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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

The English as a Second Language (ESL) program in the Department of English at The Ohio State University was originally set up during World War II as a temporary measure to help refugees from Germany and occupied countries.¹ It grew enormously over the years. In Autumn Quarter, 1959 a program was instituted for a core of eight students. (See Appendix A.) In 1975 it served 99 students. In Autumn Quarter, 1980 it served 418 students. This great boost in enrollment was due to several factors. First, there was a substantial increase in the number of foreign students on campus. (From 450 in 1959, to 1,040 in Autumn Quarter, 1975, to 1,853 in Autumn Quarter, 1980.)² The second factor was the closer coordination between the Graduate School, the International Student and Scholar Services Office, the Office of Foreign Student Admissions, the English Department,

¹ Personal interview with Betty Sutton, Assistant Professor, Department of English, The Ohio State University, 8 February 1982.

² Telephone interview with Dorothy Brickman, Director, International Student and Scholar Services Office, The Ohio State University, 11 February 1982.
and various other campus departments, colleges and offices. A third influence was the changes in the directorship of the ESL program. In Fall, 1975 a new director took over the ESL program. She made it a full-time job for the first time and committed a great deal of her energy to revitalizing, upgrading, and professionalizing the program. All these influences combined to result in a larger number of foreign students taking ESL classes each year.

The ESL program was designed to help improve the writing of foreign and immigrant students who had been accepted to the University and, presumably, had some command of the English language. In most cases, a score of 500 on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) or of 80 on the Michigan Test of English as a Foreign Language was required. When the students arrived on campus they took a recent form of the Michigan test and a diagnostic composition test. The composition was read by at least two ESL teachers, and the decision was made as to whether the student needed the ESL course(s) or not, and if so, which one(s). At the time of this study there were four courses taught.

1. 106

This course was on the intermediate level, with an emphasis on sentence-level writing in the beginning of the quarter, building to paragraph-writing by the end of the quarter.
2. 107

This was an advanced-intermediate level course, with an emphasis on paragraph-level writing in the beginning of the quarter, building to essay-writing by the end of the quarter.

3. 108.01

This course was designed for undergraduates, who had to go on to take Freshman Composition with American classmates. The course, therefore, was akin to the Freshman Composition course, with essays written in different modes, on subjects reflecting the undergraduate students' personal interests and experiences.

4. 108.02

This course was designed for graduate students. It tried to help prepare students to write theses and dissertations. Emphasis was on scientific, technical, and other scholarly writing.

If a student placed into 106, then he had to successfully complete 106, 107, and 108, or three quarters of ESL (if he passed each course the first time through—most, but not all, did). If he placed into 107, then he had to complete 107 and 108, or two quarters of ESL. If he placed into 108, then he had to complete one quarter of ESL. This was part of his regular coursework, though it did not satisfy hour-requirements for graduate degrees. Undergraduates received
credit for ESL courses; graduate students did not. Every quarter, the majority of incoming foreign students were required to sign up for ESL courses. These courses were compulsory, but some students would put off enrolling in ESL for a quarter or two, and some would try to "slip by"

The rapid expansion of the ESL program, especially in recent years, caused many problems. I will mention only a few of them. Finding staff members to teach the increased number of sections (from 9 in Fall, 1975 to 30 in Fall, 1980) was at times problematic. Orienting new teachers was at one time done informally, by word of mouth. When there were only two or three new teachers a year, that was an acceptable method. When there were eight or ten new teachers at a time, more formal measures needed to be taken. The same was true of course coordinators. All of a sudden there were seven or eight teachers teaching a course, most of them for the first time. Program-wide information dispersal also became formalized. In the course of a few years we went, in the words of one staff member, from an oral culture to a written one.

In the course of writing down the rules, or guidelines, of the program, many came to be examined more closely than ever before. One example of this was the tutorial system. In the tutorial system, each ESL teacher had a meeting in her office once a week with each student. These meetings were either with one student or with two at a time. When
two students were scheduled to share a tutorial time with a teacher, that was called a double tutorial.

Because of the university's budget problems, tutorials came to appear more and more expensive. They reduced the number of students a teacher could have in a class, and the number of classes a teacher could teach. As an illustration of this, in the Writing Workshop, a unit of the Section of Basic Writing in the English Department (along with ESL) the Instructors were required to teach thirteen classes a year, compared with the seven a year that ESL Instructors taught. The enrollment was higher in those classes, too. That was the difference that tutorials made.

As a member of the ESL staff, I had double tutorials in Autumn Quarter, 1980 and Winter Quarter, 1981, and I was fairly satisfied with that system. Then in Spring Quarter, 1981, I taught Freshman Composition, a course without tutorials, and I had the chance to observe first-hand the difference that not holding tutorials makes in a writing course. Also, I did a project for a research course about an ESL class. As part of the project I observed a double tutorial for half the quarter. The observer stance gave me new insights into the tutorial system and raised many new questions in my mind about it.

At the beginning of Summer Quarter, 1981, I was convinced of the value of tutorials and wanted to do this project partly to help convince administrators not to drop the tuto-
rial part of the ESL program. My other reason was a sincere
interest in and curiosity about the tutorials, in which I
invested hundreds and hundreds of hours of my life.

In the following section I will present the problem I re-
searched as a result of this wish to understand the tutori-
als better.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

The major goal of this study was to describe the tutorial
system, which I saw as the first step in an evaluative pro-
cess. I examined in particular the following aspects of the
tutorial system.

1. How does the tutorial system fit into the ESL pro-
gram? What special problems does it cause?

2. How could teaching effectiveness be improved?

3. How much similarity is there in what happens in tuto-
rials with different teachers and students?

4. What special problems do ESL students have, aside
   from language?

5. What do students think about tutorials?

6. What do teachers think about tutorials?

7. How do students and teachers see the connection be-
tween tutorials and classes?

8. How could the tutorial system be improved?
1.3 **RATIONALE OF THE METHODOLOGY**

The questions that interested me about tutorials, listed in the previous section, were of two sorts. First, I wanted to know about the perceptions of students and teachers. Secondly I wanted to get an overall picture of how the system of tutorials worked, where it intersected with classroom teaching and where it did not, and how it fit into the ESL program as a whole.

The methodology that seemed to be most likely to help answer those questions was a qualitative one. In order to find out what students and teachers thought, I asked them. Along with that, I observed them in tutorials, and gathered more information about their opinions in that way. To find out how the tutorial system connected with class, I attended tutorials and classes, asked teachers and students what they thought, and drew my own conclusions based on an analysis of the data gathered.

The reason for choosing the methods I did was that the focus of the study was not something static, but something in flux. Student attitudes were not formed one day and then frozen forever; they took shape over the course of the quarter, as the students experienced tutorials. The same was true for teacher attitudes. If I had gone to tutorials one time, or even a few times, I would have missed observing the little daily occurrences that all together created the perceptions of the people involved. In the same way, the rela-
tionship of tutorials and classes changed over time. It was important to an understanding of the issues that I see how the students and teachers interacted in classes and in tutorials, on a daily basis. The number of hours spent in the field added a richness to the data not achievable with quantitative methods.

In the next section I will discuss the contributions this study can make to the field of ESL.

1.4 IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

It is hoped that the findings of this study will be of use, first of all, to the ESL program at OSU. The picture painted in this thesis of the tutorial system is one that has not been seen before. Certain measures are called for and recommendations are made for the improvement of the tutorial system and the ESL program as a whole. Secondly, questions are raised in this thesis that may be applicable to ESL programs elsewhere, whether they have tutorial systems or not. The problems that the ESL staff were having may face others at other institutions. The issues of program unity, student input, articulation of goals, emotionally disturbed students, and teacher observation probably are not unique to OSU. Those in other places may profit from understanding these issues and their interaction at OSU.
1.5 SUMMARY OF CHAPTER I

In Chapter I I have described the setting of my study, the ESL program at OSU. I explained how the program began, what kinds of students it served, what courses were offered, and how the students were placed in those courses. I introduced the tutorial system and explained how I became interested in doing a research study about it. I then stated my reasons for choosing a qualitative methodology. Finally I discussed the implications of my study for the ESL program at OSU and for the field of ESL at large.

In the last section of this chapter I will give a brief description of the contents of the rest of the thesis.

1.6 OVERVIEW OF CHAPTERS II THROUGH V

In Chapter II I will present a discussion of the relevant literature in the field of ESL, giving special attention to the subjects of qualitative research in ESL, and research on tutorials in ESL. In Chapter III a detailed explanation of the methodology used in this study is given. Chapter IV presents the results of an analysis of the data gathered in the study. Chapter V contains the findings, including some conclusions and some recommendations for change. I end Chapter V with some suggestions for future research and some final comments about the study.
Chapter II

LITERATURE ON ESL

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I will discuss the place of qualitative research in ESL. Then I will look at some of the qualitative research that has been done in the broader field of second language acquisition. Finally I will survey the literature about tutorials in ESL. First a look at what researchers think ESL research is doing, and what it should be doing.

2.2 QUALITATIVE RESEARCH IN ESL

2.2.0.1 Current Research Theory

The first thing that needs to be said about qualitative research in ESL is that not much has been done to date. This may be partly due to the great influence of linguistics on the field of ESL. ESL theory is based on linguistics and linguistically-oriented research. Educational research has made comparatively few contributions to the knowledge base. As William Norris noted in 1971:

...the contributions of pedagogy to second-language teaching seem to be ill-defined. ESL specialists turn to linguistics for information about language, to psycholinguistics for information about how language is learned, and extrapolate from both to explain how language is taught.
There appears to be little systematic effort, however, to draw on pedagogical theories in shaping second language courses and second language teaching methods.³

Donald Bowen, writing two years later, in 1972, warns of the necessity for avoiding common problems in ESL research, including "novelty for the sake of novelty, innovation for its own sake; the Hawthorne effect; overenthusiasm and too favorable publicity; and trivia." He calls for small-scale, short-term research projects and cautions that it is necessary to control extraneous variables in the research designs.⁴ In an article that appeared in 1978, Stephen Cooper surveyed 200 theses and dissertations completed since 1975. The results of that survey indicated that very few studies done were experimental.⁵ He divided the research into two methodological categories, labelled "creative-prescriptive" and "descriptive-analytic." Each of those categories contained about half of the studies done in that period.

---


⁴ Donald J. Bowen, "TESOL Research for the Classroom," TESOL Quarterly, 6 (1972), 351-361.

The creative-prescriptive approach included studies that:

- offer advice for teaching special groups (e.g., Israeli adults) or handling special problems (e.g., culture shock);
- develop units, courses, curricula, programs, and workshops for teachers;
- prepare or adapt materials for teaching (including workbooks, collections of songs or stories, etc.);
- develop and prescribe teaching techniques (e.g., field trips, exercises, learning activity packages);
- prescribe applications of audio-visual aids and technology;
- adapt theory for classroom practice or propose methods;
- recommend changes in existing practices or curricula.

The descriptive-analytic approach included studies that:

- analyze problems of ESL learners according to age, language, or cultural background;
- study language acquisition;
- describe and analyze theory;
- apply methods of analysis;
- study attitudes and motivation;
- describe and analyze teaching situations, practices and programs;
- provide bibliographies;
- do case studies and field work.  

Cooper called for more empirical research. He also called for the establishment of research priorities in the field of ESL.  

---

6 Cooper, pp. 134-135.

7 Cooper, p. 137.
It is significant that field work was only a small sub-category of studies in Cooper's list. It is also significant that Cooper did not make any comment on this methodology at all, other than to admit that it existed. The major trend he felt ESL research should follow was toward more experimental studies.

Not everyone in the field is totally in favor of moving in the direction of a more quantitative research methodological standard. In 1972 Leon Jakobovits recommended that less emphasis be placed on basic research and more on applied research. He makes the distinction between basic and applied research as follows:

A clear distinction is to be made between "basic research" and "applied research." Basic research is esoteric, specialized, and inaccessible to the teacher. To be a consumer of it, to be dependent upon it means to be subjected to the authority and expertise of others. It means giving up the freedom of choice in favor of faith and trust in the technocrat who very often is far removed from the realities and needs of the classroom, and in any event, is not the person who is held "accountable." Basic research is a method of arriving at general theories about basic human behavior. It deals with laws and principles in the abstract; its observations are made under "controlled" conditions, which involved the creation of artificial, non-natural settings. When basic research is carried out in naturalistic settings, its artificiality is not thereby reduced. Only some of the relevant factors are investigated at any point and these are reduced to operational definitions by observation techniques that must meet certain restrictive standards (e.g., observability, objectivity, elementarism). The problems that are researched are dictated by these standards not by the real needs for greater practical know-how. Their claimed relevance in teaching problems turns out to be false.
Applied research refers to the systematic investigation of a particular social setting. It is a tool used for gaining additional knowledge about the total configuration of interacting factors in the setting. The setting and the problem are defined independently of the techniques available through applied research. They are given by personal judgment, folk theory, ordinary experience, intuitive understanding. The systematic techniques made available by applied research are plugged in wherever possible or desirable. The overall integrity of the social setting, as given in the ordinary understanding of it, is never compromised, altered or reduced to the demands of "scientific" standards. In a sense, it is the scientific standards that are being compromised for the sake of maintaining the full meaning of the problem being investigated. 8

Jakobovits' ideas of applied research fit the qualitative mode nicely. Another proponent of a new look at research methodology in the field is Robert Ochsner. Instead of coming down definitely on the side of either quantitative or qualitative methodologists, he suggests that researchers adopt "research bilingualism." 9 So there is some evidence that a shift may be beginning in the standard research model in the field.

Having looked at the current thoughts about ESL methodology, I will now examine the kind of qualitative research that has been done.


2.2.0.2 Some Qualitative Studies

One field closely related to ESL that has been influenced by qualitative research is bilingual education. A few examples follow. One qualitative research project was done by the Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (SWRL) during the period 1969-1974. The purpose of the study was to evaluate a program designed to help Spanish-speaking children to succeed in regular classrooms. The instruments used were pre-test--post-test, questionnaires, and classroom observation.\(^\text{10}\) Another study done in 1977 by Margaret Bruck and Jeffrey Shultz claimed to be the first bilingual classroom study to use videotape equipment. Videotapes and ethnographic methods were used for program evaluation purposes.\(^\text{11}\) A quantitative analysis of the data was done to answer the question "How much of each language was used?" A qualitative analysis was done to answer the question "Under which conditions was each language used?" The authors call for more research like this.\(^\text{12}\)

---


12 Bruck, p. 68.
In another study of a bilingual program, Luis Moll made use of ethnographic methods. He videotaped students taking part in reading lessons in both languages and analyzed the communicative activities of the lessons. A study of the language proficiency of six bilingual children was done using qualitative methods. The children's language was recorded on audio and videotapes, and field notes were taken. The researchers claimed that current language tests only measure a fraction of a child's language proficiency. They recommended discourse analysis as a method of language measurement and as a way of assessing communicative competence. This sort of analysis, they asserted, "provides insight into what children are capable of, rather than what they are incapable of, doing linguistically."

The qualitative research that has been done in the field is not all related to classrooms. For example, Woodrow Clark did a study of EFL learning in Colombia in two places: a barrio and a major institution of learning. The methods he used were participant observation and survey data. His findings were related to the political infrastructure of the educational system in Colombia, but not too

---


relevant for ESL classroom teachers. Another example is the research project done by Bruce Downing and Sharon Dwyer. They did a case study of the language contact of one Hmong family. The methods they used included interviewing, observation of class and outings, and cassette recordings. Their data had some implications for classroom practice, in that they questioned the assumption in ESL that the students will get reinforcement for what they learn in class from the outside world.

There is some indication of an increasing interest in qualitative methods in recent years. Dwight Strawn did a study of teacher feedback to ESL students, in which he attempted to describe the types of feedback given to students and the different ways in which the teachers made use of the feedback types. He videotaped classes and then had the tapes transcribed and coded according to a coding system. Another doctoral dissertation that made use at least in part of qualitative methods was that of Mary Hui-Tze Wong. She did a study of anxiety in the ESL classroom, using packaged

15 Woodrow W. Clark, Jr., Learning: Intellectual Imperialism from Barrio to Nation (ERIC ED 118 708).

16 Bruce T. Downing and Sharon Dwyer, Hmong Refugees in an American City: A Case Study in Language Contact (ERIC ED 206 202).

inventories to assess the students' ideas about their own anxiety level and to compare them with the teachers' perceptions of the students' anxiety levels. She also did a series of interviews with six of the students. She found the interviews to be the most helpful tool to get the information she wanted.  

Next we will look at the literature on tutorials in ESL.

2.3 TUTORIALS IN ESL

Although there has been a great call for individualized instruction in the literature in recent years, the subject of a tutorial component of an ESL program is one that is not often mentioned in the literature. As Marcia Woodward writes, "Tutorial instruction had been all but ignored in the literature on teaching English as a Second language." Woodward thinks that that is unfortunate, since tutorials can "eliminate some of the most frustrating problems in this type of course and can speed up the learning process significantly." Woodward mentions several benefits that tutorials have for students. Among them are receiving more of the


20 Woodward, p. 158.
teacher's time and attention, help at the exact level of the individual student, and a clearer understanding of the errors in the paper through verbal presentation by the teacher. Benefits for the teacher include a reduction in the amount of time spent marking papers, finding out the reason the student is making the error, and a deeper insight into the language-learning process.²¹

There are three distinctions that Woodward draws between group teaching and the kind of one-to-one that takes place in tutorials. First, the tutorial teacher needs to read and mark papers in advance, marking selectively. Second, the teacher should "take the role of a friendly co-editor who is working together with the student to produce a good final draft." And third, the teacher needs to be able to deal with individual personalities more in tutorials than in class.²²

Another supporter of tutorials is Muriel Harris, although she cautions that tutoring is not necessarily effective. It depends on what happens in tutorials. But, as Harris says, "The potential for using tutoring as a teaching tool is certainly enormous."²³ Harris goes on to discuss the three

²¹ Woodward, pp. 159-160.
roles a tutor should play in tutorials. These are coach, commentator, and counselor. As a coach, the tutor tells the student what needs improvement, but does not do the work for the student. The commentator tells the student when he is doing well and also gives a larger perspective to the student. The counselor tries to "look for sources of error beyond the surface manifestation of what is on the page, and to probe attitudes and motivations which may hinder the student's learning."24

In a research study done in 1981, Ruth Maddox looked at the effects of one-to-one tutoring on student writing ability and on student writing anxiety. The methods used to gather data included a writing anxiety measure, an objective writing test, paragraphs and essays, a questionnaire, and tape recordings of the conferences. She found that students improved in their writing ability, but not in their feelings about their writing. Maddox also noted that "the time instructors devote to providing instruction may prove to be prohibitive."25

Michael Foley reports on a tutorial program in practice at the English Language Institute at the The Church College of Hawaii. The teachers of the tutorials are English and

---

24 Harris, pp. 64-65.

TESL undergraduate majors. The students go to class in the morning and come to the tutorials in the afternoon. They enter any time during the open hours and take materials from folders. Then they do a short writing assignment. When they have finished, they return to the tutorial room and a staff member goes over it with them. "The staffer marks errors and asks the students to make corrections." Grammar and vocabulary are checked thoroughly. Foley is enthusiastic about the success of the program. He says that almost 50% of the college enrollment is foreign students. Some of these students resent having to take ESL classes. "The tutorial has injected some revitalizing enthusiasm against this resentment."  

Carol Fraser also recommends correcting student papers in a personal interview. The teacher corrects student errors while the student is present. The first time only the global or text errors are pointed out. These are errors such as topic sentences, unity, and coherence. Then the student rewrites the composition. At the second interview the teacher focuses on sentence and word-level errors.  

---

26 Michael E. Foley, "ELI Tutorial," TESL Reporter, 6 (Spring 1973), 1, 8.

27 Carol Fraser, Teaching Writing Skills: Focus on the Process, (ERIC ED 200 044), pp. 1-16.
2.4 SUMMARY

In this chapter I have examined the current status of qualitative research in ESL and the literature on tutorials in ESL. In the next chapter I will describe the methodology used in this research study.
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter I discussed the literature relevant to this study. In this chapter I will turn to the methodology used in this study. The methodology is broken down into the following sections: sample, instruments and techniques, organization and procedures.

3.2 SAMPLE

There were five samples in this study. I observed the first sample over a four-year period, from fall of 1977 through fall of 1981. During these years I was a teacher in the ESL program of the Department of English at The Ohio State University. I received my M.A. in 1977 and came to OSU in the fall. The first year I was a Lecturer; after that I was an Instructor. At the time of the study I was in my late twenties. For four and a half years I taught classes, gave tutorials, discussed issues with my coworkers, students, and administrators, and observed the tutorials of others. This first sample gave me a wide knowledge of the program, enabling me to have a basis of comparison for the observations in other samples. Although this observation was not pre-
planned, it nevertheless was thorough, and I found myself calling on it to make sense of scenes I observed during the summer of 1981. For instance, I would observe an interaction in a class and recall a similar happening in the first sample. In this way I could formulate some hypothesis to explain the interaction I had witnessed and could try to determine whether the hypothesis fit.

The second sample consisted of five ESL classes that I observed for one day only during Winter Quarter, 1981. I was trying to decide on one teacher to observe for the entire Spring Quarter, and so I had asked for the permission of all of the teachers on the staff to observe classes one day. Everyone gave me permission, but my schedule did not allow me to get around to see everyone, and so I visited only five of the classes. As it turned out, one of the teachers, T4, was the one I observed Spring Quarter, and two more of them, T1 and T2, were the teachers I observed Summer Quarter. This initial observation gave me some ideas of the variation of teaching styles, and some insights into what I discovered later on in this study.

The third sample was made up of two 107 classes and one 108.01 class, observed during Spring Quarter, 1981. The first of these, taught by T10, I followed only for two weeks. The second class, taught by T4, I followed throughout the quarter. I attended this class three or four days a week (out of five weekly classes) throughout the quarter,
taking notes and making audiorecordings. I interviewed T4 several times over the quarter, and eight of the eleven students individually. (This was in addition to many casual conversations I had with the eight students.) Furthermore, I observed T4's tutorials with two of her students five times. This observation was particularly valuable to me, as it led me to choose tutorials as a focus of the study of Summer, 1981. Another way in which observing T4's class helped me was that of the eleven students in this 107 class, seven were in one of the two 108.01 classes I observed in Summer Quarter, making my entry into those classes a little bit easier. Those seven students knew me; we had established a certain amount of rapport; they had an idea of what I would be doing in class. Their being at ease with me helped the other students to feel at ease with me.

The third of the classes observed that spring was a 108.01 class, taught by T11. T11 asked me to sit in on the class as a favor to him, so that he could check his own observations against mine. I sat in his class five times, once a week on Friday for five weeks. This observation turned out to be more helpful to me than I had anticipated. I had never taught a 108.01 class, and although I observed two 108.01 classes in Winter Quarter, the spring observation gave me the opportunity to observe a class over a period of time, giving me a more in-depth feeling of what the course was like. Besides that, some of the observations made in
T11's class helped me to check hypotheses made in T4's class, and later on in T1's and T2's classes.

The fourth sample was made up of all the students enrolled in the ESL program in Summer Quarter, 1981. That was by far the largest sample. More will be explained about this sample in the section in which I discuss the student questionnaire.

The fifth sample was made up of two 108.01 classes, observed during Summer Quarter, 1981. Most of the note-taking, audiotaping, and interviewing was done on this sample. All of the videorecording was done on this sample. In the next sections I will give an in-depth description of the teachers, classes and students in this fifth sample.

3.2.1 Teachers

There were two teachers whom I observed closely during Summer Quarter, 1981, T1 and T2. I had also observed both of them teaching one day in Winter Quarter, 1981, as mentioned above. Both T1 and T2 were women in their late twenties. They had both earned M.A.'s in Teaching English as a Second Language. Both had taught at OSU without any problems, and as far as the university was concerned they were both qualified, experienced teachers. T1 was teaching only one section Summer Quarter, since she was also Acting Director. T2 was teaching two sections.
3.2.2 Classes

As mentioned previously, I did a research project in Spring of 1981, during which I observed T4's English 107 class. All but one of the students in the class were undergraduates, and most enrolled in 108.01 in Summer Quarter, 1981. I decided that it would give me a headstart to already have a relationship built up with some of the students, so I chose to follow two 108.01 classes (two for purposes of comparison; three sections were offered that quarter, but it would have diluted the design too much to observe all the classes and tutorials and interview all the students.) I selected to study T1's 108.01 and the earlier of the two sections that T2 was teaching.

3.2.3 Students

In order to give a fuller picture of the classes and tutorials I observed, I will briefly describe each of the students in the two classes I observed. In this way a deeper understanding of the interaction of the students and teachers may be reached.

3.2.3.1 10 a.m. Class (T1)

There were 15 students in T1's class.

1. A1—a 24-year-old man, single, a refugee from Czechoslovakia who had been in the U.S. for two years. He was friendly, polite, and fairly fluent in English.
His reputation, T1 told me later, was that of a student who promised a lot and delivered little. He had taken both 106 and 107 twice. He was outgoing and took an active role in class discussions. He was one of the "Big Three Talkers". He missed class five times during the quarter. His expressed attitudes towards teacher, tutorials, course and program was noncommittal. I suspect that he was actually a little negative about the tutorial, course and program, based on his absences from classes and tutorials and his record of not doing homework. On the teacher evaluation form at the end of the quarter, he was fairly positive about T1.

2. A2--A 21-year old woman from Egypt, single, who had been in the U.S. for one year. She was lovely and was rumored to be from an influential family. Her attendance was extremely spotty. She never came for an interview with me. T1 had several discussions with her about her attendance and homework record. At one point T1 told A2 that her grade would be lowered the next time she broke any of T1's rules. T1 asked A2 to sign a note stating that A2 understood the consequences of her next infraction of the rules. After this scene, A2's performance in class improved. She did not come to class so late again. However, she would frequently come a few minutes late, and
skipped classes as before. She missed one of the three remaining tutorials as well. She did not make any explicit remarks to me or in my hearing about her attitude towards ESL.

3. A3—a 22-year old man from Venezuela, married, with one child, who had been in the U.S. for nine months. His spoken English was good compared to that of the other members of his class. He was overscheduled and extremely pressed for time. He was a conscientious worker, and what he did, he tried to do well. A3 was very positive about T1 and about the tutorials as well. He was less positive about the course and the program.

4. A4—a 20-year old man from Iran, single, who had been in the U.S. for two and a half years. He was fairly quiet all quarter. He sat next to A5 everyday. He was militantly noncommittal about everything connected with ESL. When I asked him, during our interview, to tell me the worst thing about tutorials, he said, "I don't want to talk about that."

5. A5—a 23-year old man from Iran, single, who had been in the U.S. for four years. He was usually quiet in class. His writing and private conversations, both with T1 and with me, revealed a great deal about him. His attitude about T1 was mixed; my feeling was that on a personal level he liked her, but she represented
the ESL program to him, which he had very strong negative feelings about, and so at times he was negative about T1, too. He was very positive about tutorials but very negative about the course.

6. A6—a 33-year old man from Nigeria, married, who had been in the U.S. for six months. His wife and three children had remained in Nigeria. He was one of a group of Nigerians who came to the U.S. in January, 1981 to study in the College of Education. I knew him from having observed him the previous quarter in his 107 class. He, like many of the Nigerian students who came in the group, sometimes seemed to demonstrate a greater unfamiliarity with American culture than even we ESL teachers were used to dealing with. I sometimes had the feeling that A6 was teasing me, because his responses to questions were so different from what I had expected.

For example, A6 was answering a questionnaire about tutorials. He was responding to the question, "How could tutorials be improved?" His response:

How could tutorial be improved is a big question which needs great attention not only from the Students; but also from the teachers; University and the government. Actually, tutorial hour is usually out of class time, where by both teachers and students are tired and susposed to rest. In this sense they should be encouraged by giving them either coke or tea for refreshment so that they can think fully and logically upon what they are going to discuss.
In this case, I had expected a serious, thoughtful answer, especially after A6's opening sentence. What I got was a request for refreshments. It may be that A6 considered a cup of tea the most important improvement to be made in tutorials, but it was definitely not the sort of improvement I had in mind when I asked the question. His expressed attitude towards the teacher and tutorials was very positive. His expressed attitude towards the course and program were also positive, although less so.

7. A7—a 21-year old man, single, a refugee from the Soviet Union who had been in the U.S. for one and a half years and lived with his family. He was working full-time and was pressed for time. He was usually quiet in class. He also often came to class late. T1 spoke to him about it, and after this conversation his promptness improved. He still came to class late occasionally, but neither so frequently nor so late. It was interesting to see the contrast in reaction to T1's attendance rules between A2 and A7. After T1's conversation with A2, A2 did not come to class late so often. Of the following eight classes, A2 came to class late only twice; however, she was absent four times. After T1's conversation with A7, he managed to come to class either on time or within the first few minutes of class. He was not absent at all. A7
was positive about T1, tutorials, the course, and the program.

8. A8—a 20-year-old Vietnamese refugee, single, who had been in the U.S. for six years (since the fall of South Vietnam in 1975), living with his family. He had graduated from an Ohio high school. He rarely uttered a sound in class, yet when approached individually he was friendly and quite talkative. His English was fluent, but full of grammar errors. He worked hard and was enthusiastic about the course, yet did not improve much. Both T1 and I liked him a great deal and felt sorry for him. T1 said he was nice, but his tutorials were discouraging. On a questionnaire, A8 was asked why he had chosen to study at OSU. He wrote:

I go to OSU because it is a good University. Otherwise, OSU is near my living headquarter. Besides that, my financial is poor. I can not pay tuition out of State. As you know, a quote which I am always remember, "Home sweet Home."

A8 was extremely positive about T1 and the tutorials and was positive about the course and the program, too.

9. A9—a 22-year-old man from Nigeria, single, who had been in the U.S. for six months. He was not one of the big talkers, but was vocal enough. His plan, af-
ter completing his education here, was to return to
Nigeria, work for his state for a while, and then go
to work in his father's company. A9 expressed a po-
sitive attitude toward T1, tutorials, class, and the
program.

10. A10—a 23-year old man from Mauritania, single, who
had been in the U.S. for six six months. He was vo-
cal. On the first day he established himself as one
of the "Big Three Talkers"—A1, A70, and A11. A10
was extremely positive about T1 and about tutorials.
He was positive about the class, and so-so about the
program.

11. A11—a 22-year old man from Nigeria, single, who had
been in the U.S. for six months. He was also quite
vocal, and he, A10 and A1 carried the class many a
time. I knew him from having observed his 107 class.
He was friendly and exceedingly interested in my re-
search. As with A6, I wondered if A11 was joking.
He would go off on tangents in class discussions.
Not infrequently, the other students in the class
would laugh at him. He took an active interest in
my research and was a "super-volunteer." He would
sit next to me often and start conversations with me
about subjects completely unrelated to the class. He
asked a lot of questions about my study. He even
showed up at my office one day in Fall Quarter, 1981,
because he thought I wanted to see him. (I did not.)
A11 was positive about T1 and tutorials, noncommittal about the class and the program.

12. A12—a 19-year old man from Iran, single, who had been in the U.S. for three and a half years. I knew him from his 107 class. He was friendly and nice. He was the most Americanized of the group. His spoken English was great, although his written work demonstrated a need for the course. He did not take the course seriously and dropped it halfway through the quarter.

13. A13—a 28-year old man from Nigeria, single, who had been in the U.S. for six months. He seemed more attuned to American culture than most of the other Nigerian students. I did not notice as many instances of miscommunication with him as I did with the others. His attitude toward T1 and the tutorials was positive; toward the class and the program it was noncommittal.

14. A14—a 22-year old woman from Hong Kong, single, who had been in the U.S. for three years. She was quiet and usually sat in the far corner of the room, although occasionally she would sit near me. A14 was positive about T1 and the tutorials and noncommittal about the course and the program.
15. A15—a 19-year old male from Mexico, single, who had been in the U.S. for one and a half years. He was an example of the Latin-American stereotypical man. He projected supreme self-confidence. In our first interview he told me that he was "very good friends" with X, a Professor in the College of Education at OSU, and that he would be glad to intercede for me if I wanted to ask any questions. (I thanked him politely for his offer, trying very hard to keep a straight face, but never took him up on it.)

A15 was extremely positive about T1. This was at least partly due to his bad experience the previous quarter. A15 had been in T4's class the first two days of Spring Quarter, but the class had been divided and A15 had been sent to another 107 class taught by T12.

At the beginning of the fourth week of the Spring Quarter, A15 entered T4's class after the bell had rung and the other students had left. He did not pay much attention to me, as I was packing up my recorder and other gear, getting ready to walk back to the ESL offices. At first I did not pay much attention to him either. He complained to T4 about his new 107 class. He said that he was not learning anything. He said, "I don't want to make trouble." At that point I started to pay attention to the conversation.
A15 said that he did not want to get T12 in trouble, but he wanted something done. Exactly what he wanted done was unclear to me. He said that he was taking twenty-one hours and he did not have time to waste on the class. But did he want to drop or to transfer? I was not sure. T4 told him she would think it over and that he should call her the next day.

After he left, T4 and I walked back to the ESL offices together, and she told me that she was not sure if she had done the right thing or not. She thought she should have told him to talk to the director of the program. However, she was the coordinator of the 107 classes that quarter, so she felt some responsibility. She said, "I'd like to help T12 out; he's just getting started." When I asked her what she thought A15 wanted her to do, she said that this was just between us. That was all the information I could get out of her. She later told me that she had talked with the director herself, and that the situation was taken care of. A15 did not join T4's class; nor did he drop. It was not until my interview with A15 during Summer Quarter that I discovered what he had been so unhappy about.

A15 had had bad luck for the last two quarters in his teachers in ESL. The first quarter, Winter,
his teacher, T3, got sick after the first month. A15, along with all the other students in T3's classes, had a different substitute teacher in each tutorial. In Spring Quarter, A15 had T12, a new teacher. According to A15, who could not wait to tell me about it in his interview, T12 was a homosexual who was interested in A15 sexually. A15 did not reciprocate T12's feelings and also did not like the way the other students were teasing him about the teacher's ideas about him. So A15 had tried to get back into T4's class. A15's attitude toward T1, tutorials and the course was extremely positive; toward the program in general it was negative, because of his bad experiences in the two previous courses.

During a typical class day, T1 would enter close to 10 o'clock. She would chat with a few students, take care of administrative matters, and talk to students who came up to her to give her their homework, or to explain why they were not giving her their homework. When the bell rang, or within two or three minutes after that, she would begin class. Sometimes she had the students get into groups; on other days, she passed out handouts and made them the topic of a group discussion. The chief talkers were A1, A10, and A11. Often during the flow of discussion, either A1 or A11 would ask some question or make some remark on a tangential subject. If A1 started, A11 tended to leap in on the other
side; if A11 started, A13 kept in on the other side: they were typically opponents. A10 sided sometimes with one and sometimes with another. Many times other students got drawn into the discussion, including A3, A7, A9, A13, and A15. A2, A4, A5, A6, A8, A12, and A14 rarely spoke unless explicitly called on to do so. As the quarter wore on, A6 and A8 would occasionally volunteer a short answer. T1 tried to get the students to interact both with her and with each other. She asked many open-ended questions, such as "What do you think?" "How could this topic sentence be improved?"

For a summary of the student population of T1's 10 o'clock class see Table 1, p. 47.

3.2.3.2 1 p.m. Class (T2)

There were 15 students in T2’s class, too.

1. B1—a 37-year old woman from Nigeria, married, who had been in the U.S. for six months. Her husband and three children had remained in Nigeria. She was a strong person, and relatively vocal in class. She was friendly. Her expressed attitude toward T2, the class, and the program was noncommittal. Her attitude toward tutorials was more positive.

2. B2—a 24-year old man from Nigeria, single, who had been in the U.S. for six months. He was extremely quiet. He usually sat next to B1. His expressed attitude toward T2, tutorials, class, and the program was noncommittal.
3. B3—a 30-year old man from Nigeria, married, who had been in the U.S. for six months. His wife and four children had remained at home in Nigeria. He was one of the students that I had known in the previous quarter. He had been friendly in the spring, but he was less so during the summer. This may have been due to his close association with B9, who was hostile, not especially to me, but to everything connected with the ESL program. B3 was polite throughout the quarter, but not so outgoing as before. His expressed attitude toward T2, class, and the program was noncommittal. He was more positive about tutorials.

4. B4—a 35-year old man from Nigeria, married, who had been in the U.S. for six months. His wife and six children had remained in Nigeria. He had a hard time adjusting to life at OSU, more so than most of the other Nigerian students I knew of who had come as part of the same group. For one thing, he was older than most of them. He had more children than the others. And he did not especially want to come to the U.S. On his data sheet, in answer to a question about his reasons for coming to the U.S. to study, he wrote: "It wasn't my decision but the decision of my country and their arrangement with OSU." He had several run-ins with T2. His expressed attitude toward
T2, tutorials, the class, and the program was extremely negative.

5. B5—a 19-year old woman from the Philippines, single, who had been in the U.S. for two years. She was pretty and friendly, although a little shy, and so I was mildly surprised one day when I approached her outside and began talking to her, and she gave no sign of recognition. It turned out that she had an identical twin sister. She did not say much at all in class. She felt bad about making mistakes, and was intimidated by T2. In an interview with her she told me that the worst thing about tutorials was when the teacher looked at her and said, "[B5], what's wrong with you?!" By her tone she indicated that T2 was implying that she was stupid. She sat in front, usually near B6, with whom she had taken other classes. Her expressed attitude toward T2 was negative; about the class and the program she was non-committal. She was more positive about the tutorials.

6. B6—a 21-year old man from Iran, single, who had been in the U.S. for 3 years. He was friendly enough, and polite in class, but did not like the class. He was absent a lot. When I talked to him before class one day he said that he did not do his homework, and that he did not believe in doing English homework. In our
interview he expressed his dissatisfaction with the ESL program. He said that most of the people were asleep in class. He said, "If tutorials were optional, no one would go, because they're boring, they don't help. Tutorials are more helpful than class, but not as helpful as they sound." His expressed attitude toward T2, tutorials, class, and the program was extremely negative.

7. B7—a 21-year old man from Syria, single, who had been in the U.S. for two and a half years. He was polite and extremely quiet in class. During his last tutorial, he thought I was videotaping and he let loose with some criticism of T2's class. (Unfortunately, I was not taping, and by the time I realized the significance of what I was hearing, it was over.) His expressed attitude toward T2 was negative; toward the tutorials, the class and the program his attitude was noncommittal.

8. B8—a 21-year old man from the United Arab Emirates, single, who had been in the U.S. for 2 years. I had known him the previous quarter, and so we started off on a cordial basis, which continued throughout the quarter. He, like B7, was extremely quiet in class. B8 had also been comparatively quiet in his 107 class, but he would occasionally volunteer to answer a question in 107, something he rarely did in 108.
His expressed attitude toward tutorials was positive; about everything else he was noncommittal.

9. B9--a 27-year old man from Nigeria, married, who had been in the U.S. for six months. His wife and a baby daughter were at home in Nigeria. T2 considered him "the troublemaker." He definitely began the quarter with a negative attitude, and he did not change his mind.

The first class day, before T2 entered the room, B9 started talking to me. He did not know who I was, although it was certainly not a secret, as several of the people in the class did know me. He told me that he hated English, and that it was a big joke, and that he did as little as possible for the classes. (This was all volunteered, I did not ask him.) He would have continued, but B3, who was sitting on my other side, told B9 that I was not a student, as B9 had supposed, but a researcher. B9 glared at me, and shut up. That was the first and last bit of information that B9 willingly gave me.

His actions toward me seemed to highlight his general hostility toward the program. He would refuse to make appointments with me, or when he made them, would break them. I had to ask him several times to turn in the data sheet and other forms I asked the students to fill out. After our interview,
he started to ask me personal questions about my life, and when he found out that I had a daughter in a childcare center, he told me his opinion of mothers who put their children in childcare centers (not favorable). I grew to dislike him as the quarter went on. He made it clear on the first day of class, to T2 as well as to me, that he did not want to be in the class, and so I can understand why T2 gave him the label she did. His was the most openly negative attitude of any of the students I observed in both classes. He did not like T2, tutorials, the class, or the program.

10. B10—a 22-year old man from Yemen, single, who had been in the U.S. for two years. He had been in the 107 class I had observed Spring Quarter, 1981, and so I knew him a little. Like B8, he was friendly, but we did not talk much. He was quiet in class. His attitude toward T2, tutorials, class and the program was noncommittal.

11. B11—a 21-year old man from Iran, single, who had been in the U.S. for two years. I also knew him from the previous quarter. He was fairly quiet in class. He had been more vocal in the previous quarter. He told me in an interview that he was not happy about the class. His expressed attitude toward T2 and the class was negative. He was more positive about tutorials and noncommittal about the program.
12. B12—a 27-year old man from Greece, single, who had been in the U.S. for three years. He and T2 had a personality conflict, as the following example demonstrates. On July 7, 1981, B12 wanted to ask a question.

B12: I have a problem [an introduction to his question]...
T2: And everyone else does, too.
B12: [Asked some question about the dividing line between being specific and being uninteresting and too dry.]

B12 was quite negative about T2. He was negative about the class and the program, too. Nevertheless, he was positive about tutorials.

13. B13—a 24-year old man from Nigeria, single, who had been in the U.S. for six months. He was quiet in class. On his data sheet he wrote:

My presence here in the U.S. and at O.S.U. is not my choice or decision. It is a contract signed between the O.S.U. and my state government, that's the Bauchi State Government of Nigeria. Nevertheless, my being is not against my wish.

He tended to sit by himself in class. His attitude toward T2, tutorials, the class and the program was negative.

14. B14—a 22-year old man from Iran, single, who had been in the U.S. for two and a half years. B14 was
an extremely friendly and outgoing person. He took a
more active part in the class than anyone else. He
was the student who was most positive about T2. B14
told me that he liked T2 a lot better than his 107
teacher. B14 told me in an interview that T2 was
more sensitive than his previous teacher, and that
she spent more time and thought on students and had a
smiling face. B14's expressed attitude toward T2,
tutorials, class, and the program was positive.

15. B15—a 23-year old man from Malaysia, single, who had
been in the U.S. for six months. He was extremely
guilty. The best way to describe his attitude is to
say that he appeared sullen. He never spoke in
class, but in an interview he expressed some dissatis-
faction with the class. I felt that there was a
lot of negative evidence here. In class he always
sat in the far back corner, as far away from T2 and
the other students as possible.

During a typical class, T2 entered close to 1 p.m. She
would organize her notes before class, and if a student ini-
tiated a discussion on any subject, usually homework, she
would enter into the discussion. She would usually distrib-
ute a set of sample paragraphs to the students. She would
lecture on the lesson of the day and then ask the students
to read the handouts. They would be asked to make some
notes on the paragraph, for example to find the topic sen-
tence, or to underline the examples the author used. After about five minutes she would call on students to supply answers to her questions. She gave many explicit instructions to her students about what they were supposed to be doing at any given time in class. For example, "Write this down." "Memorize these." "Remember these." "Make a list of these gerunds." When a student asked a question or made a comment not directly related to the point of the lesson, she said, "We'll talk about that later." There were no "Big Talkers" in this class. B9 would occasionally make a negative comment about some point 12 was trying to make, but this lessened as the quarter went on. B12 asked information questions in the beginning of the quarter, but this also lessened as the quarter went on. B14 was the one who volunteered to answer the questions the most, and he would occasionally ask a question about a sentence being considered, or a vocabulary item in one of the sentences. B1 would also volunteer to answer a question sometimes. The rest of the students were quiet most of the time. The least vocal students in the class were B2, B7, B8, B13, and B15. They rarely spoke unless directly called on to do so, and then only very briefly. T2 did not seem too concerned with getting the less vocal students to participate more in class.

For a summary of the student population of the 1 p.m. class, see Table 1, below.
TABLE 1
Students in Sample 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>13/2</td>
<td>13/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Single</td>
<td>2/13</td>
<td>4/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages</td>
<td>19-33</td>
<td>19-37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stay in U.S.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 mos. - 1 yr.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1 yr.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 INSTRUMENTS AND TECHNIQUES

Six instruments and techniques were used in this study. They were: observation, audiostreaming, videorecording, interviewing, questionnaire, and introspection.

3.3.1 Observation

I observed samples one, two, three, and five, described above. By observation I mean that I was bodily present, awake, alert, trying to take in everything around me and make sense out of it, as advised by Morris Zelditch. "The field worker directly observes and also participates in the sense that he has durable social relations in the social
system under investigation."

I was in class nearly every-
day, talking to the students before and after, trying to es-

establish and continue friendly relations with them. I also

had friendly relations with T1 and T2. I sat in class among

the students, taking notes. When I ran into some of the

students on campus, I would stop to chat with them. Some of

them, notably A5 and B12, talked to me about personal mat-
ters, an indication that they trusted me to a certain de-
gree.

3.3.2 *Tape Recorder*

Starting with the third time I attended the classes, July

1, I brought my tape recorder with me. In the 10 o'clock

class it did not cause me too many problems, but in the 1

o'clock class the room was so big that my small recorder
could not pick up everybody's voices well. I had to decide
each day whom I wanted to record. I always wanted to get T2
on tape, to be able to follow the thread of the conversation
in class (since she was usually the only one talking, or at
most, it was a dialog with her and another student), and
this meant that I never sat in the back to pick up the com-
ments of B15 or B9. (See Figure 4, p. 66.) In any case,
the tape recorder freed me from the onerous burden of trying

---

to write down everything I heard, and allowed me to look around me and think about what was going on.

During the formal interviews I did with the students, several of the Nigerian students in the 1 o'clock class told me that there was someone in the class who thought that I was going to use the tapes to make fun of the accents of the students. I assured them that that was not the case and explained to them again the purpose of the study and the purpose of the tape recorder; nevertheless, I discontinued bringing the recorder. This discontinuation allowed me a little more freedom of movement, and I made use of it by sitting in different places in the class.

In addition to classes, I also recorded the tutorials I observed, as well as the student and teacher interviews.

3.3.3 Videorecorder

The videorecorder did not turn out to be as helpful as I had hoped it would be. In the first place, the tapes were so expensive that I had to limit the taping sessions a great deal. Secondly, the equipment (on loan from the English Department) was quite bulky and cumbersome. It took me about a half hour to put it all together before I began taping, and I needed help in moving it around from room to room. In addition, because of the incident of August 8 (which will be described later), I was asked by the police and T1 not to videotape A5's tutorial session as I had planned. This in
effect meant that I could not videotape any of T1's tutorials that morning. Most of the videorecording I did was of T2's tutorials.

3.3.4 Interviews
There were three sets of interviews that I conducted during the summer of 1981. The first set was the student interviews. In addition, I also interviewed the teachers of the two classes I observed, and the other teaching staff that summer. Each of these interviews will be explained separately.

3.3.4.1 Student Interviews
The student interviews were formal, structured interviews. During the fourth week of Summer Quarter, I passed out a ditto sheet, asking the students in both the 10 o'clock and the 1 o'clock classes to sign up for an interview. (See Appendix B.) I had informed them in an earlier handout that I would be asking to interview them. The following Monday, the interviews began. It is interesting to note that in T1's class, all the students signed up for the interview right away, with no further prompting from me, with the exception of A2, who was absent the day the sign up sheet was passed around. In T2's class, five students had to be further prompted to sign up. This could possibly be seen as one more response to subtle messages the teachers were sending the students about how much cooperation to give me.
The interviews were held in a small room off of the English Department office, on the fourth floor of Denney Hall. This location was chosen because it was convenient to the students and to me, but it was not on the fifth floor, with the offices of T1 and T2. I hoped that the students would feel freer to speak openly in this setting than they would have if we had met in my office. I started the interviews by telling the students once again that their responses would be kept confidential. Then I asked each student the following questions, and recorded the responses.

1. How do your previous tutorials compare with the present set-up?
   a) Were they double or single?²⁹
   b) What was the teacher-student relationship like?

2. What is your major problem with the English Language? Is the tutorial helping to deal with this problem?

3. What do you think is the main purpose of the tutorial? Does the tutorial serve other purposes as well?

4. Do you feel free to ask questions in tutorials? How does this compare to your feelings about asking questions in class?

5. Do you think you learn different things in tutorials and in class?

²⁹ In a double tutorial, two students share the same time slot with the teacher. In a single tutorial, the student has a private conference with the teacher.
6. Do you think tutorials should be graded?

7. What sort of preparation do you make for tutorials?
   What sort of preparation do you think your teacher makes for tutorials?

8. What sort of improvements can you suggest for the tutorial system?

9. What are the best and worst aspects of tutorials?

10. How much interconnection do you see between what happens in class and what happens in tutorials?

The interview session was scheduled to last 30 minutes. Most took about that long. Several had to be ended because the next person had arrived.

Of the fifteen students in T2's class, I interviewed everyone; two students, B6 and B9, made appointments with me which they failed to keep, but I caught them on their way into class the next day and made new appointments with them, which they kept. Of the fifteen students in T1's class, I interviewed 12. A12 had already dropped out by then, and A2 was not around enough for me to catch her. One student, A7, failed to show up for his appointment, but later rescheduled and did come to be interviewed. A6 did not come for an interview. All interviews were conducted during the fifth week of the quarter.
3.3.4.2 Teacher Interviews

I conducted many interviews with T1 and T2 during the course of the quarter. They were all informal. I would usually approach one of them with a list of questions, either written down or not, and just start asking. These interviews took place either in person at Denney Hall, or sometimes over the telephone.

3.3.4.3 ESL Staff Interviews

In addition to interviewing T1 and T2, I also interviewed the other teachers on the ESL staff. The staff interviews were conducted at various times from the fifth through the tenth week of Summer Quarter, whenever I could manage to find a time convenient both for me and for the busy teacher. These interviews were held in the same little room in which I interviewed the students. I asked the teachers the same questions I asked the students. The only difference was that I asked them from the teacher's point of view. So, for instance, instead of asking if they thought that they learned different things in tutorials, I asked if they thought the students learned different things in tutorials.

Of the nine teachers teaching that quarter, I interviewed five: T1, T2, T3, T4, and T5. I informally interviewed the other four teachers on the subject of tutorials, but did not have the opportunity to schedule them for a formal interview during that hectic quarter.
3.3.5 Questionnaires

During the fourth week of Summer Quarter, I passed out an announcement to all the teachers, telling them that I wanted to give their students a questionnaire, and asking for their opinion about the idea. (See Appendix C.) I did not receive any negative responses, and so two days later, still in the fourth week, I passed out the questionnaires with instructions to the teachers about what to do with them. The questionnaire asked the students a series of questions about their perceptions of tutorials. It asked if the students preferred double or single tutorials, and the reasons for the preference. It asked the students to tell what they usually did in tutorials. The questionnaire also asked for the students' opinions of tutorials and for suggestions for possible improvements. (See Appendix D.) I received 136 responses, about 89% of the enrollment that quarter. I used those responses, in part, to help me formulate the questions that I used in the student interviews the following week.

In addition to this student questionnaire, the data from a teacher questionnaire was made available to me. I distributed the questionnaire to the summer staff in the third week of the quarter, asking questions about the teachers' plans for tutorials for the summer. She turned the questionnaires over to me after she had seen them. For a copy of the teacher questionnaire, see Appendix E.
3.3.6 **Introspection**

The sixth research tool I used was introspection. This was perhaps the most valuable tool of all, as it allowed me to draw on five years' teaching experience, four of which I spent at OSU, to make sense of what the other five research tools were producing. For example, anyone could note that T2 moved her class from a room with movable tables and chairs to a room with chairs bolted to the floor. But listening to five years of complaints about chairs that could not be moved by teachers who wanted to do group work, or just wanted to have a more informal atmosphere, allowed me to realize that T2's action was unusual. This realization led me to ask myself questions I might not have thought of otherwise.

3.4 **Organization**

Summer Quarter was divided into eleven weeks, from June 22 to August 31. During each week I emphasized a certain activity, while continuing some of the activities from the previous weeks.

During the first week, I concentrated on getting myself organized, getting the permission of T1 and T2, and entering the classes.

During the second week I observed classes without a tape recorder and just tried to get a feel for what was going on and to build rapport with the students and the teachers.
During the third week the tutorials began. I started to bring my tape recorder to class and I also attended tutorials with my tape recorder.

The fourth week was the week that I distributed the questionnaire to all the students in the PSL program. I also arranged the student interview schedule for the following week at this time. I continued to attend classes and tutorials.

The fifth week I interviewed the students.

The sixth week I sat out. I did not attend classes or tutorials. I worked at home, studying the interviews and the questionnaires, going over all my notes and trying to pick out the major areas of interest that I would pursue for the second half of the quarter.

The seventh week I returned to classes and tutorials. I had planned to conduct the staff interviews that week. In the event, I could only schedule one interview for that week.

The eighth week I attended classes and tutorials. I also had planned to videotape both the 10 o'clock and the 1 o'clock classes one time that week, and eight tutorials, four each of T1 and of T2. I had asked the students during Week 7 for their permission to videotape their tutorials during Week 8. Unfortunately, I was asked not to attend A5's tutorials, and that meant that I could only tape one of the students of T1 whose permission I had asked for. Also,
I taped T1's class, but the class reacted so strongly to the experience that I decided that it was not worth the bother to tape T2's class. A large part of the problem was the fact that I had to budget the videotapes carefully. If the class had been taped consistently over a period of time, then there might have been some value in doing the taping. As things stood, there was not. In T1's class, the students kept smiling into the camera, and looked at it (and at me) a large part of the time.

The ninth week I continued my observation of classes and tutorials. In addition, I concentrated on informal interviewing of the students. I managed several conversations with A5, which I found revealing, and chats with several other students who particularly interested me as well.

During the tenth week I observed classes and tutorials, and in addition I videotaped five of T2's tutorials. The students I videotaped were of necessity chosen according to the schedule for the videotape equipment (on loan from the English Department).

The eleventh week was exam week. During that week, I consulted with T1 and T2 to see how the grading process was going. I also read the students' exam papers and made copies of them. I interviewed both T1 and T2 a final time, asking them general questions about how the quarter had gone. Figure 1 shows how the study was conducted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing class</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing tutorials</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributing questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing T1 and T2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiotaping class</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiotaping tutorials</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videotaping tutorials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Organization of Study
3.5 PROCEDURES

3.5.1 Getting Permission of T1 and T2

After deciding on a topic of research, I needed to ask for the permission of the two 108.01 teachers that quarter, T1 and T2. I decided to explain my study as fully as possible to them, and let them know all that I was planning to do so that we would have a mutual understanding and agreement about the process. I approached T1 first, since she was a friend of mine. I had observed T1's teaching once before, in Winter Quarter, as part of another project. She had been willing and interested in feedback on my observations. She was also interested in my research in general. T1 was also Acting Director during Summer Quarter, 1981. She was planning to move to another country in September, and so had no reason to feel threatened.

In fact, T1 was even more open to my request than I had expected. She was willing to have me come into her class and her tutorials, taking notes, asking questions, making requests, and taping. Her attitude stayed the same throughout the quarter. I discussed some of my questions with her during the quarter, insofar as it was possible to do so without violating the confidence of another informant, and found her input helpful, insightful, and enlightening.

Encouraged by T1's response, I asked T2 for permission to observe her classes and tutorials. T2 and I had known each other for a long time. While not especially close, we
had been friendly, with many friends in common. Our relationship was cordial, with occasional visits and phone calls exchanged. In recent years T2 had become deeply involved in interests that I did not share, and so our relationship never deepened into a true friendship. But we were friendly, and I was surprised at T2's hesitancy when I asked to observe her class. I had observed her class once before in Winter Quarter, but that was only for one day. I had been mildly surprised and displeased with what I had seen in her class that day and was slightly disinclined to use her class for my study, but other considerations, outlined above, made me decide to go ahead with this plan.

T2 tried to discourage me from using her class. I put her cooperation on the basis of a personal favor, and she finally agreed. However, she frequently seemed uncooperative. For one thing, she avoided discussions with me. An example of this is the following dialog, which took place at a 108.01 staff meeting on July 7, 1981. Present were T1, T2, and me. After the meeting, I tried to make an official appointment with T2, having had no luck in catching her by chance. T2 tried mightily to avoid making an appointment.

**Me:** As long as I have you here, I'd like to schedule an appointment with you, if I may, for some time this week. I have some questions to ask you and I can't catch you because you're so busy. You're always in and out. When can we do that?

**T2:** Let me get my tutorial schedule.
Me: I happen to have your tutorial schedule right here.
T2: It's not accurate.
Me: Did you change it today?
T2: I made a couple of changes, yeah.
[Pause]
Me: Would you like to schedule it for Thursday? Are you going to be in on Thursday?
T2: No, not at all.
Me: How about Friday? Would you like to schedule it on Friday?
T2: 
Me: Oh. Friday I'm busy all day, so it really doesn't matter.
T2: Well Wednesday is really hard for me.
Me: Are you ever here at 4 or 5? Wednesday or Friday?
T2: 
Me: How about tomorrow at lunchtime? Do you bring your lunch?
T2: I don't want to schedule anything else for Wednesday, at least not until after class.
Me: Ok.
T2: 
Me: How about 4 o'clock?
T2: No. Can you call me?
Me: When are you home? I don't even know when I can call you.
T2: 
Me: [Laughing] I have to make an appointment to call her on the telephone, that is how busy she is.
T2: Ohhhhh. Well, we could make it Wednesday at 4, but I'm not absolutely sure if I'll make it.
Me: Can you give me a call if you're not going to be here?
T2: Mmm. What about right now [a few minutes before her class].
Me: Right now is ok with me. I thought you were going somewhere.
T2: Well, I was just going to prepare for class.
Me: That's what I was going to do, too. How about 4 on Friday? Are you busy then?
T2: I think I'd rather do it now. How long will it take?
Me: I don't know. I just want to talk to you about some stuff.
As an aside to that incident, we had little time to talk then, as T2 prepared for class while I interviewed her. That was the last time that I tried to set up a formal interview; after that, I just tried to catch her when I could. I did manage to talk to her, but not as much as I could have wished.

T2 refused or "forgot" to do minor (and major) things for me, like giving me her handouts on the days I had to miss class, or lending me students' compositions or other papers for xeroxing before handing them back to the students. By the time the first few weeks of this passive resistance and sometimes what I considered "sabotage" had gone by, I was frustrated, irritated and resentful of T2 and her attitude. The contrast between T1's helpfulness made T2's unreliability even clearer. My feelings only grew stronger as the quarter went on, and they definitely colored my observations. Since I was conscious of this problem, I tried to make conscious efforts to overcome it. At one point I made a written note to myself to look especially for T2's positive attributes during a class. I also made a special effort to cultivate the student who seemed to be most favorable to T2. But it was difficult.
3.5.2 **Entry and Observational Methods**

The first day in the quarter was disorganized, with students wandering in and out, searching for the right classroom. The second class day was set aside for an in-class diagnostic composition. Both T1 and T2 asked me to wait until Friday, the third class meeting, to come to class for the first time. I complied with their wishes.

3.5.2.1 10 O'clock Class

The 10 o'clock class met in 238 Denney Hall. The building was built in 1960. It is glass and steel, five stories high, fairly ugly and a little out of place, as it is juxtaposed with other older buildings of stone and brick. Room 238 is on the second floor. The students' chairs are arranged in rows and bolted to the floor, making groupwork difficult. The windows look north, over a grassy patch on both sides of 18th Street. The section of grass next to the building caused some comment during the summer, as part of it was dug up and an outdoor physical fitness center was installed. Several of the students wrote about that, finding it hard to understand why the university could afford an outdoor fitness center (in Columbus' climate, yet), and could not afford other items the students felt to be more important.

The first time I came to that class I arrived early and sat in the back corner. The students arrived during a
20-minute period. They seated themselves as illustrated in Figure 2. With minor exceptions, they kept the same seats throughout the quarter.

| blackboard |
| T1 |
| table |
| d |
| o |
| o |
| r |
| x A5 A4 x A3 x A2 x A1 |
| o x x x A15 x A7 x x A6 |
| w x x A10 A9 x x x x x |
| s A14 x A13 x x A12 x A11 Me |

Figure 2: Seating Arrangement in 238 Denney Hall
(Note: Me = the researcher, x = vacant seat)

3.5.2.2 1 O'clock Class

The 1 p.m. class met in 338 Denney Hall, the same building that the 10 a.m. class met in. The classroom, however, was set up differently from Room 238. There were no chairs bolted down. Instead, there were three large tables, which were pushed together to form a rectangle. The students were seated around the perimeter of the rectangle, and also in movable chairs along the back and side walls. Figure 3 shows the layout of this room.
T2 told me after class the first day that she did not like the room's setup, that the students sat too closely together, allowing them too much interaction. She moved the class to another room at the sixth class meeting. The new room, 245 Denney Hall, was much larger than 338. There were 52 chairs in rows bolted down to the floor. The students were spread far apart and seemed lost in little islands. Figure 4 shows the layout of that room.\(^{30}\)

\(^{30}\) The seating arrangement shown is not exact. Some of the students would occasionally change seats. I did so myself frequently. Also, there was never a day with perfect attendance. I have indicated the most favored place of each person.
After moving to this room, the change in atmosphere was noticeable. The first few days, in Room 338, there was a lot of talking among the students, and students got together to move the tables together before T2 came in. Students from different countries were conversing in English. In the new classroom students rarely spoke to one another, with the exception of a couple of pairs of students, who would whisper before T2 entered the room.

I was surprised that T2 wanted to change the room, and was even more surprised when I saw the room she changed to.
This action seemed to me to violate a principle of language teaching, that the teacher should try to get the students to use the language as much as possible. T2, by moving the class, went in the other direction, trying to prevent the students from interacting with each other as much as possible.

In summary, I entered both T1's and T2's classes on the third day of the quarter, seated myself at the rear of the room and took notes of the class. In T2's class some of the students talked to me, notably B9, who expressed his negative attitude toward the ESL classroom.

As the quarter wore on, I continued in the same pattern. I would come to class a few minutes early, chat with various students and seat myself, in the 10 o'clock class at the rear, in the 1 o'clock class usually in front. During class I would take notes, and for two weeks in the middle of the quarter I audiotaped as well. At the end of class I would chat with a few students if the opportunity arose, would wait for all the students to leave, and would then exit. In tutorials I came on time or a few minutes early, taking notes and audiotaping for the most part, videotaping some, too. In both classes and tutorials I tried to keep a low profile, not entering into the discussion and trying to avoid answering when the teacher or students asked for my opinion.
At the end of the quarter, I said goodbye to the students and thanked them for their cooperation. I also thanked T1 and T2. I had a long discussion with T1, in which we talked about what had happened during the quarter. I told T1 about some of my findings and conclusions, and I asked for her reaction to them. I did not have this sort of discussion with T2.

3.6 SUMMARY

In Chapter III I have detailed the methodology used in this study. First I have described the five samples, giving special attention to the fifth sample, including the teachers, classes and students of this sample. Then I listed the six instruments and techniques used to gather data and discussed how these instruments and techniques were used. The instruments and techniques included: observation, tape recording, video recording, interviewing, questionnaire, and introspection. Thirdly I presented a chronological outline of the organization of the study. Finally I have described the procedures and observational methods used.

In the next chapter I will present the results gathered from an analysis of the data.
Chapter IV

RESULTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In Chapter III I have described the methodology used in this research study. The sample, instruments and techniques, organization and procedures of the project were explained. In this chapter the results of the study will be presented. The chapter is divided into two main sections. In the first section the relationship of tutorials to the ESL program at OSU will be explored. The implications of problems such as lack of job security, money and status, heavy workload and changes in administration for the tutorial system will be discussed. The second section takes a closer look at tutorials. The tutorial as perceived by all the students in the program, and more specifically the students in T1's and T2's classes will be presented. Staff views on tutorials will be outlined as well. In addition, the results of my observation of the two sets of classes and tutorials will be detailed in this section. We will begin with a look at the broader picture of how the tutorial fit into the ESL program as a whole.
4.2 ESL PROGRAM AND TUTORIALS

4.2.1 Introduction
At the time of this study, tutorials had been a part of the ESL program at OSU for over fifteen years. They were a part of every ESL class, compulsory for teacher and student alike. For this reason, matters that concerned the program, concerned the tutorials. In the following pages I will attempt to show some of the program concerns that influenced the tutorials during the course of this study. Those concerns included dissatisfaction with staff job security, money and status. I will explain how the tutorial workload was distributed, trying to give an idea of the amount of time and effort it required of the teachers. This tutorial load was another source of dissatisfaction during this study. Finally I will touch briefly on the extensive changes that were taking place during this period in the administration of the ESL program. First, I will discuss the job situation in the program.

4.2.2 Job Security, Money and Status
Until Fall Quarter, 1981, most of the staff members of the ESL program were Lecturers. Being a Lecturer meant that a person was hired for one quarter at a time. There was no guarantee that a job would last for more than that one quar-

---

31 Personal interview with Betty Sutton, Assistant Professor, Department of English, The Ohio State University, 8 February 1982.
Lecturers received no benefits, no annual raises, no promotions, no vote in the English Department; in other words, they were not "Regular Faculty." They did not receive a copy of the departmental faculty mailings, even though they might be concerned in the subjects discussed there. In summary, Lecturers were in an ambiguous, tenuous position. By Summer Quarter, 1981, some of the "Temporary Employees" had been around for two to three years. This included T1 and T2. The Lecturers felt a lot of dissatisfaction with their situation, which they expressed to me all through the spring and summer.

In the spring of 1981, the Department announced that five new Instructorships would be opened up in ESL in Fall, 1981. So all through Spring Quarter there was a lot of tension due to interviewing, teacher observation, resume writing, and wondering about who would get the jobs. T1 applied for an Instructorship and got one. (In the event, she decided to leave the university, anyway.) T2 did not apply. By Summer Quarter, everyone knew who had gotten the Instructorships.

4.2.3 Workload

A large part of the conflict in the ESL program had to do with the heavy workload. Until Summer Quarter, 1980, all tutorials were individual. The 106 and 107 tutorials were thirty minutes long, and the 108 tutorials were one hour long. Figure 5 shows the teaching load in that system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Class Hours/Week</th>
<th>Tutorial Hours/Week</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and 107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Teaching Hours/Week in ESL up to Summer, 1980

A 106 or 107 teacher who was teaching full-time (two classes) would have a classload of ten teaching hours a week and a tutorial load of fifteen hours a week (thirty students at one-half hour each), totalling twenty-five teaching hours a week. A 108 teacher who was teaching full-time (two classes) would have a class-load of six teaching hours a week and a tutorial load of twenty hours a week (twenty students at one hour each), totalling twenty-six teaching hours a week. Although the loads look similar, in fact, the 108 load was lighter than the 106 or 107 load. The added flexibility of two non-teaching days in the week made a big difference. This difference was part of the motivation for the discussions of tutorials that took place in Summer Quarter, 1980.

Those discussions were the topic of several staff meetings. During that summer there was a series of staff meetings, convened to discuss the ESL teachers' situation. Most
of those meetings degenerated into gripe sessions. The Director of the program was off-duty Summer Quarter. The Acting Director left half-way through the summer to take another job. The new Acting Director chaired the staff meetings during which the subject of tutorials arose. It was a summer of turmoil and uncertainty in the program. Teachers were concerned about the lack of job security, prestige, and recognition within the English Department. Stipends were low. The workload was higher than that of others in the Department. Several staff members went to the Department, asking for an improvement in working conditions. For one thing, they wanted to be compensated for the work involved in tutorials. The Department's response was to question the importance of the tutorial in the ESL program. The staff felt that the Department was not too concerned about the foreign students' welfare, and that while the ESL teachers could do tutorials if they so chose, they could not expect to be paid for them, or to have that time compensated for in any other way.

Staff members agreed that tutorials were extremely beneficial to the students, and that eliminating them would reduce the quality of instruction significantly. Considerable debate was heard on how to reduce the teachers' load in the way least detrimental to the students. What came out of those meetings was a decision to change the standard tutorial system, to experiment with it. Teachers instituted
double tutorials, or kept single tutorials but reduced the time by 50%.

The new method of tutorial scheduling continued throughout the academic year 1980-81. In Summer Quarter, 1981, the Acting Director requested that each teacher give students a minimum of twenty minutes individually, or forty minutes in pairs. That teaching load is illustrated in Figure 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Class Hours/Week</th>
<th>Tutorial Hours/Week</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Teaching Hours/Week in ESL since Summer, 1980

In that system, if a 106 or 107 teacher followed the rule of twenty minutes per student, the teaching load was ten hours in class and ten hours in tutorial (thirty students at twenty minutes each), totalling twenty teaching hours a week. The 108 teaching load was six hours in class and ten hours of tutorials (thirty students at twenty min-
utes each), totalling sixteen teaching hours a week.32

4.2.4 Change in Administration
Another major source of conflict in the ESL program during 1981 was the change in administration. The person who had been directing the program for the past several years decided to resign. For a while it was not clear who would be replacing her. When the new director was decided upon, staff members were worried about the changes that would be sure to be made in the future. So, in a six-month period, from March 1981 to September 1981, the program was under three different administrators. (The resigning director through Spring Quarter, the acting director--T1--through Summer Quarter, and the new director after that.) It was just one more source of confusion and irritation to the staff.

4.3 TUTORIALS WITH T1 AND T2
4.3.1 Introduction
In this second major section we will turn away from the ESL program as a whole to an examination of the tutorial on the level of two teachers and two sets of students. First I will present the results of a questionnaire asking for student opinion of tutorials that I distributed to all the stu-

32 I am disregarding for now those quarters in which Instructors taught three classes.
dents in the program in Summer Quarter, 1981. Then the
information that I received from conducting the interviews
with T1's and T2's students will be detailed. Along with
those interviews, the staff questionnaires and interviews
will be examined.

Finally in this section, the results gleaned from my
many hours of observation of classes and tutorials will be
outlined. The different ways in which T1 and T2 conducted
their classes and tutorials will be discussed. Coping
strategies used by teachers and students to help them deal
with the burden of tutorials will be listed and explained.
Then the uses that students made of tutorials will be high-
lighted. The problem of students who are loners and what
the tutorial can do for them is the last subject in this
section. Let us now take a look at the student question-
naires.

4.3.2 Student Questionnaires

In Spring Quarter, 1981 I became interested in the tutorial
system. I wanted to know how the students felt about them.
The questionnaire I passed out asked the students in the
program for their opinion about double versus single tutori-
als, as well as for other information. In the following
section I will present the results of the questionnaire.
Table 2 shows the results of the questionnaire about tutori-
als. (For complete text of questionnaire, see Appendix D.)
### TABLE 2

Student Questionnaire Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS AND REPLIES</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires answered</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Course Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.01</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amharic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangla</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolewa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulani</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longuda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical &amp; Physical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College (major undecided)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Academic level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Scholar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer (NA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other ESL courses taken at OSU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tutorial frequency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tutorial length</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 minutes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 minutes - 1 hour</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Double tutorial this quarter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tutorial preference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for preferring double</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can learn from other student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less pressure on each student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More challenging</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good to work in group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can compare work with others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More efficient</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reason</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for preferring single</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on student's own problems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private, comfortable, less embarrass</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time for individual student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T &amp; S know each other better</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More efficient</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people's Eng. problems boring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More chance for oral work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reason</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities in tutorial</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss paper</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher corrects (in general)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher corrects mistakes in paper</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher corrects paper organization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher corrects grammar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher explains mistakes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher shows good points of paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get special assignments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student asks questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About grammar &amp; spelling in paper</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About course content</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About paper (in general)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss non-ESL topics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on oral skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student's opinion of tutorials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistakes clearer than in class</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One on one best teaching method</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because teacher is good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T &amp; S learn more about each other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can ask questions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can discuss student's own problems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can work on oral skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can get paper corrected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can talk with teacher privately</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can discuss non-ESL topics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dislike**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither like nor dislike</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not useful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enjoyable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not boring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tutorial/class connection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or none</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested improvements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better teacher-student relationship</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher needs to prepare</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student needs to prepare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer digressions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional non-ESL content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural discussions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal advice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase tutorial time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make all tutorials double</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make all tutorials single</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow flexible format</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make tutorials optional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omit tutorials altogether</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade tutorials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss student's course performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work more on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More thorough critique of paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study models of good papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use practical examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher should come on time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve refreshments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No improvements needed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Some students listed more than one.

4.3.3 Discussion of Questionnaires

Since M12 dropped the class on 7/15/81, the day the questionnaires were passed out, there were fourteen students remaining in T1's class, and all of them turned in the questionnaire. All of the fifteen students in T2's class turned
in the questionnaire. All together, including the responses from T1's and T2's classes, 136 students turned in the questionnaires. This number was about 89% of the students in the ESL program that quarter.

It is interesting that although T1 only did single tutorials, four of her students answered that they had double tutorials. Their answers were definitely incorrect. One hypothesis to explain this inaccuracy is that they did not understand that the question was asking about that quarter (Summer Quarter) only, not previous quarters. All four of the students who answered incorrectly had in fact had double tutorials in previous quarters. In T2's class, all of the students answered correctly that they had single tutorials that quarter.

As far as the subject of double/single tutorials was concerned, twice as many students expressed a preference for single tutorials as did for double tutorials. In T1's class, four students expressed a preference for double tutorials. All four of them were Nigerian, and there were only the four Nigerian students in the class. Of these four students, three students had had both double and single tutorials, and one had had only single tutorials. The reasons given for liking double tutorials better included the following. First, one student could learn from the other student. Second, working in groups was helpful. As A13 put it, "It is good to share experiences." Third, there was
less pressure on the individual student; he was not "on-the-spot" so much when there were two students. Fourth, there was more of a challenge to improve when there was another student present. Of the fifteen students in T2's class, only two said that they preferred double tutorials. One of the students was B8, from the United Arab Emirates. The other was B4, a Nigerian student.

In contrast to the results from T1's class, four of the six Nigerian students in T2's class expressed a preference for single tutorials. The two students who preferred double gave the following reasons. B8, who had had both double and single tutorials, wrote that in double tutorials, "You will learn from each other and you will avoid making the same mistakes in writing." B4, who had had only single tutorials, wrote that he preferred "to share ideas." Those are almost the exact words used by A13 to express his preference for double tutorials. Of the 136 respondents, only 41 said that they preferred double tutorials. The reasons given most often for this preference for double tutorials were that one could learn from the other student, and that one could compare one's work with that of another student.

Of the three students in T1's class who did not state a preference for either double or single, all three had had both double and single tutorials. Their reason for liking double tutorials was that one student could learn from the other student. Their reasons for liking single tutorials
were that there was less embarrassment and more privacy, and there was more time for the individual student. Only one student in T2's class said that he did not have a preference. B13 did not give any explanation for his answer. Eleven students out of the whole group expressed no preference. For the most part, there was no reason given.

Of the seven students in T1's class who said they preferred single tutorials, five had had both double and single tutorials, and two had had only single tutorials. Their reasons for preferring single tutorials were that the student and teacher could focus on the student's individual problems, the student and teacher could concentrate better and work more efficiently, and that the tutorial was private, more comfortable, and less embarrassing. Of the twelve students in T2's class who said that they preferred single tutorials, eight students, including all four of the Nigerian students who listed a preference for single tutorials, said that single tutorials were more private and less embarrassing. As B5 wrote, "Because the teacher have more time to talk to me and I can ask questions to her without any embarrassment." The other three most frequent responses were that single tutorials were more efficient, focused on the individual's problems, and gave more time to the student. One student, B14, said that the teacher had a chance to get to know the student better in a single tutorial. Of all the students, the most often-mentioned reasons for pre-
ferring single tutorials were that there was more time for the student, it was private and less embarrassing, and there was a focus on the student's own problems. The questionnaire did not ask the students what their previous experience with tutorials had been.

Students listed many different activities that took place in tutorials. By far the most common tutorial activity mentioned had to do with the teacher correcting errors. This could be error in general, in a composition, in grammar or in organization. Students perceived tutorials as a place where the teacher pointed out to them the mistakes they made. B10 said that the teacher corrected his organization. Only one student out of 136 wrote that his teacher showed him the good points in his paper. The second largest group of responses was that students viewed tutorials as a place to ask questions of all kinds. B12 said that he asked questions about the course in general, not only about his composition. B8 said that he asked questions about grammar and spelling. The third largest group of responses, a distant third with eleven responses, was that students viewed tutorials as a place to practice and improve on their oral skills. Two students said that it was their only chance to speak English all day.

Most of the students said that they liked tutorials. Even more students said they thought they were useful. About one-third of the students said they enjoyed tutorials.
Of those students who were favorable to tutorials, the most frequent reasons given were that they could see their mistakes more clearly in tutorials than in class, they could discuss their individual problems, and they could get their work corrected. A10 was very positive about tutorials, because, as he said, he liked his teacher. He wrote, "I believe that the professor is a determinant factor of the student's reaction to the tutorials." Another student said, "From tutorials, I can find what I have done wrong in my composition very directly." Another student said, "Tutorials are the best aspect of these English courses."

Only three students admitted to disliking tutorials. One student was vehement in his dislike. His response:

I hate it! No use at all. Frankly waste of time. They treat us (foreigners) as sources of financing their TA's. (English Dept.) They are terrible. They don't teach anything.

Another two students were less extreme in their feelings. One said, "I dislike it. But is helpful." The other said, "They are boring because I waste my time for waiting. But I think it's useful."

Three students said they neither liked nor disliked tutorials. One of them was B6. He said, "Unfortunately, I don't have any choice to like or dislike tutorials. Some of the tutorials are useful but not all. and the ones which are usefull are very boring."
As far as the connection between classes and tutorials was concerned, almost half of the students said that they saw a strong connection between tutorials and classes. Another quarter of the students saw some connection. Twelve of the students said they saw little or no connection between classes and tutorials.

The students had many, many suggestions for improving the tutorial system. By far the most frequent suggestion was to increase the tutorial time. There were requests for more work on oral skills as well. One student wrote:

> Usually ESL pays too much attention to composition and doesn’t pay attention to speaking and listening. My major is physics and we never have opportunity to write composition. I usually have hard time (in class and teaching hours) in speaking and listening. The class should give importance in speaking and listening.

Another student wrote, "I think foreign students want to know how to express in English. The most important point which must be corrected rapidly is that ESL program should influence to speak and to express rather than to write." There were several suggestions for changes in the format of the tutorial, ranging from making them all double or all single, to making them optional, to giving credit for them. Fifteen students said that no improvements were necessary. Thirty-nine of the students did not answer. B6 was one of these. His response was, "No comment. (by the way would you listen)."
Having examined the results of the student questionnaire, we will now look at the student interview data, to see how the two sets of results compare.

4.3.4 **Student Interviews**

The student interviews were conducted during the fifth week of the quarter, one week after the questionnaires were given out and collected. During the interview I asked the students to answer a list of questions. The questions concerned the student perception of the purposes of tutorials, the differences between tutorials and classes, the relative freedom to ask questions in tutorials and classes, and possible improvements to make in the tutorial system. I also asked the students to tell me the best and worst things about tutorials. For a complete list of the questions I asked during the interviews, see pp. 51-52. Table 3 below shows the results of the student interviews about tutorials.
### TABLE 3

Student Interview Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of interviews

|           | 12 | 100 | 15 | 100 |

#### Purposes of Tutorial*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asking questions (in general)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can ask without others hearing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can ask more questions (time)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can ask about other topics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not waste class time with some questions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about mistakes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps student to improve composition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time for individual student</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get help with own English problems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help student understand America</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to teacher about non-ESL topics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher can explain corrections</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T &amp; S get to know each other better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Difference between tutorial and class*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class is general, tutorial specific to student's own errors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In tutorial, can learn what student thinks he needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can understand class material better in tutorial since can ask specific</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (one response each)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Do you feel freer to ask questions in tutorial?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Should tutorials be graded?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Improvements*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make all tutorials double</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make all tutorials single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase tutorial time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Give credit 2 17 1 7
Make more flexible, optional 1 8 5 33
Work on oral skills 3 25 3 20
Teacher should
Give specific suggestions for improvement 2 17
Be willing to talk about non-ESL topics 1 8 3 20
Show student how to relate tutorial skills to other work
Be more patient 1 8 1 7
Be better 1 8 1 7
Explain, not just correct 1 8 2 13
Try to understand student needs better 1 8 3 20
Make students feel comfortable 2 17 11 7
Be careful with red ink on papers 1 8 1 7
Should look for grammar, not content 2 17
Should correct all the mistakes
Not allow digressions 1 8 1 7
Program needs more unity, coherence 1 8 5 33
No improvements 1 8
Other (one response each) 5 42 5 33

Best Aspects*
Improvement in understanding grammar 2 17 1 7
Improvement in writing 2 17 3 20
Tutorials are fun 2 17
Can talk individually about Engl. problems 5 42 3 20
Can understand teacher's corrections better 2 17 1 7
The errors are corrected 1 8 3 20
Get to know teacher better 1 8 2 13
Doing well on paper (not many mistakes) 1 3 20
Other (one response each) 2 17 4 27

Worst Aspects*
Not enough time 2 17 1 7
Do not learn as much as expected 1 8 1 7
Sometimes a waste of time 1 8 5 33
Compulsory 1 8 1 7
Time-consuming 1 8 1 7
Scheduled time is inconvenient 1 8 2 13
Having to wait
Teacher's inability to explain well
Feeling embarrassed
Other (one response each) 3 25 4 27
NA 3 25 2 13
4.3.5 Discussion of Student Interviews

Of the fourteen students in T1's class at the time of the interviews, twelve came for an interview. A2 and A6 did not. Of the fifteen students in T2's class, I interviewed all.

The students did not answer the questions "neatly," as can be seen in Table 3. Some of the answers to the question about the purposes of tutorials seem to be describing the differences between tutorials and classes. So there is some overlap in the information.

Most of the students made mention of asking questions as one of the activities in tutorials. Some of them said that they could ask questions without other students hearing them. That helped them to worry less about asking something stupid. Some students said that in tutorials there was more time for questions than in class. Some students said that in tutorials they could ask about other topics, not only the lesson of the day.

The largest response about questions was that students were concerned about wasting time of others in the class with their questions. A3 said that he asked questions in class only about what the class was discussing. The other questions he left until the tutorial. He gave me an example of a question he asked in a tutorial. He wanted to know the
difference between "He work." and "He does work." The class
topic at that time was sentence-fragments. A14 said, "Class
doesn't teach all things, but we have to learn all things.
So in tutorial, mistakes that we make, teacher will tell me
what problem is." A7 said, "In tutorial I learn what I
think is important for me."

Aside from dealing with questions, the next most common
purpose of tutorials seen by students was correcting errors.
A few students mentioned that in tutorials they learned
about America and Americans, and that they used the tutori-
als to talk about non-ESL topics. In T2's class, five stu-
dents said that a purpose of the tutorial was for the teach-
er and student to get to know each other better.

As far as the differences between classes and tutorials
are concerned, students saw the greatest difference in the
fact that in class the discussion was tied to the book or
syllabus, and in tutorials the lesson concerned the stu-
dent's individual problems. B7 said, "Tutorial is practice
for what you learn in class. In class we learn many things,
but how to use rules correctly you learn in tutorial." B11
said, "In tutorial I learn about my mistakes, in class about
everybody's mistakes. Sometimes I don't make them [others'
mistakes]." A13 said, "If all but one student doesn't un-
derstand something in class, it's OK. In tutorial, each one
has to understand." A3 said, "Sometimes you make mistakes
that they don't teach in course, so you can learn things in
tutorial that you'll never learn in a course."
By far the majority of students felt freer to ask questions of all kinds in tutorials than in class. A8 said that he was embarrassed to ask in class. "Maybe it's a stupid question, and they [students] will laugh." The three students who said that they did not feel freer in tutorials than in class had very different reasons for their feelings. In T1's class, A11 said that he liked to ask his questions in class because he liked to share his views with others. (When I observed him in class in Spring Quarter, he told me that he sometimes asked a question in class that he knew the answer to, if he thought that there might be someone in class who did not know the answer.) In T2's class, B14 and B9 also said that they did not feel freer to ask questions in tutorials than in class. B14 said that he asked about the same number of questions in classes and in tutorials, but the nature of the questions differed. He did not ask questions in class that might not interest the other members of the class. B9 said that he asked more questions in class, because in tutorials he just wanted "to finish and go away." He also said that according to his experience, "Women teachers don't like to answer questions."

Students were fairly evenly divided on the issue of whether tutorials should be graded separately or not. Those who favored the idea thought that they should get some credit for all the work of the tutorial. Those who opposed the idea thought that grading would inhibit their asking ques-
tions and learning. B9 did not want tutorials to be graded because he missed "as many as possible."

The students had many suggestions for improvements. Most of them were mentioned only by two to four of the students. The suggestion mentioned most often was a problem of unity. The next two common suggestions were that the teacher be willing to talk about non-ESL topics, and that the teacher try to understand the student's needs better. B72 said, "The teacher should ask me what I feel I need. She didn't ask, just told me, 'You made this mistake. Don't make it again, because this is the rule.'" Students also commented on improving student-teacher relationships. B14 said, "I like to get close to my teachers, to get to know them better." B2 said, "The student-teacher relationship is very important in tutorial to help the student progress." B3 said, "Teachers should meet to share experiences with students." A13 said that "Teachers need to help students see that they [teachers] are not trying to laugh at them [students]."

There were some comments on the need to work on improving teaching skills. Some students did not like teacher digressions. Several students suggested that the tutorial system be made more flexible. They did not like the fact that it was compulsory. B6 said, "If tutorials were optional, no one would go, because they're boring, they don't help." A3 thought that the students should be told about
tutorials in advance at orientation and in the catalog, so they could be considered in making up the class schedule.

The best aspects of the tutorials for the students were that they could talk to the teacher individually about their English problems, that they could improve their writing, and that they could get their papers corrected. Other comments included the improvement in understanding grammar, understanding the teacher's comments better than just seeing them on the paper, and getting to know the teacher better. Three students commented that the best part of tutorials was when their papers did not have many errors. Two of T1's students thought the best part was that tutorials were fun. B6, in T2's class, said that the best part of tutorials was "the last minute."

The worst part of tutorials for six students was that they were sometimes a waste of time. A15, in T1's class, said that this was the worst part, but added that he was referring to the two previous quarters, and not the present quarter with T1. The other comments included the fact that the tutorial was not long enough, that the scheduled time was inconvenient, and that sometimes the tutorial was unpleasant for the student when his paper contained a lot of errors and the student was embarrassed. B5 said that the worst part of the tutorial was when the teacher said, "[B5], what's wrong with you?!" According to B13, the worst part of tutorials was when his paper had a lot of errors. He said,
"I hate to see a lot of red marks all over my paper." B6 said that the worst part of tutorials was "the first minute." B6 also did not like women teachers. He said that they "try too hard and blow it. They're too strict." Two of T2's students thought the worst part was when the teacher did not explain well. B11 said, "You ask a question and she can't explain well and you still don't understand."

Now that we have heard the student point of view about tutorials, we will turn to the data from the ESL staff questionnaires and interviews.

4.3.6 ESL Staff Questionnaires

The ESL Staff Questionnaires were distributed by T1 during the third week of the quarter. All nine staff members turned them in, including T1 and T2. The questionnaire solicited information about typical tutorial procedures of the teachers. For a copy of this questionnaire, see Appendix E.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires answered</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single or double tutorial this quarter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of time per student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25 minutes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer (NA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly tutorial</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read papers in advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark papers in advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss grammar and content separately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give students rewrites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give grammar assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take notes on tutorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to keep records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.7 Discussion of Staff Questionnaires

Most of the teachers planned to have double tutorials that quarter. The two teachers who planned to use both double and single, intended to conduct double tutorials for the majority of their students, and single tutorials only in special cases. For one teacher, weak students would be given single tutorials and twice as much time. For the other, if students came late, the one who came first would ipso facto have a single tutorial, but no extra time. The time allocated to each student varied from fifteen to thirty minutes. All of the teachers planned to conduct tutorials weekly. Six of the teachers said that they read and marked the papers in advance. Six said that they discussed grammar and content separately. Only three teachers gave students rewrite assignments; only two gave grammar assignments in tutorial. Five teachers said that they took notes on tutorials, and six said that they planned to keep a record of what their tutorials were like that summer.
Having seen the results of the ESL staff questionnaires, we will now take a closer look at what went on in T1's and T2's classes and tutorials during the study.

4.3.8 Observation

As part of this study, I sat in on T1's and T2's classes and tutorials on a regular basis. Those observation periods helped me to understand the relationship between tutorials, classes, teacher and student. To get a clearer picture of the tutorial system, we will first take a look at the different ways in which T1 and T2 handled their teaching, both in class and in tutorials.

4.3.8.1 Differences in T1's and T2's Classes and Tutorials

4.3.8.1.1 Classes

Ostensibly, T1 and T2 were teaching the same course. They had both taught 108 before. They were using the same textbooks and the same syllabus. (See Appendix I.) There were only the two of them teaching the course in Summer Quarter 1981, so there was the opportunity for close coordination. They both felt they were doing about the same things in class.

In fact, they did almost nothing the same. Their midterm and final topics were the same, since they had to be according to the program policy. That was the extent of the similarity. In other ways their classes and tutorials were
different. As far as tone went, T1's class was relaxed and easy-going, and the students were more vocal. T2's class, as mentioned above, was more formal, and the students did not talk much. Teaching techniques were different, too. While T1 encouraged discussion, T2 relied heavily on lecture. The following is a clear example of the differences in their classes.

Both T1 and T2 tried to teach their students the concept of unity on the same day, right at the beginning of the quarter.

1. T1.

My field notes of T1's class went like this:

10:03 T1 enters. She takes care of administrative matters.
10:04 T1 asks class members to introduce themselves.
10:14 T1 talks about the textbook. There are some questions from the students about the book. T1 answers.
10:16 T1 tells the students about the objectives of the course.
10:17 A1 asks about the placement exam. He has several questions. T1 answers.
10:21 A1 starts to ask questions about the placement exam, too.
10:25 T1 says she will talk about this on a more individual basis.
10:26 T1 passes out a handout with three paragraphs and asks the students to read the first paragraph. [See below.]
More so than at other meals, there is a wide difference in the tastes of breakfast eaters. Some people, teenage girls especially, prefer to eat no breakfast at all--or perhaps a piece of toast and a glass of milk. Many women take only a cup of coffee and a glass of juice, while others eat a hearty morning meal and watch their calories at lunch. Men generally like a more substantial meal, sometimes two or three courses, including fruit, cereal, and eggs. Unlike other meals, breakfast may, and should, be ordered "to order." That is, if Susie truly dislikes eggs she may be given a dish of cold cereal, but Father should not therefore be deprived of his scrambled eggs and bacon.

10:29 T1 starts talking about this paragraph. She asks, "What is a paragraph in your mind?" She gets a response from four students in the class. She sums them up and restates them for the class.

10:34 T1 asks, "Is paragraph 4 good?" A11 and A1 get into a debate about the first sentence in the paragraph. Other students get into the debate. T1 pulls them back to discussing the topic sentence and what the paragraph is about. This discussion of the paragraph continues until the bell rings. The students finally get close to the point that there is a lack of unity. The last two sentences do not belong in the paragraph.

10:48 T1 tells them the word "unity," and explains the problem with the paragraph. She gives them their homework assignment, to read the rest of the handout, while the students are picking up their books.

In this report we can see a typical lesson in T1's class. She gave the students a chance to find the point themselves. A few students, mostly A11, A1, and A10, the "Big Three Talkers," took over the conversation, and they got off the point that the
teacher wanted to discuss. T1 let them stay off the point for a while and then called them back to the topic of the day. This usually occurred right at the end. The teacher's "message" was given to the students at the last minute. A lot of information was crammed in at the end.

2. T2.

Now we will examine T2's lesson on unity. The following are my field notes of that lesson.

12:57 T2 enters the room. The students get quiet. T2 begins to write a list of coherence devices on the board.
1:00 T2 makes announcements.
1:06 T2 hands out three paragraphs. She lectures to the students about unity and coherence.
1:14 T2 reads off a definition of coherence. (It appears that most students are unable to write it down completely.)
1:15 T2 asks, "How do you supply coherence? Any ideas?" There is not much response, as the students are busy writing down the list of coherence devices from the board.
1:20 T2 tells the students, "I expect you to be able to tell me about these coherence devices in your compositions. To point them out to me in tutorial." (This lecture is in the abstract, without many examples.)
1:23 A student asks about spatial organization. He wants to know what it is. T2 tells him it has to do with location. No examples are given.
1:24 T2 puts on the board diagrams of different language rhetorical patterns. B1 objects to this classification system. T2 tells her to believe what she [T2] is saying. She knows what she is talking about.
1:28 T2 tells the students to look at the first paragraph. [See below.] She reads through this paragraph fast. When she is done, she asks, "Comments?" There is no response. She asks, "Is it unified?" No answer.
Examine the following paragraphs for unity and coherence.

A. Why I plan to live on campus

There are several reasons why I plan to live on campus next year. My home is far away and my mother worries about me constantly when I'm in an apartment. When I'm off campus, I tend to get involved in many outside activities and my studies suffer. Something seems to keep happening to my car, and I have missed more eight o'clock classes than I have made. Next year life should be different for me when I live on campus.

**Is the above paragraph unified? Why? Is it coherent? How could this paragraph be improved? How could it be expanded?**

**Write a possible revision of the above paragraph:**

1:31 T2 asks students to recall the list of coherence devices she put on the board (and then erased).

1:33 T2 tells the students to turn to the next paragraph. [See below.] T2 reads it more slowly. B5 says she likes the paragraph. T2 says, "Read it more critically."

Examine the following short essay for unity and coherence.

B. The City of Toronto

The city of Toronto, Canada is a pleasant place to spend a summer vacation. Upon arriving in Toronto, one sees a remarkably clean city. The streets are not littered with dirt, and Toronto's buildings are in such good condition that even the old ones look new. In some cities, the buildings look like they are falling apart. Other cities are using specially treated steel to build their
skyscrapers. Pittsburgh has one of these buildings. Toronto is also a delight to shoppers. The streets in the shopping district are closed to traffic and lined with shady trees and outdoor cafes to provide the shopper with a pleasant, relaxed atmosphere. Toronto's restaurants also add to the city's appeal. Besides good food, they have a good atmosphere and best of all they have good reasonable prices. Pittsburgh has some nice restaurants too. The people who live and work in Toronto also add to the charm of the city. Because of their diverse cultural backgrounds, they are interesting people, and their warm, friendly personalities make a visitor feel welcome. In conclusion, the cleanliness of the city, the inviting shopping districts, the good restaurants, and the friendly people make Toronto a wonderful place to visit.

**Is this brief essay unified? Coherent? What are the strong and weak points of this essay?**

**Write a brief outline of the above essay:**

1:35 Then T2 tells the students to read the paragraph again, but she talks most of the time they are supposed to be reading, telling the students to ask themselves questions about the coherence.

1:37 T2 starts asking questions about the paragraph. B12 asks a question about the second line in the paragraph. He wants to know why the next two lines are necessary. T2 tells him, "You have to support your ideas." She goes on and on about this, repeating the sentence four times. She says, "You had better get that idea through your heads. If I have to spend the next ten weeks on that idea alone, I will."

1:41 B9 says, "You English teachers are not coherent, either." He goes on about this subject, complaining. T2 responds, "You have to learn to support your ideas."

1:46 T2 says, "Think about unity and coherence. We will be working on this in each composition you write."

1:47 T2 gives the class their homework assignment, which is to revise the first and last paragraphs. [For the third paragraph, see Appendix F.] Class is dismissed.
This class was typical of T2's classes. She came in with notes from which she read. She did not let the class get her off the topic for anything, and she firmly controlled the class.

On July 7, when T1 and T2 met, they were both able to say that they had "covered" unity and coherence. The differences in style and content were even clearer in tutorials than they were in class. Following are examples of one tutorial each of T1 and T2, the first tutorial I videotaped for each teacher.

4.3.8.1.2 Tutorials

1. T1.

On August 11, T1 had a tutorial with A9. The tutorial was scheduled from 9:30 to 10:00 a.m., but actually lasted till 10:05.

9:30 There is a bit of chit-chat to begin with. A9 is not feeling well.

9:31 T1 wrote questions about the student's paper in advance. The first question is "Where's your thesis statement?" [See below for a copy of the student's paper.]

Composition of A9

My father always asked me this. "Do you think owning a car is a luxury my son?" When my answer was possessive then he said now listen to me boy.

First of all, necessity makes owning a car to be a must. One day I may be transferred and carrying our luggage would be an expensive task if we
are to bring a public transport. A car in this case helps a lot.

Next, owning a car is a necessity because one and his family may like to pay visits to relatives and some holiday resorts. Without a car, this could be a difficult job to perform because of the expense.

The most important, is going for shopping. At the end of the month one and his family would like to go for shopping. If there is no means of transport like owning a car, paying for the public bus and getting in and out the loads from the bus are two main problems. The buses are always rushing and sometimes do not bother stopping to carry heavy loads.

Well, my response to his question is still positive. Owning a car is a luxury. One, sitting in the car comfortably and driving to the shopping centre, to the resort or during transfer is a luxury because it is better then walking on foot.

What is more, one has to admit that owning a car itself is a pride. A car standing in front of one's house inserts a sense of pleasure in self. Whatever brings pleasure is considered a luxury. So owning a car is a classical example of luxury.

Last, we consider not only the body of the car but what is connected to the car. The music, television and the phone in a car all make the car. This is a luxury to be considered.

Owing a car is just an enjoyment in the sense that one has first, the pride of possessing a car, has free mobility at any time, and has many means of enjoyment in the car itself.

There are several questions and answers, trying to find the thesis statement in the paper. A9 cannot find it. They look at the paper in sections. T1 asks, "What's this part about?" They spend two or three minutes on this. Then they find the thesis statement. It is in the beginning of the fifth paragraph.

9:34 T1 goes to the next question on the list she has prepared. She gives positive feedback about the organization of the paper.
T1 tells A9 to include more background information in his paper. They discuss this.

The next point on T1's list is a strengthening of the transitions between sections. T1 explains to A9 the difference between a main clause and a subordinate clause, using the example of his transition sentences.

They move to another section of the paper. T1 starts with positive, and then negative feedback. She asks A9 to supply more information in explanation of his ideas.

After A9 explains what he meant to say, T1 shows him how to put it in his paper. There are lots of questions here, such as, "What did you mean here? Why did you choose these three?" A9 does the explaining.

T1 writes A9's assignment on his composition. "For next week, fix these sentences with no generalizations."

T1 gives A9 the paper and says, "I made some grammar comments in the margins." She tells A9 how to do the rewrite.

A9 has some questions for T1. His first question is about the organization of a persuasive essay, about straw-man organization.

After discussing A9's questions, T2 tells A9 that she hopes he will feel better. That concludes this tutorial.

Almost the entire time is spent on organization in this tutorial. T1 directs, but there is a dialog with A9. T1 was well-prepared for this tutorial. But it was not only due to a reaction to the presence of the videotape; she was almost always well-prepared.

2. T2.

On August 10, T2 had a tutorial with B12. The tutorial, scheduled from 4:20 to 4:40 p.m., actually took place from 4:30 to 5:00 p.m.
4:30 T2 did not finish reading B12's paper. She asks him if he wants to proofread it. He says no. T2 starts reading the paper aloud, sentence by sentence.

4:31 T2 tells B12 that he left out a word in a sentence. B12 tells her the word. T2 continues reading.

4:32 T2 says, "I question your use of commas here. Necessary?"

B12: No.

T2: Right.

T2 continues reading aloud.

4:35 There is a short discussion about a dash, is it necessary or not. They decide it is o.k.

4:38 T2 tells B12 not to use one-sentence paragraphs.

4:39 T2 corrects an article error.

4:40 T2 says, "This is not a sentence." They change the punctuation, and the non-sentence is now a sentence.

4:41 T2 continues reading. She corrects a count/non-count error.

4:43 There is a brief interruption from outside. Someone is looking for T8, who has left.

4:44 T2 corrects a missing word.

4:46 There is a brief discussion about a vocabulary item.

4:47 T2 continues reading aloud, sentence by sentence.

4:48 T2 corrects an idiom.

4:49 T2 reads.

4:50 T2 corrects an article error.

4:54 T2 corrects more sentence-level errors.

4:59 T2 says, "A nice paper."

That is the end of the tutorial.

It is important to note that in this tutorial there was no talk about organization whatsoever. This was in contrast to the tutorial of T1 with A9, described above.

There was some evidence of a reaction to the videotape. T2 kept B12 an extra ten minutes, something I did not see her do at other times. Also, T2 was
less sharp, with fewer negative comments than I had noted in other tutorials she had. Excerpts of another tutorial she had with B12 will be given in the following section. Finally, at the end of the tutorial, T2 wrote notes on a little card in an index file, something she did only the first week of the quarter.

4.3.8.1.3 Teacher Control

There was a striking difference in teacher control between T1 and T2. T1 felt comfortable with a far looser control of the class than that which T2 could tolerate. This was demonstrated time and again by field notes. In T1's class, the class was monopolized by the "Big Three Talkers"—A1, A10, and A11. This monopoly was allowed by T1 to continue throughout the quarter. A5 wrote about it in his journal, complaining that he did not have a chance to speak in class. T1 told him to learn to speak without raising his hand. As she told me, "It's their class."

T2 did not allow the students to take control of the classroom or direct the topic of conversation for more than a few minutes at a time, and that rarely.

One way in which T1 did exert more control than T2 was in her attitude towards promptness. When A7 and A2 came to class late, it bothered T1, and she spoke to both of them about it in tutorials. I never heard T2 mention coming to class on time, although there were students in her class who
would frequently come late (e.g., B9). T1 also spoke to A2 about her prolonged and frequent absences. T1 had A2 sign a note at one point in the quarter, indicating that A2 understood that one more absence would result in a lowered grade. In fact, her classwork grade was lowered.

One example of loose control in T1's class occurred on July 15. A1 was having a hard time understanding a certain concept being discussed in class. A10 and A3, on their own initiative, tried to explain it to A1. T1 allowed them to discuss it among themselves for five minutes before directing the class's attention to another topic.

This never happened in T2's class. Students did not talk to other students (except in an undertone, not meant to be heard by the whole class).

In almost every instance, T2 tried to keep a tighter rein over the class and tutorials than T1 did. The pace in T2's class was fast. T2 walked into class with a set outline of points to be covered that lesson, and tried as much as possible not to deviate from that outline in any way.

This could be noticed in tutorials, too. When questions came up that would take some time to answer, T2 just said, "We'll talk about that later." The questions rarely came up again, in class or in tutorials. As B11 said about T2 in his interview:

Today someone asked a question and she said "Write it down, and we'll talk about it in tutorial." It was a good question. [T2] had time.
[T2] doesn't do much in class and also doesn't have time. I don't want to ask questions, I know I won't get an answer.

4.3.8.1.4 Use of Put-Downs

The noun "put-down" is defined in one dictionary as "A dismissal or rejection, especially in the form of a critical or slighting remark." In another dictionary, one definition of the verb was: "2. to repress or suppress." In that same dictionary repress was defined as: "4. to reduce (persons) to subjection." Suppress was defined as: "6. to quell, crush, vanquish or subdue (a revolt, rebel, etc.)." My definition of a put-down is a combination of the meanings given in the two dictionaries referred to above. In most cases, it came in the form of a critical or slighting remark, but it also was used to subdue the "rebels."

There were not many examples of put-downs in T1's class. There were numerous examples of put-downs in T2's class but there is no need to list them all here; a few will give enough of a feeling for the situation. The major put-downs occurred when T2 interacted with with B4, B9, and B12. B4 and B9 were the students with the most openly negative attitudes towards T2. B12 was by far the best student in class, as far as his English skills were concerned; he end-

---
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ed up with one of the two "A's" given in the class. (The other going to B7, who sat quietly in class and never said much at all, if he could help it.) However, B12 did ask questions, especially at first, and some of his questions were ones that T2 did not handle well. Two examples follow.

One day towards the end of the lesson, B12 asked T2 a question about how to write a good transition sentence. She said, "Your question is about everything I just covered. We'll go over this in tutorial." (I was present at the next tutorial, and the subject was not touched upon by either B12 or T2.) On another occasion, T2 was talking to the class about subordination. B12 asked for an example of subordination. T2 said, "I've been here since 1970. 'since 1970' is an adverbial clause. Everything you studied in 107 is an example of subordination."

T2's response to the challenges of B4, B9, and B12 was to try to put them in their places. She definitely seemed to feel threatened by them. She told me that they had "attitude problems." They were "trouble-makers." One example of a put-down follows for each of these three students.

First, there was the incident involving B4 and his shoes. On July 7, T2 moved the class to 245 Denney Hall. This took up some of the class time, and it was not until 1:05 that T2 began class. She passed out a dittoed handout to the class and made a few announcements. At 1:07, T2 in-
touched what she was saying, turned to B4, and said, 
"[B4], put your feet down and put your shoes on!" This was 
in a loud, angry tone. B4, who had slipped off his sandals 
and was sitting with his stockinged feet on the seat of the 
chair in front of him, said nothing. He quietly complied 
with T2's directions. T2 began to lecture on topic senten-
ces, and the incident was over.

I asked T2 later about this, and she told me that B4 
was the one she considered to be "the other troublemaker." 
(The first troublemaker was B9.) B4 told me in an interview 
that he had been embarrassed by T2's comment, and that he 
felt that she had treated him like a child.

I observed carefully after this incident to see how T2 
dealt with other postures of other students. At various 
times during the quarter I noticed students sitting with 
their shoes on, but their feet up on the seats of the chairs 
in front of them, or with their shoes off, but their feet on 
the floor. T2 did not reprimand anyone for either of these 
postures. No one ever sat with shoes off and feet up again.

I also observed carefully in T1's class, and noticed 
that posture was not an issue in that class at all. It was 
summer, and some students would slip their sandals off and 
put their feet up. T1 was not concerned. I asked her how 
she felt about the students' posture, and she told me that 
it was more important in a class such as 108-01, in which 
all the students are undergraduates, than in another class.
There could be times, she said, when she would consider commenting on how a student was sitting. However, it did not occur while I was present.

During B12's first tutorial, he was effectively put in his place. On July 6 B12 had his first tutorial with T2. His tutorial was scheduled to begin at 4:20, but B13 did not finish until 4:28. When B13 left, B12 entered.

T2: Next time come on time.
B12: I was here on time [in a grieved tone].
T2: Next time, come in on time.
[A few minutes later into B12's first tutorial, T2 was correcting a composition B12 wrote in class. T2 corrected a sentence. B12 said he did not understand the correction.]
T2: Write it down.
B12: Can I use abbreviations?
T2: Anything.
[B12 complied with T2's order, writing down the sentence that T2 corrected, even though he did not understand it. At 4:38 T2 told B12 that he needed to write more.]
B12: You didn't specify length.
T2: I am now. I am now.
B12: Ok.
[At 4:39 they turned to a composition B12 wrote at home. They spent one minute on it. At 4:40 T2 asked if B12 had any questions.]
B12: Nothing.
[That was the end of the first tutorial of B12.]

There were many more instances of friction between B12 and T2.

It is interesting to note the difference in T2's reaction to B8. The next day, July 7, B8 had his first tutorial
with T2. B8 waited out in the hall until T2 had finished with B7 and then entered the room to begin his tutorial. It was seven minutes late. Instead of reprimanding B8, T2 apologized to B8 for getting behind in her tutorials. This different reaction to B12 and B8 might be seen as owing to the possibility that T2 felt more threatened by B12 than by B8. It is easy to see why this might have been the case. B8 sat quietly in class and never said much. He did not ask any questions.

In the previous pages we looked at examples of tutorials with T1 and with T2. Now we will examine ways in which both teachers and students attempted to ease the load that tutorials place upon them.

4.3.8.2 Teacher Strategies for Coping with Tutorials

To say that the teaching load for a 106 or 107 teacher was twenty hours and for a 108 teacher was sixteen hours does not give an accurate picture. Tutorials had to be made according to the schedules of both teacher and students, so that there were often blocks of time during the day when the teacher had half an hour or an hour with no students. Since this was not enough time to leave campus, or to do much planning, it was time that was usually spent in the office.

Also, tutorials were more intense, more draining than classroom teaching. In the classroom, the teacher could rely on other students to respond to questions, to take up
some time by discussing topics. In tutorials there was no place to hide. If a student asked a question, there was only the teacher to answer. And, there was not the excuse of irrelevance to the class as a whole (a response T2 used to students in her class). There was only one teacher, one student, and one piece of writing.

At the best of times, this kind of teaching was draining, but exhilarating at the same time. There was a feeling of satisfaction in knowing that one was meeting the needs of the student in as specific a way as was possible. At the worst of times, when the students were uncooperative, or the teacher was bone-weary from an overload of tutorials, the tutorials were just draining.

Over time, most teachers developed strategies to help them cope with the sometimes extremely burdensome workload of tutorials. When I first started working at the ESL program, and I would see a teacher making use of one of these strategies, I would think to myself that the teacher did not realize how much time was being wasted in this way, and that the tutorial time could be used much more efficiently. It was only last summer, while observing T1 and T2, that I realized that these strategies were used purposely, and often consciously, in an effort to get some relief from the awful schedule most of the teachers had. Five teacher strategies of coping with a heavy tutorial schedule, which T1 and T2 used, will be listed below, with a brief explanation of each one given.
1. Not reading the students' papers in advance.

Generally the students turned in compositions to their teachers at least several days in advance of their tutorials. The teachers read the papers, marked them, and were prepared to discuss them with the students when the students came for tutorials. Some teachers, however, did not read the papers in advance.

When the students came in, the teachers did one of two things. Either they asked the students to read the papers over and mark them themselves (Strategy 2), or they took the papers up and read them aloud with the students, marking and discussing as they went along. This strategy was rationalized as giving the students another chance to correct their own errors (which could have been done at home, and not as part of the twenty or thirty minutes a student had with the teacher).

An example of this coping strategy was given in the previous section in the description of T2's tutorial with B12. T2 had not read B12's paper in advance.

2. Asking students to correct their papers in tutorial time.

This, as mentioned above, was done when the teacher had not read the paper. It was also done when the
teacher had read the paper and made some marks, and the student sat with the paper and tried to make corrections, while the teacher engaged in some other activity. (Usually, this activity was marking the papers of students who were still to come that day, or homework to be returned to students that day, or some other work-related activity. Sometimes teachers would use this time to make phone calls or continue social discussions, or run down the hall for a cup of coffee or a trip to the restroom. These last four were also part of another strategy of relief—Strategy 3.)

In the example of T2's tutorial given above, she wanted B12 to proofread his composition in the tutorial time. (B12 did not want to do it.) T1 also used this strategy. For example, during one tutorial with A8, she gave him back a composition that she had marked and asked him to correct it. While A8 did this, T1 marked another of A8's papers.

3. Allowing or in some cases being unable to avoid lots of interruptions.

The ESL offices were shared, with from three to eight people sharing an office. Many times there would be phone calls for the teacher, or another staff member would come by with a question, either work-related or not. Sometimes a conversation going on in the office
among other people would grab the attention of the teacher and/or student. For one reason or another there was a lot of noise in the offices while the tutorials were going on, with not infrequent breaks for the teacher to direct his/her attention elsewhere.

An example of an interruption occurred in a tutorial of T2 and B14. Another teacher, who had been B14's teacher the previous quarter, interrupted the tutorial to comment on a correction T2 was making on B14's paper. It was a common error for Persian speakers. The other teacher went into a lengthy explanation of the linguistic reasons for the error. T2 did not appear especially interested in this explanation, but she allowed the teacher to continue for several minutes before returning to the composition at hand.

Since T1 was Acting Director that quarter, she had an office to herself. Thus, she did not get interrupted by office mates. On the other hand, since she was Acting Director she had to take care of administrative matters that sometimes intruded on the tutorial time. There were many phone calls from different officials on campus that T1 accepted during tutorials.

4. Scheduling tutorials back-to-back.
Scheduling tutorials back-to-back was an attempt to limit the number of hours spent in the office, to free some time for other interests. A quick look at T2's schedule for Summer Quarter, 1981 will show how this is done. (See Figure 7.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>MON</th>
<th>TUE</th>
<th>WED</th>
<th>THU</th>
<th>FRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>B5</td>
<td></td>
<td>B24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td>B26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>B21</td>
<td></td>
<td>B16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20</td>
<td></td>
<td>B13</td>
<td></td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>B8</td>
<td></td>
<td>B4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20</td>
<td></td>
<td>B11</td>
<td></td>
<td>B10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:40</td>
<td></td>
<td>B3</td>
<td></td>
<td>B27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>B14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20</td>
<td></td>
<td>B12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:40</td>
<td></td>
<td>B9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:40</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>B25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:20</td>
<td>B20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:40</td>
<td>B19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:20</td>
<td>B12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Teaching Schedule of T2, Summer, 1981
By looking at Figure 7, we can see that T2 had scheduled the bulk of her twenty-seven tutorials on just two days, Tuesday and Wednesday. She had thirteen tutorials on Tuesday, with seven in a row. On Wednesday she had nine tutorials in a row, with no break from 9 a.m. to 12 noon. She was able to keep Thursday completely clear, and in fact, she did not come to the office on Thursday at all. On Friday she only had to come to class. On Monday, she did not need to appear until time for her 1:00 p.m. class. So by juggling the tutorials around, T2 managed to free up a considerable amount of time.

Even within the context of the office time itself, there was an advantage to this type of tutorial scheduling. When there are seven or eight students coming in a row, the teacher is extremely discouraged from getting behind. There is little opportunity for a student to get any extra time from the teacher in this way, while if there is a break before the next student is scheduled to appear, the student can sometimes get more of the teacher's time.

So if the object is to give the student as little time as possible within the rules of the game, this kind of scheduling is ideal. The great disadvantage, of course, was that the schedule was extremely exhausting. By 1:30 on Tuesday, after five hours of almost continuous tutoring, T2 was worn out.
5. **Limiting unnecessary thinking.**

This strategy is easy to understand. In my experience as a composition teacher, the absolutely hardest thing to do is to sit down with a student and his writing, to try to understand what the student is trying to communicate, to understand how he wants to communicate it, following his method of organization, and to help him figure out where his thought patterns and the rhetorical patterns of English have parted company. This process requires concentration and communication between student and teacher. This process is, in my mind, the best justification for the tutorial system, since a dialog is required. On the other hand, the tutorial system itself makes it extremely difficult to follow this process. T2 had thirteen students in a five-hour period on Tuesday. There is no way that a normal human being could turn the brain on and off like that thirteen times between 8:20 a.m. and 1:30 p.m. In the old system, of one-hour tutorials, it was possible to keep up for two or three hours, but even then after that the effort was too exhausting. So some teachers did not even try.

It was an easy trap to fall into. The quickest way to go through a stack of twenty or thirty compositions and read and correct them was to pick them up and skim, marking obvious grammar mistakes such as
tenses, punctuation, articles and word order. I saw this done many times. A teacher would say (and perhaps think) s/he was helping the student with organization, but would spend the tutorial time correcting the students' grammar. T2 spent by far the major part of her time working on grammar. Her comments on organization tended to be quite superficial, e.g., "Nice organization."

In addition to these five strategies, three other strategies were used. I observed them in the other samples used in the study.

1. Abbreviating the tutorial time.

A favorite way to ease the load was to start the tutorial late. Some teachers started practically every tutorial late. Some had certain tutorials, which because of their timing (first one in the morning or after teaching, or at lunchtime), frequently began late.

The other side of the coin was to end the tutorial early. This was a little more difficult, because it depended in part on the cooperation of the student. There were students who could keep talking and asking questions for hours if given the chance. However, some students came to tutorials unwillingly, or were at least docile enough to get up and leave when the teacher decided to end the tutorial.
For example, T5 scheduled her tutorials back-to-back, leaving her no lunch break. So at lunchtime, she would end one tutorial early, go to the snackbar next door, get her lunch, and bring it back to the office with her, beginning the next tutorial late.

As the morale in the program continued to sink, this strategy came more and more into use. It was reported to me by two teachers that they never met their students for more than five minutes (with the exception of a few students, who the teachers felt really needed more time). At the end of the five minutes the students were excused, the teachers recorded their presence in the gradebook, and that was that.

This sort of thing was hard to check up on, since the tutorial system was run on the honor system. The administrators felt that the teachers could be counted on to do what they were supposed to do. For the most part they did. There were a few exceptions, as mentioned above. When it was discovered that a teacher was not doing the tutorials, s/he was reprimanded and told to get with it. If that did not clear matters up, the teacher was not rehired. But since it was the honor system, not everyone was caught. The two teachers mentioned above found a way to be able to say that they were doing tutorials, and yet, not do them.
2. Lightening Homework Assignments.
Another method of easing the workload was to limit the number of homework assignments the students were asked to do, thus limiting the number of homework assignments the teacher was supposed to read, mark, and discuss with the students. At one time in the program, some teachers would assign two compositions a week, plus daily homework assignments. Some teachers assigned only one composition a week, (a few required even less than that), and severely restricted the number of homework assignments the students were asked to do. This let the teacher off the hook as far as reading, correcting, recording and discussing the work was concerned, and also helped to shorten the tutorial session.

3. Cancellation.
The last strategy was to cancel a tutorial session completely. Of course, it happened to nearly every teacher that something would come up (illness, accident, family emergency) that necessitated the cancelling of a tutorial with a student or with several students. But some teachers used this strategy much more than others. As work-avoiding strategies went, it was the best. The only problem was to cover one's tracks enough so that the director did not find out.
4.3.8.3 Student Strategies for Coping with Tutorials

Teachers were not the only ones on whom the tutorials placed a burden; students also had added pressure because of them. The tutorials were not mentioned in the course offerings catalog, nor in the schedule of classes. They did not carry any credit, and were separately graded, if at all, only on a came/didn't come basis. Many students knew about tutorials from the grapevine, or from taking previous courses in the ESL program, but some of the students did not find out about them until they showed up for class. By that time they had already scheduled their other courses. The necessity of finding a twenty or thirty-minute period of time that would be mutually convenient both for student and teacher each week was a bother for some students. In the end, the teacher decided the tutorial schedule, and unless the student had another class at that time or a clear conflict of some sort, he was expected to show up at the teacher's office each week at that time. The teachers usually tried to please all the students, without ruining their own schedules too much, but it was not possible to please everyone. E9, for example, tried on several occasions to change his tutorial time with T2, saying it was inconvenient, but they could not agree on another time, and so E9's time slot was not changed. Students also adopted strategies for lowering the work load.
1. Missing tutorials.

Some students dealt with tutorials by not attending all of them. (A few dealt with them by not attending at all, but that carried consequences for their grades that not many students were willing to risk.) This skipping of tutorials had three forms, listed in order of increasing irritation to the teachers:

a) Giving the teacher previous notice of a planned absence.

Sometimes students would let the teacher know in class that they would not be attending the next tutorial. This might be because of a trip out of town, or a doctor's appointment, or some other urgent errand. A3 told T1 in advance one time that he had to take his child to the doctor and so would miss his tutorial.

b) Calling the teacher at the scheduled time to announce that the student would not be coming.

Sometimes the student would call at the appointed time to tell the teacher not to wait for him/her. The reason usually given was car trouble, urgent meeting with advisor (for graduate students), or some other emergency.

c) Letting the teacher figure it out for him/herself that the student was not coming.
Frequently, students would not call, and just not show up. I personally found this extremely annoying, as most teachers did. The excuse most often given in the next class period, "I forgot." A2 made use of this coping strategy with T1. B15 did this with T2.

2. Showing up late.
Another favored gambit of students was to show up anywhere from one minute late to $X-1$ minutes late ($X$ = the number of minutes the tutorial was scheduled for). In this way, they could claim to have come to tutorials, but did not have to actually sit through it. A12 made use of this strategy by entering his tutorials with T1 about ten minutes late.

3. Leaving early.
This strategy was not used so often as coming late, but it was not uncommon. The student would plead a series of exams that he needed to study for, or an appointment at a distant spot on campus, or some other such worthy cause, and ask to be excused anywhere from one to $X-1$ minutes early.

4. Limiting unnecessary thinking.
The students, along with the teachers, were sometimes not overly anxious to think about their writing. This strategy took many forms, but the most common, and the most overt were the following.
a) Maintain a dazed look and say as little as possible.

The students who made use of this strategy were physically present, but mentally appeared elsewhere. Sometimes students were paying attention, but terrified to say the wrong thing. Those two types of student were not always distinguishable. B13 was extremely quiet in his tutorials with T2. He sat still, not looking at her, speaking only when she asked him a question, and then briefly and in a soft voice.

b) Chit-chat about something other than English.

There were some students who were quite willing to talk about Life in the United States, American Culture vs. Chinese Culture, or a number of other topics, as long as it was not directly related to the English class. Those students tended to be the ones who felt that the department should offer a conversation class, or that they did not really need help with their writing anyway. A10, in T1's class, liked to talk about American culture in tutorials.

c) Argue about inconsequential matters.

There were students who were prepared to argue for the whole period about whether that comma really needed to be there, or whether or not a certain
phrase was acceptable in British English. Those students definitely felt that they did not need to be in ESL classes.

5. Showing up unprepared.

This was the all-time favorite strategy for avoiding work. The student simply did not do anything. He did not do his homework, or if he had done it, he did not bring it with him. He did not correct his compositions. If the teacher gave him some time to go over his paper, he took less than two minutes to do so before signalling to the teacher that he was done. This student put the whole responsibility for his learning on the teacher. In T1's second tutorial with A1, he did not bring with him the composition that T1 had marked for him to correct. He also did not bring any homework with him.

Turning from a consideration of teacher differences and difficulties, we will now examine a case of a student who needed help on a personal level and got some of it in tutorials.

4.3.8.4 The Problems of A5

I take A5 as an example, not because he was unusual, but just because he illustrates the problems so many foreign students face when they come to study in the U.S. During the quarter I observed him, A5 exhibited emotional distress and seemed unable to handle his problems.
As mentioned above, A5 was quiet in class. He sat up at the front, next to A4, who was also Iranian. One day A5 talked to me outside of the classroom while we were waiting to get in. He asked me about my study. I explained it to him. He told me that his mother was also a teacher and he understood about research like mine. I thought we were off to a good start. But the next minute he told me that it was embarrassing that everything he said in class was going to be recorded. I did what I could to reassure him. I thought I had succeeded, but it turned out that he did not really trust me, after all.

That same class period, T1 passed out a data sheet for me. (See Appendix G.) I had borrowed it from T4, who had passed it out to her students during Spring Quarter. The next class period, most of the students turned the form in. I went around to those who had not turned it in and asked them to please do so. They said they would, and they did. A5 did not. I asked him what the problem was. He told me that the form asked too many personal questions. I told him that I did not want him to feel that he had to answer questions that were too personal, but that I did not see how those questions could be considered personal. I asked him which questions made him uncomfortable. A5 said, "Why do you need to know where I was born?" I explained to him that it would be interesting to know if all the students from a given country, say Iran, felt similarly about tutorials, or
if undergraduates felt differently from graduates. I explained to him a little bit about variables. He seemed satisfied with this explanation, but again, did not turn the form in. Finally, when he came in for an interview, I filled out the major sections of the form with him before we began the interview.

It was during our interview that A5 gave me another indication that he was troubled. He said that he felt too embarrassed to ask questions in class. He was afraid that his accent was too bad. I assumed at first that he was talking about other classes, but he meant the ESL class as well. I pointed out to him that everyone in the class had an accent, but he said he still did not like to ask in front of them. I asked him if he could ask questions before or after class, and he said that he could not, because there were American students filing in and out then, and he did not want them to overhear what he wanted to say. He emphasized the importance of the tutorial as a place to ask questions. He said that it was important for the teacher to be willing to answer questions on subjects other than only composition. He also said that the grading system was unfair. He had mentioned this also to me in class, but he did not elaborate.

A5 revealed more about himself in his journal entries. In these entries, he expressed his feelings of alienation from Persian culture, and his problems of adapting to Ameri-
can life. He talked about his unhappiness and his inability to deal with his problems. He made mention of his unhappiness over and over again in his writing, as some excerpts will demonstrate:

I was a couple of times so depressed that I was thinking of suicide.

I am seeking my ultimate goal everyday, but it seemingly is turning back to me & running away from me. Why? Why isn't God even fair? Do I expect a lot out of life or just the minimum possible. This is the meaning of life; namely, rejection, depression, and all those discouraging words I don't want to write down. In my opinion, the absolute relief comes at the time of death or permanent silence. How wonderful it is! The complete end to all those minor & major issues!

After all, I am so tired of being isolated from the member of this Society. I can't tell anybody about my problem either, not even my mother whom I love more than anybody else on the earth. The school stress is not that much but once it co-ocate with other problems they smash me to the extent that I get sick. If I knew this is the kind of life I was destined, I would prefer not to be born.

In addition to writing about his unhappiness, A5 also expressed his resentment of the English Department several times. The following are some excerpts:

I accepted my fate and took English 106 & 107 consecutively last fall & winter, but nothing can express my feeling the moment I got the final grade of those courses. I was give a B- & C respectively in those English courses I took. My rights were totally trampled upon even with respect to other students. Even since I came to U.S. I didn't have a C in my record. As far as I know the supposedly purpose of these courses is to help us foreign
students to achieve more in other course on the contrary, we are smashed down both grade point and mental point of view.

Are these english courses assigned to torture foreign students or help them. know that it hasn't helped & won't. In addition they have affected our average severly. We are all forced to take these courses. Otherwise, none of us would take them.

A5 was able to express his feelings fairly clearly in writing. He told me once that he liked to write the journals. In fact, he had started writing a journal in English when he was still in Iran. I asked him why he had written in English when he was in Iran. He said that it was so no one else would be able to read his journal and understand it.

T1 was aware that A5 had problems. She tried to be extra understanding of him. She gave him a lot of extra time in tutorials. The following is a report she wrote for me about a tutorial of one and a half hours with A5.

Tutorial with A5 7/23/81

1 and 1/2 hours! Discussing paper about what things he does to help overcome loneliness in the U.S. Paper shows some overall understanding of composition structure but lack of unity within paragraphs and no definition of what loneliness is for s. Start with discussion of defining loneliness in intro. Move to discussion of individual paragraphs and unity problem within paragraph. S. hasn't come up with clear attitude--can't decide whether loneliness can be "solved" with the activities he discusses or whether they are simply "time killers." In each paragraph of body (3) he has explained the activity but not how it conquers loneliness. We talk about each paragraph (mostly
1) to see how he could have stuck with the idea of loneliness. What feeling does the activity give? Does this feeling/emotion replace the emotion of loneliness? If so, isn't it a solution rather than a time killer? Is it possible that the activity could do both? Discussing the unity problem thereby makes student more clearly define attitude and helps him develop ideas in the paragraph. Main input of teacher in this case is to keep pushing student back to the track. Typical comment: "Right, reading books makes you feel a lot of excitement. How does that relate to your loneliness?" Student meanders, thinking through related points, and teacher functions as a reminder of need to go back to controlling idea and as interested questioner "so how do you feel when you come out of the library?"

Student is really excited about what he is saying. He says overtly: "I really like this topic. It's something I'm interested in and I think the other people in our class are too." Much positive reinforcement for the teacher in that comment. He starts discussing his ideas and rambles but continues a strong interest in topic. Both teacher and student realize the importance of this subject to student so the discussion must go on. Student wants to think through these things. Teacher doesn't want to stop flow of ideas of the rapport because student is sharing personal perceptions and discovering things about self. Student seems enthusiastic and totally unaware of time/totally involved in thinking. Teacher acts like verbal thesis statement "But don't forget your main idea." "Hold on to that other idea--put it in your journal." Sometimes teacher shares reaction of student: "I remember feeling that way when I used to come out of library. I'd get on my bike and ride back to the dorm feeling alive and excited. I can remember smiling and feeling sunny." At end of tutorial student is surprised that so much time has passed and is anxious to rewrite paper for tomorrow. Student looks over paragraph and says--oh this didn't fit in with original (topic) sentence. I see--I should include this idea in topic. At beginning of tutorial, S, when questioned about what paragraph regards, says: "hmm," and reads over it line for line and then points to topic sentence. At end, S says "hmm" and almost physically moves back to look at paragraph. Teacher has impression that student started inside paragraph and has now moved to outside because he discovered how many ideas were locked
up within the sentences he had originally written. S seems to display a new found respect for everything that was in paragraph. "I didn't realize all that was there" kind of attitude.

Think major accomplishment of this tutorial was picking up on s's interest in exploring his own feelings through writing. Good s-teacher feeling will help hold atmosphere of class together back in classroom. Hope S began to see how using a thesis as a question-springboard "How does this relate to X?" expands thoughts on any subject. S started to ask questions like: "I didn't make that X because I didn't think I could with this topic sentence. Could I have?" Teacher is helping S learn to bend what he has learned as "rules" about composition to his own needs to express "real" feelings. Also much cross-cultural discussion--"What is loneliness for an Iranian student who can't go home?"

That was during the fifth week of the quarter. Two weeks later, T1 again had a 90-minute tutorial with A5. She said that A5 was extremely upset about his midterm grade, a B-/C+. T1 reported that when he entered her office, he seemed emotional. They talked it over for a long time, and by the time A5 left, T1 felt that, although he was still angry about his grade, he was calmer. T1 told me that she was surprised that A5 had been so upset about his grade, as it was not a bad grade for the midterm. This tutorial took place on Thursday. T1 told me about it the next day, Friday.

That Saturday, someone broke the window in T1's office. T1 and I both assumed it was A5. The police were called in to investigate. They asked us to keep it quiet. Therefore, T1 passed out a low-key handout to all the staff on Monday,
asking them not to talk about the incident. (See Appendix H.) I was asked not to come to A5's tutorial. He was a suspect, and the police hoped he would confess. Also, my presence at his tutorials might have increased the stress for him, and he was under enough tension as it was. A5 was not pressured to confess; there was a fear of pushing him too much if he was very disturbed. There were backup people in the outer office during A5's tutorial with T1. In the event, A5 did not confess, and no one was ever charged with breaking the window. T1, after the first shock had subsided, decided that she was just as glad it had ended that way. She felt sorry for A5 and did not want to see him in trouble with the law, if he was the guilty one. She also learned that A5 was getting professional psychological counseling. That was the end of the incident. A5 made a B in the course.

A5 was not the only foreign student in the ESL classes who was unhappy, lonely, feeling anomie. The incident occurred during a time when there was strong anti-Iranian feeling in the country. It was a violent period in Iran. A5 was unsure if he would ever get back to his country. The extra burden of trying to fit into a new culture, one that did not seem particularly to want him, did not help. In addition to all these pressures, which are not uncommon for students from Vietnam, Lebanon, and other countries as well, foreign students are often far more concerned with grades.
than American undergraduates. For some students a B average is a requirement in order to retain scholarships. A5 was not all that exceptional. Most of the staff members who have taught for a while could relate similar stories.

Some questions arise as to how the teachers should deal with students like A5. Another issue is the role of the tutorial in helping A5 to express his feelings and control his rage. I will not speculate about what A5 might have done if he had not had that cooling off period with T1. But the tutorial was important to him, as he said, because it allowed him to ask questions and to exchange ideas with another person. The tutorials were not set up as counseling sessions for foreign students, and yet that was a purpose they sometimes served.

From this obviously troubled student we turn now to consider another source of problems for the teacher--the student who is a loner.

4.3.8.5 Loners
Loners were students who did not interact with other students or with the teacher much. They usually answered when the teacher called on them, but they did so briefly; they did not generally volunteer. They sat by themselves. Loners could fall anywhere on the academic spectrum. There were loners in both T1's and T2's classes.
In T1's class, A14 was a loner. She sat in the rear corner next to the windows, except for a few times when she sat next to me. She was the only woman in the class, except for A2, who did not come to class consistently and who was from a very different culture. A14 was the only Chinese student. The other oriental student, A8, was also something of a loner, although he did begin to interact a little as the quarter wore on. A14 did not. T1 made a conscious effort to help A14 and A8 mix in, by putting them in groups with whom she thought they might do well. A14 was put in a group with A13 and A9. The first day they did group work, they were given a handout and asked to find the topic sentences in the paragraphs. A9 and A13 decided to make A14 the secretary, because, as A13 put it, "women are good secretaries." A14 did not take any active part in the group, and A13 ended up taking notes. A9 and A13 tried to involve A14, asking her for her opinion. She said, "I don't know."

In T2's class, B15 was a loner. He also sat in the back of the class, near the windows. He did not change his seat all quarter. He never volunteered any information. When T2 asked him a question, he answered briefly. B15 was the only oriental student in his class. Aside from occasionally calling on B15 to answer a question, T2 made no effort to draw him into the class.

The subject of loners is an important one in a language classroom especially. An analogy would be swimming students
who refuse to get in the water. They know the theory but they will not use it, and so they do not improve. A coach can take an extreme measure and throw a student in the water, but a language teacher has a harder time forcing a student to take the plunge. It is a difficult, but not uncommon problem. Part of the solution lies in a comfortable class atmosphere, where neither student nor teacher feel threatened. In T2’s class, none of the students were vocal, and none interacted much with the others. However, atmosphere is not the whole answer. In T1’s class there were was more interaction among the students. Some of the students were almost too vocal. Part of the problem there was that there was a competition for the teacher’s attention, and the more aggressive students won. But A14 did not even try. More work needs to be done in ESL to see how loners get established as such, and what the implications of “lonerhood” are for students and teachers. Some questions I would have liked to explored more in this area include the following.

1. Were A14 and B15 loners in their other classes?
2. Were they loners in previous ESL classes?
3. Did they perceive themselves as loners?
4. Did the other members of the class perceive them as loners?
5. How important was it to A14 and B15 to be a part of the class?
6. How did they feel about the more vocal members of the class?

7. What can the teacher do to help loners like A14 and B15 take a more active part in the class?

4.4 SUMMARY

In this section I have attempted to present a clear picture of the tutorial system in the ESL program at OSU, both from the point of view of how the system fits into the program as a whole, and from the point of view of the individual students and teachers who work with the system on a daily basis. Results of data gathered from different instruments and techniques were presented. In Chapter V I will draw some conclusions based on those results, and will further make some recommendations about tutorials.
Chapter V

FINDINGS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter I presented the results of the data gathered in this study. In Chapter V I will draw some conclusions based on those results. First I will discuss the limitations of the study; then I will discuss my conclusions. This section begins with a discussion of the changes that have taken place in the ESL program in the past nine months. Next some thoughts and suggestions on teacher differences and teacher control are presented. The implications of the problems of A5 are the subject of the next section of Chapter V. Then an explication of the connections between classes and tutorials and some suggestions for improving the tutorial system and the ESL program as a whole are presented. I make some suggestions for further research towards the end of the chapter, concluding with a summary of the study and some final comments.
5.2 LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

Following George McCall's discussion of data quality control criteria, the following factors can contaminate observational data: A. Reactive effects; E. Ethnocentrism; and C. Going native.35

Reactive effects means that the observer's presence changes that which he wishes to observe. This could be due to roles, sex, personality, or many other factors. To start with T1, I do not believe that she reacted strongly to my presence. She seemed comfortable throughout; she did not discourage me from coming to her classes and tutorials. She tried to put the students at their ease with me.

The student's in T1's class, of course, are a different matter. Some of them reacted more than others. A5 told me himself that he was embarrassed to think I was recording what he said. But most of the students seemed to get used to my presence soon enough. They would sit next to me at times and talk to me or around me. They would volunteer information to me, both positive and negative.

T2 definitely reacted strongly to my presence. She did not make any secret of her unhappiness at my presence. The class was aware that she was uncomfortable with me, and that was communicated to them. During the interviews with the

students, several Nigerians told me that "Someone" -- never the person talking -- did not like the tape recorder. On the other hand, the students in T2's class also volunteered comments both negative and positive. Some of them could not wait to tell me their opinion of T2 (not favorable) and of the ESL program (also not favorable) and of the U.S. in general (also not favorable).

McCall suggests two checks for data quality: getting informant accounts of class and tutorials when not present, and getting informant opinion of reactivity. In the first case, no significant differences were reported. In the second case, I found out about a problem with some students reacting to my equipment, and I acted on the knowledge by dropping the use of the recorder.

The second contaminating factor is ethnocentrism. This is a problem when the observer views the culture from a foreign perspective, putting his own belief system in. This was a problem for me. I do not know enough about the various nationalities represented in the class to be sure how the students were perceiving the class. McCall's suggested checks for this problem are to compare data with interview responses and to discuss findings with informants from each culture. The first check I used. The second was more difficult, since I did not have an informant from each of the cultures represented in the classes.
This problem of ethnocentrism is a serious one in a setting where almost every participant is from a culture different from that of all the other participants. Not only did I not understand all that the students did and said; neither did the students understand all that the teacher, their fellow students, and I did and said. No effective way of overcoming the dangers of ethnocentrism presented itself to me.

The third damaging factor, going native, happens when the researcher over-identifies with the subjects. I was in definite danger of over-identifying with T1, but never with T2. My distance from T2 helped me to retain an idea of the students' perspective, which I could bring into T1's class, too. Some of the checks recommended by McCall are: 1. to discuss the observer's interpretations with informants and with knowledgeable outsiders; 2. introspection; 3. to try to see the phenomena from different viewpoints. I did these things, but how successful I was at overcoming the teacher's point of view is unknown.

McCall also discusses six pitfalls to watch out for in interview data. I shall take up them one at a time.

The first is knowledgeability. This has to do with the question of whether the interviewee knows what he is talking about. Since I was asking the students for their opinions of the tutorial program, based on their own experiences, they all pass the knowledgeability test.
The second criterion is reportorial ability. This is a question of how well a person can express what he knows. With foreign students this a greater question than with native speakers. Nevertheless, these students were all fluent in English, albeit at times ungrammatical English, and their English was sufficient to communicate their ideas.

The third criterion is reactive effects, which, as in observation, has to do with how much the fact of the interview and the interviewer influences the report. The possibilities of reactive effects in the interviews were the same as in the class observation, discussed above.

The fourth trouble spot is ulterior motives. In this case the interviewee is trying to use the interview to his advantage. I could not detect any of this going on.

The fifth category is bars to spontaneity. This has to do with physical and social environment. I tried to overcome this by conducting the interviews in a private room on a different floor from the ESL offices.

The last category is idiosyncratic factors. Examples of this would be an upset stomach, a drug overdose, or sudden change in personality. I did not notice any of these things during the interviews.

Another category of data quality problems is null data. This is when interviewees are keeping something back. I suspect this happened in several interviews. Some students would spontaneously come up with something that corresponded
to my classroom observations, some students would agree when asked, and some would not agree. The reasons for null data are obvious—they are closely related to the reasons for reactive effects. Nevertheless, something can be learned from what people will not tell you, as well as from what they will.

5.3 CONCLUSIONS

5.3.1 Problems in the ESL Program

A number of measures have been taken since this study was done that have resolved some of the conflict outlined in Chapter IV. The job security situation has been improved. That was accomplished by doing away with most of the Lecturer-ships. By Fall Quarter, 1982, the majority of ESL teachers will be either T.A.'s or Instructors on three-year terminal contracts. While these jobs are not secure in the same way that a tenured position is, at least the uncertainty of not knowing from one quarter to the next whether a job would be available has been done away with for most staff members. The T.A.'s know that as long as they are enrolled for the minimum number of hours in graduate courses they will have a job. (Two Lecturers entered Ph.D. programs this year, at least partly to be able to continue working.) The Instructors know that they will have full-time work for three years, after which time their employment will end. The money situation of the Instructors is a little better
than that of the Lecturers. The problem of status within the department and the university still exists.

The problems which arose from the change of administrators have been minimized now that the same director has been in charge of the program for three quarters. However, the decisions to make the changes in the program that were made, were made without the input of most of the staff members. Now some of them, especially those who do not have Instructorships, feel that they lack input into the decision-making process, that their ideas do not carry weight within the program itself, a feeling that leads to a lower morale. The ESL teachers in past years felt part of a group making a group effort. Now the "disenfranchised" Lecturers and T.A.'s feel left out.

The workload of the tutorials is the same as in previous years. In fact, for Instructors, it has increased, since they now teach three classes one quarter, and therefore do tutorials for more students that quarter, too.

Another area that has not seen much progress is the area of student input into the program. As far as I know, my questionnaire was the first example of a program-wide polling of the opinion of the students. The students do not have much say in the curriculum of the ESL courses. A systematic effort should be made to ascertain what the students feel they need, not only in an individual class, but from the ESL program as a whole.
5.3.2 **Teacher Effectiveness**

Teaching ESL presents special problems, as the results of data gathered during the course of the study show. These problems include, among others, foreign students with emotional problems, and intercultural misunderstandings. In the following pages I will make some recommendations for actions that might help the ESL administrators and staff to improve the teaching effectiveness of the program.

First of all, there should be more frequent observation of the teaching staff. The frequency might be increased even more in certain cases, where problems exist. In this way, the administrators would be more aware of what was going on in the classrooms. Up through the quarter of this study, observation was not done with any regularity. As an example, in the four and a half years I taught in the program, my teaching was observed only one time, at the end of my second year of teaching. It is true that in cases where there were serious problems with students and/or teachers, the people involved usually found their way to the director's office, bringing the problem to her attention. This happened, for example, in the case of A15 and his problems with T12. However, there were other situations that were not brought to the attention of the director, but which might have been improved if the administrators had been aware of them.
It is not enough in itself, however, to observe. There should also be a system of helping the teacher to improve her teaching. Donald Freeman has proposed three approaches to the relationship between teacher and observer.\textsuperscript{36} He makes a distinction between teacher training, done for new teachers, and teacher development, done with experienced teachers. The first approach he discusses is the Supervisory Approach, the standard where the observer comes to class to critique the teacher's work. In this approach the supervisor is in a position to direct the teacher, to make suggestions to the teacher about changes in teaching. It is one-way. This approach is recommended for teacher training.

The second approach is the Alternatives Approach. In this one the observer suggests alternatives to the teacher, while trying not to sound judgmental. This approach can "provide a bridge from prescription, which is the basis of training, to open-ended questions, which set the groundwork for continuing professional development."\textsuperscript{37}

The third approach is called the Non-Directive Approach. It has three stages. In the first stage, the observer tries to get the teacher to explain what she was trying to do in the class in general, and then in the

\textsuperscript{36} Donald Freeman, "Observing Teachers: Three Approaches to In-Service Training and Development," \textit{TESOL Quarterly} 16 (March 1982), pp. 22-26.

\textsuperscript{37} Freeman, p. 23.
particular lesson observed. In the second stage, the discussion moves to the particular lesson in question, and the observer relates what the teacher has told him to what he observed. In the third stage, the observer offers the teacher comments and suggestions, being careful to offer the teacher "a perspective and not advice or a prescription." It sounds like the last step would be a tricky one for the observer, especially at first, but it seems worth a try.

If observation were viewed as a helpful experience rather than a threatening one, it would be less unpleasant and more beneficial to both teacher and administrators alike.

Another tool that might be helpful in teacher development is suggested by Janet Hafner, who has developed a resource for staff development in the form of demonstration tapes of various ESL/ABE classroom strategies. These tapes offer the chance to view a variety of teaching methods and can be viewed repeatedly. The format of the tapes includes an unrehearsed classroom demonstration of a selected technique, a narrative interview with a theoretical background, and an in-studio interview with the demonstration teacher.  

38 Freeman, p. 25.

The goal of each tape is to let the viewer see a strategy in action and understand the steps required to implement the techniques. These tapes vary in length from half an hour to about one and a half hours.

From the synopses of these tapes, they seem to be aimed at a teacher with little or no background in ESL and also are for low-level ESL classes, where the students speak little or no English, or for Adult Basic Education classes, where the students are native speakers with poor verbal skills. So, these particular tapes would not be helpful to the ESL program at OSU.

But the idea of a resource bank of video tapes dealing with instructional topics of relevance to the program at OSU seems to be a good one. These topics might include techniques such as group work, eliciting class participation in discussion, correcting student papers, and conducting tutorials. Other topics might include sensitivity awareness and dealing with students who exhibit emotional problems (for instance, A5). Numerous other topics come to mind. It could be used for purposes of new teacher orientation as well as staff development. This bank would not be difficult to set up and would involve only a small investment, since the English Department already has video tape equipment.

Another suggestion to help ESL teachers would be a closer coordination of the ESL program as a whole, and of the courses within the whole. When B9 complained that ESL
teachers were not coherent either, he was not alone in thinking so. Several students complained to me that they learned one thing in one course and then were told something contradictory in the next. Some of their complaints concerned minor things such as one teacher's preference for "whom" and another's preference for "who." Another example came up in T1's class when she suggested a topic sentence that began "There are a number of reasons ..." Some of the students in the class complained that they had been told in the previous quarter not to write topic sentences like that one. These sorts of differences are annoying to the teacher and student, and it lessens the teachers' credibility when they contradict each other (even unknowingly).

On the other hand, there are more serious cases of differences in classes than those mentioned above. T1 and T2 were both teaching 108.01, and yet their students were not taught the same things. In tutorials, T1 focused on organization, T2 focused on sentence-level grammar errors. Clearly, the program has an obligation to make sure that all the students taking a course with the same number (and supposedly the same content) get a reasonably similar course. Of course, it is impossible for any two classes to be the same in every respect, with different students in them, but they ought to be closer together than the two I observed were.

One method to help bring about this closer coordination is one I have mentioned above—class observation. Gordon
Becktold suggests in his article that classroom observation can serve four purposes: 1. teacher evaluation; 2. determining proper staff assignments; 3. developing better teaching techniques; and 4. getting teachers to work together toward a realization of common goals. Becktold thinks that "probably the most important reason for classroom observation is articulation [§4, above]."40 If teachers are to teach the same things, it is important for them to know what the others are doing in class. Just talking about it in staff meetings is not enough. T1 and T2 talked about what they were doing, but they thought they were doing the same things. (I asked.)

A further suggestion to help ESL teachers would be to have a series of sensitivity workshops for ESL teachers, to help them be aware of the effect of their actions on their foreign students. Currently there is one day each quarter devoted to staff development. Talks are given, discussions are held, and workshops are presented. A series of workshops dealing with the topic of sensitivity could fit into such a program day nicely.

---

5.3.3 Teacher Differences

From the examples given in the preceding chapter, it should be clear that T1 and T2 differed radically in the amount of control they exerted. T1 exerted comparatively little control. Not infrequently a few members of the class would take over and direct the attention of the class to topics other than those that T1 wanted to discuss. This oligarchy bothered some of the students, including A5, who wrote about it in his journal, and also A1, one of the most vocal members of the class, who complained about getting off the point in his teacher evaluation form at the end of the quarter.

T2 went to the other side of the fence, exerting a lot of effort to keep the class tightly controlled. It is possible that part of her concern may have been a reaction to a feeling of insecurity and being threatened by some of the students. Partly, it was a result of her being tied to the curriculum. As she said, she wanted to "get through it," and the only way to cover all those points on the course outline (Appendix I.) was to move quickly through the material, without getting sidetracked by what the students were interested in.

To a certain extent the tight control/loose control decision is a personal one, and each teacher will have a preference for one or the other. On the one hand, a loosely controlled class poses problems when students such as A5
feel that some of the students are too much in control of the class. There is a danger of losing sight of the course objectives, as sometimes happened in T1's class. An example of that was given in Chapter IV. On the other hand, trying to maintain a tight control over the class creates the possibility of alienating the students. For example, T2 tried to control the class tightly, and only $\frac{3}{4}$ of all her fifteen students spoke positively about T2. This poor a student-teacher relationship can possibly affect the whole class and influence what the students learn, too.

Neither extreme of too tight or too loose control is to be preferred to the other. The teacher has to do a careful balancing act, trying to make sure that a few students do not take over the class, and at the same time allowing for a certain amount of student input.

Again, a partial solution to this problem would be more class observation. Also, more input from the students. The students wrote evaluations of the teachers, but only at the end of the quarter. And those evaluations were not seen by the administrators. Another suggestion is to not use classrooms like 245 DE for small ESL classes. ESL classes should not meet in rooms where the chairs are fixed in place, or where the room is too big for the class. These factors in the setting had a detrimental effect on class interaction. They should be eliminated insofar as is possible.
5.3.4 Some Special Problems of ESL Students

Looking back on the compositions of A5 and thinking over the conversations I had with him and the remarks he made to T1 and me, it seems that it should have been obvious early on in the quarter that A5 was troubled and in need of special help, help beyond the expertise of an ESL teacher. And yet, it was not obvious. ESL teachers do not generally learn in their degree programs about how to recognize students with emotional problems. This is unfortunate.

College students in general are in a stressful situation, but foreign or immigrant college students are in a doubly stressful situation. In addition to all the pressures that everyone faces on campus, international students also have to cope with language and cultural differences. Some of them are in the U.S. not exactly of their own choice, as in the example of B13. Another example is A8, who like most of the young Vietnamese refugees, came to the U.S. to escape political problems at home. This is also the case with many of the Iranian students, like A5, and students from other countries as well. Many times the ESL teacher is one of the first American acquaintances the foreign student has, and certainly the ESL teacher usually has more contact with the student than other university instructors, even in a program without tutorials, by virtue of small class size and the nature of the class situation. So in many ways, the ESL teacher is ideally situated to watch
out for danger signals and help the student overcome some of his problems, or at least direct him to the correct agencies for help, if the problems are too overwhelming.

Every prospective ESL teacher should be instructed in detecting students with emotional problems. To date, this is not done. I've been in courses and workshops where lists of "danger signals" were given for dyslexia, for first language interference, and for other possible difficulties an ESL teacher might be expected to have to deal with. It is time that emotional problems were included in the list, and that ESL teachers should be prepared to deal with them.

5.3.5 Tutorials

In this section I will first examine the student and teacher perceptions of tutorials and then the relationship of classes and tutorials in the ESL program. I will present the student view, the teacher view, and then my view of the relationship. Next I will make some recommendations for improvement of the tutorial system.

5.3.5.1 Student and Teacher Perceptions of Tutorials

As can be seen from the data presented in Chapter IV, students and teachers emphasized different aspects of tutorials in their descriptions and evaluations of them, but the opinions were not contradictory.
Students were generally favorable to tutorial; about half liked them, and two-thirds thought they were useful. Students viewed tutorials as an opportunity to get their work corrected, to ask questions more freely than in class, and to get help with their own particular problems. Students preferred single tutorials by a two-to-one margin, because they received more of the teacher's time, they worked on their specific problems, and they were less embarrassed when no other students were around.

Teachers were also favorable to tutorials. As B5 put it, "I wouldn't feel I was doing my job if I didn't do tutorials." But teachers also felt tutorials were quite time-consuming. Teachers viewed tutorials as a place to individualize instruction, both content and method, to suit the needs of the students. They also emphasized more than the students did the value of the relationship-building aspect of the tutorial. Teachers enjoyed, for the most part, getting to know their students better. Teachers also thought that the tutorials helped them to assess the students' progress better than was possible in class. Most of the teachers preferred double tutorials because of the time it saved them, although they thought single tutorials were better for the students. Two teachers said that they would be more willing to do single tutorials if they were paid for them.
5.3.5.2 Connection between Classes and Tutorials

One subject that interested me from the beginning of the study was the amount of connection between classes and tutorials. In the following paragraphs I will give a picture of the connection students saw between classes and tutorials, and of the connection teachers saw. Then I will present the connection I observed during this study.

In both questionnaire and interview students indicated that they saw a strong connection between classes and tutorials. During our interviews it came out that the students tended to see that connection as one-way, moving from classes to tutorials. And three of the students said that this was done only "when necessary." If a student was having a special problem with the course material, it came up in tutorials; otherwise not. On the questionnaires, many of the students who indicated that there was a strong connection between classes and tutorials based their responses on the fact that they wrote a composition in class and then went over that composition in tutorials. This view of tutorials and classes is represented in Diagram 1 in Figure 8, below.

Only one student indicated that he saw a strong movement from tutorials to classes. E14, in his interview, gave me an example of this. He cited the time that T1 made up a list of sentences with errors on them, taken from student compositions gone over in tutorials, and brought them into class to use as an exercise. Other students indicated that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. $C \rightarrow T$</td>
<td>Write a composition in class, discuss it in tutorial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. $C \leftarrow T$</td>
<td>Write a composition in class, discuss it in tutorial. Teacher brings to class a list of incorrect sentences gathered in tutorial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. $C \rightarrow T \leftarrow W$</td>
<td>Write a paper in class, discuss it in tutorial. Student asks questions about letter-writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Double line indicates strong connection. Single line indicates weak connection. $C =$ Class, $T =$ Tutorial, $W =$ World outside.

**Figure 8:** Student Views of Class and Tutorial

There was some movement in that direction, too. If a common problem came up in tutorials, the teacher would bring it into class. For a representation of this view of class-tutorial interaction, see Diagram 2 in Figure 8.

Other students thought that the connection between classes and tutorials was not so direct. In classes one
learned theory, and in tutorials one learned to apply the theory. Also, in tutorials, the students could ask questions that would take up too much of the class time. As one student put it, "The class time belongs to everybody, the tutorial time belongs to me." A related idea was the relative amount of input students had in classes and tutorials. Some of them felt they had more to say about the topic of the tutorial than about the topic of the class. One example was the question A3 wanted to ask about the difference between "He works." and "He does work.", which he asked in tutorial rather than in class. A3 provided another example of this kind of connection when one day in tutorial he asked T1 to help him write a letter to Immigration officials. This view of the connection between classes and tutorials is represented in Diagram 3 in Figure 8.

The teachers' opinion was a little different from that of the students. They saw a strong connection between classes and tutorials, and they thought there was a movement from classes to tutorials, just as the students did. Teachers said that whatever the lesson of the week was, they would look for those points in the composition. The difference was that teachers saw a stronger influence of tutorials on class than the students did. The teachers felt that they could gauge how well the students were picking up key concepts in the tutorial, and adjust the class accordingly.
Teachers agreed with students that there were distinctions between classes and tutorials in the amount of individualization possible. Teachers said they adapted their teaching methods to fit the personalities of the students in the tutorial. Also the teacher could reach a better understanding of why the student was making a particular error. An example of this occurred in a tutorial with T1 and A9. A9 had a lot of sentence fragments. T1 started out by talking about different kinds of clauses, but quickly realized that A9 did not have a clear understanding of the difference between the subject and the verb. If they had not had a face-to-face discussion, it might have taken T1 a lot longer to determine where the problem lay. A diagram of the way the teachers viewed the class-tutorial connection is given below in Figure 9.

My own view of the class-tutorial connection is different from both that of the students and that of the teachers. First, the amount and direction of connection varied from teacher to teacher. During the course of this study, it became clear to me that T1 and T2 were doing very different things in their classes and tutorials.

T1's tendency was to use the tutorial first of all to help the student with any pressing problems he might have, whether personal, as in the case of A5, or language-related, as in the case of A9. If he had none, then she would go ahead with a tutorial in which she looked in the student's
Example of influence of class on tutorial: the topic of class is transition words, and the teacher underlines the transition words in a student's composition in tutorial.

Example of influence of tutorial on class: many students have a problem with articles, discovered in tutorial, and the teacher brings it up in class.

Example of influence of outside world on tutorial: student wants to know what is expected of him when he receives an invitation to an American wedding; teacher tells him.

Figure 9: Teacher View of Class and Tutorial

work especially for those points covered in class that week. A diagram of this tutorial-class connection is given below in Figure 10.

T2, on the other hand, did not allow much influence from the outside world on the tutorial. The connection between classes and tutorials was mostly indirect. Whatever the topic of the class lesson, T2 focused on sentence-level errors in the composition during the tutorial. A diagram of this class-tutorial connection is given below in Figure 11.

Clearly, T1 and T2 did different things in tutorials. The question is, which one of them was doing more of what
Example of influence of class on tutorial: the topic of the week is topic sentences, and T1 examines the topic sentences of a composition with a student in tutorial.

Example of influence of tutorial on class: T1 talks to A7 about coming to class on time in tutorial, and A7 comes to class on time after that.

Example of influence of world on tutorial: A3 wants help writing a letter, and T1 gives it to him in tutorial.

Figure 10: Class-Tutorial Connection of T1

Example of an indirect connection between class and tutorial: the class topic is unity, and T2 corrects the sentence-level errors in a student's paper in tutorial.

Figure 11: Class-Tutorial Connection of T2
the tutorials were supposed to do? There is no definite answer. Nowhere in any written form were the goals of the tutorial specifically laid out. What reference to them there was tended to be vague, mentioning only that tutorials provided the student an opportunity to get individual help with his composition skills. This lack of articulation of the purpose of tutorials will be taken up in the next section, in which I will make some suggestions about the tutorial program.

5.3.5.3 Recommendations about Tutorials
I started this project because I was curious about tutorials: about what they were, what happened in them, how the teachers and the students felt about them. I started out with a definite bias: I was sure that tutorials were helpful and worthwhile. I was sure that students and teachers shared my opinion. Now after having done this study, I have to modify my original opinion. Tutorials can be helpful and worthwhile, but with some teachers and with some students they were just a waste of time. Some of the teachers were enthusiastic about tutorials, some were so-so, and some felt they were too great a burden. The students, for the most part, did believe in the tutorials. This was confirmed in the questionnaire, in the interviews that I had with the students, and on their evaluations at the end of the quarter. The most common suggestion to improve the tutorial was
to make it longer. Of course, there were some dissenters. Even those who supported tutorials were not always totally delighted with them. As B6 put it in his interview, "tutorials are helpful, but not as helpful as they sound."

To make tutorials a more useful experience for student and teacher alike, I would like to propose certain measures.

1. The tutorial system should be made more flexible.
   It does not seem pedagogically sound to mandate that every student spend the same amount of time with the teacher, regardless of his needs or wishes. Some of the students needed and benefited from out-of-class time with the teacher. Some of the students did not. The length of time devoted to each student should be opened up to the joint discretion of student and teacher. In fact, this step was already taken by some of the staff, anyway. They gave most students only a few minutes of time and gave a few students a great deal of time.

2. The double/single tutorial issue should be researched further.
   In my study, the majority of students indicated a preference for single tutorials. However, some students did say that they preferred double tutorials. This second group seemed to agree with A. Trillin, who says, "If two to five students have a particular need or problem, small-group tutoring can be even
more effective than individual tutoring because of the interaction among students and the fact that a single student is not always 'on the spot.'"**1** The first group seemed to agree with Roger Garrison, who says, "The most effective teaching method is one-to-one: tutorial, or editor-to-writer."**2** What seems clear is that different students and different teachers do better with different methods. This is no different in tutorials than in class. As Trillin says, "Tutors and students express strong and widely differing opinions about group tutoring, and it seems essential to ask students how they feel about it since the best tutoring cannot work if its format is objectionable to participants."**3**

3. If the tutorials are going to remain as a fixed item of the ESL program, they should be listed in the course catalog, so the students will know about them and will be able to take them into consideration in signing up for other courses.

---


**3** Trillin, p. 203.
4. Teachers should be given specific instruction in how to teach in tutorials. Tutorials are different from classroom teaching in a number of ways. These differences need to be pointed out to teachers. Workshops and/or video tapes could help in this area.

5. More of the burden of learning should be placed on the student's shoulders. Both the teachers and the students would benefit from this. When the teacher makes all the corrections on a paper, hands it to a student and asks him if he has any questions about it, neither teacher nor student has learned much.

6. The purpose tutorials are meant to serve should be articulated by the administrators. This suggestion in a way subsumes all the others. The first step is to determine what the expectations and goals of tutorials are; only after that are the other ones practical.

5.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study has raised many questions in my mind, questions that I hope will someday be investigated by ESL professionals. Some of them I have already mentioned in the previous pages. Others I have not.
1. The first suggestion I would like to make for future research is that more qualitative studies be done in ESL classrooms. Observation, not once or twice but over a period of time, interviewing, taping, and the other instruments and techniques I used proved to be valuable tools that turned up information hard to get at with other methods. The way to find out what goes on in class is to go to class.

2. The tutorial system needs to be further researched, as I mentioned above. Not only the issue of double/single tutorials needs attention. The curriculum of the tutorial deserves a closer look. How do different teachers handle them? What are the alternatives to a tutorial system?

3. The interaction of teacher and student, and of student and student in an ESL class is a topic that would benefit from this methodology. The questions I would pose about loners I mentioned earlier.

4. What is the real meaning of the word "curriculum" in ESL? What are the connections between what is written on paper and what actually goes on in class? I would ask this last question of teachers, students, and researchers.

5. What sorts of intercultural problems are posed by the ESL classroom? How much interference is there? How aware of this problem are teachers and students? What can we do to overcome it?
6. What is it that students want from an ESL program? What do they perceive as their needs? How do they think the program meets their needs?

7. How can ESL teachers learn to better understand the emotional problems special to foreign students? We need to know more about why students come to American universities to study. What are their hopes and aspirations while here? Are they planning to return to their own countries after completing their education here? These questions all influence the amount of pressure the students feel to become a part of our culture. How can ESL teachers help the students with these problems? How can we teach ESL teachers to recognize students who seem unable to deal with these problems?

8. What are some other methods of staff development and professional growth that might be effective? For example, when a trained, experienced teacher becomes so threatened and defensive that her teaching is affected, we need to know how to deal with this sort of problem.
Appendix A

ESL PROGRAM IN 1959

September 16, 1959

To the Secretaries of the College of Agriculture
Graduate School
School of Home Economics
College of Arts
   " Commerce
   " Education
   " Engineering
   " Pharmacy

Despite our efforts to screen out students with inadequate proficiency in English before they enter the university, in past years a handful of students have appeared here without the necessary competence in English to profit from taking even elementary courses in their special fields. In the past, the only remedies available have been: (1) to deny the student entrance upon his arrival here, thus causing him great personal (usually financial) difficulties, (2) to send the student off temporarily to a special institute (we have been using the ones at Michigan, American University and Columbia), (3) to allow the student to attempt to
make up his English deficiency while in residence here, at the rate of maximally two courses per quarter over a period of a year.

During the Fall Quarter, for the first time we will be trying a new system. For the special eight or so students who show up unprepared to engage in a regular program, we propose to offer an intensive one-quarter program consisting of two hours of courses daily in the English Department, one hour daily in the Speech Department and two hours daily in a language laboratory with an assistant. This total of five hours is to be distributed under the following course numbers: English 406, English 407, Speech 405, and Speech 410 Special. The Speech 405 will meet at 8:00 A.M. daily, the laboratory (under the number of Speech 410 Special) from 9 to 11, English 406 at 12:00 and English 407 at 1:00. The times scheduled for these courses in the official time schedule do not coincide with the times I have given here; I would like to caution you that these few special students should not be allowed to schedule courses before 2 o'clock in the afternoon. Whether the students involved should be allowed to take a course in their special fields is a matter that I think can best be decided in the individual college offices, but my recommendation would be that they should be permitted to enroll as auditors in one or two afternoon classes, or possibly to enroll for credit in at most one afternoon class in their own fields.
Students will be recommended for these special courses on the basis of their scores on the Lado English Language Test and the Lado Aural Comprehension Test, with as much flexibility in the interpretation of such scores, of course, as seems compatible with the students' own interests. You will be able to recognize which students are involved by the fact that on their recommendations for English and Speech both English 406 and 407 will be noted and both Speech 405 and 410 Special. Other students will continue to be recommended for English 406, 407, or 408 and Speech 405 as usual, or excused from all special work in English, so the new program in effect will simply allow us to offer a few problem cases the intensive work in language that they need. If there are any questions about our program, please do not hesitate to call me at my office, extension 754 or at my home TU 5-5852.

I have talked with many of you already about the desirability of having a program such as the one I have outlined above; I hope that this will prove to be a step towards the solution to the problem that has faced us.

Sincerely yours,

Leonard Newmark

Director of English for

Foreign Students
Appendix B

SIGNUP SHEET FOR STUDENT INTERVIEWS

Wednesday, July 15, 1981

To 108-01 ESL students:

I would like to schedule a private, 30-minute interview with you to ask you about tutorials. The interview will be next week. We will meet outside at the east entrance to Denney Hall. Please put your name next to a time that is convenient for you. If none of these times are good, please tell me when we can meet.

Thank you.

Meritu Berkovitch

Monday, July 20

9
11
11:30
12
2
2:30
3
3:30
4

Tuesday, July 21

1
1:30
2
2:30
3
3:30
4

Wednesday, July 22

9
1
2
4

Thursday, July 23

9
9:30
10
10:30
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Friday, July 24

11
12
12:30
1
1:30
2
2:30
3
3:30
4
Appendix C

HANDOUT TO STAFF ABOUT STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

7/13/81

Dear ESL people:
I would like to pass out a questionnaire about tutorials to all ESL students. I hope to distribute the questionnaires on Wednesday, to be completed and returned on Thursday or Friday. Does anyone have any objections? Please let me know. I would also appreciate questions, suggestions, etc.

Thanks.

Merilu
Appendix D

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

July 15, 1981

Dear ESL people:

Here are the tutorial questionnaires I promised you. Please give them out to your students today. If at all possible, I would appreciate you going over in class questions you think the students may not understand, if any. Then ask the students to turn the questionnaires in at the next class meeting. I'd like to have them a.s.a.p. Of course, I'll take them later also. If it is not too much to ask, please keep track of those who have not turned the questionnaires in and keep after them to do so. It would be really hard for me to do for the whole program, but it's important that I get as many responses as possible.

Again, if anyone has questions or suggestions, let me know.

Thank you very much.

Merilu

P.S. If you don't have enough copies for your class, take some more from my mailbox.

P.P.S. Please put extras in my box.
July 15, 1981

To all ESL students:

I am a graduate student in English Education. I am doing research on ESL tutorials. I want to know what happens in tutorials and how tutorials can be improved. Your ideas are important. They will help me to understand the student viewpoint. Please answer my questions. Please give the questionnaire to the teacher when you are done. If you have any questions, call me at 422-6360. Thank you much.

Sincerely,

Merilu Berkovitch
Tutorial Questionnaire

July 15, 1981

Name________________________________________________________

Social Security Number ________________________________________

Teacher's Name ____________________________________________

ESL course number _____________ Age ________________________

Sex _______ Country _________________________________

Native language ________________ Major ______

Graduate/Undergraduate ________________________________

What other ESL courses did you take at OSU?

How often do you have tutorial with your teacher?

How long does tutorial last?

Do you have a double tutorial?  (That is, does another student share your tutorial time with you?)

Which do you think is better, double or single tutorials?

Why?

What do you usually do in tutorial?  (Answer as fully as possible.)

(PLEASE NOTE: THERE ARE MORE QUESTIONS ON THE OTHER SIDE.)
What is your opinion of tutorials? (Do you like them/dislike them? Are they useful/not useful? Are they enjoyable/boring/terrible/other?) Please explain your answers.

How much connection is there between what you do in tutorial and what you do in class?

How could tutorial be improved?

Is there anything else you would like to tell me about tutorial? Please do!

Would you like to be interviewed about tutorials?
Appendix E

ESL STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

To:__________________________

From: [T1]

Date: July 6, 1981

Hope you all had a good long weekend. Remember the need for information on tutorials? On this sheet please jot down briefly (or at length, if you want) your information as follows:

1. How are you scheduling tutorials this quarter? (One or more student(s) at a time? Amount of time per student? Weekly or bi-weekly meetings? Special tutorials planned—i.e., extra help sessions with more than one student? Weak students get longer tutorials? etc.)

2. Your usual approach (or lack thereof) to tutorials (Read and/or mark papers in advance? Discuss content/grammar separately? Give students rewrite assignment or grammar exercises? Take notes on student’s progress or material discussed? etc.)

3. Do you plan to keep records of your tutorial sessions this quarter? ______yes ______no
If yes, how will you do this?

Return this sheet to Vickie by Wednesday, July 8, please.

Thanks for your help!

P.S. Since Merilu has focused her attention on tutorials, this info. will probably be funneled to her. It may serve some fairly immediate purpose after all.
Appendix F

THE THIRD PARAGRAPH T2 USED IN THE 1 P.M.-CLASS

English 108.01

Unity and Coherence

Examine the following paragraph for unity:

There are several things I like about music. It is found in every single house and at every spot in the world because it is the only language that does not need any translation. Something else I like about music is its variety. Everyone can find some kind of music that he likes and which goes with his personality. Although music is an abstract thing, it can deeply affect a person's mood. Most people after a long hard day at work or school like to go home and listen to some music. What makes people relax differs from person to person. Moreover, music is found everywhere. If you go to almost any store or shop, you hear low music coming from some hidden speakers. Even in science, they have been using music in contemporary experiments.

**How could the above paragraph be improved? What is its major weakness?**
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STUDENT DATA SHEET

NAME ___________________SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER ____________

AGE ___________ SEX ______________________________

CITY AND COUNTRY YOU WERE BORN IN _______________________

CITY OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE ____________________________

ARE YOU MARRIED? ______________________________________

DO YOU HAVE ANY CHILDREN? ___________ (PLEASE GIVE THEIR

AGE(S) AND SEX BELOW)

WHAT DOES YOUR HUSBAND OR WIFE DO? _________________

ADDRESS IN COLUMBUS ________________________________

TELEPHONE NUMBER ________________________________

WHAT KIND OF HOUSING DO YOU LIVE IN? (APARTMENT, DORMITORY,

ETC.) _________

DO YOU HAVE ROOMMATES? _______ HOW MANY? _________

WHAT COUNTRY ARE THEY FROM?

WHAT LANGUAGE DO YOU SPEAK WITH THEM?

_____________________________________________________

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

COLLEGES OR UNIVERSITIES MAJOR DEGREE DATE PLACE

ATTENDED
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HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN IN THE U.S.? _______________________

LANGUAGE BACKGROUND

NATIVE LANGUAGE __________________________________________

OTHER LANGUAGES THAT YOU KNOW OR HAVE STUDIED ___________

ENGLISH LANGUAGE BACKGROUND

APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF YEARS OF STUDY ______________________

PLEASE LIST BELOW THE PLACES THAT YOU HAVE STUDIED ENGLISH

WHERE                  WHEN                  WHAT KIND OF STUDY

HAVE YOU STUDIED ENGLISH BEFORE IN THE U.S. OTHER THAN AT
O.S.U.?_________

IF YES, PLEASE TELL WHERE AND WHEN IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

PLEASE CIRCLE IF YOU HAVE TAKEN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING COURSES
IN ENGLISH AT O.S.U.

106 _____ 107 _____ 108.01 _____ 108.02 _____ 110 _____

100.01 _____ 100.02 _____ 100.03 _____

WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE YOUR STRONGEST ABILITIES IN ENGLISH?

WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE YOUR WEAKEST ABILITIES IN ENGLISH?

WHAT DO YOU EXPECT TO LEARN IN THIS COURSE?

HOW MUCH TIME PER WEEK OUTSIDE OF CLASS DO YOU THINK YOU
WILL BE ABLE TO SPEND ON THIS COURSE?
CURRENT EDUCATIONAL GOALS

ARE YOU A GRADUATE OR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT? ________

WHAT DEGREE(S) DO YOU PLAN TO GET AT O.S.U.? ________

DEPARTMENT __________________ MAJOR __________________

SPECIAL AREA OF INTEREST OR RESEARCH ____________

IS THIS YOUR FIRST QUARTER AT O.S.U.? ________ IF NOT,

HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN AT O.S.U.? __________________

HAVE YOU ATTENDED ANY OTHER AMERICAN COLLEGES OR

UNIVERSITIES?

IF YES, PLEASE LIST THEM BELOW AND TELL WHEN YOU ATTENDED.

DID YOU ATTEND HIGH SCHOOL IN THE U.S.? ________

IF YES, WHERE? __________________

________________________________________________

WORK EXPERIENCE

JOB POSITION/PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT/DATES WORKED/DESCRIPTION

________________________________________________

PLEASE LIST BELOW ANY PREVIOUS PUBLICATIONS OR PRESENTATIONS

(INCLUDE THE LANGUAGE)

FUTURE PLANS: PLEASE WRITE A FEW SENTENCES WHICH TELL WHAT

YOU PLAN TO DO IN THE FUTURE AFTER YOU LEAVE O.S.U. IN THE

SPACE BELOW.
PLEASE LIST ANY HOBBIES THAT YOU HAVE OR ANY INTERESTS OUTSIDE YOUR FIELD OF STUDY.

TRAVEL—PLEASE LIST BELOW ANY COUNTRIES YOU HAVE VISITED OR LIVED IN OUTSIDE OF YOUR HOME COUNTRY.

PLEASE LIST BELOW ANY SUGGESTIONS FOR TOPICS YOU WOULD LIKE TO WRITE ON IN YOUR COMPOSITIONS THIS QUARTER.

IN A BRIEF PARAGRAPH, PLEASE GIVE YOUR REASONS FOR DECIDING TO PURSUE YOUR STUDIES IN THE U.S. AND AT O.S.U.
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REPORT TO STAFF ABOUT BROKEN WINDOWS

To: All Staff

From: [T1]

Date: August 10, 1981

Broken Window

As you have probably noticed, the inside windows in 566 were broken some time over the weekend. I don't know exactly how it happened, but it could have been broken by an angry student.

As part of my effort to explore that possibility, I ask for your help. 1. Please do not say anything to any of your students unless they ask you specifically about the window. Then respond with "It was broken over the weekend and we don't know how." Anything further, plead ignorance. Do not indicate that I'm trying to find out if it was a student. 2. Please don't discuss it among yourselves (If you have comments or questions, come to me.) 3. If you know of any student who has been a special problem to you during the quarter or unusually displeased with our program, please let me know. 4. If any student shows unusual interest in the window or what happened to it, please let me know. 5. Finally, if you returned midterms or did any kind of evaluation that might have upset students in the last week, please let me know. As always, I appreciate your help.

Since there is a good deal of broken glass on the floor inside 566, I am going to keep the room locked until it can be cleaned.

Vickie's Absence

As you know, Vickie is out of town this week on her well-deserved vacation in Gatlinburg. Since I am unable to man the office at all times, certain procedures will have to go into effect. Namely,
1. When I am at class or out of the building, I will lock the door. Sorry, but I don't see a way around this. If you need to get in or don't have the key, you can get the pass key from the main office in 421. Please don't block the door open or leave without being sure it's locked.

2. I will answer the telephone when I am in the office. If you are in the office, you may wish to answer it also. You should remember, however, that if you are expecting an important call, there may not be anyone in the office to answer the phone.

3. Since I will probably be moving out to Vickie's desk for tutorials for at least part of the week, I would appreciate it if you could enter the office quietly and as infrequently as possible.

4. Whenever I leave the office, I will try to leave notes on the door regarding my return time so that students will be kept posted on the times at which the office is open.

Thanks for your help.
Appendix I
ENGLISH 108.01 TOPICS OF STUDY

English 108.01

Areas to be studied

A. Rhetorical Principles
   1. overall organization
   2. narrowing a topic
   3. topic sentence
   4. thesis statements
   5. unity
   6. coherence
   7. transitions
   8. supporting your ideas
   9. introductions

B. Patterns of Organization
   1. extended examples
   2. classification
   3. cause/effect
   4. agree/disagree

C. Other Types of Writing
   1. summaries
   2. evaluative writing
3. paraphrasing

D. Grammar and Punctuation
1. fragments
2. comma-splice
3. run-ons
4. parallelism
5. subject/verb/object agreement
6. wh-clauses
7. noun-clauses
8. gerunds
9. participles
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