"INTERPRETINI"[1] RUBRIC:

What we see in a good inductive paragraph, in order:	"+" paragraphs	✓ paragraphs	✓ - paragraphs	"-" paragraphs
Opening: clearly establishes context and what happens	clearly introduce concrete time/place/events; Set up a compelling question	May begin with overly broad setup: unclear whether you're focusing on a scene or a general concept	do not define scene or their focus clearly	do not define scene or their, focus clearly; may not even maintain focus on 1 specific scene
Paragraph hints at topic sentence: gives some direction or speculation.	smoothly introduce general direction for paragraph without revealing answer; each implies an interesting and appropriate question that coheres with the "setup."	Introduces direction for paragraph but may: -awkwardly and abruptly "ask a question" -not be totally coherent with the setup details just given -may slip into deductive"topic sentence," giving away answer too soon.	Probably introduce an "off-track" question, missing a more obviously compelling direction. Awkwardly or abruptly introduced	Digress or take an obviously off-track or unclear direction that does not cohere with the setup.
Finds and interprets text from the passage:	Quotes all show important evidence relevant to main idea, incorporated smoothly and grammatically	one or two quotes may be off-topic of conclusion, but all are incorporated smoothly and grammatically	Unclear how quotes were chosen; may be incoherent; Text is incorporated awkwardly. Makes only obvious or redundant interpretations	Unclear focus in choice of quotes; Text is incorporated awkwardly or even ungrammatically. Makes little interpretation.
Interprets each passage clearly	Paragraph conclusions make reasonable and interesting claims: follow from what is set up, and connect passage to the most compelling plausible focus without vagueness.	Paragraph conclusions make a reasonable and interesting claims that follow from what is set up, but may ignore an obvious, potentially more compelling focus.	Paragraph conclusions make a reasonable but fairly obvious claim: focus more on the scene itself, rather than larger possible significance	Paragraph conclusions may not make any interpretation at all; possibly off-topic, incoherent with paragraph, or unsupported.
Concludes with an explanation of important idea, introduced fluently.	Paragraphs conclude by synthesizing an answer (based on ALL evidence) to "what does this passage contribute to the passage as a whole?"	only partially synthesizes answer; may be redundant of other points. Little significance of passage as a whole.	Offers little explanation, mostly redundant or summarizing; may lack generalizing lead-in transition.	No real conclusion, unclear that paragraph reaches some interpretation at all.

---

[1] **"Interpretini".** *n. plural:* student-created cute pet name for self-contained, paragraph-length explanations that respond to a passage of text to answer: "what happens in each passage and how's it important?" Technically, such a format would be called "paragraph-length inductive responses-to-literature explications." I agree-- "interpretini" sounds much better.

What makes Inductive and deductive paragraphs different?

Traditional "Deductive" form:	"Inductive" paragraph form:
Begins with complete topic sentence (a claim of S—>Tell)	Begins with concrete summary, the "show" part of the thesis—> "here's what we're looking at" We need to front load this so that it's clear what we're analyzing
Body of paragraph is all s—> t, supporting the Topic sentence. Each meme in effect will have all the supporting details woven into the body; this makes sense, since we have already stated EXACTLY what we're proving: the reader will now be looking at everything as support for that idea, so we need the show and tell, step by step, to follow how they're supporting the main idea.	Body tends to "compress" the supporting content into fewer sentences, emphasizing the interpretations of the details, rather than a strict S—>T alternation. (This makes sense, too--we've already covered more of the "what happens" at the beginning, so it would be redundant to revisit too many concrete details.)
Ends with explanation of last detail--needs no conclusion, as we've already been told at the outset exactly what "the point" is	Signals ending with a generalizing transition, and MAY End with a secondary, "if this is true, then it's really important that…". This creates that stronger "conclusiveness," that we've led up to, or arrived at, the main idea.

A few interpretini that live in our models archive:

To Kill a Mockingbird: Jail

A few mixed To Kill a Mockingbird examples

A Few Grapes of Wrath 11th-grade examples

Pride and Prejudice: Some senior examples
Notice that in a good "inductive" paragraph, you need not even know the passage (as a reader of the essay) to follow the essayist's argument: They tell you what happens, interpret some details, then conclude some important OVERALL interpretation.

The one skill you NEED to make good inductive Paragraphs:

You MUST transition to signal that you're moving from analysis to generalization/conclusion, or the reader won't be able to tell that it's a conclusion.

Consider these few examples:

Throughout the passage, Hawthorne thus highlights...

All these <actions*> in effect seem to hint that...
or "descriptions" or "characterizations" or "choices" or "Symbols" or whatever they actually are...

In effect, it's as if Hawthorne is…

By highlighting how <big idea>, H could be suggesting that ultimately <still bigger idea>.

Overall, the passage seems to argue*that
*or "suggest," or "highlight," or "hint, or "contend," or….

Essentially, the whole scene seems to….If true, implies Hawthorne...

Consider how each of these transitions you just looked at does two things to tell us that we're concluding:
- Indicate that we're commenting somehow *on* what was just said [note words like "this" "these" "throughout" or "thus."
- Show movement towards *general* ideas: "Most importantly," "significantly," "essentially," "overall," "ultimately," etc.

Appendix: a former 9th-grade class used the following checklist for self/peer-editing. I've left these notes here:

✓Start with your main idea (your conclusion): It needs to sound like a smart, human, reasonable answer to the question—"So what did you think was the point of this whole scene, once you looked at it?"

> ✓ Consider the ¾ rule: does it have a "How," "under what conditions," and/or "so what?" to go with whatever you said about the characte)
> ✓ Make sure that you fill in any VS (ENPs or UQs!) Don't be vague with your main idea!

✓Look at the beginning: does your opening sentence hint (it must hint at something, as it's intentionally vague, after all) at the same question that your conclusion seems to answer ?

> STYLE note:
> To get rid of vague statements, look for ways to turn noun phrases into ACTIONS:
> "relationship between humans and animals regarding their fears"-->(bad)
> "The way that humans, perhaps too much like animals, react too much out of fear in their environment" (much more specific: what they DO!)

✓Look at all your transitions:

> Style rules about transitions:
>
> > +DO you use Ordinal AND types of logical transitions? Mix both!
> > -DON't ever put transitions ONLY at the beginnings of sentence. Vary their placement.
> > -Don't rely only on "1-word" tr's (like "also" or "Further," or "later," etc.)

✓NOW, at last (we've got the beginning, the general flow of the middle, and a good end) look at the memes:

> ✓Make sure that every idea that you TELL us is connected to or contains TEXT or concrete detail! (otherwise it's an UA)!
>
> ✓Make sure that you never create two memes in order with the same structure and order of show and tell! (esp. Show → T, show → Tel!)

✓ Watch out for the dreaded "Reverse S ← Tell"! Remember that words like "Because, since, when, given that, as, etc, ALWAYS go with the details, never with your interpretation.

✓ Be careful with using NR Adj clauses as "Dangling" interpretations:
*"Pi says that "blah, blah, blah" when he's all blah blah blah, **WHICH SHOWS THAT…"***
(how does whatever comes first SHOW that?": add this to your list of other shortcut-formulas-to-avoid , like "this shows that:" these just don't connect your interpretation specifically enough to be useful.)

✓ *Remember the PART V fluency rules:*

- *no chop: vary your sentence beginnings*
- *don't waste a simple sentence on just one action*
- *vary S → Tell order*
- *Vary Tr placement*
- *Vary sentence structure*
- *Trs (ordinal with new examples, logical throughout, other adverbs and connectors) in every sentence*

✓ Finally, check your arguments for logic in each meme:

//	Evidence (show) disconnected from interpretation (tell)
→ **//** →	Evidence doesn't specifically cohere with claim; may not match logically
←	Reversed S← T: instead of interpreting quote, you say "why it happens" without evidence.
→ **?** *(so…)*	Quote needs more interpretation:

if this is true, what does it → *show…*
(don't simply repeat detail, but infer some significance from it!)