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CHAPTER I
Introduction

Need for Research in English

In 1962 James E. Miller, Jr., a participant in the Allerton Park Conference on Research in the Teaching of English, asked his audience to consider whether it is "not time for English departments to accept, alongside historical and biographical scholarship, alongside interpretive and analytical criticism, alongside imaginative and creative writing--to accept genuine research in the teaching of English as appropriate--and even vital--to their interests and functions?" Miller's question, as valid as it was, had not been answered positively for several very good reasons. The inclusion of writing study in English courses taught by teachers trained almost solely in literature and literary criticism certainly did not aid "genuine research in the teaching of English." But more importantly, we had few tools to use in carrying out such research. The whole notion in the social sciences of case studies (or of studying people and their relationships) was new to us, as were the research techniques of statistics. Cognitive psychology and the insights it offers into the learning process were either unavailable or were applied only to studies of young children. The
scientific study of language had only recently begun to be revolutionized by Noam Chomsky and his colleagues. But as a result of developing research models in these fields and of recurring calls such as Miller's, research in the teaching of English (and especially in the teaching of writing) is becoming increasingly legitimate and productive.

In fact, the charge that English departments should undertake serious pedagogical research can be traced not only to Miller's talk and the Allerton Park Proceedings but to a number of influential publications that appeared during a kind of research watershed in the early 1960's. Arthur Applebee describes the most significant of these, the National Council of Teachers of English's The National Interest and the Teaching of English, as "a direct and shrewd presentation of the importance of English to the national welfare, coupled with a startling documentation of instructional inadequacies."² Basically an attempt by the NCTE to balance the science-dominated Sputnik years and to urge the inclusion of funds for English in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the National Interest report (published in January, 1961) closed with a strong call for "better and more basic research in English," specifically noting the need for work in language development, learning theory, and methods of teaching."³ In April of the same year, the NCTE and
the United States Office of Education moved to review and clarify what was currently known about "the teaching and learning of composition." Richard Braddock, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer's *Research in Written Composition*, which appeared in 1963, provided a meticulous review of existing research and concluded lamentably that "composition research is not highly developed." The field could, in fact, "be compared to chemical research as it emerged from the period of alchemy. . . ." At about the same time, the USOE's "Project English" produced its *Needed Research in the Teaching of English* (monograph No. 11), specifically calling for better training of writing teachers. While different in focus and broader in purpose, another series of meetings, which took place during these same years, reached somewhat similar conclusions. From late 1961 to 1963, the NCTE held a series of conferences, sponsored by "Project English," on research in the teaching of English (the Allerton Park conference cited above was the third of these; the first two were held at the Carnegie Institute of Technology and at New York University, respectively). Held only three days after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the fourth conference called for "patterns . . . for empirical and other approaches to the study of teaching English." The subdivision meeting on "Research in Teaching Composition" reported interest in encouraging
"experimentation in composition . . . and creating an information center or agency through which researchers could learn of others working in similar areas. . . ." 5

The calls for more and better research were balanced during these same years by several influential critiques of the English status quo. The year 1963, for instance, saw the publication of James Lynch and Bertrand Evans's attack on secondary English texts (High School English Text-Books: A Critical Examination) and Albert Kitzhaber's highly influential assessment of the teaching of college writing (Themes, Theories, and Therapy). Lynch and Evans deplored (and documented) inadequacies in most of the books they examined, complaining that, in general, the texts contained "too much of almost everything, too much of a sense of hustle and bustle," but "not nearly enough . . . composition."6 Unfortunately, the authors assume that the ideal subject for all high-school composition is literature, and this underlying assumption colors all of their subsequent advice. At the college level, Kitzhaber reported that his study of the Freshman English course descriptions and syllabi from ninety-five colleges and universities and his subsequent visits to eighteen of those institutions revealed three major weaknesses: "First, . . . the confusion exhibited in the course—a widespread uncertainty about aims, a bewildering variety of content, a frequent lack of progression within the
course. Second, . . . a variety of administrative adjustments and precautions that indicate little confidence in the expertness of those who teach it. And finally, . . . the textbooks for this course are for the most part less rigorous and less scholarly than those for other college freshman courses."  

As Leonard Greenbaum demonstrated in a 1969 article, "The Tradition of Complaint," the attacks on Freshman English were by no means new. Indeed, in 1939 Oscar J. Campbell, past-President of the NCTE, stated his belief "that the standard college course in Freshman composition has done much more harm than good," and went on to call for its abolition.  

Attacks such as Campbell's were echoed in Warner Rice's 1959 NCTE address "A Proposal for the Abolition of Freshman English, as It Is Now Commonly Taught, from the College Curriculum." These and similar "frequent intramural whippings" led Edward P.J. Corbett to refer to Freshman English as the department's "Poor Relation That Won't Go Away."  

The critiques of the system and the calls for more serious research and study which gathered force and exploded in the early 60's were accompanied by such provocative and influential general works as James B. Conant's The Education of American Teachers (1963) and Jerome S. Bruner's The Process of Education (1960). Conant underscored the need to reexamine our assumptions about teacher
preparation, and Bruner, calling attention to Piaget's work on the cognitive processes of children, urged development of a "spiral curriculum" which would foster the growing understanding of basic ideas through repetitive experience with them in progressively more complex forms. All told, the extraordinary amount of attention focused on education in general, the plethora of specific calls for increased research in English, and the success of attempts to secure federal funds for such research resulted in a surge of studies on writing pedagogy and theory.

That much of significance and value has been produced is documented by the 1976 publication of Teaching Composition: Ten Bibliographical Essays, a current "state of the arts" assessment of composition theory and pedagogy. Yet my reading of much of the resultant research leads me to believe that more often than not the best studies have either been restricted to a very small number of observations, concerned primarily with "average" or "superior" student writers, or carried out primarily as a means of justifying some particular educational technique. For example, Janet Emig's rigorous and justifiably-praised study, The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders, is nevertheless based on the writing of only eight students, all of them of above average intelligence and identified as "good writers." Emig's extremely valuable work points up the need for individual-observation case studies and
for the recognition of process in writing, yet its
generalizations, at best, can be applied only to "above-
average" students. The work of John Mellon, Frank O'Hare,
and others on syntactic maturity (to be discussed in
detail in Chapter III) deals with large numbers of
students and even larger numbers of writing samples.
This work is consistently characterized, however, by
the wish to validate a particular pedagogical technique
(transformational grammar, with or without its technical
terminology). These studies, praiseworthy in themselves,
have yielded a wealth of information on teaching techniques
as well as new and exciting textual materials which utilize
the transformational grammar/sentence-combining techniques.
Yet they are no doubt emblematic of the work James Britton
refers to when he says that "there has been, of course, a
great deal of research in America on the teaching of com­
position at all levels. In the main, however, these are
studies with a severely methodological or pedagogical
intention . . . . We found very little, either in America
or elsewhere, in the way of general descriptive studies of
the kinds of writing that high school students actually
do."12

Whatever its focus or aims, a prodigious amount of
research on English (and composition) was carried out
during the '50s. No doubt the competitive situation spawned
by Sputnik and the predominance of the sciences and the
optimism of the Kennedy years form a basic context for what occurred. But in several crucial senses, much that was done now seems shortsighted. Kitzhaber, for instance, confidently predicted in 1963 that "it seems certain that the improvement that has lately been noticed in the English preparation of entering freshmen is bound to continue." Kitzhaber saw increasing college enrollments as a sign that "selective admissions" and higher entrance requirements were here to stay. Robert Havighurst's projections for American Higher Education in the 1960's also sounded rosy enough. He predicted the continued rapid increase of enrollments beyond 1980 and projected an equal "increase in the demand for college-educated people." As a corollary to increased enrollments and rising standards, Kitzhaber predicted (accurately so) the demise of remedial English courses in college. He then went on to recommend that "it is time that the English departments of reputable four-year colleges and universities announce that elementary instruction in the details of correct grammar, usage, and mechanics is not a proper activity for college classrooms."

At the same time, several Curriculum Study and Demonstration Centers in English (funded by the United States Office of Education beginning in 1962) based much of their work on an influential 1959 report, The Basic Issues in the Teaching of English (which failed to consider the needs of very poorly prepared students), and on the lead provided
by Northrup Frye, who argued that "Poetry should be at the centre of all literary training, and literary prose forms the periphery. In a properly constructed curriculum there would be no place for 'effective communication' or for any form of utilitarian English." The Centers and the profession in general thus remained steadfast in the commitment to keeping literature central to composition study. As the following chapter demonstrates, this trend began only at the turn of the century. And in spite of the growing need for a wide variety of writing in American society, English teachers trained almost solely in literature and rewarded on the basis of literary research naturally perpetuated the trend.

Most importantly, as Michael Shugrue notes in his *English in a Decade of Change*, "the Basic Issues conferees . . . did not foresee the national movement to free the ghetto from intellectual and cultural as well as economic blight." Yet at the same time that so much energy was being expended on research in teaching English, the cumulative effect of the 1954 Supreme Court decision on desegregating the schools and the strong commitment of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations to equality of educational opportunity began to be felt. Little by little, the universities opened their doors (even those later labeled as "revolving") to former academic pariahs--those students variously pegged as "bonehead," "new,"
"disadvantaged," or "high-risk." Indeed, Shugrue points out that in the latter part of the decade, the "disadvantaged or deprived child has become . . . the primary target for educational experimentation." Volumes have subsequently been devoted to questioning the basic assumptions of this experimentation. Suffice it here to say that most of what was done was aimed at pre-college students.

The positive calls for improved teacher training and research studies were balanced, then, by our short-sightedness in expecting college enrollments to expand and student quality to improve and by our consequent neglect of remedial programs or courses. Indeed, recent studies demonstrate that "remedial" students have typically been the most neglected of all by college English curriculum planners and researchers. John E. Roueche, of the University of Texas at Austin, indicted two-year colleges in his 1968 monograph Salvage, Redirection, or Custody? Roueche's study indicated that these schools failed to live up to the promise of the "open door" by providing inadequate and ineffective programs for current students. Roueche also notes, "Research on developmental programs . . . is virtually nonexistent" and argues that "the best direction for improving remedial education is to investigate the areas of identification and description of the student . . . as well as the evaluation of classes,
William Moore, Jr., Professor of Educational Administration at The Ohio State University, who uses the term "high-risk" to identify remedial students, challenges the fact that, to many, the description of cultural and/or educational disadvantages "has been widely accepted not as a tentative hypothesis but as a confirmed explanation of the poor achievement among high-risk students." Moore calls for better and more intensive research on "the effects of instruction, teacher attitudes, institutional climate, attendance, the materials and equipment used" in remedial teaching. And K. Patricia Cross's latest book, Accent on Learning, demonstrates that "until the era of open admissions, remedial efforts were low-key projects of concern to a limited number of students, parents, and educators. The nation as a whole was certainly not concerned with the problem, and even colleges . . . gave little attention." In the scramble to catch up, to throw together stop-gap programs (taught all too often by highly reluctant teachers pressed into service), research on this group of students took a back seat. In her review of thirty-five years of research, Cross finds "a lack of well-designed remedial programs" and an almost total "ambiguity of research evaluations." Although Roueche and others (notably S. Kendrick and C. L. Thomas) deplore the paucity of research on the effectiveness of remedial courses and programs, the
research which has been done all too often seems to take the form of hastily-conceived means of justifying (or validating) a program and thereby earning a badge for "effectiveness" instead of closely observing the learning patterns and written products of these students in an attempt to refine and improve instruction. Indeed, E. W. Gordon finds that "research has been dominated by concern with hypothesis testing or verification to the neglect of investigation based on careful and systematic observation."  

The work of Roueche, Moore, and Cross deals largely with general remedial instruction in the two-year colleges. Mina Shaughnessy, currently the director of CUNY's Instructional Resources Center, addresses herself directly to the specific problems of remedial instruction in writing. In Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing, she argues that "little has as yet been written about the problems and progress of basic writing students." These students, "still viewed by many educators as eleventh-hour learners with dim prospects for improvement in writing . . . have attracted little scholarly interest among teachers and researchers."  

In two other recent works, one a bibliographical article included in Gary Tate's Teaching Composition: Ten Bibliographical Essays and the other an address given during the 1976 MLA meeting in New York, Shaughnessy has further detailed this lack of scholarly investigation and research.
Professor Shaughnessy, in fact, has been studying the writing of remedial students and pointing up the need for more and better research since at least 1973. In that year, she called for a commitment to "close systematic observations over extended periods, to a pooling of our research energies and resources, and, finally, to a search within the social sciences themselves for techniques of observation and evaluation and for researchers who will help us see what our students are learning." And in an address presented at the 1975 MLA meeting (which later appeared in *CCC*), she urged her academic colleagues to "dive in" to the basic and exciting work which remains to be done.

This dissertation represents an attempt, if not to dive, at least to wade into the turbulent waters of remedial English instruction. Because we have traditionally met the needs of remedial students with patchwork measures conceived in desperation (or boredom) by largely uninterested teachers, we know little about the history of higher education's response to the remedial English student. Yet such an understanding would at least help us to view the current "crisis in literacy" from a more well-informed perspective. Toward that end, the second chapter of this dissertation attempts to set the current hue-and-cry into historical perspective and to evaluate past as well as present responses to remedial students. The
following chapter presents the results of a study of representative remedial students at The Ohio State University, including a close look at high-school backgrounds and attitudes toward writing and "English" as well as writing samples. The final chapter attempts to assess the weaknesses of the study, draw out the most significant implications, relate these to relevant work in psychology, linguistics, and reading theory, and outline a suggested course for future study and research.

Defining Terms

"New," "disadvantaged," "handicapped," "nontraditional," "developmental," "marginal," "high-risk," "remedial," "basic," "compensatory"—the welter of terms used and abused in the writing on this group of students is indeed long and tedious. Clearly, all of these terms are currently in use, hence, the futility of an attempt to eradicate any or all of them. On the other hand, using them interchangeably can be misleading and ambiguous. Before proceeding, I should like to group and characterize these terms as best I can.

Of them all, "remedial" has been used for the longest period in America in association with education (especially reading). Dictionaries before the 1950's do not list a specific educational meaning, but by 1957 Bergen and Cornelia Evans's *A Dictionary of Contemporary American Usage* lists the following definition and example: "Remedial means
affording remedy, tending to remedy something. (If you take a remedial reading course, you will soon be able to read rapidly and to understand better what you have read.) And the 1956 Britannica Book of the Year reports that "remediated" ("subjected to remedial education") seemingly was used for the first time or "became prominent" during 1954 or 1955.

In spite of its relative long standing, however, "remedial" carries certain undesirable associations. As Mina Shaughnessy points out, "the medical metaphor suggests a disease, and . . . students assigned to 'remedial' classes do get sent to writing 'labs' or 'clinics,' where their problems are 'diagnosed'; but worse, it is a soiled word with unhappy associations that go back to grade school, where many college remedial students began the losing game of 'catching up.'" Of course, there are other objections to the term "remedial" as well. John Roueche offers this definition: "'Remedial' implies the remediation of student deficiencies in order that the student might enter a program for which he was previously ineligible." K. Patricia Cross agrees with Roueche's definition but goes on to add that "remedial" is therefore an "incomplete" or inaccurate term because it has led us to "correcting weakness without giving equal time to developing strength."
The term I have found most often used interchangeably with "remedial" is "developmental." Yet the two words carry subtle connotative differences as well as practical or political differences in certain situations. Roueche articulates the distinction between "remedial" and "developmental" by saying that "developmental refers to the development of skills or attitudes and may or may not have anything to do with making a student eligible for another program."\textsuperscript{37} Cross implies that this distinction has been less than helpful and says that Roueche's definition "suggests that the distinction between remedial and developmental education lies in the pedagogical sophistication of the approach."\textsuperscript{38} She goes on to argue that "a more useful distinction is to be found in the purpose or goal of the program. If the purpose... is to overcome academic deficiencies, I would term the program 'remedial'.... If, however, the purpose of the program is to develop the diverse talents of students, whether academic or not, I would term the program developmental."\textsuperscript{39} Cross's distinctions, I think, inform many of the best "developmental" programs around the country today. But the term also is used as a catchword for minority programs and as a means of assuring allocation of federal funds. Finally, "developmental" is often used as a euphemism for "remedial" in states whose legislatures ban funds for remedial work in universities. My own
reading of the literature and my survey of programs across the country lead me to believe that Cross is right when she says that "developmental is frequently used as a euphemism for remedial in a dim awareness that developmental education is the more enlightened term to use," and to agree with Mina Shaughnessy that "'developmental' tends to get translated into 'remedial' when the chips are down."

Of the remaining terms, all are essentially attempts to label the students of the open admissions era. "Disadvantaged," "nontraditional," "marginal," and "high-risk" are all loaded terms, some more offensively so than others; more importantly, all fall into the category of "pedagogically empty" terms. They refer for the most part to the student described in 1970 by William Moore in Against the Odds: "He is subjected to deliberate professional neglect. . . . No books are written about him and virtually no research. . . . Attitude of his instructors is that he cannot learn. . . . The new [high-risk] students are those whose erratic high school records, economic plight, unimpressive standardized test scores, and race/cultural/class distinctions succeeded in placing them at a disadvantage with the vast majority of students." For many members of the academic community, the description above signals only one thing: students from minority ethnic groups. Among other considerations,
this led K. Patricia Cross in *Beyond the Open Door* (1971) and *Accent on Learning* (1976) to choose the relatively neutral term "new" to refer to those students who "ranked in the lowest third of the high school graduates on traditional tests of academic achievement." Cross goes on to point out that the idea that these "new" students belong primarily to minority ethnic groups is "one of the most persistent misunderstandings" among us today. My study of such students bears out Cross's claim: the "remedial" English students at Ohio State University are predominantly white; they come from middle-class homes, from small towns and wealthy suburbs as well as from inner cities, from fancy prep schools as well as from four-room rural schools. Yet in spite of the fact that Cross's use of "new" is carefully defined and is consistent throughout her work, I find this term one of the most unsatisfactory of them all. To take the word that is assigned indiscriminately, along with "improved," by advertisers to almost every product on the market seems to me to invite ambiguity. In addition, we already use the term "new" to refer to incoming freshmen.

As difficult as they seem to be to label, however, these students have at least one common characteristic: as readers and writers, they are beginners. This common denominator led Mina Shaughnessy to adopt the term "basic" to refer to the students she describes in "Basic Writing":
First, they tend to produce... small numbers of words with large numbers of errors (roughly from 15 to 35 errors per 300 words)... errors with the so-called regular features of Standard English,... misspellings that appear highly idiosyncratic, syntactic snarls that often seem to defy analysis, and punctuation errors that reflect an unstable understanding of the conventions for marking off sentences and little or no acquaintance with the uses of colons, semi-colons, parentheses, or quotation marks. Second, they seem to be restricted as writers, but not necessarily as speakers, to a very narrow range of syntactic, semantic, and rhetorical options, which forces them into either a rudimentary style of discourse... or a dense and tangled prose... 

As the third chapter of this dissertation demonstrates, Professor Shaughnessy's description fits the Ohio State "basic writer" fairly well. And I applaud her choice of the term, "basic," because it is not pejorative or judgmental (after all, we do not denigrate those who take "basic banjo" or "basic French cooking"). More importantly, the term "basic writing" implies that learning the skills of writing involves levels of acquisition and mastery and, as Shaughnessy has repeatedly pointed out, establishing that sequence of levels and skills should be the most pressing business of composition and English teachers today.

In spite of its excellences, however, I have chosen in the long run to use "remedial" rather than "basic" in
this dissertation for three reasons: 1) "remedial" has clear historical precedence; 2) it was used to describe the pilot project on which Chapter III is based; and 3) all the other terms tend to translate into "remedial," as Mina Shaughnessy herself points out, "when the chips are down." Nevertheless, as I use the term, "remedial" by no means refers primarily to minority students or to those from economically "deprived" areas. It does refer, however, to students whose level of reading and writing skills does not allow them to perform successfully in most college-level courses. Until or unless we change the content of these courses, such students are clearly remedial, and we need not shun the use of that term. But the fact that remedial writing students are working on basic skills does not indicate that their remedial course is somehow a "sub-college" course. Rather, it is a course whose subject David Bartholomae of the University of Pittsburgh identifies as "intellectual processes," or the generation of "new ways of seeing and knowing." Such concerns are central both to the remedial writing course and to the university.
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CHAPTER II

An Historical Survey of American Higher Education's Response to Remedial English Students

The Present "Crisis" in Writing Skills

The past two and a half years have seen an explosion of national concern over the "skills crisis." Malcolm Scully's front-page article in the Chronicle of Higher Education (September 25, 1974) documented the "crisis" and reported on reactions to an ADE survey of English department chairmen which found that "middle-class as well as well as disadvantaged students" are arriving at college with a "far less firm grasp of fundamentals than before." Additional articles on the "crisis" in the October 15 and October 29, 1974 issues of the Chronicle were followed by a flood of testimony, documentation, conjecture, and blame-labeling: e.g., "The Tools of Thought" (Wall Street Journal, December 4, 1974); "Can't Anyone Here Speak English?" (Time, August 25, 1974); "Why Johnny Can't Write" (Newsweek, December 8, 1974); "The Writing Gap" (Yale Alumni Magazine, January, 1976); "The Condition of Student Writing" (Education, March, 1976); "Rise in Remedial Math and Writing Courses" (New York Times, March 7, 1976); "Why Young People Can't Write" (The National Observer, April 17, 1976); "Drop in Student Skills Unequaled in History" (Los Angeles Times, August
The loud and often strident cries over deterioration of "basic skills" are based, at least partially, on strong evidence from a number of sources. Practically every set of achievement test scores shows a drop after the mid-sixties; declines in recent years are the most precipitous. The average SAT verbal score (which peaked at 478 in 1963) declined steadily to 444 in 1974 and then plunged 10 points to 434 in 1975 (a score below the first revised SAT in the forties). Scores on the English ACT test dropped from a national mean of 18.7 in 1966 to 17.6 in 1974. Scores on the Minnesota Scholastic Aptitude Test (given to more than ninety percent of Minnesota's high-school juniors) and Iowa Tests of Educational Development (widely used in Iowa) follow the same trend as the ACT and SAT. Evidence of declining scores culminated in the publication of the results of the second National Assessment of Educational Progress in Writing. (The NAEP, a federally-funded service, gathers information on the educational attainments of nine-, thirteen-, and seventeen-year-olds in ten learning areas. The first writing assessment took place in 1969; the second in 1974.)
A comparison of the results for seventeen-year-olds shows an "overall decline in the quality of the essays written for the second assessment" and "increases in awkwardness, run-on sentences and incoherent paragraphs..." While good writers' scores remain stable (i.e., they have the same mean holistic score), poor writers are clearly worse (i.e., they have a lower mean holistic score and are far more numerous).

These downward trends are paralleled in Ohio. The Ohio Statewide Student Needs Assessment Program: Report on 1974 Twelfth Grade Reading Assessment reports that "Actual student performance did not equal or surpass the desired performance level on any major skill area or objective." At The Ohio State University, where mean ACT scores have generally exceeded the national mean, mean scores have dropped two full points since 1966. An informal six-quarter study conducted by the office of Freshman English provides more specific information on the writing skills of Ohio State freshmen. For the three quarters of 1975-76, a diagnostic paragraph assignment given to all Freshman English students the first week of the quarter revealed that about thirty-one percent were unable to state a thesis and develop it in edited American English. During the Fall quarter of 1976 the percentage leaped to forty, and the results for Winter and Spring quarters showed further leaps to forty-five percent and fifty-one percent respectively.
Phenomena as clear cut, measurable, and alarming as the steady decline of achievement scores and the rising incidence of functional illiteracy might predictably elicit a search for causes. Equally predictable are the highly vocal attempts to tag a particular cause, with or without empirical evidence as support. Popular scapegoats include the Free Speech Movement, the whole "creative" movement of the 60's, the growing use and popularity of television and other technological instruments such as tape recorders or telephones, the abuse of language by those labeled as "double-speak" artists, and, naturally, the schools themselves.

Very little data of any kind exist by which we might measure the effects of the Free Speech or creative movements. And while much has been conjectured about the evil effects of television, those effects are so widely assimilated into our culture and so highly complex that they also yield little concrete or measurable data. Furthermore, the inferences that we might make are often contradictory. For instance, R. T. Bower's *Television and the Public* reports that during the years of the test-score decline the amount of time American families spent watching television steadily increased. Yet the *New York Times* recently reported that during 1975 families spent six percent *less* time watching television than before. *TV Guide* and the Nielsen statistics show that "By the
time a child is 18, he (or she) has spent 11,000 hours in school--and 15,000 hours watching television" (TV Guide, April 23, 1977, p. 4). If we attempt to correlate television viewing time with National Assessment of Educational Progress results, valid inferences are still nigh impossible to draw: while the writing skills of both seventeen- and thirteen-year-olds showed an overall decline in quality, those of nine-year-olds (fourth graders) showed equal or slightly higher quality (scores on the Iowa Tests for Basic Skills also follow this pattern). Annegret Harnischfeger and D. E. Wiley pose an intriguing hypothesis: might the "visual and verbal stimulation of television and the existence of educative preschool programs [be] responsible for the achievement increases in lower grades" while older children's television viewing keeps them "from educationally important activities, such as reading or consultative interaction with adults?"4

Tempting as it may be, however, no valid or adequate data are available to prove such an hypothesis.

Certain social changes that indicate less parental supervision of a child's time may be more easily documented. National Institute on Drug Abuse figures indicate that the fastest-growing group of drug abusers are eight-to-fourteen-year olds. And in "The Next Generation of Americans," Urie Bronfenbrenner reports some dramatic post-World War II trends: 1) increase in the percentage
of working mothers; 2) rise in the number of single-parent families; 3) dramatic drops in the number of adults in family units; 4) precipitous rise in the number of illegitimate children (the percentage has tripled since 1948).^ Yet no matter how intriguing or alarming such trends may be, we have no way at all of establishing a sound causal relation between any one of them and the decline in student writing skills.

When we turn to changes in the student populations or to changes in the schools themselves, we may be on stronger ground. We do know, as indicated in Chapter I, that student populations are increasingly mobile and also that their overall make up has changed over the years since the 1954 Supreme Court decision concerning desegregation of schools. But the NAEP results would not be affected by these variables, and the data from Iowa (where population is relatively stable) follow the pattern of national decline. And those who say that the recruitment of minority students is in direct proportion to the need for remedial courses might well be surprised to learn that the open admissions policy at City College in New York did not result in a disproportionate increase in black and brown students; on the contrary, by far the great majority of students were white.

Statistics gleaned from Department of Health, Education, and Welfare publications and summarized in
Achievement Test Score Decline: Do We Need to Worry? are considerably more compelling. Such statistics reveal, for instance, that pupil dropout rate has changed radically. In fact, while a full fifty percent of students dropped out before graduating from high-school in 1950, that rate has now decreased to twenty-five percent. It seems reasonable to infer that those students who formerly would have dropped out of school have had some influence on declining scores. Furthermore, increased absenteeism may be causally related to declining scores. Most telling, however, are the national figures on course enrollments.

We know, for instance, that college composition or Freshman English requirements have been steadily eroding following the trend Albert Kitzhaber foresaw in 1963. Ron Smith's 1974 national survey revealed that only forty-five percent of the schools polled required two or more courses, a drop of almost thirty-three percent since 1967. Furthermore, only seventy-six percent of all schools surveyed required even one course, a drop of seventeen percent. This tendency is clearly reflected in high-school enrollment figures which show a drop of eleven percent in grade-specific English enrollments between 1971 and 1973 alone and another remarkable drop in foreign-language enrollment. Only sixty-one percent of high-school seniors were taking English courses during these
years, and these courses were strongly literature-oriented; only eight percent were taking writing courses. Specific figures for Ohio high schools are not yet available, but a recent opinion poll sent to all four-year colleges in Ohio revealed that most respondents felt that the "lack of writing training in high-school" is a chief reason for deteriorating writing skills.

In spite of the fact that we cannot fully understand or identify causes, the dramatic symptoms of basic-skills deficiencies have led many to search for at least temporary or partial cures. One clearly predictable attempt is reflected in the national call for high-schools to return to a strong emphasis on basic skills (a call reinforced by the theme of the 1976 Conference on College Composition and Communication: What's Really Basic?). Already this call is being echoed through legislative halls as bills requiring minimum high-school levels of competency or accountability are debated. On March 13, 1976 the New York Times reported on a two-day conference in Denver at which representatives from 32 states discussed these issues. By the end of 1976, seven states had enacted minimum competency legislation (California, Colorado, Florida, Maryland, New Jersey, Virginia, and Washington) while another nine (Arizona, Delaware, Georgia, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, Oregon, and Vermont) had asked state boards of education to begin work on minimum
This legislation, impending as well as enacted, has come in response to the national cries of alarm just surveyed. (The Florida bill, for instance, is in response to the estimate that one out of every ten Florida high-school graduates is functionally illiterate.) In short, legislators across the country are demanding accountability in education—measurable results from the taxes spent on the schools.

As great as is the need for guaranteeing that our high-school graduates are competent in the basic skills of reading, writing, and computing, achieving this goal through minimum competency legislation is fraught with pitfalls and devilish complexities. Most importantly, achieving the goal effectively demands that we ask exactly what "minimum competency" means. Who will determine the skills and subskills involved, how will we measure those skills accurately and fairly, and what will happen to the students who fail to pass the skills tests; i.e., will the tests be mainly punitive or remediative in purpose? To date, these questions have not been adequately answered. In her study of minimum competency legislation, Chris Phipo of The Education Commission of the States found that action taken by various states (as well as the assumptions upon which that action was founded) varied widely. Clearly, no national consensus now exists.
What should be the role of higher education in the current controversy? Those involved in basic skills work in colleges are in a position to take the lead in trying to find answers to the questions which swarm around minimum competency. Whatever we do, we must not be content to point our fingers at high-school and elementary English teachers (many of whom are not properly trained to teach basic skills and almost all of whom are overworked). Indeed, many public-school teachers already fear that, although they will be responsible for teaching the skills and held accountable for doing so, they will be completely or partially ignored by legislators anxious to ease public fears as quickly as possible. As convenient as it may be for higher education to blame the high-schools for our current troubles, we should rather work with high-schools and state boards of education to define levels of skills, find appropriate and fair methods of testing them, and, most importantly, train teachers who will be able to teach those skills effectively.

The "Crisis" at the Turn of the Century

Perhaps at this point we should reassess the situation in light of the lessons history holds for us. Certainly, public outcries over declining student abilities are not the exclusive property of our current "crisis." In his "Where Do English Departments Come From?" William Riley Parker points out that during the 1880's and 1890's "the whole structure of higher education underwent profound
changes, yielding to the pressures of new learning, the elective system, increased specialization, acceptance of the idea that practical or useful courses had a place in higher education, and, not least in importance, the actual doubling of college enrollments during the last quarter of the century.¹¹ During such a time of change, we might reasonably expect dissatisfaction with the educational system and, indeed, outcries during this time were particularly virulent. In 1880, Richard Grant White charged that the public school system had been a failure, that most students were "unable to read intelligently, to spell correctly, to write legibly, to describe understandingly the geography of their own country. . . ."¹² Increasingly, colleges found students who came to them deficient in skills. Adams Sherman Hill, who took over Harvard's Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory from Francis James Child in 1876, later reported that when he read entering freshman themes (from 1873 to 1884), he found that "a tedious mediocrity was everywhere."¹³ Hill's further lament:

If the dreary compositions written by the great majority of candidates for admission to college were correct in spelling, intelligent in punctuation, and unexceptionable in grammar, there would be some compensation; but this is so far from being the case that the instructors of English in American colleges have to spend much of their time and strength in teaching the ABC of the mother-tongue to young men of
twenty-work disagreeable in itself and often barren of result. Every year Harvard sends out men . . . whose manuscripts would disgrace a boy of twelve; and yet the college can hardly be blamed, for she cannot be expected to conduct an infant school for adults.14

The reading that led Hill to such depressing conclusions was of the Harvard entrance examination compositions. (The exams themselves began in 1865-66; by 1873, a mandatory theme was included.) Because of great concern over the low level of student abilities, the Harvard Board of Overseers in 1891 appointed a distinguished committee of laymen to study problems in composition and rhetoric. Their 1892 findings, published in the "Report of the Committee on Composition and Rhetoric" revealed that of the 1892 entrance exam candidates, twenty percent failed completely (or were totally unprepared for college writing) and another forty-seven percent were passed only conditionally or "unsatisfactorily." This committee continued its work, each year reporting roughly the same alarming lack of preparation and even going so far in 1896 as to place 1300 papers in the Harvard library to testify to the "growing illiteracy of American boys."

Meanwhile, a tremendous hue and cry set up in the general press and in the educational journals over the "deplorable" lack of skills displayed by students in public as well as private universities. In 1898, C. C. Thach lambasted both schools and students by announcing
that "It is difficult to believe, at times, that many of the writers of college entrance papers are English-speaking boys. In the most mechanical points of execution—in handwriting, spelling, punctuation—a large number are deficient to an appalling degree. They have no vocabulary; words do not appeal to them, or have for them the least significance. . . . Unity or coherence of thought is seldom exhibited. Long chains of unrelated ideas are tacked together in a slack-rope sentence. . . . Paragraphing is seldom attempted, unless after the fashion of one student who systematically indented the lines in blocks of five. . . ."

Indeed, the eighty- and ninety-year-old complaints sound familiar; they might have appeared (with a few changes in wording) in any of the articles cited at the beginning of this chapter. The result of all this late-nineteenth century agitation, then, should be particularly interesting to us.

At least partially in response to the loud public outcry, the National Council of Education appointed its famous "Committee of Ten" to study the problem of "the secondary schools." Harvard president Charles W. Eliot headed the committee, which sponsored and organized nine conferences in 1892. The committee, whose members came from both public and private universities and from high-schools, was embroiled in such issues as standardization of studies (uniformity), the elective system, and the
waning role of classical studies (Latin and Greek). In terms of writing, the Committee urged that literature and composition be unified in high-school courses and that more writing be done at the high-school level. (William Riley Parker, in fact, traces the inclusion of composition courses in the bailiwick of English departments to the work of Eliot's Committee of Ten.)

On the whole, the work of this Committee reflects the attitude of the late nineteenth-century colleges toward remedial work: the place of all such work was in the high-schools. They "solved" their problem by raising entrance requirements and by asserting that "theme writing should be classed once and for all as part of elementary education and not a concern of a university." Albert Kitzhaber's assessment of the work of the Committee appointed by the Harvard Board of Overseers notes two major errors. First, their reports "erred by trying to raise standards in English by coercion and intimidation" and they oversimplified both problem and solution by continually emphasizing only one aspect of composition--"mechanical correctness." As a result, high-schools saw their function as dual--either preparing students for life, or preparing them for college. If they prepared students for college, they taught directly to the "Harvard" entrance examination--whose pattern was widely followed by other schools--and students thus prepared arrived at
college able to write a passable composition on MacBeth or Silas Marner (two works often chosen as topics of entrance tests) but unable to write coherently on anything else. If this short history lesson tells us nothing else, it should convince us that merely leveling charges against the high-schools or demanding that they get back to some vague "basics" that may all too well result in an oversimplified emphasis on "mechanical correctness" would be to compound error.

As much as they might have liked to, however, the turn-of-the-century colleges and universities could not entirely ignore the needs of ill-prepared students. Wellesley College introduced a course to remedy academic deficiencies as early as 1894.\textsuperscript{21} And Harvard made some effort to help its poorest students, though not in the form of a special course. Explaining Harvard's English A in 1901, C. T. Copeland and H. M. Rideout begin by saying that ". . . the habitual use of correct and intelligent English, is what the instructors try to drill into the Freshmen. The problem is not without difficulties. At one extreme . . . are the illiterate and inarticulate, who cannot distinguish a sentence from a phrase, or spell the simplest words. At the other are fairly mature writers. . . . Between these two extremes come many sorts and conditions. The avowed object of the work is to bring all . . ., by constant training from
October to June, to the point where they can write English of which they need not be ashamed."\textsuperscript{22} Professor Paula Johnson has recently reviewed Freshman English at Yale, noting that in the early decades of this century, remedial work was done in "awkward squads," in which students met regularly with instructors to "slog through grammar and punctuation drills and lists of spelling words. . . ."\textsuperscript{23} Berkeley's century-old English A followed a similar course in its early years.

It is difficult to assess and describe these early efforts at remedial work, because often the courses are either left out of the catalogue or, if listed, not described in any way. Moreover, many schools apparently followed Harvard's plan of heterogeneous grouping, small classes, quarterly conferences, and a strong tendency to let the poorer students sink or swim.

Nevertheless, a few generalizations can be made about early remedial work in English. As a general rule, the courses offered no college credit and were clearly punitive in nature. They emphasized mechanical correctness and relied heavily on drills and exercises; ill-prepared students were often thought of as either lazy or stupid—or both. Finally, the courses were taught by teachers either totally or largely unprepared to teach composition and uninterested in doing so when they could be lecturing on moral excellence or on a favorite work
of literature. And everywhere, the accusatory finger pointed to the high-schools and demanded that they mend their ways, that somehow they produce proficient writers by having them study literary classics. Such was the condition of remedial teaching in English at the turn of the century.

The Response of Universities to Remedial English Students

And such is the basic pattern remedial English instruction in colleges and universities has more or less followed ever since. For example, the Sixty-Second Ohio State University Annual Report (1931-32) sets forth the policy:

The ability to write lucid and correct expository English should characterize every student on entering the University. Unfortunately, this is not the case, and a majority require at least a term's work in this subject. Hitherto all students have been required to take the course in freshman composition. In the future those students who are able to demonstrate a satisfactory skill in written English by a proficiency test will be excused from this requirement. Provision is also being made for those students who are unable to carry the course in freshman English; they will be given special work without credit until they can qualify for the regular freshman course (p. 59).

The 1933-34 Ohio State University Catalogue elaborates by saying that "During the first two class sessions in English 401, writing tests will be given to determine the ability of students to use the English language effectively. Students found with less than expected ability
will be dropped from the regular classes and assigned to review sections in English fundamentals, without credit, for one quarter. A fee of $5.00 will be charged to cover the cost of tutorial instruction" (p. 395).

Some changes, however, were being made in approaches to remedial education. During the 1940's, "how-to-study" courses proliferated. At Stanford, for instance, the Dean of Men's office developed a non-credit course aimed at developing efficient study habits. At the same time, many colleges introduced remedial reading courses.

K. Patricia Cross sees such trends as generally encouraging: "Although each [perceived cause of low academic achievement] seems to have been predominant at a given time in history, each new generation of treatment specialists has perceived the problem as more complex than did the preceding generation. . . . The trend is toward remediation or developmental efforts embedded in a total program that includes cognitive, social, and emotional components."

Whatever the varying trends in remedial English courses, one element has held steady: the refusal of remedial students to disappear. The remedial problem, of course, escalated after World War II when the GI Bill brought thousands of older and poorly-prepared students into college classrooms. Kitzhaber notes that by 1950 most colleges had a "full-fledged remedial course" which offered "a lengthy review of grammar, usage, and mechanics. . . . The marginal student was most carefully
attended to and nursed along as far as he could be induced to go." Indeed, The Ohio State University introduced (or re-introduced) such a course in 1955, which was "devoted to functional training in the fundamentals of grammar, punctuation, sentence structure, and paragraphing; ... credit earned is not counted toward graduation, and an extra fee is charged. ..." The 1958 Sputnik crisis, while not directly related to college remedial programs, did lead to a national dedication to producing a well-educated, skilled populace. And that resolution, of course, brought new NDEA funds to higher education, first to the sciences but eventually to the humanities as well. With college enrollments swelling (partially as a result of "talent searches" such as those developed in New York during the late '50s) and federal funds becoming available, departments were able to offer a variety of remedial courses. But schools found such efforts increasingly expensive. The National Council of Teachers of English in 1960 estimated that the "cost of instruction in remedial English in American colleges today is $10,114,736.62." As we have noted, by 1963 Albert Kitzhaber (and others) were predicting the demise of such a costly system, basing such predictions on the "improvement in the caliber of entering freshmen" and assuming that rising enrollments would naturally lead to higher admissions standards.
And while entering freshmen scores on national tests did climb until 1963 (the year Kitzhaber's book came out), those scores, as we noted earlier, have declined ever since. Moreover, expanding enrollments have not resulted in higher and higher admissions standards. In fact, the era of open admissions has brought more and more poorly-prepared students (as well as students from groups that traditionally did not attend universities, such as technical workers, middle-aged housewives, or retirees) into the nation's colleges and universities. As a result, the phased-out remedial programs of the '50s and early '60s are rapidly reappearing. A 1974 survey of all accredited colleges and universities in the United States revealed that 71 percent of those schools either had a basic skills program or were in the process of developing one. My own 1976 survey of fifty-eight colleges revealed that ninety percent either already had or were planning to institute remedial English programs for their students.

At issue today, as it has been throughout the history of American education, is a deceptively simple question: should American public university education be elitist or egalitarian, aristocratic or democratic? In a 1973 essay, K. Patricia Cross argues that our answer must be "democratic" and that "The way to raise the standard of living for everyone is no longer to train leaders but rather to educate the masses to their full humanity."
The basis of Cross's argument is not an entirely new goal for education. Charles W. Eliot, who in many ways saw clearly the relationship of education to capitalism and democracy, insisted as long ago as 1898 that "the mobility of democratic society . . . has brought home to us the importance of discovering and training each individual gift. . . ."35

The question of egalitarian versus elitist education is central to the resistance of universities to remedial education. It informs our tendency to blame the high-schools and to assume that remedial students are simply not "college material"; it lies at the base of the unwillingness of departments to assign their best teachers to remedial classes and of administrators, boards of trustees, and legislators not to allocate funds for remedial programs in the universities.

Past Failures and Current Solutions

The American commitment to education for all her people and, more specifically, the philosophy of open admissions would seem to answer our question theoretically in favor of egalitarian or democratic university education. However, even if we could agree with the implications of such an affirmative answer (which seems to me unrealistic), serious and valid questions about the cost-effectiveness of remedial education, and remedial English, remain. In spite of their best efforts, contemporary attempts of American colleges and universities to provide remedial
help for their students have been, until only the last few years, generally inept and unsuccessful. John Roueche has been a particularly strong critic of community college remedial efforts. His Salvage, Redirection, or Custody? demonstrates the general ineffectiveness of most remedial programs; William Moore's Against the Odds levels similar charges and denigrates the hypocritical programs which turn the "open door" into a "revolving door." In a California study, Richard Bossone found that forty to sixty percent of the students enrolled in remedial English classes in California public community colleges earned either D or F and only twenty percent later enrolled in college credit courses. And a more recent study by Bossone concludes that "the majority of the students improved very little in writing ability, regardless of instructional mode." John Losak's study of remedial programs at Miami-Dade Junior College reported similar discouraging results.40 In a 1970 study, S. A. Kendrick and Charles L. Thomas found that "studies at the senior college and university level have been particularly limited in regard to effectiveness . . . of compensatory programs."41

Dominant in the great majority of studies I have read has been the desire to learn from past mistakes and experiences and to construct programs that can be successful.
New York's CUNY system has been in the forefront of efforts to provide effective remedial programs. Mina Shaughnessy at City College, Lucille Shandloff at Hunter College, Lynn Q. Troyka at Queensborough Community College, Nancy Cotton Pearse at Baruch College, and Mary Epes at York College all have data that show their programs to be effective in helping students learn basic skills and persist in college. Other schools around the country, including Northern Virginia Community College, Purdue University, and the University of Michigan have conducted similar studies to validate their programs, with encouraging results.42

Some of the strongest critics of remedial programs have not only striven to identify the causes for failure in remedial education but to search out those elements which lead to success. Roueche identifies lack of clear-cut goals and a common direction, courses designed only as "watered-down" versions of the regular ones, unwilling and untrained instructors, and general "assembly-line practices" as some of the reasons remedial programs have been ineffective. Richard Bossone cites the failure to emphasize reading, the use of ineffective diagnostic procedures (or none at all), and outdated and inflexible course structures as further reasons for failure.

On a more constructive note, these critics and others like them have gone on to isolate the elements conducive
to success. After examining forty community college remedial programs, John Roueche chose five for study (three in Texas, one in North Carolina, and one in New Jersey). After three years of careful observation, he concluded that these remedial programs were indeed effective in raising student grades, satisfying students, and keeping them in college. On the basis of this study, Roueche argues that successful remedial work will be characterized by 1) credit-carrying courses, 2) non-punitive grading, 3) trained and interested teachers who provide constant opportunity for practice, 4) clear objectives and goals, 5) careful individual diagnosis, 6) alternative learning materials and instructional modes, 7) a close tie-in of composition skills with specific content areas, 8) full administrative support for improving basic skills, and 9) an effective counseling program. Patricia Cross, who has also studied the effectiveness of remedial programs, offers the following injunctions to those who wish to build successful remedial programs: "1. Skills training must be integrated into the other college experiences of the student. . . . 2. Cognitive skills training must be integrated with the social and emotional development of the student. . . . 3. Staff working with remedial students should be selected for their interest and commitment as well as for their knowledge about learning problems. . . .
4. Degree credit should be granted for remedial classes.

5. Remediation should be approached with flexibility and open-mindedness." Although Roueche and Cross deal with remedial education in general and with that work in two-year colleges, many of their recommendations easily apply to four-year schools as well. Indeed, we should be especially eager to learn from our colleagues in two-year colleges since much of the important work on remediation has been done there.

Mina Shaughnessy, as we have seen, focuses specifically on remedial writing students. While she would no doubt agree with much that Cross and Roueche say, she recommends in *Errors and Expectations* that the remedial writing teacher's preliminary steps must be to "understand what tends to go wrong when our students write and to acquire the habit of reasoning about what goes wrong." After taking these crucial preliminary steps, the teacher may design a course or program, taking into account such exigencies as time limits and class sizes, and defining as clearly as possible the work to be accomplished. Shaughnessy suggests making a "skills chart" that would include syntax, punctuation, grammar, spelling, vocabulary, order and development, academic forms, and steps of the writing process as a starting point in apportioning work to be done in certain periods of time. She goes on to urge that all tasks be examined from "four pedagogical perspectives:
1. What is the goal of instruction? Is it awareness, improvement, or mastery? 

2. What is the best method of instruction? What cognitive strategy, that is, will work best in teaching a particular skill? 

3. What is the best mode of instruction--the most effective social organization and the best technology? 

4. How do the individual items of instruction relate to one another? Where do they come in a sequence of instruction and how much time can be allowed for each?" 

Finally, Shaughnessy recommends frequent meetings in a workshop setting and use of individual tutoring in remedial writing classes. But most importantly, she insists that we continually balance our theories and abstractions with a close, careful, and continued observation of our students and their writing. In short, she asks us to welcome the opportunity to remediate ourselves and our teaching methods by learning from our students.

If remedial courses can prove their effectiveness (i.e. through measurable results) and at the same time meet the needs of a college population that is predicted to shrink even as it includes more and more non-traditional groups of students, then such courses may no longer remain the "Poor Relations" of English departments. The next chapter will examine one remedial writing project which attempted to meet these challenges.
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CHAPTER III
The Ohio State University Remedial English Pilot Project: A Study of Remedial Writers

Description of the Students

Planning for the remedial English pilot project, sponsored by the College of Humanities and the Department of English, was launched in late June, 1976. Since funding restricted us to teaching no more than 105 students in the pilot, far fewer than the number we anticipated might need such a course, we began with a list of 376 prospective students who had 1) paid fees by July 1 and 2) scored ten or below on the ACT English test and fourteen or below on the ACT composite. After figuring proportionate percentages for each ACT score, we chose students randomly. The results of this random selection (45 percent women, 55 percent men) matched the total OSU student population closely; in addition, we found that the students chosen came from big Ohio inner city schools, small township schools, preparatory schools, and even out-of-state schools. We then wrote to the 115 students thus selected and invited them to participate in our pilot; out of this total ninety accepted and an additional four students who were recommended by their Freshman English instructors and
who met the criteria stated above were admitted during the first week of classes.² We began the quarter's project, then, with ninety-four students enrolled in seven sections of English 193X (the largest class had fifteen students, the smallest ten).

High-School Questionnaire

The average student in our group scored nine on the English ACT test (though several scored as low as one or two). In an attempt to further detail our student profile, we administered an extensive questionnaire eliciting information about high-school background.³ The results of these questionnaires indicated that twenty percent of our students took no English after the sophomore year and that another thirty percent took their last English course as juniors. Furthermore, students reported that the last two English courses they took could best be described as "literature," that they did little writing (number of themes reported per course averaged slightly over two), and that, in fact, they could remember little instruction in sentence- or paragraph-writing. Though we expected misperceptions, we were nonetheless surprised at the shape some of them took. Our students reported that they had "not much" difficulty with either reading comprehension or speed, yet the reading test we administered (McGraw-Hill Study Skills Series, From A) revealed severe deficiencies. As a group, the students also felt that they were well-prepared to work with the dictionary, yet classwork revealed
that many confused the dictionary with the Thesaurus and that most thought of the dictionary as simply a list of correctly spelled words. Another discrepancy emerged in student responses to questions about grammar and mechanics. Sixty percent of our students reported that they received "little or no instruction and practice in revising and correcting mechanical grammatical errors in . . . writing," while sixty-five percent reported "a great deal or some" instruction in grammar and ninety-six percent felt that these matters influenced the grades given on written assignments. While no hard and fast generalizations can hold, the distinction, in the eyes of these students, seems rather apparent; teachers were indeed instructing them in grammar and mechanics, but were not relating such instruction directly to the students' own writing. Small wonder, then, that students viewed much grading of their writing as unfair. (Half of our students reported that grading on written work in high-school was based "to a great extent" on grammar and mechanics; only four percent felt that these matters had "little" effect on grades.) In fact, we found that for a great many of our students, the dissociation between grammar (the structure of our language and, in many respects, our thought) and writing was largely complete. In short, these students' views corroborated the many studies which have shown that the study of grammar does not improve
writing. Our students felt that they had been instructed in grammar, but they could see no relationship between that instruction and their writing. (One student reported that in her last two high-school English courses, which were mini-courses in rock poetry, little writing took place, but that the one paper she did write was graded "to a great extent" on "grammar and spelling." ) If we couldn't have guessed it, then, the responses to our questionnaire convinced us that we would have to work hard to establish a link in our students' minds between well-formed sentences or paragraphs and well-formed thoughts presented on paper. It also suggested to us that the relatively high grades our students received in their last two high-school English courses (forty-eight percent received either A or B in the next to last course; forty-nine percent received A or B in the last course) might be attributed not only to general grade inflation but to the fact that much of the grading may have been based on response to literature or on such intangibles as "class participation" or "effort" rather than development and mastery of skills.

Attitude Survey

In an attempt to gain additional information about our students that might not be revealed by ACT scores or high-school background, we developed an attitude survey based on
the Likert model.\textsuperscript{4} Administered the first week of the quarter, this survey provided us with a plethora of easy-to-tabulate but difficult-to-interpret information. Although we did elicit student attitudes toward college education, high-school training, teachers, assignments and grades, reading, speaking, and writing (including sub-components such as vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and grammar, sentence structure), the relationships among those elements often provided us with unexpected insights. The ambivalent feelings concerning the connection between grammar study and writing, for instance, cropped up again in this attitude survey. Most (eighty-one percent) agreed that studying grammar improves writing, and yet on another question, many of them (seventy percent) disagreed with the proposition that "if you know grammar, you know how to write." Predictably, these students focused most strongly on spelling or grammar as the basis for their problems, almost surely because such errors are highly visible, countable, and markable by teachers and because these errors serve as convenient labels for problems. Asked to rank writing skills on a scale from one to ten (with one indicating greatest difficulty), half of these students ranked grammar either first, second, or third. Furthermore, the survey revealed that this concern with grammar could be related to high-school grading standards. Two-thirds of the students
disagreed with the statement that "if people understand your writing, that is more important to teachers than errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation."

The attitude survey also corroborated earlier evidence that our students misperceived the level of their reading skills. A majority of them (fifty-seven percent) seemed to equate reading speed with comprehension. (The reading test revealed low flexibility scores for these students, i.e. the ability to match reading speed to content level. They were unable to vary reading speed to match difficulty of content. In other words, our students tended to read at the same rate regardless of the difficulty of the passage.) Nor were they certain of a relationship between reading and writing. (In response to the statement "People who can read well can also write well," students were divided almost equally among "mildly disagree," "not sure," and "mildly agree." ) As we came to know the students better, we learned that, to them, reading denoted primarily the act of decoding. Hence the belief that they had no trouble "reading" could co-exist with the failure to comprehend.

By no means all of the items on the attitude survey resulted in ambivalence or misperception; some statements, in fact, got remarkably unified response. One attitude we regarded with particular optimism was elicited through several different questions: our students apparently did
not view writing as some sort of mystery available only to the gifted or the "brainy." They showed remarkable unity in agreeing that "writing is a skill anyone can learn" and in disagreeing with the statements that "writing is a talent you are born with" and "people who can't write well are not intelligent." As a group, the members of English 193X were also in strong agreement that "on writing assignments, you should be free to write about anything." They also seemed to be in favor of grades, provided that "part of a grade should depend on how hard you worked on the assignment." The notion that effort expended should somehow equal level of skill attained remains deeply engrained in these students and, indeed, in most versions of the American dream.

While we could not determine whether the students' desire for freedom in choosing topics was causally related to rigid high-school assignments, we did see a connection with two other items on the attitude survey. The majority of our students felt (and many strongly so) that "you can't argue with another person's opinion" and that "a person should not be asked to explain his beliefs or opinions." In short, the students wanted to be able to choose their own topics or positions and then not be questioned or attacked on them. These attitudes match what we know about remedial writers in general and what we came to know about our group of writers in particular:
their strengths lie in informal oral presentation and in narrative writing; their weaknesses lie in expository and argumentative writing. Our students found it much more to their liking to say "Well, that's just the way I believe" or "Well, that's my opinion" than to explain or defend. Concomitantly, they had great difficulty drawing inferences from sets of data or in tracing the lines of an argument. Though these characteristics became increasingly evident as our course progressed, we were at least partially prepared for them by the attitude survey.

On the basis of test scores, high-school questionnaire, and attitude survey, then, we feel able to sketch a fairly accurate picture of the 193X students. Predominantly white and middle class (seventy-three percent white; twenty-seven percent black) from all sectors of Ohio, they wrote little in high-school, expected difficulty with writing in college (ninety-two percent agreed that "the ability to write well is important in college," though they weren't so sure of its relationship to later success--only forty-seven percent agreed that "people who write well are more likely to be successful"), remained hopeful that they could yet learn to write well, but were extremely concerned or preoccupied with error.

Skills Assessment

While we now knew something about our students' educational backgrounds and attitudes, the need to assess and
describe individual skills levels led us to administer a series of diagnostic tests during the first days of the quarter. Although days of testing can threaten or bore students, careful balancing of class time and friendly reassurance from teachers can go far toward allaying fears. And in spite of these drawbacks, thorough testing is not only helpful but indispensable to the teacher of basic writing. Unfortunately, we know relatively little about the writing processes of these students and the ways in which their writing develops. Mina Shaughnessy has told us that the research data, the vital information, the new groundbreaking theories, the keys that may reveal the pattern in the learning processes of beginning writers—all stand before us in our students if we can begin to look carefully at the evidence they offer.

Our early looking took the form of four tests:
(1) Form A Reading Test of the McGraw-Hill Basic Skills Series, (2) a syntactic maturity test developed by Ray O'Donnell and Kellogg Hunt, (3) an error-recognition editing test, and (4) a writing sample. Each test yielded valuable and detailed information immediately; and since the same tests were administered during the final days of the quarter, comparative analysis gave us even further insights into student skills and the development of those skills.
Reading Test

In a 1975 review article for Research in the Teaching of English, Sandra L. Stotsky explores—and argues for—the hypotheses that "(1) enhanced syntactic knowledge leads to improved reading comprehension, and (2) enhanced syntactic skills through writing activities leads to improved reading comprehension."\(^5\) We began our diagnostic work by attempting to assess our students' levels of both reading comprehension and syntactic skills. Although no standardized tests may be regarded as perfect, they do offer several advantages in terms of comparative norms and readily quantifiable measures. Specifically, the McGraw-Hill test offered us a means of (1) measuring reading speed and flexibility, (2) measuring comprehension, (3) comparing our students' scores with those of other college freshmen, and, most importantly, (4) breaking down the test items in comprehension into several sub-skills areas. For example, the test indicates which items in the comprehension sections relate specifically to skills in organization. On the basis of this information, we hoped to direct individual students to developmental work in particular areas of difficulty.

The reading pre-test was administered in two parts to the 193X students. (Students took parts 1 and 2 the first day and part 3 the next.) Time limits were observed to the second, and all students received identical
instructions. When we sat down with the self-score sheets at the end of that week of diagnostic testing, we were of course anticipating low scores; i.e. we assumed that low ACT scores might be reflected in difficulty with reading.

We were unprepared, however, for the results which greeted us. Our students were invariably slow readers who tended to read at a fixed rate regardless of the difficulty in the reading material. Several obviously depended on sub-vocalization. A great many students, in fact, did not read at nearly the rate of 200 words per minute, below which reading-researchers warn that the student "has very little chance of comprehending." Reading rates ranged from a low of seventy-one words per minute (first percentile) to a high of 271 words per minute (forty-ninth percentile); the average reading rate was 162.4 words per minute. In order to read for meaning, as Frank Smith reminds us, the student must "keep moving ahead of losses in sensory store and short-term memory." The great majority of our students could not move beyond such losses and hence "missed" a good portion of what they read.

On the comprehension sections of the test, the average 193X student, who was able to answer correctly only fourteen of thirty questions, fell into the twenty-second percentile (compared to other college freshmen around the country who
have taken the same test); thirty percent of the students scored in the tenth percentile or below. Informal conversations with Ohio State University reading specialists Brenda Lewis and Jane Kollaritsch indicated that scores below the thirtieth percentile on the McGraw-Hill test could generally predict severe difficulty with college-level work. In short, these reading scores underlined for us one depressing generalization: as a group, these students could not read for meaning, certainly not in college-level textbooks. (On the high-school questionnaire, few students reported any formal work in reading. Perhaps more importantly, they estimated that they spent no more than seven hours per week on all reading, including in-class reading and homework. More than a third reported that, on their own, they read little or none at all.)

Current learning theory indicates that all language skills are related, that level of reading comprehension is related to complexity of sentence formations, and that both are related to mature synthetic thought processes. Since these are three of the skills most essential to success in college, we had good reason for concern. A glance at our students' first-quarter schedules confirmed our fears: most were enrolled in psychology, sociology, history, and/or biology, in addition to the remedial mathematics sequence. Little wonder, then, that we approached the results of our next diagnostic test, the one designed
to measure syntactic maturity, with an equal mixture of concern and anticipation.

**Syntactic Maturity Test**

In 1963, Kellogg Hunt published results of a study he had conducted of the syntactic structures written by children with average intelligence-quotient scores in grades 4, 8, and 12 and by two groups of skilled adults. His empirical study revealed that as young people mature, "they use more and more sentence-embedding transformations per uppermost S constituent" and that "the number of words they write per T-unit (terminable unit—that is, per main clause plus all the clauses and phrases syntactically related to it) increases also." Hunt's original study, based on 1,000-word samples which took great amounts of time to gather and analyze, was difficult to replicate. Seven years later, however, Hunt and Roy O'Donnell designed and conducted an experiment to study these same syntactic factors more quickly and easily. According to Hunt, the instrument used—a passage of thirty-two single-clause sentences describing the manufacture of aluminum—"will give as valid and reliable results as counting words per T-unit on a thousand or more words. . . ." Hunt and O'Donnell's passage thus ruled out "differences due to content or subject matter . . . ; the only difference in the output of one
Since we wished to describe our students and their reading and writing skills as fully as possible, the Hunt and O'Donnell Syntactic Maturity Test (SMT) seemed an ideal measure for us. It could be administered in 30 minutes, scored quickly, and the results could then be compared to Hunt's normative data. Specifically, Hunt's
study yielded the following average number of embeddings per main clause:

Table 1
Syntactic Maturity Test: Embeddings Per Main Clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Embedding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Adult</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart reveals, as Hunt explains, that given the 32 kernel sentences, the fourth-graders embedded one-tenth (or three, for an average of one in ten), the eighth-graders embedded about eighteen within twelve main clauses, and the twelfth-graders embedded about twenty-one under nine main clauses. The biggest jump came with the skilled adults, who were able to embed about twenty-five of the kernel sentences in five or six main clauses. Hunt also provides the following sentences as examples. The first, written by a fourth-grader, embeds only one of the kernel sentences: "Aluminum is a metal, and it is abundant, and it has many uses. Aluminum comes from bauxite, and bauxite
is an ore which looks like clay." We may compare this fourth-grader's sample with that of a skilled adult who manages five embeddings in one main clause: "Aluminum, an abundant metal with many uses, comes from bauxite, an ore that looks like clay."¹⁴ (In an informal repetition of the test, ten composition teachers at The Ohio State University reduced the number of main clauses, on the average, to between four and five and yielded sentences such as "Aluminum, an abundant metal with many uses, comes from bauxite, a clay-like ore containing several other substances.")

In addition to an increased number of embeddings, Hunt's study shows that as a writer matures, he writes longer and longer clauses:

Table 2
Syntactic Maturity Test: Mean Words Per Clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Mean Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Adult</td>
<td>9.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administered to our students during the opening days of the quarter, Hunt and O'Donnell's SMT provided us with striking and consistent results. Listed below are average results for the seventy-eight 193X students (who repeated the test at the end of the quarter):

Table 3

English 193X Syntactic Maturity Pre-Test Results

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embeddings per main clause</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean words per clause</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean words per T-unit</td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to Hunt's data, these results told us that our students fell precisely between Hunt's eighth- and tenth-graders, both in average number of embeddings and in mean words per clause. The syntactic maturity of our students, then, was perhaps not higher than ninth grade, and this information fit well with our earlier findings that their reading level was very low.

One other bit of information gleaned from Hunt's studies interested us as we read, over and over again, our students' attempts with the "Aluminum" paragraph. Hunt had noted that (1) since many embeddings involve deletions, the more mature writer avoids unnecessary repetition, (2) the mature writer supplies more "organization for the reader" and (3) he is more apt to supply "a meaningful
node" (such as causal relation or purposiveness). Our students often did not avoid needless repetition. More importantly, they were noticeably unable (or unwilling) to supply organization or "meaningful nodes." But most importantly, many of our students did not completely comprehend the passage they had read. As a result, in their versions the basic meaning of the paragraph becomes garbled and, in some cases, is completely lost. Here is one by no means atypical example:

Aluminum is an abundant type of metal. It comes from bauxite which is an ore. It look and shaped like clay. It contains several substances, such as aluminum. Workmen extract and they grinds these from bauxite ore. They place them in tanks which pressure them and they form a mass. When a mass is formed they remove the mass and use a type of filter. But the liquid still remains. Other type of observatory exams are used, all the necessary processes will be given attention to. Then a white powdery alumina chemical is used. It's a mixture of aluminum and oxygen. Electrical equipment is used for all the necessary processes. After all the work is completed, a form of metal is a variety of shapes and sizes. A light, luster brightness silvery piece of metal is your productivity.

The number of embeddings per main clause in this paragraph is 1.13, the mean words per clause 6.9, only a little below the average for 193X students and roughly comparable to Hunt's eighth-graders. Moreover, as we read through this student's paragraph we noted that the three stylistic generalizations Hunt makes about more mature writers do not
apply to this sample. Although in many ways the student deals ingeniously with the data provided, she relies on linear sequences as opposed to hierarchically-arranged, multiply-embedded sentences which establish relationships for the reader. After reading the first sentences of the student paragraph, for instance, the reader may not know whether it is aluminum or bauxite that looks like clay. Furthermore, sentence 5 does not reveal that the grinding is used as a means of extraction. Rather, the student equates the two processes, "workmen extract and they grind" whereas Hunt's more mature students expressed that relationship explicitly. Finally, and equally important from a teacher's point of view, we cannot assume that this student has grasped the meaning of this passage, that she has understood what she read and rewrote. Note, for example, that this student seems to think that alumina is used in, rather than produced by, the process. Nor do the last two sentences indicate that the student understands that this final metal is indeed what we all know as aluminum.

This quick and simple test, then, told us more than we expected about our students. It reinforced our conviction that lack of reading skills was integrally related to problems in writing, and it helped us relate our students' need to learn how to perceive and express logical relationships to their difficulties with formulating
multiply-embedded sentences. We turned next to a quick preliminary assessment of our students' ability to recognize errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation.

**Error Recognition/Editing Test**

Consisting of 190 words (in two paragraphs) written by a former student, the editing test contains a total of thirty errors. The majority are spelling errors, including those involving homonyms, contractions, double consonants, word endings, and transpositions. Other categories include punctuation (one error), capitalization (two errors), agreement (six errors, including noun-verb and pronoun-antecedent), possession (two errors), adjective/adverb and comparatives (two errors), case (two errors), and verb tense (two errors). We asked the students to spend thirty minutes reading the paragraphs through completely and then to edit the paragraphs, sentence by sentence, correcting all errors they found by crossing out the incorrect item and writing the correction above the line. We were unable to time each student individually, but the general consensus was that many students, perhaps over fifty percent, completed the task within twenty minutes; i.e. they seemed not to read carefully and to rush through the assignment. The struggle with written words, so often their enemies, and the constant uncertainty of "right-" or "wrong-ness" led to frustration and nervous
speed. As a result, the students missed an average of eighteen (or sixty percent) of the errors, including, most probably, errors that they knew (over half failed to capitalize \textit{tuesday}). Some introduced new errors (especially in spelling) or hypercorrected (changing correct \textit{who} to \textit{whom} or correct \textit{him} to \textit{he}), although not extensively. (We could not get exact figures, but fewer than ten percent introduced new errors or hypercorrected).

Of all the built-in errors, those in spelling, use of the possessive, and agreement eluded our students most often. Among the spelling errors, the homonyms offered great difficulty: ninety-three percent failed to correct \textit{to/too}; seventy-seven percent failed to correct \textit{there/their}. Homonyms were followed closely by contractions: sixty-four percent missed the \textit{its/it's} distinction; sixty-eight percent missed \textit{whats/what's}). Ninety-four percent failed to recognize possession errors and, later, we found that in the writing of many of our students, the possessive apostrophe was almost completely unused. In the area of agreement, we found that our students had greatest difficulty recognizing inconsistencies in pronoun-antecedent usage and, as we expected, with subject-verb agreement in instances involving third-person present singular indicative. Interestingly enough, this last error was by no means limited to the writing of black students. Though many of the black students had difficulty with the third-person
singular, so did a number of white students. In fact, problems with error were fairly equally distributed among all English 193X students, although particular errors and the degree of difficulty they presented varied enormously. Certainly our results corroborate Mina Shaughnessy's statement that the basic writer is crippled by error, that for him, "error is more than a mishap; it is a barrier that keeps him not only from writing something in formal English but from having something to write."\(^7\)

Writing Sample\(^18\)

By far the most important diagnostic procedure was the paragraph students were asked to write in response to a pre-determined topic: "On the reverse side of this paper write one paragraph in which you present the major reason your worst teacher was ineffective."

Holistic Rating

Tested with different groups of freshmen over two quarters by The Ohio State University English Department lecturer Joseph Sperry according to the methods suggested by Edward White, head of California State University and College system's English Equivalency Examination and an expert on reliability and validity in essay testing, this question worked well with 193X students. That is to say, almost all of the paragraphs elicited spoke to the topic; they indeed talked about ineffective teachers and the causes of that ineffectiveness rather than getting off
the track onto another topic. Since topic content held constant throughout the sample, the holistic team's reading and scoring had a much improved chance to be reliable and hence helpful. The three-member holistic team, trained by Sperry and by the Director of Freshman English, Susan Miller, did not participate in the English 193X course and did not know any of the students involved. The paragraphs written during the first week of class were mixed with those written during the last week (on the same topic) and with those written by 65 students who did not participate in 193X but whose ACT scores matched those in the 193X population. After the entire set had been randomized, the holistic team read and scored each paragraph. Sperry then reviewed the scores, assigned an average score to each paragraph, and returned all the data. As a group, the holistic team turned in a reliable performance, achieving unanimous agreement on thirty-four percent of the paragraphs; two of the three readers agreed on sixty-four percent of the paragraphs (and in only one case did this disagreement involve more than one numerical ranking). Table 4 contains a breakdown of the holistic scores 193X students received on the test given during the first week (ranging from a low score of one, to a high of six):
Table 4
English 193X Pre-Test Holistic Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holistic Score</th>
<th>Percentage of 193X students receiving each score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, scores one and two indicate that the writer is completely unprepared for Freshman English or for college writing; score three, that he is probably unprepared; score four, that he is probably prepared; and scores five and six, that he is prepared for college writing. The mean score for the 193X students on the pre-test was 2.4. Thus, the scores correlated well with our other diagnostic findings: eighty-eight percent were either "completely" or "probably" not prepared for college writing. Of the remaining twelve percent (ten students), two dropped the course to enroll in Freshman English and the remaining eight stayed in English 193X, primarily because the analytic scoring of their writing indicated that they could benefit from the course.
Analytic Scoring

The first phase of the analytic scoring constituted the final step in our diagnostic work. To accomplish it, each 193X teacher used the paragraphs written by his or her students to tabulate, on a writing profile, mistakes in (1) sentence structure, (2) punctuation, (3) spelling, (4) usage, (5) paragraph structure, (6) logic, and (7) dictionary. On the basis of these tabulations and results from other diagnostic tests (especially the reading test), each teacher prepared a preliminary list of individualized activities and assignments which each student would carry out in the 193X writing lab (described in the next section on pp. 96-97).

The second phase of the analytic scoring, formally quantifying the information gathered on the Writing Profile, we carried out after the close of the quarter. Consisting of an elaborate system of coding for computer processing, this phase included counting, marking, and tabulating fifty-four items on 230 paragraphs and consumed between 150 and 200 man-hours. To gain as much consistency as possible, the seven 193X teachers (the analytic coding team) spent one day working through and discussing the items on the coding key and practice-scoring student paragraphs. As an additional safeguard, I checked every tenth paragraph for scoring consistency. Hence the tabulations, while surely not as completely consistent
as if they had been produced by a computer (impossible in this situation) or a single individual (highly impractical in this situation) may be regarded as reasonably accurate and reliable. Following is a list of the variables, identified with a short title (see Appendix H for more complete description of each variable), and the 193X pre-test mean score on each variable:

Table 5
Analytic Scoring of Student Paragraphs: 193X Pre-Test Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Number of words</td>
<td>136.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Number of correct contractions</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Number of sentences</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Number of T-Units</td>
<td>9.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Number of words in T-Units</td>
<td>136.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Number of sentences with I as subject</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Number of subordinate clauses</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Number of words in subordinate clauses</td>
<td>18.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Number of relative clauses</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Number of words in relative clauses</td>
<td>20.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Depth level of most deeply embedded sentence</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Topic sentence: 1=yes</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2=yes but weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Number of paragraphs</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Number of all coordinating conjunctions</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Number of &quot;ands&quot; between main clauses</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Number of other &quot;and's&quot;</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Number of instances of faulty parallelism and illogical coordinations</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Number of sentences with non-subject openers</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Number of fragments</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Number of fragments due to punctuation</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Number of fragments logically connected to preceding sentence</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Number of fragments containing -ing forms</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Number of faulty subject-verb agreement</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Number of errors in use of principal parts of verbs</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Number of errors in tense shifts</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Number of passive verbs used</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Number of all spelling errors</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Number of homonym errors</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Number of two-words-as-one errors</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Number of end-of-word errors</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Number of pronoun case errors</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Number of noun-pronoun agreement errors</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Number of unclear pronoun antecedents</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Number of illogical subordinations</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Number of capitalization errors</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Number of omitted words</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Number of illegible words</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Number of double negatives</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Number of awkward word order, dangling modifiers</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Number of garbled sentences</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Number of non-idiomatic phrases</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Number of wrong words or nonce forms used</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Number of semi-colons</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Number of colons, dashes, parentheses, and/or quotation marks</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Number of fused sentences</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Number of run-on sentences</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Number of comma splices</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Number of remaining misplaced commas</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Number of misplaced semi-colons</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Number of misplaced (or omitted) question marks/exclamation marks</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Number of misplaced dashes, hyphens, parentheses, quotation marks</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Number of omitted commas</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Number of omitted dashes, parentheses, or quotation marks</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Number of sentence fragments containing no finite verb</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Number of total run-ons</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Total number of errors</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While it is impossible to discuss fully the reams of data provided by the computer, the most significant items should be noted. Together with the information gleaned from other diagnostic tests, the means listed above provide us with a rather complete skills-profile of our students. We know that this group writes laboriously, producing an average of only 136 words in the forty-eight minutes they were given to complete the assignment. The number of words written ranged from a low of forty-six to a high of 301, but only seven students (ninety-one percent) wrote more than 200 words while twenty-one (twenty-seven percent) wrote fewer than 100). Those of us who administered the assignment observed other signs--tight gripping of pens, awkward positioning of writing arms and paper--that indicated this laboriousness. What little embedding the students did came as a rule in subordinate clauses, but these clauses were short, averaging only eight words in length; the average sentence length of seventeen words is
accounted for by strings of linear coordinate clauses. Ability to formulate a specific topic sentence is weak, in spite of the fact that the assigned topic implicitly provides a topic sentence for the students. Perhaps surprisingly, this group wrote few sentence fragments of any kind, though run-on sentence/comma splice errors run slightly over one in every eight sentences; errors in agreement occur with about the same frequency, and spelling errors average four per 136-word paragraph. As a group, these students made a total of 1275 errors, a mean of seventeen per 136-word paragraph. In other words, the students made one mistake in every eight words they wrote. Many teachers decry what they see as the over-emphasis on error in remedial classes, and, to some extent, their warnings should be heeded. The teacher who attempts to attack all of a remedial writer's errors at once will only confuse and discourage the student. And, as we have noted earlier, the teacher who teaches grammar as divorced from the student's own writing will no doubt fail to help that student improve. Nevertheless, most remedial writing students are greatly concerned with error, and, as Mina Shaughnessy has pointed out, view the teacher's avoidance of it as a general cop-out or admission of defeat. Furthermore, our computer data indicate that student concern with error is well-founded: the correlation (.7) between total number of errors and both the
holistic rating score and the analytic rating score is significant at the .001 level, and the correlation (.5) between total errors and final course grade is significant at the .01 level.\(^2\)

Study of the possible correlations between holistic scores and other variables revealed the greatest levels of significance for the following items:

Table 6

Correlations Between Pre-Test Holistic Score (V62) and Selected Analytic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Strong topic sentence</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Subject-verb agreement errors</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Spelling errors</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Depth level of embeddings</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Principal parts of verb errors</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Number of run-on sentences</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Number of subordinate clauses</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Average words per T-Unit</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These correlations suggest, but by no means prove, that the holistic graders' impressionistic response may most obviously be related to the student's ability to articulate a purposeful statement about the topic. They also suggest that the readers' response is related to matters of error
(items two, three, five and six above) and syntactic maturity (items four, seven, and eight).

One additional correlation should be noted. In a somewhat similar study of Freshman English writing (not restricted to students with low ACT scores) conducted during the Spring of 1976, I found a strong correlation between ACT English scores and holistic scores. In the current study, however, the correlation of .1 is not at all strong. These figures suggest that while the ACT scores may provide a general guideline for initial placement, at the lower performance levels they are not helpful in finer discrimination. That is to say, the student who scores one or two on the English ACT may quite possibly compare equally in his writing to the student who scores eight or nine. For scores below ten, then, we must assess skills individually, without relying on the ACT to group students for us.

Although the percentages, sums, means, and correlations presented thus far are necessary and useful parts of this study, they can and should be concretized in actual student writing. It is, of course, impractical to include all student paragraphs, so I have chosen two at random from the group of pre-test paragraphs which I think adequately represent the students' writing at the beginning of the quarter:
Paragraph 1

Papers in on time, not being tardy, speak loud enough to hear, and being totally alert, are expected from each and everyone of us as students. The experienced teachers of today's society are suppose to show us the way to the future ahead by setting examples. Not examples of being unorganized, soft voice, and being late, were we taught that? The examples that was taught to me, lightened the spark in the minds of many students. So show us the way to more organized future than to a future of confusion.

Paragraph 2

My worst, ineffective, teacher was Mr. Opel whom taught our 8th grade history class. Mr. Opel had a nervous condition, he easily got upset and couldn't keep the class under control. To get the idea of how the first 15 minutes of our class time was spent Mr. Opel would yell at one student for coming in late, another student would shoot him with a spit ball, with this Mr. Opel would start yelling at whom ever shot him. Some rude student would get up and start to walk out of class with Mr. Opel trying to ask where is he going. Nearly the whole class left their books in their lockers. With conditions I didn't learn anything about history the whole year. Mr. Opel was my worse, ineffective teacher.

A look ahead to p. 117 of the results section will reveal in what ways the writing of these two students changed and demonstrate that remedial writers can begin to improve their skills, even within the short span of a nine-week quarter.
Description of the Course

The information summarized in the previous section, available to us only after the first week of classes, provided great help in individualizing parts of English 193X and in working day by day with our students. Nevertheless, the basic assumptions, goals, and direction of the course evolved directly from the research study "Remedial English: A Descriptive and Evaluative Report" which I completed in July, 1976. That report concluded that effective remedial courses are characterized by "adequate placement procedures; trained and interested teachers from all ranks of the faculty; clear objectives and goals; thorough individual diagnosis; a variety of learning materials and instructional methods... which allow for the difference in the ways students learn and the paces at which they proceed; ongoing evaluation of techniques, materials, and student progress..."23

In light of these findings, the report recommended that Ohio State University's Department of English establish a remedial writing course in which:

(1) placement is supplemented by a diagnostic reading test, writing sample, and writing profile; (2) objectives and goals are clearly defined; (3) classes are no larger than 15, taught by volunteer teachers, and accompanied by required work on diagnosed problems in a writing laboratory; and (4) a reduced-pace, two-quarter option exists for those students who need additional time
in order to meet [the following] course objectives . . . : (1) to enable students to write paragraphs that are built around a clear central idea to which all following sentences are linked, that adequately develop, complicate, and sustain the central idea, and that are adopted to a specific audience; (2) to enable students to control basic syntactical and grammatical errors; (3) to enable students to read and comprehend University-level materials; (4) to bring students to realize the importance of reading and writing as the major means of achieving successful University performance. 24

For the one-quarter pilot program, we were unable to carry out every recommendation. All the classes, for instance, were taught by graduate teaching-associates or by lecturers; no regular faculty members volunteered. Nor were we able to provide an adequately staffed or equipped writing lab. Finally, we could not offer the students a two-quarter option. Nevertheless, we were able to carry out the majority of the recommendations: we adopted the course objectives listed above; we chose only teachers who volunteered for the assignment and who were committed to the idea that writing skills can be learned; we participated in a week-long training session; we administered thorough diagnostic tests; and we did our best to equip and staff a mini-writing lab (equipped with three tables, one desk, one bookcase, and one filing cabinet; no more than eight students could work in the lab at a time) in which students could work alone or with a teacher-tutor on individual writing or reading problems. We decided to keep the
writing lab open seven hours a day (one teacher on duty each hour) and to arrange our office hours so that two of us would be available each hour for individual or group conferences with students from any of the sections. Finally, we worked out the video-tape schedule and reading-class schedules with people in the Learning Resources Center, hammered out our day-by-day syllabus, and debated the merits of various approaches and assignments. Graduate teaching-associate Nevin Laib estimates that, all told, the remedial pilot-project teachers spent 440 hours in planning and preparation before the term began, all of them without pay--proof positive, if any were indeed needed, of the resourcefulness, commitment, and dedication that these teachers brought to the task.

Texts

After screening dozens of remedial texts, we decided to ask our students to buy three books: Lynn Troyka and Jerry Nudelman's Steps in Composition, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976); Sheila Graham's Sentencecraft (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976), and The American Heritage Dictionary (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976). The Troyka text had the advantages of containing readings of varying difficulty, comprehension and vocabulary-development exercises for each chapter, and constant reinforcement of earlier learned skills in end-of-chapter editing exercises. Hence the book seemed founded
on assumptions we knew to be true: that reading and writing skills are closely interrelated, that learning processes are recursive, and that vocabulary is the single best indicator of success in college. The Graham text we found unsuitable to the course, largely because its terminology differed radically from that of the video-tapes. Furthermore, this text fails to engage students in enough generation of their own writing. Finally, for our students at least, Graham's directions were so unclear as to elicit no responses or mistaken ones.

**Video-tapes**

Developed and produced by the state and city universities of New York, this series of video-tapes provides instruction in sentence-writing and sentence-combining. Unfortunately, we were unable to get the tapes until after the beginning of the quarter and, consequently, were unable to build them into the course properly (the last two tapes, in fact, arrived too late to be used at all). Nevertheless, because we wanted to stress the sentence-combining approach taken by the tapes and because we wanted to see how our students responded to instruction in another medium, we did our best to weave the tapes into the fabric of our course. Here is a brief description of what the tapes contain:
Tape I: Overview and introduction

Tape II: Kernel recognition

  subject/verb
  subject/verb/complement
  subject/verb/complement/complement

Tape III: Basic Sentence Combining

Tape IV: Part A

  1. function words
  2. relative pronouns
  3. -ing participle

  Part B

  1. -ed participle
  2. subordinating conjunctions
  3. coordinating conjunctions

Tape V: Noun modification

  Verb modification

Tape VI: Nominalization

Tape VII: Advanced Sentence Combining

Since most of our students had been working in class or in the writing lab with sentence-combining exercises, the approach was familiar and acceptable to them. The television medium itself, all too familiar to the students, seemed to sink them into passivity; they had difficulty remaining alert enough to participate actively. In fact, only the third tape, an animated scene in color which features a voice-over describing the scene in sentence kernels, and then combining all the kernels, motivated enthusiastic participation. In general, the other tapes often failed to keep the students' attention and often confused them as
well. The student workbooks which accompany each tape are designed to involve students in the lesson at hand by having them stop the tape and write responses. When we carefully prepared our students for each step in a tape, then stopped the tape to discuss the concept and answer questions, they worked fairly well with the workbooks. Without such preparation, however, they were often simply paralyzed. As a result, we decided that our students should not watch the tapes without an instructor present to help. In spite of these criticisms, our very limited success with the tapes was surely influenced by the fact that they were not available in advance of the quarter and therefore could not be completely integrated into the course.

Class and Lab Activities

Students attended class sessions four hours a week, one hour each day from Monday through Thursday. In addition, they signed up for two hours per week in the writing lab. Class time we decided to devote primarily to class- or small-group discussions or workshops and to actual writing while reserving one-to-one work for our bi-weekly office conferences with students or for lab time. In retrospect, the assumptions upon which we based our decision held true: most remedial writing students make the greatest gains on particular problems in, say, spelling or subject-verb agreement in one-to-one tutoring
sessions. However, these students progress best in their overall writing from generating ideas and interacting in groups and from constantly writing for the instant audience which the rest of the class provides. Moreover, these students clearly need the experience of becoming part of a college class. As David Bartholomae, director of remedial writing courses at The University of Pittsburgh, has pointed out, these students need the chance to perceive themselves as part of the Academy and as capable of learning the skills necessary to function successfully within the academic environment. For these reasons, I oppose totally individualized programs (such as total computer-assisted instruction) for remedial students.

Class work generally took a three-pronged approach aimed at (1) sharpening reading skills by emphasizing pre-reading, skimming and scanning, note-taking, and comprehension; (2) highlighting concepts introduced by the texts or tapes and practicing the skills involved; and (3) generating writing topics which would give the students practice in drawing inferences, in summarizing, and in tracing (or developing) lines of analysis or argument. Since these are the skills a student needs to perform successfully in the university, these are the skills we tried to build into assignments and activities.

Students devoted the two hours per week of lab time to working with a teacher/tutor on specific writing or
reading problems, practicing with workbook exercises or programmed texts, and editing (or generating) their own writing. Students reported to the writing lab, checked the writing profile sheets in their folders (on which the instructors catalogued various tasks and projects), checked the index for appropriate supplementary books (multiple copies of which we kept in the lab) and began to work. (We prepared an index of all the items listed on the writing profile and then, for each item, listed the five best texts or mimeographed exercises, in order of difficulty, for easy student and tutor reference.) As the students worked, the instructor/tutor moved around the room, checking exercises, answering questions, and helping the students in any way possible. To our surprise, attendance at the lab was generally regular, and response to it (in spite of the severely cramped quarters) was overwhelmingly positive; some students even asked to sign up for extra hours in the lab. We found, however, that most remedial writing students should spend only one hour in lab work at a time. Students who began by working for two-hour stretches got notably restless shortly into the second hour, and their ability to concentrate declined.

Reading Component

In addition to class and lab attendance, we encouraged 193X students to enroll in one of the classes taught in the Reading and Study Skills Center. Because the times of
these classes were already set and because many of the classes were already over-enrolled, many of our students could not participate in them. In fact, only about twenty percent of the 193X students enrolled, although another twenty percent were promised places in winter-quarter classes. Those who did attend the classes, however, brought back positive responses and good information to the classroom. The difficulties we experienced in this area further convinced us that, since reading skills are all-important to these students, such skills should be included formally in remedial-English courses even if it means that teachers will have to do some extra study and retraining.

Grading

For administrative reasons, English 193X was offered as a five-hour, S/U-graded course, the hours counting toward a student's graduation but not substituting for any English requirement. There is much controversy over the grading system in all of higher education, and perhaps nowhere is the issue more important than with remedial or "New" students. In Accent on Learning, K. Patricia Cross, of the University of California--Berkeley, points up the complexity of the problem in her chapter on cognitive styles:
There is now evidence that field independents [those who deal with situations and tasks analytically and independently of background or total field] learn better than field dependents [those who see the whole or total field instead of the parts] when motivation is intrinsic but that the differences disappear when external rewards are introduced. . . . If New Students do tend to be field dependent, then present moves to abolish grading may be ill-advised. It is clear that the New Students themselves are more interested than traditional students in grades and other extrinsic rewards. . . . Since field dependents are also more sensitive to criticism than field independents, . . . it has seemed reasonable to attempt to avoid the fear-of-failure syndrome by eliminating failing or poor grades for New Students. But the research indicates to me that extrinsic reward is desirable for New Students, hence my recommendation in Chapter One that we attempt to have the best of two worlds by giving grades in the areas of excellence (where New Students will work toward success) and abolishing grades in the areas of adequacy (where New Students can avoid the stigma of failure and where graduated judgments are not necessary anyway). 28

We did not have cognitive-style data available for our 193X students, but observation leads me to agree with Cross's generalizations: our students' great difficulty with analytic tasks and their equally great interest in grades (or extrinsic rewards) both support Cross's hypotheses. In the ideal pluralistic model that Cross proposes, a system of grades in some courses and no grades in others seems workable and advantageous. Given our present system, however, and given our remedial students' tendency toward
field dependence and their positive response to extrinsic rewards (on the attitude survey, 72 percent disagreed with the statement "schools should not grade students"), I would recommend retaining the A-B-C-D-E grades rather than the S/U grade. Furthermore, since most of their other college courses will be graded on the A-B-C-D-E system, giving S/U grades in remedial courses does little to prepare the students for the other system. Because of their interest in grades, in fact, we marked some of the student paragraphs with A to E grades in spite of the fact that their final grade would be S or U.

In spite of the complexity of the theoretical issues surrounding grades, our actual grading procedures were very simple. The course objectives which we gave the students at the first of the term noted that "in order to complete 193X with a grade of satisfactory, you must submit nine edited paragraphs from among the total number of paragraphs you write during the quarter." To help the students avoid the wait-till-the-last-minute syndrome, we had several "due dates" on which they submitted two or three paragraphs for evaluation. And as each of these due dates approached, we provided the students with a set of standards they could use as checklists before submitting their paragraphs (Appendix J includes a copy of these standards). Students were allowed to revise their paragraphs up to the time they turned them in as "edited."
At that point, we considered them to be "published" and hence beyond our power to change them, a concept to which Susan Miller strongly recommends students be introduced.

**Student Evaluation of the Course**

During the last week of classes, we asked the students to fill out a course evaluation form. Most student evaluations must be regarded with a good bit of healthy skepticism. Remedial students are notably reluctant to criticize anyone, even their teachers, and as we might have expected, the students responded favorably to all aspects of the course. Graduate Teaching Associate Betsy Brown, who designed the evaluation form and tabulated student responses, was dissatisfied with the form because it often elicited only one- or two-word responses and because, since it was not designed primarily as a research instrument, it did not produce consistently reliable data. A form which asked students to rank various activities in order of helpfulness would probably be preferable to the one we used. In spite of these criticisms, however, several generalizations emerge from a study of student responses. Most importantly, the students reported overwhelmingly that they found the writing, revising, and discussion of their own paragraphs to be the "most helpful" aspect of the course. This seems a valid point: remedial (and perhaps all) writers learn best from their own writing rather than from working through exercises
based on other people's writing. Another question to which student response was unanimously positive involved self-confidence: every student reported feeling "more confident" and "less afraid" of writing than when he or she entered the course. For our students, this increased confidence may provide the extra aid they will need for success in Freshman English where larger classes will limit the amount of individual attention they can expect to receive.

Teacher Evaluation of the Course

In spite of the heavy load (in addition to teaching a class every day, teachers manned the lab one hour a day, held office hours every day, and attended countless meetings in an attempt to keep the structure and approach of the course unified), the seven teachers who taught English 193X were unanimously glad to have done so; all said they would like to do so again. All teachers also noted improvement (though some was admittedly small) in all but a fraction of the students' writing. That is not to say, however, that the special pressures and frustrations of teaching remedial writers were not present. The exhaustion that comes after several straight hours of intense one-to-one work with students, the despair at seeing old errors crop up unexpectedly and new ones seemingly invent themselves, the lack of patience that develops with the need
to repeat--in different and interesting ways--the same concept or lesson, the constant challenge of trying to explain highly complex syntactic or grammatical structures without being able to rely on traditional terminology of any kind--these we all felt to lesser or greater degrees during the term. But for me, those pressures and frustrations paled dramatically one day early in Winter quarter when one of the 193X students hurtled out of a crowd and ran toward me waving, bursting with his good news: "Today in Freshman English we got back our first papers, and I got an S!" For that student, and for his teachers, English 193X was a success.

Results

Attitude Survey

When we re-administered the informal attitude survey at the end of the quarter, we did not expect to be able to note much discernible change. As a general rule, that expectation was borne out. Happily, our students still held their beliefs that anyone can learn to write and that the inability to write well does not indicate lack of intelligence. They were also still strongly in favor of freedom to choose their own topics and of grades. In some areas, however, we did note a subtle shift. The statement, "You can't argue with another person's opinion," with which the majority of the students agreed at the beginning of the
quarter, drew seventy percent negative response at the end of the quarter. Positive response to another statement, "If other people understand your writing, that is more important to English teachers than errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation" more than doubled, from eighteen percent at the first of the quarter to thirty-seven percent at the end of the quarter. Most significant, I think, was a shift in the ranking of ten items in order of difficulty and importance (on a scale from one to ten with one being most difficult). At the first of the quarter, fifty percent of the students ranked "grammar" first, second, or third in difficulty while only twenty-nine percent ranked "making the writing mean what you want it to say" in that order. At the end of the term, however, those figures were almost directly reversed, with fifty percent rating "meaning" first, second, or third in difficulty and twenty-eight percent rating "grammar" in that order. It would be dangerous to conclude too much from this survey, especially since it had not been pre-tested or the statements subjected to item or regression analysis. Nevertheless, as an informal tool, we felt that it helped us to know our students better than we otherwise might have, and it provided the basis for several productive class discussions on the concepts and values involved.
Skills Assessment

Reading Test

For the seven teachers participating in the remedial pilot project, reading was a constant sore spot. All lifelong avid readers, we had few ways to relate to those for whom reading was often an unnecessary burden—or a crushing bore. In spite of the fact that we all studied Frank Smith's *Understanding Reading* and Horace Judson's *The Techniques of Reading* before the quarter began and that we spent one day in a workshop session led by The Ohio State University Reading and Study Skills Center's Brenda Lewis and Jane Kollaritsch, we felt woefully inadequate. Determined to try, and urged on by the first-of-the-quarter test results which indicated that the students' reading skills couldn't get much worse, we coached them in techniques of pre-reading, note-taking, and reviewing, worked in class on comprehension and vocabulary, and had students work in programmed reading texts in the lab. As a result, the end-of-the-quarter test results show some improvement, though meager indeed in view of the leaps most of our students needed to make in reading skills. Table 7 summarizes the gains our students made.
Table 7

English 193X Gains in Reading Comprehension Scores

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Increase in Raw Score</td>
<td>+ 2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Increase in Standard Score</td>
<td>+ 4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Increase in Stanine</td>
<td>+ .97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Increase in Percentile Rank</td>
<td>+12.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Raw Score on Pre-Test</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Raw Score on Post-Test</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percentile Rank on Pre-Test</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Percentile Rank on Post-Test</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Averages, as usual, mask dramatic variations. Many of our students did move up about thirteen percentile rankings, but a few actually went down, and a surprising number made superman-leaps of thirty to forty percentile rankings. Seeing how quickly students begin to respond to reading instruction, even by rank amateurs, and believing with Sandra Stotsky, Marilyn Sternglass, Lynn Troyka, and others that growth in syntactic maturity and in reading maturity are intimately related, lead me to conclude that reading should be a formal component in remedial writing classes.

**Syntactic Maturity Test**

Earlier in this chapter (pp. 69-76), I described the syntactic maturity test and explained the ways in which we used it to learn more about our students. We can now
compare the figures gathered at the beginning of the quarter with those obtained at the end.

Table 8
English 193X Syntactic Maturity Pre- and Post-Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embeddings per main clause</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean words per clause</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean words per T-unit</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>11.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing this group of students to Kellogg Hunt's normative data placed our students at about the level of ninth-graders at the first of the quarter. Figures gathered at the end of the quarter, however, placed the 193X students at the level directly between Hunt's tenth- and twelfth-graders, or at about the eleventh-grade level.

I earlier attempted to concretize all these averages, comparisons, and figures by reproducing one typical student's response to the "Aluminum" assignment (p. 74). The student's paragraph revealed a very low level of embedding (1.1 per main clause), short clauses (6.9 words per clause), and, in fact, apparent failure to comprehend the meaning of the passage. We may now compare that student's original response with the paragraph she wrote at the end of the quarter:
Aluminum is an abundant type of metal with many uses. The aluminum comes from bauxite which is a kind of ore. Bauxite has similarities to clay and contains several different substances. The bauxite is placed in tanks and grinded, and pressure is used to form a mass. After removing the mass with filters, the liquid remains. Then the mass undergoes several other processes before it yields a white, powdery chemical mixture, alumina. This chemical contains aluminum and oxygen. Workmen use electricity to separate the aluminum from the oxygen. Then finally a light metal which has a bright, silvery luster and comes in several forms has been produced.

This passage shows considerable gains over the original one; embeddings have jumped to 2.2 per main clause and the clause length has expanded to 8.0 mean words per clause. The sense of progression is much more clear in this paragraph, with words such as "after," and "then" signaling temporal and perhaps causal relationships. Most noticeably, however, the student writer of this paragraph seems to have understood the meaning of the passage and clearly represents this meaning in her own rendition of it. Everything we know about the development of writing skills indicates that growth in syntactic maturity is a slow process perhaps resembling a spiral much more closely than a straight line. The gains shown by the 193X students in this area seemed small but measurable--and very promising.

Error Recognition/Editing Test

At the beginning of the quarter, the 193X students missed an average of eighteen out of thirty possible errors
on the editing test, or sixty percent. When they took the test again on the last day of class, those figures were exactly reversed; they missed twelve, or forty percent, of the errors. (Appendix E contains a complete list of the errors on the test and the students' pre- and post-test scores.)

Although improvement in error recognition on a test cannot guarantee improvement in the students' own writing, we were pleased with the results of this test. But our students continued to be plagued by error. For many, perhaps a majority, nine weeks provides not nearly enough time to understand old habits, break them, and begin to form new ones. We felt, also, that achievement on this test was closely related to reading ability; the students' difficulties in reading should naturally be reflected in a test that asked them to read carefully for error. And though we had no way during the pilot project to test the hypothesis, we strongly suspected that many of our students needed eye examinations. Almost a third of them wore glasses, surely a high percentage, and in one class of ten, two students had great difficulty seeing words written on the blackboard from anywhere but the first row of seats (and those same two students reported that they last had eye examinations over two years ago).

The complexity of these relationships could easily lead to hasty generalization. Nevertheless, the results
of the error recognition/editing test indicate to us that if editing skills are stressed and conscientiously practiced, significant improvement is possible.

Writing Sample

Holistic Rating

The holistic rating process described above on pp. 78-80 and applied to pre-test, post-test, and control group paragraphs revealed that the 193X students had moved from an average rating of 2.41 to a 2.96. Roughly speaking, these figures indicate that the average student now wavered between "probably unprepared" and "prepared," and, for a great many of the 193X students, the instructors felt that such terms provided an accurate assessment. Certainly our students demonstrated marked improvement for nine weeks' work, but whether or not they could close the rest of the gap by themselves seemed problematic at best. A complete list of 193X students' pre- and post-test holistic scores may be found on pp. 179-83, but the following table contains a breakdown of average holistic scores for the three groups:
Table 9
English 193X and Control-Group Holistic Rating Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holistic Score</th>
<th>193X Pre-Test (Percentage)</th>
<th>193X Post-Test (Percentage)</th>
<th>Control-Group Post-Test (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures indicate that the greatest gains occurred as 193X students moved up from one or two to a three ranking and from three to a four ranking. The control group scores, available only for a post-test (these sixty-five students matched the 193X population in ACT score, sex, and high-school ranking) perhaps need some further explanation. Once these students had not been selected for the 193X course, we had no way available to us to control what happened to them during the first quarter. We did, then, the next best thing; we simply watched them as they did what all entering freshmen have done during the twelve years since remedial English courses were last available at The Ohio State University--sign up for courses and then sink or swim in them. As it turned out, twenty-four
(thirty-five percent) of the group reported that they had enrolled in Freshman English, thirty-six (fifty-six percent) had enrolled in no English course at all, and five (nine percent) had enrolled in English 194A (a reduced-pace version of Freshman English available only to minority students). As a whole, control-group scores at the end of the quarter were very similar to the 193X group's scores at the beginning of the quarter. This evidence thus partially supports our hypothesis that the writing of students who did not take the remedial course probably changed very little during the first quarter of their college year. In order to analyze these results more fully, I asked statistician Gregory Mack of the Instructional Resources and Computer Center at The Ohio State University to program the computer to separate those students who took English 100 from those who took no English (excluding the 194 students as too small a sample) and to subject the resulting data to t-test analysis in order to compare the performance of the two groups. In a comparison of holistic scores, the computer reported the following information:
Table 10
Comparison of Control-Group Holistic Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Holistic Score</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control-Group Members in English 100</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-Group Members in No English Classes</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures show that, in fact, those students who had taken no English scored slightly higher on the holistic rating than did those who took Freshman English; the t-value and probability figures show that this slight difference is not statistically significant. That is to say, the two groups' scores were almost identical—and they matched very closely the 193X pre-test holistic mean of 2.4. With this in mind, we may now turn to the second phase of the writing sample study—the analytic scoring of student paragraphs.

Analytic Rating

On the post-test, the students wrote more, averaging 147 words compared to 136 words at the first of the quarter. (On the post-test, only seventeen percent wrote fewer than 100 words while fifteen percent wrote more than 200 words. These figures compare significantly with the twenty-seven
percent who wrote fewer than 100 words on the pre-test and the one percent who wrote more than 200 words.) More significantly, length of T-units and of subordinate clauses jumped about two words in each case, from thirteen to fifteen for T-units and from seven to nine for subordinate clauses. Furthermore, depth level of embeddings increased from 1.30 to 1.50, and the t-test yields significance at the level of .04. Topic sentences are stronger and more focused on the post-test, and errors are generally reduced. A full listing of pre-test, post-test, and control group means for all variables is included in Appendix I; following is only a summary of what seem to be the most important findings. Spelling errors decreased from a mean of 3.8 to a mean of 2.8, run-on sentences fell from a mean of 1.0 to .7, and the use of more sophisticated punctuation (such as semicolons and colons) increased from practically zero to .25. On the post-test, the sum of all errors was 1,010 in a total of 11,172 words, or about one error in every eleven words written. This figure compares well with the pre-test paragraphs in which students made one mistake in every eight words written (t-tests indicate that improvement in ability to reduce error is statistically significant at the .01 level). Comparison of control-group means with 193X pre- and post-test means consistently shows the control-group scores to be very close to the 193X pre-test scores. As the following list reveals, the control group
writers made 1253 errors in a total of 9722 total words or one error in every 7.8 words written.

Table 11
Comparison of English 193X and Control-Group Error/Word Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total Words</th>
<th>Total Errors</th>
<th>Error/Word Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>193X Pre-test</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>11,144</td>
<td>1:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193X Post-test</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>11,172</td>
<td>1:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-group</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>9,722</td>
<td>1:7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in the pre-test, I correlated the holistic scores with other analytic variables. The most interesting of these correlations follow in Table 12.

Table 12
Correlations Between Post-Test Holistic Scores and Selected Analytic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Strong topic sentence</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Depth level of embeddings</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Total spelling errors</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Final grade in 193X</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Total errors</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Number of subordinate clauses</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Number of subject-verb agreement errors</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These correlations suggest that certain strengths and weaknesses in student writing are more closely related to how our holistic scorers determine "preparedness" or "unpreparedness" than are others. Especially important to us is the correlation between holistic score and final grade in the 193X course, since the grades were assigned by teachers who had worked with and watched the students all quarter while the holistic scores were given by teachers who knew neither the students nor what the course involved. Two items which were strongly correlated on the pre-test puzzlingly failed to hold constant on the post-test. The mean words per T-unit, which Hunt and others feel is a tested and valid measure of syntactic maturity, correlated well with the holistic score on our pre-test. However, the correlation between the two measures on the post-test was not strong at all (a significance level of .15). Further analysis of the writing may well yield an explanation of this disparity, but it is not now at hand. We may find that the relationship between "syntactic maturity" and high holistic scores is much more complex than we might have imagined. As with the pre-test, post-test holistic scores did not correlate well with the ACT score. As I noted earlier (see p. 88), this information indicates that for those students scoring below 10 the ACT English test is not a good predictor and should not be used for further diagnosis.
Above on p. 89, I reproduced two typical pre-test paragraphs and promised to present their post-test counterparts. Here are the paragraphs these two students wrote after nine weeks of instruction:

Paragraph 1

My worst teacher was ineffective because she could not keep the interest of the students. She could not present, in an interesting way, the academic subjects which we were supposed to be learning. She would talk in a monotone voice at a fast rate of speech which nobody could understand. (She also had a weird sense of humor and wore very strange clothes.) The atmosphere she created was out of place for the subjects she taught. So she would lose my interest in the course along with the interest of the rest of the class. For example, we were suppose to have studied a chapter on the Egyptians and be ready for a quiz. So our teacher walks in, dressed up as an Indian, and starts to explain about the Indians in Mexico. The whole class went into shock. This was just one of many episodes. The atmosphere that my teacher created and the way she presented the academic subjects was completely boring and could not keep her class, including me, interested.

Paragraph 2

My most ineffective teacher was Mr. Opel, who taught our rude and rowdy eighth grade history class. Although he tried to keep everything and everyone in order, the entire class time was often spent in total chaos. Spit-balls would be soaring through the air, frequently hitting Mr. Opel and other students. Although Mr. Opel had a bad heart, he was constantly yelling. Someone always took the hall pass and
abused its purpose by getting a friend out of classes or by never returning it. Mr. Opel would be furious because he never knew who had taken the hall pass. Some students wouldn't even bother with the hall pass; they would just stand up and leave the room while Mr. Opel was trying to keep the students in order. I really didn't think he would last the whole year. We never did any homework, and almost everyone left their books in their lockers. Because of these conditions, I didn't learn anything about history that whole year.

These paragraphs are not perfect. Errors still creep in, logical connections are not always strong, transitions are often ignored, and unity could certainly be improved. Yet compared to the paragraphs from the first of the quarter, these two students show considerable improvement. Both have a clear sense of topic and of purpose; both provide strong support and interesting detail. Semi-colons and parentheses, completely absent in the pre-test sample, are beginning to appear, and use of commas has become more regular. On the pre-test, the holistic team rated the first paragraph as a 1, the second as a 2. On the post-test, both paragraphs received a ranking of 4. To my mind, these two students corroborate Mina Shaughnessy's contention that "while the skills and priorities of student-hood are not easily acquired at the age of eighteen or over, students are demonstrating that competency can be acquired at that age."31
Winter Quarter Follow-Up of English 193X and Control-Group Students

I have now been able to follow the English 193X students through their second quarter of college work. While it is certainly too early to predict eventual rate of persistence, the following tables clearly suggest that the remedial English classes helped the students to succeed in Freshman English and that, in general, the 193X students are moving into the mainstream of our University more easily than are the members of the control group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of 193X students at beginning of Autumn quarter</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who withdrew during Autumn quarter</td>
<td>7 (7.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who withdrew during Winter quarter</td>
<td>8 (8.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who enrolled in Freshman English Winter quarter but dropped the course before the quarter ended</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who were unable to take Freshman English during Winter quarter but who were enrolled in the University</td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who completed Freshman English Winter quarter</td>
<td>67 (74.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 14

**English 193X Students' Grades in Freshman English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average grade-point for 193X students who completed Freshman English: 1.48 (between C and C+)

Percentage of 193X students who received D or above in Freshman English: 90%

Percentage of 193X students who received C or above in Freshman English: 79%
Table 15

Control-Group Students' Grades in Freshman English*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average grade for control-group students who completed Freshman English: 1.2

Percentage of control-group students who received D or above in Freshman English: 40%

Percentage of control-group students who received C or above in Freshman English: 13%

*Of the 65 control-group members, only 21 enrolled in Freshman English. Of those, six (28%) dropped the course.
Table 16
Comparisons Between English 193X and Control-Group Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of 193X students beginning* Freshman English who finished &quot;satisfactorily&quot; (defined as C- or better)</th>
<th>78%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of control-group students beginning Freshman English who finished &quot;satisfactorily&quot;</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*This measure includes the students who dropped the course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of 193X students completing Freshman English who finished &quot;satisfactorily&quot;</th>
<th>81%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of control-group students completing Freshman English who finished &quot;satisfactorily&quot;</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of 193X students beginning Freshman English who finished at or above 2.0 GPA</th>
<th>52%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of control-group students beginning Freshman English who finished at or above 2.0 GPA</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of 193X students completing Freshman English who finished at or above 2.0 GPA</th>
<th>54%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of control-group students completing Freshman English who finished at or above 2.0 GPA</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III: FOOTNOTES

1. Appendix A provides a breakdown by city and by particular schools within each city.

2. We chose another ninety-four students from this list as a control group, sixty-five of whose members we tested at the end of the quarter.

3. See Appendix B for a copy of the entire questionnaire and for a tabulation of responses.


7. Smith, Understanding Reading, p. 228.

8. See Appendix D for reading pre- and post-test results.


13 These figures are all taken from Hunt's "Syntax, Science, and Style."

14 Hunt, p. 115.

15 Hunt, p. 115.

16 See Appendix E for a copy of this test and pre- and post-test results.

17 Mina P. Shaughnessy, Errors and Expectations, p. 11.
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CHAPTER IV

Conclusions and Implications

Weaknesses of the Study

Research in teaching, and perhaps especially in teaching English, always proceeds in the face of great difficulty. Unlike the relatively stable scientific laboratory, the classroom teems with uncontrolled variables. Sickness forces a shift in teachers, equipment breaks down unexpectedly, some students withdraw, and others appear two weeks after the term has begun. And outside the classroom, untold variables abound. Pressures from families, from jobs, from other classes cannot be screened out as the student steps into the classroom. Every teacher has seen the most carefully structured and planned class activity rendered useless or futile in the face of such pressures.

As might be expected, our Remedial English Pilot Project was not immune to these difficulties, although some were far more serious than others. By far the greatest weakness in our research design involved the control group. Ideally, our seven 193X (experimental) classes would have been matched by seven traditional classes taught by the same teachers. Budget limitations,
however, kept us from providing instruction for any students other than those enrolled in 193X. As a result, although we managed to identify a control group which matched the 193X group in ACT scores, sex, and class standing, these students were scattered throughout the regular Freshman English sections or were not enrolled in any English class at all. The post-test confirmed my hypothesis that the writing of the control-group at the end of the quarter would closely resemble the writing of the 193X group at the beginning of the quarter. That is, while the 193X students improved in their control of gross errors and in ability to formulate and expand clear topic sentences, the control-group students did not improve and in some cases regressed. However, these results must be viewed with caution because of the many uncontrolled variables surrounding the control-group students.

Strict section-to-section continuity also presented a problem in terms of our research design. While the seven 193X teachers planned the course together and met frequently (often daily) in an attempt to achieve close coordination, obstacles invariably appeared. A writing workshop on prewriting took two days in one section, three in another. One section simply boycotted the second part of a video-tape on modification; they were not in the mood, they said, and besides, they hadn't understood the
preceding tape anyway. Vocabulary-building games that inspired fine writing in one section failed miserably in another. Most importantly, as the quarter wore on, the teachers became increasingly aware of a subtle tension between research and pedagogy. We began the project committed to the idea that course evaluation and measurement were both desirable and possible and that the way to achieve such goals was through careful pre- and post-testing and thoroughly coordinated instruction. Basically, we held to this commitment, but we found that our commitment to helping the students improve led us to modify some of our original plans. Therefore, when we found that the terminology in one text worked at odds with that of the video-tapes (and hence confused most students), we stopped using that text. And when one teacher found that two-thirds of her students were passionately interested in basketball, she began juggling writing projects to capitalize on that interest. I assume that every educational researcher must face similar dilemmas. But perhaps the point is still worth making: if any tension or conflict develops between research plan and teaching effectiveness, the research plan should yield.

In addition to controls and course continuity, two other components in our research design could be improved in light of this study. First of all, the fifty-four items counted by the analytic raters should be refined and
modified. Mean clause length (as defined by Mellon) should certainly be counted in addition to T-units, errors in possession should be counted as separate from spelling errors, and the depth-level of embedding measure should be refined to enumerate types of embeddings. In addition, future researchers using this plan should develop a measure of logical connectors (or transitions) and include it in the items counted. Finally, future studies using this design should gather pre- and post-writing samples in response to more than one question, and each question should ideally elicit a different mode of writing. Doing so would not only provide larger and more diverse samples of student writing but also allow researchers to compare student strengths and weaknesses among the various modes.

Close study of the total 193X project also reveals weaknesses in the general course design. Most serious was our attempt to attack writing problems on too many fronts at once. This diffusion of focus can be avoided, at least partially, by keeping the students' own writing at the center of every other class activity. This method is used by David Bartholomae, Director of Remedial English at The University of Pittsburgh, who assigns all work with grammatical error to individualized sessions in a writing lab. Another, less serious weakness involved our use of the SUNY/CUNY video-tapes described in Chapter III. Because these tapes were not fully integrated into our
course, we were unable to use them with anything approaching maximum effectiveness and hence were unable to measure in any way their relationship to improved student writing. Now that the tapes are readily available, teachers should be able to design courses and research projects which would accurately measure the pedagogical effectiveness of the tapes.

**Significant Implications**

My observations of Ohio State University remedial English students led me to generalize that they are poor readers, that their level of syntactic maturity is low, that they are plagued by errors, and that the strategies they use in their writing often work against them to compound their difficulties. These observations, in turn, have led me to several interrelated implications. First, my study strongly supports the notion that all language skills are related; that is to say, level of reading comprehension is related to complexity of sentence formations (or syntactic maturity), and both are related to mature, synthetic thought-processes. Our students were all both poor readers and poor writers, and their gains in the two areas certainly paralleled each other. Furthermore, as our students' ability to manipulate syntactic structures improved, so did their ability to draw inferences and make logical connections. In view of the close relationship
among language skills, the contemporary divorce of reading instruction from departments of English is especially lamentable. Especially in the remedial classroom, the reunion of reading and writing instruction is a consummation devoutly to be wished.

The implication that all language skills are closely related is supported by much current theory. In a 1975 review-article, Sandra Stotsky seeks to evaluate two hypotheses: (1) that the "enhancement of children's syntactic knowledge leads to greater reading comprehension," and (2) that "the enhancement of children's syntactic skills in writing . . . leads to improved reading comprehension." After a thorough look at recent research and experimental programs, Stotsky argues that "comprehension is, in part, a function of implicit syntactic knowledge" and concludes that "sentence-combining exercises may have not only illuminated a new method for helping children develop greater structural understanding of mature reading material, but also suggested the possible intellectual benefit of writing itself."^1

Robert Thorndike also supports the interrelationship of language skills when he argues that reading is a reasoning process, a cognitive skill, and as such can be fostered by the development of "thinking skills."^2 And Miriam Chaplin's 1976 dissertation, although devoted primarily to a study of reading, argues forcefully for the
interconnectedness of language skills when she says that "language experiences reinforce the organization of thought processes, and organized thought is the basis for ... solutions to practical problems."^4

Closely related to reading theory and research is another implication I wish to draw. On the basis of my experience with remedial students, I feel that teachers should be wary of the temptation to reduce reading levels of college materials on the assumption that only by doing so can the remedial student comprehend the material and thus improve. Frank Smith has taught us that "there is a tradeoff between visual and non-visual information in reading--the more that is already known 'behind the eyeball,' the less visual information is required to identify a letter, a word, or a meaning from the text."^5 Smith goes on to point out that "a reader who concentrates on words is unlikely to be able to get any sense from the passage that he reads."^6 Smith argues persuasively for the crucial need of the developing reader to take risks, to "guess," or to make errors, and concludes that "the best way to discover the meaning of a difficult passage is to read more of the passage. The best way to identify an unfamiliar word in text is to draw inferences from the rest of the text. The best way to learn the strategies and models for identifying new words 'by analogy' is to read."^7 In light of the evidence Smith provides, the
tendency of some remedial programs to reduce the reading level of all materials to, say, eighth grade, may actually deter students from plunging beyond their current capacities and making mistakes, thereby internalizing new knowledge and sharpening thinking skills.

This view (as well as the notion that all language skills are closely related) is further supported by the work of the Russian psychologist Lev Vygotsky. His experiments convinced him that "all the basic school subjects act as formal discipline, each facilitating the learning of the others; the psychological functions stimulated by them develop in one complex process" [emphasis added].

Basic to fostering this process, Vygotsky believes, are imitation and instruction: "In learning to speak, as in learning school subjects, imitation is indispensable. What a child can do in cooperation today he can do alone tomorrow. Therefore the only good kind of instruction is that which marches ahead of development and leads it; it must be aimed not so much at the ripe as at the ripening functions . . . ; instruction must be oriented toward the future, not the past." Vygotsky reminds us that if we provide a child only with problems he can solve without help, we play to his weakness rather than to his strength. Although Vygotsky based his studies on children under the age of our college students, I believe his theories are relevant to our teaching of them. If remedial English classes limit themselves to the current
reading level of the students, they will miss vital opportunities to help students form the logical bridges that they must form for themselves by grappling with and solving problems initially beyond their reach.

A further implication concerns the cognitive levels of remedial writing students. In general, our students had not attained the level of cognitive development that would allow them to form abstractions or conceptions and apply the principles derived successfully to college tasks. In short, they might well perform a given task in a specific situation, but they had great difficulty abstracting from it or replicating it in another context.

In Thought and Language, Vygotsky identifies three basic phases in the ascent to concept formation: the initial syncretic stage, in which "word meaning denotes nothing more to the child than a vague syncretic conglomeration of individual objects that have... coalesced into an image";¹⁰ the "thinking in complexes" stage during which "thought... is already coherent and objective... , although it does not reflect objective relationships in the same way as conceptual thinking";¹¹ and the true-concept formation stage. Vygotsky cautions, however, that "even after the adolescent has learned to produce concepts, ... he does not abandon the more elementary forms; they continue for a long time to operate, indeed to predominate, in many areas of his thinking. ... The transitional character of adolescent thinking becomes especially
evident when we observe the actual functioning of the newly acquired concepts. Experiments specially devised to study the adolescent's operations bring out . . . a striking discrepancy between his ability to form concepts and his ability to define them.¹² Vygotsky goes on to distinguish between "spontaneous" concepts, those which are formed as a result of ordinary, day-to-day experiences, and "scientific" concepts which are formed largely in conjunction with instruction. The student described above by Vygotsky is able to formulate spontaneous concepts, but not able to remove himself from them, abstract from them, or define them into scientific concepts.

The remedial English student most often works at what Vygotsky calls the "thinking in complexes" stage and the spontaneous-concept stage rather than the true-concept formation stage. While he may have little difficulty in dealing with familiar everyday problems requiring abstract thought based on concepts, he is not aware of the processes he is using. Thus he often lacks the ability to infer principles from his own experience. He is not forming the "scientific concepts" which are basic to mastery of almost all college material.

Jean Piaget categorizes mental development basically into four stages: the sensori-motor stage; the pre-operational stage; the concrete-operations stage; and the formal-operations stage characterized by the ability to
abstract, synthesize, and form coherent, logical relationships. At the stage of concrete operations, the child's thought is still closely linked to concrete data; completely representational, hypothetical, or verbal thought still eludes him. As the child moves through the stages of cognitive development, he goes through what Piaget calls the process of "de-centering," a process further defined by Lee Odell as "getting outside one's own frame of reference, understanding the thoughts, values, feelings of another person; ... projecting oneself into unfamiliar circumstances, whether factual or hypothetical; ... learning to understand why one reacts as he does to experience." Although a child first begins to "de-center" as early as the pre-operational stage, egocentricity is still strong in the concrete stage, and, indeed, we apparently continue the process of "de-centering" throughout our lives.

The relationship of Piaget's concrete stage to Vygotsky's "thinking in complexes" stage and "spontaneous-concept formation" stage is clear. What strikes me as important in our consideration of remedial students, however, is that my observations suggest strongly that these students are operating well below Piaget's formal-operations stage and that they often have great difficulty "de-centering." For example, asked to read an excerpt from The Foxfire Book which describes the use of signs of
the moon in planting crops, a typical group of 193X students found it almost impossible 1) to "get outside themselves" enough to understand anything about the values or habits of people unlike themselves, and 2) to draw inferences or form concepts based on what they had read. Instead, they preferred to ignore the people revealed in Foxfire and to shift instead to how they themselves liked to plant crops or to what they thought about the "superstitious" folks in Foxfire.

Some existing evidence suggests that many students have not attained anything near full cognitive development. A 1971 study of freshmen at a university in Oklahoma showed that "50 percent of the entering college students tested were operating completely at Piaget's concrete level of thought and another 25 percent had not fully attained the established criteria for formal thought."\textsuperscript{15} The investigators further describe the students as generally unable to abstract from a particular principle if the content of it were even slightly altered.

The implications of these findings for remedial instruction are complex at best. But I think we are safe in assuming that one reason that drill exercise so often fails to transfer a skill into the student's own writing is that the student is operating below the cognitive level at which he could abstract and generalize a principle and then apply it to tremendously varied writing problems.
Rather than focusing our instructional efforts primarily on such exercises, then, we would be wiser to design problem-solving situations that would provide practice in the inferential and synthetic skills necessary to profit from intensive drill.

The inability to abstract principles and to apply them to various tasks may also explain why our students did not respond as well to sentence-combining techniques as we had hoped they would. The exercises offered on our worksheets, the textbooks we used in the lab, and the SUNY video-tapes often assume the student's ability to form "scientific" concepts. The student at the concrete level of thinking, however, can manage to string many kernels together into a fairly complex sentence, but he will be unable to abstract from the principle if the content is altered. I am thus inclined to urge that available sentence-combining techniques, while extremely helpful because they remove some of the need for grammatical terminology, should be carefully redesigned for remedial writers. Such exercises should begin by motivating the student to generate his own kernel sentences for combination, and subsequent exercises should focus on inferential skills, logical relationships, and the movement from spontaneous to scientific-concept formation. By doing so, we could hope to lead the student to build those cognitive bridges that would foster the assimilation of principles and the
subsequent "accommodation" or application of those principles to new data.

Two further implications are somewhat related to the last one. First, my observation of remedial writing students has led me to the inductive generalization that they almost never profit from lectures or "teacher-centered" classes or from studying and memorizing isolated rules but from continuous trial-and-error writing directed to members of a small workshop group. This implication is clearly related, of course, to my earlier discussion of cognitive levels and to Vygotsky's notion of instruction "marching ahead" and appealing to "ripening" functions. Certainly the work of Piaget also supports this implication; his theory indicates that cognitive development moves first from doing, to doing consciously, and only then to formal conceptualization. As Eleanor Duckworth says in an essay in *Piaget in the Classroom*, "thoughts are our way of connecting things up for ourselves. If somebody else tells us about the connections he has made, we can only understand him to the extent that we do the work of making those connections ourselves." 16

In *The Concept of Mind*, Gilbert Ryle makes his crucial distinction between knowing how and knowing that:

Learning how or improving in ability is not like learning that or acquiring information. Truths can be imparted, procedures can only be inculcated, and
while inculcation is a gradual process, imparting is relatively sudden. It makes sense to ask at what moment someone acquired a skill. 'Part-trained' is a significant phrase, 'part-informed' is not. Training is the art of setting tasks which the pupils have not yet accomplished but are not any longer quite incapable of accomplishing. . . . Misunderstanding is a by-product of knowing how. Only a person who is at least a partial master of the Russian tongue can make the wrong sense of a Russian expression. Mistakes are exercises of competences.17

Chomsky's distinction between "competence" and "performance" has a similar bearing on the implications I have drawn about how to teach our students. Chomsky's views as expressed in Aspects of the Theory of Syntax can be used to argue against the notion that "language is essentially an adventitious construct, taught by 'conditioning' . . . or by drill and explicit explanation. . . ."18 In other words, students learn by doing and then by extrapolating principles from their activity. This theory informs an educational model proposed by James Britton in a recent talk at The Ohio State University (and based on his 1970 Language and Learning). Essentially, this paradigm incorporates learning by doing as opposed to learning solely by the study of abstract principles.

Britton's model is closely related to that articulated in Michael Polanyi's discussion of "skills" in Personal Knowledge. Polanyi begins his discussion by citing "the well-known fact that the aim of a skillful performance is achieved by the observance of a set of rules which are not
known as such to the person following them."¹⁹ Polanyi uses examples of the person who rides a bicycle, keeps afloat in the water, or plays a musical instrument without at all comprehending the underlying rules: "Rules of art can be useful, but they do not determine the practice of an art; they are maxims, which can serve as a guide to an art only if they can be integrated into the practical knowledge of the art. They cannot replace this knowledge."²⁰ Polanyi goes on to discuss the importance of apprenticeship in acquiring a skill or an art, by which he means that we learn by doing with a recognized master or "connoisseur" better than by studying or reading about abstract principles. By direct practice, we build up a "subsidiary awareness" of a particular skill which can be hampered if we apply "focal awareness" to it. As an example, Polanyi cites the case of the pianist who "shifts his attention from the piece he is playing to the observation of what he is doing with his fingers while playing it" and thus gets confused and has to stop playing. The "focal awareness," then, destroys "one's sense of the context which alone can smoothly evoke the proper sequence of words, notes, or gestures."²¹

The import of all this theory to the teaching of remedial writers is apparent. Rather than attempting to teach principles abstractly or directly, we must allow the students an extended period of actual doing--generating
and imitating--from which they can begin to draw conclusions themselves. The relationship between teacher and student should perhaps more closely resemble the active sharing of the apprentice/master model than the passive teacher/learner model traditionally accepted. The remedial-writing classroom, then, becomes a place where teacher and students write together and where practice takes the place of formal precept. And, above all, errors and mistakes are viewed as "exercises of competences" rather than a brand of stupidity.

All that I have argued thus far leads to the inescapable conclusion that the function of time in the education of remedial students must be seen in a new light. Heretofore, almost all colleges and universities have operated on a system in which time is a constant factor. That is, on the quarter system, the ten-week time unit is invariable. The student must adapt his learning to the limits of this unit. Yet my work with remedial writing students indicates that individual learning patterns, movement between cognitive levels, and acquisition of skills vary greatly from individual to individual and that, in fact, long plateaus often occur before the next peak of learning or mastery is achieved. Clearly, if we are to meet the challenge of teaching remedial writers, the time unit must be much more flexible than it is at present. If we are to integrate the teaching of language skills, then we must provide time for the recursive learning pattern that characterizes the acquisition of these skills.
Finally, I would suggest one other inescapable conclusion. The teacher who can integrate the instruction of language skills and help students achieve full cognitive development must be highly trained. Perhaps never have the problems facing writing teachers (and the trainers of writing teachers) seemed so impenetrable, but never have the solutions seemed so tantalizingly close. We now have the means--through study of such related fields as learning theory, cognitive psychology, linguistics, and statistics--to begin effective training programs. And one of the major benefits of such programs and the teachers they produce may be to establish, finally, what Janet Emig argues persuasively is the unique value of writing to learning.\textsuperscript{22}

**Recommendations for Future Study**

Two recommendations I have already suggested at least indirectly. First is the modification of current sentence-combining exercises to 1) elicit student generation of sentences as well as combination of them, 2) foster skills in inference-drawing, abstraction, synthesis, and conceptualization. These modified exercises should, of course, then be tested and evaluated in a number of research projects. Another experimental study could well attempt a writing program carefully designed to provide constant practice (or "knowing how") alone,
in small groups, and with the teacher for an extended period before any principles or rules are introduced. Such an experiment should not be based on current "free writing" techniques, however, because such techniques almost always presuppose cognitive levels remedial students have not achieved. Rather, the writing should begin with student attempts to find answers (and draw inferences) in problem-solving situations designed to foster cognitive growth.

Another recommendation for future study grows out of a restrospective look at my own analytic study of remedial writing in light of Britton's *The Development of Writing Abilities (11-18)* in which he defines three functions of writing as expressive, transactional, and poetic. The writing samples in my study were all transactional, and all were addressed to the same audience. Repeating this study with variations in audience, in function, or in both should yield intriguing information about the ways in which sentence and T-unit patterns, levels of syntactic maturity, and error patterns are related to different forms of writing.

Finally, my study of remedial writers convinces me that many more case studies need to be undertaken, either with small groups (as in Emig's work) or with large ones (as in Britton's). Ideally, such studies should span at least one year and should attempt to chart not only external
writing processes but the movement among cognitive thought levels as well. Some case studies might adapt some of the clues provided us by Kenneth S. Goodman and his colleagues in their development of miscue analysis in reading instruction. If we could begin to isolate and categorize writing "miscues," we could no doubt clarify the tasks to be accomplished in writing instruction, and thus provide more direct help to our students.
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APPENDIX A

ENGLISH 193X: A GENERAL PROFILE
ENGLISH 193X: A GENERAL PROFILE

Students entering: 94
Students completing: 86 (2 of these students failed to disenroll)
S grades: 61 (70%)
U grades: 25 (30%)
Women: 39 (45%)
Men: 47 (55%)
Black: 23 (27%)
White: 63 (73%)

High Schools Attended (listed by city) Per School Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Per School</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alvordton - Hilltop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron - North</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firestone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green - Custar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chillicothe - Chillicothe H.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland - Bay High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Central Catholic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield Heights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Adams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Kennedy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Marshall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw (Cleveland Heights)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde - Clyde H.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus - Bexley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastmoor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.E.B.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gahanna Lincoln</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linden McKinley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mifflin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynoldsburg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles Prep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Arlington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Westland 1
Whetstone 1
Worthington 2 24
Cincinnati - Sycamore 1 1
Dayton - Beaver Creek 1
Kettering Fairmont 1
Charminade Julienne 1
Miamisburg 1
Water E. Stebbing 1
Patterson 2 7
Delaware - Buckeye Valley 1 1
Findlay - Findlay H.S. 1 1
Fredericktown - Highland 1 1
Fremont - Fremont Rose 1 1
Grafton - Midview 1 1
Grove City - Grove City H.S. 1 1
Groveport-Madison - Groveport-Madison H.S. 1 1
Hamilton Township - Hamilton Township H.S. 1 1
Hilliard - Hilliard H.S. 1
Lowell - Fort Frye 1 1
Millersport - Walnut Township 1 1
Mt. Gilead - Northmore 1 1
North Canton - Glen Oak 1 1
Parma Heights - Nazareth 1 1
Piqua - Sidney 1
Central 1 2
Plain - Blanchester 1 1
Pleasantville - Fairfield Union 1 1
Rocky River - Rocky River H.S. 1 1
Springfield - Springfield North H.S. 1 1
Spring Valley - Centerville 1 1
Toledo - Scott 1
unidentified 1 2
Vermilion - Vermilion H.S. 1 1
Warrensville Heights - Warrensville Heights H.S. 2 2
Waverly - Waverly H.S. 1 1
West Carrollton - West Carrollton H.S. 1 1
Zanesville - Zanesville H.S. 3 3
Woodcliff Lake, N.J. - Saddle River Country Day 1 1
Mobile, AL. - Rain H.S. 1 1

Physical Characteristics

| Number wearing glasses | 24 |
| Number hard of hearing | 1 |
| Number of dyslexics | 2 |
| Number with speech impediment | 3 |
| Number left handed | 16 |
Reasons for withdrawing

1) to attend vocational school and become apprentice to a printer
2) to go to work full-time (family financial problems)
3) to take a higher level English course
4) to go home (homesick)
5) to reduce total number of hours (decided to keep graded courses)
6) to attend to personal family problems
7) to work increased number of hours
8) to get over a serious illness
9) to find something easier to do
10) unknown
APPENDIX B

HIGH SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS
HIGH SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE
(total responses: 81)

A. Courses

1. In what high school years did you have an English course?
   91% freshman  93% sophomore  80% junior  71% senior

2. Approximately how many high school English courses did you take? 4-5

Please describe briefly several of your most recent courses:
   a) ____________________________________________
   b) ____________________________________________
   c) ____________________________________________

3. Which of the following best describes the majority of high school English courses that you took?
   53% Literature  31% Composition  1% Business
   15% Other (Specify: drama, cinema, etc.) _________

4. Please rank the following (#1-#4) according to the emphasis and importance they had in your total English program in high school.

   Literature (1)
   Composition (2)
   Business (3)
   Other (Specify) ______________________

5. a. Which of the following best describes the last high school English course you took?

   12% Creative Writing
   43% Literature
   17% Composition
   6% Business
   22% Other (Specify) _______________

   b. the next to last course you took?

   14% Creative Writing
   50% Literature
   22% Composition
   12% Business
   2% Other (Specify) _______________
7. How would you characterize the type of instruction you received in your composition courses?

23% Lecture  
48% Discussion/seminar  
29% Programed instruction

8. a. Did you have access to a language lab? 33% yes 66% no  
b. English 16% yes 84% no (49 responses)  
c. Foreign 73% yes 27% no (49 responses)  
   _____ A lot _____ Some _____ A little

9. a. How many students (approximately) were in your last high school English class? 27  
b. Next to last high school English class? 27

B. Skills and Assignments

1. How much instruction did you receive in high school on writing themes, long papers, and/or book reports?  
14% A great deal 36% Some 41% Little 9% None

2. Did you learn how to organize long papers?  
41% yes 47% no 12% can't remember

3. a. How many themes, long papers, and book reports did you write in your last English course in high school? 2.7  
   b. In your next to last English course? 3.0

4. How much instruction did you receive in doing research (library) papers?  
14% A great deal 37% Some 54% Little 5% None

5. How many research papers did you write in your last year of high school? 1-2

6. How much instruction did you receive in writing paragraphs and paragraph organization?  
12% A great deal 39% Some 37% Little 12% None
7. Did you learn about topic sentences and how to use them?
62% yes 26% no 12% can't remember

8. How much instruction did you receive in writing sentences?
11% A great deal 46% Some 33% Little 10% None

9. Were you taught the types of sentences (simple, compound, complex, compound-complex)?
51% yes 20% no 29% can't remember

10. Were you taught how to write a variety of sentence types?
31% yes 38% no 31% can't remember

11. Were you taught how to write longer and more difficult sentences?
29% yes 50% no 21% can't remember

12. How much instruction did you receive in grammar?
10% A great deal 55% Some 29% Little 6% None

13. How much instruction and practice did you have in revising and correcting mechanical and grammatical errors in writing?
4% A great deal 35% Some 45% Little 15% None

14. How much instruction did you receive in improving your vocabulary?
17% A great deal 43% Some 30% Little 10% None

15. How much emphasis was placed on correct spelling in your high school English courses?
39% A great deal 39% Some 20% Little 2% None

16. Did you do spelling exercises?
53% yes 40% no 7% can't remember

17. a. Were you instructed in how to use a dictionary?
69% yes 26% no 5% can't remember
b. What was the total number of letters, memos, or business writing assignments in the last high school English course you took?

Approximately 3, but the number is not reliable.

19. a. Did you receive instruction in free writing or journal writing in high school?

28% yes 61% no 11% can't remember

b. What was the total number of journal or free writing assignments in the last high school English course you took?

Approximately 2

C. Reading

1. About how many hours per week were you required to read in high school (for all courses including in-class reading and homework)? 7-8 hrs.

2. a. How many books (excluding the text) were assigned for reading in your last English course in high school 3-4 books

b. Next to last course? 3-4 books

c. Please list some of the titles, if you remember them: __________________________________________

3. How much do you read on your own?

10% A great deal 54% Some 29% Little 7% None

4. Please rank the following (#1-#5) in the order of importance they have in your own reading:

___ Magazines
___ Newspapers
___ Books (Fiction)
___ Books (Non-fiction)
___ Breakfast Cereal Boxes

5. Approximately how many non-classroom-assigned books have you read in the last two years? 7-8 books
(This average is raised by several students who reported unusually large numbers of books.)

Name at least two: __________________________________________
7. What is your favorite reading material (book, magazine, or newspaper)? no clear favorite emerged

8. Did you have a high school course in reading skills?
   32% yes 48% no 20% can't remember

9. How much emphasis was placed on reading in your English courses?
   30% A great deal 31% Some 36% Little 3% None

10. a. In your English courses were you required to summarize what you read?
    68% yes 24% no 8% can't remember
    b. Were you required to answer questions about reading assignments?
    30% Always 66% Sometimes 4% Never
    c. Were you required to read out loud?
    5% Always 75% Sometimes 20% Never

11. How much difficulty do you have in your reading assignments (for all courses) in each of the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Not much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Difficult words</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Speed</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Lack of concentration</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Forgetting content</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Grading

1. To what extent was your written work in high school English courses graded on the basis of content (ideas)?
   35% Great extent 53% Some 12% Little
2. To what extent was your written work in high school English courses graded on the basis of mechanics (spelling, grammar, punctuation, sentence structure)?

45% Great extent 51% Some 4% Little

3. To what extent was your written work in high school English courses graded on the basis of composition skills (controlling idea, paragraph construction, organization)?

29% Great extent 59% Some 12% Little

4. a. What grade did you get in your last English course in high school? ___

   A - 10%
   B - 38%
   C - 46%
   D - 6%
   E - 0%

b. Next to last English course in high school? ___

   A - 10%
   B - 39%
   C - 47%
   D - 4%
   E - 0%

c. What was your average grade in your high school English courses (approximately)? ___

   A - 3%
   B - 37%
   C - 59%
   D - 1%
   E - 0%
APPENDIX C

ATTITUDE SURVEY: PRE- AND POST-TEST RESPONSES
Dear English 193 student:

The following questions are designed to help us teach better and evaluate our own teaching. There are no correct answers. The results will not be a part of your grade, although completing the questions is required. Do not choose the answers you think English teachers would like to hear. Instead, for the first forty-three questions, circle the answer on the right that most nearly matches your own response to each question: Strongly Disagree (SD), Mildly Disagree (MD), Not Sure (NS), Mildly Agree (MA), or Strongly Agree (SA). For instance, if you strongly agree with the statement, "The U.S. should try to put a man on Mars by 1980," you would circle SA in the column on the right. If you had no opinion or were not even slightly inclined to agree or disagree, you would circle NS. On Part II, please rank the ten writing skills in order of difficulty.

You will have twenty-five minutes to record your answers. Thank you very much for helping us by answering these questions. Before you begin, please put your name on the back of the last sheet in the upper right-hand corner (for clerical purposes only).

PRE- AND POST-TEST RESPONSES TO ATTITUDE SURVEY, *1=pre and 2=post

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART I</th>
<th>92 Responses Pre</th>
<th>77 Responses Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD (1)</td>
<td>MD (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. An English teacher's main job is to correct students when they make mistakes in speaking or writing.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Writing is a skill that almost anyone can learn.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. People who speak well are successful.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD (1)</td>
<td>MD (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grades on English themes are a matter of opinion.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Trying to fix writing only makes it worse.</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Studying grammar improves your writing.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Writing courses are easy.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Short sentences are better than long ones.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It's the writer's fault when you can't understand his writing.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Writing is a talent you are born with.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. You can't argue with another person's opinion.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sincere, honest writing is good writing.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. High Schools do a good job of teaching writing.</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. On writing assignments, you should be free to write about anything.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD (1)</td>
<td>MD (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. People who copy other people's papers should be penalized.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. A person can learn how to write by learning the rules of good writing.</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. People who write well are more likely to be successful.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Good handwriting is important.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Reading fast is as important as understanding what you have read.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Schools should not grade students.</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. People who can't write well are not intelligent.</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. If you know grammar, you know how to write.</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The only real difference between writing and talking is that writing is done on paper.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. You have to have a large vocabulary to be able to write well.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD (1)</td>
<td>MD (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. It's embarrassing to use a word incorrectly.</td>
<td>3%  4%  20% 31%  6%  9%  50% 40% 20% 14%</td>
<td>3  3  19  24  6  7  46  31 19 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Part of a grade should depend on how hard you worked on the assignment.</td>
<td>2%  1%  5%  6%  6%  11% 36% 41% 51% 37%</td>
<td>2  1  5  5  6  9  33  32 47 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. A college education is worthwhile even if it doesn't lead to a better job.</td>
<td>6%  10% 11%  9%  14% 18% 38% 37% 30% 23%</td>
<td>6  8  10  7  13  14  35  29 28 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. It's better to say nothing than to give an answer you are not sure of.</td>
<td>21% 26% 48% 36% 11% 15% 16% 18% 4% 4%</td>
<td>20  20  43  28  10  12  15  14  4  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. People who use big words are just trying to impress you.</td>
<td>6%  6%  44% 39% 17% 32% 27% 17% 3% 5%</td>
<td>6  5  41  30  16  25  25  13  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. A composition that is well-written is interesting to read.</td>
<td>2%  10% 11% 10% 12%  5% 39% 40% 36% 34%</td>
<td>2  8  10  8  11  4  36  31 33 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Proper spelling improves your writing.</td>
<td>1%  1%  3%  7%  4%  10% 41% 47% 50% 32%</td>
<td>1  1  3  6  4  8  38  36 46 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The ability to write well is important in college.</td>
<td>2%  0%  1%  1%  4%  5% 23% 28% 69% 65%</td>
<td>2  0  1  1  4  4  21  22 64 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Reading literature helps your writing.</td>
<td>0%  0%  3%  6%  24% 27% 41% 47% 31% 19%</td>
<td>0  0  3  5  22  21  38  36 29 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Discussing literature improves your writing.</td>
<td>0%  1%  7% 11% 31% 35% 41% 36% 19% 14%</td>
<td>0  1  7  9  29  27  38  28 18 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. People who can read well can also write well.  
\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
SD & MD & NS & MA & SA \\
(1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) \\
9 & 10 & 37 & 46 & 25 & 17 & 25 & 26 \\
3 & 1
\end{array}
\]

36. A person should not be asked to explain his beliefs or opinions.  
\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
SD & MD & NS & MA & SA \\
(1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) \\
20 & 10 & 43 & 10 & 13 & 5 & 20 & 40 \\
2 & 34 & 13 & 23 & 13 & 18 & 26 & 26 \\
9 & 8 & 40 & 8 & 12 & 4 & 19 & 31 \\
8 & 1
\end{array}
\]

37. You have to write what your teacher wants to hear to get a good grade.  
\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
SD & MD & NS & MA & SA \\
(1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) \\
24 & 22 & 31 & 35 & 21 & 13 & 16 & 23 \\
6 & 7 & 32 & 29 & 27 & 20 & 10 & 15 \\
22 & 17 & 29 & 27 & 20 & 10 & 15 & 18 \\
6 & 6
\end{array}
\]

38. If you know what all the words in a piece of writing mean, then you understand it.  
\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
SD & MD & NS & MA & SA \\
(1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) \\
6 & 9 & 35 & 37 & 14 & 18 & 27 & 30 \\
17 & 5 & 8 & 6 & 6 & 3 & 7 & 5
\end{array}
\]

39. Punctuation is important only on English papers.  
\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
SD & MD & NS & MA & SA \\
(1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) \\
44 & 40 & 37 & 39 & 6 & 5 & 8 & 6 \\
3 & 7 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 3 & 6
\end{array}
\]

40. If other people understand your writing, that is more important to English teachers than errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation.  
\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
SD & MD & NS & MA & SA \\
(1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) \\
30 & 14 & 35 & 34 & 16 & 14 & 14 & 19 \\
4 & 18 & 19 & 13 & 15 & 16 & 11 & 13 \\
21 & 32 & 26 & 16 & 11 & 13 & 15 & 3 \\
4 & 6 & 4 & 8 & 5 & 3 & 6
\end{array}
\]

41. Creative writing can help improve your theme writing.  
\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
SD & MD & NS & MA & SA \\
(1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) \\
2 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 15 & 11 & 52 & 45 \\
2 & 1 & 2 & 15 & 11 & 52 & 45 & 22 \\
17 & 22 & 24 & 15 & 11 & 52 & 45 & 22 \\
17 & 22 & 24 & 15 & 11 & 52 & 45 & 22
\end{array}
\]

42. Creative writing is enjoyable.  
\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
SD & MD & NS & MA & SA \\
(1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) \\
0 & 5 & 10 & 7 & 24 & 12 & 40 & 40 \\
19 & 13 & 15 & 20 & 17 & 20 & 17 & 17 \\
19 & 15 & 11 & 15 & 11 & 15 & 20 & 17 \\
5 & 3
\end{array}
\]

43. Most of what goes into a theme is just stuffing to pad it out and make it sound good.  
\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
SD & MD & NS & MA & SA \\
(1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) & (1) & (2) \\
17 & 15 & 26 & 41 & 28 & 28 & 24 & 11 \\
3 & 2 & 11 & 15 & 26 & 41 & 28 & 24 \\
17 & 15 & 26 & 41 & 28 & 28 & 24 & 11 \\
3 & 2 & 11 & 15 & 26 & 41 & 28 & 24
Part II. Rate the following writing skills from 1 to 10, with 1 being the most important for you, and 10 the least important for you. Although some may seem to be of equal difficulty, assign only one number to each skill and use each number only once.

- Putting sentences in the right order.
- Making it interesting.
- Finding a good idea.
- Spelling.
- Choosing the right words.
- Figuring out what to say about your idea.
- Punctuation.
- Putting words in the right order.
- Making the writing mean what you want it to say.
- Grammar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRE-TEST RESULTS</th>
<th>(82 responses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence order</td>
<td>5 6 15 10 10 5 8 10 7 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>4 9 8 3 2 5 9 10 12 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>9 6 2 5 12 4 1 7 14 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>9 4 8 7 9 1 8 11 4 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words</td>
<td>3 6 13 15 10 9 11 6 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to say</td>
<td>7 7 9 11 8 11 6 6 10 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>7 10 8 11 6 13 6 1 9 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word order</td>
<td>2 9 8 10 10 12 13 10 4 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>10 7 7 5 7 11 10 9 10 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>15 15 10 4 6 4 8 6 6 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## POST-TEST RESULTS

(67 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence order</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right words</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word order</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct meaning</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

RESULTS OF READING PRE- AND POST-TESTS
### Paragraph Comprehension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average raw score</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(out of a possible 30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average percentile rank</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading Speed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>figures unavailable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average words per minute</td>
<td>162.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of students taking both tests: 71

Average increase in raw score + 2.92
Average increase in standard score + 4.65
Average increase in stanine + .97
Average increase in percentile rank +12.20
APPENDIX E

ERROR RECOGNITION/EDITING TEST AND PRE- AND POST-TEST RESULTS
Advice to My Classmates in English 101

Sometimes writing is an easy task, but often writing is quiet difficult. The kind of writing that is just putting words on a page is not to difficult: sitting in class, jotting down notes about an assignment that is due next tuesday is a simple enough tasks. The kind of writting that come from ideas in ones own head, however, is real hard to do. That kind of writing is the most hard of all when its called a "essay" or "Composition." Or is it?

People really do alot of writing from thêre own head; they just don't stop to think about it. For example, when you writes letters to you're freinds, the ideas are your own, aren't they? No teacher tell you what to say. When you write in a diary or a friends' yearbook, you are the one whom tell you what to write. So this business of writing from your own ideas isn't whats so burdensome; rather, the trouble has stemmed from worrying about wether or not you can please you're teacher. Why not stop trying to please he or her and be trying to please yourself?
## RESULTS OF ERROR RECOGNITION/EDITING TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Wrong</th>
<th>Right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Quiet/quite</td>
<td>spelling</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. to/too</td>
<td>homonym</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. :/ ; or .</td>
<td>punctuation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. tuesday/ Tuesday</td>
<td>capitalization</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. tasks/task</td>
<td>agreement:</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complement</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. writting/writing</td>
<td>spelling</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. come/comes</td>
<td>agreement:</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subject-verb</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ones/one's</td>
<td>possession</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. real/really</td>
<td>adjective/</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. most hard/hardest</td>
<td>comparatives</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. its/it's</td>
<td>contraction/</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>homonym</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. a/an</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Comp/comp</td>
<td>capitalization</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. alot/a lot</td>
<td>spelling</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Wrong Pre</td>
<td>Wrong Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. there/their</td>
<td>homonym</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. head/heads</td>
<td>agreement:</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-a</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. writes/write</td>
<td>agreement:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subject-verb</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. you're/your</td>
<td>homonym</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. freinds/</td>
<td>spelling</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends'</td>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. tell/tells</td>
<td>agreement:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subject-verb</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. friends'/</td>
<td>possessive</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friend's</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. whom/who</td>
<td>case</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. tell/tells</td>
<td>agreement:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subject-verb</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. whats/what's</td>
<td>contraction</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. has stemmed/</td>
<td>tense shift</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stems</td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. wether/whether</td>
<td>spelling</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. you're/your</td>
<td>homonym</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. he/him</td>
<td>case</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. be trying/try</td>
<td>verb form</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. yourself/e</td>
<td>spelling</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yourself</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS 1436 963 904 1377
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average missed on pre-test:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average missed on post-test:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average correct on pre-test:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average correct on post-test:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

WRITING SAMPLE QUESTION AND HOLISTIC SCORING MODELS
1. Please sign your name in the place provided.

2. On the reverse side of this paper write one paragraph in which you present the major reason your worst teacher was ineffective.

3. Plan, write and reread your paragraphs carefully (scrap paper will be provided). Organization and progression are important. Think of a responsive topic sentence, a specific supporting example, and a conclusion. In general an effective paragraph will require that you (1) state and develop a central idea; (2) have an organization which is indicative of an overall plan; (3) deal with the assigned topic; (4) avoid serious errors in diction, sentence structure and paragraph development.

* * * * * *

Following are the six models against which the 193X and control groups were measured. They are listed from 6 (the highest or best score) to 1 (the lowest or worst score).
HOLISTIC GRADING MODELS

(6) The major reason my worst teacher was ineffective was that she constantly compared me to my brothers. When she handed back tests she would bring out her old file of test results. Then she would read through the list of high scorers on that particular test, given anywhere from one to ten years ago. When she read through the list she would make it a point to read my brothers' names and to announce their scores. Then she would compare my scores with theirs in front of the entire class. If my score was in the range of theirs, she would say intelligence ran in the family; if my score happened to be low, though, she would say that I didn't work as hard as they did. Teachers should judge students on their own work and not compare them to anyone else.

(5) There are many reasons my worst teacher was ineffective, but I suppose the major one was due to her lack of organization. It is not everyday that most teachers forget the previous assignment, but everyday my teacher somehow seemed to forget. Not only that, she had to be reminded to grade papers, to pass papers back, and to collect assignments. Her desk top was so cluttered with junk that she couldn't seem to find a thing. The bookcase she kept in the corner for reading days was so unorganized that by the time you found a book the period was practically over. My teacher's lesson plans got so messed up that our class was studying the Civil War before The Pilgrims even landed in America. If you wanted to look at your grades for the last term you would have to ask weeks ahead of time so she could rummage through the files to find them. All in all my teacher was a well educated person, but her lack of organization and order seemed to ruin her effectiveness, so the total teaching effect was a disaster.

(4) The major reason my worst teacher was ineffective was that he did not have the natural talent of being a teacher. Some people are born to teach. They seem to have a knack for it. He did not possess this talent. Consequently, trying to learn from him was like trying to learn from an apple tree. It was a very unproductive experience. He was unable to present the material in a way in which the student, namely me, could comprehend it. He seemed to lack any enthusiasm or concern toward his students. When you had a problem and went to discuss it with him, his attitude was,
"you dummy. I already explained this once. Weren't you listening?" Sometimes I wished that I was as smart as he was and could just understand things real quick. As one can see, my teacher was ineffective because he didn't care about the student.

(3) The major reason my worst teacher was ineffective can be explained in one simple word...boaring. This particular teacher happen to be a he and taught Economics to high school seniors. Mr. Cooper was his name and boaring was his game. He was a tall thin man in his late fifties and knew about everything on the subject he was teaching. One of the worst things about this teacher was he talked softly and never changed the expression on his face. He never raised or lowered his voice it always stayed the same continuously for the whole forty-five minute of class time. It was as if someone had just plugged him in and turn him on. He sounded like a machine talking constantly about one subject over and over again. Economics was the one class I was relieved to hear the bell sound.

(2) The major reason my worst teacher was ineffective was not his fault it was mine. He was the type of teacher that just let the kids run the class, he just stood by and let others tell him what we were going to learn, so that in the end we all just killed nine weeks fighting what we were going to learn. unless it finally did come time for him to teach us something, the man was going to try and tell us something he knew nothing about, except what he had read the night before. But the problem was mine if he didn't wish to teach us nothing, then I should have tried to get it on my own, but I just expected it to be handed to me, and that I wasn't supposed to dig for it myself, so what it comes down to is this, the teacher is there to help but it is up to the student to pull his own weight if he wants to learn.

(1) My algebra teacher was so bad. He used words I did not know, therefore I didn't understand what he was saying. He said an equation would have a repeated solution instead of saying one real number, so I thought he meant the answer was a sequence, such as one, two, three. I didn't understand what he was saying.
APPENDIX G

ENGLISH 193X STUDENTS' PRE- AND POST-TEST HOLISTIC SCORES AND 193X GRADES
## Pre and Post Holistic Scores/Final Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Pre-test code #</th>
<th>Post-test code #</th>
<th>Pre-test Holistic Score</th>
<th>Post-test Holistic Score</th>
<th>Grade in 193X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A score of 9 indicates that the student did not write on the assigned topic and thus was not included in the sample.*
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Drop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Drop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Drop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

KEY FOR ANALYTIC SCORING OF STUDENT WRITING SAMPLES
KEY FOR ANALYTIC SCORING OF WRITING SAMPLE

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:3-5</td>
<td>Code number for each student sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_</td>
<td>1:4</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_</td>
<td>1:5</td>
<td>Grade in 193X (S, U, or Drop)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>193X instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_</td>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>Code for control group (1 = English; 2 = no English)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_</td>
<td>1:8-10</td>
<td>Number of words as punctuated by student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_</td>
<td>1:11-12</td>
<td>Number of correct contractions (there for they're = 1 word; they're for there = 1 word; they're for they are = 2 words, i.e. 1 contraction).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_</td>
<td>1:13-14</td>
<td>Number of sentences as student punctuates them (if in doubt about a period or capital, give student benefit of the doubt).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_</td>
<td>1:15-16</td>
<td>Number of T-Units (a t-unit is defined as a main clause and all its subordinate clauses and relative clauses regardless of the student's punctuation. If you can't tell where a fragment belongs, i.e. to which main clause the fragment is logically connected, don't include it in the t-unit). Intentional fragments (Yes, of course; Nice work if you can get it.) are counted as sentences and as t-units. He is as tall as I am = 1 t-unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_</td>
<td>1:17-19</td>
<td>Number of words in T-Units (expand correct contractions before counting. Do not count words in fragments not included in 1:15-16.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>Number of I's used as initial subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_</td>
<td>1:21</td>
<td>Number of subordinate clauses, not including relative clauses or nominal clauses. These will start with words such as when, because, as, if, although, until, while, and however</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in constructions such as: However you do this, but not in: However, I flunked the course; as in As I was walking down the street; and as . . . as in constructions such as (He's as good as I am.)

_ _ 1:22-23 Number of words in subordinate clauses--expand contractions first.

_ 1:24 Number of relative clauses (noun followed by a clause which must have a finite verb in it; typically introduced by who, which, that and in some cases by zero: The teacher I had was strict).

_ 1:25-26 Number of words in relative clauses--expand contractions first.

_ 1:27 Depth level of most deeply embedded S sentence according to the number of correctly used vertical or stacked sentence modes (not coordinated or horizontally-related sentence modes). Don't give the student the benefit of the doubt.

_ 1:28 Is there a TOPIC SENTENCE in this writing sample?

1=yes
2=attempted but weak
3=no
4=can't tell

_ 1:29 Number of paragraphs indented; 1=1, 2=2, 3=3, etc.

_ 1:30 Number of all coordinating conjunctions between main (independent) clauses in one sentence as punctuated by student, but not between other constituents; all defined coordinating conjunctions according to McCrimmon: and, but, nor, yet, or, either . . . or, neither . . . nor (count as one).

_ _ 1:32-33 Number of other and's.
Number of instances of faulty parallelism and illogical coordinations (failure to make things parallel that should be parallel; making things parallel that aren't parallel).

Number of sentences that begin with anything other than the subject (not including nominal phrases, definite articles plus modifiers; There is/are sentences, etc. Including And's, So's, However's, and sentences which have the subordinate clause first, and sentences such as Panting, the boy ran up the stairs).

Number of sentence fragments (not including intentional sentence fragments).

Number of sentence fragments due to PUNCTUATION errors.

Number of sentence fragments that are logically connected to the PRECEDING sentence rather than to the following sentence.

Number of sentence fragments that contain -ing verb forms.

Number of faulty subject-verb agreement (NUMBER).

Number of errors in the use of the principal parts of verbs: I done it; I have wrote it; it needs washed.

Number of errors in tense shifts, i.e. sequence of tenses, not shift in mood. Count one error for each shift: present to past = 1, past to present = 1 (add total). These may occur within and across sentences.

Number of passive (vs. active) verbs used; don't count mood (subjunctives).

Number of all spelling errors, including errors at ends of words, (ect.), inappropriate abbreviations such as: 4 Eng. classes (don't correct for numerals), Lit. = error. Count improper plurals: babys; doubled-letter errors: writen, benefited.
Number of homonym errors, phonologically derived errors (not with apostrophes), a/an errors; an/and errors; they/the errors; of's for have's. Include accept/except, illicit/elicit, effect/affect here; include It's a doggie dog world; male shoviness, alotta, etc.

Number of spellings of two words as one: alot, allright; all commission and omission errors involving apostrophes: your (you're), their, there (they're), it's for its.

Number of spelling errors that occur at ends of words (may include some errors already counted), e.g. omitted -s in plural nouns (I read 5 book), third person singular present tense verbs (He write essays everyday), possessives (It was her to keep), -ed missing or put in (past participles), suppose to, use to.

Number of faulty pronoun case (subject/object--all inclusive: whom in subject position (My teacher whom was teaching English; whom is it?), but not who in object position (Who did you say wrote it?).

Number of faulty noun-pronoun agreement, number of faulty noun-noun agreement, number of faulty, illogical antecedent, or missing antecedent. (Each student must choose their major. The teachers must choose his or her topic to teach. One must do your work.); or unclear pronoun reference (I had been writing for a long time and found this to be a problem. He likes math which is good because he can get a good job.)

Number of unclear pronoun antecedent (he_1 . . . he_2 . . . he (1 or 2)).

Number of illogical subordinations, illogical appositions: We had studied the basic reading skills, such as book reports. We studied American literature, the famous writers themselves like Shakespeare.

Number of capitalization errors (both omission and commission), names of courses are exempt, when small = o.k.; if inconsistent, then count
as error, 1 error for each switch. (My English teacher taught us Grammar in b/Basic w/Writing = 2 errors). Give a 9 if student uses block letters and you cannot differentiate between upper and lower case letters.)

_1:54_ Number of omitted words--obvious omissions; don't guess in fragments.

_1:55_ Number of illegible words (buy vs. bury = bag).

_1:57_ Number of occurrences of awkward word order, dangling modifiers, repeated transitional elements. (The teacher tried to get her students to seek all possible knowledge. And therefore, since he was the only boy he therefore did better. He was the student to whom she gave the assignment to.)

_1:58_ Number of garbled sentences--write out the examples and the number of the survey form. Do not recount sentence fragments.

_1:59_ Number of non-idiomatic phrases (on the contrast, in contrary).

_1:60_ Number of wrong words used (diction errors), noun forms (appropriacy), exclusive of homonym errors. (tools for grammar--should be of), number of adjective vs. adverb errors.

_1:61_ Number of semi-colons used.

_1:62_ Number of colons, dashes (pairs of dashes = two), pairs of parentheses, pairs of quotes used.

_1:63_ Number of fused sentences (according to McCrimmon); main clause plus main clause with no intervening punctuation.

_1:64_ Number of run-on sentences (according to McCrimmon).

_1:65_ Number of fused sentences punctuated with commas, i.e. comma splice.
Number of remaining misplaced commas including restrictive clauses punctuated with commas.

Number of misplaced semi-colons (Don't punctuate student's fragments).

Number of misplaced question marks, exclamation marks and number of omitted terminal question marks and exclamation marks.

Number of misplaced quotation marks, dashes, parentheses, hyphens, colons.

Number of omitted commas, including omitted commas with non-restrictive clauses. Use: main clause, and main clause as correct model. If no comma before last member of series, do not count it as an error.

Number of omitted quotation marks, parentheses, and dashes.

Number of sentence fragments which contain no finite verbs.

Holistic score based on analyst's criteria: (6 = high to 1 = low).

ACT Score

Average holistic score

Holistic scorer A

Holistic scorer B

Holistic scorer C
APPENDIX I

PRE-TEST, POST-TEST, AND CONTROL-GROUP MEANS FOR ALL ANALYTIC VARIABLES
## PRE-, POST-, AND CONTROL-GROUP MEANS FOR ANALYTIC VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pre-test Mean</th>
<th>Post-test Mean</th>
<th>Control Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td># of words</td>
<td>136.90</td>
<td>148.63</td>
<td>149.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td># correct contractions</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td># sentences</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td># T-units</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>10.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td># words in T-units</td>
<td>136.25</td>
<td>148.23</td>
<td>148.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td># sentences with I as subject</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td># subordinate clauses</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td># words in subordinate clauses</td>
<td>18.19</td>
<td>29.34</td>
<td>20.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td># relative clauses</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td># words in relative clauses</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td>16.42</td>
<td>20.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>depth level of most deeply embedded sentence</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>topic sentence: 1=yes; 2=yes but weak</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td># of paragraphs</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td># coordinating conjunctions</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Pre-test Mean</td>
<td>Post-test Mean</td>
<td>Control Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td># &quot;ands&quot; between main clauses</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td># other &quot;ands&quot;</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td># instances of faulty parallelism and illogical coordinations</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td># sentences with non-subject opener</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td># all fragments</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td># fragments due to punctuation</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td># fragments logically connected to preceding sentence</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td># fragments containing -ing forms</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td># faulty subject-verb agreement</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td># errors in use of principal parts of verbs</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td># errors in tense shifts</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td># passive verbs</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td># all spelling errors</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td># homonym errors</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Pre-test Mean</td>
<td>Post-test Mean</td>
<td>Control Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td># 2-words-as-one errors</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td># end-of-word errors</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td># pronoun case errors</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td># noun-pronoun agreement errors</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td># unclear pronoun antecedents</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td># illogical subordinations</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td># capitalization errors</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td># omitted words</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td># illegible words</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td># double negatives</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td># awkward word order, dangling modifiers</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td># garbled sentences</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td># non-idiomatic phrases</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td># wrong word used</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td># semi-colons</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td># colons, dashes, parentheses, and/or quotation marks</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td># fused sentences</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Pre-test Mean</td>
<td>Post-test Mean</td>
<td>Control Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td># run-on sentences</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td># comma splices</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td># remaining misplaced commas</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td># misplaced semi-colons</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td># misplaced (or omitted) question marks/exclamation marks</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td># misplaced dashes, hyphens, parentheses, quotation marks</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td># omitted commas</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td># omitted dashes, parentheses, or quotation marks</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td># sentence fragments containing no finite verb</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>analytic rater's overall score</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(l=lowest; 6=highest)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>ACT English score</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>8.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Holistic score</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(l=lowest; 6=highest)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td># total run-ons</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

COURSE MATERIALS

General Syllabus and Three
Day-to-Day Syllabi
List of Books Used in Lab
Thirty-Three Writing Assignments
Additional Class and Lab Exercises
Individualized Student Checklists
and Student Writing Profile
GENERAL SYLLABUS

English 193X
Fall Quarter, 1976
Mr. David Willis, Ms. Betsy Brown, Mr. Nevin Laib, Ms. Kathy Kelly, Ms. Sue Payne, Mr. John Ruszkiewicz, Ms. Andrea Lunsford

Offices: Bevis 254, 256
Ruszkiewicz, Ms. Andrea Lunsford

Phone: 422-0589

REQUIRED MATERIALS


English 100 folder

One college dictionary


The American Heritage Paperback Dictionary ($1.25).

COURSE OBJECTIVES

English 193X is designed to help you succeed in English 100 and other college courses. In order to complete 193X with a grade of Satisfactory, you must submit nine edited paragraphs from among the total number of paragraphs you write during the quarter (due dates are listed in the syllabus). Each paragraph must:

1) be built around a clear central idea to which all following sentences are linked;
2) develop, complicate, and sustain the central idea;
3) use language which is appropriate and accurate;
4) be adapted to a specific audience.
Furthermore, your paragraphs must be free of basic errors and show your ability to write complete and varied sentences. (Specific standards you must meet in order to reach these goals will be discussed in class.) Finally, you must be able to read and comprehend college materials with reasonable speed.

**COURSE PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

As a member of English 193X, you will meet in class sessions four days a week. In addition, you will spend a minimum of two hours a week in the 193X writing center (Bevis 317) working independently or with an instructor on individual problem areas. Your other course responsibilities will include:

1) completing all formal assignments by the due date (unless prior arrangements have been made with your instructor);

2) missing no more than three class or lab sessions;

3) keeping a folder of all your writing during the quarter;

4) participating in class and/or group work; and

5) participating in the reading center program if referred.

**CLASS SCHEDULE**

**WEEK 1 (September 21-24)**

21 Introduction to 193X, the syllabus, and the writing center; attitude survey

22 Introduction to instructors; Reading test, parts 1 and 2

23 Reading test, part 3

24 Writing diagnostic

**WEEK 2 (September 27 - October 1) (First student conferences held)**

27 SMT diagnostic; Error recognition/editing diagnostic

28 Speed writing exercises; Reading skills: previewing, skimming, note-taking
29 T & N, Chapter 1: exercises, pp. 5-13.

30 T & N, Chapter 1: exercises, pp. 14-24; *Foxfire* handout; differences between speech and writing.

1 In-class writing based on Terkel handout; work on generalization and inference-making.

**WEEK 3** (October 4-8)

4 Class work on revision

5 T & N, Chapter 2: exercises, pp. 34-42.


7 In-class writing

**WEEK 4** (October 11-15)

11 Columbus Day

NB: During this week you will set up a conference with your instructor to choose your first paragraphs for final editing.

12 T & N, Chapter 3: exercises, pp. 59-67; class work on revisions

13 T & N, Chapter 3: exercises, pp. 68-86.

14 In-class writing (second diagnostic)

**WEEK 5** (October 18-22)

18 Class work on revisions; high school questionnaire

19 T & N, Chapter 4: exercises, pp. 95-103; Graham, Chapter 1

20 T & N, Chapter 4: exercises, pp. 104-120

21 In-class writing

**WEEK 6** (October 25-29)

NB: During this week you will set up a third conference with your instructor to discuss the paragraphs you have chosen for final editing.
25 Class work on revision
26 T & N, Chapter 5: exercises, 128-137 and 165-167
27 T & N, Chapter 5: exercises, pp. 138-150
28 Graham, Chapter 2
   in-class writing

**WEEK 7 (November 1-5)**

1 In-class work on revision
   FIRST DUE DATE
2 T & N, Chapter 7: exercises to be assigned
   Graham, Chapter 3
3 T & N, Chapter 7: exercises to be assigned
4 In-class writing

**WEEK 8 (November 8-12)**

8 T & N, Chapter 8: exercises, pp. 222-236
9 T & N, Chapter 8: exercises, pp. 237-253
   Graham, Chapter 4
10 In-class writing (third diagnostic)
11 Veterans' Day

**WEEK 9 (November 15-19)**

NB: During this week you will set up a fourth
   conference with your instructor to discuss the
   paragraphs you are working on for final sub­
   mission.

15 Class work on revision
   SECOND DUE DATE
16 T & N, Chapter 9: exercises, pp. 267-277
   Graham, Chapter 5
17 T & N, Chapter 9: exercises, pp. 278-287; 292
18 In-class writing
WEEK 10 (November 22-26)

22  T & N, Chapter 10: exercises, pp. 300-311
23  T & N, Chapter 10: exercises, pp. 312-332
24  In-class writing
25/26  Thanksgiving

WEEK 11 (November 29-December 3)

29  T & N, Chapter 11: exercises, pp. 340-348
30  T & N, Chapter 11: exercises, pp. 349-362
    FINAL DUE DATE

1  Reading test, parts 1 and 2
2  Reading test, part 3
3  In-class writing (final diagnostic)

WEEK 12 (December 6-9) (Final student conferences held)

Final Exam Week: Error recognition test; SMT diagnostic; Attitude Survey.
STANDARDS FOR FIRST EDITED PARAGRAPHS

Each of your edited paragraphs will receive an S if it meets the following criteria:

1. The paragraph has a clear central idea which is appropriately limited and stated in a topic sentence;

2. Every sentence in the paragraph is linked to the central idea;

3. The central idea is adequately developed and sustained with specific facts, examples, or incidents;

4. All words in the paragraph are used accurately and are spelled correctly;

5. The paragraph is adapted to our specific audience (class members of 193);

6. Every sentence is complete (no fragments, comma splices, or run-ons);

7. The sentences use coordination and subordination correctly.

The first due date for edited paragraphs is November 1 (three paragraphs due by that time). After your paragraphs have been returned to you, please select the paragraph that you think is the best and most interesting one and give it to your teacher to be duplicated. The whole class will then choose the three paragraphs they find best and most interesting, and those three paragraphs will be printed in the first English 193 Newsletter.
STANDARDS FOR FINAL EDITED PARAGRAPHS

Each of your edited paragraphs will receive an S if it meets the following criteria:

1. The paragraph has a clear central idea which is appropriately limited and stated in a topic sentence;

2. Every sentence in the paragraph is linked to the central idea;

3. The central idea is adequately developed and sustained with specific facts, examples, or incidents, and these are presented in an intelligible order.

4. All words in the paragraph are used accurately and are spelled correctly;

5. The paragraph is adapted to our specific audience (class members of 193);

6. Every sentence is complete (no fragments, comma splices, or run-ons);

7. The sentences use coordination and subordination correctly;

8. Every verb agrees with its subject and every pronoun with the word for which it stands;

9. Commas and other marks of punctuation are used correctly.

10. Sentences are logical in form and in word order:

    a) Equal (parallel) ideas are expressed in matching (parallel) form, and

    b) Modifying words and phrases are placed as close as possible to what they describe.

We will allow this margin for error in your edited paragraphs:

Two mechanical mistakes--errors in agreement, punctuation, spelling, word order, or parallelism--can be tolerated.
SAMPLE DAY-TO-DAY SYLLABI

Syllabus I

Week 1
T: Introduction to course, syllabus, lab.
W: Introduction of instructors;
Reading pre-test, Parts 1 and 2.
T: Reading pre-test, Part 3.
F: Writing diagnostic: "the major reason my worst teacher was ineffective."

Week 2
M: Discussion of Writing Profile and lab;
discussion of writing process, audience;
Error Recognition pre-test;
Attitude Survey.
T: Speed writing exercise: "The red is . . .";
discussion of reading and study skills:
Previewing a book, a chapter, an essay;
note-taking.
W: Syntactic Maturity pre-test;
T + N, Ch. 1. Toffler, "The Throw-Away Society"; reading survey.
T: Previewing exercise on textbook;
discussion of topic sentences and paragraph development, T + N, Ch. 1.
F: In-class writing: "Choose one physical object you could not do without and explain why."

Week 3
M: Speed writing exercise: "Fill up a page with everything you know about ducks";
vocabulary, T + N, Ch. 1;
discussion of topic sentences and paragraph development.
T: In-class revision in pairs;
revision of paragraph at home,
discussion of Gregory, "For White Only," T + N, Ch. 2.
W: Speed writing: "Prejudice";
discussion of Gregory essay continued.
T: No class.

F: Editing exercise; vocabulary and spelling, T + N, Ch. 2; Sound-Alikes exercise; discussion of paragraph development: T + N, Ch. 2; in-class writing: "People attend college for a variety of reasons" or "I had a variety of reasons for attending college," developed by order of importance.

Week 4

M: Columbus Day, no class.

T: Paragraphs due, comparison/contrast or definition, topics from T + N, p. 44; revision at home; review of paragraphs: topic sentences and development.

W: Review of paragraphs continued; paragraph organization exercise; discussion of sentence fragments: T + N, Ch. 3.

T: Discussion of comma splices and run-ons: T + N, Ch. 3; discussion of resources of Reading and Study Skills Center.

F: SUNY/CUNY Sentence Videotape: Module 1, L.R.C.

Week 5

M: Practice in sentence workbook: Module 1; second diagnostic paragraph: the major characteristic of an effective teacher.

T: Review: Sound-Alikes; Comma splices and run-ons; in-class revision in pairs: Editing Guidelines.

W: Discussion of student paragraphs; discussion of coordination and subordination: T + N, Ch. 4.

T: SUNY/CUNY Sentence Videotape: Module 2.
Week 6

M: Discussion and Reading Survey: Gross, "Who Cares," T + N, Ch. 4; discussion of guidelines for edited paragraphs; practice in sentence workbook: Module 2.

T: SUNY/CUNY Sentence Videotape: Module 3.

W: High School Survey; practice in sentence workbook: Module 3; classwork on sentence combining.

T: Discussion of Larson, "The Case Against College," T + N, Ch. 5.

Week 7

M: First due date, edited paragraphs; discussion of subject-verb agreement, T + N, Ch. 5.

T: Paragraph on career goals, based on Larson essay and Labor Department statistics; discussion of pronoun agreement; dictation exercise, "Commonly Confused Words," T + N, Ch. 6.

W: Discussion of student paragraphs; Graham, Sentencecraft, Ch. 1 + 2.

T: SUNY/CUNY Sentence Videotape: Module 4:1.

Week 8

M: Paragraph discussing changes in attitude since coming to OSU; return and discussion of edited paragraphs; discussion of Graham and practice in sentence workbook: Module 4:1.

T: Discussion of Foxfire readings: dialect, differences between written and spoken language.

W: Discussion of Foxfire readings and paragraph assignment: "Forecasting Weather by Plants."

T: Veterans' Day: no class.

F: Discussion of paragraph assignment on Foxfire readings.
Week 9  
M: Discussion of editing guidelines, second set of edited paragraphs; in-class revision, Foxfire assignments: "Moonshining As a Fine Art."

T: Discussion of student paragraphs; work on punctuation: T + N, Ch. 8.

W: Discussion of sentence coherence: Dangling Modifiers, parallelism.

T: Discussion of sentence coherence continued; in-class revision of edited paragraphs.

Week 10  
M: Second due date: edited paragraphs; in-class writing: "Worry" paragraph assignment.

T: Discussion of paragraph coherence: order, transitions, repetition: T + N.

W: Discussion of how to take essay exams; essay question in class on Rosenbaum, "Let's Shake on That," T + N. "How is aggression related to manners?"

T-F: Thanksgiving: no class.

Week 11  
M: In-class writing: "If you could come back as something or someone other than yourself, as what would you come back?"

T: Discussion of Working readings and paragraph assignment: interview with Therese Carter.

W: In-class revision in small groups: edited paragraphs.

T: Reading post-test, Part 3.

F: Syntactic Maturity post-test; Attitude Survey; Student Evaluations.

Exam Week  
In-class writing: final diagnostic; Error Recognition post-test; final due date: edited paragraphs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sept. 21</td>
<td>Introduction to 193X.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 22</td>
<td>Reading Tests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 23</td>
<td>Reading Test, Attitude Survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 24</td>
<td>Writing Diagnostic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sept. 27</td>
<td>SMT Diagnostic, Error Recognition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 28</td>
<td>Speed Writing (Ducks) Prev. + Skimming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 29</td>
<td>Note-taking. T + N, Ch. 1; Exercises (to p. 24).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 30</td>
<td>Complete Ch. 1 ex; Topic Sentences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 1</td>
<td>In-class writing: topic sentence into full paragraphs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Oct. 4</td>
<td>Speed Writing (Fireplugs): Prewriting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 5</td>
<td>Lab organization; Paragraph development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 6</td>
<td>Comparison/Contrast paragraph assigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 13</td>
<td>&quot;War on the American Family,&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 14</td>
<td>Vocabulary Exercise (pp. 61-66).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oct. 18</td>
<td>Diagnostic paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 19</td>
<td>T + N, Ex. 3f, 3g; Reading: pp. 77-78.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oct. 20</td>
<td>SUNY Tape: Unit II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 21</td>
<td>Graham, Ch. 1, Assign. 3, p. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Oct. 25</td>
<td>Discussion of principle of agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 26</td>
<td>SUNY Tape: Unit III (modification).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 28</td>
<td>SUNY Tape: Unit IV, Part I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraph on presidential elections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasizing details and specifics of campaigns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td>Nov. 1</td>
<td>SUNY Tape: Unit IV, Part II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 2</td>
<td>Work on Summaries. Kernel exp. &amp; combining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 3</td>
<td>Summarizing &quot;Love is a Fallacy.&quot; Discussion of logic and supporting evidence (T + N, Ex. 7g).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Nov. 8</th>
<th>SUNY Tape: Unit V, Part I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 9</td>
<td>Review of Tape. The Joys of punctuation explicated. T + N, Ex. 8e, 8f, c. High School survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 10</td>
<td>Group work on paragraphs. &quot;Gone With the Wind&quot; paragraph: character analysis/personal problem analysis. --emphasis on coordination and subordination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>Nov. 15</th>
<th>Review Week: in-class group paragraph. Speed and Writing and Prewriting. (on 193X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 16</td>
<td>Formulating and Improving Topic Sentences. Generating Ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 17</td>
<td>Expanding topic ideas. First paragraph draft: sentence ideas. Parag: Eng. 193X or favorite T.V. show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 18</td>
<td>Editing and polishing group paragraphs. Review of concluding additions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 10</th>
<th>Nov. 22</th>
<th>Transitions. Paragraph ideas: T. Carter, Fat, Chastity and Careers, roommate contrasts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 23</td>
<td>Wordiness and informal language. General discussion: turning Hamlet's soliloquy to modern slang, and then formal written prose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 24</td>
<td>Discussion of paragraph ideas. Surprise editing skills quiz.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 11</th>
<th>Nov. 29</th>
<th>SUNY Tape: Unit V, Part II.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 30</td>
<td>Editing skills: Student-generated sentences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec. 1</td>
<td>Editing skills: Instant Cameras.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Syllabus III

Week 1 (September 21-24)
21: Intro. to 193X: purpose of pilot project, syllabus
22: Intro. to instructors; reading test, parts 1 and 2
23: Reading test, part 3; Attitude Survey
24: First diagnostic paragraph

Week 2 (September 27 - October 1)
27: SMT diagnostic (Aluminum Test); Error Recognition
28: Lecture/discussion: previewing, skimming
29: Lecture/discussion: note-taking
30: Xeroxed copy of diagnostic paragraph returned, brief discussion, students given 15-20 minutes to study
Vocabulary exercises discussed, T+N, Ch. 1
1: Discussion of topic sentence, T+N, pp. 14-18

Week 3 (October 4-8)
4: Discussion of Toffler's "The Throw-Away Society"
   Began discussion of paragraph development, T+N, pp. 19-21
5: Continued paragraph development discussion
   Discussion of Gregory's "For White Only"
6: Quick discussion of Ex. 2c in T+N on "Sound-Alikes"
7: In-class writing

Week 4 (October 12-15)
12: In-class work on revisions of paragraphs written previous Friday; focus on topic sentences and means of development
13: Discussion on ordering of details, T+N, pp. 46-49
14: CUNY Video Tape
15: Second diagnostic paragraph

Week 5 (October 18-22)
18: Discussion of Lester Velie's "The War on the American Family" (difficulty, distinguishing Velie's views from those he is attacking)
   Began discussion of Sentence Fragments, Comma Splices and Run-ons, T+N, pp. 68, ff. 5 "Incorrect"
   Sentences placed on board
   1. Fragment 2. The hit man boy the
   Sleep Furiously 5. The boy run home.
19: Continuation of previous day's discussion
20: CUNY Video Tape
21: Conclusion of week's work/discussion on sentences
Week 6  
(October 25-29)

25: Discussion of Workbook Exercises (students were lost)
26: Continuation of discussion on Workbook
27: CUNY Video Tape
28: Discussion of Subordination, T+N, pp. 109-119
Sentencecraft, Ch. 1

Week 7  
(November 1-5)

1: First Due Date
Discussion of Workbook Exercises
Discussion of Agreement (Subject-Verb), T+N, pp. 138-44
2: Continuation of discussion on Agreement, including pronoun agreement
3: CUNY Video Tape
4: First set of S/U paragraphs returned; most of period spent discussing paragraphs and lifting students' spirits

Week 8  
(November 8-12)

8: Review discussion of Turson's "The Case Against College" in conjunction with Labor Department statistics
9: Discussion and exercises on Punctuation; main focus on "The Comma," T+N, pp. 237-55
Group Work on 8h: students grouped by Zodiac signs--individuals responsible for "their" paragraphs in Ex. 8h
10: CUNY Video Tape
11: Veteran's Day

Week 9  
(November 15-19)

15: Brainstorming on Worry Topics
16: Revision and discussion of previous day's worry topics
17: Discussion of paragraph coherency, especially transitional works, T+N, pp. 278-85.
18: Catch Up and Review Day: student questions, discussion on grading standards, punctuation, agreement

Week 10  
(November 22-26)

22: Discussion on Formal/Informal Language, Speech vs. Writing, Usage, Style, Convention, Appropriateness, T+N, pp. 325-28
23: Discussion of Essays "Let's Shake on That" and "Give Drugs to Addicts" in preparation for paragraph topics to simulate essay exam

24: Discussion of Therese Carter selection from Working; emphasis on inference and causal analysis

Week 11 (November 29 - December 3)

29: In-class writing "If I could return as . . . . ."

30: In-class writing "If I had the chance to relive . . . . ."

1: Glance at Parallelism and Dangling Modifiers

2: Reading Test, Part 3

3: Attitude Survey, SMT, Student Evaluation; Final Due Date

Final Exam: Dec. 8: Final Diagnostic paragraph and Error Recognition Test.
BOOKS USED IN THE 193X WRITING LAB


Assignment 1

Choose one of your own prejudices and write a paragraph in which you explain your main reasons for this prejudice. Develop the paragraph with at least three examples.

SAMPLE

CENTRAL IDEA: I am prejudiced against people who drink coffee because this habit seems to disrupt their lives.

EXAMPLE ONE: My roommate Mary has a cup of coffee every night after dinner. Once she forgot to buy coffee and had to go to the store to get it, which took one hour away from her studying time.

EXAMPLE TWO: My boyfriend Tom must "put the water on" first thing each morning. When we go camping, he must light a fire to do this. We can't get an early start because of his coffee drinking.

EXAMPLE THREE: My father drinks only a special kind of coffee. When my mother buys a cheaper kind, my parents have a fight.

*Special Note: The sample above is in the planning stage. The finished paragraph would not be worded exactly the same way.

When you write your paragraph, pay careful attention to the following questions:

Does your paragraph have a central idea? (In this assignment, your central idea should state ONE reason for your prejudice.)
Is it supported by three examples?

Does your paragraph have a good introduction?

Does your paragraph have a conclusion? (Be careful. Do not end your paper with the third example.)

Assignment 2

After reading the excerpt from The Foxfire Book, write a paragraph in which you do one of the following:

A. Show off! Write a paragraph in which you tell how to make or do something. Be sure that the process is clear enough so that the reader can reproduce the object or process. (Try to write about something which you think the other members of our class won't know about.)

B. Share a bit of folklore with us. Did your grandmother ever tell you a tale or a family story? Perhaps you have a superstition which has been passed down through your family? Write a paragraph in which you either tell the tale or talk about the superstition. (In either case, be sure you make clear the history of the tale or superstition.)

Assignment 3

Directions: Read Mark Twain's "The War Prayer" and then write a paragraph which answers one of the following assignments. Be sure that you use specific details from the story to support what you say.

A. Write a paragraph in which you discuss what you think is Mark Twain's attitude toward the stranger.

B. Write a paragraph in which you discuss what you think is Mark Twain's attitude toward the people.

C. Write a paragraph in which you discuss what you think is Mark Twain's attitude toward war in general.

D. Irony uses the conscious statement of an untruth to convey the opposite of what it seems to say. (Example: You are standing in the rain. You say to your friend: "The weather is just super.")

Using the above definition of irony, write a paragraph in which you discuss how Mark Twain employs irony in the story "The War Prayer."
SPECIAL NOTE: Be sure that your paragraph has a topic sentence which controls the rest of the paragraph. (Example: Do not simply ramble on about Twain's attitude toward the stranger. Make a general statement about it, and then support it with specific details from the story.)

Assignment 4

Read "A Mother Speaks for Amnesty" and then choose ONE of the following assignments:

A. Write a paragraph in which you discuss whether you feel draft dodgers should receive amnesty or pardon. (Your paragraph will probably have to contain an explanation of the differences between the two.)

B. Write a paragraph in which you defend or attack the maxim, "My Country, right or wrong."

C. Write a paragraph in which you define what you think a loyal citizen is. Consider Peg Mullen's question: "Who is the more loyal citizen, the one who agonizes over his nation's policies and attempts to change them or the one who docilely accepts government policy--no matter how immoral or misguided?"

D. Write a paragraph in which you discuss the "euphemisms" which surround a particular event or profession. Try to discover why this event or profession is surrounded by euphemisms. (Remember that a euphemism is a fancy or abstract substitute for plain words. Example--"passed away" for "died.")

Assignment 5

(We wrote these paragraphs by having each student write a sentence, then pass it on. Then we talked about using pronouns as transitional devices. We also pointed out transitional devices the writers had used automatically.)

Directions: In the following paragraphs, circle any transitional words or expressions which you can find. If you feel that the paragraph needs more transitional expressions, please insert them.

Adventures of Bionic Woman

Mary was walking toward the parking lot when she met a stranger. The stranger was tall and thin. All of a
sudden the stranger grabbed Mary. Mary reached for a 44 magnum and shot the stranger. The stranger was wearing a bullet proof vest and beat Mary up for shooting him. Then he dragged her off in the woods and stabbed her forty times in the heart. Mary was wearing a knife proof vest. She then broke a tree stump over the stranger's head. And then she shouted, "You didn't know I was the Bionic Woman!"

Crazy Mary

Mary was walking toward the parking lot when she met a stranger. As Mary met the stranger she looked towards the ground. The ground was purple and blue. Her orange dress clashed with the sunset reflected in the puddles. Mary looked into the puddle and said to the stranger, "Look, I can see myself." Mary was very unattractive and was the only one that would look at herself. "Look, the puddle is as clean as my dinner dishes because I wash with Lux detergent." The stranger began to think that Mary was a little on the weird side. He got this impression when Mary started blowing bubbles with the detergent. So the man finally backed off and started to go harass someone else.

The Surprise Party

Mary was walking toward the parking lot when she met a stranger. The stranger made a pass at Mary. Mary
looked at the stranger with fear. Halloween is a man-made holiday to scare people. The stranger had a Caspar the Ghost mask on. She had no idea who might be under the mask. Suddenly, Caspar started floating around the room. So she reached into her purse for a hair pin, so she could deflate his floating joke. After Caspar came back to earth, she found out who it was. It was a surprise party for her on Halloween.

Assignment 6

Essay Summary: Prepare by class Thursday a paragraph summary of one of the introductory essays to chapters 1 through 5. Your summary should accomplish at least two objectives: first, it should accurately state or paraphrase the author's main point; second, it should trace his line of argument. A limited amount of quoting may be appropriate, but the bulk of the paragraph should be in your own words.

Assignment 7

Read "Give Drugs to Addicts So We Can Be Safe."

An effective argument always anticipates objections. What does the author feel would be the effect of his proposal on the number of new addicts? Explain why he feels this way, drawing on the essay for support.

Note: You are not asked to agree or disagree with Goldstein, so be careful to distinguish his opinion (what the question asks for) from your own (which it does not ask for). If you wish, you may give your response to Goldstein in a separate paragraph.

Assignment 8

Read "Let's Shake on That."

The essay's first sentence connects manners with our existence as social creatures: "We can probably assume that manners first became important shortly after man's
early attempts at tribal unity." If, as the author says elsewhere, manners reveal our individual personalities, how are they connected with our lives in society, with our relationships with other people? Explain why Rosenbaum feels manners are connected with "tribal unity." Your discussion may draw partially on your own experience and insight, but much of the argument should come from material in the essay.

Assignment 9

Read "Let's Shake on That." Note especially page 267, Inference 3b.

Give examples of so-called "manly" behavior and explain why, in the author's opinion, this type of action is "unmanly."

Assignment 10

You have now been at college for over a month. Think about the "you" who graduated from high school or the "you" who left home in September. How have you changed your ideas about yourself or about college? Write a paragraph discussing these two "yous." Think through the topic at length, then limit your topic for the paragraph. Write a topic sentence which states your main idea and develop it clearly and specifically.

Assignment 11

In her interview with Studs Terkel in Working, Therese Carter says things that seem to be contradictory. On the one hand she says:

"I myself feel like it's not much" (paragraph 6)

"A housewife is a housewife, that's all" (12)

"Somebody who goes out and works for a living is more important than somebody who doesn't" (13)

But, on the other hand, she says:

"Deep down, I feel what I'm doing is important" (13)

Read her interview and see if you can understand how she can say both of these things at the same time. Then write a paragraph that will help us understand this contradiction in Therese's feelings. Your explanation should be based on the things Therese says in the interview.
Assignment 12 (suggested by Patrick Hartwell and Robert Bentley)

Write a list of twenty-five things that everyone has to worry about. Don't take more than five minutes to make your list.

1. love
2. a decent meal
3. grades
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.
14.
15.
16.
17.
18.
19.
20.
21.
22.
23.
24.
25.

Now choose one of the problems from the second half of the list and write about it. In the first part of your paper, explain why this is a problem for you and then just write down solutions to the problem as fast as they occur to you. Finally, pick the solution you like best and explain why.

Now try to revise the paragraph, cutting out everything that doesn't contribute to either explaining why this is a problem for you or why the solution you chose is the best one for you.

Assignment 13 (Suggested by Mina Shaughnessy)

The U. S. Labor Department expects about 2.8 million jobs to open up each year during the mid-1970's. The highest number of openings will occur in fields such as the following:

Stenographers .................................. 237,000 openings
Salespeople (retail) ......................... 150,000 per year
Hospital Attendants ......................... 110,000
Engineers ..................................... 97,000
Mechanics/Repairmen ....................... 89,000

Among the jobs least in demand will be the following:

Physicists .................................... 3,200
Psychologists ................................. 3,100
Architects .................................... 2,300
Historians .................................... 800
Sociologists .................................. 600
In the field of teaching, openings are expected to occur as follows:

Kindergarten and Elementary School . . . . . . . 56,300  
Secondary School . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 40,000  
College and University . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 17,000

As you have perhaps observed, the jobs that are going to be most in demand are not, for the most part, the jobs that colleges train people for. In light of this information about what colleges produce and what the labor market demands and after reading the Larson essay, "The Case Against College," have your own ideas about your college education and your career goals been altered? If so, discuss why. If not, discuss why not.

Write about the topic in a paragraph which has a controlling topic sentence and develops its main idea using specific details or examples.

Assignment 14

You are a reporter whose assignment is to conduct an interview with one of your classmates. You must discover:

1) a prejudice your classmate has;  
2) the reasons he has for this prejudice;  
3) several examples of this prejudice.

As you interview your classmate, take notes on everything he or she says. Your next task is to:

1) formulate a specific topic sentence that contains key limiting words, and then  
2) develop that topic sentence by using examples, incidents, or facts.

At the next class meeting, you will present your finished paragraph to your partner for comments and editing. You will then revise it and present it to the class as your contribution to our first English 193 newsletter.

Before you finish your work this hour, write your proposed topic sentence in the space below:
EDITING GUIDELINES FOR INTERVIEW ASSIGNMENT

FOR THE EDITOR:

Listen carefully to the paper being read to you. Then

1. Find the topic sentence and ask
   a. Is it specific and limited? If not, how can it be improved?
   b. What are its key word(s)?
   c. Is every other sentence directly related to the topic sentence?

2. Determine the method of development by asking
   a. Is it developed with facts, examples, stories, or with some other method?

3. Ask what should be taken out.

4. Ask what should be added.

5. Ask whether or not all sentences are complete.

Help your partner answer all of these questions.

FOR THE WRITER:

Listen carefully to all suggestions. Take notes on the ideas that seem most helpful to you. When you are through answering all the editing questions, write down your revised topic sentence.
Editor: ______________________

EDITOR'S SHEET

Writer: ______________________

This sheet is designed to help you and your partner improve your paragraphs. After reading each other's paragraphs, fill out this sheet together.

1. Find the topic sentence and write it here: ___________

2. Is it specific and limited? If not, discuss some ways you might improve it. Think of ways to limit the subject so you can turn it into a complete and interesting paragraph.

3. What are the key words in the topic sentence (words that tell you what the paragraph will be about)? List them: ____________________________

4. How many sentences are there in the paragraph? ___

5. Is every sentence directly related to the topic sentence?
   If you find some sentences that are not related to the topic sentence, put them in brackets and discuss why they do not belong in the paragraph or how they can be improved to support the topic sentence.

6. Determine the method of development:
   a. By facts? (if so, give examples: __________, __________, __________.)
   b. By examples? (if so, give examples: __________, __________, __________.)
   c. By stories? (if so, give an example: __________)

7. Are all the sentences complete? (Subject and Verb) ___
   If not, discuss with your partner how he might change the sentence "fragment" into a complete sentence.
8. Talk about the improvements, changes, or deletions you think the paragraph needs to be more interesting, clear, and effective. (Give this sheet to the writer now so that he or she can take notes on your suggestions in the space below:

Assignment 15

For your next paragraph, take one of the following suggestions and use it to begin the thinking, brainstorming, and prewriting that will lead to a well-developed discussion of your chosen topic.

A. Read the "Forecasting Winter by Plants" list in The Foxfire Book. Read it over at least five times, thinking about each sign and its relation to a bad winter. Then try to imagine the people who forecast winter in this way. Jot down as many things as you can about these people. What are their beliefs? What do they value? What kind of background do they come from: When you have gathered your ideas, choose one of them and develop it in a paragraph, referring back to the list for examples and evidence. Try to make us understand something important about the people who use plants to forecast the weather.

B. Read Granny Cabe's account of planting by the signs of the moon. Then follow the same procedure suggested above.

C. Read "Moonshining as a Fine Art" in The Foxfire Book. Notice especially the last two sentences of paragraph six: "I never once let anyone know who I had gotten information from. It just would have caused trouble." Read through the story at least twice. Then write a paragraph which explains to us why the sheriff is able to come out on top of all the crimes committed. Think carefully before you begin to prewrite and write to make sure you understand what his basic plan of action is and how he follows through on it. You have all the evidence you need in the story to show us why he was so successful.

Assignment 16

Read "Let's Shake on That," by Jean Rosenbaum, M.D.

A. Goethe said, "Behavior is a mirror in which everyone shows his image." Agree or disagree with this statement, developing your paragraph with an incident.
B. Write a paragraph in which you compare and contrast the manners you believe a woman should display when on a date and the manners you believe a man should display when on a date.

C. Using the resources in Chapter 9, write a paragraph in which you analyze your own handwriting or mine. (I would be glad to provide you with more samples.)

D. Write a paragraph describing an incident in which your "id" clashed with your "superego." What did your "ego" finally decide you should do?

Assignment 17 (Practice Essay Exam)

In his essay "Give Drugs to Addicts So We Can Be Safe," Jonah J. Goldstein argues that narcotics should be legalized and made available to all addicts who need them. The addict who can pay would get his narcotic shot from the doctor, and the poor addict would get his free at a clinic.

Goldstein realizes people will make objections to his proposal. Write two paragraphs in which you name two of the most important objections he anticipates and explain how he argues against them.

Allow one paragraph to name and explain one objection. Before you begin writing, decide what the content of each paragraph will be, jotting down notes for each. Then begin writing.

Double space and allow a left-hand margin.

Before turning in your exam, proofread for spelling errors, comma splices, fragments, faulty parallelism, dangling or misplaced modifiers, and agreement errors.

Assignment 18

Recently, we talked about the fact that even though before college many of you had never discussed paragraph writing, English 100, required of almost all freshmen, assumes that all of its students can write acceptable paragraphs. English 100 directs its attention at developing forms for larger units of thought; it works on from five-to eight-paragraph essays. We agreed it was good that English 193X was available to you and that it was too bad good paragraph writing was not demanded of you in high school.
But then I told you that English 193X was not going to be taught again, not next quarter and maybe not even next year. Dean Arthur Adams, of the College of Humanities, says the University and the legislature are reluctant to channel money to the English Department to hire remedial teachers, first of all because money is tight (the Governor cut the University's budget by 1 percent), and secondly because the college does not want to hire teachers to do a job that should be done in high school. As a result, many freshmen who may need this course will be going into English 100 without it. The burden is on them and the English instructor to accomplish in one course what should really take two, or perhaps more, courses to do. We may probably assume that students starting English 100 without knowing how to write paragraphs will not do nearly as well as those who start out with that ability.

For this paragraph assignment, then, write a letter that is as persuasive as possible, either 1) to Dean Adams, urging him to support English 193X; or 2) to your high school principal or to a particular high school English teacher, encouraging him or her to emphasize good writing in high schools.

A persuasive letter must take into consideration the objections the people you are writing to would probably make to your proposal. Then it must convince them that while their objections are important, they are not as important as your reasons for the proposal.

There is a form you can use to help you express the idea that one reason is not as important as another, and that is the subordinate clause. For example, if in your Therese Carter paragraph you wanted to conclude that, after all, Therese thought housework really was important, you might express it this way:

Even though when Therese Carter compares herself to others she says housework is not important, deep down within herself she thinks it is very important.

Or, if you were arguing that scouting troops are very annoying, you could say that and yet still acknowledge that scouting was a good thing:

While scouting makes an essential contribution to the youth of our country, Boy Scouts themselves, especially in large numbers, are generally no gift to the backcountry.
Your letter should contain at least two main paragraphs dealing with the most important reasons the person you are writing to would have against your proposal and trying to show that those reasons are not as good as yours. The topic sentences of those paragraphs should use a subordinate clause. For example:

Even though Governor Rhodes cut your budget, English 193X is worth the money.

Even though high-schools are supposed to teach paragraph writing, they are not doing it, and we suffer.

Assignment 19

Write a paragraph explaining why you think Gerald Ford or Jimmy Carter or Gene McCarthy or Lester Maddox (or any other candidate on the ballot) should or should not be elected to the presidency on November 2.

Your paragraph:

1. Must contain a clear and specific topic sentence. Do not begin: "I think ______________________ should be President." The topic sentence must be more specific. UNDERLINE YOUR TOPIC SENTENCE.

2. Must contain at least seven sentences:
   a. 1 topic sentence
   b. 5 sentences full of details, specifics, facts, figures, personalities, etc.
   c. 1 fantastic concluding sentence.

3. Must be so interesting and lively that it will convince everyone to vote for or oppose your candidate.

4. Must contain at least one sentence in which you use coordination and one in which you use subordination.

5. Must have a title.

Assignment 20

For those of you who saw Gone With the Wind and enjoyed it:
A. Write a paragraph with a clear topic sentence explaining why you would or would not want to room with one of the characters in GWTW. This will require you to analyze the good and bad points of the individual characters—using EXAMPLES and DETAILS from the movie. Some of the characters you might consider writing about are:

- Scarlett O'Hara
- Rhett Butler
- Ashley Wilkes
- Aunt Pittypat
- Mummy
- Melanie Wilkes
- Prissy
- Mr. Kennedy (Scarlett's second husband)

Have a good time with the assignment, but remember all the points about development, sentence structure, agreement, and punctuation we have talked about. Remember that you want to interest your audience—your fellow classmates—and some of them may not have seen the movie. So be clear, descriptive, and argue effectively. Would you be afraid that your roommate, Scarlett, would steal all your boyfriends? Would the honorable Ashley ruin your beer blasts by turning you in to your R.A.? Would Melanie help you with your Botany? Consider well before you choose.

B. If you are in a more serious mood, write a paragraph about a problem you have faced in your life and successfully overcome. Be sure to explain the problem carefully. Then explain how it affected you and what steps you took to solve it. The problem may be a very serious one (trouble in school, trouble in your personal life), or it may be less earth-shaking (a flat tire after the high school prom, no water from the shower after you lathered up). In any case, consider your readers—your classmates. Give them all the details they need to understand your predicament, and develop your paragraph carefully.

In either paragraph, try to use subordination, coordination, and introductory interrupters effectively whenever you can. Be sure to edit for such things as commas, capitalizations, and agreement.

Assignment 21

Look over this list of topic sentences (compiled by one of our classmates) carefully. Decide which would be limited and specific enough to develop into a full paragraph. Revise those you think need improvement: clearer focus, more detail, more interest. Then pick the one you think we ought to develop in class.
A. There are ten different ways to make a good paragraph.

B. English 193X will teach a person how to write a good paragraph and will prepare him for English 100.

C. English 193X helps you to think about a topic sentence, construct sentences, and organize themes.

D. Wordiness is a major problem that must be mastered in 193X.

E. English 193X is a good reference for English 100.

F. Of all the courses I am taking, I have more homework in 193X than in all my other subjects put together.

G. In order to pass English 193X, you must have learned the four basic skills: punctuation, sentences, paragraphs, and grammar.

H. English 193X is designed for students having problems in punctuation, developing sentences, and writing paragraphs.

I. English 193X is a course dealing with paragraph development.

Once you have picked the best topic sentence, list below some of the ideas, subjects, examples, facts, and details you will want to include in the paragraph to make it clear, intelligent, purposeful, and INTERESTING:

In-Class Paragraph

So far we have searched for a topic, listed our ideas, formulated topic sentences, chosen and improved our topic sentences, listed points we want to talk about, and organized those points. Now we want to start assembling our paragraph. Listed below are our four major sentence ideas and our topic sentence. Choose two of the four ideas listed below and write a sentence or two developing that idea. Be sure the sentence is interesting, clear, and specific.
The ideas:

1. Teachers/Lectures in English 193X.
2. Textbook/Homework/Paragraph-writing in English 193X.
3. Labs in English 193X.
4. Video-tapes in English 193X.

(We also want to include no class on Friday.)

Resulting topic sentence:

English 193X is designed for students having problems in developing sentences and writing paragraphs.

Assignment 22

In Troyka and Nudelman, read pages 190-198, "Love Is a Fallacy." Then summarize--in your own words--what the article is about. Try to identify the main point of the piece and develop that into your topic sentence. Then provide several sentences supporting your thesis. Don't quote from the article or use any of its language.

Assignment 23

In Troyka and Nudelman, read pages 336-39, "The New Case for Chastity." Think about the article. Is it true? How does it relate to what you have experienced of life on campus? After you have thought about the article, write a paragraph bringing it up to date (it was written in 1968) with particular reference to Ohio State. Do you agree or disagree with Dr. Ernest Gordon, the author? Is there an aspect of the question he has ignored? Or is the whole business really unimportant? Remember that in a paragraph, with a good topic sentence, you will be able to treat only one aspect of the problem. Be content to do a good job with that.

Assignment 24

Most people go to college to prepare for a career. You probably have some idea of what you want to do after you graduate. But most people also have less practical aspirations that they never expect to achieve, but which they enjoy dreaming about. Think about your practical career--the one you are preparing for--and the career you
would like to have if there were no limitations on your choice, opportunities or abilities (President, NFL's most valuable player, richest man or woman in the world, Oscar winner). Compare or contrast your two goals. Why is one more practical than the other? Which would be more useful? More suited to your talents? Write a paragraph after thinking about this idea. Be sure the paragraph is limited and contains facts and ideas that will interest the readers of your work.

Assignment 25

Fifty percent of college freshmen gain ten pounds or more during the first year of college. In a paragraph of seven to ten sentences, explain why.

Assignment 26

If you live with a roommate in the dormitory, compare his/her wall and room decorations with your own and explain what differences they show in your tastes. Or compare your interests in music. What records does your roommate like and which do you prefer? What do those differences tell about your respective characters?

Assignment 27

Explain an embarrassing situation you have been in and how you could have avoided it. Concentrate on the reaction of others to your traumatic experience. Was the experience embarrassing in itself, or was it painful because it was witnessed by others? Be sure to formulate a clear thesis sentence before analyzing your experience.

Assignment 28

Read Sentencecraft, Chapter 4 (pp. 67-80). Then, using at least one concluding addition and two transitional words or phrases:

Write a paragraph like the one we did in class on English 193X. Be sure your topic sentence is carefully focused. Talk about only one aspect of the course if you choose. You may be critical or humorous. Be sure to use details, facts, and examples. And write a paragraph that will interest your reader.

Assignment 29

Write a paragraph explaining in detail why your favorite television show is your favorite T.V. show. Once
again, the topic sentence must be carefully focused and specific. Be sure to give at least one reason why the show is your favorite, with supporting facts, details, and evidence. Or, if you don't want to talk about an entire show, write a paragraph about an individual character you like or dislike. For instance, you might write a paragraph entitled: "Why I Hate Howard Cosell on Monday Night Football" or "Why Watching Julia Child Cooking French Food Makes Me Hungry." Try to use a variety of sentence types. Be very specific, naming people, places, and things.

Assignment 30

After looking at the advertisement and cartoon on pp. 52 and 53 of your Troyka text, write a paragraph in which you answer the following question: "If you had a daughter, would you want her to be sure to get married when she grows up? Why or why not?" Your topic sentence should contain the reason why you would or would not want her to get married. The rest of your paragraph should support your reasoning. (You do not have to refer to the advertisement or cartoon.)

Assignment 31

Write a paragraph in which you compare and contrast one aspect of two separate marriages or relationships. You might, for example, talk about the way housework is handled in each of the two relationships. (Other suggestions: money, decision-making, child-raising, sex roles, leisure time, responsibilities, etc.). Remember, you are to compare and contrast ONE ASPECT only. If your paragraph is about how housework is handled in each relationship, do not stray from your topic and begin to talk about decision-making. Draw some conclusion about which method of handling the housework seems to work better. Throughout your paragraph, your attitude toward the two relationships should emerge.

Assignment 32

Look on p. 88 in Troyka at the reproduction of George Tooker's painting The Subway. Study the picture carefully and decide what you think the meaning of the painting is.

Write a paragraph in which you say what you think the artist feels about the people in his picture. 1) Write a topic sentence that states what you think his feeling is. 2) Then look over the painting for specific details that you can use to support that statement. Make a list of the
Assignment 33

Today in class we will be discussing Lester Velie's article "The War on the American Family." We will attempt to discover what his main thesis is and how he develops and supports it. Tonight, for your paragraph assignment, write a one-paragraph summary of his article. It should state his main thesis and explain the major steps he uses to develop that thesis. You should assume the audience for whom you are writing the paragraph has never read the essay. Your paragraph must be understandable to them.

This should be an objective summary of his article, with no personal opinions added. Whether you liked it or not, or whether you thought it was important or not, is irrelevant to this particular paragraph.

Please head your paper: "Velie Paragraph."

The conventional way of opening a paragraph summarizing an article is this:

In his article "The War on the American Family," Lester Velie argues that describes states that a main thesis is etc.

Although there is no rule that requires paragraphs summarizing articles to begin this way, for this assignment I want you to begin this way.
ADDITIONAL CLASS AND LAB EXERCISES

Pre-Reading Exercise

Name of Textbook _____________________________________________
Author of Textbook ____________________________________________
Name of Course ______________________________________________

I. Pre-read the Book

A. Examine carefully the table of contents and the index. How is the book divided? (chapters? sections? units?)

B. What, if anything, appears to be similar in each chapter? EXAMPLE: Does each chapter contain a summary?

C. What appears to be different in each chapter? EXAMPLE: Does each chapter introduce a new concept?

D. How do you think the author has organized his book?

E. Does the book have a glossary? an index? an appendix?

F. Give a brief explanation of what you might be able to find using each of these aids. EXAMPLE: The glossary contains definitions of technical terms as well as page references.

G. Date of publication? Why is this date significant?

H. Prefatory Material.
Read any prefatory material which appears at the beginning of the book. What significant things did you learn about the book by reading the prefatory material?

II. Pre-read Chapter (or Unit) 2 in your textbook. Do this by reading the boldface headings first. Then go back and read the first two paragraphs of the chapter completely. After the first two paragraphs of the chapter, read only the first sentence in every paragraph. Then read the last two paragraphs all the way through. Write a one paragraph summary of what you think you are going to find out in this chapter. Base this paragraph only on information which you have gleaned from pre-reading.

NOTE: Write the answers to these questions on another sheet of paper. Please answer them thoroughly.
Paragraph Organization Exercise

(adapted from McGraw-Hill series)

To tell what a paragraph is about, you must pay close attention to the subject of each sentence in it. Read the following short paragraph to determine what it is about:

(1) Weather profoundly affects transportation, especially the operation of aircraft for both military and peaceful purposes. (2) Fog and storms are dangerous for ocean shipping. (3) Freezing rain, fog, snow, and storms may make highway travel difficult and dangerous.

The subject of the first sentence is _____________________.
The subject of the second sentence is ____________________ and ________________.
The subject of the third sentence is ________________, __________, and ________________.
All of these sentences are about _________________________.

However, each sentence limits or qualifies the topic in some way.

Sentence (1) tells about the ______________ of weather on transportation, especially in the operation of ____________.
Sentence (2) tells about the effect of weather on ________.
Sentence (3) tells about the effect of weather on ________.

The paragraph as a whole tells how weather affects transportation on ______________, ______________, or _____________.

The following paragraph's sentences are out of order. Read through the paragraph carefully and find the topic sentence. Put the topic sentence first and then put the remaining sentences in the proper order.

(1) Specialized dictionaries are confined to restricted fields or purposes—law, medicine, philosophy, pronunciation, dialects, slang, and so on. (2) Dictionaries are of two main kinds, general and specialized. (3) It does not limit its vocabulary to any special field, but neither does it include highly technical, scientific, or professional terms. (4) A general dictionary, which is the type we are most familiar with, records information about words in general use among educated speakers and writers.
Editing Exercise

Identify the topic sentence in the following paragraph. Then decide which sentences develop the topic sentence and which do not. Correct any additional errors in grammar, spelling, or punctuation.

Automobiles are more comfortable than buses. The best cars are Cadillac, Merecedes-Benz, and Porsche. A car's seats are softer and wider than those in a bus, and sometimes they can be adjusted. Cars are safer than buses to cause each seat in a car has a seat or shoulder belt. There is more room in side a car for individual passengers than in a bus, and more doors to get into the seats. You can control the heat or air-conditioning in a car and listen to the radio. You can't do that in a bus. CB radios are very popular now. Many trucks and cars communicate on the highways with them. So, given my way, I would rather ride a car than a bus any day.
Venereal disease has reached epidemic proportions in the U.S. Indeed, V.D. are now the most widespread reported communicable disease; the amount of V.D. cases recorded exceeds those of strep throat, scarlet fever, measles, mumps, hepatitis, and tuberculosis combined. Because it spreads from person to person like wildfire, experts figures that a millions or more Americans get the disease each year. More than 55% of these here people are under 25 years of age.

V.D. is alot differnt then most other diseases in that if it's not treated they may lay hidden for a long time--perhaps 10 to 25 years--before any recognizable damage shows up. During this time, the victims may feel good because he isn't even aware that he has the disease. But years later, he may develop, mental illness, heart disease, blindness, become crippled, and even die. In a recent year, for instance, at least 9,000 patients were hospitalized for insanity caused by venereal disease. In addition, its the cause of more sterility in both sexes than any other disease. In spite of these very real dangers, many people who is afflicted with V.D. still doesn't seek treatment.
The instant cameras available from the two camera makers, is of difference sizes, shapes, and qualities. The two camera maker's, they are Polaroid and Kodak. Polaroid is the company, which have been making instant pics for a longtime. Kodak for a shortertime. Kodak makes a varietie of camer's, and they make film and lenses too, and there product line includes projectors for movies and the slides. Polaroids instant camera's are of two kinds. They are the SX-70 and the pronto kinds of camera's. The SX-70 folds up like a wallet. Its made out of a shiney mettle and leather. But the pronto don't fold up like a wallet, its made out of a plastic and sorta looks strange. The SX-70 costs more. Nevertheless, Kodak makes two instant camera's, but it don't fold up like them that is made by the polaroid's. They are square like halve a cereal box. One of the instant Kodak's have a crank. The crank turns out a picture, the picture pops out from the camera's bottom. Both cameras take only color fotografhs. The polaroid camera's are smaller and lighter. The Polaroids' film's glossie and shiney when it develops. Not the Kodak! It have a satin finish. The satin finish is suposed to hide the finger prints. The kind of camera you buy is up too you. They cost about the same. Not to much.
Editing Exercise

All the sentences below have errors in grammar, punctuation, agreement, sentence structures, etc. Rewrite the sentences, correcting all errors.

1. When I was twelve, I want to learn to fly a plane.

2. I use to have time to play tennis on the weekend but now I have to study instead.

3. Standing in the cafeteria, the plane looked as if it would come through the window.

4. Let me know. When your going to the store.

5. Everyone will bring their lunch to the picnic.

6. Give this book to the young lady which left it here.

7. Has everyone got their own coats?

8. After swearing the oath and signing my name. I was formally inducted into the army.

9. Throughly excited by the carnival atmosphere, the ferris wheel lifted the children high above the crowd.

10. First he read the book then he wrote his research paper.

11. There happy that they're car was found their under the bridge.

12. Set off the fire alarm, it will bring the fire trucks.

13. There team placed first, ours came in second.
14. The scissors is on the table.

15. Alot of people who don't seem to know the difference between cramming and learning.

16. Although there is a full moon. No werewolves were discovered.

17. He is the man who I met at the concert last week.

18. The reason people don't like you is because your to sarcastic.

19. William Shakespeare the worlds greatest playwright not only wrote thirty-seven plays but also created many new English words.

20. Surprise quizzes is fun!
Editing Exercise

1. However, not with antifreeze, but with insulation.

2. The adventuring aspect of camping is when you've never been camping, and a person finds the atmosphere an exploring type of experience.

3. Another reason could be from eating junk food.

4. One reason for this is that a student becomes lazy from studying all the time, also he becomes inactive from all the studying.

5. I would rather be an accountant so I could make good money, then go camping on my vacation.

6. A full tank of gas, which will last me for about two days or 200 miles depending on how I drive cost me only a dollar.

7. Family is in modern time, like today with the father working, the boy a drop-out, mother a housewife, and the girls are in school.

8. Family, to me is a family type show.

9. However, the characters are important in themselves, what is enjoyable about the program is that it portrays how these characters function together as a family unit during the 1930 depression era.

10. I am not only homesick for my family but also for the freedom from responsibilities which lie at home.

11. By listening to Johns criticisms I learned to improve my stroke.

12. Everyone has his or her different ideas about marriage, and everyone is entitled to their own opinion.
13. I was never so embarrassed when, I forgot the words to a song that I was singing in front of an audience.

14. First I went and got my blood pressure taken, finger pricked; to see what blood type I have, temperature taken, and heart rate.

15. Since a lot of students are away from their parents for the first time in years and they can now be adults and drink.
Spelling Exercise

Write the correct form of each sound-alike in the space provided.

its, it's

1. ______ a difficult problem for me.
2. The chair had a hole in ______ seat.
3. ______ been a long time since I've seen you.
4. The government is doing ______ best.
5. I hope ______ not too cold tomorrow.

then, than

1. If she goes, ______ I will go too.
2. Marty sings more ______ he dances.
3. A wise person listens and ______ speaks.
4. My dog is older ______ my cat.
5. What will you do ______, if he is bigger ______ you?

their, there, they're

1. I found my shirt over ______, by the table.
2. ______ not coming over tonight.
3. I found ______ test papers in the folder.
4. ______ is a good film playing down the block.
5. ______ not so smart as they think they are.
6. The tutor helped them with homework.

to, too, two

1. There are ______ many students in this classroom.
2. Where do you plan ______ go this summer?
3. Where are the ______ dollars that were here before?
4. This room is ______ cold.
5. ______ friends of mine are coming over.
6. I am going ______ do that later.
7. The test was ______ easy.
8. They're ______ old for the team.

whose, who's

1. He is a student ______ always on time.
2. I don't know ______ it is.
3. I met the man ______ written those strange letters to the paper.
4. ______ going to the movies tonight?
5. I'm not sure ______ tickets those are.
6. ______ automobile is that?
7. It's hard to find a child ______ never bad.

your, you're

1. Is ______ instructor a man or a woman?
2. I saw ______ your brother in the record store.
IDENTIFY THE METHOD OF DEVELOPMENT IN THESE PARAGRAPHS (BY FACTS, EXAMPLES, ANECDOTE, OR COMPARISON/CONTRAST.): Cross out all unnecessary or irrelevant sentences.

Cleveland is the coldest city in Ohio. I remember going to a football game in December at Municipal Stadium. The wind was blowing and the snow was falling hard. No two snowflakes are alike. I had a thermos of hot chocolate with me, and I poured myself a cup mid-way through the first quarter. Nestles makes the best chocolate. Suddenly, the game got exciting and I forgot my hot chocolate, leaving the cup on an empty seat beside me. The Browns marched down the field and scored. The drive took about five minutes. The Browns scored on a pass by Frank Ryan who was quarterbacking then. Mike Phipps is the Brown's quarterback now. When I reached for my chocolate to celebrate the touchdown, I discovered my drink had crusted over with ice!

Method of development: _______________________________________

Cleveland is the coldest city in Ohio. In Dayton, for example, spring arrives in mid-March, and seventy degree temperatures are not unusual. In Cleveland, winter is still coldly present then. In Columbus, the average yearly temperature is 62 degrees; Cleveland's average temperature is only 56 degrees. Of course, Cleveland has a much better orchestra, a variety of professional sports teams, and a lakefront. All Columbus has is OSU and Woody Hayes. Which is enough for some tastes. But football only lasts a few months. Then what do you do for fun? Cincinnati, located on the Ohio River, enjoys a mild southern climate. Cleveland gets much of its weather from cold Canada. The best things in life may be in Cleveland, but Dayton, Cincinnati, and Columbus are all hotter towns.

Method of development: _______________________________________

Cleveland is the coldest city in Ohio. The average temperature in the city, 56 degrees, is the lowest of all the major metropolitan areas in the state. While summer temperatures in Cleveland occasionally rise to the mid 90's, such days are rare. More typical are the average 40-50 degree days of fall and spring, and the still chiller days of winter. The cold Canadian winds, which gain strength and moisture as they blow across Lake Erie, are responsible for Cleveland's cold climate.

Method of Development: ______________________________________
Cleveland is the coldest city in Ohio. It is so cold that local citizens claim that even the pigeons wear ear muffs in January. It is not unusual for pedestrians, trying to walk across a downtown street, to be blown over by heavy winds from the north that come sweeping off Lake Erie. But Cleveland is not the only big city on a lake. Chicago is on Lake Michigan. The lake freezes over near Cleveland in January, but the city is shivering long before then.

Method of development: ________________________________
In the forenoon of a blazing August day, a blond, husky young man strolled into a hardware store in Austin, Texas, and asked for several boxes of rifle ammunition. As he calmly wrote a check in payment, the clerk inquired with friendly curiosity what all the ammunition was for, "To shoot some pigs," he replied. At the time, the answer seemed innocent enough, for wild pigs still abound not far from the capital. The horror of its intent only became obvious a few hours later, when the customer, Charles Joseph Whitman, 25, a student of architectural engineering at the University of Texas, seized his grisly fame as the perpetrator of the worst mass murder in recent U.S. history.

The subject of sentence #1 is ________________________.
The verb in sentence #1 is ___________________.

Sentence #2 employs a) coordination. Circle one.
   b) subordination.

In sentence #2, the coordinating conjunction is ________. subordinating

The independent sentence part of sentence #2 is _________________.

The subject of sentence #4 is ________________________.

Sentence #4 employs coordination. Circle one.
   subordination.

In sentence #4, the coordinating conjunction is ________. subordinating

Sentence #5 employs coordination. Circle one.
   subordination.

In sentence #5, the coordination conjunction is ________. subordinating
Coordination/Subordination Exercise

Directions: Change each of the sentences below two times. First, use a coordinating conjunction to combine them. Second, use a subordinating conjunction to combine them. The first one is done for you.

1. The tide went out last night. Our boat went with it.
   a. The tide went out last night, and our boat went with it.
   b. When the tide went out last night, our boat went with it.

2. The book my father wanted was in the store. I couldn't resist buying it for him.
   a. _____________________________________________
   b. _____________________________________________

3. Cigarette smoking has been linked with cancer. People continue to smoke anyway.
   a. _____________________________________________
   b. _____________________________________________

4. The snow fell for fifteen hours. My car was practically buried under it.
   a. _____________________________________________
   b. _____________________________________________

5. Essay writing has never seemed to be a necessary skill. I see the reason for it now.
   a. _____________________________________________
   b. _____________________________________________

6. John Updike's novels are interesting. His poetry is better.
   a. _____________________________________________
   b. _____________________________________________
Paragraph Development Exercise

Directions: Fill in the blanks, using the topic sentences as your guide. Don't be afraid to use exaggeration or humor. There are no RIGHT answers!

I. Using facts:

We live in a society which frowns upon male ballet dancers. In a recent Gallup Poll,

If this prejudice continues, the American Ballet Institute predicts that by

II. Using examples:

Our wedding was different from most. For instance,

Also, we

Unlike most weddings, then

III. Using incident, anecdote, or story:

I know that Ohio State is a huge institution, but I never expected

The other day I

When it was all over, I realized
Sentence Exercise

Directions: Correct any of the following sentences which need correcting and identify what type of error you are correcting. Some need no correcting.

1. She does not have the prettiest teeth in the world. As you can see when she smiles. (type of error:
   ______________________)

2. While I was heading for school, hitchhiking as usual. (type of error:
   ______________________)

3. Critically evaluate the books we have read by ranking them in order of your favorite to least liked explain the reasons for your ranking. (type of error:
   ______________________)

4. He would rather watch television than read, as I'm sure many boys his age would. (type of error:
   ______________________)

5. Dr. Causet lectured on many interesting things. For example, black magic, devil worship, and other occult ideas. (type of error:
   ______________________)

6. A sentence is usually described as a group of words expressing a complete thought, it contains a subject and a predicate and is an independent unit of expression. (type of error:
   ______________________)

7. Every morning, my grandmother used to go for a walk in the park in the afternoons she watched her favorite television serials. (type of error:
   ______________________)

8. Since we are all going in the same general direction. (type of error:
   ______________________)

9. We used to walk through the woods in the fall finding a nice spot in the warm sun, we usually stopped and had lunch. (type of error:
   ______________________)

10. When the irate customer asked for his money back. (type of error:
    ______________________)
Note-Taking Exercise

The goal of taking notes on essays in this course is to give you enough information to write a good paragraph summary of the essay. To do that you must be able to discover the main ideas of the essay which all the details of the essay help explain. The questions on this worksheet should help you to discover the main ideas of the essay and their relationships. Please answer all questions with complete sentences.

1. Paragraphs 1-6 describe Connie S.'s experience with her boyfriend. What point is the example of her experience trying to illustrate?

2. Paragraph 9 begins with the phrase "For example." What point is the paragraph's example of Professor Ridley's course trying to illustrate?

3. Paragraphs 10 and 11 describe a group of professors' Dallas, Texas conference on the future of the American family. What major point in the essay is this incident trying to illustrate?

4. Paragraph 12 states one reason why an anti-family person thinks the family is finished. What is that reason? In paragraphs 13-17 Lester Velie proves this is not such a good reason. How does he do it?

5. Paragraph 19 explains "What breaks up a young marriage?" What major point does this explanation reinforce?

6. Paragraph 21 shows that far-out marital innovations are not new. Why is this an important point to Lester Velie's argument?
7. Paragraphs 22-25 discuss the evidence some people use to support their claim that group marriage and open marriage are meaningful trends toward new marriage arrangements. What do the paragraphs conclude about the evidence?

8. In a sentence, write what you think is the main point of this whole essay.

Now see if you can outline the essay by writing its major points and supporting points, in complete sentences, in these blanks. Some have been filled in to give you a few leads.

Thesis Statement:

I. __________________________________________________________________

A. Connie S. is a victim of this war.

B. The reason for it is that _______________________

C. The Dallas conference shows _______________________

II. Evidence used in the war against the family is false.

A. _______________________

B. _______________________

C. _______________________
Individualized Proofreading Rules

Name ________________________________

Before I hand a paragraph in, I will check the following things carefully:

1. ____________________________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________________________
4. ____________________________________________________________
5. ____________________________________________________________
The marks on your paragraph only indicate where you have run into a problem. This sheet will identify some of those problems. Go over your paragraph and this sheet carefully, pinpoint your errors, and re-edit your work, if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: ___________________</th>
<th>Paragraph ____</th>
<th>Mark ____</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The paragraph has a clear central idea which is appropriately limited and stated in a topic sentence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Every idea in the paragraph is linked to the central idea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The central idea is adequately developed and sustained with specific facts, examples, or incidents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. All words in the paragraph are used accurately and are spelled correctly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The paragraph is adapted to our specific audience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Every sentence is complete (no fragments, comma splices, or run-ons).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The sentences use coordination and subordination correctly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional remarks:
## Individualized Spelling List

Name _____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word (spelled correctly)</th>
<th>Word (spelled correctly with trouble spot enlarged)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**English 193X Student Writing Profile**

Name: ______________________________

Instructor: _________________________

1. Total number of words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Sentence structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>run-on, comma splice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faulty co-ordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inadequate or improper subordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incomplete comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faulty parallelism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dangling/misplaced modifier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL

3. Punctuation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>misplaced commas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing commas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faulty or missing capitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misplaced or missing apostrophe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misplaced or missing colon/semi-colon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f) other punctuation marks misplaced or missing 
(Specify ____________) 

TOTAL ____________

4. Spelling errors 
   a) reversals ____________
   b) homonyms ____________
   c) improper consonant 
      doublings ____________
   d) word endings ____________

TOTAL ____________

5. Usage errors 
   a) subject-verb agreement ____________
   b) pronoun reference or 
      agreement ____________
   c) tense shift ____________
   d) inflection ____________
   e) adjective/adverb 
      (Specify ____________) ____________
   f) idiom ____________

TOTAL ____________

6. Paragraph structure 
   a) lack of controlling idea ____________
   b) inadequate development ____________
   c) incoherent development ____________
   d) inadequate transition ____________
   e) irrelevant content ____________
   f) weak introduction/ending ____________

TOTAL ____________
### 7. Logic

- a) unsupported generalization
- b) fact/opinion
- c) other fallacies (Specify ___________)

**TOTAL**

### 8. Diction

- a) inaccurate word choice
- b) inappropriate word choice
- c) needless repetition
- d) ineffective cliche, jargon
- e) inappropriate/mixed metaphor
- f) imbalance of concrete/abstract

**TOTAL**

### 9. Style

- a) wordiness
- b) redundancy
- c) inconsistent point of view
- d) inappropriate tone or sense of audience
- e) lack of variety
- f) lack of emphasis

**TOTAL**

**Additional Notes or Comments:**
APPENDIX K

STUDENT EVALUATION OF ENGLISH 193X:

TABULATION OF RESPONSES
I. The Class

1. Which class activities did you find most helpful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of paragraphs</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing paragraphs</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision/editing</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of essays in text</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group discussions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videotapes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercises from text</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class exercises</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Which class activities did you find least helpful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Videotapes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed writing</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group discussions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentencecraft</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of paragraphs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videotapes modules/workbooks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of essays</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercises</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class discussions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Did you feel free to speak out in class and participate in the discussions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Did you feel that you could learn from other students in the class as well as from the instructor?

Yes 59
No 11
Not sure 2

5. Can you suggest other kinds of activities that you would have found helpful in improving your writing?

Write more paragraphs 4
Write longer papers 3
More time for the course 2
More in-class writing/revision 2
More discussion of paragraphs 2
Better topics 2
More labs 3
More group work 1
More reading 1
More sentence work 1
More class discussion 1
Library research 1
Less revision 1
More discussion of essays 1

II. The Lab

1. Did you find lab sessions helpful in improving your writing?

Yes 60
No 7
Some 3

2. Did you think lab materials were clearly related to your other class activities?

Yes 62
No 8

3. Was the lab easy to use?

Yes 65
No 1
Not sure 1

How could the procedures be improved?

More space 7
More hours 3
Night labs 2
More work on paragraphs 2
More materials 2
Quieter 1
Include work at Reading
& Study Skills Center 1
More supervision 2
Less supervision 1
Fewer hours required 1
More work assigned by instructor 1
Less writing 1
Make lab work harder 1

4. Did you think two lab sessions a week were enough?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enough</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too few</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. The Texts

Steps in Composition

1. Did you find Steps in Composition useful in improving your writing?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Which sections did you find most helpful?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence structure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing skills</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essays</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical thinking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Which section did you find least helpful?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions of writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision/editing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence structure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essays</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which sections did you find most interesting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essays</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence structure</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions of writing</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which sections did you find least interesting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence structure</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions of writing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essays</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercises</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try It Out</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Survey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Were the explanations of writing skills and writing problems clear enough?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Were the exercises you did helpful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sentencecraft**

1. Did you find *Sentencecraft* helpful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Did it fit in clearly with other class activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. What did you learn from Sentencecraft?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence structure</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence combining</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word order</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't use it enough</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste of money</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. The Topics

1. Did you find the videotapes on sentences helpful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you find the videotapes interesting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Did they fit in clearly with other class activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Was the work in the tape workbooks (modules) helpful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the work too difficult, too easy, or too long?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too difficult</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too easy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too long</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Where would you prefer to view the tapes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the Learning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Center?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Lab?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. The Instructor

1. Did your instructor seem well prepared?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Did he or she know the subject matter of the course?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Did he or she make class sessions helpful?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did he or she make class sessions interesting?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Did he or she encourage student participation in class discussions?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Were the comments on your paragraphs helpful?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Was the evaluation of your edited paragraphs fair?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. The Written Work

1. Do you think you got enough writing practice this quarter to improve your general writing ability?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Do you think revising your paragraphs several times helped you improve your general writing ability?

Yes  67
No  4

3. Which did you find most helpful in improving your writing ability:

- Prewriting  9
- Writing  19
- Revising  45
- All  2

4. What kinds of writing assignments did you learn the most from:

- Personal experience  40
- Analysis  20

Which did you find most interesting?

- Personal experience  36
- Analysis  15
- Both  3

5. Do you think the standards for edited paragraphs were too high?

Yes  10
No  51

6. Do you think 9 edited paragraphs is enough work for final evaluation?

- Enough  42
- Too much  15
- Not enough  8

VI. In General

1. If you could change any part of this course by adding or taking out material, what would it be?

- Take out videotapes and/or workbooks  22
- Take out Sentencecraft  9
- Take out labs  7
- Fewer edited paragraphs  4
- Fewer labs  1
- Less work on revision  1
More labs 2
More in-class writing/revision 2
More writing 2
More edited paragraphs 1
More group work 1
More topics 1
More individual work 1
Write essays as well as paragraphs 2
Change text 1
Make it harder 1
Looser standards 1
Make labs voluntary 1
Use tapes individually 1
Change nothing 1

2. What did you expect to learn from this course?

Improve writing 17
Prepare for English 100 7
Learn basic writing skills 6
Learn to write good paragraphs 4
Learn about writing structure 4
Learn to write sentences and paragraphs 4
Learn how to write 3
Learn grammar 3
Learn to use the right words 3
Learn correct writing 2
Improve reading comprehension 3
Learn editing skills 2
Learn correct punctuation 1
Do creative writing 1
Learn to write unified papers 1
No expectations 1

3. Did the course live up to your expectations?

Yes 63
No 2
Somewhat 1

4. Would you recommend this course to others if it were being taught again this year?

Yes 66
No 2
Maybe 1
5. Do you feel more confident about your writing now, or are you more afraid to write than when you entered the course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More confident</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More afraid</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Do you feel prepared to take English 100?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L

TEACHER EVALUATION OF ENGLISH 193X
Evaluation of 193X: Betsy Brown

I. Self-Evaluation:

1. Classroom work:

Our small classes made it possible for classroom teaching to be informal and personal, but I'm not sure I always took advantage of these possibilities. I tended to lecture a little too much when we were discussing writing problems, sentence structure, mechanics, etc. I'm not sure what approach would have worked better, but I felt myself losing a few students who weren't interested in listening to a detailed explanation of the material covered in the text. The question-and-answer exchanges that accompanied such discussions were successful, however; I think my students felt free and were eager to ask questions or bring up additional problems, so that the whole-class discussions were valuable. When we discussed essays, I always tried to lead the discussion by asking questions; generally the students were quite eager to answer them, then expand on them, disagreeing with each other and taking over the discussion. When this happened, I tried to let them go, interrupting only when necessary to keep the discussion on a fruitful track. I think this approach worked; the students found themselves coming to judgments and perceptions they had not been able to reach on their own.
I have concluded that, in the classroom, a structured but informal atmosphere is best for the students we had. They need to feel free to speak but responsible for what they say. They can see themselves refining their ideas and perceptions by responding to my comments or those of other students, and I think they learn a lot about their own thinking, reading and writing processes that way.

2. Lab work:

I was rarely completely satisfied with a lab session. The problem was always deciding how much to interfere with a student's independent work; I found that I couldn't always wait until a student asked for help; often when I asked them if they needed help, they were having problems but hadn't bothered or were hesitant to ask me a question. On some days, no one seemed to need much help; on others, everyone did. At those times, I tried to team up students who were working on the same skill, often moving them to another classroom so they could conduct a sort of workshop themselves; that freed me to work individually with the other students in the lab. The real problem came when a student needed one-on-one work for the whole hour; rarely could I spend that much time with a single student without being interrupted or feeling that I was ignoring other students who were goofing off or having trouble.

3. One-on-one work:

I have always felt that I did my best teaching one-on-one, and I think this course made that kind of work even more
effective. I held conferences with each of my students every other week (approximately). Usually these sessions were devoted to discussions of one or two paragraphs which the student was revising. Questions, answers, suggestions, as supplements to written comments on the paragraphs, usually led the student to make real improvements in the next draft of his or her paragraph. Sometimes, however, I used these conferences to do intensive work on a skill or concept that the student hadn't quite understood in class. I felt confident that those students who were having trouble with classwork could get the extra help they needed in conference. Thus I didn't have to spend extra minutes of class time re-explaining a skill that all but one or two of the students understood. This approach seemed to work well.

II. Materials:

1. Laboratory materials:

I found the workbooks, particularly Grassroots, quite effective for students working on usage or sentence problems. The programmed texts seemed to work well for vocabulary and spelling but for little else. The reading index and texts were effective but need to be keyed in some way so that we can check immediately on level of difficulty. More resources on study skills would have been useful, too. The problem came with materials for work on paragraph problems: topic sentences, unity, development, coherence. Other than
Comp/Mods, none of the texts seemed to meet the students' needs. I think we need a workbook with paragraphs the students could rework; exercises on topic sentences and development don't work. Perhaps we should do more work, too, with the students' own paragraphs in lab. I avoided that whenever possible, and I think that was a mistake.

2. Textbooks:

Graham, *Sentencecraft*: I used only three chapters of *Sentencecraft*, in part because of lack of time, in part because much of what it covered was already being covered in class, in the text, and in the SUNY/CUNY tapes. I regret that we chose *Sentencecraft* because of its duplication of other work and because its approach didn't fit in very clearly with our other work on sentences. *Sentencecraft* could work in a course like ours, but we probably don't need it and the tapes, and if we used it it would best be used after the sentence work in *Troyka*, studied intensively for a week, followed by pattern practice as homework or classwork. But I'm not sure we need an additional text to introduce the sentence patterns Graham uses. We could do the foundation work ourselves in class, I think.

*Troyka* and Nudelman, *Steps in Composition*: On the whole, I liked *Steps* because it combined readings, vocabulary, writing, sentences and usage/editing practice. I'd be satisfied to use it again, although it does have one big disadvantage: it approaches many skills, especially
sentences, negatively, that is from errors rather than from positive models. I found this a particular problem in trying to integrate tapes and Sentencecraft, and I think it's probably a wrong-headed approach. The readings were okay, since the students seemed to like them and they usually provoked an interesting discussion. I don't think I used the vocabulary and spelling sections as effectively as I could have (lack of time), but the sections on usage and on paragraphs were useful. I learned early to check carefully before assigning exercises: they were sometimes confusing or inconsistent (especially those on agreement).

The weakest sections were those on agreement (confusing and complex--overkill) and the reading surveys (always asked the same kinds of questions--not very challenging). I thought the section on fragments was useful (the simplest and easiest explanation I've seen). I found it difficult to draw paragraph assignments from the readings, but that may be because we discussed the essays so thoroughly that I didn't want to duplicate the discussion.

3. Videotapes:

I did a pretty thorough evaluation of these already; I'll just say that I think the tapes could have been used more effectively had we seen all of them before the course began and been able to integrate them more closely with the Troyka sections on sentences. I found Modules 1 and 2 unnecessarily slow and dull, Module 4 unnecessarily complex.
Module 3 was good, although we didn't do enough other sentence-combining work to make it fit in clearly.

I'd be in favor of using the tapes again, I think, but they need to be seen in class and linked more clearly than I could do this quarter to the rest of the course.

4. Pre- and post-tests:

I don't think we "taught to" the tests directly enough to make them really meaningful (except perhaps the writing samples and editing test), so we shouldn't be surprised if we don't see great improvement in the scores, particularly Reading and SMT. I think the SMT is an interesting diagnostic (that's not, of course, its purpose), but we shouldn't expect vast improvement over a single quarter. It will be hard to interpret the reading scores, I think; we did a lot of work with paragraph comprehension, but not enough, of course. We should not feel satisfied with the reading instruction we gave our students even if their scores improved. I don't see much use or even interest in the attitude survey; we knew pretty much what their attitudes toward writing were after the first few days, and we knew more than the scale could ever tell us by the end of the quarter.

The writing diagnostic topics were adequate, I suppose. I'm interested in seeing the holistic results, although I don't put much faith in them. We might have a clearer idea of the paragraphs' relevance if we read them S/U according to English 100 standards.
5. Writing assignments:

I think the assignments on Working and Foxfire asked the students to do exactly what they needed to do: struggle with data and draw inferences from it. I wish I had done other assignments to prepare them for the Foxfire topic, which scared them to death. The analysis topics are definitely more useful to the students than personal experience topics. We should probably make all our topics involve analysis and inference, rather than narration, description, etc., for its own sake.

I think all the topics I gave were successful; some weren't demanding enough, but taken together, they asked the students for a variety of types of thinking and writing.

6. Syllabus:

Our original syllabus was hopelessly ambitious, but of course we couldn't have known that at the beginning. If we dropped Graham and, maybe, met five days a week (for most weeks), then we could have done more work with in-class writing and revision. I think that was very useful but too often I was reluctant to give up a whole class period to it when other activities seemed just as pressing. If I were to teach this class again, I'd teach five days a week: in-class writing every Friday, revision every Monday, and the rest of what I had to do in between. The writing and revision should be priority items for class time.
III. Teaching Strategies:

I've discussed this, in part, in section I. I'd add that I found small group work or work in pairs on paragraphs very successful; discussions of essays were usually successful, discussions of other sections of Troyka usually not (I think because of the negative approach to so much of the material). Foxfire and Working discussions went very well, as did positive approaches to sentences. Work with mimeographed student paragraphs usually flopped, but I'm not sure why. Perhaps the students weren't free enough to criticize their peers in front of the whole class without feeling uncomfortable.
Evaluation of 193X: Kathleen Kelly

I. Self-evaluation

One preliminary remark: Judging from the responses I got to my questions to the class during discussions, I would say that 3 out of 12 of my students clearly could not understand my explanations as a progression or development. Instead their minds would work associatively and their answers to my questions would not be genuine answers to the questions, but the first things they thought of that in any way related to the question. I think these students got very little from the class discussions. Most of what they learned came from conferences. The rest of the students were distributed fairly evenly along the line between understanding fully and understanding not at all.

1. Classroom Work

Readings:

My emphasis was on reading the essays to discover the argument's structure. I felt I did not want to discuss whether the class agreed or disagreed with the essay until they knew clearly what it said. To guide their reading, I would ask them, for homework, to take notes on the essay as if they were preparing for a test. In class I would ask them to focus on examples and other details within certain groups of paragraphs I isolated for them, and to tell me
what generalization these details were trying to demonstrate. For writing, I asked for a paragraph summarizing the argument.

On the whole, their notes showed no sense of the ability to distinguish major from minor points, or, sometimes, the writer's points from those he was arguing against. In class and in their paragraphs, they showed the same difficulties. They are just learning that each paragraph has a generalization to make and that it is often stated explicitly in the topic sentence. In readings, though, the generalization is not always stated explicitly anywhere in the paragraph, much less in the first sentence of the paragraph. So, of course, they had difficulty with my assignments. I have learned that it is difficult for them to sustain in their minds very much of an argument at one time. Their span for argument development is much briefer than I expected.

Recommendation:

I think the students did learn from our class discussions of paragraph groups within the essay (along the lines of my "Work Sheet for Velie's 'The War on the American Family'") so I would continue to do this. But I would approach the essay on the whole a bit differently. Instead of waiting for them to be able to give me an accurate account of the essay before I let them argue with it, I would approach the essay itself as a kind of debate. My work sheet would
consist of two or three objections to the writer's thesis, and then I would ask the students to prepare arguments against those objections using the details of the essay. In class, we could do the same thing and look carefully at those parts of the essay they had thought argued against the objections. As a writing assignment, perhaps I could isolate an objection and ask them to argue against it as if they were the essayist (as I did in my paragraph assignment on Goldstein's essay). Or perhaps I would simply find one generalization the essayist makes and ask them to support it as if they were the essayist.

2. Frags, Comma Splices, Coord., Subord., Punctua., Agr:

I don't think it is profitable to spend much class time going over exercises on these things. The students should learn what they are, for editing purposes. A ten-minute explanation of the concept and a couple of examples should be enough to prepare them for an exercise they could do partially for homework. This could be collected the next day to see where anyone had trouble. These students could get further explanation in lab or conference and then complete the exercise.

Recommendation:

I spent entirely too much class time explaining and going over comma-splices and sentence fragments. Some people learned to avoid them; others didn't. I think this problem is best approached through sentence-combining and
sentence-building. Rather than trying to teach students not to make these errors by showing them how to recognize them, I would rather spend the time having them get accustomed to the written dialect by practicing sentence-building.

Now that I know most of what the SUNY tapes contain, I would work much more closely with them to explain coordination and subordination, modification, parallelism, and punctuation. I would save the error recognition approach for the last 2 weeks of the term.

3. Class Writing Work:

Except for the diagnostic paragraphs, I assigned almost no in-class writings. When I gave paragraph assignments, we would talk through the prewriting and organizing stages of the paragraph in discussion, but the students did no composing on their own outside of that context. Since I think my students often would not carefully follow these discussions, I would change my approach somewhat.

Recommendation:

Now if I were to give paragraph assignments, I would explain the assignment and then have prepared written exercises in various phases of the paragraph for the students to do individually or in parts. I would probably use the type of exercises Building Writing Skills uses. (Steps in Composition is singularly lacking in exercises like these.) So, for example, if I asked them to write a
paragraph that categorizes certain details, I would go over the concept orally and then, instead of going over several examples of categorizing in discussion, I would have them work on their own, or perhaps in pairs or trios, on categorizing exercises. I would hope thereby to be able to identify before they leave those students who do not understand the assignment so that I could clarify my explanation to them.

4. Lab Work

I don't know how to evaluate my performance here. Most students did exercises and we went over them. One or two took the attitude that they were just going to put in time doing the least amount of work. They responded fairly well to one-to-one work, but seemed really uncomfortable working on their own.

But it was most difficult to discuss anything one-to-one in those cramped quarters. I am interested to know how well students could transfer to their writing the concepts they practiced in lab. Insofar as these exercises help make for better writing, the lab did a good job. The students seemed to like the structured study period, and I think it was an advantage to them to have contact with instructors other than their classroom one.

5. One-to-One Work

For me this was almost entirely in-office conferences. I think the intervals at which I saw students was efficient
and productive (every 2 weeks or so), but overall it was terribly time-consuming. I would usually go over two paragraphs during a conference of 20-30 minutes. The greatest frustration I had was created more by my revision policy than by the conferences themselves. The six "S" requirements together with unlimited revisions meant that several students came back several times with successive revisions on the same paragraph, so that finally it was difficult for me to judge where the student's paragraph left off and mine began and difficult for the student to care one way or the other.

II. Materials

1. Books in Lab

Programmed learning books did not work well. It was difficult to take them up in the middle of things and have them make sense.

Most sentence exercises worked well. We need more, though, on subject shifts and faulty prediction (especially faulty equations).
We need more exercises on the paragraph level, such as *Building Writing Skills* offers. Most paragraph exercises were not useful. And we need better exercises on transitions within paragraphs, and on paragraph coherence. (Maybe Graham would be helpful as a lab book here).

2. Textbooks

Troyka, *Steps in Composition:*

This book was most adequate in its abundance of exercises on sentence errors: fragments, run-ons and comma splices, subject-verb agreement, punctuation, and misplaced modifiers. I especially liked those exercises that asked students to invent a certain type of sentence (e.g., compound or complex) on a topic that was specified for them (e.g., marriage, food, hospitals). I think it would be a great book for lab work. But for the more complex lessons on building paragraphs with unity, order, and coherence, I think it is most inadequate. First of all, most of its sample paragraphs are indescribably dull and this is exactly the place where I think a book in writing should be most interesting and imaginative. Then, after it states that a paragraph must have a topic sentence and must develop it in an intelligible order, it abandons discussion of the paragraph. So it never gets beyond the concept of the paragraph as a topic sentence with a list of details supporting it. *Building Writing Skills* does much
more to develop the idea that a paragraph can have more sophisticated structures, with subtopics or categories, with lesser and greater generalizations, and with various sorts of conclusions.

I found its discussion of the "Unified Paragraph" too limited, and the section on "Deliberate Repetition" should be greatly expanded.

The book provided enough essays at the right level of sophistication, though on somewhat outdated topics. I worked best with the practical arguments: "The War on the American Family," "The Case Against College," and especially "Give Drugs to Addicts So We Can Be Safe." Toffler's more abstract "The Throw-Away Society" was less easy to do something with. Everybody responded to Dick Gregory's essay and we had a lively class on it, but I found the essay too untame to draw from it lessons about writing that the students were ready for. It worked best in a discussion on audience, but going into that very far seems like English 100 material to me.

I feel ambiguous about the value of Troyka exercises on spelling and vocabulary. I think I am glad they are in the book. I assigned them, but never went over them in class. Not many students got much from them, but I know at least one did.

Graham: **Sentencecraft**

Except for one exercise, I didn't work with Graham.
If the SUNY tapes are used for the course, I would suggest that, rather than Graham, a book on sentence combining be used.

From the little use I did make of the book, though, I found its explanations of concepts much too stingy. To do anything beyond the first chapter, the student must be able to pick up fairly quickly what verbals, modifying words and phrases, and subordinate clauses are.

On the other hand, if the teacher were committed to working very carefully with the book, I think it would offer a good way to practice correct subordination, modification, and punctuation. I much prefer its approach to sentences over that of Troyka. I wish though that its explanations of terminology were expanded. I suspect the book may be more accessible to an English 100 class.

SUNY Video-Tapes:

The tapes had their shortcomings (or is it 'long-goings'). Mods I, II, and III went over well enough with my class; IV and V, which needed to be most inspiring since they explained subordination and modification, were much too long and monotonous.

Nevertheless, I think they are worth trying to incorporate thoroughly into the course. I think much is gained simply by there being a different media. Interrupting the tape with workbook exercises seemed a very good rhythm for my class. While the sentences on the tape may pass by too
slowly, the concepts they are illustrating need repetition, so the fact that the workbooks repeat the tapes is good. The contrast between the tape's voice and my own (I read all the workbook exercises aloud) seemed to encourage students to rethink what they had just heard. Insofar as the tapes give practice in seeing, hearing, and composing sentence patterns of the written dialect, they are valuable. Often, though, the complexity of their explanations distracts from that practice. I predict that once I become more accustomed to this approach to sentences I will find the tapes more useful.

As for what the tapes accomplished this quarter, though, I would have to say then did very little. They did introduce the term "sentence kernel," which I found helpful. But since the tapes arrived so late, I didn't spend much time at all with workbook exercises beyond what we did during the tape sessions.

Recommendation:

If the tapes are to be useful, I think that they must be available from the first week, that all the concepts they introduce must be reinforced in class, in writing assignments, quizzes, and in comments on papers, and that the tapes must not only be shown in class but must be available for individual sign-out. The instructor should use their concepts almost exclusively to talk about sentences during the quarter. I think they cover everything Troyka covers on sentences (except perhaps subject-verb
agreement), and they do it by practicing sentence-building rather than by analyzing sentence mistakes. If students can understand what is going on in the tapes and workbooks, it is conceivable that we can put off discussion of "errors" until the last two weeks of the quarter, and cover them under "editing," as David Batholomae suggested. By then, through sentence-building practice, the students will have become much more familiar with the written dialect so that in explaining errors we may simply be giving them rules for things they can by now already recognize.

3. Diagnostic Pre- and Post-Tests

Diagnostic Paragraphs, Post:

I cannot help believing that because almost all our students wrote, and revised extensively, paragraphs on the one characteristic they felt a good teacher should have, they were prepped considerably for writing a paragraph on the major reason their worst teacher was ineffective. I had, for example, one student whose paragraph on the characteristic of a good teacher read: "He must be able to explain the material by doing x, y, and z." Then his paragraph on the major reason his worst teacher was ineffective read: "He was ineffective because he did not explain the material by doing x, y, and z."

Reading Test:

I approve of our having limited it, in the end, to a test of paragraph comprehension. We should know, if we
can, whether paragraph writing improves paragraph comprehension.

SMT "Aluminum" Test:

This test was neatly conceived. I object to some sentence kernels within it which some of my students left out of their version because they considered them redundant: Aluminum comes from bauxite; **bauxite contains aluminum.** Alumina contains aluminum and oxygen; **alumina is a mixture.** It has a luster; the **luster is bright.**

The study which produced the test, though, was comparing the relative syntactic maturity of people separated by four school years. Robert R. Potter, in "Sentence Structure and Prose Quality: An Exploratory Study" *(Teaching High School Composition*, pp. 174-183) says that when the best and worst paragraphs written by students in the same grade were compared, there was no significant difference in the number of subordinate clauses, but rather in the kinds of subordination. I suspect that it would be unfair to evaluate students' improvement in one quarter solely on the basis of this test. But I would like to see how its results compare with the information on subordination derived from the analytic grading of pre- and post- diagnostic paragraphs.

High-School Survey:

One question on this survey probably won't tell us much: "How many English courses have you had?" For some students, "courses" mean 6-week periods; for others, one term; for others, one year.
4. Writing Assignments

"Tool" paragraph: the least successful; I didn't have a clear enough idea what I wanted.

Troyka's exercise 1h. paragraph: the dullest assignment, it produced only lists.

"Define a word or phrase you use differently from everyone else" paragraph: worked well only for a couple of people who found good topics; with more help from me, it could have worked very well.

"Summary of Velie's Essay" paragraph: far beyond the ability of all but one of my students.

"Subway" paragraph: the best sort of paragraph assignment since it detailed the structure of the paragraph beyond the topic sentence and gave them all the same thing to analyze.

Terkel/Carter paragraph: too difficult without a lot of preparatory work on using quotes as evidence to prove something, but with prep work could be a good assignment.

Letter to High School teacher or to Dean Adams: The assignment sheet needed much more refining, but it worked well; students had to complain without whining; they liked the exercise.

Essay exam on Goldstein's essay: The best way to work with essays; students did not do well on the in-class exam, but it focused their attention on certain arguments within the essay; on revision they did fairly well with this.
Recommendations:

It was unfortunate our method for final evaluation ended up being 6 "S" paragraphs (*mea culpa*). When I endorsed those standards I did not have in mind the wide range in complexity paragraph assignments could have. To demand perfect paragraphs tends either to push students to choose simplistic topics, or, as happened with almost all my students, to push them to revise *ad nauseam*. This is a great mistake since after at most two revisions, they are no longer actively involved in trying to express precisely what they meant. Instead, they simply want to do anything you tell them to get an "S." I suggest that evaluation be made on the basis of a holistic team grading of three out of the last five paragraphs the students have written and revised only once, and one diagnostic paragraph they have revised not at all.

My most serious complaint about the way I approached writing assignments is the same complaint I have with the way I taught sentences. Essentially I had students write paragraphs and then I would tell them everything that was wrong with them, they would revise and revise, and then on to the next. According to James W. Nay in "On Not Practicing Errors" (*Teaching High School Composition*), I was having students practice errors.

I recommend, instead, that the first two weeks be devoted to teaching sentence by sentence, as outlined by Jackson Burgess (*Teaching HS Comp.*., pp. 240-246). It seems to me
much easier to discuss saying precisely what you mean in these sorts of units than with whole paragraphs where there is so much going on simultaneously. At the same time during those first two weeks, I would like to see students doing a lot of journal writing, or more specific topic assignments, from which students could take sentences to analyze.

I would plan five primary paragraph assignments, each paragraph having a distinct structure. The structure need not necessarily be based on a type of exposition (cp/ctr, def, categ, etc.), but a structure that, say, is a list, or one generalization with two subdivisions (e.g., my "Subway" paragraph), or a paragraph that has a compound topic sentence so that the body must treat both ideas in the sentence equally (e.g., my "definition" paragraph), or one that has a complex topic sentence so that the body of the paragraph must spend a bit of time on the subordinate part and the major time on the independent part (e.g., "even though X, I believe Y). I would like to take a look at Building Writing Skills again before I develop these. Notice that this sort of paragraph assignment can fit in, to some extent, with discussion of sentence structures.

These primary assignments would be the paragraphs students would write and revise, and they would demand analytic ability from the students. But before each was
assigned, students would have written two or three "throw-away" paragraphs that require the same structure and some analysis. By the time students got to the primary paragraph assignment, then, they would be familiar with the form and function of the paragraph.

5. Syllabus

I've already noted above what I'd change in course substance. I am perhaps too sanguine about how much of this can get done in ten weeks. I would want to schedule three SUNY tapes in the first two weeks, and then less after that. For the last eight weeks, assuming four days per week, I would want to spend ten days on tapes and workbooks, four on discussing essays, five on primary paragraph assignments, and the remaining eleven on paragraph practice and sentence building. Obviously this does not work into a weekly pattern.

6. Notable Successes/Failures

My course failed because it exercised my students' brains fairly rigorously. It failed, however, in that more of the exercising occurred in conferences than in the classroom.
Let me start by talking about the textbooks and materials and my use of them. Troyka-Nudelman did turn out to be a good primary text for the class, although some of the readings seemed unnecessarily "relevant" and some of the content was only indirectly relevant to a paragraph-oriented course (e.g., the discussions of essay structure, which seemed more superficial than simplified). I had all I could do to just get the students to understand and use sentence and paragraph conventions, without dealing with the magnified conventions and problems of longer writing. Still, the students were understandably eager to write longer themes, as though such writing would by virtue of its length be better, more meaningful, and therefore more worth writing. Several of these students had consistent difficulty constraining themselves to the boundaries of a paragraph and editing prewriting into paragraphs, not realizing, apparently, that it is possible to stop writing and be through with an idea even though the experience cited or the idea being pursued may have some natural continuation.

I would defend the paragraph-oriented approach on the grounds that it (the paragraph) is the smallest practicable "molecule" or model of developed writing, whether or not it has any real existence outside of longer essays or short answer questions on essay tests. I tried using something
like the Christensen approach to paragraph development a couple of times (i.e., using an analogy between coordinated or level-developed sentences and paragraph structure) without success. For one thing, I don't understand it especially well myself yet, and anyway it seemed absurd to discuss levels of ideas in terms of an analogy to sentence structure when my students couldn't coordinate or subordinate sentences in the first place. I don't know which skill should come first, but I suspect that it may be the conceptual skill—which would make it more profitable and accurate to work backwards from paragraph to sentence.

When students discovered tenable concepts, they started writing longer, self-sustaining, multi-leveled sentences. Only one of my students reached that stage, though several others would imitate or achieve such sophistication occasionally. One of these students, however, never incorporated unity and focus into his writing, and as a result his subordinations were often improper though frequent. Another had less severe problems, but I think it's significant that he sometimes couldn't subordinate properly in sentence-combining exercises, even at the end of the course, but could subordinate with much greater facility and fewer errors when writing his own paragraphs. At the other extreme were students who could subordinate surprisingly well on exercises but could not apply that skill to their paragraph-writing.
I have my doubts, therefore, about the usefulness of the Graham book in the course. I frankly didn't have time to use it much, but any further concentration on sentence skills (in addition to the video-tapes, parts of Troyka, and the exercises done in lab) would have thoroughly distorted the objectives of the course and the qualities of good writing. On the other hand, I liked the SUNY tapes and think I did a good job of teaching them. The class didn't like them. I have no way of knowing whether they learned anything of value from working with the video-tapes, but I'm inclined to trust their judgment and say that they did not.

The writing lab and lab materials were useful, more because they provided extra opportunities for close student/teacher contact than because of any intrinsic merit in either the lab or books themselves. It was knowing and talking to the students that resolved writing problems. That's why the diagnostic tests and writing profile were useful, though I think I could have done more with them. And that's why the conferences were especially important. They not only provided time for one-on-one explanations and discussions of writing, but they gave me some sense of what I should teach in the class sessions and how I should teach it. When I missed two days of conferences late in
the quarter I lost contact with the class. It was in conferences and lab work that I developed some of the ideas, examples, and approaches that were most successful in the classroom.

I have mixed feelings about the assignments I gave. From beginning to end I was fighting the students' readiness to oversimplify rather than conceptualize. Assignments that were heavy on prewriting (e.g., one in which I had the students interview each other) took too much time and created almost insurmountable (for my students) problems with focusing and unity—even though the sorts of questions that should be asked were discussed beforehand. Assignments that were based on readings tended to turn into paraphrases and lumpy topic sentences no matter what I did. I see now why Mary Lou Conlin teaches her course by beginning with paraphrasing. Assignments based on personal experience turned into rambling narratives (as you might expect).

But on the whole I think 193X was a well-conceived course and I'm pleased with the way I taught it. It was nice to see students making progress that was the direct result of our teaching.
Evaluation of 193X: Sue Payne

I put off writing this for so long because I felt that I wanted to put some distance between myself and my students and between myself and the most difficult quarter I have ever had. Now it is vacation time. I have slept until noon every day, trying to replenish my body. In a week I have read--no, devoured--four novels. I went to two movies, a rock concert, and a ballet, but there is still this "thing," this "self-evaluation" that must be written. I suppose that now is the time to look back.

I. Self-Evaluation

1. Classroom Work

I felt that my work in the classroom was hindered by the general tone my students developed. They were, by any standards I have to measure with, one of the quietest classes I have ever had. I thought at first that this meant they were not motivated, so I injected loudness and cheerfulness into my voice and I did everything short of dancing at the front of the room to try to get them interested. Later, when we began discussing specific readings from the text or from other sources, I noticed that while our discussions were not "heated" they were interesting and perceptive. I learned something which I think indicates that as a teacher I am beginning to mature. I stopped trying to make the class into the kind of class I was "used" to teaching. I accepted my students as a
"quiet" class and adjusted my tone accordingly. I suppose
that all this really meant was cajoling a shy student with
the words "C'mon, Tom" instead of hoping that another
student would come to his rescue. Ultimately, I became
"used" to longer periods of silence and realized that these
periods did not mean my students were bored.

I function best in the classroom when we are doing
something I feel is fun as well as valuable. During this
class, I experienced the greatest amount of frustration when
trying to figure out "a fun way to teach the semicolon" or
"a new way to go over commas." My housemates and the
older TA's I know, had to listen to me break into the
middle of our dinner conversation and say, "Don't you
know any fun way to teach the semicolon?" or "Will you
help me make up some funny sentences with dangling modi-
fiers in them?" My friends would respond with a sigh and
a groan and sometimes the dismal "There IS no interesting
way to teach the semicolon." I guess I'll never be satis-
fied with that. But I did learn to say to my students
occasionally: "Look, I know this isn't fun. I know this
is hard work. But, dammit (bleep) you NEED it." That
approach does not always work. The students still feel
cheated because you were not able to make it "fun."

As usual, I felt that on the good days my teaching
was very good and on bad days it was very bad. I wish we
could all sit down with a slide rule and calculate how to
eke the greatest number of good days out of a teaching quarter. This would be a complicated formula because it would involve considerations such as "What if they're all depressed because we lost the Michigan game?" and "What if I can't concentrate because I'm worried about the 20 page paper that's due tomorrow that I haven't started yet?"

The best days for me this quarter were the days when I was able to strike the proper distance between my students and myself. This proper "distance" was often elusive.

On a day when I hand back a set of paragraphs which they have rewritten 3 or 4 times and which I have found to be mostly "U's," I notice that I am more sensitive to their facial expressions, more aware of each individual's mood. I am hurting because one student still misspelled three words in an otherwise perfect paragraph. Sometimes I was unable to separate my students' writing from myself. We could "lose" whole class days this way--me feeling shy and vulnerable just as they felt when I returned their papers.

It is difficult to say what the "proper distance" was with this class. Before I walk into a class on the first day, I have a voice in my head which gives me a pep talk: "Now this time you're going to be tougher. Go in there and be friendly, but not too friendly. You don't want them walking all over you. Don't accept any papers that aren't typed, etc." Inevitably this voice is blotted out by the very first thing I do when I walk into a class--
whether it be tripping over a wastebasket or walking in fully poised and smiling sternly. The proper distance in this class fell somewhere in between being extremely open and being extremely closed. What was most important was communicating that I felt what we were doing at that particular time was essential. If my students sensed that I was not interested, they were not interested. I guess I had to convince them always that I was not just having fun.

Have I self-evaluated myself? I think not. I have delineated what I, as a teacher, have learned this quarter. I suppose the fact that I have LEARNED should contribute to my self-evaluation. I felt that this quarter instead of being any IMAGE of myself as a teacher or any IMAGE of myself the students created I became a teacher more capable of adjusting to changes. There were moments when the class seemed dead--like we were packed in cotton. And then there were electric moments--when what I said followed a direct line to my students' heads and what they said came back to me and branched out to other students on the way.

2. Lab Work

One day I would like someone to give me a lot of money and ask me to set up a writing lab. I would find a job like that very exciting. As for my own part in our writing lab, I think I should have done more tutoring. At the beginning of the quarter I volunteered to take the writing lab an hour a day, five days a week. This wouldn't have
been a bad thing if I had not signed up for the hour immediately following my class. Usually by the time I got to the lab I was exhausted. I yearned for a half hour of silence to drink a coke and collect myself. Instead I was immediately thrust into getting 6 to 8 people working on their individual writing problems and then helping each of them as they went along. Sometimes I would just sit and let them work on their own unless they asked me for help. That was a bad thing to do because it assumes that a student always knows when he needs help. A few times a student would do an entire exercise wrong because I had been too tired to check often enough. On days when I did spend the entire hour tutoring, I felt like I was rushing from student to student. One person simply cannot spread herself equally between 8 students. While admittedly the conditions in our writing lab were not ideal, that is no excuse for my sometime negligence. I simply didn't know my own limitations. I guess I never knew how much I needed that half hour after class to relax.

I should say that sometimes my greatest successes took place in the writing lab. I got to know students who were not my own. Somehow it was reinforcing for all of us when a student heard the same things from more than one instructor. (Of course, problems arose when a student heard DIFFERENT things from different instructors.) With these students who were not my own I was able to establish a relationship which allowed me to tease them into doing well. Rich or
Mindy would hand me a paragraph to read and I would hand it back saying, "Oh, c'mon. You've got about 30 errors in this thing. You know you can find them." Students seemed less frightened of making errors and of "not understanding" something than they would have been if I were their classroom teacher.

3. One-to-One Work

I had approximately six conferences with each of my students. (This does not include in-class conferences while working on paragraphs.) My success or failure in these one-to-one confrontations seemed to depend on the student, but now I realize that while I learned to accept long silences in the classroom, I was still unable to accept long silences in a conference. I simply talked too much. It was therefore difficult to know whether a student really understood what I had said or not. I think that if I had it to do over again, I would be sure to make the students talk more about their paragraphs. I might even approach it by beginning with some very broad question like: "Now what did you think about this paragraph?"

Although I feel I usually talked too much, I received paragraphs that were much improved after having conferences with students. I was, perhaps, lucky in that they usually understood and agreed with what I had said in a conference. With my students it was extremely important to go over any
errors I marked on their papers and to explain the terminal comments I made. They were students so used to seeing their English papers marked up that they became oblivious to my little green marks unless I pointed to them and said, "What does this mean?" I used the one-to-one conferences successfully in this way.

I was also successful in applying some extra "strokes" in a one-to-one conference. I always asked my students about their other courses and tried to get them to talk a little about college life or life in general. They seemed to appreciate these questions—even if it only gave them a way to blow off some steam about all the work they had to do or about their noisy roommates who don't believe in studying. What was especially nice about getting to know the students in this way was that when I met them in the hall or on the West Campus bus, I at least had something to say to them that was not related to the class.

II. Materials

1. Books in the Lab

This will be difficult to do without having all of the books in front of me.

I would say the two books the students in lab used the most were the American Heritage Dictionary and Grassroots. The dictionaries were essential tools and it was encouraging to see students using them so often. Grassroots I have mixed emotions about. While it is a good book for
a student to use on his own (directions are simple, exercises arranged according to difficulty), it is precisely this kind of book which led someone to write the word "JAIL" under our "WRITING-LAB" sign. The exercises seemed tedious for the students.

Books like *Shaping College Writing* and *Building Writing Skills* seemed more successful to me because they were not merely EXERCISES. They had sections to read and sometimes paragraphs to write. These seem more valuable to me because they were not inherently boring, as I believe *Grassroots* was.

The "One Skill At A Time" books had the advantage of being booklets. A student could work his way through an entire booklet and really feel like he had accomplished something more than if he had simply worked through four or five pages of a TEXTBOOK. These booklets used passages of literature as examples. I found the students enjoyed pointing out to me passages from books they had read or wanted to read.

Although not many students used the reading skills books, those who did seemed to enjoy them and learn from them. But honestly, I am amused and embarrassed by the title of one book which we seem to have so many copies of—*Topics for the Restless*. It may sound trivial, but I think our students are all too aware of the titles of the books we ask them to use. *Topics for the Restless* sounds like it's meant to appeal to juvenile delinquents.
For our purposes, books like Comp/Mods which have answer keys built in were most helpful. This way a student waiting for a tutor to get around to him could check his own answers, then settle disputes when the tutor got to him.

I would like to see our files of dittoes beefed up a bit. It is much less tedious for a student if he can write his answers right on the page instead of having to use another sheet of paper. I also think that the mimeoed sheets function similarly to the booklets. When a student finishes a mimeoed sheet he feels he has accomplished something. What's more is that when he finished a number of mimeoed sheets, he has a stack of them.

I can't really evaluate any of the other books unless I have them here with me.

2. Textbooks

Troyka and Nudelman, Steps in Composition

Before we even chose the textbook for 193X, we had agreed that the articles in Troyka and Nudelman's book, Steps for Composition, were uninteresting, if not totally boring. The book seemed to have other merits which outweighed its outdated models. My feeling now is that I underestimated the importance of interesting models in this course. When I gave my students mimeoed articles from other texts, our discussions were livelier.

Now--about those "other merits" we felt that SIC had . . . . The pictures, diagrams, etc. were a plus.
While I did not use the "Springboards to Thinking" very often, I found my students commenting on them voluntarily. The "Reading Surveys" would not put the students off so much if they did not begin with the question: "What is the central theme of the essay?" The "Inference" and "Opinion" parts of the "Reading Surveys" were generally very good.

We all agreed from the beginning that our students would need a lot of practice with spelling and vocabulary, but I found that SIC placed too much emphasis on these things. There were just too many other things for our students to deal with--things which were much more important to their writing.

I found that most of the exercises (excluding spelling and vocabulary) which were in SIC were fresh and valuable. I think these exercises are the part of the book which should be kept if the book comes out in a new edition. I still believe there is not a good "remedial" text on the market, so I want to make sure I don't criticize SIC too much.

I did find, however, one thing about the book which made me angry. In order to simplify things, perhaps, SIC says that the topic sentence is ALWAYS the first sentence in the paragraph. The ignorance of that statement becomes evident almost immediately in the model essays which are provided.
Possibly the best thing that I, as a teacher, learned from SIC was the concept of "danger words." It is a helpful concept for explaining fragments to a student who has not yet developed a "writer's ear."

Graham Sentencecraft

My evaluation of this textbook should be short, due to the short amount of time I devoted to this book. I found that Sentencecraft is an interesting book which could more easily be used as the main textbook for a course. There are so many exercises in it that the students are simply overwhelmed by it. I had trouble fitting Sentencecraft into our schedule smoothly.

3. SUNY videotapes

Perhaps I should let my students speak for me on this issue. They found the tapes boring, mechanical, and impersonal. They also railed against the awful conditions under which they had to view the tapes. (They were crammed into a tiny room. The machine was temperamental. The teacher was often unable to find the place where she wanted to be on the tape.)

I cannot, however, let my students speak for me because I still believe in the tapes. I think they would be excellent if they were the focus for an entire course or if they were part of a writing lab and students could use them on their own. The workbooks, which are currently overwhelming, could be shortened considerably. Then, the teacher would
be able to spend more time helping students while the tape is stopped. (This would help eliminate the impersonality which my students felt.)

4. Diagnostic Pre- and Post-Tests

These functioned for me purely as ways to tell what my students needed to be working on in the lab. I did not have time to analyze the difference between pre- and post-tests carefully. (Our analytic coding will certainly prove to be interesting.)

Let me say something about "The Writing Profiles" here. While I felt that the "Writing Profiles" should have been made from larger writing samples, I still found them valuable. Without them, I don't see how we could have run a Writing Lab. Perhaps they could be used more efficiently if the teacher had them by her side as she graded each new set of paragraphs. That is probably a very time-consuming suggestion.

5. Writing Assignments

Most of the writing assignments I took from the book turned out to be dismal failures. When I invented my own or used ones I heard about from other members of the staff, they were much better.

One particularly good assignment was one which began by having the students interview each other. They then had to write paragraphs about each other, but the paragraphs had to be limited to one aspect of the person's
personality. My students had great success with this topic. They wrote lively paragraphs which were limited!

Another successful writing assignment I used asked the students to write a mini-process essay--one paragraph in which they told how to do something which they thought no one else in the class could do. (This probably worked so well for my class because we had so many interesting people.)

Writing assignments based on reading assignments failed if the readings the students were asked to respond to were boring. When I gave my students readings from sources other than their textbooks, the writing I received from them was usually better. I think that generally the rule held--students wrote best on topics they were most interested in.

6. Syllabus

I found the syllabus which we labored over nearly worthless (except, of course, for the standards, objectives, procedures part). I made out a detailed syllabus for each week. My students soon realized that we would have to be flexible. We set our own pace.
Evaluation of 193X: John Ruszkiewicz

I'll begin by being cowardly and avoiding a general assessment of the success of 193X. If I would make such a judgment, I'm afraid it would be negative. All of my students learned something, and all improved, but I'm not sure the time, effort, and money expended were worth what was accomplished. My gut feeling is that the program is uneconomical in many senses of the word. I believe only three, at most four, of my twelve students will pass English 100, or have the linguistic equipment to even take a stab at it. A success rate of 25 percent to 33 percent is not, I believe, acceptable. However, I reserve judgment until our numbers are tallied and, more important, our students have moved through English 100. I hope I will be proved wrong.

Class work:

I did not feel unprepared to teach the course, and I enjoyed the experience. Early in the quarter, I believe we tried to do too much too fast. I am not used to teaching out of a textbook, and for several weeks, I found myself confined by the emphases and strategies of Steps in Composition and by the attempt to keep up with the syllabus. Eventually, I pared away what I didn't like in the syllabus, slowed down the pace in the classroom, and concentrated on those aspects of writing which I felt most confident to deal with and which my students needed the greatest practice
in. I sharply curtailed spelling and vocabulary exercises and de-emphasized reading. I know my students needed help in reading, but I was not trained to teach it well, and the time we spent in the classroom specifically on it did not prove to be as fruitful as work in other areas. I was most surprised to see, then, the rather large improvements in reading comprehension most of my students demonstrated when they took the second reading test. I attribute the advance in part to the greater attention they were probably giving to printed data because of their intimate involvement with it and words over a ten week period.

The students themselves formed a more homogeneous group than a typical 100 class. With a few exceptions, the members of my class were acutely aware of their own failings and not ashamed to admit them before a group of peers. They were also more serious than most of my 100 classes, and remarkably deficient in their senses of humor. My class may have been atypical in this respect, to judge from the portions of 193X classes I have encountered in lab and in the office. But my bunch was somber, almost dismally so at times, as if it were saying to me, "We've got a problem; let's fix it."

Lab work:

The lab was a fundamentally sound instructional instrument that would benefit 100 as much as 193X if properly staffed and funded. Because the lab was crowded, the time limited, our resources new to us, and our students covetous
of individual attention, we occasionally ran into problems. I found an hour's teaching followed by an hour in lab with six to eight students to be exhausting. As I grew more familiar with the exercises and resources, I was able to handle them more effectively. But a full time lab staff would make the concept work infinitely better. Further, the lab is a great pedagogical device for teachers. T.A.'s who spent a quarter working with students in a lab before undertaking their own classes would find that they had confronted many of the complex linguistic problems that puzzle students and seem to defy explanation in lectures. In the lab, the instructor is forced to grapple with the most basic structures of language in the most demanding environment possible. I found it as exacting as it was demanding for the first five weeks or so, then exhaustion set in--for both instructor and instructee--and, when they had worked through all the check marks on their writing profiles, the most productive students began to suspect, I think, that they were being assigned busywork. Many turned to work on edited paragraphs.

One-to-one work:

Because so many of my students scheduled their lab hours to coincide with mine, I did not find it necessary to hold a great number of conferences. The conferences I held in lab--for some reason--always proved more fruitful than those I held in 256. The explanation of that phenomenon
escapes me. I do believe that conferences in general should be initiated by the student (the instructor making it plain at the beginning of a quarter that such intrusions on his/her time are welcome) and should never become a primary educational device at our level of funding and instruction. But here we have a crux, since remedial students seem to respond very well to one-on-one teaching. The question is--expanded into a larger scale than our little pilot program--can the University afford one to one instruction? Can we attain good results with developmental students without it?

Materials and books in lab:

Because I don't have the lab materials with me, and my memory for book titles and authors is notoriously weak, I'll limit my comments here to a general praise for Grassroots and a hatchet condemnation of the Prentice-Hall Workbook for Writers. The former was very effective in explaining those elementary concepts of language and usage through its exercises. It might make a useful text (supplemented by a rhetoric like Troyka and Nudelman) in a developmental course. The latter was often vague and always too difficult for students at our level.

Almost all of my students liked Steps in Composition, and I believe their endorsements are sincere. The approach is sound, though I disliked some of the vocabulary lists which seemed eccentric and forgettable. Some of the readings were dated and I find Steps for Composition typographically
ugly. But the exercises were great. *Sentencecraft*, on the other hand, did not play to rave reviews. One student told me that she could understand it only after first reading the comparable section in *Steps*. Part of the problem may have been that I gave the students too little guidance and assistance in assigning reading and work in *Sentencecraft*. They were, essentially, on their own in this book. However, I found the concepts and terminology of the book very workable (excepting "nude sentence"), and was able to refer to additions and interruptions with some confidence that my students were following my direction. When we did an on-the-board paragraph, the classroom chatter was full of introductory additions, concluding additions, and various kinds of interrupters. So *Sentencecraft* may have been more successful than even the students realized.

I have exhausted myself on the subject of the SUNY video-tapes in my note to Kathy Kelly. Suffice it to say, my feelings are just this side of loathing them for their pitiful production values and decidedly unimaginative instructional techniques. I do believe that a good set of tapes would be an asset in a developmental course if for no other reason than the affection which most students have for the video screen. Well done, tapes would also relieve some of an instructor's burden, and provide a student with an avenue of approach to review, if tapes were available for viewing at any time. But the SUNY tapes did not fit the bill, by no means, as my students might say.
Diagnostic tests:

The battery of diagnostic tests was a burden to the students and a burden to us, but intriguing in the results. I have some doubts about the reading tests, which I shall not go into here. The diagnostic paragraphs seemed to be on a dull topic, but every student could respond to it, and hence the topic proved to be reasonably successful. I am not convinced however that the diagnostic paragraph and what it shows should be the sine qua non of diagnostic tests. There is so much artificiality in the circumstances of the test that I do not think we should rely too heavily on it as a barometer of writing ability. The SMT and ERT are, in some ways, more reliable and the results more interesting. The results of these tests, which I've seen for my own class, tally well with my quarter-long experience with the writing of individual students. But without question, the high school survey was the most singularly brilliant information collection device we used all quarter.

Writing assignments:

I gave a wide range of writing assignments that ranged from the very serious (analysis of a personal problem and possible solutions) to the almost ludicrous (why students get fat) and was surprised by the consistency of student response. I have mentioned that my students were a markedly humorless bunch, and I would venture that it is also a staid group, unwilling to play with an idea or treat it with much imagination. Just the facts was what I usually got, whether
they were writing on ducks or the presidential elections. I do not criticize this response, because it is a defensible one. But the result is a general flattening of assignments, so that it is not possible to say what worked and what didn't. All paragraph assignments polled some good responses and some bad ones. I can't find any pattern or preference. Like good soldiers, my students did their five-seven sentence duty with whatever topic I assigned. Sometimes they showed enthusiasm and sometimes they did not.

*Syllabus:*

My comments on the syllabus are contained, partly, in the section above on classroom work. I believe we approached this course with the unspoken fear that we would quickly run out of things to say about comma splices, sentence structures, and topic sentences. Hence we burdened ourselves with a demanding, multi-texted, multi-media syllabus that promised a healthy level of activity whatever the quantity of information conveyed. I believe we quickly discovered—at least I did—that we could easily overload our students with linguistic input and fluster ourselves with attempts to coordinate labs, film strips, lectures, and two textbooks. For the first few weeks, lacking pinpoint accuracy, we substituted a barrage. Fortunately, the sequence of *Steps in Composition* saved us. From topic sentence to paragraphs, from simple sentences (and fragments) to coordination and subordination, the early chapters led
the students systematically into an understanding of problems and approaches that I found quite satisfactory. Were I teaching this course again, I would design a syllabus along a two-pronged attack on topic sentences and sentence structure, complicating each systematically and in tandem, with a heavy emphasis on editing skills. I would ignore spelling (except as an editing skill), vocabulary, and to a large extent, readings.

Revisions:

I would allow fewer revisions. My students took advantage of the loophole in my editing system and brought paragraphs back, again and again, for consideration. They worked hard, and I made a conscious effort not to plug in the sorts of corrections their paragraphs needed. But it was a tiring struggle, seeing the same paragraph four and five times. I got to the point where I didn't want the students to recopy an erring composition if they could identify and explain remaining errors. I am convinced that my students benefitted by multiple revision, but Betsy's system of one revision more closely reflects the realities of the college writing experience and it is the one I would strongly recommend future instructors to hold to.

Notable failures:

Speedwritings proved to be notable failures, partly because I wasn't sure what to do with them when they were finished and partly because my students produced unusually
large numbers of "can't think, can't thinks." Another bomb was an attempt to explain the principle of agreement in general terms so that the class could approach the exercises with an abstract principle to guide it. The lecture and diagrams would have been little less effective had they been in Latin. Group correction sessions did not always go well for the same reason they prove intractable in English 100. The students love whatever their comrades produce and would rather miss the West Campus bus than say a nasty thing about their neighbor's skills in writing. Group correction sessions also consume a great deal of time. There are more effective ways of teaching editing.

**Notable success?**:

I was amazed by how well in-class exercises went in 193X, compared to what usually happens in 100. More conscious of their deficiencies, the 193X students gladly plod through twenty sentences, correcting comma splices or fragments. And the exercises go much better when done on the board by students. Along the same line, I had good success with in-class, on-the-board, editing exercises. As they chatted away about a puzzling sentence or groups of words, the students went through, orally, the entire editing process. During the eighth week of the course, as a review, I had the class write an in-class group paragraph on 193X. It was their own choice for a general topic. We began with a three-minute speed writing, some discussion, a listing of ideas, some prewriting, a decision over topic sentence possibilities and proceeded to construct an entire, very
respective paragraph in three days. The work was entirely the students', and when they were done, they were not only proud of their creation, but wanted to claim it as an edited paragraph for each of them. Nixing that idea, I was, nonetheless, able to point out that since they had created one such paragraph in class, they should be able to create many more at home. Corny as the reasoning sounds, it was true, and I believe doing that in-class paragraph late in the quarter gave several of my students the confidence they needed to get them through those last, difficult edited paragraphs. It was no accident that one of my students insisted that I brand an S on the paragraph before I erased it from the board.
Evaluation of 193X: Dave Willis

SELF:

1. Classroom work: On the whole, I was satisfied. Most students managed to get involved in class discussions; some even showed a real interest in what seemed to them "new subjects." Several students had either had so little English before or had been turned off by what they did have that much of the "grammar" discussion seemed new and fresh to them. Perhaps there's an advantage to students' not having English for twelve years in school: in college it may not seem like "the same old thing" they've been bored with since they started school.

My major frustration came from trying to do too many things--and as a result leaving many unfinished and unconnected. The time spent on sentences was the most hectic. I assigned a couple of chapters in Graham, never found time to do anything with the book in class, and finally dropped it. Because the video tapes ate up one day of class a week, I didn't feel free to spend much extra time in class discussing the homework from the accompanying workbooks. Consequently I fear the sentence combining exercises and discussions did not receive the reinforcing and discussion they needed to be effective. Exercises in Troyka helped fill some gaps, but on the whole tended to be rather boring. The result was something of a mish-mash.
Perhaps my biggest regret is that I slighted in-class writing and workshops. A last minute spurt at the end of the quarter helped. The problem was that when I got behind, it was always easier to cut a writing session than something else that I felt had to be "covered" in class discussion.

Had I to do it all again, I'd scrap the tapes, try to handle more of the "grammar" sections in SIC through homework, and spend more time in class on writing and workshop sessions.

2. Lab Work: I regret that I wasn't more familiar with the lab materials at the beginning of the quarter. Even with the index I too often wound up giving students the wrong assignment. If the lab is to be run by part-timers like us, it would perhaps work more efficiently with a smaller number of texts that the staff was thoroughly familiar with.

An impression--the lab seemed to work well for those students who saw it as meeting their needs; for the others, it seemed like more a make-work time. Would it be better to make the lab optional? Or perhaps leave it up to the individual teacher to send students to the lab only as particular problems arise?

3. One-to-One Work: Probably the most effective way of teaching, especially when the student has prepared for the session. I was satisfied with what I did, but perhaps should have scheduled more conferences.
MATERIALS

1. Books in the Lab: Grassroots was my favorite; perhaps because it's so basic. Prentice Hall Handbook for Writers I had less success with; especially bothersome were paragraph development exercises that primarily just told the student to write a paragraph using X method of development without explaining the method adequately. Shaping College Writing seemed too advanced. Because immediate feedback is important, I liked many of the programmed texts.

There's one real question I have about the lab approach in general, and it's related to feedback. The lab seems to work fine for small, nuts-and-bolts problems like usage conventions; it also works well when the student has a definite problem that he wants to work on; but it can break down on those larger, more subtle areas--development, organization, diction--where the student doesn't know what he doesn't know or doesn't know whether or not he understands. For small, focused problems, the lab works well; for those other problems it works well only to the degree that the lab instructor finds time for one-to-one work, something the lab may not provide enough time for.

2. Textbooks

   a. Steps in Composition: I was satisfied with this choice. It covered almost everything needed. Yet it is a rather old-fashioned, traditional textbook. I would prefer a text that combined a generative or sentence combining
approach with the rhetoric discussion. Perhaps I'm just noting the area where *Steps in Composition* needs supplementing, but the ideal text would have those sections right in it.

b. **Sentencecraft:** didn't use enough to form an opinion on.

3. **SUNY Video-Tapes:** Their ineffective use of the medium made them boring, but they were solid in content. Unfortunately they were also very time consuming, especially when one adds the time the students spend completing the homework assignments and the time devoted in class to reviewing them. Using them effectively would require at least two hours a week--probably too much, unless one assumes that working with them would take care of all work on sentences, such as comma splices and fragments.

The expertise sections are just that, but with some time spent explaining the sections in class, I think we could show the students just how much as native speakers they do in fact already know about English. Since one of their problems is a poor self image of themselves, as writers, this potentially could be an ego-building section.

4. **Writing Assignments:** Too many of my final "S" paragraphs came from personal experience assignments; I'm skeptical about some of my students' abilities to write more detached expository papers.
I'm not sure whether this is the place to say it, but the students' main difficulty seemed to come in developing their ideas--perhaps that is why they performed better on narrative-type, personal experience writing. Next time around, I would like to work more on essay exam questions, especially those based on readings.

5. Syllabus: Too ambitious. More padding or cushion is needed to allow for catch up. It is difficult to estimate how quickly students will latch on to certain subjects, but the tendency is probably to underestimate the time remedial students will need. What we feel is likely to be "old hat"--primarily because it was that for us as freshmen--may, for them, prove new and difficult to absorb.
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ERRATA

P. 121: chart should read: "Average grade-point for 193X students who completed Freshman English: 1.80 (between C and C-)

P. 115: table should read:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total Errors</th>
<th>Total Words</th>
<th>Error/Word Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>193X pre-test</td>
<td>10,405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P. 114: line 14 should read: "run-on sentences fell from a mean of 1.0 to .58, and"

P. 110: line 9 should read: "average rating of 2.41 to 3.57"

P. 195: Variable 62 should read:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable 62</th>
<th>Holistic Score</th>
<th>Error Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>