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The interpretive-rhetorical situation was formulated by blending Lloyd Bitzer's concepts of the rhetorical situation with contemporary interpretation theory. The concept of interpretation as a suasory speech act in the sense that it is momentary, transactional, and intentional, established the foundation for theory formation. The key concept established as an application for the interpretive-rhetorical situation was that it formed a cohesive framework for guiding post performance aspects of interpretation, especially performance criticism and experimental research. An experimental study was conducted, testing the newly formed breakdown of the traditional interpretation elements of writer, reader, and audience into the constituents of exigency, audience and constraints. Statistical analysis revealed that favorable audience evaluation of an interpreters theatre production corresponds to a significant change in the interpreters' perception of their character. The study indicates that an interpretation performance provides a valuable method whereby an interpreter comes to a better understanding of the literature he performs. Hence, the delineation provided by the interpretive-rhetorical situation
proved to be valuable in establishing a more precise understanding of the nature of the audience—interpreter interactions.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The theme that unites contemporary twentieth-century interpretation theory focuses on the proposition that interpreters study literature through performance. Several definitions by leading contemporary scholars of interpretation lend support to the proposition. In his text, The Art of Interpretation, Wallace A. Bacon defines interpretation as "the study of literature through the medium of oral performance." ¹ Beverly Whitaker likewise believes that "interpretation is best defined as the study of literature through performance." ² Joanna H. Maclay and Thomas O. Sloan base their text "on the premise that interpretation is a viable and valuable means of studying literature," and that "to interpret a literary work means to speak it, to oneself or to others." ³ Alethea Smith Mattingly and Wilma H. Grimes view "interpretation as a performing art and


the interpreter as the expressive agent for a work of literature." 4 Don Geiger asserts that "oral interpretation is but an aspect of literary study" as the interpreter sounds an author's words. 5

Inherent within the cited definitions are two major concepts, 1) an interpreter should have a good knowledge of the literature he is about to perform, and 2) an interpreter should have some mastery of technique for the purpose of translating that knowledge of the literature into performance. As Mattingly and Grimes say, "interpretation is a doing that rests on a foundation of knowing." 6

The goals of interpretation, then, are gaining an understanding of a piece of literature and then translating the knowledge gained through understanding into performance. Several methods of articulating these goals can be found in different scholarly treatises. For interpretation, two particular methods of reaching the first goal expressed, gaining an understanding of a piece of literature through analysis, have enjoyed popularity in recent years, namely dramatic analysis as put forth by Geiger 7 and rhetorical


6 Mattingly, p. 6.

7 Geiger, pp. 61-70.
analysis as practiced repeatedly by Sloan. 8

On the first level of analysis, Geiger believes our own real experiences in life can be seen as a series of situation-attitude relationships. The situations and attitudes that make up those relationships may be found by discovering the dramatic elements of the experience. For example, one may find the elements by asking the following questions: "Who is performing What action of thought or feeling or deed? Where, when, how, and why performed?" 9 Geiger argues that literature can be approached the same way because it is a representation of experience. In connection with a poem (by which is meant any work of literature), he affirms that six observations can be made bearing on an analysis of a poem's dramatic nature composed of different situation-attitude relationships:

First, the dramatic elements of the experience represented can be discovered in answer to our six questions. (Who) (Where) (When) (What) (How) (Why). . .

Second, these elements are organically related. . .

Third, we should observe that our statement of these elements and their relationship to one another is not equivalent to what the poem says. . .the only way we could get the exact attitude, or meaning, would be to repeat the words in their exact order in the poem. . .Fourth, it follows that when we

---


9 Geiger, p. 61.
discover a complication in the language of the poem we are also discovering new aspects or dimensions of attitude. . .fifth. . .A change in our understanding of one element in the situation-attitude relationship inevitably causes a change in our understanding of other elements. . .The sixth thing we should notice in our dramatic analysis. . .is the "theme" of the poem.10

Seeking the same goal as Geiger, interpreters can also turn to rhetorical analysis. Sloan is the best known proponent of employing rhetorical theory in the study of literature.11 Other authors who believe that rhetorical theory should be used in particular situations include S. John Macksoud,12 Mary Z. Maher,13 and Donald R. Salper.14 The two major approaches of these authors have been, 1) to examine a piece of literature in light of the prevailing rhetorical theories at the time of its creation (historically), and 2) to examine a piece of literature in light of persuasive attitudes that exist among characters within the literature. These two approaches apply an external and an internal rhetorical approach, respectively, to the study of literature.

10Ibid., pp. 63-65.

11See footnote 8 above.


The two different methods of literary analysis (dramatic and rhetorical) both operate as effective means through which an interpreter can approach an understanding of a piece of literature. The succeeding translation that occurs for the interpreter from analysis of literature to the actual performance of that literature is a key to the interpreter's ultimate success in his striving to orally study the literature. Bacon suggests one looks at both the poem and reader as being active; and to him the art of interpretation "aims at establishing in oral performance a congruence between these two sets of acts." 15 The congruence that Bacon posits only occurs when there has been a thorough analysis of literature and when the interpreter has a good grasp of the necessary skills involved in the translation process. Mattingly and Grimes state that "another important step in the study of interpretation is achieving the management of the body and the voice, the physical means of expression." 16

In order to achieve a congruence between poem and interpreter, then, two things are necessary. First, an understanding of a piece of literature through different methods of literary analysis must be gained, and secondly, an expertise in the use of learned performance skills must be developed. The means by which the theory formulated to accomplish these tasks are primarily recorded in the

15 Bacon, p. xii.
16 Mattingly, p. 10.
field. Such matters as discovering whether the situation in a piece of literature is open or closed and the resultant shift in the interpreter's focus exemplified skill acquisition highlighted in textbooks. The reason for skill emphasis lies in the fact that a smooth handling of focus and placement of characters by an interpreter is vital if his performance is going to match the experience in the literature. In order to accomplish his task most successfully, an interpreter must base practice on sound theory.

A further extension of interpretation theory that deals with performance relies on the continued use of conventions. Bacon states that "a good interpreter ought to know how to use a lectern, just as he needs to know how to use a book." Coger and White also point to the correct use of conventions in readers theatre. Veilleux emphasizes that each interpreter has an obligation to adapt his particular style to the literature while using the conventions.20


18 Bacon, p. 160.


The point of concern here is that there is a substantial body of interpretation theory that directs the interpreter in two main areas of concern, 1) in the analysis of literature, and 2) in the translation of the interpreter's knowledge of a piece of literature into performance. The problem that arises is that while theories abound, there is very little published material available dealing with how to validate those theories. In other words, as a substantial body of theory directs interpreters to a moment of performance, almost no theory allows for the interpreter to be sure of his success in actually achieving a congruence. The problem stems from the neglect of the third element of the interpretation union, the audience. Interpretation is considered to be a union of three separate entities, writer (literature), reader (interpreter), and audience. Theory that takes an interpreter up to the moment of performance, including seeking to involve the audience, but then in actuality virtually ignores the audience as well as the performer's own resulting success or failure with the audience, is a theory that is lacking a significant degree of clarity in philosophical vision and in precepts for accurate performance.

Several authors of interpretation hint at the problem of validating performance, but leave the fulness of an answer to further examination. Lee and Galati state:

If you are strongly performance oriented, you will find that analysis gives you greater confidence in what you have sensed intuitively and increased your flexibility in handling various moods and kinds of
material. If you are not primarily interested in performance but rather in the processes of literary examination you will find that your performance and the audience's reaction are valuable tests of your thoroughness. 21

The suggestions here are that the interpreter will be more at ease through implementation of current theory, and that audience reaction is a test of validity. The questions that remain are, 1) to what extent will the confidence and ease of an interpreter help him reach a congruence with literature, and 2) what exactly can an interpreter expect in terms of his reaction to audience response? Brooks, Bahn, and Okey recognize that listener response in the form of feedback may influence an interpreter, but they too fail to indicate how the feedback will influence performance, other than noting that the interpreter will modify his vocal and physical cues. 22 None of these authors successfully describe precisely what kind of change might occur in an interpreter as a result of audience influence, if indeed there is a change, or how to determine the validity of that change once it has occurred.

The answers to the questions posed in regards to the influence of interpreter confidence and audience response on performance may be found in two areas, 1) performance criticism, and 2) experimental research. These two areas have in fact been sorely neglected in published research

21 Lee, p. xiv.

by interpretation scholars. Beverly Whitaker notes that "our critical procedure for dealing with literature performed is not as sophisticated (nor perhaps as defensible) as our techniques for judging the literature itself." Jerry D. Young states that "little has been written about evaluative procedures useful for a Readers Theatre performance." The impact of these authors' comments is strengthened by the overall paucity of published material on performance criticism.

In addition to the lack of research on performance criticism, there is a lack of published material dealing with experimental studies. Whitaker notes that the potential of experimental research is of widespread interest to teachers of interpretation, while David A. Williams and Dennis C. Alexander state that there is a lack of empirical research in interpretation. The major impact of the 1969 symposium on experimental research in interpretation in *Western Speech* was that more experimental research needs


to be conducted. Also in the symposium, Samuel Becker concludes that any future experimental research must follow some focus that as yet is not clear.

An interesting dichotomy exists between the theory guiding interpreters up to the moment of performance and the theory dealing with post performance aspects. There is a wealth of information dealing with the aspects of interpretation prior to performance, specifically in the areas of literary analysis into performance. On the other hand, there is little published research dealing with the post performance aspects of interpretation, that is, those ways in which interpretation can be tested for validity. Performance criticism and experimental research have been neglected. Several possible reasons for the dichotomy exist. The one possible explanation that seems most central and urgent concerns the paucity of an overriding body of theory to direct research concerning post performance aspects of interpretation.

Although there is not a complete void in research published concerning the post performance aspects of interpretation, that research lacks continuity. By comparison, rhetoricians consistently have followed a reasonable pattern,


spotlighting certain factors of rhetorical theory in criticizing rhetorical events, and then testing these assumptions experimentally.\footnote{29 \textit{Taken from an interview with Dr. Larry Winn, Associate Professor Communication and Theatre, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, Kentucky, 13 June 1977.}}

The purpose of this thesis, then, is to provide a basis for a body of theory concerning post performance analysis, including criticism and experimental research. In conducting the research contemporary rhetorical theory and criticism will be blended with interpretation theory to produce insight into the post performance phenomena. The rationale stems from an inherently rhetorical nature of interpretation, an inheritance frequently unexplored and unused. The analogy of rhetorical critics and communication theorists studying rhetoric in terms of effectiveness to the goals of post performance analysis in interpretation is clear. In both cases, criticism and experimental research are seeking to validate theory in terms of actual practice.

To more perfectly blend selected dimensions of interpretation and rhetoric, a basic assumption normally applied to rhetoric must be established for interpretation; that interpretation is a suasory speech act. This foundational concept is elaborated upon in chapter two of this thesis. Following this elaboration of the rhetorical nature of an interpretation performance, chapter three provides one method for looking at a performance in terms of a
specific theory that will be able to guide research in post performance analysis. Lloyd Bitzer's concepts of the rhetorical situation are blended with interpretation theory allowing for the aforementioned goals of post performance analysis to be reached.

Chapter four contains reports on some experimental research conducted as part of this thesis that provides a case study for the theory formed. Chapter five concludes the thesis.
CHAPTER II

INTERPRETATION AS SUASORY SPEECH

A blending of interpretation theory with contemporary rhetorical theory is predicated on the concept that both have similar natures. As one looks at the goals of post performance analysis in interpretation, similarities with rhetorical analysis begin to appear. Likenesses such as criticism of a particular event and experimental research related to that event come to mind for both rhetorical and interpretation purposes. In each case, the critic seeks to better illuminate the effectiveness of a particular event. In rhetoric, analysis serves to illuminate a rhetorical discourse; in interpretation, post performance analysis serves to illuminate a particular performance. However, if these similarities are to be extended to allow a blending of forms it is necessary for interpretation to build on the primary foundation of rhetoric, that of suasory discourse. Therefore, this chapter demonstrates how interpretation serves as a suasory speech act.

Three main concepts dominate a discussion of a suasory speech act: 1) speech is momentary, existing at a fixed point in time, 2) speech is transactional, occurring as a process in

---

which the participants interact not only within an environment, but also with an environment, and 3) suasory speech is intentional, occurring for some particular reason, and inducing some change in action or attitude.\(^2\) When these three concepts occur in practice, a suasory speech act is the result. If an interpretation performance also fits these concepts, it too must be considered a suasory speech act. To demonstrate interpretation as suasory speech, each of the three concepts mentioned will be considered in turn.

Joanna Maclay and Thomas O. Sloan note that although literature may exist indefinitely, interpretation itself is momentary. They state, "one may duplicate the printed page or simply repeat words. But to create anew the experience of which those words are a part is in large measure an existential process, that is, something that is 'going on' right now in someone's body and mind."\(^3\) S. John Macksoud states that "oral interpretation must proceed through moments of time. There will be no work until the interpretation ends."\(^4\) One of the basis for Sloan's textual-contextual


\(^4\)Macksoud, p.72.
approach to interpretation is that an interpretation performance occurs in a particular context at a particular time.\(^5\) Judith C. Espinola expresses the idea succinctly as she states that "a solo or group performance is impermanent - time and space bound . . ."\(^6\) The conclusion that must be reached is that an interpretation performance is momentary. The performance occurs uniquely in time and can not be reversed or repeated exactly.

The second concept being considered is that interpretation is transactional. Joe A. Munshaw gives insight into the transactional view of speech by suggesting that "objects which participate in the motion are not separate and distinct but are components of the system of motion, and an observer or critic can not discuss them adequately apart from that system."\(^7\) Interpretation theory as a whole rests squarely on the idea that its elements cannot be separated. It is impossible to talk about the performance of an interpreter without talking about his success or failure in achieving a congruence with the literature. Again, it is impossible to extract an audience from the process, for it is inevitably a member of that audience who responds to the interpretation performance, whether that be the interpreter as audience member, or another person in the audience who serves as a

\(^5\) Sloan, p. 346.


respondent. It is the union of writer, reader, and audience which cannot be separated. It is the different life worlds of each of these three elements which, according to Sharpham, Matter, and Brockriede, initiate a rhetorical transaction. In short, an interpretation performance must be considered as a process that acts within a specific environment at a particular time, and at the same time is a commingling of the components which comprise the environment.

The third concept under discussion is that interpretation is intentional, occurring for some particular reason, and inducing some change in action or attitude. It is here, as interpretation strives to induce some change in an audience, that it is most closely aligned to rhetoric.

The function of rhetoric throughout history has typically been to induce a change in action or attitude. Donald C. Bryant takes rhetoric to be "the rationale of informative and suasive discourse" and the function of rhetoric to be that of "adjusting ideas to people and people to ideas." Karlyn Kohrs Campbell delineates rhetorical acts as "not only written and exhortative works and persuasive campaigns but also all contemporary acts that influence attitude." Kenneth Burke believes that "wherever there is meaning there

---


9 Bryant, p. 405.

is rhetoric."\textsuperscript{11}

The commonality among all the different modern approaches to rhetoric remains the same as it has been historically. The nature and function of rhetoric is that of altering people's attitudes, actions, beliefs, or perceptions. Allen Tate expands the total concept by referring to rhetoric as "the study and the use of the figurative language of experience as the discipline by means of which men govern their relations with one another in the light of truth."\textsuperscript{12} The implication of these authors is that if something is to be taken as rhetoric it must be suasive. If something is to be taken as suasive, it must investigate the commonality of men, and somehow influence perceptions as a result. The implication for interpretation is that if it is to be considered as having an inherently rhetorical nature it too must be suasive, and that if it is to be considered as suasive, it must influence perceptions, change attitudes, beliefs, or actions.

As a beginning point to note how an interpretation performance is suasive, a consideration of varying performance possibilities will be undertaken. It is probably a rare exception for anyone who has continually exposed himself to interpretation to have not heard what is called a bad or wrong reading. The evaluation by which an interpretation performance is usually conducted relates an interpreter's


embodiment to a written text. Mary Maher succinctly states that the "speaker of the work is only represented correctly (or conclusively) when the interpreter has been accurate in embodying the speakers in the work."\textsuperscript{13} Of course, there may be several variations on exactly how to embody the speakers in the work, or as Richard Haas says, "there is no one right way to read a poem."\textsuperscript{14} The conclusion is that there are several correct ways in which a poem may be interpreted. Some ways may be more correct than others, or some ways may be totally wrong. Geiger states that "though many interpretations may be more or less 'right' and 'good' it is also possible that many interpretations may be more or less 'wrong' and 'bad.'"\textsuperscript{15}

When an interpreter chooses to perform a particular piece of literature for an audience, he first studies that literature. Based upon an analysis of the literature, the interpreter then makes certain choices concerning his embodiment. The choices he makes are the ones he believes will correctly activate the potential for meaning in the audience. In other words, the interpreter is affirming in performance that he has a correct understanding of the poem, even if in


reality that understanding is partial or not the best. The resulting performance may be "right" or "wrong," but it assumes a prior correct understanding of the literature. It is possible, of course, that a person may have a correct mental understanding of a poem and still give a "wrong" reading. In such a case, the interpreter is still, though mistakenly, affirming that his performance is a method of better understanding the literature through a correct approach to it.

The interpreter's function in interpretation is to act as a stimulus for an audience. The message that serves as a construct for the speech act is the literature as performed. Through the stimulus provided by performance, the interpreter is asking his audience to respond in a particular way. He is not asking every audience member to respond in the same way, or even as the interpreter himself does; he is asking, though, that the audience respond correctly.

In order to provoke a certain meaning of a poem in an audience, the interpreter must do particular things bodily. Mattingly and Grimes say that the response evoked by an interpreter from his audience is "by reason of his creative embodiment of a piece of literature."\(^{16}\) Macksoud believes that "the ultimate point of oral interpretation is the structuring of listeners' experience in such ways that the thesis which the interpretation seeks to call to the attention of an audience shall emerge as dominant over stylistic and

aesthetic features per se." He further expostulates his theory by noting that "every piece of interpretive behavior is important to directing perception toward or away from meanings critically designated as central." Lee and Galati believe that "the listeners' understanding, their mental and emotional response to the content and to the form in which it is presented, depends to a large degree on the interpreter's ability to discover these elements and to project them satisfactorily in their proper relationship."

It is the interpreter, and no one else, who embodies a piece of literature in performance. The decisions he makes reflect a thoughtful and experienced judgment as to the meaning of a poem. By physically making choices about the appropriateness of matching body to poem, the interpreter is affirming that his is a right reading. In the affirmation of correctness, the interpreter further strives to channel his listeners' responses in such a way as to become congruent with his own and the poem. If an interpreter is not striving for such an ultimate achievement, the interpretation performance must therefore be assumed to be either vain or charlatry.

Whatever meaning lies in a particular poem is always potentially available. Through a particularized embodiment of a poem, an interpreter is seeking to influence an audience's

---

17 Macksoud, p. 71.
18 Ibid.
perceptions. Whether the interpretation performance is the first exposure to a literary work, or whether the performance is presented to an audience completely familiar with a literary work, the interpreter is seeking to initiate perceptions of that poem that correspond to his understanding of the poem. The interpreter does not intend to limit the audience’s perceptions by his own understanding, but, rather, to direct them in the right direction, as opposed to allowing those perceptions to wander aimlessly without guidance or direction.

In the sense that an interpreter makes a choice, or set of choices, about a piece of literature, and thereby tries with all of his artistry to influence an audience accordingly, he is performing a suaisory act. The suasion that takes place occurs at a particular point in time and is transactional. In these regards, interpretation is a suaisory speech act.
CHAPTER III

THE INTERPRETIVE-RHETORICAL SITUATION

In order to accomplish the goals of determining how an interpreter is influenced by the different aspects of a performance, some particular framework for looking at an interpretation performance, and resulting performance criticism and experimental research, must be established. The fact that an interpretation performance has an inherent rhetorical nature has been demonstrated. A particularized theory blending rhetoric with interpretation, allowing the aforementioned goals to be met, will now be developed. Lloyd Bitzer's "The Rhetorical Situation" is the particular rhetorical theory that will be blended with existing interpretation theory.\(^1\) Although it is possible that other theories may also be appropriate for blending, the idea of looking at the context of discourse is particularly suited to the needs of interpretation. It is, after all, the interpretation performance by an interpreter for an audience that, according to Sloan, provides a context for a text.\(^2\)

This chapter of the thesis will review the situational


aspects of rhetoric as posited by Bitzer, blend those aspects with interpretation, and then briefly discuss how such a blending can be particularly useful for the interpretation scholar.

Bitzer defines a rhetorical situation as a complex of persons, events, objects, and relations presenting an actual or potential exigence which can be completely or partially removed if discourse, introduced into the situation can so constrain human decision or action as to bring about the significant modification of the exigence. ³

Bitzer believes that rhetorical works belong to the class of things which obtain their character from the circumstances of the historic context in which they occur. In other words, the rhetorical situation looks at the nature of those contexts in which speakers or writers create rhetorical discourse. The view that a work of rhetoric is pragmatic, that it comes into existence for the sake of something beyond itself, has been supported by a plethora of other writers. Hoyt Hudson posited that rhetoric is for the sake of impression, with the rhetor keeping his eye on his audience and the occasion at hand. ⁴ Bryant believes that the core of rhetoric requires that rhetorical discourse speak the language of the audience or not at all. ⁵ Coming full circle, Bitzer himself states that rhetoric functions to ultimately produce action or change in the world. ⁶

³Bitzer, p. 6.
⁶Bitzer, p. 4.
Refining the notion that rhetorical discourse is pragmatic, Bitzer notes seven keys to the rhetorical situation: 1) rhetorical discourse comes into existence as a response to a situation; 2) a speech is given rhetorical significance by the situation; 3) a rhetorical situation must exist as a necessary condition of rhetorical discourse; 4) many rhetorical situations mature and decay without giving birth to rhetorical utterance; 5) a situation is rhetorical insofar as it needs and invites discourse capable of participating with situation and thereby altering its reality; 6) discourse is rhetorical insofar as it functions, or seeks to function, as a fitting response to a situation; and 7) the situation controls the rhetorical response, not the rhetor and not persuasive intent, but the situation is the source and ground of rhetorical activity and rhetorical criticism. These seven keys form a working definition of the rhetorical situation for Bitzer.

Further amplifying the original concept, Bitzer believes that any rhetorical situation has three separate constituents, the exigency, the audience, and the constraints. An exigency is an imperfection marked by urgency, something waiting to be done. The controlling exigency in any situation will act as an organizing principle and will specify

7Ibid., p. 4.
8Ibid., p. 6.
the audience to be addressed, and the change to be effected. The audience in a rhetorical situation is always required, and must be capable of serving as mediator of the change that is desired. The third constituent is a set of constraints, made up of persons, objects, and events, acting together to influence the situation through attitudes, beliefs, documents, facts, etc.

Finally, for Bitzer, there are six general characteristics which rhetorical situations possess: 1) rhetorical discourse is called into existence by the situation; 2) the rhetorical situation invites a fitting or proper response; 3) the situation must somehow prescribe the response that fits; 4) the exigency and the constraints which generate rhetorical discourse are located in reality, are objective and publicly observable historic facts in the world we experience, and are therefore available for scrutiny by an observer or critic who attends to them; 5) the structures of rhetorical situations will vary, either being simple or complex, and more or less organized; and 6) rhetorical situations come into existence, then either decay or mature and persist, perhaps persisting indefinitely. These six characteristics, along with the other features of Bitzer's theory, delineate a rhetorical situation.

\[9\] Ibid.
As already stated, interpretation is considered to be a union of writer, reader, and audience. Each of the elements involved brings certain characteristics into an interpretation performance, and each element interacts with each other element. The concept of these three elements working together to create a particular context is not original with this thesis, but the idea of an interpretive-rhetorical situation controlling the performance of a piece of literature is unique.

Bitzer notes seven keys that form a working definition of the rhetorical situation. These keys, as Bitzer states them, have already been summarized. Their blending with interpretation for an interpretive-rhetorical situation follows:

1. An interpretation performance comes into existence as a response to a situation. The message in interpretation is the literature that is performed. The subsequent unique nature of a particular performance of a piece of literature after a thoughtful choosing of the text comes about as a result of a particular situation.

2. An interpretation performance, through its very nature, and as a result of the situation, is given a rhetorical significance. Interpretation, by the nature of what it accomplishes in performance, takes on the qualities of a suasory speech act, hence being given its rhetorical significance only through the situation.

3. An interpretive-rhetorical situation must exist as a necessary condition of an interpretation performance.
Bitzer explains a similar portion of his theory by giving the example of a question existing as a necessary condition of an answer. Likewise, the aspects of an interpretive-rhetorical situation, as they unfold in this chapter, demand an interpretation performance.

4. Many, or at least some, interpretive-rhetorical situations mature and decay without giving birth to an interpretation performance. How many interpretation scholars have adapted and directed an interpreters theatre production, only to vow to never do that particular literary work again without doing it in its entirety? As time, finances, and other problems besiege the director, how many complete works fail to come to full fruition? In such a case the situation has matured and decayed as a result of lost energies, finances, and the other problems. An interpretation performance has not come into existence, although the situation has at one time invited it. The same may be true of other interpretive-rhetorical situations, either because of some obvious practical problems, or because of the sheer lack of initiative on a would-be interpreter's part.

5. A situation may be considered to be interpretive-rhetorical so long as it needs and invites discourse capable of participating with the situation and thereby altering the reality of the elements involved. In the interpretation union of writer, reader, and audience, it is impossible for each of the elements to not participate with each other. As already noted, each element of the
union is interdependent on each other element. Through the introduction of an interpretation performance into a situation, all three elements are altered. The literature takes on life, as well as a new historical context precisely unlike any that has gone before. The interpreter, through his embodiment, has had to physically make choices and decisions about a piece of literature precisely unlike any he has previously had to make. The audience, through the intentions of the interpreter, have had their responses focused in a particular direction. Reality for each element, as well as the situation as a whole, has been altered.

6. An interpretation performance is rhetorical insofar as it functions, or seeks to function, as a fitting response to a situation which needs and invites it. As already mentioned in detail, the obligation of each interpreter as he performs a text, is to affirm that literature. The interpreter seeks to direct responses of an audience in a given right direction. He seeks to give a right reading. The interpreter may not always succeed in giving a right reading, but he is always striving in that direction.

7. The interpretive-rhetorical situation controls the interpretation performance. It is not the interpreter, nor any of the individual elements by themselves that control the performance, but rather the situation acts as the controlling factor of performance. The situation controls the performance by dictating either the choice of literature, the
occasion for performance, or such precise factors as rate, posture, and total tonal patterns.

These seven items listed generate a working definition for an interpretive-rhetorical situation. Paralleling Bitzer, a formal definition of the interpretive-rhetorical situation may be stated as follows: a complex of elements presenting an actual or potential exigency which can be completely or partially removed if an interpretation performance, introduced into the situation, can bring about a significant modification of the exigency.

Amplifying the nature of the interpretive-rhetorical situation, there are three constituents that exist prior to an actual interpretation performance. They are the exigency, the audience, and the constraints.

An exigency, says Bitzer, "is an imperfection marked by urgency; it is a defect, an obstacle, something waiting to be done, a thing which is other than it should be."¹⁰ There are several exigencies in an interpretive-rhetorical situation that are ongoing and omnipresent. Foremost of these exigencies is that of giving life to the dead words on a printed page. Wallace Bacon stresses that for interpreters it isn't the black marks on the printed page which are the end of the matter, but rather "the whole transaction in human terms (experience, behavioral engagement) which is for us the heart of the matter."¹¹ Likewise, Janet Bolton believes

¹⁰Ibid.

that a text is not the same as black marks on a white page, but that "words must be made to come alive." In addition to the fundamental exigency of giving life to literature, a second primary exigency exists as interpretation serves as a method and medium for studying literature, as noted in detail in chapter one of this thesis. Interpretation theory has maintained throughout modern history that it provides a valuable and undeniable service to literature through its unique approach to literature. Beyond such primary exigencies as giving life to the black marks on a white page and studying literature through oral performance, secondary exigencies also exist. Reading hours, classroom assignments, full length interpreters theatre productions, and experimental festivals all provide needs which cannot be met except by interpretation performances. It is true that the underlying causes of the secondary exigencies often overlap with the primary exigencies presented. The important factor, though, is that these components of the situation require that an interpretation performance occur. Until a performance occurs, the exigence has not been modified. In any event, though, a particular audience to be addressed is specified, as is the change to be effected, as a particular piece of literature is affirmed by an interpreter. That is, an interpretation performance is designated and designed for one

particular audience. In a like manner, the directional focusing of perceptions in an audience by an interpreter signifies the specified change to be effected, as a particular piece of literature is affirmed.

The second constituent is the audience. The explanation that Bitzer gives for a rhetorical audience corresponds closely to an audience for an interpretation performance. Bitzer states that

since rhetorical discourse produces change by influencing the decision and action of persons who function as mediators of change, it follows that rhetoric always requires an audience - even in those cases when a person engages himself or ideal mind as audience. 13

In a like manner interpretation, as it serves as a stimulus to evoke responses in an audience, does not occur without an audience. In interpretation, the interpreter himself is a member of his audience. The physical embodiment of literature, requiring choices that must be made, stimulates a perceptual change within the interpreter, and the rest of his audience, that reaches toward the goal of interpretation. In response to the stimulus of the interpretation performance, the members of the audience are influenced in some manner as they decide themselves whether to accept or deny the affirmation that is presented to them. In other words, as an interpreter presents a particular stimulus, he attempts to focus the perceptions of his audience in the chosen direction. The audience, on the other hand, may agree or disagree with the particular

13 Bitzer, p. 7.
interpretation. If they agree, they are stimulated to respond in the direction chosen by the interpreter. If the members of the audience disagree, they respond in a direction variant from the one suggested and endorsed by the interpreter. In each instance, though, the audience acts as the agent for any change produced in the initial perceptual patterns.

The third constituent is a set of constraints. Constraints are made up of beliefs and attitudes of the people involved in a situation, known relevant facts about objects in a situation, and the interrelationships that develop between the constraints. The constraints have the power to influence directly the particular tact an interpreter will take as he modifies the exigency. More precisely, a set of constraints would include the different life-worlds of the literature, interpreter, and audience, any authorial intent which may be relevant, the intentional fallacy and new criticism notwithstanding, and any relevant historical life that a piece of literature may have had. In terms of these particular constraints listed, it is easy to see that, if all are studied exactingly, the eventual interpretation performance will be affected. The baseline for interpretation remains an analysis of literature; but subsequent to that analysis, relevant facts about an audience, performance limitations, historical information, etc., will and should influence the interpretation performance, and subsequent reception of that performance by the audience.

The three constituents noted—exigency, audience, and
constraints—along with the interpreter and his performance which become constituents when they enter the situation, comprise everything relevant in an interpretive-rhetorical situation.

Following Bitzer's line of analysis, the general characteristics of interpretive-rhetorical situations are:

1. An interpretation performance is called into existence by the situation. The performance is invited, or in some cases, demanded by a situation. "Why interpretation?" is really the key question being asked. In other words, why do people interpret literature? The answer may be complicated and many faceted, but if there is a particular reason, or set of reasons, these may be said to be a part of the situation. For example, if interpretation is called into being because it is a way of studying literature, then when the impetus for studying literature is introduced somewhere, an interpretation performance is invited into the situation. Indeed, if interpretation is the best way to study literature, then a performance is demanded when study is desired.

2. An interpretive-rhetorical situation invites a response that fits the situation. The idea of a fitting response in this case is one which affirms the literature. In addition to the fundamental idea of affirming literature, other elements in a situation may cause certain things to occur for a performance. The choice of literature often times is determined by the situation. For example, a reading hour designed to honor a particular person will usually require their favorite authors or works of literature to be performed.
The difference in reading to a gathering at a national convention and reading to a junior high school audience presents obvious intricacies in choosing different types of literature. Beyond the type of literature to be performed, the precise handling of literature must fit the situation. A classroom setting requiring the ultimate in precision, will differ markedly from the kinds of performances that would take place in an experimental festival environment. In addition, the same piece of literature may be read individually or adapted to interpreters theatre depending on what the situation invites.

3. The situation that creates an interpretation performance is comprised of an exigency, persons, objects, events, and relations which are real, objective, and observable, and as such, are available for examination by a critic or other observer who attends to them. The examination by a critic will reveal these components and will therefore certify their reality. The literature chosen for performance is real, any pertinent historical data about that literature may be certified, the people involved in the situation are real people, any attitudes held may be discovered by measuring techniques, and the relationships that exist among the components may be discovered by a combination of logic and observation.

4. Interpretive-rhetorical situations exhibit structures which are more or less organized, and simple or complex. A situation is highly organized if the components are
located and readied for the interpretation performance. A classroom setting usually provides a highly organized situation. The literature to be performed is often pre-assigned, the audience is known and has certain expectations about the literature, the instructor serves as primary critic for the performance, and the interpreter is well appraised of what is required from him. On the other hand, a touring one-man show may be loosely organized. For instance, Hal Holbrook, as Mark Twain, and Emlyn Williams, as Charles Dickens, travel from city to city not knowing exactly of whom their audiences will consist. In addition, certain allowances as to precisely which sections of the program are presented to which audiences, and a particular length of show may be changed in response to an audience's likes or dislikes. The acting critic may be a trained and able literature expert, or he may be the local fine arts editor whose specialty is impressionistic art, and who barely knows who Charles Dickens is, much less Emlyn Williams.

The structure of the situation may further be delineated as simple or complex as the actual type of performance is called into existence. Complexity is here defined by the number of elements which must be made to interact; more elements indicate higher complexity, while fewer elements indicate lower complexity or a simple structure. The situation that calls an interpreters theatre production into existence, instead of a solo performance, has given rise to a more complex structure, in the sense that numerous personalities, and relationships are now being dealt with.
In a like manner, the situation that calls for a compiled script in favor of an adapted script has introduced interconnected relationships of different pieces of literature that once again indicate a more complex structure.

5. Interpretive-rhetorical situations come into existence, then either mature or decay or mature and persist, some persisting indefinitely. In a classroom setting, the time invariably comes when an instructor calls on a particular student to perform. The situation has matured, and the interpretation performance is brought to fruition. Unless, of course, the student fails to perform, whereby the situation decays, normally prohibiting a future performance to fill that situation. An interpreters theatre production may be scheduled for a showing and then have any number of incidences arise to prevent that showing, whether it be an electrical failure, an equipment failure, or the like. In such an instance, the situation persists, usually causing a rescheduling of the show as the situation matures at a later date. There is also the example of a situation inviting an interpretation performance, but lack of rehearsal, or money, or judgement that something else is wrong, will prevent actual performance, and the situation will decay. A final example is of a situation that perhaps persists indefinitely, as in the case of a director wishing to perform the entire Trilogy of Tolkein, or an entire Faulkner novel, The Sound and The Fury. In both cases, the desire is admirable, but the invitation to perform these entities may go unheeded indefinitely.
These five features, then, characterize an interpretive-rhetorical situation. As shown through the examples given, most possible circumstances in interpretation have been accounted for. The specific application of the theory presented will be demonstrated as the component parts are available for dissection. The next section attends itself to such applications.

Applications of
The Interpretive-Rhetorical Situation

After the development of a theory comprising the interpretive-rhetorical situation, the question may be raised as to the value of such a theory. How does an approach to interpretation through the interpretive-rhetorical situation better overall understanding of interpretation? The answer may lie in the fact that a situational approach to interpretation allows for a systematized breakdown of the elements that comprise and invite an interpretation performance and, hence, provide a unique framework for performance criticism and resulting experimental research.

The clearest observation of the altered, systematized breakdown of interpretation comes from a look at the constituents of the interpretive-rhetorical situation. It will be remembered that the three constituents of an interpretive-rhetorical situation are the exigency, the audience, and a set of constraints. At first, it may superficially appear that the three constituents correspond to the traditional three elements of interpretation; writer, reader, and audience.
However, on closer inspection, it will be noted that the literature (writer) element has been subdivided into two parts. Part of the literature falls into the category of exigency. Here the words as they appear on the printed page are lifted and given life, a new criticism approach to the literature. On the other hand, part of the literature element has been assigned to the set of constraints. Here, the author's intention, historical influences, and other romantic approaches to the literature exist. This duality of assignment allows the interpretation critic, researcher and performer to systematically study literature as it exists solely on the printed page, or as historical influences alter the interpretation performance.

The interpretive-rhetorical situation further allows a breakdown of the remaining two elements of traditional interpretation theory, the interpreter (reader) and the audience, by subdividing these elements into both the constituents of audience and constraints. The situational approach permits the interpreter's influence on the literature to be studied separately from the literature's influence on the interpreter. Likewise, the audience's influence on performance can be separated from the performance's influence on the audience. The divisions that exist within the interpretive-rhetorical situation also allow a separation of the persuasive intent of an interpretation performance, and any subsequent persuasion that may occur regardless of prior intent. Of course, the systemic breakdown of the component
parts for study must never preclude the realization that the interpretive-rhetorical situation is underpinned by interlocking interrelationships of all components. Figure 1 shows briefly how the elements of the traditional interpretation union subdivide into the situational constituents, allowing for the independent studies suggested.

In addition to the applications made already, the interpretive-rhetorical situation provides an obvious advantage as a critic tries to attune himself to the variety of performances to which he is likely to be exposed. The differences between critiquing performances in a college classroom, a high school tournament, and an experimental round at a festival, are more logically handled within the framework provided by viewing the performances as called into existence by the situation. In order to critique reasonably, one must identify the constituents of the situation and apply the criticism accordingly.

The concept of viewing interpretation in terms of the interpretive-rhetorical situation provides obvious advantages for performance criticism and experimental research. As the components are demarcated and examined independently and interrelatedly, a framework for establishing a cogent method of analysis is provided. While other methods of analysis are possible, and may even be shown to be superior, the contextual environment of interpretation as put forth by the interpretive-rhetorical situation is clearly an illuminating and effective way of providing a useful cohesion to the processes of performance criticism and experimental research.
CHAPTER IV

THE EFFECTS OF AN AUDIENCE

ON INTERPRETERS' PERCEPTION OF CHARACTER

Over the last several years there has been a continued call for experimental research in oral interpretation.\(^1\) In addition, the experimental research that has been conducted lacks focus. For example, in a critique of a symposium on empirical and experimental studies in oral interpretation, Samuel Becker suggests that interpretation scholars should decide on some focus for their studies.\(^2\) He also states that "we have been given a large number of interesting ideas but not much of a hint of what to do with them or why."\(^3\) The kind of focus that Dr. Becker asks for is provided by the interpretive-rhetorical situation described previously. By looking at interpretation performances within the framework of the interpretive-rhetorical situation, it is possible to approach experimentation in interpretation

---


\(^3\)Ibid., p. 269.
systematically. One portion of the systematized breakdown that occurs within the interpretive-rhetorical situation has been tested experimentally, and the results are reported in this chapter.

It will be recalled that the interpretive-rhetorical situation allowed the different components of interpretation to be studied in isolation. For example, by subdividing the traditional elements of the reader and the audience into both the constituents of audience and constraints, it is possible to study the audience's influence on the performance separately from the performance's influence on the audience. The central question framing the present investigation was: "What is the nature of the audience - interpreter interaction?" The most appropriate and objective method for answering this kind of question stems from heuristic devices of experimental research.

Little research has been conducted testing the interaction between an interpretation performance and an audience. Keith Brooks and Sr. I. Marie Wulftange, testing the medium of performance, found that different media elicit different kinds of responses. Specifically, they reported two major findings: 1) television was significantly better than audio transmission for arousing interest in low quality stories, and 2) a face to face presentation was significantly better than an audio presentation for eliciting an aesthetic response. 4

Daniel Witt, in another study, tested the style of presentation (acting, readers theatre, and silent reading) and type of drama (realistic, anti-realistic) in relation to four areas of audience response: action, seriousness, ethical value, and aesthetic value. In terms of audience response, Witt reported three major findings: 1) acting was judged significantly more active than readers theatre or silent reading, 2) acting and readers theatre were judged significantly more serious than silent reading, and 3) acting and readers theatre were judged significantly more valuable ethically than silent reading.\(^5\)

In a more recent study, David A. Williams and Dennis C. Alexander examined the effects of positive and negative audience responses on an interpretation performance. They tested three specific hypotheses:

1) Interpreters' levels of performance will differ depending on positive or negative audience response.
2) The interpreter will perceive the difference between a positive and a negative audience response.
3) Given that the interpreter does perceive the positive or negative response given by his audience, there will be a relationship between his level of performance and his evaluation of the responses of the audience.\(^6\)

Using videotaped recordings of different interpreters responding to positive and negative audience responses, the experimenters tested their hypotheses by having three judges rate the different performances in the areas of vocal


\(^6\)Williams and Alexander, p. 275.
responsiveness, general effectiveness, emotional response, and physical responsiveness. In addition, the interpreters were asked to rate audience response in the areas of attentiveness, restless activity, and receptivity. Based on the results of appropriate statistical tests, hypothesis two was accepted while hypotheses one and three were rejected. In other words, while the interpreters could perceive a difference between a positive and a negative audience response, the type of response did not significantly affect an interpreter's level of performance.

In summary, the three studies reported here either measured the effects of some variable on audience response or the effects of a planned audience response on an interpretation performance. None of the studies, however, revealed the reciprocal influence of an interpreter and a corresponding audience response. The interpretive-rhetorical situation, constructed in the previous chapter, investigates such a relationship. However, such a paradigm remains pre-theoretic without substantial evidence to confirm its existence and its influence. The present study sought to discover the differential effects of audience evaluation of interpretation performances on an interpreter's perception of the literature being performed. If audiences affect an interpreter's perception, then some evidence will exist for the theoretic stance of the interpretive-rhetorical situation. Similarly, evidence revealing an interpreter's influence on the audience

7Ibid., p. 280.
will also support the impact of the interpretive-rhetorical situation.

Specifically, this study sought to determine the differences between the effects of an interpretation performance on an audience and the effects of audience response on an interpreter across two different interpreters theatre productions. Furthermore, the rationale derived from the interpretive-rhetorical situation leads to three plausible hypotheses tested in this study:

1. Interpreters will perceive different levels of audience interaction with their character corresponding to the favorability of the audience evaluation of their story.

2. Interpreters will perceive different levels of audience interaction with their story corresponding to the favorability of the audience evaluation of their story.

3. A highly favorable audience evaluation will cause change in an interpreter's perception of his character.

Method

Procedures and Subjects

Two different interpreters theatre productions, The Displaced Person by Flannery O'Connor and Maria Concepcion by Katherine Anne Porter, were chosen for study. Both productions were student directed with ample rehearsal time prior to the testing. Each show was performed before an audience of basic speech students. Two groups of seventeen and ten students rated the two different shows, respectively, on three separate scales measuring empathy towards the literature, empathy towards the performance, and attitude
toward the author of the literature.  

**Measuring Instruments**

The seven interpreters in each production were given a ten item semantic differential measuring their perception of their particular character immediately prior to the performance and immediately after the performance. In addition, each interpreter answered an eight item semantic differential scale measuring their perception of the audience interaction with their character, and a like scale measuring their perception of audience interaction with the story. Both of these scales were completed only after the performances. As already mentioned, the audience evaluated the shows on three separate scales. The two empathy scales were ten item Likert type scales, while the attitude scale was a ten item semantic differential scale.

**Data Analysis**

Three separate t-tests were applied to the audience evaluations of the two shows across the three scales measuring empathy toward the literature, empathy toward the performance, and attitude toward the author. In addition, t-tests were utilized to determine any of the interpreters' perceptual differences of audience interaction with story and characters between the two different shows. Furthermore, t-tests were applied to determine if there were any significant

---

8Empathy scales were derived from a paper by Howard Doll, University of North Carolina, "The Development of an Empathetic Response Scale for Use in Readers Theatre Situations," delivered at the SSCA convention in Tallahassee, Florida, 1975. The attitude scale was developed by Carley H. Dodd, Western Kentucky University, 1975.
differences between the pre- and posttest scales measuring the interpreter's perception of their character. Additionally, a factor analysis revealed the unidimensional nature of this particular scale.

Results

Table 1 presents the data relevant to the differences in audience evaluation of the two interpretation performances. The performance of The Displaced Person (show #1) was judged significantly more favorable on all three measuring scales than the performance of Maria Concepcion (show #2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean #1</th>
<th>Mean #2</th>
<th>t Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy towards literature</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>3.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy towards performance</td>
<td>36.35</td>
<td>27.71</td>
<td>2.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards author</td>
<td>52.45</td>
<td>43.71</td>
<td>2.93*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01; t crit.=2.787; df=25

Table 2 presents the data relevant to the interpreters' perceptions of audience interaction. No significant differences were discovered between the two shows for either perception of audience interaction with a character or with the story. As a result, hypotheses one and two were not confirmed.
A factor analysis applied to the ten item semantic differential used to measure changes in character perception by the interpreters revealed that eight of the ten items accounted for 73% of the total variance. This proportion of explained variance provided evidence for the unidimensional nature of this scale.

Table 3 presents the data relevant to the changes that occurred in the interpreters' perceptions of their characters as a result of the performances. There was a significant change for the interpreters in The Displaced Person, but no significant changes for the interpreters in Maria Concepcion. As a result, hypothesis three was accepted.
Discussion

The findings of this study support the idea that evaluation of an interpretation performance is related to an interpreter's understanding of the literature performed. The data revealed that the interpreters significantly changed their perceptions of character on the very performance that subjects rated favorably. Such a finding would indicate that favorable audience evaluation, whether consciously perceptible or not, influences an interpreter's perception of the literature being performed. The experimental design was such that all factors (such as rehearsal time, performance facilities, etc.) between the two performances were equal. Since the same perception did not occur in both shows, that is, the one show was judged more favorably than the other, it is logical to conclude that the difference resulted from some factor of audience response.

One uncontrolled factor in the study was the quality level of each performance. A remote possibility exists that a performance difference in the second show may have influenced both the audience's evaluation and the interpreter's perception of character. A second factor, lending to a weakness in the study, was the small number of subjects rating the shows. Further, rater bias factors were uncontrolled, although it was assumed that few prior attitudes were held before viewing the performances because of the relative lack of previous exposure to this type of performance. Also, the present study dealt only with a single performance of two
different shows. In the future, it may be profitable to examine perceptual changes in character of interpreters in a single show over extended performances, or over a prolonged rehearsal schedule. In fact, it may be possible to better understand how an audience influences an interpreter's perception of literature if it can first be determined that perceptions have stabilized after repeated measurement during rehearsal periods. Another possible area of research would be that of relating the interpreter's perception of audience interaction to a rating by a panel of independent judges. It may be that differences in audience response are not perceptible to interpreters in an interpreters theatre production at a conscious level. Rather, audience interaction may be operating at a subconscious level that still affects the interpreter's perception of the literature.

Finally, it may be that there were some intervening variables operating with the interpreters that prevented the achievement of significant differences in the perception of audience interaction. Such variables as performance experience, knowledge, or directorial comments may be important to control in future studies.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

The interpretive-rhetorical situation, a theory which provides a cohesive framework for post performance analysis of interpretation, was formulated in this study. A blend of Lloyd Pitzer's concepts of the rhetorical situation and contemporary interpretation theory, the interpretive-rhetorical situation allows for the individual examination of the components of interpretation with respect to the environment in which they occur. Specifically, the delineation of traditional concepts into the constituents of exigency, audience, and constraints permits the study of particular concepts and interrelationships which occur in an interpretation performance.

Chapter four tested, experimentally, one particular relationship which occurs in interpretation, the influence of an audience on an interpreter and his understanding of the literature being performed. Favorable audience evaluation of an interpreters theatre production corresponded to a change in perception of character by the interpreters in that production. The conclusion is that an interpretation performance does influence an interpreter's perception of the literature he performs. This finding supports the contemporary theory of interpretation being a valuable means of studying
literature for the interpreter as a member of his own audience. Other areas for future research were also discussed in chapter four.

Similarly, investigation into the post performance aspects of interpretation remains open to future research. Other areas of rhetorical theory as well as interpretation and literary theory are available for use in guiding scholars to a purposeful framework for analyzing an interpretation performance and for validating existing theory. Whichever areas are used, though, the need for published research in the areas of performance criticism and experimental testing remains great.
APPENDIX A

EMPATHY TOWARDS LITERATURE

For each of the following statements, please circle the number that best represents your attitude toward that statement. The numbers for each statement correspond to the following scale:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reader seemed interested in the literature, so I became interested.

I was emotionally attracted to the literature.

I visualized the characters and situations in my mind as the reader performed.

I projected myself into the situations described in the literature.

The reading has stimulated my interest in literature.

I think I know the literature better than I did before as a result of the reading.

I sympathized with the attitudes of one or more of the characters.

I could not relate to the literature.

I could understand the thought processes of the character being portrayed in the literature.

The literary selection itself was boring.
APPENDIX B

EMPATHY TOWARDS INTERPRETER

For each of the following statements, please circle the number that best represents your attitude toward that statement. The numbers for each statement correspond to the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I was "emotionally moved" by the reading. 1 2 3 4 5

I was captivated by "the spell" created by the reader. 1 2 3 4 5

I was emotionally stimulated by the reading. 1 2 3 4 5

I was "drawn to" the reading. 1 2 3 4 5

I felt that, as a result of the reading, the character had for a moment "lived." 1 2 3 4 5

The oral performance itself was boring. 1 2 3 4 5

The reader communicated the ideas in the literature clearly. 1 2 3 4 5

The reading was "fresh." 1 2 3 4 5

The audience was "caught up" in the performance. 1 2 3 4 5

I often lost interest in the reading. 1 2 3 4 5
APPENDIX C

ATTITUDE TOWARD AUTHOR

Please fill out each set of spaces below by placing an "X" in the one space that most clearly represents your attitudes toward the author of the literature. Respond to every adjective pair.

| good       | __:__:__:__:__:__:__:__ | bad       |
| worthless  | __:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__ | valuable  |
| aggressive | __:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__ | meek      |
| puny       | __:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__ | potent    |
| vigorous   | __:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__ | apathetic |
| dishonest  | __:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__ | honest    |
| attractive | __:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__ | unattractive |
| irrelevant | __:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__ | relevant  |
| reputable  | __:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__ | disreputable |
| incompetent| __:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__ | competent |

### APPENDIX D

**PERCEPTION OF CHARACTER**

**DO YOU PERCEIVE YOUR CHARACTER AS BEING:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Trait</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Antonym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>humorous</td>
<td></td>
<td>serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tragic</td>
<td></td>
<td>heroic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important to story</td>
<td></td>
<td>unimportant to story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard to identify with</td>
<td></td>
<td>easy to identify with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real</td>
<td></td>
<td>artificial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inactive</td>
<td></td>
<td>active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likable</td>
<td></td>
<td>unlikable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td>admirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competent</td>
<td></td>
<td>incompetent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hostile towards other characters in story</td>
<td></td>
<td>unhostile towards other characters in story</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

PERCEPTION OF AUDIENCE INTERACTION

Please respond by placing a mark by the one space that best represents your feelings about the concept above.

good ____________:__________:__________:__________:__________:__________:__________ bad
worthless ____________:__________:__________:__________:__________:__________:__________ valuable
helpful ____________:__________:__________:__________:__________:__________:__________ harmful
non-favorable ____________:__________:__________:__________:__________:__________:__________ favorable
highly involved ____________:__________:__________:__________:__________:__________:__________ not involved
apathetic ____________:__________:__________:__________:__________:__________:__________ vigorous
attractive ____________:__________:__________:__________:__________:__________:__________ unattractive
ineffectual ____________:__________:__________:__________:__________:__________:__________ effectual
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