content, and see that a collaborative experience was taking place. And here, some notable reactions:

> "When the character Kerewin meets Simon she refers to him as a 'weird saint' ...made me feel uneasy. A saint is supposed to be holy and kind[,] weird makes it unnatural...'shrouded in the dying sunlight' made me feel uneasy. Shrouded makes me think of something unnatural..."

The student writer here is responding to the device of the oxymoron, which calls attention to itself through juxtaposition. Here the student shows both an evaluative and an empathetic response, and in this case the empathetic response is to the construction of language. And:

> "'She buzzes in the back of my head like a bluebottle sometimes' (431)--I just really like the alliteration here."

The student said it simply and best. They are having an evaluative response to the poetic language. And:

> "'The punches keep coming. Again. Again. And again. The lights and fires are going out'...makes the feeling more livable."

Here the shortness of line keeps the reader reading quickly and echoes the furiousness of the moment. The repetition of "again" is short and has the feel of repeated punches. The student might be making an evaluative judgment of the craft, or they might be empathizing with the character being beaten. Also:

> "'Blown his top! Blown his cool! Berloody fool!' ... I laughed at this part...She rhymes even in her most excited moments."

This is in a big fight scene. The brevity of language coupled with rhyme seems to spark the student's interest. "She," the character of Kerewin, remains quite in control in this scene, despite an explosive situation, and the content, or the action in this scene, is frequently remarked upon by students as well, once again showing that students write what their instructor asks for—in this case the language. And:

> Kerewin's "rebirth": "'She felt her hair literally start to move. Shaking with laughter, shaking with tears, shook to the core with joy.' In my copy, I literally wrote, "WOW."'

There is a parallel structure to the sentence that the student is responding to, here. Repetition makes us pay attention. Perhaps if we can see an empathetic response as craft, or "showing," e.g., a place where these poetic elements are used, as opposed to an evaluative "telling," a summative statement (for example, the above-mentioned passage might read "Kerewin was reborn), we might find that the physical space on the page becomes sanctuarized for readers (e.g., "WOW.").

A selection of the emotional language students used in their 500-word responses to write about the novel can be divided into Robinson's process for responding to literature: compassion, response to the effective appraisal of that compassion, and cognitive monitoring, and Crosby's kairic conception of time: pause, recognition, and action:

Compassion/pause:

I was almost shaking reading this part.

Kerewin makes me angry.

How Kerewin is still talking to Joe is beyond me!

I feel as if the whole thing is Kerewin's fault.

I am very caught up in the abuse.

I feel terrible, it seems so unfair for him.

I am extremely disappointed

Here readers are feeling, an opening up of a moment, or a pause.

Response to the appraisal of that compassion/recognition:

I have no words to explain how sad I am.

This made me scream out loud to the whole world on behalf of Simon.

I have mixed feelings about everything.

I love this moment for the two of them.

I was hoping…I was hoping.

I can't determine how I feel.

I worry how he would make it.

The reader can actually feel what the character feels as they go through it.

I fear that Simon and Joe share more than kinship. I fear they place hopes

in an alcoholic, depressed, spiraling out of control Kerewin.

Her actions have me disliking her character.

Here, readers are responding to their feelings about the novel and/or recognizing that they

are having emotional responses.

Cognitive monitoring/action:

I secretly want them to improve their roles.

I really hope Kerewin doesn't forgive Joe…if she does, I will have a tough

time reading on.

I also enjoy Kerewin's transformation.

I feel Simon would be best off with Joe and Kerewin, and I feel terrible

about myself everytime [sic] I write that.

I'd like certain things to happen.

I hope they will have more happiness.

I am enjoying the book so far, even if I get very upset with some of the

things that occur.

While students are monitoring their thoughts on the novel, they also move into verb

usage here, with "want," "hope," etc., and show an active participation in the novel.

Throughout their responses, they are frequently, in fact, making themselves the subject of

the action ("I went through a rush…" "I was shaking…" "I was disappointed…" etc.).

There is no denying that students are responding to the novel on an emotional level,

practicing empathy and evaluation, and participating in a kairotic, energetic space.

Complete coding results for this year will be reported under "Regrounding

Theory" with all phases or iterations of the study, as the textual data (500-word

responses) for all four versions was coded together in one group.

Years Two and Three

In the second iteration of the study, I wanted to see if students would move

toward areas of critical theory before being introduced to the theories, in other words, to

locate authority in their individual aesthetic experience rather than reading in an efferent,

or externally-biased way. As before, students wrote 500-word responses before each class period, what writing theorist Peter Elbow calls "low-stake writing." In other words, they only needed to complete the writing in order to get credit for it—grades were not determined by grammatical or essay structure, or even coherence (though students at a Junior/Senior level almost always wrote in coherent ways). In low-stakes writing, the space is opened up for students to respond rather than to carefully construct. In addition to allowing students to supersede the writing constructs that might bind their thoughts and so write more lengthy responses in less time, allowing them to ignore these writing constructs also, I believe, let them allow their emotion come through (for example, students almost always use "I" in a response, rather than avoiding its usage to be more critically academic). They did this writing, and after they were done reading the novel and responding to it in this way, they researched and then presented in groups an introduction to these areas of critical theory: New Historicism, postcolonialism, Marxism, gender studies, psychoanalysis, and ecocriticism. As noted previously, the novel can be examined by way of any of these areas of theory and more. Of both sections of the class that semester, only one student (an English major) had taken a theory class, and thus had a little familiarity with all six theories students presented on. Some of the topics students wrote about in their responses, this "low-stake writing" before studying critical theory were gender and sexuality, parental roles, family roles, abuse, Nature vs. Nurture, responsibility vs. blame, connection to (or not) to characters, what is (or isn't) "normal," the emotional effect of book, fairness, justice, history, and culture. These preliminary codes do show students beginning to move toward some of those areas of critical theory unprompted. But there was also a lot of speculation about what would happen, expressed

desires for characters and their lives, and writing themselves into the story, or speaking

for the characters. Both the empathy of kairos and the evaluation of metanoia seem to be

present, here. But is one more important than the other? Robinson writes:

> [I]t is the process of reading that is emotionally educational, not just the
>
> eventual acquisition of beliefs…the emotional education of characters and
>
> readers alike takes place via a series of emotional episodes in which
>
> *beliefs* are less important than such things as unexpected psychological
>
> responses, non-cognitive affective appraisals, shifts in focus of attention,
>
> the perception of new aspects of situations, and the revelation of
>
> previously hidden wants and interests. (155-57)

Robinson also writes about "coping in literature, that is, viewing the form and structure of

the literature as a mechanism for coping with the authors' and the readers' identity

themes" (ibid). A compelling aspect of this argument is the assumption that part of the

pleasure we get from reading troubling literature is in managing our emotional responses

to it.

I also gave students a list of some of Elbow's ways to write about literature,

which includes things like changing the point-of-view and writing a letter. I wanted to

find out if giving students a variety of coping strategies to manage their emotional

responses would lead to increased collaboration between the reader and the text. Here, a

notable one:

> *Dear Simon,*
>
> > *Things are getting worse and worse for you all the time. It is*
> >
> > *becoming extremely difficult to continue following all that is going on*

when things for you, a child, keep getting worse and worse. Many of the times that you do get into trouble you are asking for some sort of punishment. However, I can't believe your father would do something like that to you. Hopefully you can make a full recovery to being the child that you were when you first met Kerewin.

There is one thing that you absolutely need to do when you recover. You need to stay away from your father. I know that may sound difficult because he is your father, but you have taken his abuse for far too long now. Your best chance of having a more normal childhood is if you can stay with Kerewin. She may not want to have a child, especially since she has always preferred to be alone, but you are going to have to use your puppy dog eyes and convince her that she is your best bet. The only problem with that is that Kerewin still seems to be able to forgive Joe for doing the things he does to you. This is also an issue because she seems to be falling for that mad man. You are going to need to tell Kerewin all of the things that Joe has ever done to you to help ensure that Kerewin doesn't forgive Joe again. And I don't know exactly how much of a presence the local law authorities in New Zealand in 1960s are, but if they are an option you should probably make sure that they don't allow your father to come near you. Or better yet, have him arrested so he can't hurt you anymore.

Finally, there is your biggest task. I know you have had the most abnormal upbringing of any just about every other child, but you are

going to need to change your ways. Kerewin is not going to be very

forgiving if you keep getting in trouble with other people, and especially

not if you are stealing from her. If you want a mother (and trust me, you

do), you need to make sure that you are always on Kerewin's good side,

because she cares about you. That means you have to ditch the stealing,

ditch ruining people's gardens, and also stop skipping school. If you want

a normal childhood you are going to have to start behaving like a normal

child. This may be tough, especially since you can't speak (or choose not

to, whatever), but other kids won't want to be friends with someone who is

going to steal from them, or find other ways to harm them. So it is time

for you to make changes yourself. You aren't an exception because of how

your life has turned out so far. So it is time to start acting more like the

rest of the children your age would.

Sincerely,

A concerned reader

In this lovely letter, we can see an emotional, aesthetic experience is happening. The
student expresses the difficulty of bearing witness to a child being beaten: "It is becoming
extremely difficult to continue following all that is going on when things for you, a child,
keep getting worse and worse." The student expresses disbelief and hope on behalf of the
character. The student offers up advice, writing, "You are going to have to stay away
from your father…change your ways…ditch the stealing," etc. The direct, emotional
addressing of a character indicates that the student feels a connection with the character.

Since there is no meta-analysis of the letter done by the student, I cannot say for certain that in writing it the student was in an energetic, kairotic space, but I can say that there must have been several if not many instances of kairotic, energetic space in this student's reading experience for them to make a plea for the character to change. Three other students chose to write letters that day (letter writing was one of the eight prompts). One was a letter to Kerewin requesting that she have "faith and willingness" in regards to Simon, and take custody of him; one was requesting that Kerewin turn back to her art for healing; the other was to the author and reads "I am getting attached to your story little by little."

So what did students write about in their literary analysis paper after all this? Fifty percent wrote a psychoanalysis of a character. (Why they would do the things they do was an ongoing concern in the response-writing as well.) Twenty-five percent wrote about gender issues in the novel, and the other 25% was split between class issues and cultural issues. Why might students write a psychoanalysis of a character? One reason is that it is obviously easier to examine or pass judgment on a person than it is to examine social or critical constructs. Understanding or seeking to understand a person's motives comes to us naturally in life, far before we ever start to think about understanding systemic motives. Psychoanalysis is a much easier mode for us than is class and culture analysis. This avoidance of or eschewing of critical constructs, even after students have studied them, gives the student more agency and personal authority in writing a literary analysis. In writing about a character, they can make claims about the internal workings of a character's mind with less evidence. Obviously, undergraduates are not doing proper diagnoses, though I did have to repeatedly remind them to not refer to a character as

"depressed," as this is a diagnosis a professional should make, and therefore, not a term to be thrown about lightly. Another reason students might write a psychoanalysis of a character is in the notion that students/readers interact with literature emotionally. It takes an external, or efferent reading, to write about gender issues or class or cultural issues unless one is currently going through those issues oneself. In an aesthetic reading, one in which readers are entering into a kairotic, energetic space, they are not checking their notes or thinking back to that gender studies course they took last semester; they are experiencing the text on an intimate level. The actions of the characters affect us. Much in the same way that people try to figure out the basis for motivations of other people, readers find themselves asking the same things of characters.

Year Four

In the final version of this study, conducted in 2015, I continued to find students reacting to the text on an emotional level. Based on the data, my thesis had begun to change to that students will move toward areas of critical theory unprompted, thus making literature a vital part in classes like feminist theory or Native American studies, or anything where learning about people is a focus. Students show empathy when they live through the lives of characters, and this can supplement theory classes. When pressed for an argument, people select facts that support what they already believe, but when they are immersed in literary fiction, they experience a particular world. What I had not found in the first two phases of the study was much discussion or reflection on issues of indigenousness, and *The Bone People* has those issues in multitude. After students had

finished reading the novel, and had written all of their personal responses, I gave them

this questionnaire:

1. What has your experience with indigenous/native culture (in the U.S. or elsewhere) been?

2. Have you studied any native literatures or postcolonial theory in other classes? Please specify classes.

3. Have either of these experiences (from #1 or #2), if applicable, informed your reading of *The Bone People*? Why or why not?

4. What issues or instances related to indigenous culture have you encountered in *The Bone People*, directly or implicitly?

5. Has reading *The Bone People* changed or informed how you see indigenous/native peoples? Why or why not?

Students' responses to question 1 were varied: many from this area of the Midwest had

either grown up near American Indian reservations or went to school with American

Indians. Some of the education majors had done student teaching on area reservations.

Others had grown up in other countries where indigenous peoples are more visible. None

of the students had taken a native literature or postcolonial literature class (question 2).

To the question of whether those experiences had informed their reading of *The Bone*

People, some said yes. A student whose family traveled Europe when he was younger

wrote that if he had not had those experiences, *The Bone People* might have been "a

harder/weirder read." Most students said that the Maori were unlike the American Indians

so they never really thought about it, or that they did not see indigenousness as an issue in

the novel at all—which is amazing to me as an instructor, and reader of the novel, as the

three main characters are a Maori who notably eschews his culture, a half-Maori, half-white woman who embraces the Maori culture, and an orphan boy of European descent, who Kerewin (half-Maori) and thus, the reader, spends almost the entire novel trying to find his family and history. The answers to question 4 ranged from "I did not see it as an issue" to language, food, drinking, and one bright student noting the theme of the individual vs. the collective. Not one student wrote of land, which in my mind is the definitive difference between the history of the American Indians and the Maori—the Maori were not so brutally moved from their land. Of course, the novel does not address this at all, and so this might be a case for the novel as instruction. Question 5, as to whether the student's reading had changed or informed how they see indigenous/native peoples, was met with a variety of responses as well, but it really was the answers to question 4 I was after. Why weren't students writing about these issues in their responses? I do not have the answers, but I do know that in this case, the change that might have been brought about through the experience of kairos somehow had not been prepared for in most students' minds. The students were emphatically not living an indigenous experience though the text; in fact, a few might have been actively avoiding it, a la, Gerrig and Rapp's "construction of disbelief." For example, the student who answered question 4 as to what instances of indigenous culture were in the novel "I did not see it as an issue," answered question 1 about her personal experience with indigenous culture with writing about how the Indian students at her school "expected special treatment." Though she indicated in her 500-word responses a positive emotional attachment to the characters, when asked about their heritage, she constructs it as irrelevant, when in fact it is a major part of the issues the characters face. There is no

evidence of Robinson's process for responding to literature (compassion, response to that compassion, and cognitive monitoring) or Crosby's kairic conception of time (pause, recognition, and action). What seems to be missing is an actual pause, leaving a leap right to reaction or evaluation. I would argue that this is why affect is important in story— because sometimes teaching by way of guiding students' experience just does not produce critical thinking.

A retrospective analysis of the data

Though I had already been employing grounded theory strategies in evaluating student response, such as constant comparison, a strategy I think any teacher must do, I had to go back to all four years of students' 500-word responses and look for correlations. Without starting from a thesis, I charted students' writing, the text, and broke this down into codes, subcategories, and finally two categories: evaluative responses and empathetic responses (see example in Appendix A). I use the term and category "empathy" as it is commonly understood—to perceive the feelings of another person—not as a neuropsychological term. We are used to evaluating in academia. Like the thesis/hypothesis-driven work, evaluation implies an external or efferent bent. The work of empathy is where we might locate the kairotic, energetic space.

When students were empathizing, they were expressing emotion in regards to the lives, actions, and fate of the characters or acknowledging their enjoyment of the book. Some responses were easy to code. Writing like "My heart is always breaking for Simon" is obviously empathetic. I coded this as "heart always breaking for S," subcategorized it as "relating to S," and categorized it as "Empathetic." Questioning a character's motives

also fell into this category, as opposed to judging the characters by a given standard.

These responses held things such as "Why didn't Joe go to the Maori for a sleeping

ceremony for Simon?". Or even wonder, such as "I wonder if Joe would disrespect his

biological son as he does Simon?" Or, "Reading this made me cry. This is the first time a

book made me wish for less description" is empathetic because the comment about the

writing is a wish for it to be different. The same thing happens with "I love a story with

conflict, but this is not what I wanted." Here a reader seems to be actually expressing

guilt.

These reactions of empathy remind us that affect can precede cognition, and that

kairos can precede evaluation. Readers come to the novel with experience that might

predispose them to responding a certain way, but kairos can sometimes have us at its

mercy, and other times we can be predisposed. The empathetic or kairotic response

clearly deepens students affective experiences with a text, making them then evaluate the

ethical situation of the text's content. John Poulakos, writing on the sophists, wrote that

> Both timeliness and appropriateness are rhetorical motifs whose essence
>
> cannot be apprehended strictly cognitively and whose application cannot
>
> be learned mechanically [and] the two together constitute what may be
>
> called the artistic elements in rhetorical theory as opposed to the
>
> prescribed rules. (42)

When students were evaluating they were commenting on the writing, stylistically, in

terms of craft, in terms of the author's intent, and so on; judging the actions of the

characters in a formulaic, not personal way; or anticipating the plot. Statements like "the

lack of physical description for Kerewin is frustrating" is evaluative, and somewhat

relates to my original thesis, that students would react emotionally to places where elements of craft are. In this case, there is a reaction to the absence of such, but it is still not an empathetic response.

Some responses had secondary categories in the other category, such as a student that wrote about a character changing because of the presence of the other two: the student was analyzing the characters, but was also empathizing with the change. At times, I had to categorize an analyzing statement as empathetic, such as "the past haunts these characters": an evaluative statement, but not something written in the book—the student has come to this empathetic judgment on their own. With those subcategories I marked as "diagnosing character," usually they were also empathetic. Take for example "Kerewin is very clever. Those people have the hardest time trusting." While it is an evaluative statement, it is empathetic in that it shows the student putting on the shoes of a clever, non-trusting character. If they were not doing so, the evaluation might read something like "Kerewin doesn't trust people even though she is very clever." On the other hand, responses like one that "applauds the author for making [a character] mute" is a strictly evaluative statement that judges the merits of authorial choice. Though some responses expressed emotion, they were evaluative. For example, "It's weird that Simon and Joe shower at Kerewin's house, especially when they are on their own timeline. They said they'd be there in the evening sometime." While this student seems to be responding emotionally on some level, labeling something "weird" and imposing their culture on the text is more of an evaluation, despite their perhaps uncomfortable-ness with the actions of the characters.

There was a general but consistent pattern across the years of responses beginning as evaluative, becoming increasingly empathetic as the novel goes on, and returning to evaluative after the last reading, when the students reflect on the novel as a whole. There are more selections categorized as empathetic than evaluative. That the responses become empathetic suggests that after an initial acclimation period, students begin to experience the novel internally, and again reminds of Robinson's process for responding to literature: compassion, response to the effective appraisal of that compassion, and cognitive monitoring, and Crosby's three-step pattern of movement, his "kairic conception of time": pause, recognition, and action. In this case, an empathetic response is similar to compassion, pause, response, and recognition; evaluation frequently seems like monitoring or the action phase. It is difficult to put an exact formula on what is going on in a student or in any reader's mind. But, as Takolander writes,

> …literature and literary studies offer potential *for individual and social*
>
> *learning* and empowerment in ways that do not have to be subsumed
>
> under any particular political program and, indeed, that represent what is
>
> meant by intellectual freedom. (167, emphasis added)

Takolander does not go so far as to argue that all aesthetic experience will make us better citizens: she cites the effects of violent video games on children and the Nazis' love of the classics, for example. But her insistence on language/literature as a way to associations that make us responsive, if not responsible to, "the material conditions of our experience" (169) is hard to ignore. As anyone who has ever been lost in any work of art knows, one enters a liminal space and emerges a changed being—one that looks at the materials of life in some kind of a different way. Takolander does not limit her definition

of literature to the classics, either, but says the transformative experience, the "self reduced to a language being" (177) can be reached by all symbolic beings through any text that is capable of provoking such experience. Through decentering and entering the language-space, we have a direct connection between author and audience, rather than a hierarchical sender-receiver of information relations. The kairotic, energetic space provides the space for our virtues, whether they are imposed or felt, to overlap with the text, or vice versa. When students experience through reading, their empathetic reactions teach them about social issues by allowing them to teach themselves. The flux between empathy and evaluation can be seen as the opportunity of Kairos and his follower, the teacher Metanoia. Whether Kairos or Metanoia, or empathy or evaluation is the better teacher, the aesthetic experience in literature is the scaffolding we must look to if we are to disregard efferent, hierarchical forms, and account for experience in ourselves and others.

CONCLUSION

"Reality can have a metaphorical content; that does not make it less real."

--Salman Rushdie

Knowledge is not a teleological, completely knowable thing. Speculation is what theorists do. It's what philosophers do, and it's what writers do. To insist on some absolute truth or knowledge is impossible. In Plato's *Phaedrus*, Plato has the character of Socrates in the role of audience, emotional responder, and composer. Kennedy writes of it that "[t]he dialogue is an artistic unity, but there has never been agreement about how to describe its subject in a few words" (39). Although other subjects are broached, my reading of it suggests that mostly it is an epideictic piece on love and the emotions of the rhetor/listener/rhetor. Socrates is, after all in love with, or at least enamored with Phaedrus, who has got his hands on a written copy of Lysias' speech on that very subject. The speech, as read aloud by Phaedrus, argues that the affections of a lover who is not in love with the object of his affection are better than the affections given by one who is in love. Socrates responds by giving what he says is a better speech using the same argument, but then cannot help but recant and make an argument for the opposite: that love for the lover is the better thing. Composed on the spot (in the story), the argument for and even prayer to love is influenced by his change in feelings, due to the presence of his beloved. While Socrates' speeches on both sides of the argument can both be seen as epideictic (praising or blaming) on the surface, they can also be seen as epideictic on a deeper level, as his intent is to influence the young Phaedrus. Kennedy writes that "The concept of [Aristotle's] epideictic (praising or blaming) rhetoric […] needs to be broadened beyond Aristotle's definition. In later antiquity, some rhetoricians included

within it all poetry and prose. Perhaps epideictic rhetoric is best regarded as any discourse that does not aim at a specific action, but is intended to influence the values and beliefs of the audience" (Kennedy 4). To sway Phaedrus to his favor and to influence his ideas on love are quite obviously part of the use of the speeches, but no absolute truth of the matter is ever decided.

While I had begun my study of students' responses to literature hoping to write about creative writing, it stands that creative writing craft and rhetorical craft are both, or both should be, concerned with what effect they will have. We can't predict emotional response (kairos); emotional responses are fraught with inconsistencies. We can, however, prepare ourselves for the kairos, and we can ground ourselves in the experience afterward, in a kairotic space. A kairotic, energetic space provides opportunity and space that more effectively steers belief and thought than taking a rational, planned, even hierarchical approach to a topic. The two streams of kairos, appropriateness in relation to cosmic order, and an ethical system appropriate for the time/space, can both be seen in students' flow between empathy and evaluation. Students and all readers experiencing literature seem to be quite willing to start from belief as opposed to needing to suspend their disbelief. As seen in the coded data, students expressed compassion, appraised that compassion, and did some cognitive monitoring; they paused, recognized, and took a form of action; they were in kairos, and they turned, as in metanoia, to reflect on that moment. There is an order, whether internal or externally imposed, by which students experience right timing and proper measure. If we can provide a space in the classroom for students to use their own experience as educational, in this case their response to *The*

Bone People, students can become co-authors of a text. Students can even participate in grounded theory themselves, in a way marking the moment of transformation.

One way that I had students doing Grounded Theory was to have them read their own and others' work and afterward categorize what they were writing about (I had students use the social media icon of a hashtag, which worked well). In reading, writing, and then categorizing writing, students can participate in the five stages Charmaz deems necessary for one to be doing grounded theory:

1. Conduct data collection and analysis simultaneously in an iterative process (reading as data collection and writing in response to it as iterative analysis)

2. Analyze actions and processes rather than themes and structure (writing about their emotional responses rather than through a lens of theory or craft)

3. Use comparative methods (reading other students' writing)

4. Draw on data (e.g. narratives and descriptions) in service of developing new conceptual categories (categorizing their own and others' writing)

5. Develop inductive abstract analytic categories through systematic data analysis (using their grounded writing to develop literary analysis papers grounded in their own writing)

This study gave students the opportunity to express their hopefully near-truthful responses to a work of literature that is provocative and raises issues in many areas of critical theory. Using the response, rather than the formulated questions, might not work for younger students. Students who were in their third or fourth year of college seemed as a group to have no lack of things to write about, and so it seems that teachers of literature and other disciplines might build on this research by using other novels in other classes in

other disciplines. When students reach the point where they are taking classes in their major, literature can be used as a stand-in for experience, when there is none to add to the study of theory. I think that the most important takeaway here is not that critical theory should not be studied, but that unless students are actively experiencing something in that area of theory, there must be an experiential stand-in. Evaluation is only part of the equation; an empathetic response is a necessary pedagogical tool that should not be avoided. Returning once again to the idea of Theory of Mind, that ability of ascribing mental states to oneself and others, and the claim that literature helps to develop this ability, though some might resent this claim as too lofty, we should not ignore that an emotional education will hold more resonance. When campuses recently began to require or ask that instructors provide "trigger warnings" for course material that might cause students to experience emotional distress, responses from the Modern Language Association, the American Association of University Professors, and the American Library Association have shown that not only is this policy an attack on academic freedom, it is also an attack on student learning.

In addition to being emotionally vested in their work, students who are expected to learn to write well should be exposed to good writing—good writing that holds their interest, and works longer than ten or twenty pages. I have used *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks*, a narrative nonfiction book, in Business and Professional Writing courses, and while there are always a few who refuse to read the book, most students are enthralled with the book, and it teaches the research process and the review of the literature by way of example quite well. In edition, if we ask students to learn critical thinking, a skill that requires developing an idea for usually more than five pages, they

need examples of longer-form writing that develops ideas. These ideas can be story lines. Story lines hold almost everyone's interest, particularly in great literature. A future study might make use of a nonfiction piece of literature such as this, and not only have students participate in low-stakes writing at the outset, but do further investigation into why students eventually choose the writing topics that they do around the book.

In the future, this study could be repeated using two or more coders, and using multiple methods of data collection. For example, after collecting qualitative data by way of low-stakes writing responses, one might use Sadoski, Getz, and Kansinger's methods of having participants rate paragraphs on emotional, imaginative, and importance scales for quantitative data. As much as I believe I have been objective in my coding, there's no doubt that the students' writing has affected me. It is writing about their emotions, after all, not cold, hard, quantitative data. We can certainly use such data in rhetoric studies and in literature studies: rhetoric and literary devices share crossover, after all, their effect on the reader cannot be said to be wholly different. But researching affect in literature always comes back to the internal experience, the kairotic, energetic space, the aesthetic reading. Grounding belief in experience makes room for making sacred ones' own personal, kairotic response, and perhaps even room for work on the level of the soul, the use of literature having never left us; having always been there.

WORKS CITED

Burke, Kenneth. "Psychology and Form." *The Dial 79* (July 1925): 34-46. Web.

Cain, Susan. "The Rise of the New Groupthink." *The New York Times* 13 January, 2012. Web.

Charmaz, Kathy. *Constructing Grounded Theory.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc., 2014. Print.

Crick, Nathan. "The Sophistical Attitude and the Invention of Rhetoric." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 96 (2010): 25-45. Web.

Comer Kidd, David, and Emanuele Castano. "Reading Literary Fiction Improves Theory of Mind." *Science*, 2013: 342.6156. 377-380. Web.

Corbin, J.M. and A.L. Strauss. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory.* 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2008. Print.

Crosby, Richard Benjamin. "Cathedral of Kairos: Rhetoric and Revelation in the National House of Prayer." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 46 (2013): 132-155. Web.

---. "Kairos as God's Time in Martin Luther King Jr.'s Last Sunday Sermon." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 39 (2009): 260-280. Web.

de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life." Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984. Print.*

Gale, Frederic G. and Michael W. Kleine. "Speaking of Rhetoric: A Conversation with James Kinneavy." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 27(1997): 31-50. Web.

Gerrig, Richard J. and David N. Rapp. "Psychological Processes Underlying Literary Impact." *Poetics Today* 25.2 (2004), 265-281. Web.

Golden, Joanne M. and John T. Guthrie. "Convergence and Divergence in Reader

    Response to Literature." Reading Research Quarterly, Vol. 21, No. 4 (Autumn,

    1986). 408-421. Web.

Gorgias. "Economium of Helen." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical*

    Times to the Present. 2nd ed. Eds. Patricia Bizzell and Brice Herzberg. New

    York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. 44-6. Print.

Hakakian, Roya. "Journey From the Land of No." *On Second Thought: A publication of*

    the North Dakota Humanities Council. Fall 2014, 30-33. Print.

Hulme, Keri. *The Bone People.* New York: Penguin, 2010.

Iser, Wolfgang. "The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach." *New Literary*

    History Vol. 3, No 2. (1972), 279-299. Web.

Jack, Jordynn. "What are Neurorhetorics?" *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 40.5 (2010):

    405-410. Web.

---and L. Gregory Appelbaum. "This is Your Brain on Rhetoric": Research Directions

    for Neurorhetorics." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly,* special issue on

    Neurorhetorics, 40.5 (2010): 411-437.

Janzen, Melanie D. "(Re)searching methods: reading fiction in literary response groups."

    International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 28:8, 98901004. Web.

Jung, Rex. Interview with Krista Tippet. "Creativity and the Everyday Brain." *On*

    Being podcast, 22 March, 2012.

Kandel, Eric R. *The Age of Insight: The Quest to Understand the Unconscious in Art,*

    Mind, and Brain. New York: Random House, 2012. Print.

Kinneavy, James L. and Catherine R. Eskin. "Kairos in Aristotle's Rhetoric." *Written*

Communication 17(2000): 432-444.

Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982. Print.

Latour, Bruno. Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007. Print.

LeFevre, Karen. *Invention as a Social Act.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987. Print.

Longinus, "On the Sublime." Transl. A.O. Prickard. *Criticism: Major Statements*. 4th ed. Eds. Charles Kaplan and William Davis Anderson. Boston: Bedford, St. Martin's, 2000. 48-83.

Lundsford, Andrea, and Lisa Ede. *Writing Together: Collaboration in Theory and Practice.* New York: Bedford/St. Martins, 2011. Print.

Miller, Caroline R. Forward. *Rhetoric and Kairos: Essays in History, Theory, and Praxis.* Phillip Sipiora, James S. Baumlin, eds. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002. Print.

Myers, Kelly A. "Metanoia and the Transformation of Opportunity." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 41 (2011): 1-18.

Nietzsche, Fredriech. "From The Birth of Tragedy." *Criticism: Major Statements.* Eds. Charles Kaplan and William Davis Anderson. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000. 319-32. Print.

North, Paul. *The Problem of Distraction.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012. 27. Print.

Ondaatje, Michael. *The Cat's Table*, New York: Knopf, 2011. 181. Print.

Poulakos, John. "Toward a Sophistic Definition of Rhetoric." *Philosophy and Rhetoric*
16 (1983): 35-48.

Phaedrus. "The Fables of Phaedrus." *Project Gutenberg.* Web.

Phillip Sipiora, James S. Baumlin, eds. *Rhetoric and Kairos: Essays in History,
Theory, and Praxis*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002. Print.

Plato. "Phaedrus." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the
Present*. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg, eds. 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford/St.
Martin's, 2001. Print.

Robinson, Jenefer. *Deeper than Reason: Emotion and its Role in Literature, Music,
and Art.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. Print.

Rosenblatt, Louise M. "Efferent and Aesthetic Reading." *The Reader, the Text, the
Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work.* Southern Illinois
University Press. Carbondale, IL: 1994. 22-47. Print.

Rushdie, Salman. *Midnight's Children*. New York: Random House, 2006. 230. Print.

Ruskin, John. *The elements of drawing, & The elements of perspective,* (Everyman's
Library. Essays and Belles Lettres [no. 217]).Boston: E.P. Dutton, 1932. Print.

Sadoski, Mark, Ernest T. Goetz, and Suzanne Kansinger. "Imagination in Story
Response: Relationships between Imagery, Affect, and Structural Importance."
Reading Research Quarterly, Vol. 23, No. 3 (Summer, 1988). 320-336. Web.

Schlinger, Henry D. Jr. "Theory of Mind: An Overview and Behavioral Perspective."
The Psychological Record, 2009, 59, 435-448. Web.

Sullivan, Dale L. "Kairos and the Rhetoric of Belief." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 78
(1992): 317-332.

Takolander, Maria. "'Energetic Space': The Experience of Literature and Learning."

College English 36.3 (Summer 2009): 165-183. Web.

Woolf, Virginia. *Mrs. Dalloway.* New York: Knopf, 1993. Print.

APPENDIX A: CODING EXAMPLE

Bone People Discussion Board responses

CODES	SUBCATEGORIES	CATEGORIES
2013	*2013*	*2013*
Believe Simon has five sx of PTSD, not bad child.	Diagnosing S PTSD	Evaluative
Relate to Simon on personal level (abuse, orphan)	Relating to S	Empathetic
S shows emotional growth through rabbit scene, bird scene	S emotional growth	Evaluative Empathetic
Judged S before knew his story	Evaluating judgment S	Evaluative
Cannot create an ending in mind	Anticipating plot	Evaluative
Would be "exactly like Kere," trying to find out all info on S	Relating to K sleuthing	Empathetic
Must be deeper meaning behind name "Clare"	Anticipating plot	Evaluative
Enjoy K's transformation	Relating to char development	Empathetic

The Bone People quiz/discussion, chapter 6.   Name: ██████████

1. Without looking at the text, write down some language that you remember from the assigned reading: "Simon is wholeheartedly in love with music." — *Great one! I forgot about that quote*

"A family can be the bone or the meaning of one's existence"

"The sea eats the land." — *this seems really symbolic to me.*

2. Again without looking at the text, write down what the focal point [e.g., where your attention was grabbed with the most force] would be if you were to summarize this two chapters:

When Joe asked Simon if he should marry Kerewin. This stood out to me because it seemed to come out of nowhere. *I thought so, too. Do you think he is in love with her? Convenience? Something else?*

3. Create a thesis statement about some emotion you feel about anything in the book. Remember a thesis statement contains the THIS because THAT structure.

Feelings of empathy + anger compete for our emotions. Because of Joe's past, his treatment of Simon is difficult to categorize: *what actions stand out the most? He's* a complex person, for sure.

4. Switch your papers, write in questions of #s 1, 2, and 3. Reviewer, write your name here: ██████████████████

5. Return your papers. You will share your answers from 1 &2 with the class, and describe why you feel it is important. Write any notes for discussion here:

I'm not sure Joe is in love with Kerewin. I think he is scared of losing her because she makes him a better person.

6. Share your tentative thesis with the class, and give three pieces of evidence to back it up. Writes any notes for discussion here:

The Bone People defies traditional literary tradition through the use of a female lead character who is completely self-reliant.

Kerewin lives on her own. She is stronger + a better fisher than Joe, the main adult male. In the story she outdrinks & outsmokes Joe as well

7. (a) Think about the title of the chapter in reference to the plot. Why title is this? (b) Now read all of the chapter titles at the beginning of the book and do the same. Split the chapters up by members in your group, and write your answers to 7a and 7b here:

1. Kerewin Draws a portrait of a Sandal.
2. Simon, Joe, + Kerewin are feeling out the situation.
3. Kerewin is figuring out more of the truth about Simon
4. The holiday provides a peaceful place for the 3 main characters
5. The tension is growing between Kerewin + Joe

APPENDIX C: STUDENT CODING EXAMPLE

	LANGUAGE: cite passages from the book that you have remembered/underlined.	EMOTION: what do you feel when you read/reread these? Why?	FACT: What is happening in the plot at the time of this language and emotion?	
Ch.1 p.41	"she saw I am cold. she saw I am cold. ... I am in her jacket to warm, he croons inside himself. she saw I am cold and I am in her jacket to warm."	Bittersweet warmth for Simon, empathy in his joy over something "small." A bit of an ache at the implication.	Kerewin offers Simon a coat + coffee after they are out in the garden b/c she sees he's cold.	#Validation #"Real" in external world
Ch.2 p.63	"Funny how her words echoed now, where before they sounded right, her voice for her ears."	K is trying to draw, speaking aloud and realizes that she is feeling differently about her solitude maybe.	→ Emotion: Anticipation for the change/potential. Curiousity about the new perspective. Hopeful.	#character Rev. #Internal conflict
Ch.3 p.107	"there's a viscious streak in him...frightened it might be bred into him."	Frustrated! I felt like this was an excuse... a common excuse, but not a reason.	Joe and Kere are talking after the match-throwing incident.	#Surface explanations
Ch.3 p.114	"She has a strange feeling that a chance has passed...could not describe the nature...or even why."	this makes me feel antsy, like a shop that could have been made but it wasn't and something ominous lurks as a result.	when Kerewin first talks w/ Joe's family at the bar/pub	#Internal conflict
Ch.3 p.127	"Unbidden the thought drifts in, why does he trust me?" ..."I became...aware of the shivered base we all have to build on."	I felt empathy for Kerewin's dad and pity because she values her own care so little. She is analyzing herself harshly.	Kere + Simon are [p??] on the beach together.	#Internal conflict

85