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CHAPTER I

FINDING OUR FEET:
Establishing a Theoretical Ground

Although one starts any effort at thick description, beyond the obvious and superficial, from a state of general bewilderment as to what the devil is going on—trying to find one's feet—one does not start (or ought not) intellectually empty-handed.

Clifford Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures

INTRODUCTION

For nearly twenty years, research in composition and in business and technical writing has been increasingly interested in collaborative writing and/or learning, mirroring the similar interests of colleagues in anthropology, sociology, psychology, and education. In the business world, recent survey research (Lunsford and Ede; Faigley and Miller) indicates a majority of professionals collaborate on writing tasks from memos to major documents. Although increasing numbers of students are being given a great deal of classroom practice, few professionals and even fewer students receive special instruction in the dynamics of small groups. However, practice without an understanding of group processes can, and frequently does, lead to failed collaborative experiences (Locker, 1991; Cross, 1990).
Confronted with the task of wading through nearly ninety years of research on group processes, the busy classroom teacher may simply take at face value the increasingly reported benefits of collaborative work. Conscientious teachers might incorporate group work without explaining—perhaps without understanding themselves—how seriously even minor conflict can disrupt a group and render it dysfunctional. As a result, collaboration can fail, frequently due to poor—or non-existent—conflict resolution techniques.

My experiences collaborating with colleagues on research projects, preparing collaborative conference presentations, writing an article collaboratively, as well as teaching collaborative assignments and observing collaborative classrooms as a researcher have revealed the process of writing with others to be both rewarding and frustrating. Both the rewards and the frustrations resulted from the kinds of conflicts that arose and from how those conflicts were negotiated. In trying to understand how and why some collaborations worked well and others not at all, I kept finding myself saying, "It's a personality issue," "They had a personality problem," or "We have very similar personalities." I began to wonder about that huge generalization when I attributed a successful collaboration to similar personalities in myself and one other group.
member and then realized that we weren't at all alike. He focused on details well; details escape me. He lived very much in the here-and-now; I tended to focus on the future. He liked definite reality; I preferred fantasy or, at least, possibility. When we worked, he frequently had to act as a check on my imaginative flights, tying my future possibility to a more manageable present reality.

This experiential base began to coalesce when I read Jung's *Theory of Psychological Types* and Isabel Briggs Myers' *Gifts Differing*. Jung's own battle to make sense of the personality differences which had severed him from Freud, Jung's subsequent work identifying the different attitudes and mental functions, and the accounts of how Katherine Briggs developed her theories, began to clarify for me some of these issues of difference. After reading and studying these theories, I began to notice a change in my interaction with other people and especially in my teaching. Much of the process to these realizations was not conscious, but I can see a steady progression, the steady development of a line of thought, from my introduction to type theory at a conference in 1988 to my interest in using personality theory in the writing classroom.

I chose to use personality theory to study collaborative writing groups and how they negotiate conflict
because I suspect that personality theory can offer teachers a viable pedagogical alternative (to mastering the massive body of literature on group dynamics) in the collaborative writing classroom. Jung's theory of psychological types may seem an odd lens through which to view collaborative writing; however, since the members of any group are persons first, one logical starting point is a close examination of how those differing personalities interact in a group writing situation.

PERSONALITY TYPE THEORY

History. Nearly a hundred years ago, entirely unbeknownst to each other, two people on opposite sides of the Atlantic began to work out a theory of personality. Carl Gustav Jung and Katharine C. Briggs were separated by more than an ocean. He was a world figure in psychoanalysis, Freud's former star pupil and heir apparent, recognized and respected for his skill and scholarship. Katharine Briggs had no formal education until she was fourteen and entered college, from which she graduated at eighteen second in her class. She had no formal training whatsoever in psychology. But both of these people were driven by a similar impetus—the desire to account for the differences in human behavior that they had observed firsthand.
Jung had had a terrible row with Freud which led to a permanent rupture, and he firmly believed that there was more to their clash than just personal disagreements over the definition of "symbol" or therapeutic issues. He decided to study the psychological aspects of a similar dispute between Adler and Freud to see if he could learn anything about his own problem with Freud. He concluded that he, Freud, and Adler approached life from opposite directions and used opposing psychological processes to perceive and to make decisions.

Across the Atlantic, Katharine Briggs "a thinker, a reader, a quiet observer" (Gifts x), became fascinated with the similarities and differences in the personalities of the people around her. She was driven by a desire to understand how spouses (among her family and friends) who were so obviously different could develop and maintain successful relationships. Thus, unaware of the other, Jung and Briggs each developed a viable theory, much of which overlapped. However, when Katharine Briggs came across Jung’s Psychological Types, she cried, "This is it!" and burned her notes. (Jung told her later that that was a great mistake, that she might have made a real contribution; the obvious scope of her contribution belies that rather condescending remark.) Then she set out to master every bit of his theory, eventually expanding it and developing fully
ideas that Jung had only touched on briefly and cryptically. For nearly twenty years she and her family "lived type and used it, but never dreamed of making an indicator" (2.7 APT). That final step came about with the realization that allotting manpower during WWII would be much more effective and satisfying if people could be given jobs in which they would be content and productive. With her daughter, Isabel Briggs Myers, Katherine Briggs set about developing the Type Indicator.

Katharine Briggs and Carl Jung shared the fundamental desire to understand how individuals differed and to appreciate and prize those differences without valuing one type more than another. Jung theorized that much of what appears to be random behavior in human beings is really the predictable results of a few basic differences in mental functioning. He believed all conscious mental activity to be divided into four processes or functions: two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition) and two judging functions (thinking and feeling).

The Two Perceiving Functions

People with a preference for sensing perception take in information, become aware of things, directly through the five senses. They focus on the immediate experience, the present moment, frequently developing
acute powers of observation, a great memory for
details, a strong sense of realism and practicality.
People with a preference for intuition tack onto those
sense impressions (coming from outside themselves)
ideas or associations from within the unconscious mind.
They "perceive" beyond the immediate, focusing on
possibilities and patterns. Their knowledge may come
suddenly to consciousness as a flash of insight, or a
hunch, a feeling, the sudden perception of a pattern or
connection in seemingly unrelated events or ideas.

Once information is within the conscious mind (i.e., once it
has been perceived either by sensing or intuition), it must
be analyzed, evaluated, sorted (i.e., judged in some way).

The Two Judging Functions

People with a preference for thinking judgment make
decisions based on impersonal logic, connections based
on cause and effect. Thinking tends to be analytical,
objective, critical, concerned with principles of
fairness and justice.

People with a preference for feeling judgment make
decisions based on merit and values, both personal and
group values. Feeling is more subjective than thinking
and more people oriented. People with a preference for
feeling tend to develop an understanding of people, to
be concerned with the human, not the technology, in an issue; they tend to desire harmony and to have a greater capacity for warmth.

How these functions relate, which is in charge or dominant, can be understood in part by looking at what Jung called the attitudes or orientations toward life: extraversion and introversion, and what Briggs and Myers identified as the attitude or orientation to the external world. The introvert’s main interests lie within the inner world of ideas and concepts; the extravert’s in the outer world of people and things. The introvert derives energy from contemplation, from alone time to "think things through"; the extravert derives energy from people-contact, from sessions where she can "talk it out."

Jung described the three dichotomous pairs Extraversion/Introversion, Sensing/Intuition, and Thinking/Feeling explicitly and in detail, but he only implied the importance of the fourth dichotomy—Judging/Perceiving. The fourth scale, the judging (J)/perceiving (P) scale, identifies the orientation to the outer world, our preferred way of dealing with the external world. The judging type’s approach is organized and decisive, planned in advance; expediency in attaining goals is paramount. Perceiving types approach the world with
curiosity; they dislike structure and prefer spontaneous interaction with the world and people around them, thus continuing to gather knowledge and put off decision-making as long as possible. It is possible to imagine how common conflicts might erupt in a group situation from this opposition on structure, planning, and decision-making.

Each of the four dichotomous preference pairs or scales

- E/I Extraversion (E) or Introversion (I)
- S/N Sensing (S) or Intuition (N)
- T/F Thinking (T) or Feeling (F)
- J/P Judging (J) or Perceiving (P)

is independent of the other three, so that there are sixteen possible combinations:

- ISTJ
- ISFJ
- INFJ
- INTJ
- ISTP
- ISFP
- INFP
- INTP
- ESTP
- ESFP
- ENFP
- ENTP
- ESTJ
- ESFJ
- ENFJ
- ENTJ

The important thing to remember is that the theory is dynamic: each of us uses all four functions; each function directs conscious mental activity toward different goals:

- Sensing toward the fullest possible experience of what
is immediate and real

**Intuition** toward the furthest reaches of the possible and imaginative

**Thinking** toward rational order and plan according to impersonal logic

**Feeling** toward rational order according to harmony among subjective values (Manual 12-13).

**The MBTI.** These sixteen possible combinations are identified by administering the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), a self-reporting, forced-choice, psychometric instrument designed to "indicate" which of two equally valuable preferences an individual is more comfortable with. There are no right or wrong answers to the MBTI; it is not a test. The indicator is designed to make Jung’s theory of psychological types understandable and useful in people’s everyday lives. Its aim is to identify the basic preferences people have in how they take in information and how they make decisions about or draw conclusions from that information.

Although her mother had developed the theory, Isabel Briggs Myers was the prime motivator on the development of the instrument. Having been raised by her mother and father (Lyman J. Briggs, a research physicist) to think "that the
greatest fun in the world was to find out something that nobody knew yet," Myers determined to devise a way to make the theory widely usable. With typical thoroughness, "she haunted libraries to teach herself what she needed to know of statistics and psychometrics" (Gifts xi) and painstakingly developed the first indicator. After nearly twenty years of constant research, the indicator was published by Educational Testing Service (ETS) as a research instrument. Since its first incarnation, Form Zero in the late 1940's, the MBTI has been continually refined and studied to maximize reliability and validity. (Manual: A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator offers a full explanation of the efforts to develop the Indicator and the statistical support for its claims of reliability and validity.)

Even so, there are questions that must be raised when considering its use. The major concern should be a cautious approach to the use of an instrument based on a forced-choice approach to dichotomies. Such an approach invites the argument that the theory is reductive and essentialist. Improperly used, it can appear to be so, but when employed conscientiously by professionals trained in its history, development, and application, the MBTI has a wide variety of applications in the classroom. (Part of my preparation for this study was to arrange to be trained in the history,
theory, and application of the MBTI by the American Association for Psychological Type.) It is important to note that Jung's model of personality type is probabilistic, not deterministic. Accordingly, statements about types, e.g., "perceiving types tend to defer closure . . . sensing types often find it difficult to proceed without concrete directions," are not intended to be essentialist or exclusionary, but rather to indicate probability. It is also important to note again that the dichotomous pairs are not exclusionary.

Type theory is based on the recognition of preference, a situationally responsive choice between alternatives, not the permanent exclusion of one capability. The most common analogy used to explain type theory is the concept of handedness. Each of us is capable of using both hands for a wide variety of tasks and situations, but nearly all of us prefer or are more comfortable with one. If necessary, we can use the other, and given the right circumstances, use it quite effectively; but given an unguided choice, we repeatedly use the one preferred. Thus, every individual has the capacity to operate in either direction on the scale, and healthy type development reflects the ability to learn when to choose which direction to move in. The tendency to use categorical language to discuss the concepts can be viewed as an effort at shorthand, the motivation
behind such use reflecting a similar desire in any other field which uses jargon, to make the theory more manageable and useful.

**Personality and Composition.** Jensen and DiTiberio (1989) suggest that applying personality theory to composition can help to explain many of the variables in writing processes and differences among writers. After nearly a decade of research, they have identified correlations between personality type and preferred writing process, between type and the way writers develop, and between type and writing anxiety/writer's block. Over the course of these ten years they have collected data on personality, preferred learning styles, and writing from

- Basic Writers in the developmental studies program at Georgia State University.
- Freshman writers in regular English Courses at Georgia State.
- Upperclass students, mostly juniors, in a writing class that prepares students for a minimal competency exam in writing.
- Graduate students at the University of Illinois at Chicago or at Georgia State.
- Writers who are members of some professional community, for example, teachers, lawyers, and so forth (Jensen and DiTiberio 31).

They used the MBTI "as an indicator of learning style or cognitive style" because

First the MBTI was more carefully constructed than most instruments of its kind. The second edition of the manual contains data from more than 100 validity studies. Second, the MBTI is more conceptually sophisticated and complex than most learning style assessments. Rather than identify a few 'styles,' for example, field dependent versus field independent, the
MBTI can identify 16 types or 16 approaches to learning. Because of its sophistication, it can, as Lawrence (1984) has documented, account for most of the traits identified by other widely used instruments (30). A brief look at each of the four scales and some of the writing behaviors Jensen and DiTiberio identified as associated with each preference is necessary as foundation to my argument that this theory works with groups of writers.

The First Scale: Introversion and Extraversion. This scale describes the individual's orientation toward life, her relative interest in the inner and outer worlds, the source and focal point of energy. Introverts, because they focus on the inner world of thoughts and ideas and derive energy from introspection, frequently prefer to plan carefully any expression of thought before committing themselves to it, spoken or written. Introverts like alone time to formulate ideas, examine their thoughts and arguments, and organize the product. Applied to writers processes, this description follows Rohman's original identification of the writing process as pre-write--write--rewrite and contrasts sharply with Macrorie's, Murray's, and Elbow's more extraverted insistence on writing as a means of discovering what the writer has to say.

As Jensen and DiTiberio point out, "An important correlate in the theory of all three writers [Macrorie,
Murray, and Elbow] is that outer experience and talk are crucial to generating sound ideas" (36). Introverts search for and construct meaning before they write; extraverts as they write. This is not to say that extraverts do not plan, just that the length and nature of that planning tends to differ dramatically from the introvert's planning practices. Extraverts "tend to leap into writing, use trial and error to get words on paper, and write drafts quickly" (37). Oriented toward an external world of people and things, extraverts frequently generate ideas by focusing on experience, on interaction with the outside world, and by talking to others, claiming (even experienced writers) that although they "come up with good ideas when alone, . . . they have trouble remembering and developing the ideas until they talk or write about them" (38). Many extraverts also tend to prefer physical movement when composing, pacing or getting up frequently.

The same writing practices--the use of an outline or questioning heuristic, for example--may reflect very different processes in extraverts and introverts. Extraverts tend to use the traditional pre-writing heuristics to clarify ideas, not to generate them. Extending these observations to the classroom suggests implications for group work. Introverts, preferring quiet and solitude to generate ideas, can become frustrated with
the extraverts' seeming incessant talking. Extraverts may find introverts resistant or withdrawn and uncooperative.

**The Second Scale: Sensing and Intuition.** This scale is one of the two mental function scales, specifically the function of gathering information. The function, or mental process, of perceiving or gathering information manifests itself in either a preference for reality, specifics, the world of the immediate, the concrete—in sensing types—or in a preference for the "sixth sense," for possibility, interconnectedness, relationships in intuitive types. Sensing types prefer the "here and now," their writing tends to have a factual, sequential orientation, sometimes heavily emphasizing time relationships, sensory details. Sensing types need clear, concrete, and detailed instructions when given assignments. Instructing the class to "Write a paragraph responding to today's readings" will drive these students a little crazy. Sensing types frequently seem preoccupied with the teacher's requirements—"How long should it be?" "How many sources do I need?" "Do you want this to have a thesis sentence in the introduction?"—and prefer to deal with "facts, statistics, sensory observations" (48) rather than the riskier realm of conjecture. Because the factual holds such allure, sensing students can have difficulty discerning the relative importance of pieces of data and become overwhelmed and
blocked by their inability to rank and choose.

The intuitive, on the other hand, perceives patterns, relationships between pieces of information, and makes connections. The sensing type, given the assignment to describe a favorite place, will write a physical description, replete with concrete, visual details; the intuitive might begin with the visual description of some element and then move to an abstraction about the importance of having a special place, or the relationship between this place and another.

Both types perceive time very differently: sensing types focus on the present and consequently tend to be time-conscious; deadlines are deadlines and must be met, preferably early. To the intuitive, time, like everything else, is relative; the orientation is toward the future, toward what might be, rather than what is, and frequently deadlines slip away. Sensing types also have a greater tolerance for routine, preferring to master a skill and then make use of it; intuitives lack patience with repetition of any kind, crave variety, and once they have mastered something, dismiss it, preferring to move on to something new—another possibility.

Sensing types have a natural affinity for the clear
structure represented by the five-paragraph theme or similar models. Intuitives find such models restrictive and can even become blocked when faced with having to conform. Differences are also obvious in the way each type approaches revising. Sensing types may regard revising as primarily proofreading or fixing mistakes in grammar or sentence structure; intuitives may appear to go off on tangents trying to find a new and different approach.

In collaborating, problems can arise when sensing types fail to appreciate the validity of the intuitive’s seemingly unconscious processes and insist on linearity or when the intuitive becomes bored by the sensing type’s need to ground the writing in factual information. Benefits abound when both types work to appreciate and incorporate the other’s strengths, when the intuitive’s visions and theorizing can be firmly grounded by the sensing types affinity for concrete specifics.

The Third Scale: Thinking and Feeling. This, the other mental function scale, refers to the preferred process for making decisions. The necessary corollary to gathering information is sorting it out, making decisions with or about whatever data we have gathered. Those who prefer to make decisions based on impersonal logic, cause and effect, a sense that there is, ultimately, justice are identified as
thinking types. Those who prefer to make decisions based on a personal value system, analogous reasoning, a sense that rightness depends on the situation are identified as feeling types. Thinkers tend to value justice; feeling types tend to value harmony. The thinking type decides an issue based on an impartial analysis of the facts, with no concern for the personal; feeling types decide by reflecting, comparing, creating analogies, and always consider the personal element.

In writing, thinking types tend to prefer structure: division and classification, comparison and contrast procedures can be useful heuristics for thinkers, but feeling types may find such methods inefficient because they can easily blur lines of distinction that to an objective viewer seem crystal clear. Jensen and DiTiberio discovered that "Thinking types tend to use structure to develop ideas, while feeling types tend to develop their structure organically from their content" (58). Consequently, certain kinds of writing can be problematic. Personal narratives can be uncomfortable for thinkers, who "usually prefer to write objectively and analytically" (59). Feeling types need to know, to feel, that what they are doing matters, not just that it is right in some abstract sense, but that it is important on a personal level. Not surprisingly, writing as communication matters more to feeling types. Beginning
with the choice of topic and approach, feeling types "are concerned as much about the process of communication, that is, how they are connecting with their audience, as about the content" (62).

Thus the different bases for decision making become elements in the collaborative writing situation. Thinking types, preoccupied with the inherent rightness or fairness of a question may ignore the feeling types need to respond to the personal side; values can clash and conflict result. Feeling types, determined to have harmony, can exacerbate the situation by focusing, not on the issue itself as the thinkers deem necessary, but on the issue of relationships within the group. The possible difficulties attendant on this scale become even more complicated when we realize that this is the only gender-biased scale: 60% of all males are thinkers, 60% of all females are feeling types [See Table 4].

The Fourth Scale: Judging and Perceiving. This scale reflects an attitude--the individual's attitude toward the world, how that person deals with the world or what "face" the individual shows to the world. The differences between the poles of the final scale, as related to writing, most often occur in issues of closure. Those who prefer judging as their interactive style in the world value punctuality,
clarity, order, structure; they prefer to have schedules and keep to them. Judging types frequently prefer quick completion of tasks, so they tend to set manageable goals and to devise plans in order to achieve those goals by the due date, or even better, early. Their planning activity often includes what Flower and Hayes (1981) call process goals (how to get things done), which ideally include plans to stop at key intervals to analyze and revise objectives. Revising tends to be slighted in serving the goal of expediency. Those who prefer perceiving value openness, spontaneity, view order and structure as unnecessarily restrictive; they lose schedules if they make them and tend to either ignore deadlines or switch into overdrive. ("I always work better under pressure.") Perceiving types feel they never have enough information; there is always one more book or article to be read, one more subject to interview, one more test to run, etc.

Whereas judging types may not recognize alternatives, perceiving types may develop too many in an effort to be thorough, possibly resulting in scatteredness. Judging types tend to select rather narrow, manageable topics and to focus on limiting even further, while perceiving types tend to select broad topics, to resist narrowing because they are interested in practically everything. In collaborative groups, having members be aware of these preferences and how
they can complement each other can help to avoid a great deal of potential conflict. Judging types need to be open to further possibilities for support of their ideas, while perceiving types need to be aware that they must reach a point where both are comfortable with the amount of information gathered.

Of course, these descriptions paint each type in rather extreme terms, and, since the majority of people report varying strengths of preference, the key to understanding lies in recognizing that while each individual manifests different strengths of each preference, he or she also has the capability to develop the less preferred functions. Thus, it is the interaction of these preferences within a given personality that characterizes the individual. Jensen and DiTiberio's study gives a dramatically more complete explanation of type and writing; however, they focus exclusively on individual writers. By extending Jensen and DiTiberio's work from a focus on the individual writer to a focus on groups of writers, my study can offer insights into the functioning of writing groups by giving us a framework for (and theoretical support for) determining which group roles will work best for students of different personality types. Also necessary to this study is an examination of the research on collaboration and conflict and a look at the difficulties of defining the terms.
BACKGROUND: RESEARCH ON COLLABORATION

Collaboration in Composition. Ever since Kenneth Bruffee's early groundbreaking efforts to encourage the use of collaborative learning models (1973), composition researchers have demonstrated a growing awareness of and interest in collaborative learning and collaborative writing in its various forms. Bruffee's early work and subsequent studies by Hawkins (1976), Jacko (1978), Coe (1979), Gebhardt (1980) and Clifford (1981) advocate including group work in the writing process, although all of these early studies favor collaboration only as support for the individual author who drafts alone. None of them suggests actual co-authoring. Jacko's Triad students, for example, brought in copies of completed first drafts to share with the group in a highly-structured peer response situation. After each Triad member had served as Reader, Writer, and Observer, she or he then returned to the role of Lone Author, taking the paper home to rewrite it, in isolation. The aspect of collaborative learning that Moffett mentions, that students get "insights about their own writing" by participating in this habitual responding, falls far short of the benefits that we know today can accrue from a more full collaboration in drafting as well as in responding sessions. Quoting from Moffett, Gebhardt points out the roots of collaborative writing/learning in rhetoric, psychology, and learning theory, giving primary importance
to the emotional benefits of peer feedback for the writer. Gebhardt does suggest introducing collaboration earlier—in discovering a topic, generating details, and analyzing the intended audience—in order to counter the feelings of emotional isolation and loneliness that often afflict the writer working alone. Still, just as in earlier studies which variously recommend peer editing (Elbow 1973), peer tutoring/peer group response (Bruffee 1985; Murray 1968), and, somewhat later, Knoblauch and Brannon’s work on writing workshops (1984), the actual composing is left to the individual author.

In more recent work, however, composition scholars Bruffee, Karen Burke LeFevre, Ede and Lunsford, and others have criticized the traditional notion of the individual, autonomous author. These scholars argue for a view of composing as a social or collaborative process because of its inherently dialectical nature. Building on the work of scholars and critics in other fields—Lev Vygotsky’s concept of "inner speech"; Roland Barthes’ call for the death of the author; Foucault’s identification of the author as merely a "privileged moment of individualization in the history of ideas"; Geertz’s notion of culture as "essentially . . . semiotic"—they propose instead the idea of writing as a knowledge-constructing act and an essential element in what Stanley Fish identifies as "interpretive communities."
Researchers Lunsford and Ede (1986, 1987, 1990), Forman and Katsky (1986), Doheny-Farina (1986), Cross (1990), and Locker (1991) have begun to look at the actual process of co-authoring. Evincing a concern that what we teach should reflect, and prepare students for, "real-world" applications and uses of writing, these researchers have studied writers in the business and professional world. Lunsford and Ede began their study with two goals: to determine the extent of collaborative writing in the professional world and to derive "practical lessons from the world of work" to help classroom teachers "better understand and better prepare students for the demands and the rewards of collaboration" ("Collaborative Learning" 19). Although they "ended" the study with even more questions than they began, they did accomplish those goals, discovering that more than 3/4 of professionals engage in collaborative writing (Lunsford and Ede, 1986), findings that corroborate and extend those of Faigley and Miller's 1982 study.

Because of results like these, writing teachers across the country are setting up collaborative situations ranging from group planning to peer editing. However, many experienced teachers (as well as experienced collaborators) agree with Kenneth Bruffee that "Sometimes collaborative learning works beyond my highest expectations. Sometimes it doesn't work at all" (636).
Conflict in Collaboration. Experienced workplace writers have told researchers that conflict frequently occurs during collaborative projects (Allen et al., 1987). When collaboration doesn't work, research indicates, that failure can be attributed to failed group process (Forman and Katsky, 1986; Cross, 1990; Locker, 1991). Yet, while nearly 50% of business writing teachers use collaborative writing techniques, fewer than half of these teach their students how to work in small groups by teaching them about small group dynamics (Bosley, 1989). Problems within groups are especially common where there is very little time (and less training) available for participants to learn in which group roles they feel most comfortable and in which they perform most effectively. Such constraints challenge teachers to find ways to facilitate the collaborative experience for students, but as Lunsford and Ede note in Singular Texts/Plural Authors, despite numerous innovative studies of collaborative writing and learning, teachers of writing just don't know enough yet to make definitive statements about how best to teach students to adapt to collaborative writing situations.

This study closely examines two groups of students in English 304C, Business and Professional Writing, over the course of summer quarter 1991. Both classes were computer-assisted sections of this junior-senior level writing course and both were primarily collaborative. In both classes,
the first assignment was an individually-written introductory memo and the last assignment was an individually-written job package. All other assignments were done collaboratively with each group producing one document representing the work of all group members.

During the piloting of my study, it became obvious that the definition of seemingly clear terms like collaboration and conflict were anything but transparent. During that quarter of piloting, differing definitions of both terms were offered by the teachers participating in the study, the writing group members in the study, and many friends and colleagues who attempted to help by discussing my work with me. In fact, one of the most helpful aspects of that pilot was my realization that I needed to become much more specific in the working definitions of these key terms, collaboration and conflict.

DEFINITIONS

Collaboration. Until recently, the term "collaborative writing" appeared most frequently in academic settings in reference to peer editing, often in groups, of drafts written by a single author. In its most common form, peer editing or responding or critiquing involves a presentation by the individual author of his or her work to a group of students who respond, evaluating the draft according to a
set of criteria established (usually) by the teacher. More recently, increasing awareness of the theories of knowledge as a shared construct, in concert with studies of writing done in business or professional situations, has led to a wider variety of applications of collaborative learning in the writing classroom. Studies like Faigley and Miller's (1982) and Ede and Lunsford's (1990) which reveal the extent of collaborative writing in professional situations promote these classroom applications and are enriched by studies exploring the nature of collaborative writing. Faigley and Miller, surveying 200 professionals about their work-place writing learned that 73.5% of those professionals wrote collaboratively (561). Of the nearly 800 professionals who responded to Ede and Lunsford's surveys, 87% reported that they wrote collaboratively at least some of the time, with 58% reporting that collaboration as productive or very productive.

In an exploratory study of collaboration in the business and professional world, Nancy Allen and her colleagues cite more than eighteen studies of collaborative writing, concluding that given the widespread use of collaborative techniques and methods in both the classroom and the business and professional world,

1) we know too little about collaborative writing in general, and
2) no one has focused on the "special characteristics of collaboration involving group authorship" (73). In their study, Allen, Atkinson, Morgan, Moore, and Snow concentrate on examining the collaborative activities of 14 groups of professionals, in which each group planned, drafted, and revised a single document. These researchers identify three areas of significance in determining the features of collaborative writing in business/professional situations requiring decision by consensus:

1) the important role that conflict plays within collaborative writing groups
2) the actual characteristics of shared-document collaboration
3) the identifying characteristics of groups formed in response to a given task.

Having established that the term "collaboration" refers to a wide range of activities and "collaborative writing" to an equally wide variety of writing experiences, Allen et al note that the imprecision of such terminology leads to a corresponding lack of precision in the interpretation of research on collaborative activities. Their study, then, implies a definition of one kind of collaborative writing: shared-document collaboration, which they describe as collaboration by members of a group who work together substantively on all stages of the writing process to produce a single document, for which they share the
responsibility and on which decisions are made by consensus.

While I recognize that the definitions of collaboration are probably limited only by the number of people defining the term, I chose to use the situational definition of collaborative writing identified by Nancy Allen and her colleagues because, in both classes that I studied, the writing assignments were designed so that each group would produce a single document representing the efforts of all four or five group members. All of the particulars of the writing process, the negotiation of group roles, decisions on how best to approach the problems, and all the arrangements to accomplish the collaboration—which demanded a certain amount of out of class meeting time—were left to the students themselves. Thus, group members shared responsibility for the process, the product, and the result, i.e., the grade on the final project.

Looking at collaboration necessarily involves looking at conflict; where different people work together to achieve a common goal, different ideas, styles, backgrounds, etc. will come into conflict with each other. It becomes important, therefore, to have an operational definition of conflict.

**Conflict.** The term itself has negative connotations, primarily of confrontation and struggle between opposing forces, frequently accompanied by or hinting at violence.
When I asked students and colleagues over a period of time preceding this study how they felt about conflict, their responses were typical of this negative view: "I hate conflict--it spoils everything," I don't like to fight with people--I'd rather give in," "It's easier to get along with people if you don't make waves, you know?" "What's the point of being part of a group if you're going to battle over these things?" "Confrontation makes me uncomfortable."

While a majority of these statements came from women, a number of men admitted to discomfort, although a not uncommon response from the men I asked who were not associated with the university was, "It's no big deal."

These statements reflect prevailing conventional wisdom about conflict, and suggest gender-based differences in attitude. Nevertheless, such negative opinions as are here represented have subsequently led to a social bias toward harmony, a preference for "smooth sailing" over "rocking the boat" or "making waves."

In The Magic of Conflict, Thomas Crum (1987) proposes a neutral view of conflict: neither good nor bad, "Conflict just is" (20). He suggests that the process of negotiating conflict results in our perceiving it as negative or positive. If the people involved creatively use conflict as an instigator of change, looking at it in a positive, non-threatening light rather than making a contest of their
differences, conflict can lead to increased satisfaction and success. With a different view, Deutsch (1973) defines conflict as the incompatibility of activities, present whenever one "action that is incompatible with another action prevents, obstructs, interferes, injures, or in some way makes the latter less likely or less effective" (10). The accepted definition in interpersonal relations explains conflict as the struggle or interaction between at least two interdependent people who perceive incompatible goals and interference from the other in achieving those goals (Frost and Wilmot, 1978; Folger and Poole, 1984), people in opposition who, at the same time, must cooperate. I used this last as my operational definition of conflict in this study.

Conflicts generally fall into two categories: ideational—conflicts involving ideas (the definition of the problem, possible choices of procedure or information gathering, different proposals for solutions) and relational—conflicts involving personal issues (role choice and performance, individual worth, status/power issues). Depending on how the interaction proceeds and what its focus is, conflict can be destructive or constructive. Destructive conflict emphasizes personal issues, is characterized by inflexibility and the need to have a winner and a loser; the goal is to defeat the opposition. Someone
must come out on top, and group goals and the task itself suffer as a result of the focus on negative competition. Constructive conflict focuses on successfully accomplishing the group's goals, while maintaining each member's self-esteem. The interaction is characterized by flexibility and a willingness to examine multiple ideas and points of view. The goal is to reach a successful conclusion acceptable to all parties involved.

METHODOLOGY

Having conducted a collaborative research project with three other graduate students, I had become fascinated by the issues involved in collaboration, particularly conflict negotiation/resolution and the actual process of writing the final collaborative document. Combining these interests in collaborative process and conflict negotiation seemed entirely natural; more problematic, however, were the questions of who to study and how to study them. Because I believe that we can only begin to understand the processes involved in writing—and even more so for collaborative writing—when we study writing in the surrounding situation, the whole context, I decided to focus closely on a small group of students. As I developed my research questions, it became clear that only by doing a descriptive study looking intently at small groups of writers, would I begin to find answers to the questions that intrigued me.
Research Questions

This study investigates the role of personality type in collaborative writing groups by addressing the following questions:

1. How do the personalities of students in collaborative writing groups affect the ways students work collaboratively?

2. In what ways do people with a given personality type behave that might be consistent with Jungian personality type theory as modified by Myers and Briggs?

3. How does the mix of types within the group affect what the group members perceive as conflict? What an outsider might see as conflict?

4. How does the mix of types within the group affect the way the group resolves conflict? Do there appear to be type-related processes of resolving/dealing with conflict?

5. Does giving the students some knowledge of type theory before asking them to function in groups have an effect on the success of the groups?

6. Are some personality types more likely than others to prefer collaboration?
Many of these questions could only be answered by the members of the writing group themselves; therefore, as the only research method that allows the joint telling of the tale by researcher and community members, ethnography was the obvious choice as methodology for this study. Because of its emphasis on context, ethnography met one of my other criteria--the need to look at the entire writing situation. Having spent two years studying this methodology, reading ethnographies, and working with ethnography as a possible pedagogy in the composition classroom, I determined that the best approach would be one using ethnographic methodology.

Preliminary Procedures. In order to find answers to these questions, I designed a study which would employ ethnographic methodology. Ethnography is variously described as "the art and science of describing a group or culture" (Fetterman 11), "the work of describing a culture . . . [aiming] to understand another way of life from the native point of view" (Spradley, Interview 3), and "a theoretically driven, systematic approach to the study of everyday life of a social group" (Zaharlick and Green). Heath cautions us to be careful about the distinctions between ethnographic studies and other naturalistic methods, case studies, for example. Ethnographic studies are distinguished by "consideration by the researcher of the applicability of methods and theories used by
anthropologists . . . [particularly] ethnohistorical research, attention to definition of the unit of study, microethnographic work, linguistic investigations, and analysis of artifacts" (36).

Keeping all of this background in mind, I designed an ethnographic study, using many of the techniques advocated by anthropologists, i.e., participant observation, careful taking of fieldnotes, naturalistic inquiry, collecting artifacts, interviewing the participants, and audio-taping the groups as they met. The pilot study revealed unanticipated flaws in the design, most notably the impossibility of gathering sufficient data from more than one group in a given class and the need to fully negotiate my role as researcher with both the students and the teachers. The former was easily solved: focus on one group by joining it as a participant-observer. The latter involved negotiation of expectations—in multiple directions: the teachers' of me, mine of them and of the students, the group members' of me, and the class's expectations as a whole. Perhaps most important to the smooth progression of the study was clarifying my roles in and out of the classroom.

In one of the classes I studied during the pilot quarter, the students never became quite comfortable with my
presence, and in the other the teacher had some serious reservations about the impact of being observed closely. Therefore, before beginning what I hoped would be the final quarter of the study, I met with several prospective teachers and talked over these issues to determine with which of them I might work with the least amount of frustration and disruption. The two teachers I chose to work with were very different from each other: one male—Michael, one female—AnneMarie; one a friend, one I knew only slightly; one seemed outgoing, the other quite reserved; and I suspected that these differences would also carry into the classroom. With each teacher I made sure to explicitly state—in writing as well as verbally—the scope, purpose, and methods of my study [See Appendix A]. With each, I negotiated similar but slightly different classroom roles. In both classes, my presence was explained to the entire class as a graduate student working on research for the dissertation. I told the classes that I would be closely studying one group of students, but that I would administer the MBTI to all, unless anyone chose not to take it. The teachers and I explained that all students would be given consent forms to sign before the project began and that there would not be any negative consequences for any who chose not to participate. We explained that my presence in the classroom had no relationship to class content and would have none to their grades. I further assured the
students that my role in the group I studied would exclude active, substantive participation in composing their assignments, and that I would always be available to discuss any aspects of my study, personality theory, or my presence in the classroom with any of the students at their convenience.

Of course, having devoted a serious amount of time and thought to these various possible problems and cautions, none of the issues ever came up. No one in either class ever expressed any discomfort with being observed or having me or my tape recorders in the room, nor did anyone question my role in the groups. In both classes, I helped as requested by either teacher or students (with the teacher’s permission) with the computers, and in Michael’s with any questions about general composition issues that students asked. I also monitored the class for Michael when he had to be out due to an illness, so that the students wouldn’t lose another day with the computers.

Questions of Ethnography. In choosing an ethnographic design as methodological framework, I was (and am) aware of the problematic elements in that choice. As Herndl points out, ethnography began to appear as a research methodology in composition just about the time when anthropologists were beginning to raise serious questions about traditional
ethnographic methods and claims, primarily about the ability of ethnographers to claim any measure of objectivity in their representations of the cultures they studied.

Defining ethnography as "the written representation of a culture (or selected aspects of a culture," Van Maanen claims that as such it necessarily "carries quite serious intellectual and moral responsibilities" (1). He believes these problems of representation to be the central methodological issues facing ethnographers. Researchers, he suggests, should focus on examining

(1) the assumed relationship between culture and behavior (the observed); (2) the experiences of the fieldworker (the observer); (3) the representational style selected to join the observer and the observed (the tale); and (4) the role of the reader engaged in the active reconstruction of the tale (the audience) (xi).

Since the act of writing ethnography necessarily involves the rhetoric and the politics of the ethnographer as she attempts to "inscribe" some "other's" experience, as composition researchers, we need to be conscious of the ways we can appropriate--through our disciplinary discourse--the experience of those we study. My rhetorical choices--voice, style, images, illustrations, organization, etc.--significantly shape the final product; what the reader sees is ultimately viewed through my lens, colored by my biases. Being conscious of these possible biases, I have tried to be as objective as possible, to examine the data carefully from the perspective of outsider as well as insider, and to check
my observations against the group members' own. Of course, my position presented its own difficulties. While not a true insider (I was not and never pretended to be an undergraduate), as a student at the same institution (albeit on the graduate level) I shared many of the situations and experiences of the students I studied. Also, as a teacher of writing—and, in fact, of English 304 the previous quarter—I was far from being a complete outsider. Being a member of the community one studies creates its own complications.

In discussing the issues involved in studying one's own community, Moss suggests that we need to be highly conscious of the ethnographer's "degree of membership" in the community and how that might affect the study, of how previous knowledge could affect a researcher's assumptions about what is significant, and what issues might arise when the insider begins to write up the findings. One issue that is crucial to any ethnographic study of communication is the importance of investigating language use in context. Hymes (1974) says that the ethnographer should "look at communication from the standpoint and interests of the community itself, and to see its members as sources of shared knowledge and insight" (8). As a member of the community she studies, an ethnographer carries a double-edged sword: because she is familiar with the conventions
and patterns of language use in the community, she may bring added insight to the collection and interpretation of data, but she may also be blinded by that same familiarity of membership to some events of significance, not recognizing them as important just because they are so familiar. By looking closely at the contexts within which the communicative events take place, I hope to enhance the positive effects of membership and minimize the negative effects.

In the next chapter, I will describe the contexts in which this study took place—the physical surroundings, the course, the demographics of the class, and the teachers—in an effort to provide the reader with as full a sense of the collaborative writing experience as possible. Chapter III focuses on Group A, the group I studied in the 8:00 am class, detailing the writing events associated with two assignments they worked on. Chapter IV presents data from Group B, the group I studied in 10:00 am class. The final chapter draws conclusions from the data, examines implications relevant to collaboration and personality in the classroom, and notes question for future consideration.
CHAPTER II

CONSTRUCTING A READING:
Describing the Contexts

If anthropological interpretation is constructing a reading of what happens, then to divorce it from what happens— from what, in this time or that place, specific people say, what they do, what is done to them, from the whole vast business of the world—is to divorce it from its applications and render it vacant.

--Clifford Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures

INTRODUCTION

Ethnographies are "portraits of diversity" depending on the "peculiar practice of representing the social reality of others through the analysis of one's own experience in the world of these others" (Van Maanen ix). In order to paint the complete portrait, the researcher must therefore include contextual detail. In this chapter, I will present contextual information about the scene and the participants, including descriptions of the courses taught, the teachers, the students in the classes and the students in the groups I studied as well as physical details about the settings or locations of the communicative events. In describing the people and the events in this and subsequent chapters, I will write in the present tense; when I comment on or
analyze the events, I will use the past tense. This is an admittedly artificial framework in which I am nevertheless attempting to construct this reading and differentiate my commentary from the accounts.

THE COURSE

An integral part of the context of this study is the course being taken by both classes I studied (English 304C—Business and Professional Communication). In Business and Professional Communication, students study the techniques involved in writing for business or professional contexts, the appropriate style and organization to use in a variety of writing situations, the necessary conventions to be observed. The writing consists of memos, letters, or reports developed in response to particular problems. Some instructors follow the book (Business and Administrative Communication, by Kitty Locker) exactly, structuring their syllabus around selected chapters and drawing from its end-of-chapter problems the writing assignments for the class. Others use the book as a supplemental text, coming up with their own structure for the course and the assignments. Most classes include a job package which involves having the students locate and bring to class an advertisement or job description for which they will then write a letter of application and prepare a resume. English 304C is the computer-assisted section, so most work is done on
computers. In the collaborative sections, students are further expected to do the majority of the work as part of a writing group. Each completed assignment in a collaborative class, then, is one document representing the work of four or five students.

I studied two collaborative writing groups, one in each of two classes of English 304C. Each class had a final enrollment of seventeen. Both classes I studied met on Monday, Wednesday and Friday; one from 8:00am to 9:00am, the other from 10:00am to 11:00am.

CLASS PROFILES

The Teachers. Although this study focuses on the interactions between members of writing groups, those groups are part of regular classrooms; therefore, the teachers and the other students must be taken into account. The teachers' roles in the classroom have a direct impact on how groups operate, from the assigning of students to particular groups to the way those students approach the writing and the assignments. The two teachers in the classes that I studied had very different teaching styles, although they both reported the same personality type, INFJ (introverted-intuitive-feeling-judgment), on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Both used the same textbook, albeit it in different ways. They both believed writing should be taught
as a series of recursive processes, and both encourage drafting, revision, and rewriting, but the ways that they actually work with students and writing differ dramatically. There were marked differences in their approaches and reactions to the students in class, in the way they structured the class and in their teaching styles, and in the way they responded to written texts.

AnneMarie. The teacher in the 8:00am class, AnneMarie, a doctoral student in the English department, has a background in business communication, having worked in business, taught business communication, and done research in the field. She is small and petite, fair, and her reddish brown hair looks soft. Her size, a smattering of freckles, and her self-contained manner combine to suggest, at first glance, that she is shy, perhaps timid, but make no mistake: while AnneMarie may be somewhat withdrawn, there is nothing timid about this woman. She is quiet and contained, but can be quite forceful when necessary.

In the classroom, she maintains a distance from the students, physically and mentally. At twenty-seven, she appears much more in control and firm in the classroom than many teachers who are not so close to their students in age. The classroom is a place of business; it is where the business of education takes place. AnneMarie at all times
maintains that professional demeanor, never dressing too casually, never flippant or too familiar with the class. She speaks precisely and carefully; she is unfailingly polite. On the first day of class, she has the syllabus completed for the class, and makes no major changes during the quarter; minor ones like the adjustment of a due date for an assignment are announced well in advance and usually as the result of her recognition of some difficulties for the students should she not make the change. AnneMarie's organization provides a stable structure for the class; they may not always be prepared themselves, but they know what to expect from her.

She has divided her syllabus [See Appendix B] into sections centered around six major writing assignments: two individual ones, a self-introductory memo and a job package, and five collaborative documents: a revision of a positive message letter, a fund-raising letter, a negative message letter, a short informative report, and an administrative evaluation memo of recommendation for a job candidate. She has also scheduled a group oral report for the last week of classes and a final exam, but no mid-term. Her syllabus is a personally modified version of the model syllabus for the course and includes specific information about class procedures, grading policy, format for assignments, late-paper policy, revision policy and a long explanation of the
grading standards. With the syllabus she includes handouts on collaboration, helpful hints and troubleshooting guides, and a document produced by an earlier collaborative computer assisted class called, "All for One and One for All--The Collaborative Writing Experience."

Early in the quarter, she establishes a routine which varies only slightly as the course progresses. She begins any section by lecturing and illustrating important points, using transparencies on the overhead projector to demonstrate sample documents, procedures for identifying and correcting errors, and alternative methods to approach a topic. During the lecture-demonstration, she begins by making an introductory statement of what she intends to cover, introduces the material, and then asks for student feedback. The students rarely reply with much animation, but AnneMarie never seems discouraged, never loses focus. She responds to students' writing promptly and invites them to conference with her should they have any questions on an individual basis. Not many do.

Her personality type (INFJ) suggests that she would be quiet, keeping her enthusiasm inside because her focus is on the internal world of thoughts and ideas; that she might prefer written to face-to-face communication; that she often might prefer to work alone, developing ideas by reflection
rather than in dialogue with another; that she would tend to operate on a schedule, with an agenda thoughtfully worked out in advance; that she would consider logic and objectivity important assets; and that she would tend to dislike surprises, preferring to know in advance what to expect, and that a priority would be getting things done, on schedule. These aspects of her type description fit her well; there were some others that did not seem to describe her at all. For example, INFJ's are reported to "Prefer change, sometimes radical, to continuation of what is." AnneMarie seemed quite content with business as usual, witness her choice of the model syllabus and her unchanging approach to the class structure. INFJ's also "May make errors of fact"; I never had occasion to see any such errors.

Michael. The teacher in the 10:00am class, Michael, was also a doctoral student in the English department. Everything about Michael's approach was different from AnneMarie's. Also twenty-seven, Michael is tall and slim, with crisp black hair, a trim beard, and very green eyes. He dresses much as the students do, in this summer quarter frequently wearing khaki shorts and polo shirts, sandals and a tan. Michael has a great sense of the absurd and a most engaging manner; he laughs a lot and easily with the students, and they respond to his openness by participating
actively in class discussions and talking and joking with him before and after, and sometimes during, class.

In the classroom, he appears to be quite the extravert, always in the center of things, moving around, talking and gesturing constantly. The class feels relaxed; even though they have a great deal to do, they do not seem in any way pressured. Michael's approach to structure is much more the approach of an NP than an NJ, much less structured and organized than one might expect. On the first day of class, we are locked out of the room at first, and once we are in Michael calls out the names on the roster, explains add-drop, finds out who's not registered and identifies those who are. He then talks briefly about the nature of this computer-assisted collaborative class and gives the students the three-page handout "All for One and One for All--The Collaborative Writing Experience." He then asks them to pair up with another person and interview each other so they can introduce each other to the class. He writes a series of questions on the board as guidelines and tells them they have about fifteen or twenty minutes. His manner is casual and chatty; there is no formality whatsoever, and once the students start the introductions, he becomes even more animated, asking questions, making comments, joking about some of the responses. Everyone participates, commenting back and forth; the whole session is quite lively and
Michael discovers some interesting things about his students. With three minutes to the bell, he settles them down, sums up what he had told them earlier, notes the assignment on the board— they must write a self-introductory memo to him, read the handout and be prepared to discuss it at the next class— and dismisses the class. The students leave slowly, many stopping to speak to him, most lingering and talking with the people they sat with. This congeniality marks this class for the quarter, as does this casual, seemingly unstructured approach of Michael's.

Michael brings a syllabus to the second class, but the dates are wrong and it's only for the first week and a half of class. He explains the goals of the course, and goes over his assignment structure. He has planned for the students to write three individual assignments: the introductory memo, a memo in which they propose a project for group work and analyze the prospective audience, and the job package; a two-part group project which will lead to an oral group presentation, a mid-term exam and weekly writing logs. He explains that adjustments may be made throughout the quarter depending on the viability of these assignments. His syllabus contains information on attendance (required), revision and late paper policy, and his approach to responding to their drafts: he will not look at every draft they write, but will look at and respond in writing to at
least one. He promises that when he reads it, he is reading not "looking for a grade, but as an informed reader," who will note a few problems, but be sure to "point out what I really like." He also has built in peer responding as part of the class participation segment of the grade. He notes that his "job here is to be a resource-person and a facilitator; your jobs are to learn and help each other learn." And that is both his philosophy and his approach in the classroom.

For each assignment and each part of the group project assignment, Michael gives the students a written memo detailing what he envisions the paper to be, the goals of the assignment, due date, format, and a summary of key points. The remainder of the syllabus comes in installments, also in memos. And this causes the students some difficulty; in comments to me and in their final logs evaluating the course, many mention that a little more structure and a clear and defined syllabus on the first day would help them better plan their workload.

This lack of attention to detail in terms of the schedule is more in keeping with the behavior one might expect from a perceptive (P) type rather than a judging (J) type. Some of the descriptors for J’s are

* Work best when they can plan their work and follow their plan
* Like to get things settled and finished
* Schedule projects so that each step gets done on time
* Use lists as agendas for action

Some of the descriptors for P's are

* Do not mind leaving things open for last-minute changes
* Adapt well to changing situations
* Get a lot accomplished at the last minute under pressure of a deadline
* Use lists as reminders of things they have to do someday.

Michael does not meet the textbook description of a judging type; however, it is such differences and varied examples of behavior that make personality type theory appealing. The theory does not attempt to account for every aspect of an individual's identity, and in fact resists stereotyping by stressing that even people who report the same type, like Michael and AnneMarie, actually behave differently because of the different ways the preferences manifest themselves.

The 8:00am Class. This class, AnneMarie's class, had twenty students, seventeen of whom took the MBTI. There were thirteen women, seven men in the class; eighteen seniors, four of whom were graduating that quarter; two juniors, both of whom were men. Ten of the students had part-time jobs; two were married, Alan H. father of a one year old, and Karen S. mother of three boys. [These demographics can be seen in Table 1.] There was not a great
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EN 304C 8:00 am</th>
<th>NAME/SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>EMPLOYED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AnneMarie/f</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Grad.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie R./f</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie M./f</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Human Resource Mgmt.</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi O./f</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol S./f</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert F./m</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David W./m</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian F./f</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald M./m</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor P./f</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy F./f</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernie K./m</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missy M./f</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby S./f</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen S./f</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Medical Communication</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan H./m</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hospitality Mgmt.</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace C./f</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Pre-law/Psychology</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EN 304C 10:00 am

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME/SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>EMPLOYED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael/m</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Grad.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon T./f</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>History of Art</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David B./m</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin B./m</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert J./m</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian M./m</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert K./m</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin K./m</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Agricultural Economics</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian D./f</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole M./f</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dani W./f</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason C./m</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam D./m</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mgmt. Infor. Science</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate M./m</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristy S./f</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hotel Management</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly P./f</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie M./m</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristi B./f</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
deal of racial and ethnic diversity in this class: no African-, Hispanic-, or Asian-Americans in the class; in fact, the only minority was a Filipino woman. Ages broke down as one forty-three year old, one twenty-nine year-old, two twenty-five year olds, five twenty-three year olds, and six twenty-two year olds. The personality types can be seen in Table 2, a Personality Type Table.

The group I studied included two women who reported a clear preference for introversion on the MBTI, one who reported a slight preference for introversion, and one who reported a slight preference for extraversion [See Table 3]. The instructor also reported a clear preference for introversion. However, the class as a whole reflected the percentage of types in the general population as compiled from the more than fifty years of research on personality type reported in the Manual. [See Table 4].

The 10:00am Class. In this class, there were nineteen students originally; one transferred to the 8:00am section, one added late and chose not to take the MBTI, so again there were seventeen students typed. Eleven men took the class, eight women. This class had even less diversity than the other: no minorities at all and no one over the age of twenty-six. As is usual for this class, most were seniors.
In the 10:00 o'clock class, the group I studied included five extraverts: one woman who reported a very clear preference for extraversion, one man and one woman who each reported clear preference, and one man and one woman who each reported moderate preference. [See Table 5.] The instructor, although reporting a clear preference for introversion, was very extraverted in the classroom. The class, as a whole reported 83% extraverts and only 17% introverts. [See Table 4.]

CREATING A MOOD: THE PHYSICAL SETTING OF EACH CLASS

Room 307: The 8:00am Class. Located on the south side of the building, Room 307 sits quiet and dark at a few minutes before eight on this late June morning, the first class day of Summer Quarter. The small classroom, actually an IBM computer lab, seems overfull of equipment with twenty computers and three printers crowded around the perimeter, forming a rough rectangle of pc's enclosing the five round writing tables at which the students will sit. As you enter the room from the north, on your right is the teacher's or monitor's station: a file server on a table joins at right angles a longer table, facing the class, on which the teacher's pc stands flanked by two laser printers. This L-shaped formation sets off the teacher's space from the rest of the classroom. To the right, about three feet of open space separates the teacher's dark brown, formica desk/table
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debbie R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debbie M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heidi O.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David W.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marian F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Donald M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eleanor P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katy F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ernie K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference Level</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Clear Preference</strong> (41 or higher; 31 for F)</td>
<td>Respondents who report very clear preferences usually agree that they hold the preferences reported by the MBTI, and often the attitudes and skills that accompany those preferences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clear Preference</strong> (21-39; 29 for F)</td>
<td>Reasonable probability that the respondent holds and acts on the reported preference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate Preference</strong> (11-19)</td>
<td>Respondent may still most often agree with the description of the reported preference, but the interpreter should inquire whether the interpretation fits and should be alert for questions about preference during the explanation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slight Preference</strong> (1-9)</td>
<td>Respondent has essentially &quot;split the vote.&quot; The interpreter should encourage the respondent to consider whether he or she prefers and adequately uses the reported preference. Low scores are often associated with a sense of tension between the poles of the low preference. Reporting of slight preferences could also indicate responding in a socially expected manner, or conflicts between external expectations and internal preferences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4

Estimated Frequency of Types

In the General Population:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>60% m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>60% f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceiving</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the EN 304C 8:00 am class:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>60% m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>58% f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceiving</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the EN 304C 10:00 am class:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraverts</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>60% m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>71% f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceiving</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from a simple yellow-varnished oak library table, set at right angles to the class, on which perches the overhead projector. The student pc's start immediately to the right of the library table. The blackboard along the west wall, behind this line of furniture, is blocked by a portable whiteboard, and at the end of this space on the south wall, before the windows and the student pc's start, is a large double-doored, black metal cabinet, on top of which stand computer manuals and software help packets. Having two of the windows blocked by the huge air conditioners necessitated by the computers does not help the lighting in the room. Even with all the overhead lights on, this classroom seems dark. Physically, this space is unappealing; crowded with furniture and computers, cramped in the center--the student writing space--it seems gray even on the sunniest of days. [See Figure 1.] The atmosphere here may contribute to the subdued nature of the students and the teacher.

Room 343: The 10:00am Class. Also located on the south side of the building, Denney 343 is brighter, with more windows and a larger space with a different layout. Having the teacher's/monitor's desk at one end and the overhead and board at the other creates a sense of openness and forces the instructor to move between them. When you enter this room, on your left are bookcases, on your right a row of
Table 5

Personality Type Table
The 10:00 o'clock Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharon T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert J.</td>
<td>Robert K.</td>
<td>Marian D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian M.</td>
<td>Kevin K.</td>
<td>Nicole M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dani W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jason C.</td>
<td>Kelly E.</td>
<td>Eddie M.</td>
<td>Kristi B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sam D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nate M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kristy S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pc's, and ahead the teacher's desk with the file server and storage cabinets. The added space, making the room less crowded, and the brightness contribute to a more cheerful atmosphere. And the location of the overhead, while somewhat inconvenient because teachers have to move the table out when they want to use it, does draw the attention away from the teacher's desk, so there is no isolation as in Room 307. [See Figure 2.] Because the 10:00am class has so many more extraverts than the 8:00am class, and because many people tend to be more awake at 10:00 than at 8:00, I would not claim that the physical setting was solely responsible for the difference in class personality, but I would suggest that it plays a role.

GETTING TO KNOW THEM: THE CLASSES BEFORE GROUPS ARE SET

The 8:00am Class. The area at the front of the room—about 5 feet by 20 feet—is congested with furniture and the physical artifacts of technology, forming a barricade between the teacher and the students. Indeed, when the teacher, Anne Marie, and I enter we go into an awkward space-selecting dance as I try to find a place to stand where I will be less obvious than she. I don't want the students to be confused about which of us is the teacher, and I don't want Anne Marie to feel uncomfortably aware of my presence in the room. I know it is impossible for the
Figure 1: Denney 307

Laser Printer
Figure 2: Denney 343
observer to disappear, but I want to minimize any possible disruption of the routine on this first day of class. AnneMarie is tiny, petite, with light chestnut hair and delicate features; her manner is restrained and quiet, and I feel that next to her, I am just too large and obvious and thus might draw students' attention more. We settle on my sitting behind the teacher's computer while she stands in the open space between the formica desk and the library table. Standing there, she picks up the textbook and a folder containing her class notes and the roster; she looks through the notes and then takes out the roster. Standing where she is and holding the roster seems to establish AnneMarie as the teacher to the students' satisfaction; at least they look at her more than at me. This position and location is one to which she returns every day, even after I have moved into the class and joined my group. She seldom ventures beyond this teacher-space, as if she feels more comfortable when she is in front of the group, in this set-apart space.

As students enter on this first day of class, they focus on AnneMarie after a glance or two at me, probably wondering why there are two of us here, but they seem to have little active interest. Most glance up at us once or twice as they settle themselves, then begin to talk softly to those nearest them or look at their notebooks. A couple
of the students obviously know one another, talking and laughing easily and with great familiarity as they enter and take seats together. On the whole, after a few minutes most ignore my presence.

Quiet and soft-spoken, Anne Marie effects a no-nonsense approach with the class by maintaining a certain formality. She does not joke or banter with entering students, although she is unfailingly polite, greeting them as they enter, and responding immediately and with interest if they address her. When the bell rings, Anne Marie introduces herself, identifies the course "English 304C: Business and Professional Communication," and calls the roll from her roster, explaining to the gathered students that those not already registered for this much-wanted class are unlikely to get in. As she talks, students continue to drift in until all spaces are taken. By 8:07, all spaces are taken and one student is standing near the door, three students at the rear of the class, and everyone is looking over the syllabus, with occasional glances at Anne Marie and me. At 8:08, Catherine, from our Computers in Composition and Literature office, comes in and gives students a 7 minute introduction to the IBM pc's.

These first ten minutes set the tone for this class for the entire quarter. It will be much quieter, seem much more
focused on accomplishing task goals efficiently and quickly than the other class I observe. Later, I wonder what role the personalities of teachers have on the personalities of their classes. I suspect the overall class tone reflects a combination of physical surroundings, teacher's personality, time of day, and the personality mix of the class as a whole.

After the computer explanation, which involves a brief description of the software (Microsoft Word for Windows), how to use the hardware (IBM) and the mouse, Catherine explains the available support from the English Department's Computers in Composition and Literature program and leaves. Anne Marie asks the class how many have done group work before? How many have had positive or negative experiences? What were they? They respond slowly, and only a few students comment, seeming to be evenly split between positive and negative experiences with collaboration. Anne Marie then explains that groups frequently have problems, talks about some of the possible problems, and asks for responses about their experiences. Again, the reaction is slow and slight, but the usual comments come out: "One person always takes over," "One person--usually me--gets stuck doing all the work," "It's unfair to be graded individually for work that a group does." Some of the positive experiences have to do with proofreading and
editing, and with the increased creativity possible in group work "because you get different angles on things, different ideas." Anne Marie then explains that this class is a collaborative class, that all documents in the class with the exception of the introductory memo and the final job package will be done in groups which she will assign. It is clear from their questioning looks and the comments I overhear--"Collaborative? What does she mean? How does that work?"--that this is news to most of the class.

At this point, twenty minutes into the class, Anne Marie suggests that they get to know each other, try to meet as many of their classmates as possible while she goes from table to table answering any questions they may have. The students, however, remain as they were originally, sitting at the writing tables in groups formed by the accident of seat selection on arrival. Only one or two students extend themselves--and those only by leaning over to the next table--beyond the group they are in; no one moves from his or her original table. Based on our conversation before the class, this is not what the teacher had in mind, but she doesn’t force movement on them. After fifteen minutes, she asks that each person introduce one other student to the rest of the class, giving some interesting detail. Anne Marie had envisioned this as an ice-breaker, a move that would get the students talking and involved with each other.
Instead, each student introduces the person immediately next to him or her as briefly as possible, saying only the name, the major, and where that person is from. In five minutes we’ve exhausted the possibilities, and at 8:40 she dismisses them.

Again, this behavior characterizes the class for the quarter. They participate in discussion, but never in an animated manner. Anne Marie frequently leads them into the points she wants to make. The following sample from the second week of classes demonstrates:

_AnneMarie_: I’d like to go over Ch. 7 first, and, uh, you attitude. What is you attitude, first of all, and why do you use it?

[A student answers that she can’t hear the question; the air conditioner is too loud. AnneMarie replies, agreeing, and then repeats the question more loudly]

_AnneMarie_: You-attitude: what is it and why do you use it?

[A student begins to reply; AnneMarie leans toward her and says "What’s your name?"]

_Katy_: [Slowly and softly] It’s, um, it’s like not blaming the reader for . . .

_AnneMarie_: Okay, that’s, um, that’s one of the rules, is uh, for you-attitude, that when you have a negative situation to try not to blame the readers, and make it into a personal thing. (Can’t hear.) And so why, do you use it? What’s the attitude you’re trying to . . .?

_Katy_: You focus on the person . . .

_AnneMarie_: So you can direct it towards the person who’s receiving the letter instead of being about what you want. You want to think about first what you want to accomplish, so when you write the letter you want to
phrase it so that the reader knows you are considering
his or her opinion and what their concerns are. You
might start it out with what they’re most concerned
about and then get to your, um, points you make later
on. Okay. What are some of the, Diane gave us some of
the ways to get you-attitude. What are some of the
other ways?

Greg: Sometimes, uh, when you’re using, when you’re
not using you attitude, basically it’s negative
response, basically.

AnneMarie: That’s one of the reasons to use it, to
avoid saying "Do this, do that." That’s not going to go
over real well. You’re using it to show them what
benefits they get out of it. What kinds of things
could you do to get you attitude?

Diane: You shouldn’t tell the reader it’s, like, your
opinion because it could irritate him.

AnneMarie: It doesn’t seem like the reader’s attitude
ought to be involved. . . Here’s some more ways.
[Pointing to the transparency.] In other words, don’t
go on saying "Don’t do this, don’t do that" "You can’t
do this, can’t do that." You want to show them what
they can do. You can’t use this . . . That way it
this sounds more positive and the reader feels better
getting something like that. Again, I said talk about
what the reader is concerned about and do not refer to
your request. If they ask you, uh, for a certain
privilege or credit or whatever, then mention that kind
of thing first, that addresses their main concern.
Otherwise, they’re just waiting to get to your point.
Plus, um, feelings, don’t assume you know what the
reader feels and then, too, don’t talk about your own
feelings all the time.

There is a lot of AnneMarie here and very little of the
students. What a transcript cannot show is the tone of
voice, the eagerness or lack of it that characterizes
exchanges between teachers and students. In this class,
AnneMarie approached all the material very matter-of-factly.
The students participated almost reluctantly, as if they
were not really awake. And that could be part of it—
8:00am perhaps many of them just had not had enough rest to be animated and interested.

Because of unexpected outpatient surgery, I miss the second class. However, the third class meeting, during which AnneMarie and I have agreed to introduce me and my research project to the class, plays a significant role in determining how I chose which group to study. After taking roll, Anne Marie introduces me explaining only that I am a graduate student studying collaborative writing, and a number of knowing looks pass from student to student. As juniors and seniors at this large research institution, this is not the first time these students have faced a data-collecting grad student. I briefly explain the study, that I will use recordings, fieldnotes, interviews, and I assure them that participation in this study is entirely voluntary, that even taking the MBTI is not required. I then briefly explain the MBTI, offer them the option of participating, and distribute the consent forms required by the University's Human Subjects Review Committee. One student, Arthur, declines to participate, claiming he has "taken the MBTI three times in the last year." Every one else is willing, a few even eagerly reaching for the forms, but the other two men at Arthur's table also decline, at first giving no reason. When I offer them the forms, they look confusedly from one another to Arthur and back at the form.
Neither looks at me; finally one says, "No, I don't want to." Then a half-second later, the other returns the form to me, still without looking at me, and mumbles, "Me, too." I am surprised, but move on, wondering if their behavior will affect the rest of the class, but it doesn't seem to. Two weeks later one of the two tells me he declined because he "felt" Arthur's strong disapproval; he himself had no reason not to want to participate, and now feels "kinda funny about it." The other seventeen students participate, with varying degrees of interest and eagerness, some professing interest in learning what their type is, others merely going along with the flow.

Aside from this being the first time a student has ever refused to take the MBTI when I offered the chance, this is the weakest, least interested reaction to the MBTI that I have ever had in a classroom. As the students work quietly, I wonder what this will mean for the study. The lack of enthusiasm could be resistance to being studied, or to the presence in their room of an outsider; they may be feeling overwhelmed by the prospect of this class being both computer-assisted and collaborative; perhaps they are not at their best at 8:00 am, or it might just be that they are more introverted and quiet. Being asked later, most of the students said they weren't at all affected by the presence of an observer, especially since I confined myself to one
group except when asked by different students for help with the computers. (As part of negotiating my role in the class, I had offered to help Anne Marie with the computer part of the class, since this was an IBM class and I have IBM clones at home.) All the students knew the course would involve computers before they registered for it, and only a few were bothered by the required collaboration. Most also agreed that eight o'clock was not their preferred class time. Also, this was clearly not a primarily introverted class—only four students turn out to be introverts. These considerations color my plans for introducing the details of the study to the students and have a role in how I will choose which group to study.

The 10:00am Class. The start of class for these extraverts couldn't be more different than it was for the Introverts. Initially we are locked out of the room, and students gather in the hall near the door exchanging cracks about the situation: "Off to a great start!" or variations on that theme characterize most of the chatter. A few mention that they "wouldn't mind going back home and doing this on Wednesday." But Michael, the instructor, has the combination (all the computer classrooms in Denney Hall have sophisticated electronic locks) and arrives within minutes to open the door, laughing and joking with the students about the delay. Michael's casual approach and relaxed
demeanor make him, according to the students, easily approachable. Tall and slim, his black hair and beard striking against his tan, Michael looks as if he spends every spare moment outdoors, and his clothes make him almost indistinguishable from the students--his navy blue polo shirt, faded khaki-green walking shorts, and sandals differ only in color from what many of the students are wearing.

Once we are inside, the students settle, most taking seats at the five writing tables in the center of the room, a few at the pc's on the perimeter. Michael identifies himself and the course, and takes roll from the roster. Surprisingly, there are only fourteen students present, although there are twenty on the class roster. Michael explains the add-drop procedure because some of the fourteen are not on the list and very much want to take the class. He then begins to talk about the collaborative nature of the class, explaining that the students will be in groups of his choosing for the entire quarter, that each group will work together to produce a series of documents--all related--and the final project will be the culmination of these efforts. He hands out a three page description of a computer-assisted collaborative writing class written by students and the teacher of one Winter Quarter section of English 301, Advanced Informative Writing. Entitled "All For One And One For All--The Collaborative Writing Experience," the
document is designed to help out students trying to decide whether or not they should take English 301C. Through four different myths and facts about the class and two personal experience accounts, students will be able to see what English 301C is really all about!

Although few students read it immediately, most look over it right away and all will read it before the next class: Michael reminds them it’s part of their assignment. Talking to a few later, I discover that they thought the document helped them get a clear sense, from the first, of what would be expected of them in the class, especially in terms of time and effort. This seemed innocuous at the time, but later I came to believe that being required to read this paper gave these students something of an edge over the other class. Both classes had the document, but only the students in the 8:00 o’clock class ever mentioned using it. AnneMarie also distributed this paper, but included it in a handout with four other pages about collaboration in writing, and many of her students either never read it or didn’t remember having read it when asked about it later. Referring to it periodically helped Michael’s students understand that their experiences were not unique or unduly frustrating and that other students had found the collaborative class challenging and demanding, but rewarding.

During these early minutes of the class, Michael is in
constant motion, walking around the writing tables, reading from the roster, dispersing the handouts. He stops occasionally to lean against a pc table, but the norm is easy movement. After talking about the collaboration aspect for a few minutes, Michael explains that today the students will need to interview one another and then each will introduce one other person to the rest of us. He has a list of questions he wants them to use, but tells them that of course they are free to branch out on their own as long as they elicit the information he suggests. He moves to the board and begins to write the following questions on the board, reading them aloud as he goes and briefly explaining or illustrating if it seems helpful.

1. Where are you from? What’s your major? What brought you to OSU?

2. What was/is your family like?

3. What are your career goals right now?

4. Name 3 things that distinguish you from everyone else in this room.

He tells them they have about twenty minutes for the interview, and then he moves out of the central area and walks toward me. I have been sitting on the perimeter watching, but not participating. The students seem curious about who I am, since my lack of participation makes it obvious that I am not a student, while Michael’s attitude
toward me indicates that I am supposed to be here. But no
one asks. We agree that the class, off to a slow start,
looks like it will go well. The students seem eager and
attentive. After about fifteen minutes, Michael walks to
the board and writes out the assignment for the next class.

Walking back into the central area when the twenty
minutes of interview time have passed, he asks one of the
students, Diane, to introduce someone to the class. As the
introductions progress, the students become even more
relaxed, talking easily and laughing appreciatively at
remarks like, "Jane’s at OSU because it’s close--she’s from
Westerville." In fact, all but one of the students is from
Ohio, a majority from Columbus, and many have chosen OSU
because "it’s a family tradition." Sharing this kind of
information seems to draw them together and there is a great
deal of chatter among the tables. This class laughs a lot,
and Michael’s dry sense of humor seems to appeal to them
immediately. As the students are introduced, he focuses on
each one, periodically asking for a bit of clarification,
noting information he finds interesting--one student has
been to the Arctic Circle, another is from Hong Kong
(unfortunately for diversity, he drops the class after this
first day), one writes ad copy for local radio and models
professionally. The students react positively to his
interest in them, smiling and looking directly at him when they talk.

When the introductions are complete, Michael introduces me; we note that what distinguishes me from the rest of the class is my advanced age, my four children, and that I am here to study them as part of my dissertation. At this point, I briefly explain my study and my use of the MBTI to help them identify their personality types. I explain the voluntary nature of the study, distribute the consent forms, and remind them that they need not participate if they feel any reluctance at all.

Because Michael wants to use the personality information from the MBTI when he groups the students, we have agreed to administer the instrument during the second class. Since I have been unexpectedly scheduled for outpatient surgery the next morning, we explain that Michael will monitor the class while they take the MBTI with my written instructions. I tell the class that once I have scored their responses, I will be available to talk with them further about their individual personality types and that at any time, I am available to talk with them about type theory. Most of the class wants very much to learn about their personalities. Some are less vocal and animated, but none refuse or even hesitate when given the
consent forms.

Michael then proceeds to sum up, reminding the class that the assignment is written on the board, it must be typed, and that they need to come to class having read the "All For One" handout and prepared to discuss collaboration. He uses his voice to indicate to the class that he is switching gears, raising it and having a more firm tone when he needs them to pay close attention. Later, I note that sometimes he resorts to laughingly telling them to quiet down, but in most cases, he is able to control the tenor of the class by his actions and voice.

During this class, Michael also hands out the syllabus—through the following Monday. (He distributes his syllabus in stages over the quarter, necessitating an explanation each time.) The students seem content with the verbal overview and the limited concrete detail, and he moves on to discuss the first assignment—which is an individual memo or letter each student must write introducing herself or himself to the instructor. This is a common introductory assignment in the Business and Professional Writing courses, and Michael intends to use the information as part of his grouping plan.

Just before the third class begins, Michael and I talk
briefly about how he plans to group students. He is adamant about not putting them in groups until he "knows something about them--as people and as writers." He's particularly loath to put a good writer with a bad one: "It makes for, at best, a very uncomfortable situation." He wants to include information about their attitudes, interests, time schedules, personality and desired grade in his decision making process.

At 10:00, he calls the class to order and informs them that the "Apple Folks" are coming to explain the computers. He then hands out lab schedules and his memo to them detailing the second assignment, which he has called Assignment #1, a memo describing a problem worthy of consideration by the group for five weeks. This causes confusion; having been told that the introductory memo they are about to turn in was assignment one, some of the students question exactly what is due now and what on Monday. One student asks, "Is this a group assignment?" From the assenting comments which follow her question, it's clear that she voices the misunderstanding felt by many. Michael responds by explaining how this next assignment, although prepared individually and without even knowing who will be in what group, will actually be the seed for the project which will occupy the rest of the quarter. As they read his memo, the students question him and each other
about the nature of the assignment. It's obvious that they
don't find the memo as clear as he thought it would be, so
he must spend some time verbally elaborating on the
assignment and his expectations.

After about twenty minutes, we begin to suspect that
the Apple Folk have forgotten about us. Michael tells the
students to go ahead and start up their Macs and he will
walk them through the explanation himself. Unfortunately,
none of the machines will completely boot up; they proceed
to a point and then flash a "file server down" error
message. Michael tries repeatedly to correct the problem; I
call the Apple Office, but neither of us is successful, and
he finally dismisses the class. His frustration with the
machines is evident, and the students respond by making
soothing—"Don't worry; it'll probably work on Monday"—or
humorous—"Great class, Michael! Really smooth." remarks as
they leave. I am surprised by their lack of irritation and
frustration; they seem remarkably even-tempered after what
was a apparently a less-than-successful class, at least from
a teacher's perspective.

During the fourth class, Michael collects the last bit
of information that he wants before he groups the students.
He needs scheduling information—ongoing commitments like
jobs and other classes or vacation plans that might take a
student away for part of the time, GPA and desired grade in this class, and he asks about students' experiences with group work. The information he needs to have comes from an information sheet he gives them to fill out at the beginning of the fourth class. This fourth class is split into three parts: for the first fifteen minutes the students fill out the forms; then Michael leads the class in a brainstorming session, establishing the criteria for the evaluation of the assignment, the audience-analysis memo, as a group. After asking for a volunteer to write up the responses on the board, and getting no reaction, he requests that one student take careful notes of the criteria they select as he writes on the board, claiming that his nearly illegible handwriting will be nearly impossible for them to read. The third section, the remaining twenty minutes, he devotes to a discussion of one of the student's memos which he has put on an overhead, with the criteria and the memo displayed next to each other. The students go through the memo checking to see how well it meets the criteria. There is a great deal of animated discussion and interaction, focusing on helping the memo achieve its goals, with Michael prompting but the students taking control.

At this point, I wonder what effect this whole-class collaboration will have on the individual groups once they are formed. These four days of sitting together in small
groups but not actually being assigned to formal groups seem to have given the students a stronger class identity than the Introvert class has. As the quarter progresses, this discrepancy between the two classes becomes more clear in the way these groups do or do not interact and collaborate with each other in the classroom. And in the group that I study from this class, it is obvious that the members have a stronger interest in the emotional well-being of their group than the group from the other class do in theirs.

ASSIGNING GROUPS: THE OVERT PROCESSES

The 8:00am Class: Group A. AnneMarie assigns her students to their groups by the third class. She uses the information gathered from their introductory memos—information about their educational background, family life, interests, and goals—supplemented by what she has been able to glean from the first two classes to group them. Some of the groups are formed because they have similar interests, some because their schedules suggest few conflicts for setting meeting times out of class. One group are all women, who also have in common an interest in sports and physical fitness. Because she doesn't want to know or to use the students' personality type information as part of her process, there is no need for me to be involved, and she does the grouping by herself, giving me the information just
before class on the third day.

On this third day of class, Anne Marie greets me with a whispery voice, explaining that because she has a sore throat there will be no instructor-led, class-wide discussion. She will instead "allow the students to get into their groups and get to know each other." Then she'll introduce me to talk for a few minutes about the study, my role in the group, etc. Anne Marie has a list of the groups which I copy quickly while she calls role and starts to get them into their groups. Three of the groups I immediately reject: one is only three students, and I have decided to do four—the prospect of having only one or two group members should one be absent deters me from fewer than four, and as it turns out later, this was a wise choice. The three-member group frequently becomes a one-member group. The other two contain Arthur and one of the other students who has refused to participate. The fourth group contains a student who has told me she "knows all about the MBTI" because she has an agriculture TA who is using it in one of her classes, and since AnneMarie and I have agreed that the MBTI information will not be part of the class other than the most minimum description needed to accompany the results, I would prefer not to have to deal with one member of the group knowing about type and the others not knowing. So, I choose the remaining group, four women—Karen, Debbie A., Debbie B.,
and Heidi—the only group with no objectors and no previous knowledge of the Myers-Briggs. I particularly want a group with minimal or no knowledge of the MBTI because I want to be able to compare their collaborative behavior with the other class I am studying, which, at the request of its instructor, will be given some instruction in personality theory. Since Anne Marie has said she prefers not to use personality theory as part of her criteria for assigning groups, and the other instructor I am studying not only wants to use his students' types to set groups, but also would like me to talk to the class as a whole about type theory, this choice offers me the chance to look at the role that knowledge of type theory may or may not play in collaboration in these groups. I will refer to the group in the 8:00 am class from now on as Group A.

The 10:00am Class: Group B. Michael has a complete process worked out to put his students in groups; because he wants to use the information from the MBTI for this class, he includes me in the process. After the fifth class, we meet to talk about the grouping process. First, Michael draws up a chart with the categories GPA, desired grade, MBTI result, class schedule, work schedule. Consulting the information sheets that the students filled out, and the list of types that I gave him, he tentatively groups people according to GPA, desired grade, and MBTI type. [See Table
6.] Then he looks at each student's type in these initial groupings and asks me questions about the tentative groups, for example: "In a group of three extraverts, would a lone introvert survive well?" I give very general answers, wanting the groups to be ultimately his choice. I limit my input to information about general type characteristics; for example, to his question about the introvert among three extraverts, I reply that the introvert is likely to be quieter than the others, but that doesn't mean the introvert won't function well. That would depend on a number of other factors, including how well the groups were prepared about the differences in type and how to appreciate those differences, as well as how strong the preferences for introversion and extraversion were. After I answer his questions, he tries to balance the students' class/work schedules to minimize difficulty in setting up out of class meetings. Finally, he re-reads each student's introductory memo to determine whether he has matched writers of reasonably similar abilities.

This process takes several hours. After making several changes, he decides that he has a finished version and writes up the four groups. I look over the groupings, reread the introductory memos, consult my notes, and look at his information sheets, and decide on the group with five extraverts. Knowing that in the other class I will be
### TABLE 6

**Personality Types and Strength of Preference**

**Group A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>I(35)</th>
<th>N(27)</th>
<th>F(31)</th>
<th>J(11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AnneMarie</td>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>E (9)</td>
<td>S(45)</td>
<td>F(43)</td>
<td>J (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie R.</td>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>I(33)</td>
<td>S(23)</td>
<td>T(47)</td>
<td>J(49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie M.</td>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>I(23)</td>
<td>S(49)</td>
<td>F (1)</td>
<td>J (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>I (3)</td>
<td>S(25)</td>
<td>F (7)</td>
<td>J(19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>I(35)</th>
<th>N(33)</th>
<th>F (5)</th>
<th>J(21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dani</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>E(51)</td>
<td>N(23)</td>
<td>F(23)</td>
<td>P(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>E(23)</td>
<td>N(27)</td>
<td>F(33)</td>
<td>P (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>E(15)</td>
<td>S (7)</td>
<td>F(23)</td>
<td>J(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>E(15)</td>
<td>N(19)</td>
<td>F(13)</td>
<td>J(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>E(21)</td>
<td>S(31)</td>
<td>T(49)</td>
<td>J(49)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Very Clear Preferences** (41 or higher; 31 for F)
**Clear Preferences** (21-39; 29 for F)
**Moderate Preferences** (11-19)
**Slight Preferences** (1-9)

looking at a group with a strong preference for introversion, I feel that this contrast could be informative. From now on, I will refer to this group from the 10:00 am class as Group B.

SELECTING GROUP ROLES: THE COVERT PROCESSES

When, and how, does a collection of individuals become a group? In our writing classrooms, collaborative assignments—from peer responding to shared-document production—necessitate the establishment of groups. Writing groups can be assigned by the teacher or self-selected by the students. In either case, merely putting a few individuals in close physical proximity does not instantly create a group. Groups need to have a common goal or goals that transcend individual goals, effective communication skills, a sense of interdependence—both emotional and task-oriented, an agreed-upon role framework, and expectations or norms for the group itself. Researchers in group dynamics (Fisher; Tuckman; Benis and Shepherd; Bales and Strodbeck) have also identified a variety of interaction stages characteristic of group development in a variety of situations. However, for my purposes, a slight over-simplification renders four stages in terms of functional theory which characterize the successful group:

1. orientation — "getting to know one another," defining the situation, and identifying the task
2. evaluation — defining the problem and developing
problem solving and conflict negotiation tactics

3. resolution — emerging decisions reflect the group's ability to successfully negotiate conflicts, arrive at productive solutions to problems, and develop task-appropriate roles

4. implementation — committing to and carrying out the plan accompanied by satisfaction at their success

These stages in the development of the group can all too often be ignored by busy teachers and students intent on accomplishing the writing task. When these stages are ignored, or short-circuited, group function can be impaired. In the normal process of group development, members develop behavioral standards and expectations of each other. The most common standards are group roles and group norms.

ROLES AND NORMS

Roles. Fisher defines a group role as "a set of communicative behaviors performed by an individual . . . in light of the expectations that other members hold toward those behaviors" (203), including those "behavioral tendencies" emanating from the individual's personality, but not necessarily expressed in action. Hare defines the term role as "the set of expectations which group members share concerning the behavior of a person who occupies a given position in the group" (131). Later, Hare further states that "the expectations for a given role are met most easily
by the individual whose personality most nearly fits the role" (150).

Other than leader (and there are varieties of descriptors for the leader role), the roles in any group will be relatively idiosyncratic, dependent upon a variety of factors including the mix of members, the nature of the task, whether the group is task-oriented or relationship oriented, whether the group is relatively autonomous or responsible to an external authority. Bormann and Bormann also suggest that this idiosyncratic development of roles within groups is time-dependent and response-dependent, that the members' reaction to the individual's behavior will either encourage or discourage the individual's continuing to engage in that particular behavior.

Because of the idiosyncratic nature of roles, it is impossible to list all the roles available, but researchers (Benne and Sheats, Cragan and Wright) have developed lists of classifications of roles that are commonly observed in groups, and from which I will draw the descriptors that I use to identify the roles taken by different group members.

**Norms.** Group norms can be defined as the behavioral conventions—stated or unstated; explicit and implicit—to which members accede. Norms may originate with the group
itself—implicitly through its interaction or from explicit procedural guides the group articulates and adopts—or norms may be carried into the group from a larger community to which members belong, for example a church, university, or ethnic community. Norms may also be imposed from without by a higher authority, for example, by the teacher in the classroom.

The values and shared information that characterize a group can be determined by looking at its norms. Examples of norms can be seen in the way students return to approximately the same seats class after class, or when one group prefers to work loudly as opposed to another which settles issues quietly; norms are observable even in the way roles are established. When one person consistently exerts control over procedural decisions, that demonstrates one of the group's norms for leadership. As with roles, group norms are highly idiosyncratic.

One potentially serious drawback to group roles and norms is the tendency of the group in its establishment of cohesiveness to exert undue pressure to conform. "Groupthink" can render a group dysfunctional by making it impossible for the group to engage in consideration of a wide range of alternative actions or positions. Poor decision making results from mindless cohesion and a lack of
willingness to engage in critical thinking or negotiating conflicting ideas.

THE GROUPS IN PROCESS

Group A. In Group A, some of the necessary interaction stages were short-circuited by the group's approach. Initially, the orientation stage suffered as the women moved almost immediately to focusing on the first task, allowing almost no time for social ice-breaking and the attendant forming of emotional bonds between members. In their first meeting as a group, these four women spend only a few minutes on introductions and "getting to know you" talk. Instead, they focus on the logistics of arranging meetings, identifying each other's major academic and job interests briefly (in order to detect possible time conflicts), and focusing on coordinating their several schedules. (Their only concern when I approach them about being my informants is that I not increase their workload or create time conflicts. I assure them that I would always adapt to them, not they to me.)

Little really personal information is elicited during this first group meeting, a pattern that strikes me more and more as the quarter progresses and I contrast this group with the other group who quickly become involved with each others' lives and constantly share personal exchanges. All
four of these women have full schedules and active lives. Debbie R. is a marketing major, Karen a Medical Communications major, Debbie M. a Human Resource Management major, and Heidi majors in Journalism. All four like sports, which gives them a first topic of conversation, but the topic comes up only rarely after this first session. It becomes quickly clear that studying, the single women’s jobs, and Karen’s family fill up most of their out-of-class hours, and their collaborative meeting schedule must accommodate these restrictions.

During the first meeting behavior patterns emerge which characterize the group for the entire quarter. Contrary to much of leadership theory, there is no "contending" for leadership, as, for example, Fisher suggests in his model of leadership emergence. From the first, one woman assumes the role of leader.

The Leader. In the third class meeting, after the instructor has assigned the groups and given them time to "get to know each other," Karen immediately takes charge of the group, suggesting that they stay after class to work up a schedule planning the first two assignments and when they can meet. The other group members concur, agreeing that it would be best to meet as infrequently as possible out of class. This, too, is Karen’s suggestion; her busy schedule
doesn't readily admit extra meeting times. After about 15 minutes, at Karen's suggestion they decide to leave. This first contact of the group sets the stage for the rest of the quarter. Karen quietly, but forcefully, determines the direction on each assignment.

The only extravert, at 42 Karen is considerably older than the other three who are all in their early twenties. She is married for the second time, having lost her first husband to cancer, and the mother of three boys—12, 16, and 20. Karen is also a born-again Christian with a firm belief in her "personal need to have the Lord in my life and to have total confidence of knowing where I'm going when I leave this world." This confidence of faith bolsters the natural confidence attendant on her personality type. Karen appears quietly in command—all the time. She is impeccably groomed, never late, and never without an assignment.

Personality theory suggests that Karen's personality type would be decisive, confident, and enjoy the role of catalyst. According to the theory, Sensing-Judging types like Karen are realistic decision-makers, desirous of order, organized, dependable, and conservative. These traits in her personality are obvious from the first, and although the group never openly discusses assigning leadership, it is clear to each member—and obvious to an outside observer—
that Karen is the leader. Karen herself notes in her log,

    I feel I have been assigned the leader of the group even though it was never discussed. I think this is in part because I'm older; but also because I'm the only extrovert (sic) in a group of four.

(Karen knew she was an extravert even before I gave the class their results; most people tend to know whether they are extraverted or introverted.)

For the most part, she leads by setting a personal example--she works consistently and follows through on everything, usually doing more than her share to be sure that the project is successful. The group members recognize this both in their logs and in their ratings. (The instructor had asked each student to write a memo to her after each assignment was completed detailing each member's contribution and rating each on a scale from 1 to 10.) Karen always has the highest marks from the other group members--nearly all 10's--with one exception.

From Debbie B.: [Karen] wrote a rough draft and collaborated the group's ideas into one . . . Rating:10.

From Heidi: [Karen] spent a lot of time finding out the important information we needed to write our paper. She drove down and met with someone from the Faith Mission. [Karen] also typed up a rough draft for the group so we could better see where the paper was heading. I give her a ranking of 10.
From Debbie A.: Of the four of us, [Karen] did the most work. She . . . talked to the people and got us several newsletters from which we took our information. In the end, [Karen] volunteered to take home our letters and put them together . . . [Karen] would definitely get 10.

Predictably, Karen is an effective leader, keeping the group on task, focusing on facts and issues, usually sympathetic to members but not soft. When a point of contention arises and she feels she is right, Karen can be indomitable. On one occasion when the group is revising, Heidi sits at the keyboard with the other members clustering around her as she types in the revisions. Each of them holds a draft copy of the text and makes notes as the process goes on. Karen objects to the length of a sentence. Heidi replies, "But it's perfectly clear." Karen leans over, reads the sentence aloud, insists again that it is too long and suggests where to break it. Heidi isn't convinced. Karen makes it very obvious that she is making the correction on her copy, shows the Debbies where and then repeats the changes to Heidi, as if she has never heard Heidi's objection. This pattern repeats itself whenever a point of disagreement comes up. Karen ignores opposition and it evaporates. (Most interesting to me was that no one ever commented on this technique, never mentioned it in a log or memo, never discussed it with me in the interviews, and seemed oblivious to it throughout the quarter.)

Theory suggests that her strong sensing preference
would make Karen realistic and practical, interested in the factual. And in Karen's own words, she feels "disappointed in the group's performance." She resents not knowing at the time of registration that she was getting into a collaborative class, and she doesn't particularly like to collaborate; she feels the result isn't indicative of the total effort, that on her own she "could do a much better job." But having committed to it, she does "the best I can, given the situation" because her goals are clear and well-defined, important to her personal sense of values and important for the group. Her preference for sensing creates a desire for realism and order. Being suddenly surprised with the idea of collaborating jarred her into resentment, but her extraversion and her feeling preference pushed her toward cooperation and a desire to make things go well, that is, successfully, for the group.

As a leader, Karen makes decisions with her personal values always to the fore (her close and active involvement with her church, for example, leads to the group's choosing to write their fund-raising letter for the Faith Mission), but she clearly focuses more on the task and its successful completion than on promoting harmonious relations within the group. Her leadership style most closely approximates a task-oriented approach rather than a relationship-oriented approach (Fiedler 1967), one in which the leader focuses on
the successful completion of the task and pays little attention to the personal relationships or individual needs of group members. Karen's style can also be described as rhetorical in that she defines the situation or task according to her perception of it and by the force of her persuasive ability convinces the group to go along with her program (Smircich and Morgan 1982). Given that her dominant function is the feeling function, I found this autocratic tendency unexpected. However, Karen's personal agenda—her fierce determination to complete her degree and succeed—and her age could be strong contributors to such a style.

It is, however, impossible to expect that role assumption can be explained by personality alone. One of the dangers of using any personality theory, including Jung's, is a tendency observed in those who have only limited knowledge of the theory to overstate its claims or to stereotype. The theory offers guidelines, recognizable aspects of individuals' preferences for certain mental functions and attitudes or preferences for interacting with the world. It does not predict infallibly. In looking at the roles assumed within a given group, we must be careful to consider the particular situation as well as the overall context in which that group operates. According to type theory, Karen possesses certain tendencies which have frequently been observed in group leaders, but given
different contextual factors, one of the other group members may have become the dominant figure. Current research in small group dynamics suggests that communication is the major single factor in leadership establishment. The quantity of talking, as opposed to the quality of what is said, is actually most important. Also, who manages to speak first is another important indicator of who will emerge as a leader, "for people who speak up immediately are perceived to be motivated and self-assured, characteristics that group members find appealing in a leader. Moreover, group members who speak up first have the attention of the remainder of the group and can exercise influence" (Fisher 242). Thus, Karen’s preference for extraversion, for talking things out, can be seen as one factor in helping to predict a tendency; looked at in context, that she was combined with three introverts, it becomes more likely that she will make a successful bid for leadership. However, I think it is extremely important to remember the age and experience difference in conjunction with Karen’s extraversion and her determination in considering this issue of leadership emergence.

The Members. We cannot examine group roles in isolation one from another. By their nature, they are interdependent with the performance behaviors of one influencing the others. In this group, Karen’s preference
for extraversion, the self-confidence she radiated (probably a combination of age, experience, and life-situation), and her physical appearance made her appear appealing as a leader, while the other three women were all inclined to be less talkative and less assertive, and thus less obviously appealing as leader.

Debbie R. (ISTJ) is twenty-three years old, single, and a "fifth-year marketing major specializing in retail and research marketing." Debbie expects to graduate in Spring 1992 and is taking this course as an elective to fulfill graduation hours requirement. She is from a small town in southern Ohio (there were only seventy-eight students in her high school graduating class) and spent her freshman year at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio. She writes in her introductory memo that she has "widely diverse" interests, especially sports—any and all as a spectator and most as a participant—reading, and listening to music. She has crystal-clear goals: professionally, to work in marketing or advertising for a "well known firm" preferably The Limited, and to return for a master's degree in a few years. Her personal goals are to "become financially secure, buy a house within five years, and to be married within seven." This clarity and precision is not surprising in an ISTJ; these are qualities usually characterizing the type.
Debbie R. seems cool and withdrawn at the first meeting; she sits farther back from the table than the others, doesn’t smile or lean toward the others when they are talking. Like many introverted sensing types, she appears outwardly unruffled, realistic and sensible, even if she is in the midst of a crisis. (Scheduled for an unexpected CT-Scan to eliminate the possibility of a brain tumor as the cause of her headaches, she told us about the medical procedure with the same attitude that she told us that she would type up an assignment—matter-of-fact, calm and composed, very business-like.) She focuses on practical issues and is always careful about details.

Debbie M. (ISFJ) is twenty-two, single, but quite serious about her boyfriend. She grew up in a small town west of Cleveland, where she “played center for the girls basketball team, . . . was on the flag corps . . . and a member of the Ski club.” She has been at this University for four years and will graduate in December with a degree in business. Her interests, less wide-ranging than Debbie R.’s, “include skiing, biking, and long walks. Any activity that lets me get outside.” Her professional goal is to find a job in her major upon graduation, but since she is already working in her field, in the Human Resource Department at University Hospitals, that looks promising. She gives one short sentence to her personal goals: “to hopefully be
married and raise a happy family like my parents did."

While she shares with Debbie R. a calm demeanor, attention to particulars, and an interest in factual information, Debbie M. appears to engage a bit more emotionally in the group. She seems slightly less serious and talks a little more about her personal life—parents and a boyfriend. Neither of the Debbies favors great amounts of self-disclosure.

Heidi (ISFJ) is also twenty-two, just. From Cincinnati, Heidi comes from "a wonderful family of five" with "very supportive and loving parents." Heidi describes herself as a "sports fanatic!" who "lettered in volleyball, basketball, and track" in high school, where she was also "a member of the National Honor Society and Student Council." She is on a volleyball scholarship here and hopes to compete on the USA Olympic Volleyball Team in Barcelona in 1992. Aside from sports, she reports that her interests are "reading and watching television," especially soap operas which she video tapes when she can't watch them. Her professional goals are to finish her degree in public relations and find a job "either working with a professional sports team or working in a college athletic department." Her personal goals are to "find someone to share the rest of my life with and raise a happy, healthy family."
In the group, Heidi seems the most tentative, the most overshadowed by Karen. Only a year younger than Debbie M. and eighteen months younger than Debbie R., she nevertheless seems much less mature and settled than they. And Heidi’s feeling function seems more obvious than Debbie M.’s—also an ISFJ: she registers emotion more visibly than the others.

When I think about these women now, I inadvertently see three and one, a function, I suspect, of the great disparity in the amount of talking that took place. An examination of the transcripts from the group meetings shows that Karen initiated speech acts more frequently and talked for considerably greater lengths of time than any other group member. Consequently, attention—mine, the other group members, and AnneMarie’s—most often focused on Karen.

In their first meetings as a group, they established behavior patterns that they maintained with little variation. One of these behaviors involved decision-making. In these early meetings, decisions were made almost by default. One of them, usually Karen, suggested a solution and the others reacted with vague, somewhat non-committal responses, typical of groups in the orientation phase, according to Fisher:

Group members in the orientation phase search tentatively for ideas and directions to aid their decision-making efforts. They are unaware of the direction the group will eventually take, so they don’t
commit themselves, favorably or unfavorably, to the newly introduced decision proposals. Rather they express attitudes that are ambiguous toward proposals--attitudes that don't really take a stand one way or another (154).

This kind of ambiguous feedback, common to the orientation phase in group dynamics, characterized the group's interaction long after it should have given way to more firm responses, and suggests the somewhat retarded nature of their group development.

**Group B.** The process that this group used differed dramatically from the group process used by Group A. The men and women in Group B began by trying to get to know each other first, relegating discussion of the first assignment to the next class period and spending some of that time on personal talk. They genuinely liked each other and became involved in each other's lives, remarking in their logs periodically how much they enjoyed the whole experience. Being high achievers, they all reported pleasant surprise and delight at being placed in a group with four other responsible students. On their information sheets responding to Michael's question about what GPA they carried and what grade they wanted in this class, they responded

- **Kelly:** 3.72. I want an A.
- **Dani:** 3.7 (last quarter)
- **Eddie:** 3.2. Hopefully a B or better
- **Nicole:** 3.6 and an A.
Sam: 2.7 I want a B or higher if possible.

And in their group process logs they wrote weekly about how they felt the collaboration process to be going. By having them monitor their own group dynamics, keeping logs recording how they each felt the collaboration was going, and regularly talking with him about the group’s process and progress, Michael contributed to the positive experience that they felt they had with this collaboration. A sample of their reactions to being grouped together demonstrates how they felt:

Dani: Everyone pulls their fair share in work and ideas. It is really nice to be in this group.

Eddie: I seem to have gotten lucky to be put in a group with motivated friendly students who want to do well.

Kelly: I feel very lucky to have been in a group as dedicated to their class work as I am.

Sam: As of yet I have no problems with the group. Everyone wants to do really well and is ready to make sure the paper will be a success.

Nicole: From the time we received our group assignment we were pleased. It was so wonderful to be in a group with four other responsible individuals.

These students also talked frequently about the group, establishing cohesion and forming an identity as a group, one of the necessary stages in group development. This group moved successfully through the various stages of
developing a sense of "groupness." No less busy than Group A, this group nevertheless began with the orientation stage, devoting sufficient time to becoming comfortable with each other and working out their role identities. They talked about themselves, sharing details of their personal lives, but the key seemed to be in the responses. Each member listened attentively, asked questions for further information, and reacted with positive interest. Each of them seemed genuinely interested in who the others were as individuals. They moved from the initial stages of tentative topic broaching, restrained reactions, and reluctance to engage in disagreement to more free communication within the second meeting, in part because they liked to laugh and each was willing to be the object of humor. They shared silly stories about traffic and parking problems, registration difficulties, housing incidents, and what it was like being seniors and facing the unknown and uncertain future of the job world. They sympathised with each other over both large and small happenings: when Kelly was rousted from the shower by her parents' phone call from the Caribbean, they all reacted with sympathy to the inconvenience and engaged in good natured teasing about the ability to regularly vacation in the Virgin Islands. When Nicole shared tales of the difficulties involved in modeling "shoots" they all listened with interest, expressing surprise at some of what she said, and laughing with her
over her own small vanities. Each had a time in the spotlight, a time to be the initiator of conversation, but most important they all were good listeners, interested and supportive. After the first session, they were conscious at all times of being a group, referring to themselves that way: "Are you coming to group Sunday night?" is how one of them ascertained my participation in an out-of-class meeting, promising that "we'll do pizza and stuff."

Assessing their first week as a group, Kelly writes: "During the first week of group work things have gone very well. We work well together and are able to take ideas and make them coherent. I did notice that we spend a lot of time trying to get to know each other, which I believe is important to the dynamics of the group." Nicole's assessment is that it is "very refreshing to be in a group that cares about a project intrinsically for the satisfaction of a job well done."

The group's focus on the "job well done" surfaces again and again. In group meetings they discuss how important it is to do this well, and in their logs they write variations on the same theme. This is task orientation of a different kind than that of Group A. The members of Group B intend all along to have a good time as they go, but to make sure that they do the job well. Their expectations are high, and their goal is not merely to meet the minimum demands but to
do the best they can. As Nicole put it in her log after describing how quickly the group came to consensus on which problem to work on: "We were excited to be handling a problem that made a difference for individuals other than ourselves." The serious nature of the problem, handicapped accessibility on campus, appeals to a nearly unanimous sense they have of social responsibility. Only one member, Sam, fails to address the importance of the topic in either his log or his conversations with me.

The sense of responsibility about their topic extends to the group itself. They are all very conscious of their individual responsibility to the group and the importance of each contribution to a successful whole. Kelly writes that

We began to develop a loyalty to the group and when I was unable to add to our group project one day, because I had worked late, I would make sure that during our next meeting or in between [sic] that time I would find something to contribute to the group project. I noticed that the other members of our group also did this. For example, Dani had to go to the wedding in Florida and was going to miss some meetings and class time. In order to make up for this, although she did not say that was why she was doing it, she typed up a draft of our ideas for the second project.

The Leaders. Group B has no single leader. As can be seen from some of the excerpts above, they all feel deeply committed to the group and the project. Eddie sums up their feeling about having a leader," I think we can be successful without one person being the ringleader (which hasn't
happened yet.) My philosophy is that teamwork without jealousy and competition can outdo any ringleader and his pawns." They do, however, have roles that they choose repeatedly, and three of them—Eddie, Kelly, and Dani—share the leadership tasks between them.

Eddie (ENFJ) is twenty-two, the youngest of four children from a close and loving family. After ten years in Columbus, Ohio, he moved to Reno, Nevada, in the fourth grade, where he spent six years before returning to Columbus. He is a self-described "sports freak," both as player and spectator. Intellectually, he has "always been interested in political issues," and would "probably go to law school if I weren't an advertising major." He makes two statements in his log that reveal a lot about himself and which have an effect on the group. First, he says, "My friends also tell me that I like to argue and that I am good at it." The second comes under the category Achievements:

I am also proud of the fact that I am a man of good character. If there is one personal achievement I want to take to my grave, it is my sense of good character. If a person can't face himself in the mirror, who can he face?

Early on, Eddie recognizes the group's tendency to "get off track," and frequently finds himself trying "to put us back on line." He also recognizes another role that he has consciously adopted, in keeping with his fondness for
arguing:

One of the problems I see with the group is that everyone is quick to agree on someone else’s idea. I often play devil’s advocate just so the group will take a different perspective of a situation. I sometimes think the people in the group think I am being difficult, but it’s only for the good of the project.

In his role as devil’s advocate, Eddie succeeds at preventing the group from falling into what Janis calls "groupthink," the tendency of an overly cohesive group to be so focused on harmony that they rush to consensus without critically examining the issues. The other group members recognize this; Nicole writes that "Eddie is our devil’s advocate--which is good because the rest of us wholeheartedly agree on every issue without considering other points of view." Eddie is articulate and writes well, but he is also something of a perfectionist.

Addressing both of these qualities, Nicole writes after they completed their first draft of the project that, while he has contributed much to the writing, he "seems to like to perfect projects over and over again; I do not think he was ready to hand in the final draft of our paper when we did."

Kelly (ESFJ), at twenty, is the youngest member of the group, but not at all immature. Born in Nuremberg, West Germany, an "Army brat," she lived in Puerto Rico before moving to Columbus, Ohio, at four. From the fifth through twelfth grades, she attended an all-girls college preparatory school in Bexley, Ohio, enrolling at the
University after graduation. She will graduate in December, 1991, with a degree in Child Development and hopes to find a job as a preschool teacher in a corporate day care center in Tampa, Florida, where she will move after graduation to join her boyfriend. Kelly plans after a few years, to move to Virgin Gorda, one of the British Virgin Islands, where certified preschool teachers are "desperately" needed. After years of spending holidays on Virgin Gorda, her parents are relocating to the island this coming year, and since she is very close to them, she feels that moving there will allow her to combine the work she loves with the sports she loves—snorkeling and sailing, and the family she is so close to.

Kelly serves as idea initiator as well as focuser, roles that at first glance an outside observer might not credit her with. She looks like the quintessential beach girl, and has a ready and contagious laugh. She is, however, undeniably serious about her schoolwork and proud of having completed her program at the university in less than four years when many of her peers are regularly taking five. She and Eddie share the responsibility of keeping the group on task. He writes that she is "the most dependable and probably the most intelligent of the group . . . open-minded, had good ideas and seemed to like to work hard." She also monitors the group's process of development, noting when they have difficulty and tracking their collaboration
as it changes. She is an astute observer and an articulate writer, qualities that help in the successful completion of the project.

Dani (ENFP) is twenty-seven, the oldest member of the group and the busiest outside of school. She has a part-time job at the University, another part-time job with an interior design firm in the city, and is a personal care attendant for a quadriplegic scientist. She and the other young woman who alternates with her as caregiver live with the scientist and his wife. She does not have a great deal of free time, but she never misses a meeting (with the exception of those while she was at her sister's wedding in Florida) or a deadline. Her close association with the disabled scientist has alerted her to the difficulties that face the handicapped on our huge campus, and her intimacy with the details of his difficulties make her eloquently persuasive in the topic-deciding meeting. It is her topic that the group adopts (see Chapter IV). With four feeling types in the group, it's logical that such a human topic would be their choice.

Dani has been "attending [the University] off and on for 7 year"; putting herself through requires some quarters off to work full time. She is most proud of having made the Dean's list last quarter with a 3.7 GPA. Her goals are
characteristically vague—"to work in Florida or Atlanta . . . in a medium sized firm," and oriented to the human side: to get married and have a family eventually, and when she does, to do free-lance work and stay home with her children.

Dani frequently monitors the feelings of her fellow group members, asking after everyone's health, and expressing concern when Eddie misses a meeting. During a meeting in which Sam has been particularly quiet, she leans toward him, taps his hand, and trying to draw him into the conversation says, "Sam, you're awfully quiet. What do you think?" Since it is her idea that they choose to pursue, she provides a great deal of guidance in the initial stages of the project. As Nicole describes her, "Dani is very sociable as well as motivational. She does the research and determines what areas we need to further evaluate. She is very responsible for group cohesiveness." She is not, however, a particularly good writer, and as they get closer to completion her role changes somewhat and becomes less central, except that she is, as Eddie describes her, "our computer savior."

The Members. While there was no single, consistent leader, the leadership tasks were most often shared by Kelly, Eddie, and Dani, with Nicole assuming leadership tasks less often and Sam only occasionally. Nicole (ENFP),
twenty-two, provides a perfect contrast to Dani. Both
ENFP’s, Nicole is tall, slim, and blonde, looking very much
like the model she is. Dani is shorter and dark and, while
attractive, not really striking. Where Dani is settled and
grounded, Nicole is rather scattered. Dani appears quite
serious, not often smiling, but when she does, she means it,
and the smile transforms her face. Nicole seems to be
always smiling or laughing, striking effective poses which
emphasize her beauty. She talks almost constantly,
appearing to have an unlimited amount of energy. Kelly
reports that while Nicole
gave me energy to keep working, sometimes she would get
off the subject. Actually, she went off on tangents
about her husband, modeling, etc. I really enjoyed
getting to know Nicole and I like her but on several
occasions [sic] I was too busy to listen to her
stories.

Nicole "went off on tangents" with great regularity,
multiple times per meeting. The group never made an issue
of it, accepting this behavior as just "part of Nicole," but
usually Kelly or Eddie would gently bring her back to topic,
sometimes by laughing about, "Here we go again. We E’s are
always talking about something else," sometimes by just not
responding beyond a certain point in the monologue, at which
point Nicole would shift back to the topic on her own.
During one group meeting at Dani’s on a Sunday evening, when
they were collaborating on a final draft, Nicole alternately
directed her conversation to one after the other, even at
one point including me as audience. However, no one really
engaged with her topics that night, preferring to keep focusing on the writing. And after about twenty minutes, Nicole herself took a turn at the computer, having been asked by Debbie to help with the draft.

Nicole reports that she is "an Advertising major, and more importantly a writer. My job is to create." This is how she defines herself—as a creative artist. Nicole’s own description of her achievements reveal her better than any attempt of mine:

My achievements make me proud, because I know I have worked hard to accomplish my goals. I currently write commercials that get produced. When I am driving down the road and I hear my commercials air, the feeling is incredible! I have also been in several magazines, including "Seventeen". I never took acting lessons, but have starred in many local, regional, and national television commercials. Perhaps the achievement I am most proud of, however, is that I am graduating this quarter. Equipt [sic] for the future, I will embark on a job finding mission. My goals spread across the sky, yet seem to be as attainable as if they were spread before me on the ground. I want to write! I want to create! I want to put words on paper that can make an audience feel.

In the group, Nicole functions as a strong supporter and contributes to the writing. She particularly enjoys writing any creative parts of the drafts, for example, the introduction where she envisions painting evocative word-pictures to intrigue the audience and draw them into the project.

Sam (ESTJ), twenty-five, is the final member of the
group and the most quiet. From a small town near Cleveland, Ohio, Sam spent four years in the Navy after graduation from high school. He attributes his development of a sense of responsibility to his years in the submarine service.

There were many times that the proper execution of my duties was counted on by the entire crew. I have never been one to let people down but this was the first time in my life where my actions directly affected the lives of others around me.

The first in his family to go to college, he feels that when "I finally do graduate my Mom will graduate with me." Sam works as a Residence Advisor at a small residence hall on campus. He regards being an RA as more than just "free room and board. It lets me help other students with their problems while at the same time I learn a little more about helping others." He is majoring in Management Information Systems and plans a job in his field, but nothing more definite than that in terms of career goals. On his personal goals, however, he is a bit more specific:

One area, that may not sound glamorous for some, is my dream of having a family. I want a great wife with two children, one boy one girl. My house will have a picket fence that looks slightly worn from the weather. There will be a medium size lake that contains the smallest amount of algae. And of course, an American flag flying from a stainless steel pole in the front yard.

Early on, Sam takes the role of the group's editor; he concerns himself with the sentence level errors, mechanics and syntax. This puzzles me somewhat since he's a weaker writer than at least three of the others, but it is in keeping with the sensing side of his personality. Jensen
and DiTiberio write that sensing types "closely attend to mechanics (grammar, spelling, handwriting, etc.). Similarly, they often tend to view revising as merely 'correcting' or proofreading" (173). And Sam, the only sensing type in a group with four intuitives, may also feel most comfortable with something as specific as grammatical details.

Most of the group comment at one time or another in their logs on his schedule; he’s taking sixteen hours this quarter and frequently comments about how heavy his workload is. The group always responds sympathetically when he mentions his heavy load, and several times in their logs or in conversations mention that Sam’s the busiest or that "Sam’s schedule prevented him from really contributing this time." I find it interesting that with both Nicole and Kelly also taking four classes each, there is no resentment or even acknowledgement that sixteen hours might not be so unusual.

Nicole, Dani, Kelly and Eddie are very typical extraverts. Hirsh and Kummerow’s list of characteristic descriptors of preferred methods of communication for extraversion accurately describes this group:

* Communicate energy and enthusiasm
* Respond quickly without pauses to think
* Focus of talk is on people and things in the external world
* Need to moderate expression
* Seek to communicate in groups
* Prefer face-to-face over written communication
* In meetings, like talking out loud before coming to conclusions

But Sam, also an extravert, is quieter and more tentative than any of the others, although when I ask, he says it's because he has so much on his mind this quarter with so many classes.

This collection of extraverts quickly became a group, a unit with an identity of its own and a set of goals which transcended those of the individual members. The members also became friends, supportive, interested in each other's well-being, and concerned about each other. Along with developing these relationship orientations, they also became a productive writing group. Their collaboration succeeded in producing written responses to the assignments which they felt reflected their effort. At times they came dangerously close to groupthink, to being so focused on the relationship that they didn't engage in the conflict necessary to creatively exchange ideas, but in the end one or more of the members (frequently Eddie or Kelly) would provide the necessary prod to avoid complacency and hasty consensus.

This study would seem to support the contention of Fisher and other group dynamics researchers that communication is the key to successful group work. Based on
a comparison of these two groups, engaging in constructive, ideational conflict, as a major part of group communication, seems to be a significant factor in the success or failure of writing groups to achieve successful collaboration. In the next two chapters, I will describe several writing events for each group which demonstrate the degree to which each group did or did not openly engage in constructive conflict and did or did not come to consensus prematurely.
CHAPTER III
ACCOUNTS OF WRITING EVENTS: GROUP A

INTRODUCTION

When students enter a collaborative writing classroom, they not only have to manage the intricacies of group dynamics, they also have to manage the intricacies of trying to merge their individual composing styles. Just as the blending of individual personalities contributes to developing a group personality, so the blending of the individual composing styles contributes to developing a group composing process. In this chapter, I will inscribe sample writing events from Group A's collaboration, one event from early in the quarter and one toward the end of the quarter. Selecting samples from early and late allows me to note important progressive changes that took place in the dynamics of the group. I have chosen these particular events because they demonstrate the variety of negotiations that take place, in both personality and writing issues, which characterized this particular writing group.

Pre-collaborating. Groups are announced on Friday, the third day of class, and these four women immediately begin
to discuss how to proceed with the first assignment, the revision of a college admissions letter (see below). They spend very little time in "getting to know you" talk. Following Karen’s lead, each of them introduces herself and identifies her major field of study, then Karen suggests that they exchange telephone numbers and information about their schedules to determine how and when they will be able to meet to work on the assignments. This process takes about five or six minutes, during which time I have been sitting near them but not with them.

During this initial exchange of information, Karen speaks first and sounds more self-assured than the others, both behaviors which contribute to being perceived as leader (Hollander, Fisher). Debbie M., as she will continue to do later, assumes something of a nurturing role, frequently murmuring supportive or encouraging words: "Mmm-hmmm," "Yeah," "That’s a great idea," and so on. She consistently affirms and encourages the others. Debbie R. seems somewhat aloof from the group. She sits further back from the table, not leaning into the center as the others do, doesn’t smile, speaks less frequently, although when she does speak it is to contribute something substantive, an opinion on why the proposed schedule would work, an explanation of why she can not meet on days when she has to work. Heidi is eager, agreeing with everything Karen suggests, smiling and
offering to adjust her schedule around the others, if necessary.

Once they have exchanged personal information, and before they turn to the book, I introduce myself again to them, explaining that I would like to study their group. I tell them that my dissertation will be a descriptive study, focusing on one group of collaborative writers from each of two classes, that on a day-to-day basis I would like to join the group for every in- or out-of-class meeting they have, recording everything and taking fieldnotes. I go on to say that I am particularly interested in how they work and write together in terms of their different personalities; that because I am so interested in the personality dimension, I will be using the MBTI to identify personality types, and that I will administer it to the class as a whole on the following Wednesday. I explain that the study will in no way affect their grade, that nothing they do or say or write will be revealed to the teacher until after the quarter is well over and grades are determined, and that I will negotiate my role in the group with them, participating in ways that are mutually acceptable to them and to the teacher and class. Finally, I explain that, as I had mentioned earlier, participation is optional, that if any one of the group should decide that she is uncomfortable being involved, I will understand and not study them. Then I tell
them that I am going to leave so that they may discuss it freely among themselves and decide.

In the meantime, the instructor has been moving about the classroom, talking with different groups and trying to get to know them a bit. When she approaches Group A, she asks me if I want to talk to the class as a whole, to describe my study and choice of groups; I tell her what I have said to the group I’ve chosen and ask her to talk to them, reinforcing the optional element and encouraging them to be honest with her and each other about their inclination to be involved. She agrees, and I explain that if they decide to be my study group, I will then talk to the whole class. When AnneMarie speaks with Group A, they have only one concern: they do not want my involvement to create any extra work for them or to complicate their time schedules. AnneMarie relays their concern to me, I assure them that I will always accommodate them and their schedules, and we have an agreement.

The class listens to the description with mild interest; no one seems at all negative, there are a few comments with laughter about Group A being "the guinea pigs," but generally everyone accepts the situation as nothing unusual. I assure the class that I will not participate substantively in any of the actual writing.
With AnneMarie’s permission, I offer my assistance as an English graduate student should anyone want help with general writing issues—grammar, syntax, etc.—and with the computers since I have some experience with IBM computers. Everyone seems in agreement, and AnneMarie dismisses the class early, advising any who want to stay that I will be in the room and can act as monitor. After some chatter, everyone leaves, except the women in Group A. As I rejoin the group, they are going over the syllabus and working up a schedule for the first two assignments.

Karen clearly dominates the conversation. She speaks first and most frequently, setting the tone as well as the schedule by indicating a desire to meet only in class or on class days if at all possible, to which the others readily agree. (During the hour immediately after their class, the lab is unscheduled; no class will be held there, but no monitor will be available, either. And, since the computer labs are locked if there is no instructor or monitor available, I volunteer, as part of my entry negotiations, to stay on and act as monitor so that they can remain and work in the lab. They appreciate the offer, agreeing to take advantage of it as needed; they also decide that they will be able to meet on Mondays and Wednesdays from 11:00 to 1:00 should that become necessary.) Having settled logistics, Karen suggests they look briefly at the particulars of the
assignment, 12-7 from Business and Administrative Communication (BAC):

12-7 REVISING AN ADMISSIONS LETTER
State College is currently using the following form admission letter to high school students admitted to the freshman class. The material in square brackets is inserted by computer.

Dear [Mr./Ms. Name]:

We are pleased to notify you of your admission to State College, thus marking the beginning of your participation in an exciting educational experience.

You are admitted to the [name of] Campus for the [term] of [year]. You cannot be admitted to another campus or to this campus at another term or year without the written consent of the Admissions Office. We have determined that you are a state resident and qualify for the in-state tuition rate.

Your enrollment to State College depends upon the accomplishment of the following steps: (1) payment of a $200 nonrefundable Acceptance Fee (please use the enclosed form) by [date]; (2) participation in our Orientation Program [dates]. During this program we will conduct a tour of campus, explain dormitory and off-campus housing, require you to listen to brief speeches by several faculty and staff, and schedule a 15-minute appointment with the advisor to whom you have been assigned; (3) submission of the Medical History form (enclosed) by [date] and your high school transcript certifying graduation. We will send a transcript request form to your high school as soon as we receive your Acceptance Fee.

We welcome you and look forward to your attending State College.

As your instructor directs,

a. Using the information in the letter, rewrite it to improve you-attitude, positive emphasis, organization, and layout.

b. Adapt the letter for your own community college, college, or university. Use specific facts about
the orientation program, housing, and campus life
to make the letter more interesting and make
students who are admitted to several schools
choose to attend yours.

After reading the assignment, they note the salient points
to be maintained in their rewriting of this letter. They
all agree that the three itemized points in the next-to-last
paragraph must be kept. Finally, Karen suggests that they
break and each come to class on Monday with "some notes or
something." Everyone agrees, wishes the others a pleasant
weekend, and we leave.

Collaborating: The First Assignment. On Monday,
however, only two are there: Debbie M. and Karen. The
instructor begins the class by asking students to define
you-attitude. The students have trouble hearing her; the
air conditioners provide too much aural competition. She
repeats her question more loudly, but only one student
replies, and the reply doesn't seem quite satisfactory.
Where we are sitting, the introverts and I, we cannot make
out the student's answer, but AnneMarie frowns, shakes her
head slightly, and then begins to briefly explain what you
attitude is and how to incorporate it in letters and memos.
This difficulty with hearing and being heard clearly
surfaces periodically throughout the quarter; the air
conditioners are quite loud and AnneMarie's voice is small
and many of the students speak quietly. AnneMarie seems to
need to strain to be loud enough, and sometimes the students don't make it clear that they cannot hear, so occasionally some confusion results. Later during this class, Karen decides to just turn off the air conditioner behind us, and hearing is much easier for us.

Using transparencies of sample letters lacking you-attitude, AnneMarie demonstrates to the class what they need to be looking for in the first assignment, what they need to eliminate and change. She talks about the ways to incorporate you-attitude, pointing out how the sample letter doesn't, and periodically asking for students to respond or react. Not many do. AnneMarie then puts up a transparency with the desirable revisions to the letter, again inviting students to discuss the changes. After AnneMarie introduces the letter and throws it open to the students, there is a pause, and then Karen responds. As in discussion with the group, Karen speaks first and more frequently than other students in the class. In the following exchange between the instructor and Karen, we see clearly that Karen's later choices for her response to the assignment derive from specifics identified by AnneMarie as particularly desirable. AnneMarie's goal in this assignment is to have students revise the letters to include more definite you-attitude, to have positive-emphasis, and to clearly delineate reader benefits. As can be seen in the exchange, AnneMarie
particularly emphasizes you-attitude, friendliness, having the letter focus on the benefits to the reader rather than any possible negative connotation in the message, and the early mention of itemizing by number or letter the most important points that the reader needs to be aware of. Given the specificity with which she points these out, and Karen's obvious targeting of these specifics, we can understand Karen's reaction later when the instructor's response is critical of the group's letter.

The group feels quite confident about this first assignment, noting to each other and to me in after-class chat, that they each have been rather successful in their writing efforts at school, so far. Karen confesses to a little less confidence about English classes than the others, but feels that her experience in business (she has done some small office work) will give her something of an edge here.

AnneMarie: So the, the first one, uh, this is what you have to be satisfied on, that this is a common exchange: this is for us, this is what we do for you. And you've got a couple options on how to achieve it. But the options that Ann talked about, a couple things I'd like to point out. Uh, one is that one of the options makes the reader feel better, makes you feel like you have more control over the situation. The writer's trying to help you out a little bit. The second thing is that you know that you have options because they, they set them off - they have this 1, 2, A, B. So that your eye is drawn to that part, you can see that you do this or that, you know. That the, the choices are very, uh, very, specific where in the first one they're all dumped in the same paragraph, and you have to wade through all the legal language to find out
what it is that you really have to do. Anything else that sounds better about this letter?

Karen: It just starts off better. I mean, you know, it sounds friendlier and sounds as though, that the person writing the letter, the Pickett, Mr. Pickett, is, is willing to be friendly and wants to help them.

AnneMarie: What specific things do you see?

Karen: Well, just using the word "let, let us." That shows that Mr. Pickett is involved, too, and isn't commanding.

AnneMarie: We're going to work together to try to solve this problem, rather than just this is what you should do?

Karen: Sounds more like an invitation than a command.

AnneMarie: It sounds a lot friendlier; it's not telling you what to do, it's sort of suggesting . . . . It also ends with, "Call me and tell me which way is best for you." So it's reinforcing the idea that it's trying to . . . figure out the best way to accommodate both parties . . . . Anything else that you see is better in this letter? Those are the main things. [Slight pause] It's still got the same information. The point is not that the information is changed, but the way you presented it, and you want to see your choices, and now it's friendlier, and you feel better when you get a letter like this than one like the last one.

This repeated reference to sounding "friendlier" shows up in the later discussion between Karen and Debbie M. when Karen decides that because Debbie's draft is "friendlier," that is the draft they should use. In the sample that AnneMarie uses to demonstrate, key points are set off and itemized with roman numerals. When the students revise their letter, they mimic this format exactly. The idea that the letter should suggest rather than tell, should seem like an invitation, not an order, will also be in evidence in the
discussion of the assignment.

Another example of Karen's, and consequently the groups', focus on meeting the teacher's expectations can be seen in the following section of the exchange between AnneMarie and Karen. AnneMarie has indicated to students the importance of positive emphasis in business communication, mentioning that having positive emphasis in their letters is one of the goals of the assignment. As usual, AnneMarie introduces the idea, asks students for their input--"So what are some of the ways that you can do that?"--waits a bit, and then explains what she is after. The focus on being positive, on reducing or eliminating negative aspects in the content of the letter, contributes to Karen's resistance later in the group discussion to the placement of the required $200.00 acceptance fee. Karen interprets AnneMarie's words quite literally and considers them to be specific demands. In her notes, she records these key phrases and then in group discussion, these serve as markers for what she thinks the group must focus on.

AnneMarie: The best thing, concentrate on the positive, try to eliminate the negative or turn it around to make it a positive, if possible. So what are some of the ways that you can do that? . . . That doesn't mean that you eliminate your negative message. What you have to say is the problem. You have to keep that in, but you have to decide what is necessary and what's not necessary. It also means you don't necessarily have to dwell on it.

Karen: I was just going to say that if you have
something negative to say you try to say something positive first, and then give them the bad news.

AnneMarie: . . . you bury the negative impression by putting the bad news in the middle of the paragraph, and you say it, and then you go on. You don't spend the whole letter on this negative situation. . . . you don't want to leave the reader with a really negative impression if you don't have to. You have to look at the situation and decide how negative is it? Can you turn it around and make it a positive, you're not trying to deceive the reader necessarily, but you're trying to make him feel good about what's going on. What else can we do, for positive emphasis?

[AnneMarie pauses here, waiting for students to respond, but when none do, she continues.]

AnneMarie: What about negative words and words with negative connotations—the worst of all things, negative things you mention, the negative item you can leave out, a lot of these negative words have connotations that are, that give a negative impression, all those legal words leave a negative impression. State information positively, again, tell the reader what they can do rather than that they can't. You could also justify the negative information, if you ask them about the packet, by giving them a reason, or the reader benefits. And again, the negative is unimportant. It's not absolutely necessary.

AnneMarie: I did want to talk very briefly about reader benefits. . . . What are reader benefits?

AnneMarie follows this pattern throughout the quarter. She identifies a particular focus for a lesson or assignment, begins the class with discussion and demonstration of specifics, calls for student participation, and proceeds to expand on whatever they give her until she is satisfied that the students understand the information. This identification of specific elements to be achieved in a given assignment contributes to the Introverts' focus on satisfying the instructor's particular expectations.
The difficulty occurs during the composing process when the members of Group A assume they fully understand what the instructor wants. AnneMarie has mentioned the basic requirements, Karen has recorded key phrases and some examples, and the group members also have notes on these points. When they begin to draft their papers, they tick off those points as they meet them, convinced that they have fully addressed the issues involved, but not understanding that the teacher might expect more than simply accomplishing basic goals.

Following the discussion of reader benefits, AnneMarie announces a change in the due date for the first group assignment, from the second Friday to Monday of the third week of classes, thus giving the groups ten days to complete the assignment. After making sure everyone understands, she asks the class to focus on the first assignment, choosing Dave to read aloud from the textbook the letter to be rewritten.

During the ten minute discussion following this reading, neither Karen nor Debbie participates much. Karen hasn't brought her book, and doesn't ask to share Debbie's, nor does Debbie offer. AnneMarie then tells the students to work on the problem in their groups for the remaining twenty minutes of class time. I wonder if this will be a problem,
since the group is only half represented, but both Karen and Debbie have brought complete, written drafts. Karen claims "real-world business experience" as a help to writing this letter, and Debbie has brought along her own admissions letter that she received four years ago:

Debbie M: I put mine in a photo album book . . . a little thing I kept over the years. It sounds exactly kind of like this, but in more, this is more like, so . . . I'll just kind of get some ideas off that [referring to the transparency which is still on the overhead projector] up there.

Karen: Well, I just once I started going I kept going, and I thought that if anyone else had like their own copies, we just could meld them together. I just started out with "Congratulations." I think that's appropriate, you know.


Karen: You know, if you are, if you have applied to several schools, or if you don't know if you're going to get in, then when you do get in then it's a really great feeling.

Debbie M: Uh-huh. Yeah. "Congratulations." I was going to put that in there, when I talked to you last night.

Karen: I really like this sentence here, "marking the beginning of your participation in an exciting educational experience." That was the only good sentence in my whole letter. I wanted to kind of keep that in if everyone else liked it.

Debbie M: Yeah. See I put down "This marks the beginning of a new and rewarding adventure in college education. The next four years will be full of rewarding and challenging experiences. And we'll be very happy to have you as a student at our institution." I don't know if that sounds a little, too much or not.

Karen: Okay, yeah, you went on with a lot more than what I did because I just had that one sentence, and
then I went right into what they’re supposed to do. They’re supposed to get down to....

Having thus established credentials, and indicated the strengths in their own letters, the two women switch papers, each reading the other’s draft. As they read, they continue to make verbal comments--mostly positive. Karen takes the lead, picking out specific points of which she likes either the wording or the location. She initiates exchanges; Debbie responds. On this day, the two sit in the same seats that they would choose if the entire group were present, Karen with her back to much of the class, and Debbie to her left, back to the windows. Sitting immediately next to each other, they are both able to see clearly the two papers. As they go over the papers, there are some instances when they communicate without speaking or without using complete sentences because there is a non-verbal indication, one person pointing to a specific section, or perhaps nodding in response to what the other has said. They seem comfortable with each other, not being elaborately polite or in any way formal:

Karen: Yeah. Okay, what did you put about, can I read it about....?

Debbie M: Yeah, sure.

Karen: [reading] "... the packet of material inviting you to an orientation session this summer. Orientation will open opportunities for you to join organizations. A lot of friendships have begun at orientation."

Debbie M: I think they should have something in there
about that because I did not believe that an orientation, but I'd still go, but a lot of my friends did, and that's very important, I think, especially to new students coming in. I know they're not, worried about not knowing anybody, and like what I really didn't like about this letter was we'll just keep requiring you to listen to brief speeches....

Karen: Oh, I know.

Debbie M: I hate it. I'm like, it just turns me off!

Karen: The way I put that is that I just sort of squooshed it all together and said, "...if participation in our orientation program on Saturday, August 1. During this time you will be given the opportunity to tour the campus, given an explanation of dormitory and off campus housing, be introduced to faculty and staff," and they have to say how it's going to be introduced, you know. . .

Debbie M: Right. You have to go.

Karen: "... and meet with your personal advisor for guidance."

Debbie M: That sounds good. I like that.

Karen: Because I thought, at first I said "we will answer all your questions," and then, I thought, well now, wait a minute. That makes it sound as though they're dumb.

Debbie M: Yeah. Yeah.

Karen: And I wanted them to know that they have like a personal advisor.

Debbie M: Right. I like that. Yeah, I know. That required stuff, that's for the birds. (Can't hear). Kind of like you have to be there, but we're gonna introduce you to....

In this discussion between the two women, their behavior is quite similar to their behavior in discussions involving the whole group. In all group encounters, Karen exercises leadership power in a number of ways: by speaking first and
most frequently, by contributing ideas more often than the others, by engaging more often in clarifying behaviors—defining, paraphrasing, etc.—and also by focusing the group discussion with targeting questions. Focusing the group is one of the task-oriented techniques that mark a leader according to Fisher and other small group communication researchers. Frequently, when the group seems to be taking too much time with a given point or on those rare occasions when they wander from the topic at hand to a discussion of something unrelated to the assignment, Karen brings them back by asking a question targeting the point she thinks they should be working on. Debbie M., as can be seen in the following speech event, expends more of her communicative efforts in supporting, affirming responses to the others than she does in initiating ideas or introducing new information.

Karen: How did you lead in, I'm down in, [pointing to the paragraph] you started with, um, orientation, and then what did you go into there?

Debbie M: Determined? Determining? "You have been determined an in-state residence qualifier, qualify for in-state tuition, welcome you.... I mean it's just.... And I figure you're going to get a lot more stuff on the orientation, but I like how you set it up like that and gave a little bit like that.

Karen: Yeah. But you're emphasizing the orientation, and that's the bulk of your letter, and then sticking on these other two little things about the money and the, you know, the . . . That's good.

Debbie M: I mean the transcript and the medical form is just, you know, stuff that has to be turned in.
Anyway, I think the orientation should be stressed a lot.

Karen: Okay.

Debbie M: What did you have about that, or...?

Karen: Well, I just, like I just put in one paragraph, even on the enclosed forms. "Please return the completed medical history form by August 20," because I think we have to, she said that she wanted us to put in dates, but, 'cause that stuff does have to be done.

Debbie M: Yeah. Right.

Karen: But we have to put something in there, umm. "Also needed this year high school transcript, the request from the transcript will be sent to your high school just as soon as your acceptance is received." This needs to say "the acceptance fee." Um, and then I just put that "You’re being admitted to the Columbus campus for the Fall Quarter of 1991. Written consent of the admissions office will be needed if you want to change to another campus or another term of year."

Debbie M: Oh, that sounds good.

Karen: "Since you are a state resident you qualify for state tuition. We welcome you and look forward to your attending OSU. If you have any questions, please call us at our toll free number." And I doubt there’s a toll free number, but I just had to put one in.

Debbie M: Yeah. Umm. That sounds okay.

Although this exchange goes smoothly, and Debbie agrees with nearly everything Karen suggests, there is one difference of opinion. Karen has placed the reference to the quarter of admission at the end of the letter and before cautions about changing either the quarter or campus; Debbie prefers to have that at the beginning, since that is how her letter from the University has it. And when speaking on this point, Debbie’s voice is a little louder, firmer, and more definite than when she is murmuring comments of positive
reinforcement to Karen:

Debbie M: I put up here "We are pleased to inform you of your admission to Ohio State University, Columbus Campus, for Autumn Quarter 1991."

Karen: [Slowly, drawing it out.] Okay. So, you do that in the beginning.

Debbie M: 'Cause that’s how it was written in our acceptance letter, which I think, or, you know, when I got mine saying that, you know, right off the bat "Ohio State University, Columbus, Autumn Quarter." You know. Then that way if they just read the first paragraph they know where they’re going, what year and stuff right off the bat, and then....

Karen: I guess I was looking at the negative part, and it was saying about written consent of admission, when you talked about what we needed, what the students do down here.... Let’s see, what does it say? Oh, it put all this right here, . . .

Debbie M: Oh, yeh-yeh-yeh.

Karen: . . . and I didn’t want that early in the letter. So that’s why I moved it all down to the bottom.

They are discussing this, each trying to persuade the other, when the instructor interrupts to instruct the class on the correct letter format to be used in the assignment. With the issue unresolved, the class ends. This point surfaces later as one of the issues they need to resolve and, surprisingly to me, Debbie carries the issue. The other group members agree with her about its location and convince Karen to go along. However, at this point, Debbie and Karen suspend the conversation, reclaim their own letters, and agree to each write another draft for Wednesday.
For the first twenty minutes or so of class on Wednesday, I talk to the class about their MBTI results, so the groups have only twenty-five minutes of regular class time to meet and work on the assignment. Everyone is here, and each member of the group has a complete written draft of the letter to be revised.

This individual approach to their collaboration is characteristic of the group. In their pre-assignment negotiations, they agreed that the most workable approach would be for each of them to draft first alone and then to share these completed drafts with the rest of the group and collaborate on the revisions. In their memos to the instructor following the first assignment, each of them explained the process and their definition of collaboration. Karen notes that she "spent about 45 mins. writing a rough draft by myself to take to class and collaborate with the others in the group as we had previously agreed." Debbie M. actually suggested this approach, although she does not claim it as her own in her memo. Her description of the process is that "The group as a whole decided to let each individual member rewrite the acceptance letter instead of each member being assigned a certain topic to cover."

Debbie M. goes on to describe the rest of the collaborative process as, "We read each individual's rewrite and selected the best for the final paper. This was done for two
reasons: 1) To let all members express their views on the whole paper and not just an assigned section and, 2) To get a variety of different views for each section." And Debbie R. notes that this approach "seemed to work well, as each of us had prepared the assignment before other groups had even started working on it."

Revising. In the first collaborative revision session where all are present, each of them holds her own draft at first, reading from it and comparing it with the letter in the textbook. Then they trade copies and read each other's to compare drafts. They finally settle on having one person make notes for the next draft. Karen combines her draft with Debbie M.'s draft as the basis by using a system of numbers and lines drawn through or around sections to indicate what should go where and what should be deleted. She numbers the paragraphs and the major points on both drafts that the group agrees to, in the order they discuss, and makes notes on her draft for the rewrite. In this encounter, even though Heidi speaks first, directing attention to the last paragraph as something they need to emphasize, Karen takes over almost immediately, controlling the focus of the discussion.

Heidi: I think the main, the last paragraph, the three main points have to be included, just to let the person know what they have to do if they decide to come to the school and that kind of thing.

Karen: Right. That really is the purpose of the
letter. And let them know what the rest of it's, uh, would be, I guess, you consider fluff.


Debbie R: It's just, I think, we've all discovered that it's kind of badly worded.

[Encouraging] Yeah.

Karen: And it makes it kind of complicated and hard, you know, like that other letter she showed us the other day.

Debbie R: I like your idea about the indenting part. You know what I mean? Because then it's like you can, with this you've got to look for it. With that, you can see.

Karen: It makes it more like a list. You can put a check off when you get things done. Yeah, we agreed on that. I really like the way [Debbie M] had started out her letter. She went into saying that, let's see, she just went into a little more depth about "the next four years will be full of both rewarding and challenging experiences. We're happy to have you as a student at our institution." I mean it's like an invitation, you know, it sort of is encouraging a student, and it just elaborates a little more in the first paragraph, and I thought that was....

Debbie M: I kind of think it takes away the scary feeling. You know? When I first got mine, it was like....

Debbie R: Maybe you'd better change the four to five or six.

[Lots of laughter]

Karen: [laughing] Who makes it a four years, anyway?

Debbie M: Then, also, I wrote a lot about the orientation program. Cause I think that's something they would really want to be interested in, and I have like a whole paragraph on, like, "we're sending you a pack of material, orientation will open opportunities for you to join student organizations and learn all about student life at OSU," and Karen really liked "many friendships have begun in orientation," which I think is kind of important to stress that you will have friends.
Heidi: But I didn't think, if I, like pretty much just basically put what they needed to do, but I didn't really go into depth. I didn't know if like this was the type of letter you should go in depth with, or like later they would be getting more about what orientation was all about. That kind of thing.

Debbie M: So I have a copy of my old acceptance letter in here. That's what I used, and, I mean, there was a lot of information about challenging, rewarding and orientation, and you know, just a lot of little things to make it sound really exciting.

Karen: What she really ended up doing in this whole paragraph here is really giving the reader all the benefits to coming to OSU and what they're going to gain from coming, especially what they're going to gain here to be coming to the orientation session. That they are really going to get something. And then you go into the business part, you know, the blah, blah, blah. You have to give us this, this, this. And that's what I thought was really good about it, if we can....

In the above exchange, Karen is using Debbie M.'s letter as the main example. She is holding Debbie's letter and pointing out on it the examples of what she is saying. Debbie R. sits on Karen's right, but more than eighteen inches away, and Heidi on Debbie R.'s right, so Debbie R. has the advantage of seeing the text more clearly than Heidi, but neither has a clear view of it. Karen holds the letter up, extending it out slightly and lowering it, indicating the passage referred to as she makes a point about the text. However, she does not lay the letter flat and point out these sections so that everyone can see them. She is thus controlling the situation, even though, at the moment, it is not her draft that is being used as the group's base draft. Karen does most of the content
evaluation in these group sessions, although Debbie R. is the one most likely to do sentence-level evaluation, as noted in Debbie M.'s final memo.

As they discuss the draft, it becomes clear that they are uncertain about the format. According to theory, sensing types tend to prefer, whatever they are being asked to do, to have all the details clear and precise. When given general instructions, or when details are not made specific, they need to find ways of making them more concrete. In this group, the task of making sure things were concrete and clear usually fell to Debbie R., probably because with her preference for thinking judgment, she determined logically that questions needed to be asked and answered immediately in order to be able to proceed, and with feeling as her least developed function, she would not worry about being abrupt or interrupting because the important thing is to obtain the necessary information or clarification.

Debbie R: Are we limited to one page?

Heidi: See, that's what I wasn't sure about cause I thought,...

Karen: Well, we need to ask.

Debbie R: [addressing the Instructor] Two things. First, are we limited to one page?

AnneMarie: No.

Debbie R: Okay, second of all, are we doing A or B or a combination?
AnneMarie: B. You're going to be applying it to Ohio State.

Debbie R: Okay. I can deal with that.

In this early encounter, Debbie R. initiates fewer speech acts than any one else--20% of the total as opposed to Karen's 34%, Debbie M.'s 24%, and even Heidi's 20% [see Table 7], but when she speaks, she makes purposeful and direct statements or asks questions requesting information, nearly twice as many information requests as any of the others. The description of her personality type, ISTJ, suggests that this focus on facts and this no-nonsense approach could be expected:

Their [ST's] main interests focus on facts, because facts can be collected and verified directly by the senses--by seeing, hearing, touching, counting, weighing, and measuring. The ST types typically approach their decisions . . . by impersonal analysis, because what they trust is thinking, with its step-by-step logical process of reasoning from cause to effect, from premise to conclusion (33 Manual).

Debbie R.'s preference for the practical and matter-of-fact extends also to her writing. She prefers explicit instructions, frequently asking the instructor for clarification on specifics and being careful with the specifics in any given piece of writing. In the final draft of this admissions letter, it is her attention to detail that determines the final format of the largest chunk of the writing, the three itemized points.
Debbie R.'s directness is typical of how she operated throughout the quarter. She wastes no time on hedging or indecisiveness, unlike Heidi, who seems to preface every statement with some kind of qualifier: "See, that's what I wasn't sure about, 'cause I thought,...," "I kind of, like, thought that maybe we could . . . ." Heidi seems surprisingly tentative in group meetings, especially during writing sessions, although none of the others characterize her as tentative. They note in their logs that she "assisted with the final draft," or "contributed a little," but in discussion with me, they seem not to mind her quietness. Her hesitancy in these group meetings surprised me because she did not appear at all hesitant or tentative in purely social encounters, either with me or with the other students.

Heidi is the youngest, but only by a few months, although she does appear less mature in manner and demeanor than the other two single women. Still coltish, with short-cropped, thick chestnut hair, she looks like the quintessential all-American girl athlete: well-scrubbed, make-up free, healthy and strong; her tan has brought out a dusting of freckles on her face which emphasize a snub nose. In my estimation as a teacher of writing, she is no less able than the others, but she does lack confidence and takes fewer risks. In the early writing sessions, when she
volunteers suggestions, Karen frequently ignores her or seems to agree by murmuring, "Mmm-hmm," but in reality the change suggested by Heidi might not make it to the final draft. In the sample below, Heidi responds to a suggestion of Karen's that they each indicate what they think is important enough from their letter to be included in the final draft.

**Heidi:** Well, I kinda put that about the money in mine.

**Karen:** Oh, did you? Okay. All right. Let's see. I like saying "Congratulations" in the beginning. Okay?

**Debbie M:** Umm-hmm.

Heidi's reference is to the $200.00 acceptance fee, which she had placed in the second sentence of her letter. Karen's response is given in a very dismissive tone, and Karen immediately turns the discussion to the opening of her own letter. A few minutes later, Heidi asks Karen about the placement and form of the three main points, the fee, orientation, and the forms to be submitted.

**Heidi:** Now, you know your paragraph looks like what OSU offered and all that?

**Karen:** Uh-huh?

**Heidi:** Are we going to put this [i.e., the itemization of the three points.], state these at the beginning right away?

**Debbie M:** I think that should be at the end.

**Karen:** Yeah, more toward the end.

(Several students talking.)
Heidi: So, we’re gonna tell ’em all the pros and . . .

Debbie M: And then give ’em the business stuff . . .

Heidi: Okay . . .

Debbie M: I think more people would rather, they’re going to read this first, and then when they get done they’re going to go, "Oh." [Someone laughs] You know, . . .

Karen: Yeah. but at least they’re at first not getting hit with this first.

When she says this, Karen points to the reference to the money, thus effectively silencing Heidi. After this exchange, Karen again shifts the focus to the opening paragraph of the document.

Perhaps Heidi feels intimidated by Karen’s physical polish and confidence, an attribute which extends to the way she approaches her writing in these sessions, or Debbie R.’s detached aloofness, or Debbie M.’s focus on job and boyfriend-soon-to-be-fiancee. Each of the other three also appears more confident and knowledgeable about writing in these discussions. Or perhaps Heidi feels that her contributions are not as valid, although she never says this. Whatever the reason, Heidi contributes less substantively to the discussions as the quarter progresses.

My observations, however, do not match Heidi’s own perceptions on all counts. About this first assignment, she feels that
"my contribution to the paper [is] an important one. I may not talk as much as [Karen] and [Debbie M.], but when I do share my views it leads to a better, well-organized paper. . . my major contribution was to clarify ideas and help reword them . . . ."

Yet when I analyze the content of the various drafts, and compared them with the transcripts of meetings and my field notes, it becomes clear that Heidi’s contribution is not equal, at least in amount, to any of the others. Nothing in the final draft is directly or exclusively taken from her drafts or from her contributions, and while she is the first to emphasize the importance of including "the three main points," it is Debbie R.’s wording and Karen’s ordering that they adopt in the final. And in terms of "clarifying ideas," when I counted the number of instances of clarification acts or interacts—including defining, explaining, paraphrasing, giving examples for, and giving reasons for—Heidi contributed only six to Karen’s twenty-six, and Debbie M.’s twelve. Only Debbie R., at four, contributed fewer. [See Table 7.]

On this first assignment, the evaluation that each of the group members turns in suggests that Heidi’s contribution is perceived generally as less than equal. Karen decides that Heidi "did not contribute as much this time, but not because she didn’t want to, it just worked out that way." But when asked to explain, Karen offers only that Heidi was not in class on Monday. Debbie M. reports
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Initiated Speech Acts</th>
<th>Total Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>3 Jul. 34%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Aug. 37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>3 Jul. 21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Aug. 18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie R.</td>
<td>3 Jul. 20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Aug. 24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie M.</td>
<td>3 Jul. 24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Aug. 22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that "I found it quite difficult [to] incorporate [Debbie R.'s and Heidi's] input," and that Heidi had "few new ideas to contribute, mainly just wording sentences and phrases different to make them sound better."

In the collaboration on this first assignment, the group put in place behaviors which would characterize it for the remainder of the quarter. The self-selection of roles within the group could be a direct result of how these first sessions evolved. When Heidi and Debbie R. missed that first group writing session, they effectively eliminated themselves as possible candidates for the role of leader. Heidi probably had no interest in nor inclination toward being group leader, but Debbie R.'s increasing involvement in the process during the final two assignments, her increased efforts to control the discussion, might reflect an interest on her part. Between the first and last assignments, Debbie R. nearly quadrupled the number of times she contributed ideas to a collaborative session; her attempts at clarifying rose from one to fourteen, while the number of times she deferred to another group member dropped by 60%. Negotiations about procedure went smoothly, due in large part to Karen's habit of ignoring opposition and the rest of the group's tendency to want to "get things done" which results in acquiescence. In later assignments, resistance occasionally resulted in the implementation of a
change not necessarily desired by Karen, most frequently by Debbie R.

Debbie R. is an ISTJ, a type relatively rare in women: only 1 in 23 women is an ISTJ (Gifts 108). According to Myers, "ISTJ’s emphasize logic, analysis, and decisiveness. . . . Usually they have difficulty understanding needs that differ widely from their own" (Gifts 108). Debbie R. clearly fits that description. It is important to note, however, that there is no mean-spiritedness in an ISTJ’s lack of empathy, and there was definitely none in Debbie; it’s just that empathy is not something that would naturally occur to an ISTJ. However, combining Debbie R.’s lack of outward consideration for Heidi’s feelings with Heidi’s own natural diffidence and Karen’s assertiveness, results in the kind of situation that did evolve—Heidi became progressively less effective in negotiating the writing issues because she wasn’t able to negotiate the personality issues.

With her strong sense of logic, her focus on analysis, and her business-like approach, Debbie R. fit naturally into the role of problematizer. As Debbie M. notes in her memo: "The not-so-positive experience was that Debbie R. kept disagreeing with ideas everyone was throwing out. She just about always had some reason why an idea was not good before
we could explain it thoroughly." However, in this same memo, Debbie M. states that the most positive part of the experience was "writing it as a group. All the members ideas were on the same level and no one had any "way out" ideas. Also, communication between the group members was open." Debbie M., an ISFJ, has a strongly developed feeling function, as evidenced by her role in the group. Keeping communication open was important to her. She affirmed and encouraged other speakers more than any one else in the group did and disagreed less.

Rewriting. The group functioned well enough to compose drafts promptly and efficiently and to revise them in a timely manner. They lacked flair in their approach to solving the problems and hence in their writing. Because they focused so closely on meeting the instructor's expectations, what they perceived to be the instructors only expectations, they never managed the "A" papers they thought they were capable of.

In fairness to the students, however, AnneMarie's comments (on the drafts and on the papers that this group hands in) do not encourage students to expand their focus beyond the immediate. With the exception of a reference to their having improved the organization in this final draft over that of the in-process draft she saw, there are no
global comments on the writing; her final discursive comment enumerates details, specific items lacking, limited goals not met:

You have improved the organization over the original. Requirements for admission are clear. You need more details on orientation (will they stay in dorms? what dorms? what student organizations?). We also discussed in class that OSU may not be the reader's 1st choice & some of the advantages of going to OSU should be included (programming, social activities, etc.). You also need to work on you-attitude: put the emphasis on the reader.

On the paper itself, there were three comments: two "not you-attitude," in the margin, and one addressing the impropriety of using a first name salutation when the writer doesn't know the recipient of the letter.

This group consistently attempts to meet what they perceive as the teacher's expectations; they fail to go beyond the minimum, because they believe that the items that the instructor isolates as significant or uses as examples are the only ones that they need to attend to. When their papers are evaluated and do not receive the "A" grade they anticipate, they are at first bewildered and then frustrated. However, when they rewrite, they repeat their pattern of working only on those points specifically addressed by the teacher.

When the students met to revise and rewrite this document, they were over their initial shock and anger at
the "C+" grade the paper had received and resigned to making the requested corrections. Unfortunately, all they did was make the corrections as requested; they never revised beyond what AnneMarie stipulated in her comments, so again the grade they finally received was not quite what they expected, although they confessed that an "A-" was a big improvement.

Collaborating: The Fifth Assignment. By the time the group works on the fifth group assignment, the roles that they appear to be comfortable with in these early meetings have coalesced, with a few minor variations. Karen is still the undisputed leader, recognized by all the members as such, Debbie R. the most task-oriented and given to problematizing, Debbie M. the nurturer, the encouraging one, while Heidi continues to be a contributor, but to have no one significant element marking her role.

The final assignment to be accomplished as a group is a memo recommending a candidate for an executive position in Asia. On the day they are to begin, only Karen and Debbie R. are in class at the bell; the other two come in about ten minutes late.

C-2 RECOMMENDING A CANDIDATE FOR AN OVERSEAS ASSIGNMENT

In most companies, the Director of Human Resources has little to say about job assignments at the executive
level. But after some bad experiences with American
managers who couldn't handle international assignments,
your company has agreed that you would evaluate the
candidates for each overseas assignment. The Vice
President for each area still has the final voice, so
you must explain your criteria and show convincingly
why the candidate you support is indeed the best.

You need to recommend someone to begin a three-
year term as Manager of Asian Marketing. The Asian
division is your company's fourth-largest in terms of
sales; the company feels that with the right person,
this market can grow dramatically in the next five
years.

You don't know any of the finalists for the
position, so you must rely on the summary data you have
been given.

1. **Rachel A. Diamond**, 48, white, single. Employed by
the company for 20 years. Harvard MBA. Speaks
French and German. Formerly, Manager of Canadian
Marketing for the company; very successful.
Excellent technical knowledge, good managerial
skills, excellent communication skills, acceptable
interpersonal skills. Excellent health; excellent
emotional stability. Children ages 22, 18, and
15.

2. **Scott Robert Greers**, 41, white, single. Employed
by the company for eight years. University of
Minnesota MBA. Formerly in the Buenos Aires
office as a staff person; successful. Speaks
Spanish. Acceptable technical knowledge, good
managerial skills, excellent communication skills,
excellent interpersonal skills. Excellent health; good
emotional stability. No Children.

3. **Adam X. Fong.**, 34, of Chinese descent, married.
Employed by the company for 11 years. Stanford
MBA. Does not speak any foreign language. Has
not worked abroad. A "boy wonder" who helped
increase sales by 20% in his U.S. region. Good
technical knowledge, excellent managerial skills,
acceptable communication skills, excellent
interpersonal skills. Excellent health; good
emotional stability. Wife speaks Japanese. Wife
is a college professor of political science who
hopes to get an appointment at a university in
Japan or China. Children ages 6 and 4.

4. **Amanda Fuentes**, 42, of Hispanic descent. Employed
by the company for 14 years. University of Texas
MBA. Speaks French, Spanish, Korean, and some
Japanese. Has not worked abroad, but as liaison with the international marketing staff has written monthly summary reports for all international divisions. Excellent technical knowledge, acceptable managerial skills, excellent communication skills, excellent interpersonal skills. Excellent health; excellent emotional stability. Husband is an executive at another U.S. company; the couple plan to commute every six weeks. No children.

5. **Bill Evans**, 46, black, married. Employed by the company for 22 years. Howard University MBA. Speaks Farsi and Hebrew. Formerly manager of Middle East Marketing for the company; very successful. Excellent technical knowledge, good managerial skills, good communication skills, excellent interpersonal skills. Good health; excellent emotional stability. Wife teaches fourth grade, does not plan to seek paid employment in the Orient. Children ages 14 and 10.

Write a memo to Lawrence Vandiver, Vice President for Marketing, explaining your criteria and ranking the candidates.

As they did on the other assignments, the group starts working on this in class a week before it is due. AnneMarie directs each group to read the assignment and come up with a priority ranking of criteria for the candidates. Because no one has brought her own book, Karen borrows the instructor's and reads the problem aloud. The other three listen intently, but no one takes notes. As Karen finishes each description, the group comments, Debbie R. being distinctly outspoken here. She and Debbie M. have both had a course in International Business and both are adamant that the two women candidates are "out" because they learned that women are not accepted in positions of leadership abroad. At one point, Karen says, "Okay, help me figure out who goes next,"
although she is holding the book in her right hand in such a way that no one else can possibly see the paragraphs of description. They have ranked the individuals without deciding on a list of criteria. AnneMarie interrupts, asks for volunteers to identify criteria. Jason speaks up: 1) male, 2) interpersonal skills, 3) communication skills. AnneMarie takes exception to #1, claiming that excluding women from consideration will not work, that studies have shown Orientals will respect American females. After three groups suggest criteria and each time AnneMarie presents opposition to the criteria, Karen asks, "Is there a right answer here?" Of course, AnneMarie replies that there is not, that the goal of the assignment is that the groups demonstrate that their chosen candidate is the best for the job. The key, says AnneMarie, "is to support your choice with solid details as to a) your chosen characteristics are most important and b) why your candidate is #1."

When AnneMarie returns them to group work, they try at first to figure out an approach to dividing the work. Karen suggests each member take one candidate and "focus on the pros and cons" if they will first acknowledge that Scott, her choice, is #1. Even though AnneMarie has several times specifically stated that the goal of the assignment is to develop the list of criteria first and then to demonstrate how a given individual best fits those criteria, these four
insist on focusing on the candidates first, ignoring the criteria. They finally agree that each will analyze Scott and one other candidate and evaluate them, bringing in the results on Monday. Having come to this agreement, they all agree to leave class early and separate to work independently.

As usual, they have arranged to draft the first part of the assignment individually, but when they come in on Monday, each has had to deal with the issue of criteria and has arrived at a very different result than they had anticipated on Friday.

In this assignment, the group engages in many of the same composing practices and interpersonal communication patterns that they did in the first; therefore, I don't intend to present it in quite the detail as I did the first. I want to look at this assignment a little differently than I did at number one because it reveals the extent of change in two members of the group—Debbie R. and Heidi—and how those changes affect the group as a whole.

Karen picks up her schoolbag soon after sitting down and begins to paw through it, muttering, "Gosh, where is all my stuff? I worked on this, now where did I put it?" No one but me seems to have noticed, even though Karen
continues to look through her papers and the bag for the first five minutes of AnneMarie's lecture. Finally, Karen leaves the table and walks up to AnneMarie's desk; the others don't seem concerned at all. Debbie R. initiates discussion by saying that she ranked the candidates according to criteria she could identify from the problem:

   Debbie R: See I came up with what, nine reasons for and six reasons against. I just went through every single thing that made up their whole bio. I just went through, read it, and from there I took each of those points and ranked them pro or con.

The others concur, revealing that Karen's choice, Scott, has not fared so well. Heidi and Debbie R. have both selected another candidate, Bill, and Debbie M. admits to changing her vote:

   Heidi: When I was looking, when I was doing mine, I think that, that Bill guy, I think that he should get the job.

   Debbie R: I do, too.

   Heidi: I was doing it, and there's, I mean, I thought this guy's got everything going for him. I thought, 'cause I sat down and read them. Even though he's married, and he's been overseas before.

   Debbie R: See, that's why, this guy's been overseas, and he was only a staff person. He was never in a management position. And then it says he only has good emotional skills, and only good management skills and only acceptable technical skills.

   Debbie M: Yeah. That's.... I had to put him in a new place.

Karen returns to the group, which is discussing the issue of whether a woman can be accepted in a management position in
the Asian marketplace, as Debbie R. asks Debbie M. if she
has located anything in writing to support their joint
memory from International Business class that women managers
are not accepted and not effective in the Orient. Karen
thinks Debbie M.'s "Find anything?" refers to her search for
her assignment, and answers, "I didn't. Uh-uh," at the same
time that Debbie M. says, "No, I couldn't find anything."
Karen looks puzzled for a moment, then realizes what's going
on; the other three continue to discuss the lack of proof
for a few minutes. At a slight pause, Karen breaks in with
an announcement.

Karen: I have real bad news. I have bad news and good
news.

Debbie M: Uh-oh.

Karen: Bad news first--I worked on this really hard,
and I had, and I had half of it written, and I left it
at home. I'm sick.

Debbie M: Ohhh.

Karen: It's in my English book that I don't bring.
Right? Because I worked on it, put all the pages I
worked on right in the book, closed the book....

Carole: That's really efficient.

Giggles from Debbie R and Debbie M.

Karen: I've been thinking about I have this marketing
assignment that I had to work on and hand in today, and
I'm sorry, but I talked to her and we have an
extension.

Heidi: On this?

Karen: Yeah. We don't have to hand them in until
Friday.

Debbie M: This paper? Great.
Karen: Because it was my fault, so, if that's okay with everybody.

Debbie M: That's fine by me.

As can be seen from the transcription above, this speech event was not extensively engaged in by the other group members. When Karen makes her announcement, their physical reactions suggest that they feel less positive about what she has done. Heidi's voice is incredulous, Debbie R. looks displeased, and Debbie M., although she says, "Great," says it softly, almost inaudibly, and doesn't smile at all—an unusual occurrence in itself. Karen seems to sense that this might be a less than happy reaction, and laughs nervously as she tries to join the discussion with, "Well, I hate to put it off, but I can't even remember which two guys I had now." When no one else says anything, I reply, "You had Adam and Bill." Heidi then reacts and attempts to include Karen in the dialogue.

Heidi: We were just talking. I had Bill, who was second, we had ranked him second, but I mean I went over it, and he seems to be the most qualified. Every skill, I mean the only thing that we had against him was he was married and had kids, but his wife doesn't plan to work, he has excellent emotional stability, been overseas before, and . . .

Debbie R: I don't know. I just . . .

Heidi: and this guy --

Karen: He's lookin' good, to ya, huh?

Heidi: he sounded good, but he didn't have as much experience. He never really held a high position. I mean, you know....

Karen: The only thing, you know, that a lot of people
are really good at and can learn. I guess the reason I just kept going back here is first of all because he’s black, . . . and I hated to say that, I mean it’s not my business. And the fact that he does have, I thought that one of our criteria was that, that, as a matter of fact when I wrote our criteria out, one of them was that they do not have outside demanding responsibilities. And I think that a wife and any children, so I pretty much eliminated in my own mind anybody who had children, and that’s why he [Scott] just kept appealing, you know, to me, because he doesn’t have to worry about school for his kids and whether they’re going to adjust and whether they even want to go, and you know how his wife’s going to . . . . You’re talking about major culture change here. You’re not talking about taking them to Canada.

Debbie M: So like he’s been in the middle east market, and that’s pretty different, too.

When Karen replies to Heidi that, "He’s lookin’ good to ya, huh?" she is laughing a little, and seems to be condescending. Heidi’s response, given quickly and almost apologetically, gives Karen the opening she has needed to make her position known on Bill. She opposes ranking him high because of his color and because he’s married and has children. She still favors Scott although the other three relegated Scott to no better than fourth. In the course of the discussion, Heidi stands firm on Bill and the Debbies support her, until finally Karen appears to recognize the social incorrectness of her stance on Bill’s race, and she switches tactics and proceeds to argue against raising to number one any candidate who is married or has children, which of course would eliminate all but Scott. Heidi is surprisingly persistent and finally Debbie M., the peacemaker, steps in:
Debbie M: Well, we can always say, if we want to go with Bill, we can say but he's married. He is more qualified. We can kind of go, maybe, that we like Bill because he's more qualified, but he does have a family, which might cause a problem; whereas, Scott doesn't have a family but he's not as qualified.

But Karen is not to be dissuaded, she continues to argue for eliminating married people or parents from consideration, until finally she wears down Debbie M. who moans tiredly, "Ohhh, I don't care which one we pick."

Everyone is leaning into the table. Karen and Debbie M. have their elbows on the table. Karen uses lots of hand gestures as she makes her points, trying to convince the group to support her in rejecting anyone who is married or has children. Debbie R. and Heidi resist most stubbornly, Debbie M. manages to encourage both sides in the debate. She has not had enough sleep, she tells me, and wants only to "get this over with." After about fifteen minutes, Karen finally moderates enough to agree that married might work, if they agree to bar children. The others then balk at this denial of family. Debbie R. doesn't think it makes much difference to the company whether a candidate has a family, because "they wouldn't even put them up for promotion if that was something that they were totally against." Heidi resists, less vocally, but she has pulled back in her chair and folded her arms across her chest, and she makes it clear by her refusal to acquiesce that she thinks this criteria
cannot be allowed to eliminate candidates. And Debbie M. delivers the final prevailing statements in favor of family:

Debbie M: I think maybe if we just picked somebody, if that person thinks that they want to take their family, that's fine. If not, they'll turn the position down. So you can just say, you know, we offer it to the best qualified person and rank them that way, and then depending on what they want, if they want the family to go and what not,....

Karen: So, our criteria changes, then, as to....

Debbie M: Yeah. Just thinking about it. I mean you really do not want to go against the family in being married, so, you can offer it to the best qualified person and let them, you know, judge on what they want to do.

This is the first time all quarter that Karen has had any real opposition to the agenda she put forth, and the others are surprisingly determined. All quarter, whenever she has held out for something, whether an approach to handling the problem or how to revise or structure their pare, she has won. Today it is clear that that will not happen. Perhaps her not being prepared, not having a physical artifact to bolster her statements as the others do, puts her at a disadvantage in the negotiations. Or perhaps her being absent for the first part of the discussion reduces her power base in some way, mirroring the disadvantage that Heidi and Debbie R. were at on the first assignment when they missed the early discussion. In any event, Karen finally admits defeat.

Karen: Okay. Well. I guess I have to, I will conceded if that’s what the three of you want, but I think I have to disagree just to the fact that if they didn’t feel it was important, they wouldn’t have put the facts
in here, whether they were . . .

Debbie M: Yeah. That's true.

Karen: . . . single or married or had kids. So I do think it's a fact that you have to consider, and I think it's a fact that companies consider, too, I mean in real life when they're doing it. Umm, and I think that whether somebody's married or has kids is just as much of a part of them as if they have an MBA or if they have ....

Debbie M: [with a little laugh] You're talking from experience. We have no idea.

Karen: I think it's just as much of a part of a person that you have to evaluate and can't ignore it, and I agree that we definitely need to be fair, that to turn someone down for a promotion because they have children, but again, I mean, you're not talking about moving them to Texas. You're talking about moving them to the Orient where it's a tremendous culture change, and, I don't know. I think that we do have to sort of think about it, but if you want to choose somebody that has, you know, to go, like if you really like Amanda, she's married, she doesn't have kids and stuff....

After discussing the relative merits of the two women, Heidi reiterates her opposition to Scott.

Heidi: I guess, I think if we went without being married she would be qualified, but she's a woman. We're not putting her for the job. And I don't know. I think Bill's a lot more qualified than Scott, though. I mean, not a whole lot, but he just has more experience....

Debbie M: Well, we can always say, if we want to go with Bill, we can say but he's married. He is more qualified. We can kind of go, maybe, that we like Bill because he's more qualified, but he does have a family, which might cause a problem; whereas, Scott doesn't have a family but he's not as qualified.

Debbie M. is still the peacemaker, still encouraging harmony. At this, Karen switches tactics and introduces the idea that it would be much less expensive for the company to
send single, unmarried Scott than married-with-two-children Bill. Debbie M. agrees with that; Debbie R. adds that housing is impossible in Japan, and then Debbie R., adamant that the group will not roll over and play dead on this one, suggests that they "write up something decent about each of them" according to the criteria, and Karen interrupts her.

Karen: It said to rank them. I thought so, too, but at the very end it says "explaining your criteria and ranking the candidates." So we have to not only select, I had started to write out a number now, I wrote out a criteria, and then I wrote out a ranking that I thought we had agreed on, a sort of preliminary ranking, and then I did my two people, and explained. I think that's what we want to do in our memo.

Debbie M: Pick our person, explain why that person's qualified, and then rank the other people below them and explain why we didn't pick them. Okay?

Karen: Okay. How we evaluate them should come first. Our criteria and evaluation should be first.

Now Karen has the weight of logic on her side; she has won a measure of control of the discussion, although Debbie R. continues to wrestle, as they negotiate the ranking of the criteria. Karen thinks communication skills should be most important; Debbie R. thinks job skills should. (Scott has excellent communication skills, only good technical skills; Bill has only good communication skills, but excellent technical skills.) They go back and forth a bit, until surprisingly, Heidi interrupts and focuses the group:

Heidi: Okay. So let's make sure we all know exactly how our, so when we write up our people we're all following the same criteria. Are we going to refer back to that? So what....
They are all tiring of this wrangling over details, and seek resolution. After a few minutes, they agree to weight the words in the description:

Heidi: Okay, wait. What do we have? We have, what are the rankings? Excellent. Good. Good. Acceptable.

Debbie R: Is it going to work to rank them like three, two and one and give them points?

Debbie M: Yeah. We could add the points up.

Some mumbling from Debbie R. as she reads.

Debbie M: Sounds good. All right. Scott has acceptable technical skills. Bill has excellent technical skills.

As this discussion proceeds smoothly, Karen can’t resist the opportunity to try once more to put forth her agenda:

Debbie M: Okay. Managerial skills. They both have good.... Okay. Communication. Scott has excellent, and Bill has good, and interpersonal they both have excellent. Okay. You want to do health?

Karen: Mm hmm.

Debbie M: Okay. Health. Scott has excellent, and Bill has good.

Karen: That’s another thing to consider, too, I mean we’re talking about the cost of things, and if you send somebody over there and then they go and get sick on you, and they spend time in the hospital....


Karen: ....A lot of expense for the company.

Debbie M: Bill is excellent, and Scott is good.

Debbie M.’s comments as she makes notes of the rankings are said almost sotto voce, as Karen keeps rolling right over her. At this point, Debbie R. recognizes that the scores
will tie between Bill and Scott, and Karen points out that "what it does come down to, then, is about what we’re talking about them being married and having families and what you think about that." We are now almost back to square one, when Karen suddenly shifts her position.

Karen: Does this seem rational? No, maybe that’s what you want to, might want to go with after all because there’s another side to that story, you know. If you send somebody to an Asian market, you know, and they’re all alone, no family to support, you know, and if you send somebody that has kids.... I’m doing a flip-flop here. There’s always another side to things — another way to look at things.

Debbie M: That’s an idea.

Heidi: And he’s been to another country before with a family, and he’s done well.

seeming to come out in favor of Bill. The other three start to relax, there is some joking about how hard it would be for Scott to "meet any ladies," to which Debbie R. deadpans, "Geisha," which sends them all into laughter. While the Debbies and Heidi giggle over the prospect of Scott in Geisha-land, Karen gets serious about the reality of sending Bill:

Karen: Okay. Let’s talk about the fact that he’s black.

Debbie M: Well, Bill has been, Bill has been with the company for 22 years.

Heidi: [indignantly] That shouldn’t even come up, I mean, that’s....

Karen: If we discuss how they’re going to accept women, then we have to discuss that.

Heidi: I know. But, I don’t know. People don’t....
Karen: Not here in this country, we're not supposed to.

Heidi directly confronts Karen and refuses to give in. The Debbies add that nothing ever came up in International Business class about the inadvisability of black managers in Asian markets.

Debbie M: Nothing was ever said to me about,

Debbie R: Right, and I mean in the movies we saw there were black managers..

Heidi: Right!

Karen: In this country, though.

Debbie R: No. Over there. These were all international.

Karen: Ohhhh... They were all international...

Okay.

Karen seems surprised at the strength of opposition, and sits back. The discussion shifts to some peripheral issue about the recognizability of Americans in foreign countries, and then Karen asserts, "Well, let's take a vote." Debbie M. isn't sure that it's time yet, and they begin to talk about the impact on the candidate's emotional state of having or not having family in a foreign city. The debate goes back and forth between Karen and Debbie R. with Debbie M. again serving as peacemaker, murmuring encouraging responses to both sides. Heidi stays out of it until Karen tries to bring the discussion to a close with

Karen: Okay. How about this? We ignore the fact that he's black. We say that we will pick him as our favorite, but then we'll say if he, because of his
family responsibilities, should decide not to do it, our very next best candidate that came very close in ranking would be Scott.

Debbie M: That sounds good.

Karen: Everybody agree with that? That makes Heidi happy.

Heidi: [unhappily] I don't care.

Karen: [laughing at Heidi] She liked Bill after she evaluated him.

General laughter.

And it's almost over. Heidi's surprisingly strong resistance seems to have been the decisive factor; however, she's clearly not pleased at the emotional cost. Karen's somewhat snide reference to making Heidi happy upsets her, and Heidi, although she has won the point, withdraws from the discussion, offering nothing else on the topic. This long negotiation process has tired them. Karen asserts her leadership role by ticking off the rest of the list of candidates, and then saying abruptly, "Okay. And I'll bring my stuff on Monday. We'll have class time to work on it on Wednesday. And then if we don't get it, you know, near done, then we can maybe get together Wednesday evening or something, or Thursday. And we'll still get it done before Friday." She then asks for ideas about the oral presentation which is due on the last day of class, effectively closing down this speech event. The group winds down and leaves.
Revising. Arriving at class on Friday, we find a note on the door that the instructor will not be there. I open the room and explain to the students that they can stay and work on computer or leave to work in their groups; everyone but our group leaves. This is their last meeting before the paper is due, and they are determined to complete the draft before the class hour is over.

The actual drafting and revising process for this assignment differs little from the first and intervening ones: each member of the group drafts a document at home, alone, and then together they read the individual versions and compile a collaborative revision. The difference is that each has not written a complete draft, only a description of an individual candidate and how he or she met or failed to meet the criteria: Debbie R. on Amanda, Debbie M. on Adam, Heidi on Bill and Karen on Scott. When they get together to work on the draft, Heidi goes to the PC to draft the introduction and the description of the criteria and the others work on the description passages; Karen takes both Bill and Scott. They work in near total silence, broken occasionally by a question about a particular element: "Was managerial skills one of our top criteria?" After about twenty-five minutes, Heidi swings back to the writing table and asks, "Is there anything I can do here?" No one responds. She then reads aloud over Karen's shoulder a
piece of the draft Karen is writing, questioning the phrase, "variable assets to our company." Debbie M. agrees that it doesn't sound right and asks Karen if she meant "valuable." Karen replies that she probably did, and Heidi makes the change on the draft.

As they write, Karen looks up and says she doesn't know how four people could possibly compose on one computer, the Debbies agree with her, commenting how it would be impossible for four people to write together at one time. This is directed to me, and I respond by explaining that collaboration takes many different forms with different people. They are unconvinced; they don't believe it to be possible even when I explain how the other group I am studying actually compose from scratch at the computer with all five members contributing. They laugh in disbelief, shake their heads, and go back to their silent, individual drafting. I wonder in my field notes if this reflects the difference between introverts and extraverts or if it is the result of the insufficient negotiation of social norms for the group in the beginning? And is that in itself a reflection of extravert-introvert differences?

At 8:45, Debbie M. reads what she has written aloud. She and Karen work on a few word changes, then Debbie R. says, "Okay, you want to hear this?" Karen looks
responsive; Debbie reads; Karen indicates approval: "Good. That's good." Then Debbie M. begins to read her revised sentence and Karen turns toward her; they redraft the revision, suggesting changes to each other. Finally, Debbie R. says, "Okay, is that it?" Karen replies that Heidi will "finish this up for us," and everyone hands their drafts to Heidi. As the Debbies and Karen pack up to leave, Heidi turns to me and asks if it will be all right to remain in the lab and type for a while, and I agree to stay. She types quickly and quietly, making few changes in what has been given her. When she is done she thanks me for staying; I explain that I have to get to the next class, but if she would like to talk for a few minutes will be glad to stay and talk with her. She replies that she has an appointment and must leave.

Assessment. Since the first paper their grades have risen slightly each time, but this paper gets a lower grade than the previous one. Heidi believes that it is because of the process of each individually drafting sections and then expecting her to merely combine those sections. In her memo to the instructor, she says, "One weakness I think our paper has is in how we set it up. I am not sure if the paper flows well together." And she is right. For this paper they will do no rewrite; even though, once again, the grade is not what they hope. Their decision not to attempt a rewrite
reflects, in part, their sense of futility with the writing they are doing, and in part their inability to manage the time to come together for another session when there are still assignments to complete.

The group's difficulties with successfully meeting their own expectations can be traced in part to their less-than-successful group process and in part to their less-than-successful composing process. A lack of obvious and continuous overt conflict does not indicate successful group process, just as merely meeting the stipulated goals of an assignment does not make a successful paper. Had the group spent more time establishing emotional bonds in the first class or so, rather than immediately leaping to the task, it is possible that the conflicts which they ignored throughout the quarter and which surfaced somewhat surprisingly at the end could have been brought out into the open earlier and successfully negotiated. The group all felt that since there was never any ugliness, no actual confrontation or overt expression of anger, that theirs was a successful collaboration. Ideational conflicts occurred, but in most cases Karen's forcefulness as leader effectively eliminated opposition to her stance and the group went along with her ideas. Relational conflicts were never really allowed to surface. Had there been some training in group dynamics fostering an awareness that group relationships and roles
need to be monitored and adjustments can be made, perhaps
the outcome would have been different. Also, had there been
some training in personality type, the group members could
have predicted certain behaviors—Karen's being more vocal
than anyone else and hence perceived as leader; Debbie M.'s
quiet peacemaking, Debbie R.'s detachment—all elements
which contributed in the end to Heidi's being somewhat
excluded from full participation. In most cases, successful
group experiences do not just happen; they are made to
happen. In this case, no one was trained to or prepared to
work at group process; no one was even aware of the necessity
to do so.

While the products of this group's collaborative
efforts did not meet their own perhaps unrealistically high
expectations, those results could not be called
unsuccessful. Their grades on original drafts were C+, B-, B, A-, B+; rewrites of those papers merited A-, A, B+, no
rewrites on the final two, thus giving them final grades of
B, B+, B+, A-, B+. On their individual project, the job
package into two parts, letter of application and a resume, the
grades were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Resume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie M.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Debbie R. B- A
Heidi B (orig.) C (orig.)
A (rewrite) A (rewrite)
B+ (avg.) B (avg.)

(Heidi was the only one who asked to submit a rewrite of the assignment.)

In their memos following each assignment, the group members reported varying degrees of satisfaction with the process of collaborating,

Karen, on paper #1: The positive experiences came from the 'kind' criticism, and the least positive is when we can not all get together to work. This is a little frustrating.

Debbie R. on paper #2: In class, we all worked together to refine the paper. . . . Everyone had an equal contribution to the paper except Karen, without a doubt, did more. . . .

Heidi on paper #3: I felt each member of this group contributed equally. We came up with a lot of good ideas for this paper and it made it easy for us to get the paper completed.

Debbie M. on paper #4: The least positive experience was that all group members found it hard to meet and work on it.

And in discussions with me, all except Karen reported that they were content with the collaboration. Karen's objection was that she thought she could have done much better on her own. The others reported various reactions, mostly positive about the sharing of ideas and somewhat less positive about the actual writing together, which in their case was more
revising together than actually drafting together. Debbie R.'s reaction to working on paper #2 seems to sum up how they felt generally:

The most positive experience when composing the paper was the ideas generated between the four of us. Some of the things that were suggested, I would never have thought of by myself. The least positive was that I did not get to do it totally my way, which is to be expected in a group project.

Karen stated repeatedly to me that she could have been more successful working alone; she did not like working collaboratively and being given one grade for a combined effort. Debbie M. felt less strongly negative and appreciated the different perspectives and "ideas that could be generated in a group." Heidi reacted least strongly of all of them; she claimed to have enjoyed working in a group because of the increased possibilities that resulted from bringing more than one mind to bear on a given problem.

From my perspective, as a teacher/researcher and someone who has engaged in both successful and unsuccessful collaboration, Group A did not achieve full collaboration and consequently did not reap fully the possible benefits of group work. It seems reasonable to assume that the group's orientation toward hasty task completion and the members' reluctance to schedule out of class meetings contributed to a less-than-thorough final product, which in turn contributed to their dissatisfaction with their grades.
CHAPTER IV

ACCOUNTS OF WRITING EVENTS: GROUP B

INTRODUCTION

Nearly everything about this class and this group differed from the 8:00am class and Group A: the focus of the course, the instructor’s approach to the material, the choice of material to cover and assignments to make, the way writing was done. The structure of Group B differed dramatically from that of Group A. In this chapter, I have selected the events that I will describe to demonstrate these differences and to illustrate another range of successes and failures that writing groups can experience.

The relationship-oriented members of Group B, all extraverts, approached their assignments by engaging in a great deal of talking first, verbal brainstorming, tossing out ideas and reactions, then discussing how to approach the problem--who would be responsible for what information, who should contact whom, go to which source, etc. After gathering the information, they would meet to compose drafts or parts of drafts at the computer, frequently at Dani’s
house, all participating in the writing together. One student at the keyboard, the others would cluster around offering ideas, suggesting changes, making corrections. And when someone felt he or she had a better approach, that person would just sort of nudge the typist out and take over. This nudging out was done very smoothly, as if it had been choreographed. The incumbent would relinquish the keyboard gracefully, usually while still talking, and the newcomer would slide in, make whatever changes were desired, and continue as typist until he or she tired of it or some other member felt like taking over. Sometimes there would be a query: "Want me to take over?" or "What about doing it this way? Here, let me show you," or the typist might complain, "I'm tired of sitting here--somebody else take over." In any event, the physical transitions were remarkably seamless, although, as will be demonstrated later, in the document itself that was not always the case.

The group members handwrote only rough notes, and, with the exception of the initial memo before they were put into groups, wrote no individually-authored complete drafts.

Pre-Collaborating. Michael's syllabus [See Appendix C] calls for two individual assignments—a memo of self-introduction from each student to him and a problem/audience analysis memo introducing a possible topic for group project
work—before the class is put into writing groups. The problem/audience analysis memo, to be completed by each student individually, will be used in two ways: first, Michael will have the class develop evaluation criteria as a group after having written the memos, and second, each permanent group will choose one memo as the subject for the group's project.

A draft of the audience analysis memo is due on Monday, the class day before he will announce permanent groups. That day during class, Michael randomly groups the students—two groups of five students, one of four—and asks them to work on developing a criteria sheet for the assignment against which they will judge the memos of each group member—once they are in their official groups—as part of the selection process for a workable group project topic. For this class, he has asked one student, Kelly, to provide a draft on transparency so that the class may use her memo as a model for their responding.

As class begins, Michael explains his goals for the day, while expressing some displeasure at the scarcity of students; there are only ten present at the bell; four arrive late. He explains that first he is giving them a questionnaire to fill out as a further aid to him in grouping them, and that he would then like them to turn in
the problem/audience analysis memo, and finally that he will put them in groups to work on the criteria. He is careful to explain the questionnaire, especially the item about their GPA and the grade they expect in this class:

the only one that may need some additional explanation is the second one, and I should have worded it a little differently. What I'm trying to get at in that second thing with your GPA, what kind of grade you'd like to get in this class, umm, I want some realistic assessment of what it is that you personally want to do in terms of this course. I mean, I don't personally care. I mean if your goal in this course is to get a "C," that's fine with me, and you won't be penalized for it in any way. I mean, you're old enough, juniors and seniors, that you've made priorities and made commitments. So I guess what I really want out of that is some realistic assessment of what you expect to get in here. You know, if in these kind of courses you tend to get B- and C+ or whatever, let me know about it, and if you're going to work really hard to try to get a better grade, let me know that, too. So, it's just to prevent frustration for you. You know, if you really finally don't really need a great grade in this course and don't much care and want the credit, it's not fair to stick you with somebody who wants an A. It will be frustrating for both of you.

He has told me how important it is to him that the students understand his reasons for assigning them to groups. He wants no misunderstandings about effort involved or level of commitment to the course to create problems within groups after they are set. He also wants to group those writers who are of similar ability. Recognizing the difficulty in ascertaining ability from a few writings, he nevertheless feels that there will be fewer problems if he exercises at least some measure of selection. And, as it turns out later, none of the groups report any problems based on inequity of effort or writing ability.
The students begin to work on the short questionnaire immediately, with the expected bantering about grades and effort. Michael mentions the other elements he'll include in his selection process:

With the first memos that I had from you, the personal memos, umm, the draft of this memo that you're going to give me today, this information and some information from the Myers-Briggs, I'll make those assignments, like, you'll be in your groups on Wednesday.

He emphasizes his reasons for asking about their schedules; time conflicts on out of class meeting hours have reduced the pleasure and effectiveness of many collaborative groups. The students respond favorably, nodding and talking about how much time English classes always take, and Michael moves around the room collecting the forms. He then directs them to work in groups determined by where they are sitting, and explains that they need to determine a set of evaluation criteria "based on your reading and based on what you've tried to do for this memo." He directs them to focus on three things: Defining the Problem, Definition and Detail; Audience; and "what I'm going to call style, tone, and all that means is just how you present yourself as a writer, whatever it is."

Moving together into the groups he has indicated, the students start to discuss his request for criteria. After fifteen minutes, he asks them to turn and look toward the whiteboard, but not to turn their backs to each other in
doing so. He then asks for a scribe to record the criteria they come up with, and when no one volunteers, he tries to cajole them into it by talking about how awful and unreadable his handwriting is. They laugh, but no one moves, and finally he goes to the board to write. He tells me later that he has two reasons for this request; one is that his handwriting is hard to read and the other is his commitment to turning over the authority and responsibility for their learning to students, and this is one small way of trying to accomplish that. We are both surprised at the students' unwillingness to participate, especially given their volubility once discussion begins.

This process of establishing evaluation criteria differs from the way AnneMarie dealt with the same issue. AnneMarie demonstrated to the class what she expected, outlined her expectations by using the transparencies of sample letters or memos which accompany the textbook she used. Michael engaged his students in discussion, drawing from them their ideas based on the readings they had done and their experience trying to draft the assignment, and negotiating the points to be used as standards for judging their work. Where AnneMarie spent a certain amount of class time on format and going over textbook examples, Michael used the book only as a supplement, asking the students to read sections out of class and expecting them to have done
so, holding them responsible for the information from the text without actually walking them through it.

Michael asks someone to write down the criteria they come up with, reinforcing as he does their joint responsibility for these criteria:

The second thing I’d like someone else to do is, um, take notes on what’s going on up there, what we finally agree on for this criterion sheet. Give it to me at the end of the class, and I’ll type it up, and we’ll use that as a starting place, for ways to talk about what we’re after with this assignment, and subsequent assignments.

He then begins the discussion by asking Kelly to describe what her group has determined should be the first of the criteria. The ensuing discussion demonstrates this negotiation process:

Kelly: We wanted to know if one of the criteria would be is the problem clearly defined.

Michael: A clear definition? Okay. Does anyone else have something similar?

Eddie: Clear enough for what?

Michael: Yeah, let’s agree on which ones are important. Clear definition? [He writes on the board] And you guys have . . .?

Eddie: Something that causes you to feel the need for change.

Michael: What was that?

Eddie: Something that causes you to feel the need for change.

[Pause ]

Michael: All right, what did you have?
Nate: It's, uh, something with different ideas, people who have different ideas about something.

Michael: Okay, so there's disagreement?

Nate: Yeah.

Michael: Are "causes the need for change" and "disagreement," are they related?

Several students: Yeah.

[pause]

Michael: How? Would there be a way of putting those two, so other people . . .

Eddie: It's hard to say because the problem for one person might not be a problem for another.

Michael: Right. That gets us to what? Almost immediately. What else have we got? What else does that give us?

Brian: Argument.

Michael: Argument? [Laughter from several students.] Right. What's the second category?

Brian: Audience.

Michael: Audience, yes. We keep coming back to that. All right, well, keep in mind we might find some way to talk about "cause as a need for change," "disagree with a different opinion," whatever. So, let's take a look at the bottom there; what if the things that you come up with aren't up there. All right. [He pauses.] So that's all we came up with are a couple?

Robert K: We have no basis for comparison. We've got no idea what should be right and what should be wrong if you say there's a problem.

Michael: All right.

Brian: We have to have some idea of the situation before we can make the situation better.

Michael: That has a lot to do with number 2, it seems to me. But then again, on the other hand, what's the difference between that and the solution?
Robert: Well, there’re things that aren’t definitely covered on the alternate solution.

Michael: Okay, but you’re coming up with an ideal situation.

Robert: Well, you’d have to know what the ideal situation was, first, before you could actually see that there’s a problem.

Michael: So what you’re saying is we need to set the problem in opposition to something.

Robert: Right.

Eddie: I don’t agree with that.

Michael: All right [drawing it out, encouraging the speaker to go on]

Steve: I think that a lot of times, you have to begin with, the uh, solu, what the solution would be to a problem if you know that there’s something wrong with it. (Can’t hear.)

Robert: Ri-ight. I don’t say it’s a solution, but it would have to be something other than what it is there; otherwise, it wouldn’t be a problem. We have to know that there’s something better than what’s there.

Michael: Okay. If we keep it on our construction, you guys’ll be agreed on this. All right. How to start? If you have a problem, you have to agree that there’s a solution, or that there’s a possibility of a solution. You don’t necessarily have to find that solution to define the problem. Is that fair? Will you buy that? All right. Well, let’s maybe go on to audience.

This discussion lasted for another ten minutes or so, but this much of it demonstrates Michael’s process of drawing out the students, encouraging them to develop their responses; in this exchange, he performs his usual classroom role as guide and synthesizer. This section of classroom dialogue also demonstrates that aside from Kelly’s opening remark, and with the exception of indistinguishable murmurs
of assent a bit later in the discussion, none of the women students participated, even though the four-member group, Kelly’s, consisted of women only, while the other two groups of five were mixed gender groups, although one had only one woman and the other two women. This lack of participation by women was uncharacteristic of the class in later discussions, although in those later class discussions, much of the participation from women came from Group B. The other groups were two groups of two men, two women, and one all male group, so perhaps combining those three women made a difference.

Agreeing on the remaining criteria seems to go more quickly than establishing these first few did. At the end of this discussion, Michael distributes photocopies of Kelly’s memo to each student, assigning the evaluation of the draft as homework. He tells them to “read through the paper quickly, flip it over, write down your immediate reactions and any questions. Then read through with a pencil in hand and jot notes or questions in the margins.” Asking for any questions, he pauses a minute, and then dismisses the class.

On Wednesday morning, Michael spends the first half hour going over Kelly’s memo on the overhead. The students like the topic, the problem on campus of being closed out of
classes, and there is a great deal of anecdote sharing, but Michael makes the points he needs to make about clearly defining the problem, identifying the multi-layered audience, and focusing on a seemingly small part of a problem to do a thorough job rather than taking a too broad and possibly superficial approach. At 10:35, Michael announces the groups and leaves them to meet for the first time.

Since I know which group I would like to study, I go immediately to their table. Many of my entry negotiations with this group duplicate those I had with Group A. I join the group, explaining the study as I did to the introverts and offering them time to discuss their participation and decide if they would like to participate. Since Michael and I have already explained my presence and the study to this class, there is less explanation needed now in the group. They agree almost instantly—looking at each other, Dani raising eyebrows in query to the rest, Kelly saying, "So, like, what do you think?" Nicole's response, an enthusiastic "Cool!" seems to sum up the group's unanimous reaction, and they move their chairs around, dragging in an extra one for me. As Eddie writes in his log, "Everyone in our group seems pretty laid back and didn't mind at all that we were going to be observed." In fact, upon hearing that I will be audiotaping them, they want to know if we couldn't
arrange to videotape as well.

They meet for about twenty minutes, focusing on getting to know each other. They begin with who they are, where they are from, and move to what they are majoring in and how soon graduation can be expected: Nicole, expecting to graduate this quarter, will be the first. They all seem to thoroughly enjoy each other, smiling and leaning toward each other, gesturing animatedly. Although they have a tendency to start to talk all at once, no one seems to mind. The person who interrupts apologizes and the interrupted one unfailingly says, "That's okay," "No problem," or the equivalent. With the holiday approaching, they have a lot going on and they talk about their plans. Since the Fourth of July is tomorrow and Michael has cancelled Friday's class, the group agrees to leave things until after the long holiday weekend, setting the next meeting for the next class, Monday.

On Monday, which Michael has dedicated to group work, they decide to read each others' memos and choose the topic for the first project. This reading takes quite a while, since most of the memos are 2-3 single spaced pages and there is some commenting and sharing as they read.
Collaborating: The First Project. Michael’s first assignment, like all of his other assignments [See Appendix 3], is given out in memo format to the students and has an initial short graph describing the basics of the assignment:

In this first assignment, our goal is to find ways to identify problems and to identify the people most likely to respond to those problems. Briefly, your job is to create a memo, with me and your class members as its primary readers, that defines a problem and explains who should care and why.

The memo continues on, with sections labeled Identifying the Problem, Identifying the Audience, Goal of this Assignment, Format and Due Date, and Summary of Key Points, to explain in detail what he expects. When the members of Group B arrive at this meeting, each has a complete memo written in response to the assignment, and they exchange and read these drafts. After a few minutes of idle chatter following the reading, Eddie initiates the discussion by asking, "Which one do you guys want to do?" He is very direct and tends to be more focused than the others, with the possible exception of Dani. The actual decision making process is remarkably quick and easy.

Nicole: I thought all the problems sounded interesting, and they’re all big problems.

Dani: I think so, too.

Nicole: So that’s going to be tough. It needs to be something that we can change and tackle. So it’s like not too big, but not too small.

Kelly: We can get a lot of information, also.

Nicole: Yeah. Because we’ve got to spend four weeks doing this.
Eddie: I kind of like the handicapped one.

Kelly: So did I.

Nicole: I did, too.

[Everybody laughs]

Kelly: That was easy.

The group made this decision so easily in part because Dani’s topic, the accessibility of the campus to handicapped individuals, strikes them as socially meaningful on a personal level. They discuss the unfairness of the situation, focusing on the cost to the individual in aggravation, time, even pain in trying to negotiate some of the obstacle-course like terrain around campus. For feeling types—Dani, Eddie, Kelly and Nicole—this is textbook behavior. Myers writes that feeling types, that is, those who make decisions based on their personal values rather than on impersonal logic, are usually more interested in people than in things. Stronger in the social arts than in executive ability. Are likely to agree with those around them, thinking as other people think, believing them probably right. Contribute to the welfare of society by their loyal support of good works and those movements, generally regarded as good by the community, which they feel correctly about and so can serve effectively (Gifts 68).

After reading the papers, the students "simultaneously and unanimously decided to handle the Handicapped Accessibility problem. We were excited to be handling a problem that made a difference for individuals other than ourselves" (Nicole’s log). In their logs, each of them addresses the decision
making process, varying only slightly from what Nicole has
written. Eddie writes that he

thought that they were all pretty good but Dani’s
paper on handicapped accessibility stood out in my mind
as the best and most important topic. I thought it was
pretty poorly written but also knew that it would be
easy to change. Everyone one in our group seems really
bright—which is a pleasant surprise from past group
experiences. We all chose to use Dani’s paper as our
topic but decided we would not pursue it any further
until the next class period.

Eddie’s log further records that the meeting referred to
above, their third actual meeting, but first substantive
one,

went pretty well also. We split up different areas of
the topic to research and talked about the topic in
general. One of the problems with our group is that we
often tend to lose our focus. Someone will bring up an
idea and two minutes later we will be talking about a
problem not related to our topic.

Eddie’s astute observations of the group’s process toward
cohesion coincide with my own reactions at the time, and
with those recorded by Dani and Kelly in their logs. The
group so enjoys each other’s company, and each of them seems
to like talking so well, that accomplishing anything takes
quite a bit longer than might be necessary.

In the following excerpt from the meeting, they begin
the brainstorming process for this assignment. The way they
approach the assignment is typical of their approaches to
all their early drafts. Dani, initiator of the idea,
primarily clarifies and expands the original. Since it is
her topic, and because she knows the reality well from her experience with her quadriplegic employer and friend, Bob, she has a great deal of information. Eddie begins to demonstrate his role as devil's advocate. He's not exactly skeptical here, but he is definitely cautious and interested in helping Dani keep her details accurate.

Dani: . . . disability services puts out this, it's like a notebook, on accessibility on campus. What it is the first part of it has a listing of every building on campus, every OSU property, which ones have entrances that are electric, you know, that someone that can't open the door by themselves can get in, which ones have handicapped accessible restrooms, which ones have elevators, which elevators are modified so that the handicapped can operate them.

Eddie: I think first we need to find out what is required. I mean I'm not sure that every single building is required by state, I mean it might be, but we don't, I don't know. Do you know?

Dani: Well, the newest legislation that has just come out, that President Bush signed into law just like within the last year, says that within the next, I think it's two to three years, literally every building across the country should be handicapped accessible.

Eddie: Every public building.

Dani: Every public building, business office, whatever, should be accessible to the handicapped. A lot of small businesses have put up a big fuss about that, but that really doesn't affect Ohio State. Ohio State should make it a priority just because of the size the university is, to do this.

Eddie: Sure. There's a lot of handicapped students here.

Dani: Yeah, there really are, and I was reading through this thing that the university gives out, from disability services, a 1983 issue, so it's a little bit old, but at the time, in 1983, which is when I started here, only 18 buildings were totally accessible. I mean I just think that's pathetic.
Sam: Yeah.

This monosyllable response from Sam is the only utterance from him in nearly ten minutes of discussion. After discussing what information they might need, Dani tells them that she "has all the updated regulations." Nicole replies: "Cool! That works." Eddie's reaction is a cautious, "Oh, you do?" Nicole is breezy; Eddie cautious; Dani serious and committed. The following exchange between Dani, Nicole and Kelly follows Dani's elaboration on specifically what those regulations are and shows something of Kelly's role as innovator.

Nicole. "Okay. Where should we start?"

Kelly: [To Dani] You had a pretty good start in there, in your paper.

Dani: Well, when I wrote this, I mean, there's a lot of different ways we could look at it. When I wrote this I focused on ramps and entrances, restrooms and parking. We could also focus on, you know, classrooms, some buildings don't have accessible elevators, so only the ground floor is accessible. You know, we could focus on different buildings, we could focus on certain aspects of it like I did, and we need to decide how it is we want to....

Kelly: An idea. Campbell Hall is renovating right now. Is it accessible? That's an idea. See what their plans are during the renovation. There's a ramp by the playground outside, there's a ramp that comes down. Yeah. And then the two doors to open and everything. All throughout that building there are, like divisions, within the building, their doors and stuff, that aren't....

While Kelly seems to have the quickest mind of the group, the first to grasp the possibilities and the extent to which
those possibilities might be developed, the group is more intellectually balanced than any other group I’ve ever observed. Each of them contributes ideas, and expansions to or alterations of each other’s ideas; each is quick to make connections and identify possible problems.

Having just begun to decide how to focus the problem, the group switches midway through the discussion of the problem to a discussion of audience:

Dani: ... Do we want to focus on, I mean do we want to focus this, who should we address this to? I mean, I think Traffic and Parking and Disability Services.

Kelly: Also, well who’s in charge of all the renovations and the architecture and....

Eddie: Yeah, that’s true.

Nicole: Who’s got the money to pay for it?

Nicole’s question, intended to focus attention on possible decision-makers, engenders a long response from Dani about architects and state inspection offices. Sam interjects, finally, with a somewhat incredulous query that in an institution as big as this University, "there’s nobody that looks at the building and approves it and says ‘this is what we want’?" In the ensuing debate over whether such an individual exists, they range over a wide variety of options for determining the existence of this person, coming at last to Eddie’s suggestion that they talk to someone in the rehabilitation center.
Eddie: We should go to Dodd Hall. Dodd Hall's a big time rehab center, and I used to work for one of the directors, and he was handicapped, and he was taking classes on campus.


Nicole: Stylistically, I think it might be kind of interesting to have some personal interviews from handicapped students.

Kelly: Yeah. Yeah.

Eddie: Yeah. Sure.

Dani: I think that's a good idea.

Eddie: We should probably find out how many, if they can, I'm sure....

Dani: How many disabled people are actually students, faculty and staff. You know, all three, staff, faculty and students.

Eddie: And I mean looking at every school, like dental school, night school, dental hygiene school, whatever, undergrad.

Sam: So like which buildings aren't accessible? I mean, which type of buildings, are they classrooms?

About six minutes earlier, Nicole had suggested that they might want to talk to handicapped student organizations about the nature and extent of the problem, but when Dani responded that those concerns would be "pretty much disability services," Nicole dropped the idea, until this section of the discussion. Recognizing an opportunity, Nicole takes advantage of it to present again her interest in doing interviews as a way of adding "style" to the proposed piece of writing. Nicole consistently focuses on issues of style, and the positive responses this time from Kelly, Eddie, and Dani seem to satisfy her. Once again,
however, there is an abrupt topic switch. Sam's question about which buildings actually are not accessible swings them back to an earlier topic, the exact nature of the problem they'll focus on. The ensuing exchange again shows Eddie's determination to be careful about his, actually Dani's, facts.

Dani: Yeah. A lot of them. Caldwell Labs, and Civil and Aeronautical.

Eddie: Are totally non-accessible?

Dani: I don't remember if they're totally non-accessible.

Sam: I think you can access Civil from the back.

Dani: Can you? And there is an elevator in Civil. It does lack restroom facilities.

They continue in this vein, going over the various elements that they might want to include, for another half hour.

Finally, Nicole again brings up the issue of audience:

Nicole: Now, what about we're addressing this problem to the Disability Services and Traffic and Parking. Now, for impetus to change, what about students who aren't disabled, who are complaining already about parking, and I think we're going to need....

Dani: See, that's Traffic and Parking's biggest complaint. "Well, we have so many students and so few parking spaces that we....", you know, but the federal law says they have to have two percent of all their parking for general handicapped. They're not meeting that.

Eddie: So I really don't think students would complain, either, if they took over some handicapped spots.

Nicole: Well, no, but what we're going to have to find a way to get over would be Traffic and Parking's objectives, because that's exactly what they're going to say. Not that we have to actually go and say hey, you've got to do this right now, but....
Eddie: The law's the law, I think, and I can't see how they can have any kind of argument. If they're so far under state and federal regulations.... At this point, it seems unclear whether they are making any progress. They suggest an idea, toss it around for a few minutes, and then switch to another idea. This pattern of circularity characterizes all of their, apparently undirected, discussions. At times it seems as if they are incapable of sustaining a focused dialogue, but they do manage to accomplish their goals. In this particular case, Eddie brings them back to something a bit more concrete by asking Dani about the regulations, specifically how they can acquire copies of the federal guidelines and regulations to which she frequently refers.

Eddie: Where do you have those laws written out? I mean is it a pamphlet, or what?

 Dani: Oh, yeah. I mean you can get them by going in the main library. Any kind of state or federal regulations are all in reference material, you know, and....

Eddie: Bring those in for sure at the next meeting so we can finish this. Are we supposed to have a memo for, who, by Monday?

Kelly: Isn't it just an intensification of the problem? I don't think we have to deal with the audience, do we, for Monday? I thought that was the second part.

Nicole: I don't know.

Dani: I don't know.

Kelly: Ask him.

Dani: Michael?

Sam: (Whispering into the tape recorder) We don't know what we're doing.
Kelly: What times are good for everyone?

Dani: That's just what I was going to find out.

Having not settled anything specific, the group then detours to the subject of schedule conflicts for about ten minutes. Michael interrupts to ask if they have decided on a topic, to which Dani and Nicole reply together, "Yes/Yep," after which Michael asks what they have chosen so that he can write it in his notes. Nicole, Dani, and Kelly all reply together, "Handicapped Accessibility." They reply in such perfect unison that it sounds as if it were staged. Michael laughs, and then Kelly asks for clarity on the goal of the assignment. Hearing that they are to work on both the problem and the audience analysis for the next part of the assignment, Kelly repeats that as if to impress it on the group, and then Michael dismisses the class. The group realize that they cannot meet before the next class period; however, they will be able to use that class period to work on the project.

Since Michael has to be out of town at a conference on Wednesday and Friday that week, he has arranged for someone to monitor class on Wednesday so that groups can meet and work in the classroom on the computers, but he has cancelled Friday's class, suggesting that the groups use that time to work together out of class. As the Extraverts begin their meeting on the Wednesday, they discuss and specify the
meeting time for Friday. Then Kelly suggests that instead of staying for the whole class time today, they "assign each other stuff to do and go do it. And we can try to like type it up or like draft it up on Friday, then." The group enthusiastically agrees and then arranges to meet in another Macintosh lab across campus on Friday at class time. Sam verifies the time and place; meanwhile Nicole and Dani are talking about an article they remember reading in the campus newspaper about the renovations in one of the buildings causing the departments residing there to move to a building without wheelchair access, thus denying handicapped employees the ability to continue in their positions. Apparently forgetting the plan to disperse, they begin to discuss the article. Eddie questions Kelly about her having seen it. He seems reassured when she says she remembers reading it, but less so when she says she read it last quarter. Nicole, undaunted as ever, replies breezily, "Well, I'm sure I could explain it to them [the staff at the newspaper], and they'd know what I was talking about."

Nicole, supremely confident always, appears to live with the assumption that whatever she wants or needs will happen, as if by natural right. So, of course, if there is a lost story to be located, Nicole will be able to arrange it. Dani, the believer, agrees, and then immediately switches to telling the group what she and Nicole had accomplished on Monday after the meeting.
Somehow, without ever having assigned specific duties or arranged the particular details on Monday about who would go where to collect information, each of them had gone to a different source and come up with something for today's class. Their sense of responsibility compels them to be conscientious. As Dani begins her narrative to the group recounting her and Nicole's accomplishments of Monday, there are nods and murmurs. Within minutes, all are talking and while it seems rather chaotic, they are able to make sense of it; listening to more than one conversation at a time doesn't seem to distress anyone. Eddie, however, finally breaks in to the flow of conversation with a reality check:

**Eddie:** Yeah, we have to have a rough draft Monday?

**Dani:** Yeah.

**Eddie:** So we have to have something probably typed up by Friday.

This mention of due dates brings back attention to the present and the specifics of the assignment. Sam initiates a discussion of the writing, the first time in four meetings that they have mentioned the actual physical composing of the document.

**Sam:** [to Dani] I'm kind of curious, from your paper, are we going to use, like, the same ideas, you know? Are we going to expand on that, or are we going to, like, start from scratch and then go, you know what I mean?

**Dani:** I don't know. I mean, that's up to you guys. We need to definitely pick an area to focus on and point to focus from.

**Kelly:** Do you want to do.... I don't know. It seems
like it's awfully broad using traffic and parking and then also accessibility into buildings, elevators and all that. If we narrowed it down just to one area, like maybe parking accessibility for students. Then we could go to traffic and parking and disability services, what they're doing, because they're repaving almost all the parking lots this summer, and see if they are making the changes.

Dani: Yeah, that would be a good idea.

Having yet again returned to discussion of how to focus their topic, the group begins by looking at the issue of parking accessibility, returns to building accessibility, segues to the dangers for handicapped students at night trying to get off campus, the availability of handi-vans and whether or not crime watch walkers will escort handicapped people. Finally, Sam asks if they might be "getting broad," and Kelly laughingly acknowledges that "Yeah, it's getting broad again." Nicole, again seeing an opportunity, once more brings up her idea about interviews and style.

Nicole: One thing that I noticed when I read all of the different articles, well there were things about each article that I really liked, like maybe one person had it set up this way. One person had something in it that the rest of the people didn't have, and it was really neat. I think that that would be a good idea to decide how we're going to set up our paper, too, once we pick a topic, like decide what we're going to do with it, like how we're going to start it, what we're going to have as the body of it, if we're going to interview people. Is it raining? Are we going to have them as quotes, or, you know, stuff like that? Because that makes it kind of interesting to read, and that's one of the things we'll want to do, is make it interesting to read.

Dani: I think some personal interviews are definitely a good idea.

Nicole: Cause like I love the way he had his set up. That was so organized, and it just really, it was easy
to read, it wasn't confusing, it flowed nicely, and that's kind of hard to get transitions going in a memo because you're jumping topics.

However, rather than focusing discussion on doing interviews, Nicole's comment has encouraged them, Eddie in particular, to think again about the procedures for the actual writing.

Eddie: Are we all going to write? I mean, there's two different ways, we can all write it, or we can all take different parts or whatever. How are we going to do that?

Nicole: I think it would be best if we took different parts and then edited it to make sure it flowed together because we all have different styles, but that way it would save us time.

Dani: Yeah.

Sam: Hmm.

Dani: It would allow each of us to focus on a section of it . . .

Nicole: And then one person wouldn't be stuck with all the writing, too.

Kelly: Or we could all get our information and get together, and as we go through it, . . .

Eddie: Yeah. . .

Kelly: . . . do it together so it flowed,

Eddie: Yeah . . .

Kelly: . . . instead of, because you know once you have your, like, thing it's hard to make it fit with something else.

Nicole: That's true.

Kelly: If we get together to write it with all the information . . .

Nicole: . . . but we wouldn't know what transitions to use.
Kelly: I think it would be easier.

Nicole has, from the first, been concerned with style; in fact, she's the only one who mentions it. She also, as we have seen, believes herself to be "the resident creative," and would dearly love a chance to prove it to the group. Her initial stand here, that each person should write alone and then they should edit together, draws support from Dani, a neutral reaction from Sam, and mild opposition from Kelly, echoed by Eddie. Once Kelly suggests writing it together, Eddie's obvious wholehearted support (his responses, while single words, are quite enthusiastic) begins to sway Nicole who finally comes about completely and agrees, immediately laying claim to the introduction, which she considers the best vehicle for a demonstration of her creativity.

Dani: And, I mean any night you guys want to get together at my house, that's no problem.

Nicole: Cause generally I'm not free until after 8:00 at night, but I'm a night person, so I don't mind staying up late to work on whatever.

Dani: Yeah.

Sam: I wonder if that might be best, then. You know what I mean? Get together to write it, or, I don't know, you can . . .

Nicole: If we took like our assigned topics, and then we just got all the information for them and had something loose written up on what we think that information should go like, then as soon as we got together it would go so easy just to group write it.

Dani: Umm-hmm. And I tend to find group writing, you get a better word, you know, it's like having a thesaurus sitting next to you, you know? Sometimes I find that I'm using the same word over and over, and
when I realize it, you know, then I have to go back.... So I think the group writing idea is probably a good one.

Nicole: Well, if nobody minds, I'd like to take the beginning, because I think to start it with that front page story would be an excellent thing to start it with because a lot of times people don't, people that aren't handicapped don't realize the problem, and that's one thing that we're dealing with. We're writing this to an audience that's not handicapped. I mean, our immediate audience. When do they ever have to deal with the problem? How many of them even know somebody? I mean, maybe they see somebody walking around the campus or, but other than that, and I think to kind of bring it home, say, hey look, these people are moving, and these people won't be able to go with them, and this is why. I think that's an excellent way to start it.

Dani: I agree.

Of course, now they have switched focus again, back to buildings. Sam notes that he is confused, and Eddie responds with a laugh and a question about why they've switched direction, and finally Dani notes that

Dani: Maybe what we ought to do, is somebody talk to Traffic and, maybe two people talk to Traffic and Parking. I'll keep trying to get hold of this Warren King. Maybe we need to talk to all of them first to find out which really is the most important issue.

Eddie: That's the first thing we have to do.

Dani: You know. I mean since just a rough draft is due Monday, you know

Sam: Right.

At last, they seem to have settled on establishing priorities before determining focus. Within minutes, however, they are off on a tangent about how the blind students locate buildings and classes. Kelly refocuses them
by volunteering to call Traffic and Parking and asking them to suggest questions that she might ask Traffic and Parking. They stay on track for a few minutes, but off they go again about stickers and key cards and getting parking tickets, which then segues into housing and how it’s "atrocious even if you’re not handicapped" (Nicole). Then Nicole swings them back to a much earlier topic by asking "Are there handicapped student organizations, or is that Disability Services?" This question had been asked a few minutes into their earlier meeting, and Dani’s response had been "That’s pretty much Office of Disability Services." Now two days later, she has a slightly different answer: she doesn’t know, but would like to ask the director of disability services when she talks to him. After a few false starts, they finally decide to do more information gathering. Dani will talk to the Director of Disability Services; Sam will talk to Traffic and Parking and try to get some statistical information; Kelly will contact the friend of her Dad’s who started handicapped housing; Eddie will go to main library or contact the state house to get copies of laws and regulations. There is some discussion about whether Sam and Eddie should team up and do the library research and then they start joking about male bonding and Kelly laughs back that the women will go shopping while the men are trudging through the stacks.
From this point on in the meeting, they go off track more often than they stay on. There are side discussions about Nicole's modelling, her wedding, her husband (her three favorite topics), about journalism professors shared or not by Eddie and Nicole, and at one point there are two separate conversations going on simultaneously: one between Eddie and Nicole about professors, and one between Dani and Kelly while Kelly looks through the telephone directory for the numbers and addresses of the places they need to go to for information. After about twenty minutes of off-track talking, suddenly Dani and Kelly look at each other and both say, "Okay," at the same time, then the group all start laughing and the three women all comment at once:

Dani/ Kelly/ Nicole: [laughing] Back to the subject.

Kelly: Off on a little sidetrack there.

Nicole: That's what us E's do. . .

Sam: [laughing.]

Nicole: . . .we talk a lot.

As Eddie has pointed out in his log, the group has a tendency to "get off track" and they do again almost immediately after this. It becomes rapidly obvious that they have had as much productive time as they will have today and they break up, agreeing to meet in two days at 10:00am, and if they cannot finish the draft on Friday, they will meet Sunday evening at Dani's house. The Friday session goes well, with the exception that Eddie never finds
the meeting. After having overslept, he goes to the wrong Lab in Boltz Hall, and, not realizing that there are two, leaves after waiting and not seeing anyone. The other four spend about an hour and a half drafting a memo presenting the problem, or rather problems. They have not succeeded in focusing on one issue and target both parking accessibility and building accessibility. Nicole has talked to someone at the Office of Architecture and Planning, Dani has spoken with the Director of Disability Services, Kelly has found the federal rules and regulations, and Eddie and Sam have interviewed the Director of Traffic and Parking. As a result, their audience becomes audiences and that’s where they leave it on Friday.

Sunday night they have less success: Eddie has to work until 8:00, Nicole has another commitment, and when Kelly arrives, exhausted from working all weekend, and finds no one there but Dani, she leaves to take a nap. By the time they re-assemble, no one has much energy left to be productive. They make a few changes, but basically leave the draft until the next day in class.

On Monday, they turn in the draft to Michael who promises to return it with comments on Wednesday. His agenda for this class day includes going over his revision policy and what he wants from them in terms of group logs.
These housekeeping matters take up about ten minutes, then he puts up a transparency of one of the groups' memos. It's not a clear copy and not dark enough, making it difficult for the Extraverts to see it since they sit farthest away from the projector, so they don't participate much in the discussion. They do, however, have a sense of what he's expecting since he passes out the typed copies of the criteria sheets and the discussion makes reasonably clear what points are a problem. They compensate for the lack of clarity in the transparency by listening, asking questions, and drawing conclusions from what they can make out and what people say.

Once Michael releases them to work in groups, Group B decide to work on the Division of Labor memo, a component of the assignment that Michael has asked them to turn in with the next draft. This takes up the rest of the class time. After class they say that they feel "pretty good" about the draft, although they acknowledge that it needs work: more information, some grammatical attention and some adjustment to format. But they are confident that it is a good draft, and that they will revise it to very good.

Revising. Before the students receive their papers on Wednesday, Michael talks to them about looking ahead from this first part of the project to Part II.
One of the difficulties that you’ll face in this second part of this project, in particular, if you haven’t done a detailed enough version in this first memo, is going back and capturing the steps. You really need to have some clear understanding of who these people are, what’s going to motivate them, what their concerns are. Even if you can’t get real information, you can’t talk to them, or whatever, you need to come up with some kind of picture for yourself of what these people’s concerns are and what might motivate them. So keep that in mind as you’re finishing this project. You’re going to make life a lot easier on yourself if you do that. The next step that you’re going to have to decide, what format your solution package is going to take. Whether it’s going to be a report to administrative officials or whether there’s going to be some kind of direct mail, you know, campaign, to a limited neighborhood. You’re going to need to make that decision on Monday, so at least look over those chapters, be aware of what your options are, and...that’s that.

The final draft of this section, Part I, is due in five days, so Michael segues to talking about the papers he’s about to return. He again explains his revision policy, and then tells the class how they did:

The most successful papers managed to have very specific information they gathered either from printed sources or from talking to someone. And they use that information to support their understanding of a particular problem and a particular audience. Um, the least successful papers, and if it was much under two pages, we’re talking, you know, low C, high B range, so, the least successful papers, there wasn’t enough information. There wasn’t a clear definition of either the problem or the audience.

He advises the class that revising is not necessary; if they are satisfied they may go on to Part II, but any who want to revise these drafts should come and talk to him about them, because "I can give you more information than I can possibly give on a [written] response to a draft." The students read
over their papers for a few minutes, then Michael interrupts them and I take over the class, returning the MBTI Report Forms and explaining personality type theory to them. There are a few questions on the frequency of types in the general population and on the T/F scale, which is gender-based, but for the most part they sit quietly and listen. When I finish, after about twenty minutes, Michael and I assure the class that any further questions they have, I will be glad to answer at any time convenient to them. I move back to my group and he walks up to the overhead projector to put on some sample problems for the class to look at. Before he begins, though, he explains why he's doing this.

Academic writing tends to value complexity, lengthy sentences, a lot of information; paragraphs will look different. It's often very acceptable to start out with details and build up to a conclusion. Business writing values some other things. Clarity over complexity. When your readers need to read something, whether it's a message or a contract, the quicker he or she can read it and understand it, the better off you are. The directness and clarity are the hallmarks of business writing. It's not the same thing as simplicity, but . . . [He writes key terms on the board] So keep in mind that we'll be asking you to do things that you may not have had to do in school before. And they're hard to do, believe it or not. They're easy to grasp in the conceptual, but often hard to put into practice.

Having thus eased them back into the class framework and a focus on the writing, he then says he wants to "start off with that idea in Chapter 12 about positive emphasis. What is positive emphasis, you know? Somebody tell me." When he asks for a response, he walks a little, back and forth near the board, moving into the table area, waiting for them.
After a minute, Rob responds:

Rob: It's where, it's not criticizing the audience or making the audience feel like they're in the wrong.

Michael: Okay. Is there more to it? Rob just told us what it's not. And he's absolutely right on. What is it though?

Sharon: Would it be, using positive words, creating motivation?

Michael: That's part of it. Positive words, motivation. What else?

The students don't seem to be clear on where they are expected to take this. Michael explains briefly that positive emphasis means "telling a reader what there is good about a situation, even if the overall tone or information you want to give is somehow negative." He talks for a minute or two about this, and then suggests that they look at a scenario and try to work through it. He poses to them the problem of selling used merchandise; how would they write up an ad to sell floor models?

Michael: [Reading from problem] "You are putting up floor samples, demonstrators on sale. These machines have been in use several hours a day for the past year." What does that sound like? Somebody tell me the scenario.

Eddie: Is it that you're clearing, you're clearing out your inventory?

Michael: Clearing out your inventory.

Eddie: Is that what you're asking?

Michael: Sure. What else?

Rich: What about, "floor models that have been used less than a year are now on sale."
Michael: What do you think of that? "Floor models that have been used less than a year?" All right, Good. Good. Why doesn’t somebody write that down? All right. What do we do with that sentence? Floor models that have been in use for less than a year are now on sale. That’s a lot more positive than what we have up there. Can we make it more positive?

Nicole: They’re broken in, as in they’ve been used so that you don’t have to work the bugs out of them.

Michael: Good. So that’s even better. Used . . . I don’t know. Turn that into a real nice sentence

Nicole: As opposed to this horrible one I just made?

[Lots of laughter]

Nicole: The only thing I can think of right now is already broken-in floor models.

Michael: Write that down.

Kristi: Why not "guaranteed to work?"

Michael: Okay. We’ll give the guarantee.

Eddie: Use the word "new."

Michael: Pardon?

Eddie: Use the word "new."

Michael: Why?

Eddie: Cause that’ll make it sound better. I mean you could say "floor models like new on sale." Cause if you say "new" then they’ll think that it’s not been used a lot, I would think.

Michael: That’s true. Write that down. "Like new floor models on sale." That’s short and peppy. Now this is all so kind of, .

Eddie: But if you’re saying "floor models," then they know that they’re floor models, but if you say they’re "like new" then you’re saying that they haven’t been used much and they look good.

Michael: Well, what if we had a different way of emphasizing that in terms of these have been used so much . . .
This exchange continues on like this for the rest of the class. Michael proposes different scenarios; the students respond; he draws out further elaborations from them by asking questions or pushing them to expand, and finally, they cover all the necessary information on positive emphasis, including having different goals for different audiences in one piece of writing. This concept of multiple audiences demanding the incorporation of multiple rhetorical purposes in the same piece of writing is sometimes difficult for students to grasp. Michael works that into his discussion painlessly by creating scenarios and asking students to imagine themselves in a variety of situations, for example, the reservation clerk faced with an irate customer screaming at her on one side and a manager demanding calmness and courtesy at all times on the other. The students respond well to the diversity of his approaches, the way he mixes references to the text in with samples of their work and these imaginative situations.

The task now for the students is to synthesize all of this, to put together everything they have read, talked about in class, and learned from Michael’s comments on their draft. They decide to meet outdoors in the greenspace behind the building after class. This location is convenient but plagued by noise from the construction of the new math-science building immediately adjacent. Because of
this interference, the students have trouble settling to work. They sporadically talk about the work, but any distraction sends them off to a new topic; it takes about twenty minutes to get focused, but then they accomplish some revisions and set up a final revising meeting to put their final draft on computer. In the first part of this meeting outside, Sam is quite involved, but gradually fades out. The others follow their patterns. They open discussion by referring to Michael’s comments on their drafts. This exchange illustrates one of the differences between the two groups in terms of student reaction to teacher comments.

Dani: He really didn’t say anything about our opening. I wish he would have commented on what he thought about our opening.

Nicole: Because he didn’t say anything, that’s what made me think we needed to do something with it. Cause I thought, wow, that’s a real catchy idea, you know, to start out with all the headlines and say what’s going on with this stuff, and he didn’t say anything.

Sam: I think it’s just fine. I really do.

Nicole: One vote for just fine— from Sam.

Sam: I don’t know. I mean, what’s wrong with it? I don’t know....

Nicole: Oh, nothing, nothing’s wrong with it.

Sam: There’s five of us here, yeah, there’s five of us, plus one, and I think that it’s good. If you guys think it’s good, you know, then we shouldn’t be worried about what he thinks.

Dani and Nicole, ENFP’s, react to the lack of criticism as if it were implied criticism. This behavior can confound some teachers who don’t expect it and who operate on the "if
it ain't broke, don't fix it" theory, but to an extraverted
intuitive type, the lack of comment could signal a lack of
reader-engagement with the writing; therefore, they think
they have somehow failed their reader, not offered enough
information, or more likely, not offered it creatively
enough to captivate the reader's interest. Sam, an ESTJ,
whose dominant function is thinking, reacts with cold logic:
this isn't broken, especially if the majority agree that it
is good; therefore, there is nothing that needs to be done.
Sam's assertiveness in regard to leaving the introduction is
typical for an ESTJ who is logically convinced that the
piece of writing is fine as is, although it is not said with
his characteristic hesitancy. Interestingly, Kelly, ESFJ,
and Eddie, ENFJ, both of whom have feeling as the dominant
function, react by also focusing on the reader's reason for
not engaging; but they offer an immediate solution to what
they perceive as the problem:

Kelly: There's something I wanted to add to it was, it
says "The following headlines...convey a serious
problem at Ohio State University," and then we start
going on after all the headlines it says, "If we write
front page stories in the Lantern to help expose the
problems," but we never say exactly what the problem
is. See what I'm saying? We talked about the problem,
the problem, the problem. And although the headlines
give you an idea, I think we need to say right out that
the problem is that accessibility for physically
disabled on campus....

Eddie: I think we ought to just put right where there's
a comma after "quarter" or whatever, make that a
period, put those, and say exactly what the problem is
right after all the headlines. That'll make it
perfectly clear as to what we're talking about instead
of saying, you know, if we write front page stories or
Kelly: Yeah, that’s a good idea.

During this revising session, which they use almost as a pre-revising session, making rough notes on the draft that Michael has returned, the group evince some disagreement. Nicole keeps being overridden, but not appearing to register that it’s happening. After his surprisingly forceful defense of the opening, Sam reverts to his more customary hesitancy about suggesting change.

Nicole: Okay, now where should we put this period?

Eddie: Just take out "convey a serious problem", take the "following headlines were taken from the Lantern this past spring quarter": The five headlines. Then say "The Ohio State University’s handicapped accessibility" or whatever, describe the problem in the next sentence, and then, I mean we can even end the paragraph and then put all the special stuff in the next paragraph if we want. But that’ll, I mean, that’ll come up the first three sentences, with the exclusion of all those quotes, whatever, they’ll know exactly what we’re talking about without reading the whole paper.

Nicole: Extraneous comments.

Sam: Can I ask, like, would it be even better or whatever to say something about it being handicapped in the very first sentence? Like, "concerning handicapped students" or something?

Kelly: "Concerning handicapped students?" Probably.

Nicole: I don’t think so, cause it’s obviously . . .

Eddie: Yeah, I think that the headlines....

Sam and Nicole like the opening the way it is; Nicole recognizes that it could use some help, but doesn’t want drastic change. Eddie and Kelly are in total agreement
about how to fix it—cut it, make it "short, clear, and to the point." For most of this part of the discussion, Dani has been quiet. Once Sam concedes, and Eddie pacifies him a bit, then Dani contributes.

**Sam:** Yeah, Okay, yeah, That's fine, you know? I mean, you know, cause he's always talking about like making sure the reader knows what he's reading about.

**Eddie:** Yeah. I think you did, not only know that our headlines, I think people know, I mean, they'll get the gist of what that is, and in the next sentence we come out and say what the problem is I think it'll be pretty clear.

**Dani:** And maybe, too, to make it a little bit more readable, we should like break up the headlines and like move it down...

**Kelly:** Yeah

**Nicole:** Bullet form?

**Dani:** Yeah. So that each headline has its own lines and you realize where one's starting and one's stopping.

**Kelly:** I think that's a good idea.

Having agreed to the change, they then begin to discuss how to improve on it. Sam wonders "could we make it a figure or . . .?" And the others begin to suggest ways of altering the appearance by using different fonts and styles. They suggest, discuss, negotiate and determine the form for the introduction and then Eddie introduces yet another change:

**Eddie:** Maybe we should all, what I think, I don't know if you guys want to do this, maybe we should all write this thing and then Sunday get together and look at all of them and see, either see which one's the best one or take the best parts of each one, unless you guys just want to do it this way and then everybody, I don't care.
Sam: Yes, you do.

[Michelle laughs]

Eddie: Well, it would be more work the first way, but I think it might be better. Cause we'd actually have five different styles to sit there and look at and say, you know, these are our options.

Kelly: Take a little from each one.

Sam: Do you mean like, when you say that, do you mean like try to rewrite everything? Or....

Nicole: Yeah.

Eddie: Yeah. Well, it's not that.... It'll take an hour.

Kelly: Or areas that you find a problem with.

Eddie: Yeah. Or if you just want to do a certain one.

Kelly: Yeah. Cause there are certain areas I found that didn't quite flow, and I was trying, I marked them.

Eddie: So I think it'll be easier for us to pick from something visually than to just sit there and talk about it.

Nicole: That's for sure.

With the issue of how to actually rewrite the draft semi-settled, the group swings to discussing their next meeting time and place. This generates some side discussion, as usual, and then Dani reintroduces the problem they've had with identifying their audience. They grope around for a while trying to determine whether they have sufficiently identified their audience, but when Kelly comments that because Michael didn't comment negatively about their audience identification section, it must be fine, Dani reminds them that if they change the focus to policy, they
will probably need to change the primary and secondary audiences. This then creates a whole new issue to be dealt with, and they approach it in typical fashion, coming up with ideas, asking each other questions, noting what they need to find out, but not resolving anything. After about twenty minutes, they begin to attack the problem from the opposite end; rather than trying to identify the audience first, they decide that perhaps they should determine what their solution (Part II) might be and then target the likeliest audience to implement that solution, or at least respond to it.

This session has taken well over an hour, and they actually have little to show for all their effort at discussion. They agree on a plan for the day and the next meeting: Eddie and Sam will interview handicapped students, faculty and staff to determine the extent of the problem from the human perspective; Nicole, Dani, and Kelly will try to determine the hierarchy of decision makers and establish some sort of "flow chart" to identify potential audiences for their solution. They agree to meet Sunday night at Dani's, although settling this takes quite a while since each member has to contribute substantially to why they should meet when, and what they should plan to do and how, whether to order pizza (an enthusiastic yes), and how best to direct Nicole who has not been there before.
Rewriting. On Sunday evening, Sam and I arrive at the same time. When we enter, there is a discussion in progress among the others. Dani sits at the keyboard, typing, while Kelly, Nicole and Eddie sit on the floor around her. They have keyed in some of the changes that they discussed at the last meeting, and Nicole suggests they read the draft in progress aloud to Sam, who thinks that they have not clarified their purpose or audience sufficiently. His interviews with handicapped students from Friday have given him a slightly different perspective: the handicapped students feel that Disability Services does little or nothing of significance. What he has learned has made complete logical sense to him, and he now wants to be sure that they focus their paper on achieving some kind of change. He and Eddie have gathered more information about how Disability Services operates; they have added the human element, and the element of direct experience by talking with a number of handicapped individuals. Sam has become more committed having had direct experience to which he can relate the writing, a behavior frequently seen in ESTJ’s like Sam.

As they negotiate the changes, additions and deletions to their draft in progress, they follow the same procedure that has characterized their other meetings: a great deal of discussion, everyone engaging with one another, and of
course, a number of sidetracks pursued. Eddie prods them to keep on task, and Sam backs him up completely, convinced that they will run out of time tonight before they can finish. As usual, Nicole seems to socialize more than she works, but no one seems upset, no one really seems to notice it, because she does work and contribute to the group effort. Her primary concern here is with style, making sure there are no grammatical or mechanical errors, no "floating fragments," no "plurals where we need singulars." Nicole loves the sound of words and likes to play with the wording of the sentences, more so than most of the others, and it is she who will monitor their "flow" even as she is digressing to talk about some side topic.

Although there is still no single clear leader, Dani does offer direction more tonight than at other meetings, probably because we are in her house, in her bedroom in fact. When they are engaged in discussing a point, they tend to cluster, leaning close in to the computer, and sometimes pointing across each other to the screen. They are very mobile, not still even when composing, and they change position frequently. I sit somewhat off to the side, not easy in a small bedroom, but I try to remain out of the center of things. They are so used to my presence that they just carry on as if I'm not there, for the most part, although after about two hours, Dani comes over and says,
"What are you writing? It's killing me not knowing!" She's laughing and I respond in kind, offering to show her, but explaining that my fieldnotes are pretty illegible and serve mostly as cues for the transcript I will make later. She shakes her head in consternation, and finally says "Anybody thirsty or hungry?" This brings a chorus of enthusiastic responses from the group, and Dani and Nicole leave to prepare drinks and snacks. Kelly is at the keyboard, and Eddie and Sam flank her. They work for a few minutes, but without the full group, they just begin to talk about other things.

Whenever this group is together, the feeling in the room is quite companionable; they all seem to so enjoy each other, to be so easy with each other, teasing and joking as if they have known one another for years. The ease with which they move back and forth between the work on the project and idle conversation, with no disagreeableness or evidenced frustration, astonishes me. Nicole has jokingly referred to Sam as "The Most Polite One," but his courtesy differs only in degree, not in kind, from theirs.

When Dani and Nicole return, Eddie moves to the keyboard replacing Kelly, who reads aloud to him. The others all cluster around the screen, holding their drinks while they stand, except Nicole who sits in the other chair
in the room, just to the left of the typist. Their revision process deals with both style and content; they will decide a sentence "doesn't sound right," and then play with both its structure and what it is saying.

Dani: [reading from her draft] "This is due to inadequate, this is due to less than adequate spacing."

Kelly: You can't talk about just sides.

Eddie: Yeah, you have to . . .

Dani: Okay, "This is due to lack of space to maneuver, in the back or sides of the vehicle."

Eddie: "These spots are often difficult to . . ." something like that?

Dani: Yeah, yeah.

[everyone's laughing]

Nicole: As opposed to just writing in these fragments in there.

Eddie: Well, I, uh, I don't . . .

Sam: Get him behind a keyboard . . .

Eddie: Okay, okay. What am I typing in here?

The typist both contributes and types in the contributions of others, but when the typist wants to make a suggestion, he or she stops and either turns to the group or points to the screen indicating what the alteration should be. After another fifteen minutes of revision, Eddie suggests that they print a hard copy so that each can read it individually and look for changes. There is a brief discussion, and they decide to key in the rest of the changes they know they want to make before printing a hard copy. This makes sense to
Eddie, and after a few minutes Dani returns to the keyboard, replacing him. They engage in some horseplay trying to decide about fonts and such, laughing over what the effect of the different fonts and sizes as they play. Everyone is hot and tired. Dani’s room is small, and the single oscillating fan has not kept up with the heat of six bodies in this small space. The house is air-conditioned but she doesn’t like "living with all that stale air," so she leaves her window open and keeps her room sealed off from the rest off the house. After they settle on a font and a size, Dani has to leave the room to convert and print the document on the printer in Bob’s room. Sam asks me if they will be expected to actually mail this memo to the people they have targeted as their primary audience, the directors of Traffic and Parking and Disability Services. We discuss the possibility of doing that, Kelly begins to giggle about the effects on their nearly-completed academic careers if these people get upset by what the memo reports. They all play with the idea of disguising their identities and they get sillier and sillier. The heat and the hour have rendered them less than effective. And as usual when they meet, after a certain point they just cannot stay focused for more than a few minutes.

When Dani returns with the drafts, she hands round copies for everyone to read. Everyone reads quietly for
about ten minutes, then Eddie says softly, "You know, it's almost more difficult writing a group paper—know what I mean?" Everyone murmurs agreement, goes on reading. After a few more minutes, Eddie says, "Okay, everybody done?" They agree on a few minor changes to be effected by Dani in the morning before class, and she explains how she has to re-convert the document and therefore will just print the final draft in the classroom on the laser printer. I caution her to be there early, because the other groups may also decide to print their final drafts in the classroom, and that will cause some delays.

Everyone stands up, stretches and begins to gather belongings and move toward the door. They talk about how good they feel, that they have "done a good job with some hard stuff." This stage of the group process, this sharing of their mutual sense of satisfaction at accomplishing the task, appears to round off the experience of collaborating for them. They linger a bit after the meeting, saying complimentary things to one another, and when they arrive in class the next morning, they resume. They seem to need to reinforce the satisfaction they feel at completing Project I before they approach Project II.

Collaborating: The Second Project. At this point in the quarter, midterm week, everyone's schedule is busier,
and other classes are beginning to make demands on their
time. On Monday, Michael has them work in class on a
revision of a letter in the book as preparation for their
midterm, and then he goes over the assignment for their
midterm. They will have Wednesday to work in groups on the
midterm and/or their solution, i.e., Project II. On Friday
in class they will write a group midterm. They decide to
put off the initial work on Project II until Friday after
class, when they will each bring some notes on a solution.

The Assignment. Michael has requested that they
"expand the problem" they are working on from a focus on
"figuring out what the problem is, and who can act to change
that problem" to coming up with a solution to the problem.
He advises them that they now have a new audience:

instead of writing to me and to the other class
members, your audience must be the person or group of
people who can enact change. In addition, you’ll
explore new formats for presenting information ..
look at Chapter 20 on reports and chapter 16 on
Direct-Mail Strategies. Your decision on a format will
be based on audience. The more carefully you’ve
defined your audience, the easier it will be to draft
this solution.

You also need to concentrate on how to present your
information. In particular, chapters 12, 14 and 15
provide ways to understand how to persuade an audience
that it needs to examine and consider your solution.

On Friday after the midterm, they meet outside again, and
decide to work on the draft of the solution. After a few
minutes of idle chat, Nicole reads from her notes. Everyone
listens, and then Kelly reads. Steve and Dani make a few
comments, suggesting again that more information might be needed, but Eddie says nothing. They need to have a draft of something for peer group response in class on Monday, so they agree to combine the notes that Kelly and Nicole have. Conversation drags; none of the usual effervescence appears. The group is obviously tired. While the midterm in this class was not strenuous, they each have several other classes and have been studying late. After less than half an hour, they agree that this isn't really going anywhere and they decide to leave.

On Monday, there are only four people present at the start of class: Eddie and Kelly and two other students. We cannot get into the classroom; it is locked and there are no Apple folk around to open it, so Michael suggests moving to an empty classroom down the hall. After five or six minutes, the class is settled into the new room, a few more students come in, including Sam and Nicole, and Michael decides to start by going over "some business stuff." He reviews the syllabus, returns group logs, and then asks about drafts for peer responding. His intention is to have the groups exchange papers and comment on each other's progress. Unfortunately, no one has anything to exchange. The students mumble a variety of excuses about not being able to print because they were locked out of the room or midterm pressures preventing them from getting together.
In the face of this lack of preparedness, Michael decides that he will give oral feedback on the drafts that he has yet to return to them. For our group, he finds the biggest problem to be the lack of a clear sense of audience, and he feels that the resulting confusion diminishes the effectiveness of the paper and will negatively affect the drafting of a solution. The students listen, Nicole makes notes, and Michael moves on to generalize about the relationship between identifying the specific audience and crafting a suitable persuasive appeal. Twenty minutes later, someone from the Computers in Composition and Literature office arrives in response to the note left for them, and we are able to get into the computer classroom. By the time the system is up and running, startup disks are distributed, and students begin to print, there is only five minutes of class time left, and Michael just lets them use it to print the drafts. There is no formal dismissal or summing up; people just start drifting out when they have finished printing. Group B is split: Eddie is trying to print the draft, with Michael’s and my assistance, and Nicole, Sam, and Kelly sit at the writing table talking about their past weekend.

On Wednesday the group has scheduled an out-of-class meeting with Michael for 2:00 in the afternoon to go over their draft-in-progress. In class that day, he announces
that he wants to focus on audience, which is exactly what
the group needs to work on. None of the groups are at full
strength, but our group has four members present; Dani is in
Florida at her sister’s wedding. The discussion begins with
Michael’s opening statement and Eddie’s response:

To start off today I want to back track, that
information in Chapter 6 that we haven’t really talked
about, and obviously, we should have talked about it
much, much, much sooner. It seems to me that that’s
the weakest dimension in all of your first drafts, you
know? So let’s start there, and let’s do it sort of
free-flowingly, at least to start off. What’s an
audience?

Eddie: Somebody you’re trying to communicate a message
to.

In his usual fashion, Michael leads the students with
questions, eliciting answers, praising those that take the
direction he wants them to follow and when they don’t go far
enough or when they veer off, he gently leads them back.
Having asked the class how to communicate a message to
somebody and receiving a variety of less than satisfactory
answers, he repeats the various responses, acknowledges that
they are indeed ways to communicate and then says,

but what I really want to get at is how in the heck do
you communicate a specific message to a specific
audience? How do you make the decisions that enable
you to figure out what to do with that audience? hmm-
mm? Anybody have any ideas?

Finally, Nicole says what they have all been feeling, "No,
it was particularly difficult for this assignment cause you
had to have a bunch of audiences." The concept of
satisfying the demands of multiple audiences in one document has given every group trouble, but particularly Group B. The discussion moves from generally defining audience to identifying and explaining the three types of audiences identified in BAC as common in business writing (Immediate, Primary, and Secondary) and the inherent difficulties in matching the message to the audience. Most of the discussion is between Kelly, Eddie, Nicole and Michael. Occasionally another student speaks up, but not often. Michael tries to get them to see the rhetorical relationship between audience and problem as "sort of what we call a recursive relationship between problem and audience. . . . as you shift the problem, you shift the audience, and as you shift the audience, you shift the problem." As he talks, he draws on the board trying to help the students visualize the multi-directional communication he describes. Then he asks them to focus on the second project: "what I’m concerned about is what’s been happening in this second dimension of the assignment where you actually have to address and try to persuade an audience . . . whoever it is you think can enact change." Again, Nicole responds, stating that it is precisely that element that Group B is having most trouble with. The other students in the classroom nod, mutter "Yeah," "It’s hard," and other indications that this is where the problem is knottiest for most of the groups. Michael decides to go with his standard approach:
Michael: Right. Let's start with something really abstract first. How do you persuade people? How do you get people to do something that you want?

Nicole: Well, you show the benefits to them.

Michael: Yeah. And another word for that that we've used in here is reader benefits. What else can you do?

Sharon: Give them some sort of incentive?

Michael: All right. Provide some kind of incentive. You probably won't be able to say, "Do it this way and we're gonna give you money," but . . .

Sharon: I meant like for the disability services they could offer like some kind of advantage to . . .

Michael: Maybe. I mean, you know, you guys could say if you start doing this, then we'll start getting more . That's so complicated, though, I don't know how you'd go about persuading them to .

Nicole: You could give them positive suggestions on how they might enact change instead of a "You must do this." "It might be helpful if you tried to implement this type of a strategy."

Sam: Show em, like, show them examples, like say of how something someone has done in the past.

Michael: There's a word that I'm going to use that will bring things together. Can anyone else read my mind?

Nicole: [Drawing it out ironically] No-o-o-o.

[General laughter]

Michael: [Laughing] All right, all right. Choices. Give your audience choices, if you can. "I want this outcome. These are 16 ways that you can go about getting this."

Nicole: Can you bullet the benefits?

Michael: Sure. That could be one way of doing it. Not the only one.

They continue to explore different possibilities for presenting information, formatting the document, and
appealing to the audience by establishing common ground and using examples. A large part of the discussion focuses specifically on Group B's problem, which in effect gives them an extra amount of time beyond the conference they have scheduled with him for later that afternoon. By using this approach, Michael conveys to the students his partnership in their efforts, manifesting his claim early in the quarter that he is in the classroom as a "resource person and a facilitator." The students respond to this well, telling him exactly what they think and asking honest questions. At one point in this discussion, after they have explored how to persuade someone in a power position that a problem exists where that person sees no problem, Nicole interrupts and asks a question that several of them have been wondering about:

Nicole: This won't ever get sent out to them, will it?
Sam: Not really.
Michael: Unless you want to. It's up to you, you know?
Nicole: They weren't too happy.
Michael: They weren't happy because they saw you as probably giving a negative press or negative publicity or something?
Nicole: I think so.
Kelly: Didn't they think you were working for the Lantern or something?
Eddie: Yeah, they think we're making this public.
Michael: And this is what you run into in the real world. That's why I wanted you to talk to real people. I mean we could have created a scenario, and just never
left the classroom, about how handicapped accessibility at Ohio State. We could have gone out maybe to the library and gotten statistics to come up with a document that was acceptable to everyone in this room and to me, but, you know, when you have to write a report and you have six different people to talk to, some of who may not come out all that prettily in it....

Michael's long response paragraph sums up one of the critical differences between his class and many others in business writing: he attempts to engage the students in real world situations that have a relationship to them and on which they could have an impact. He succeeds in varying degrees, but I suspect that this involvement helps the students' collaboration because they feel a certain validity in doing projects like this that they don't feel when they only work in textbooks, at least Group B indicates that they do. Nicole sums up their reaction when she says, "I think that this way was helpful, cause we found out with our problem that not as big of a problem exists as we had originally thought and that they are making progress. It's just that they could be doing more. And at the onset of the problem, I wasn't too sure they would do anything to help the situation."

When Eddie, Kelly, and Nicole meet with Michael later that day, he builds on what took place in the classroom, particularly the idea of flexibility and reciprocity in problem-audience relationship. He begins by telling them, gently, that "You know, I think that there's no way that you
can solve the problem that you set up for yourselves to solve." After the class discussion, they can see what he means, and they are ready to rethink their approach, to redefine the problem. They decide the problem is actually twofold: the lack of funding for disability services and the relatively powerless role of the Office of Disability Services as strictly an advisory group. They discuss options for solutions, including having a box put on the registration form where students can check to voluntarily contribute two dollars to a fund for disability services. Michael suggests that the second half of their problem, having the Office of Disability Services move from its advisory role to a more politically active role, might be more difficult than they think:

The problem that I see you having, you know, coming up with a solution here, is basically where in the world do you start. And how do you get the university to bring these people on board as full board members of this committee?

Having recognized the existence of an inequity, a problem that they know needs to be addressed, the group focuses on the end result, the future possibility, and fails to recognize the myriad steps between vision and resolution. Michael tries to help them by asking questions and urging them to face the difficulties involved. Even with Michael’s direction, they do not come to a decision. They have gathered so much information that they cannot confine themselves to a small enough area to negotiate this
difficulty successfully. Michael keeps trying to rein them in, to help them focus on a smaller, more manageable part of the overall problem. They move back and forth between topics to address and possible solutions and probable audiences, finally agreeing to focus on the accessibility issue. As they wrestle further with the problem of identifying an audience, Nicole reminds them of the difficulty that they have had with the Office of Disability Services.

Nicole: I think one of the big problems, in talking to people, is they feel like, I mean, which is kind of the case, they feel like here we are making a big fuss about this, and it's just a paper that we're going to turn in, and you know, they're poured their heart and soul into the problems, and that was the problem with the guy that [Eddie and Sam] talked to. He was like "Why should I cooperate with you? This is just an assignment you're going to turn in. It's not like you really care about my plight." Which is not the case, but....

[All through this section of Michelle's speech, Eddie is in the background saying, "Exactly. Exactly."]

Eddie: Like, he felt we're trying to make our paper better by making it a bigger problem than it is. That's the impression that they have. And he didn't think we were too clear about it, and so on and so forth, and that was a big problem and as much as we tried to convince him, I don't think we really did.

Not long after this, Michael leaves, and Eddie, Kelly, and Nicole continue to brainstorm about possible solutions to suggest. After Michael's guidance, they decide to "propose ways to make Disability Services and disabled people in general, more visible on campus" (Nicole's log). The list they compile includes lobbying the University for more power
for Disabled Services, increasing the awareness of the non-disabled population on campus by having the Office of Disability Services "sponsor Psychology 100 experiments," where the students would be "required to spend one full day as a physically impaired individual, and then prepare a paper on their impressions of what it is like to be disabled." The idea for these experiments comes from Nicole and Kelly who have friends at Bowling Green University where such events are required. Once the three of them agree on these details, Kelly volunteers to type up a draft for the next class, since everyone else has other commitments. Kelly also has other responsibilities, but she refuses to sacrifice class work for other activities.

This last week the group has found it hard to schedule meetings, and they have not had a full complement all week. In logs, they note how difficult it has been and how being understaffed affects them:

Kelly: We have had a lot of trouble finding time to meet together because [our] schedules are really busy. [Dani] is out of town until Sun. night, [Eddie] is gone for the weekend, and we all have a lot of studying to do. It seems that we are doing more individual work than we have on our past assignments.

Sam: Since [Dani] has been gone, [Eddie] missed Fri along with Myself not being able to meet Wednesday, I hope that no one person in our group feels like they are sharing the brunt of the work. I myself felt like I let the group down by not being able to meet.

Nicole: I did notice that in some respects it is easier to communicate as a small group--yet the flow of ideas is not as great.
Eddie: Sometimes, I think it's easier to get more done if you have fewer people. Between [Nicole and Kelly] and myself we came up with some great ideas. This is when you really reap the benefits of working as a group. Fortunately [sic], we all get along and respect each other's opinions so this was an effective session.

Once they are all together again, they begin to operate more efficiently. Eddie comments that the efficiency or the quickness of the meetings results from their being "sick of working on this topic." Kelly, too, notes that she can feel the group "starting to lose enthusiasm and motivation . . . It's hard to keep working on the same topic." When they discuss this in a meeting, they decide to "add a little pizazz" by looking ahead to the oral presentation and trying to focus on how it can enhance the memo. This seems to be enough to add an internal charge of energy and move them back on track. They work on the two aspects of the project—the written memo and the oral presentation—simultaneously and seem happier. As Nicole puts it: "We are starting to utilize each other's strong points—realizing who would be ideal for what situation."

Assessment: In their final logs, the group members all commented on how pleased they were with the final project. Eddie felt that the group should get an "A," except for himself. Because he missed two meetings, he felt that his performance merited a "B," as he put it: "Obviously I missed them by accident, but when you get in the real world and
miss business meetings by accident — sianara [sic]." Kelly identified Eddie's, Nicole's, Dani's, and her own contributions as equal, noting that Sam "was very involved in the group in a different way," and then reported that the group members should get at least an "A— if not an A for everyone." Nicole also felt the group and the project deserved an "A"—she also mentioned that she found it hard to believe that their mid-term only merited a "B." Michael agreed with her; he had been quite surprised that their final draft of the midterm memo had completely lacked positive emphasis, one of the key elements they had discussed in class.

The group had a very satisfying collaboration on a personal level; each of them reported being extremely pleased with every aspect of the process from the idea sharing to the sense of equally distributed responsibility. The problem for this group came in the execution of their ideas. They had wonderful ideas, creative and interesting approaches to the problems they faced, and in discussion they shone; but in the final execution something seemed to slip away from them, something that they were not even aware of. Michael's assessment of the final project came as a written memo. He praised the group for their "ability to act as a group and to focus [their] interaction.' He also pointed out that they had done a "great job of gathering
information" for the project, getting some sense of the problem's breadth and then focusing on a "way of moving toward a solution that was both realistic and challenging." He then responded that he would have liked to see a more developed solution, more detail on how they expected to be able to implement the suggestions they were making. He pointed out that they could have organized the memo more effectively, utilizing praise of the director to "get your audience on your side from step one," and that his "major concern focused around 'you-attitude' and 'reader-benefits'.'"

The finished project, while very good, did not measure up to expectations—Michael's or mine—based on the energy and creativity and talent that were visible throughout the quarter, although the group felt quite satisfied with what they had accomplished. Both Michael and I also agreed with the group's assessment of its collaboration as successful. The failure of the final document to live up to expectations, I suspect, reflects multiple factors, some of which are peculiar to the student-centered collaborative classroom. For example, in this student-centered classroom, the teacher was involved all through the creative process; exposed to the high-energy idea exchanges which characterized this group, Michael and I expected to see that kind of power in the writing. In order to determine whether its absence was a casualty of collaboration and consensus,
further studies would be needed which looked specifically at comparisons of the writing of individuals operating alone and the same individuals in collaborative groups. I suspect that part of the findings might be personality related: because extraverts tend to derive energy from interaction with other people, the verbal prewriting process could tend to be more highly charged than the actual written document resulting from it. Thus, to the insider experiencing the energized exchanges, the process would be quite satisfying, whereas to the outsider observing such high-energy idea generating sessions, higher expectations might be raised than the writers would be capable of producing. From both personal experience and from talking with the extraverts in this group, I have seen ideas that seem so bright and alive flying in verbal exchanges suddenly elude the writer who tries to pin them to the page.

A key element in the collaborative process, the definition of success in collaboration merits further study. Specifically, we need to consider questions like How is success is defined? Who determines if collaboration is successful? What elements contribute to such success or failure?
CHAPTER V

DRAWING DELICATE DISTINCTIONS:
Inscribing to Understand

The ethnographer "inscribes" social discourse; he writes it down. In so doing he turns it from a passing event, which exists only in its moment of occurrence, into an account, which exists in its inscriptions and can be reconsulted. . . . what we inscribe (or try to) is not raw social discourse . . . but only that small part of it which our informants can lead us into understanding.
—Clifford Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures

What generality [cultural theory] contrives to achieve grows out of the delicacy of its distinctions, not the sweep of its abstractions.
—Clifford Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures

INTRODUCTION

Sweeping abstractions cannot be made from a small, descriptive study like this, but delicate and informing distinctions can be drawn. Having inscribed selections from the spoken and written discourse of two writing groups, and thus turned those discourse events into accounts in the previous two chapters, I must now try to achieve some measure of generality by drawing the delicate distinctions Geertz refers to. This study has examined two groups of writers--students in collaborative, computer-assisted business writing classes--seeking to determine what role
personality type plays in the negotiation of group roles and writing behaviors and how those groups deal with conflict and collaboration. The data suggest that personality plays a significant, though variable, role in group dynamics. Furthermore, this study indicates that looking at group procedures, writing behaviors, issues of leadership, power, and conflict through the lens of personality theory can provide teachers and researchers with a rich alternative to standard collaborative writing pedagogy. In particular, using personality theory complicates some of the assumptions that undergird current pedagogy, assumptions about power relationships, classroom dynamics and structure, gender roles, and the most basic assumption of all—that collaborative learning will somehow produce new and better learning. In this final chapter, I will summarize the findings in this study, briefly examine the issues those findings complicate, and offer questions for future research.

Group Procedures. As demonstrated in Chapters III and IV, both groups in this study displayed marked differences in dynamics. Fisher and other group dynamics researchers have observed that the initial interactions in small groups are tentative and awkward; small talk predominates and no one individual dominates or controls the conversation. Some self-disclosure is common, and the feedback on ideas tends
to be ambiguous or guardedly positive. Strong opinions are the exception as members attempt to orient themselves toward each other and toward the task involved. This initial orientation stage is necessary to developing a sense of "groupness," an identification of the members as a collective unit with goals which transcend the individuals' goals.

Group A eliminated many of the early stages of group process in their quick leap to establish goals and implement procedures to accomplish those goals. Examined in light of group process theory, their focus on the task and on the scheduling and assignment of duties in the first brief meeting seems premature; neglecting to establish themselves as a group, to form any social bonds, they also neglected--on later assignments as well as the first--to engage long enough in problem-definition, moving quickly to solutions before they had sufficiently explored the problems. Collaboration for them became more of a combining of individual efforts at goal attainment than a sharing in the process of working toward those goals.

Group B, on the other hand, as can be seen in Chapter IV, spent much of their first three meetings in the orientation stage--getting to know each other and selecting/defining the problem. Their early interactions
were marked by supportive and confirming comments on each other's positions and ideas which served to establish mutual respect and a shared sense of responsibility to the group.

To what extent these differences in dynamics can be attributed to personality type or to other factors—teaching style, age, gender—is impossible to say from this small descriptive study. It is possible, however, to connect much of what happened with specific elements of personality type theory. The combination of a preference for sensing and a preference for judging—which all four women in Group A reported—frequently characterizes individuals who value order, dislike ambiguity, and focus on facts of immediate experience. When introversion is factored in, the tendency toward introspection, reflection, and quiet, private contemplation takes precedence over an inclination toward social exchange. In other words, IS-J's might tend to have little interest in actively pursuing social intercourse; tending to focus inward, rather than outward, they frequently are quite slow to develop social skills. In a group composed of people with these preferences, it is predictable that the socialization identified by Fisher as necessary to the orientation stage of group dynamics would be less than likely to occur. A teacher who understood that such a potential existed could monitor the group's progress and intervene to encourage more active socialization and
In Group B, the pattern of group development can also be connected to their personality types, in particular their extraversion. All five members reported a preference for extraversion, a preference which indicates a strong outward orientation. According to theory, extraverts communicate readily and derive great enjoyment from talking with others. Many extraverts claim that they don't know what they are thinking until they hear what they say, needing to interact with others in order to clarify their ideas. Extraverts also tend to share personal information easily and to be engaging and energetic in doing so. These characteristics multiplied by five could predictably result in too much sharing of ideas, too little coming to conclusions, especially when in conjunction with a preference for intuition, which Dani and Nicole reported. In the case of Group B, the very characteristics which enabled them to form a cohesive unit--their interest in and sympathy for each other, their preference for oral exchanges, and an inclination to remain open to new ideas and information, to put off closure--also contributed to the difficulties that they experienced with their writing, difficulties in knowing when to end discussion and information-gathering and begin to focus on writing.
In a group, as in an individual, it is not merely the sum of the preferences, but the interaction of those preferences, that make up the personality. Judging from these two groups, a significant factor in successful group development could be the balance of extraversion and introversion in the members. Since research in group dynamics indicates that communication plays a primary role in effective decision-making and successful group dynamics, and since extraversion favors communication, it seems likely that members reporting a preference for extraversion would be more likely to have a successful group experience. This expectation, of course, depends upon the definition of a successful group experience. Whether the group members are extraverted or introverted will have no bearing on the quality of the writing they produce, but it will have an effect on the quality of the interaction they attempt.

**Writing Behaviors.** Given an assignment, Group A almost immediately began to set goals and divide labor. Very task-oriented, they spent little time in general discussion or in brainstorming ideas. After making the initial decisions about what they needed to do to satisfy the requirements of the assignment and the demands or perceived expectations of the instructor, they would each separately write a draft, coming together at a later meeting to review and respond to the individual drafts. During each responding session, they
created a single draft for rewrites from the four separate initial drafts by having one member make notes from all four onto one of their drafts. This rewrite copy would then be photocopied for all four members before they left campus; each would then make further individual revisions, again by handwritten notes or by redrafting the paper completely and incorporating the changes already suggested. When they met again as a group, this process of rewriting by making notes on a single copy would then be repeated until they were satisfied with the draft. At that point, one of the group members would take the document to a computer and key it in. This draft would then be the final draft turned in for a grade. Group A always hand-drafted multiple times before turning to the computer for the final copy.

As they worked on a draft, the members of Group A would tick off, as if they had a checklist, the points that the instructor had emphasized in class or, in the case of revisions, the points that she had made in written comments on their papers. Operating in this way, on an isolated point-by-point basis, they achieved closure before they had fully explored an issue. Then, when the instructor identified problems in their papers, they were shocked because in their view they had done exactly what the instructor asked for. This tendency of the group to stop gathering information prematurely is one problem that is
predictable for judging types, and all four women reported a preference for judging. According to Myers, people who prefer judging "like to have matters settled and decided as promptly as possible" (75). Myers and McCaulley report that when operating in the judging attitude (J), people are "concerned with making decisions, seeking closure, planning operations, or organizing activities" and that "for those who characteristically live in the judging (J) attitude, perception tends to be shut off as soon as they have observed enough to make a decision" (14).

While all four women in Group A reported a preference for the judging attitude, three of them also preferred introversion and sensing. Jensen and DiTiberio's accounts of writing behaviors of individual writers indicate that introverts "need time and solitude for concentration," that they usually engage in careful planning before writing; that sensing types "feel more comfortable when following a specific pattern that is what the teacher wants or is 'tried and true,' such as the five-paragraph theme," and that they tend to view revising as merely proofreading; and that judging types tend to quickly limit topics, to develop drafts "expeditiously," and to "divide the paper into sections (especially if I and T) so that it can be written more easily" and organizational and stylistic choices made more quickly (172-176). Weaknesses which might interfere in
their writing for sensing-judging types include the tendency to make observations without accounting for the ideas attendant on them, to ignore or be unaware of the unique demands of individual assignments and thus fail to respond to those demands, to set unambitious goals, and to adhere too rigidly to the original plans. This group, four sensing-judging types, exaggerated the tendency to shut-off perception in favor of decision-making by failing to recognize the existence of possible alternatives or further extensions of ideas. Their penchant for solitary drafting complicated by a reluctance to explore new options resulted in a certain static quality in their written products. And their inclination to explicitly follow the specific, stated demands of the teacher or requirements of the assignment contributed to an underdeveloped product and consequently what they perceived as an unsatisfactory grade.

The members of Group B, however, approached writing in nearly diametrically opposite ways to Group A. When Group B was given an assignment, they reacted by engaging in extensive verbal interaction, exploring as many angles and approaches as they could conceivably come up with. They typically talked about the problem for several hours in two or more meetings before they ever began to write anything, even rough notes. On the first assignment, the members of Group B focused on establishing group relationships well before they focused on attacking the task at hand.
Encouraging and supportive statements, self-disclosure, questions to identify likes and dislikes beyond the classroom characterized their early interaction. Primary tension, the initial uneasiness in small groups characterized by overly polite behavior, nervous laughter and the avoidance of negative statements and disagreement, was conspicuously absent here. The absence of such initial tension might be attributed to the instructor’s delay in formally assigning the students to groups while he familiarized himself with them as individuals. This delay in concert with Michael’s ice-breaking interview day effectively created a space wherein the students could exorcise much of that initial nervousness as they became acquainted with each other in the larger classroom group. I suspect that because of the way Michael set up the class with these built-in tension reducers, the initial stages of collaboration for the individual groups became easier, as well.

Once Group B had conceived of the substance of a draft, they would compose the piece together, actively collaborating even to the extent of sharing the keyboard as they drafted. In subsequent sessions they also focused on relationships, always taking time before any meeting turned to writing to talk about personal issues, to ask after each other’s known activities and interests, and to engage with
each other in some measure of verbal play. Their enjoyment of each other, of being part of this group, was obvious in the way they interacted; their speech was peppered with laughter and good-natured kidding; their body-language was open and easy. They frequently touched each other on the arm or shoulder when making a point. Working on revising a document followed the same pattern as composing original drafts: they engaged in a great deal of talking, exchanging ideas and suggestions verbally before attempting to commit anything to paper. Once they did begin to write, however, they continued to talk. With one member at the keyboard, the other four would cluster around switching between commenting on the draft in progress and carrying on a variety of other conversations. It was not uncommon for two or more conversations to occur concurrently, one focusing on the draft and another on either a related or strictly peripheral topic.

One behavior which marked the group and contributed to its success was their habit of engaging in some verbal evaluation of their group process at the close of a session; they also spent a significant amount of time after the completion of each project reflecting on their progress and success and taking pride in their group accomplishment. This meta-commentary about their collaborative process helped to focus their attention on both the group dynamics
aspect of their working together and on the writing processes they engaged in.

This approach to writing is also predictable according to Jensen and DiTiberio's assessment of individual writers. These researchers found that extraverts generate ideas most easily when they can talk about them, that they prefer to interview people or to actively experience the topic. One of the first things that Group B decided to do, in fact, was to interview people in positions of responsibility, and later to include interviews with handicapped individuals. Jensen and DiTiberio also found that extraverted writers tend to develop more ideas while writing than do introverts, and this group certainly did. They also, as predicted by theory, determined what needed to be revised, in part by discussing the drafts among themselves and in part by discussing the drafts with their instructor. For extraverts, discussion works much better as a response form than merely writing comments on the drafts. One predictable problem for extraverts is that they can have a tendency to write superficially, which this group seemed to have some problem with. Their instructor's comments on their final project indicate that he thought that they had been less than exhaustive in the final draft.
The feeling function shared by four of the writers contributed to their success in two ways: first, by encouraging them to be concerned with the relationships they were establishing in the group, and second, by leading them to choose a topic that would be of personal importance to them and of easily identifiable importance to a section of the community. Jensen and DiTiberio also point out that feeling types excel at making connections with their audience, often using personal examples in an effort to make that connection, a trait the group displayed repeatedly. (Interestingly, Group A also had a preponderance of feeling types, but they displayed little ability to connect with the audience. This lack of connection could be attributed to a variety of factors, including, but not limited to, the effect of the preferences for introversion and sensing on the feeling function.) The cautions for feeling types indicate that they could have a tendency to write in an overly sentimental way and that their writing might lack clear organizational structure. Both of these tendencies were countered by a certain clear-headedness that could be attributed to the presence of three judging types in conjunction with two perceiving types, effecting a more balanced approach to the final product. In fact, what characterized Group B most was the balance that it achieved between the different pulls placed on its members by their personalities.
One problem Group B did have was a tendency to talk too much and not to recognize that there is a time when quiet contemplation can help productivity. Myers says that extraverts "think best when talking with people and they enjoy talk." That all five of these students were extraverted suggests that such a problem might exist, and a teacher prepared with this knowledge could monitor group meetings to encourage some measure of control over the tendency to keep sharing ideas and help the students see when they needed to move beyond talking.

**Leadership and Power.** Researchers in small group dynamics (Benne and Sheats, Cragan and Wright, Fisher) suggest that, in many cases, it is more effective for group roles to emerge rather than be assigned by an external individual; such a case would be collaborative writing classrooms where teachers frequently need to form groups very soon after classes begin, when they may have little reliable information about the individuals involved. In both of the classes that I studied, role selection was left up to the students. In the case of Group A, the predictable leader did emerge, but more strongly than might have been best for the group as a whole. Karen's dominance reflects a complexity of factors, not merely her personality type (ESFJ), but her type suggests that she would be inclined to prefer a leadership role and to be perceived on the basis of
behavior as a strong leader-candidate. The combination of extraversion and judging frequently indicate a confident, decisive individual who enjoys making things happen. The combination of sensing and feeling frequently result in an individual with a strong orientation toward facts, but one who prefers facts relating to people rather than facts about things. Combining extraversion and sensing can result in an orientation toward action and realism, a strong focus on the practical. The role of the feeling function in such an individual could result in a people-orientation, someone who tends to be sociable and friendly, whose goals are contributing to the welfare of others. Most of these descriptors apply to Karen, and in light of the interaction of her personality with the other personality types in the group, much of what took place can be seen as predictable.

All four women in Group A shared the preferred perceiving or information-gathering function (all are sensing types) and the preferred attitude toward life (all are judging types). This sharing suggests that as a group they would have a strong orientation toward decision-making, that they would dislike ambiguity, lack of clarity and order, and that they would prefer clear organization and be somewhat conservative in their approach to problem solving. On the negative side, however, these shared qualities could indicate a tendency to shut off perceiving too early in
favor of decision making and closure, and they may exhibit a tendency to distrust imagination and intuition. In their operations as a collaborative group, these four women manifested most of these predictable traits. As demonstrated by the descriptions of their interactions in Chapter III, the group approached every assignment with a strong goal-orientation, favoring the first or second suggested solution or approach rather than engaging in lengthy discussion or data collection. Their strong preference for organization in combination with the factual orientation resulted in their focusing on meeting minimal demands from the teacher or assignment and in their tendency to neglect the reader/audience perspective in their writing in favor of the writer’s perspective.

In responding to the initial assignment, for example, they failed to achieve sufficient "you-attitude" even after the concept was explained and demonstrated in class and after they had read the chapters on it in the book. This failure could be attributed to a lack of empathy with others which resulted from their concern with achieving fact-oriented goals rather than. Support for this contention can be seen in their discussions which were marked by a scarcity of references to the audience. The group, most concerned with meeting the teacher’s expectations to the letter, did not engage in a discussion of potential audiences or
analysis of an identified audience to the extent that would allow them to achieve effective identification of their audience, or "you-attitude."

The roles which the other three members of the group adopted are also predictable, at least for the greater part, according to type theory, but I suspect they also reflect a measure of response to the situation and the contexts as well. Both Heidi and Debbie M. report ISFJ as their personality type. Combining introversion and judging usually results in a decisive individual; while Debbie appeared more decisive than Heidi, neither was nearly as decisive as either of the other two women in the group. The I/J combination also creates a tendency toward introspection and perseverance; both Debbie M. and Heidi evidenced these characteristics. And ISTJ's frequently have very intense and personal private reactions, which become known publicly only if they are highly motivated or know well the people around them. In the case of Heidi,'s surprisingly strong resistance to Karen's position on the job candidate Bill in Assignment Five, Heidi's personal commitment to fairness prompted her to a tenacity she had not previously seemed to possess. It may well be that Heidi's youth and inexperience, reflecting a lack of development of her personality, played a role in her being so hesitant during most of their interactions. Because of her ease in purely
social interactions and with other students in the class, I suspect that among her chosen peers, other women athletes, for example, she would be quite decisive. Debbie M.'s choice of the nurturing peacemaker as role might reflect her response to the situation more than any inherent desire on her part. Given Debbie R.'s detachment, Heidi's tentativeness, and Karen's obvious assumption of leadership, Debbie M. might have felt a natural pull toward the role of peacemaker and nurturer. ISFJ's frequently have a stabilizing influence, and in this situation, Debbie had such an influence, especially later in the quarter when resistance to Karen became a bit more obvious.

Implicit norms in Group A, their valuing of the practical and their appreciation of evidence, led to several predictable problems, especially in the fifth assignment when they wrote the letter of evaluation recommending a job candidate. For example, in their consideration of the candidates, they initially rejected the two women as viable candidates on the sole basis of the information that two members had received in another class which indicated that women were not considered as effective as men in managerial positions in foreign markets.

The feeling function shared by Debbie M., Heidi, and Karen suggests that the group would have a strong
orientation toward harmony, making sure each member felt positive about the association. However, in this group, the feeling function was strongly modified by their introverted orientation. They seemed to prefer to avoid or ignore any active pursuit of group maintenance. They had a very pragmatic and detached manner of looking at their association: it occurred as the direct result of random assignment to this class; it had a definite goal in mind—successful completion of the task demanded by the class and teacher; and it had a finite existence, bounded by the conditions under which it developed. Since they perceived the group as existing solely for the purpose of completing a series of writing assignments which could reasonably be expected to be successfully managed within the time and space confines of the class itself, they saw no logical need to engage in any effort at socializing beyond those limited boundaries. And, since there was a strong leader with a clear agenda which did not include constructively maintaining positive group relations, there was no expressed need to do so.

In this particular group, all judging types who had a strong desire for closure, the agenda Karen put forth was not a problem; they all agreed that the goal was to accomplish the assigned task to the teacher’s specifications; no one inclined toward extra measures. In
planning discussions, I frequently heard, "What exactly does she [Anne Marie] want here?" "How much information do we have to have?" "Have we got enough stuff?" "I don't think we need to do any more on this." And when they revised a document, they rewrote only those parts explicitly identified by the teacher as needing revision. While these behaviors could also be attributed to laziness, the evidence from their out-of-class lives indicates that these are not lazy women: all have multiple commitments and responsibilities which they actively and successfully pursue, and all are taking a full class load. This group would have benefited from someone with a perceiving attitude, someone not driven by a need for closure who might have been able to convince them to continue to try new ways of seeing. A teacher could fulfill that role from outside the group, if she were aware of the group's tendency to close off perception prematurely. Thus, an awareness of the interaction of personality types within a group would be most helpful to a collaborative writing teacher, who could use that information in forming groups or in knowing when and how it might be useful for the teacher to intervene.

In Group B, no single leader ever emerged. With five talkative extraverts in one group, it's not surprising that no single leader emerged as easily as one did in Group A; it did surprise me, however, that no one individual ever
emerged as leader. Given my reading in group dynamics and my experience observing other collaborative groups, I expected to see a dominant leader emerge. However, there seemed to be no inclination on the part of any of the group members to contend for leadership. Each of them preferred to think of the group as essentially leaderless; however, three of them (Eddie, Kelly, and Dani) actually seemed to share completely the responsibilities and actions normally associated with being a group leader: goal setting, initiating information and ideas, summarizing discussions, setting agendas, evaluating information and ideas, focusing, while the other two (Nicole and Sam) performed some of these leadership roles on a less regular basis. Each person also had preferred roles both within and apart from these leadership activities. Eddie acted as their devil's advocate, problematizing and skeptically questioning, making sure that facts were accurate or that they would be verified; Kelly seemed most often to be the realistic one, making practical decisions, but she also liked to modify ideas and suggest innovations; Dani preferred the role of initiator/contributor, at least in part due to the idea they worked with being hers; Sam acted as the evaluator, the critical editor who monitored both the ideas and the writing. Nicole had an interesting Janus-like position in the group: on the plus side, she acted as an energizer, her enthusiasm for the topic and her encouragement of the
others' ideas and accomplishments serving to stimulate the group; on the negative side, her frequent attention-seeking behavior sometimes proved distracting.

Comparing Dani and Nicole, both the same type, serves to convey the potential for difference in behavior associated with any given type. Both reported ENFP as their preference; both were creative, adaptable, energetic, and liked new experiences; both saw change as positive. But Dani's focus tended to be on others, helping other people, improving life for other people, contributing to the pleasure and welfare of other people, while Nicole focused her intuition and feeling on others in terms of how those others reacted to Nicole, how other lives intertwined with hers. In the group meetings, this tendency to seek attention could have been annoying, but didn't seem to be to the others. The group members all seemed eager to accept the individuality and idiosyncracies of their fellow members without being judgmental.

Conflict. Perhaps the last statement identifies one of the keys to conflict management: a disinclination, once conflict is recognized, to be judgmental. The role of personality in conflict manifests itself very differently in the two groups. In Group A, conflict was never successfully managed; for the most part, it was ignored (see discussions
in Chapter III). Although there were a few minor ideational conflicts in the early meetings, they were never recognized and negotiated as such. The group never developed techniques for managing conflict. Karen, who seemed fully convinced that her position was the right position in any instance, perfected passive aggression by ignoring opposition until it evaporated. Heidi gave in on every point until nearly the end of the quarter, and the Debbies seemed either not to notice or not to care. Relational conflicts were never allowed to materialize, although I suspect that Debbie R. felt dissatisfied with her role in the group, and under other conditions might have vied with Karen for the role of leader. I further suspect this ignoring of conflict as a possible function of the introverted personality with its focus on the inner world. If you are very clearly focused inward, drawing energy from and directing energy toward the inner world of thought and ideas, it seems logical that the outer world may not seem as important. Since conflicts occur in the outer world, then conflict may not seem important, either.

Ideational conflicts did arise in Group B and were dealt with fairly and creatively. When the group disagreed on an idea, for example in Project I when they had differing views about how to approach the actual writing of the document, they identified the problem, discussed it, put
forth the pros and cons of the various alternatives, and made a decision. No one individual won all the time, and each person had a chance to be heard; each person's opinion was equally considered. Later in the quarter, when Sam became more vocal, debate on these points became livelier, but in every case, decisions were made by thorough discussion and a majority decision. Relational conflicts, conflicts involving status or role-performance, did not appear. The interactions of the group were so marked by respect for the rights of the other and strong positive feelings about being in this particular group, (which the group members all reported in the various exchanges with me and in their logs), that it seems likely this kind of conflict did not exist for this particular group.

When conflict did arise in Group B, the interaction focused on the issue, the idea; it never devolved into personal attack, never into a win-lose scenario. (On the few occasions when conflict emerged in Group A, the underlying tenor conveyed personal involvement; Karen's frequently condescending attitude toward Heidi, [for example in the debate on Assignment Five about the job candidate, Bill] marked these conflicts as potentially negative.) The members of Group B, on the other hand, while working to preserve group harmony, did not sacrifice negotiation to achieve that harmony. Rather, they focused on the issue,
not the individual; no value judgment was made associating the worth of the individual with the worth of the idea.

I cannot claim definitively that the differences in the groups' approaches to conflict have any clear relationship to personality type, although I suspect a connection between the intuition and feeling functions in conjunction with extraversion. Intuitives, focusing on possibility and potential and sensitive to the underlying patterns in facts and relationships, would seem more likely to be aware of and take into consideration the effect of interpersonal conflict, and an external orientation marked by an awareness of and concern for the feelings of others would suggest that those types would be highly conscious of the ramifications of conflict negotiation and the importance of maintaining a sense of worth for all involved.

Cautions. The theory of psychological types is, however, just that: a theory, a tool, and one of many available to teacher-researchers. Personality theory functions, in some ways, as might any other extra-disciplinary theory available to writing teacher-researchers--critical theory, gender studies theory, or reader-response theory. It provides a guide, a perspective from which to examine our behaviors and by which to judge our progress, or lack thereof. This study suggests that
type theory can provide a way of looking at the issues involved in collaboration and conflict, but there are risks involved in an untutored approach to doing so. Because the theory depends on forced-choice dichotomies for type identification, there is a tendency in the uninformed to assume that the theory is only a means of stereotyping. This becomes a problem in any situation where type is used, but can be especially problematic in the classroom where so much depends on both teachers and students being open to and with one another. In the classroom, teachers must be careful not to reduce complex human individuals to "types," to see not only extraverts and introverts, or judgers and perceivers, but the fullness of potential in individuals who manifest certain preferences. If we are to use such a theory in teaching, then we must be constantly on guard against the oversimplification that can seem to be inherent in describing people as one of two extremes. Teachers must recognize that infinite possibilities of expression of type exist because the personality of any given individual depends on the interaction of all the four pairs of preferences, as well as a variety of other contributing factors. Also, the inherent strengths and weaknesses, appropriate and inappropriate uses of each of the four functions, complicate the picture. Type theory can serve as a shorthand, a way of reminding ourselves to be alert to the rich diversity in the classroom.
**Implications.** This study suggests that people in collaborative writing groups tend to exhibit the same writing behaviors that individual writers exhibited, according to Jensen and DiTiberio, and that these behaviors are consistent with Jungian personality type theory as modified by Briggs and Myers. Therefore, Jung’s theory of psychological type, as modified by Briggs and Myers, offers a model of personality that can contribute to our understanding of many of the variables in both writing processes and group processes. For example, one way that personality type theory might be applied in the collaborative classroom is in conflict management. Forman and Katsky, Cross, and Locker all identify poor conflict management as one of the problems contributing to dysfunctional group process. A knowledge of type theory could help students understand why group members seem to be in conflict and enable students to develop different strategies to deal constructively with conflict between different types.

The conflicts which affected Group A, both those that surfaced and those that did not, would be classified as mild in relation to what some teachers of collaborative writing classes have reported, but those conflicts did interfere with the group’s success. Group B recognized that they had ideational conflicts and talked about how they resolved
them; they also never reported any awareness of relational conflict, an assessment I would concur with as the observer. Group A, however, never admitted to conflict of any kind, even though conflict was clearly evident to an observer. With such a small sample, it would be irresponsible to do more than conjecture about a relationship between type and such an awareness or admission. Following that line of thought, it is possible to conjecture a relationship between type and conflict resolution techniques, but again, this study can not make any definitive claims. However, given the orientation of extraverts toward the external and introverts toward the internal, it would be interesting to see what the awareness of conflict in mixed groups of E's and I's would be, as well as what the preferred methods of negotiating conflict might be. Having one group of extraverts and one primarily of introverts begs the question of a balance between these two attitudes and suggest the need for further studies examining many more groups to attempt to determine if any connections do, in fact, exist between the mix of types in a group and the group's own perception of conflict.

This study further suggests that students given some knowledge of type theory can use that knowledge to increase their awareness of, sensitivity to, and acceptance of the individual differences of writing group members to reduce
the amount of relational conflict in group sessions. Group B, received their original knowledge of theory from me, but it was reinforced by their instructor's obvious interest in and acceptance of the theory. Group A had no more instruction or discussion of personality type theory other than my initial brief introduction of the theory and the MBTI. In a classroom where the teacher had some knowledge of type theory, that knowledge could be brought into play more widely and more often. I suspect that doing so would enhance collaborative efforts beyond individual groups to include the wider collaboration possible among the entire class.

**Questions.** This study has raised several questions about the collaborative writing classroom. A key issue for both students and teachers is the evaluation process. Many students feel that they are not well served by a single grade on group efforts; this is not a new problem, but one which deserves serious consideration. Part of the importance of collaborative experiences in the classroom lies in their direct relationship to the world students face after graduation. Given the preponderance of collaborative work in the professions as reported by researchers (Ede and Lunsford, Faigley and Miller), students need to have experiences in the classroom which will reflect practices occurring in the workplace. One element of such workplace
collaboration that can be missing in the classroom is the sense of commitment to the collaborative writing that professionals have because they are engaged in meaningful projects in which they have a vested interest—this is, after all, part of how they earn a living. Consequently, assignments need to be structured to encourage student interest and involvement beyond mere compliance with the requirements of textbook, teacher, or course. Evaluation needs to reflect workplace standards as well. Most teachers of writing believe themselves capable of judging the quality of student writing, but their criteria may differ dramatically from the criteria used to assess writing in the professional world. An understanding of the rhetorical situation becomes even more important when the issues involved can affect real people, when the effects of rhetorical choices can alter people's lives. For example, expecting Group B to deliver the final document to the Office of Disability Services might have propelled them to more thoroughness by further engaging their sense of responsibility.

Related to the evaluation process is the notion of successful collaboration. After all, how can evaluation be complete without considering the success or failure of the process as well as the product? But what is successful collaboration? Who defines it and according to what
criteria? Can collaboration be considered successful if the written product fails to meet the teacher's expectations? What if the writing satisfies the students, but the grade doesn't? And how is that satisfaction related to the collaborative process? Obviously, there are multiple dimensions to working in collaborative writing groups; multiple factors must be considered in the process of evaluation. I further suspect the definition of successful collaboration is context-dependent, and as such should be clarified for each situation; both teachers and students need to fully understand the expectations and responsibilities inherent in the specific situation.

Collaboration has become increasingly popular because many teachers and researchers in the field of composition studies share the assumption that collaborative writing and learning have positive value, that students so engaged will learn in different and perhaps better ways than previously possible. One potentially disturbing conclusion suggested by this study questions that assumption. If collaboration is allowed to "just happen," if students are placed in groups without some guiding principle or without an awareness of the potentially crippling effects of ignoring or unsuccessfully negotiating conflict, then students may not learn in any new and exciting ways; they may not even achieve up to their potential.
Another troubling question raised by this study relates to the teacher/student relationship. In the 8:00am class, the teacher maintained a position of separateness, suggesting the more traditional classroom pedagogy with power and authority centered in the teacher. Contrasting the almost hierarchic approach in AnneMarie's class with Michael's dialogic, student-centered approach raises questions about the effect of the overall classroom context on the collaborative effort. Could Group A's less than successful collaboration, their strong orientation toward the authority of the individual writer be attributed in part to the classroom atmosphere? If students in collaborative groups do not share power with the teacher or engage in collaborative learning in the larger classroom, but only in their group writing events, what in effect are they being taught? I suspect that when students are asked to work collaboratively with each other in small groups on individual assignments, but not in collaboration with the teacher to create knowledge in the wider classroom setting, the results will be less than successful from both a personal and a pedagogical standpoint. If the situation in the collaborative classroom differs little from the traditional model where power and authority remain centered in the teacher and knowledge is more or less dispensed to students, then those students are being presented with a tension that has the potential to completely undermine the
entire premise of collaborative learning. The students in Michael’s class seemed to feel empowered by his approach, his recognition and expectation of their involvement in the learning that was taking place. For collaborative writing classes to be successful, they must exist in a conceptual framework which recognizes that writing and learning are social processes, resulting from the interaction of enlightened teachers/readers/writers and empowered students/writers/readers.

Future research should examine questions like those raised above from the perspective of type theory. As Jensen and DiTiberio note, studies using the MBTI have already been done which indicate that "our evaluation of student writing may be far more egocentric than we might like to believe" (139). Such an observation suggests a corollary egocentrism may be operating in teachers’ definitions of the success of collaboration. For example, surveys could be used to identify the relationship between type and the definition of successful collaboration. Studies could be done looking at what role personality type might play in teacher-student relationships.

Conclusion. Perhaps the most significant advantage of using personality theory in the collaborative writing classroom is the potential inherent in the theory for
student empowerment. Emphasizing in positive ways the unique gifts of each individual becomes possible when the differences in our approaches to reasoning or in our value systems can be seen as the logical result of preferring different, but equally valid, ways of using our minds rather than as behaviors aberrant from some universal norm. The value of the theory to writing teachers centers in its potential for providing such a framework in the classroom. People with opposing preferences for information gathering and decision making, can find it difficult to communicate and understand each other, difficult to work together. If teachers understand the spirit of the theory, its non-essentializing celebration of difference, they should be able to empower students to recognize the increased potential for excellence in collaborative work, since collaboration is uniquely structured to take advantage of the multiple perspectives possible from bringing more than one mind to bear on a problem.
APPENDIX A

Researcher's Memo to Teachers
TO: 
FROM: Carole Clark Papper 
SUBJECT: Brief description of research for my dissertation

PURPOSES. In this dissertation I propose to study collaborative writing groups looking closely at the role personality type plays in the collaborative process and in conflict situations. The study has multiple purposes: (1) to describe in detail the collaborative writing and conflict resolution behaviors of group members; (2) to determine the extent to which students with a given personality type function—in writing behaviors and in conflict situations—in ways consistent with type theory; (3) to determine the extent to which students who are in writing groups exhibit the same writing characteristics—as individuals do as reported by Jensen and DiZilberio; (4) to determine if, as type theorists believe, with relatively brief instruction in type theory, students and teachers can employ the theory to minimize conflict and enhance group work.

METHODS. The proposed descriptive study would look closely at what happens within selected writing groups in two upper-level collaborative writing classes, English 304, Business and Professional Writing. (Thanks to both MaryLynn and Todd for making this possible!) To identify student personality type, I will use the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. My plan is to have someone other than myself administer the MBTI (kitty has said she could and Todd was planning on using a variant of the instrument anyway) to minimize any perception of me as any kind of authority figure. I don't want to tell the students that I have taught the class. I am afraid that would have a less than salutary effect on the class. They will know that I am a graduate student doing research on collaborative writing, but I plan to minimize any information about me as academic/teacher. I'd like to join one group in each class and negotiate my role within the group as a participant observer.

As a participant-observer, I will identify and describe in as much detail as possible the behaviors of group members in their collaborative meetings in the computer classroom and in their group meetings out of class. My primary sources of information will be my field notes, the audiotapes of in- and out-of-class meetings, videotapes of meetings (where possible), copies of all samples of the students' writing—notes, drafts, etc.—and interviews with the students and their teachers.

NOTES: As I told both MaryLynn and Todd, I will need to miss four classes: Wednesday 26 June, the second class; and the week of 8-12 July, the third week of class. For the week that I am gone, either another grad student will fill in or I will arrange with one of the group members to collect data for me.

I would like to maintain communication with both teachers on what I am doing and how they feel about my presence in their classrooms. If we communicate openly and regularly, any problems that arise can be more easily dealt with. I would encourage both teachers to comment or contribute at any time.
APPENDIX B

Syllabus and Assignments: The 8:00 am Class
Syllabus, English 304C

Summer, 1991

Office: 547 Denney
Hours: M, W, F, 9-10 and by Appointment

Required: Business and Administrative Communication, by Kitty O. Locker

Week 1

June 24  Introduction to Course
26  Chapter 25, Group Dynamics
28  1-2 due; Chapter 1, You-Attitude and Positive Emphasis

Week 2

July 1  Chapter 12, Positive message, discuss 12-7
3  Group work
5  12-7 due; Chapter 6, audience analysis

Week 3

8  Chapter 17, fund-raising, Begin 17-3
10  Chapter 8, style, bring in newspaper article
12  Chapter 23, nonverbal communication

Week 4

15  17-3 due; Begin job unit, Chapter 26
17  Chapter 27, Resume
19  Chapter 28, job letters

Week 5

22  Chapter 29, interviews
24  Job unit due; Chapter 13, negative messages, discuss 13-11
26 Chapter 4, Communication Theory

Week 6
29 13-11 due; begin survey
31 Group work
Aug 2 Chapter 11, numerical data

Week 7
5 Group work
7 20-2 due; Begin C-2
9 Group work

Week 8
12 C-2 due; Chapter 24, Oral reports
14 Group work
16 Review for Final

Week 9
19 Group work
21 Oral Reports
23 Oral Reports

Week 10
26 Oral reports

Final Exam Wednesday August 28, 8 a.m.
Class Procedures

Major Assignments and percentages:
Introductory Memo 10%
12-7 revision of letter 10%
17-3 fund raising letter 10%
resume 10%
job letter 10%
13-11 refusing request 10%
20-2 survey 10%
C-2 recommendation 10%
20-10 oral presentation 10%
class assignments and quizzes 5%
final 15%

1. Assignments will be group projects (except for job units): a grade will be given for the paper turned in, and a grade will be assigned each person based on a memo to me describing the group process. 75% of each person's grade will be the grade on the paper and 25% will be on the group process memo.

2. Late papers will be permitted one-third letter grade for each calendar day they are late. Papers more than 3 days late will not normally be accepted. Extensions are possible if requested at least 24 hours in advance.

3. All out-of-class papers must be typed and in proper format. Proofread for spelling and grammar, and see BAC Appendix B for more information.

4. You may rewrite your papers for a higher grade. The policy for revision:
a. Turn in the revision along with the original version with grade and comments. I will check the revision against the original to see whether you have revised according to the revisions I suggested.

b. The grade of the revision will be averaged with the original grade, and each assignment may be revised only once.

c. The revision must be handed in within 2 weeks of the date I return the paper in class.

d. You need to improve the substance of the paper as well as grammatical errors.

e. My comments on a paper reflect the problems that seem most serious and those that happen to catch my eye: I rarely mark everything that is "wrong" with the paper. When I read a revision, I probably will mark problems
that I did not comment on the first time. These problems will affect the grade of the revision. Moral: don't just "fix the things that got marked;" reread the paper critically and do all that you can to improve it!

f. All revisions must be submitted as a group (except job unit).

Grading Standards

A = An excellent paper. It offers an effective solution to the problem based on good audience analysis; it fulfills minor as well as major purposes. Its overall pattern of organization is appropriate; the internal organization of ideas is effective; transitions are smooth. Reader benefits and logic are well developed. The message is well written, interesting, and easy to read. It may show originality in visual impact, reader benefits, details, or word choice.

B = A good paper. It offers an effective solution to the problem. Both the overall pattern of organization and the internal organization are good. Reader benefits and logic are developed adequately. The writing style is clear, concise, and friendly. It may have a few minor mechanical errors or some awkward spots, but basically it is well written and has good visual impact.

C = A satisfactory paper. It offers a solution which is basically acceptable; it uses an acceptable pattern of organization; the writing follows the conventions of standard English and the principles of business writing. There may be minor errors in style, tone, internal organization, or mechanics; reader benefits or logic may not be developed fully.

or A good (B) paper with a major flaw in one of the following: solution, organization, tone, or writing style.

D = A satisfactory (C) paper with a major flaw in one of the following: solution, organization, tone, or writing style.

or A paper which shows some evidence of attempting to solve the problem, but which has many minor errors in organization, development, word choice, style, tone, and mechanics. None of the thee alone would necessarily doom the paper; however, together, they make the paper unsatisfactory.

E = A poor (D) paper with a major flaw in one of the following: solution, organization, tone, or writing style.

or A paper that violates the facts explicitly given in the problem.
or A paper that is marred by an unacceptable number of errors in organization, development, word choice, style, tone, and mechanics.

Minor errors in format (for example, not initialling a memo or signing a letter) lower the paper grade one-third letter. Major errors (for example, using a letter when a memo is needed) will lower the grade one full letter.
Congratulations! We are pleased to inform you of your acceptance to Ohio State University, Columbus campus, for Autumn Quarter 1991. This marks the beginning of a new and exciting adventure for you in higher education. The next four years will be full of rewarding and challenging experiences. We are happy to have you as a student at our university.

During a summer orientation program you will be given the opportunity to tour the campus, be introduced to faculty and staff and meet with your personal advisor for guidance. The program also will expose you to many facets of student life at Ohio State including dormitory housing and student organizations. For more information, please see the enclosed pamphlets.

Your enrollment at Ohio State will be complete when the following steps have been accomplished.

1. Participation in Orientation Program.
   We have made arrangements for you to attend August 17-19, 1991. Please plan to arrive on time.

2. Payment of Acceptance Fee.
   In the enclosed envelope, please return your $200 Acceptance Fee (nonrefundable) by July 20, 1991 to ensure your place at Ohio State in the fall.

3. Submission of Medical History Form and High School Transcript.
   Please complete and return the enclosed Medical History form by July 20, 1991. We will send a transcript request form to your high school to certify your graduation. Once we receive your Acceptance Fee, we will mail you your student ID. Be sure to fill out this form.

In the event of any questions, please call us at our toll-free number 1-800-OSU-HELP.

Sincerely,

James J. Mager
Director of Admissions

123 Any Street
Columbus, OH 43201

Dear

Wouldn't Trinity be the appropriate name?

Jul 8, 1991
Dear Miss,

Congratulations! You have been accepted for the Autumn quarter to Ohio State University, Columbus campus. This marks the beginning of a new and exciting adventure for your higher education. The next four years will be full of rewarding and challenging experiences.

Ohio State offers an enormous diversity in coursework, programs, faculty, and in the student body. Unlimited part-time employment opportunities exist along with scholarships, grants, and loan programs. Extracurricular activities include intramural sports, fraternities and sororities, religious organizations, and a variety of social activities and clubs to meet your personal interests.

Our intercollegiate sports program has a remarkable reputation with the men’s tennis, basketball, and baseball all winning the Big Ten Championship this past year.

A student’s personal safety is extremely important and it is a high priority at OSU. The OSU Crimewatch Escort Service has been expanded to provide walking and van service for you to the city and nearby campus areas.

During your summer orientation program, you will be given more information on the above mentioned programs and activities. You will have the opportunity to tour the campus, be introduced to faculty and meet with your personal advisor for guidance. You will also have the opportunity to stay in a dormitory during the orientation and you will have the chance to have all of your questions answered about "dorm-life." Your time spent at orientation will expose you to the many facets of student life at OSU.

Your enrollment at Ohio State will be complete when the following steps have been accomplished.

1. **Participation in Orientation Program**
   Please meet Aug. 17 at 9 a.m. in the Student Union, room 101, for a schedule of the weekend and your dormitory assignment. Orientation will conclude at 3 p.m. on Aug. 19.

2. **Payment of Acceptance Fee**
   In the enclosed envelope, please return your $200 acceptance fee (nonrefundable) by July 20, 1991 to ensure your place at Ohio State in the fall.
Submit the Medical History Form and High School Transcript

Please complete and return the enclosed Medical History form by July 20, 1991. We will send a transcript request form to your high school to certify your graduation after we have received your acceptance fee.

Your attendance at OSU will be welcomed this fall. If you have any questions, please call us at our toll-free number 1-800-OSU-HELP.

Sincerely,

James J. Mager
Director of Admissions

Enclosures

You have more information on OSU's advantage

and you attitude first join G's and

transfers.

It would be more practical to have more of the

information on OSU in orientation rather than

ending with no much of the paperwork.

A - average B
Date: August 14, 1991
To: Lawrence Vandiver, Vice-President of Marketing
From: Directors of Human Resources
Subject: Candidate for overseas assignment

Criteria
After careful consideration of the overseas assignment and the data provided on the candidates, the criteria we used to evaluate was as follows:

- Ability to communicate well with people
- Be accepted and respected by the Asian businessman
- Excellent health
- Excellent emotional stability
- Understanding of international business markets
- Bi-lingual

We did not consider age, level of education or place of education in our evaluation since all candidates were equal in these criteria.

Rankings
Although all of the candidates have excellent skills and are valuable assets to our company, we have chosen to rank them in the following manner:

1. Bill Evans
2. Scott Greers
3. Amanda Fuentes
4. Adam Fong
5. Rachel Diamond

As the Directors of Human Resources, we have much confidence in recommending Bill Evans for the position as Manager of our Asian Market. Bill has many of the qualifications needed to be successful on this international assignment.

The skills Bill has are highly impressive. Because the culture is so different, it is important to appoint someone who will be able to communicate and work well with all types of people. Bill has both good communication skills and excellent interpersonal skills. He also has the technical knowledge and managerial skills that are necessary to help this Asian market grow.
In the 22 years of employment with this company, Bill has been very successful. As the former manager of Middle East Marketing, Bill proved he is capable to undertake an international assignment and produce results. This past experience can only enhance his ability to do well in our Asian market.

Also, Bill's wife does not plan to work and this will only lend to the amount of support she can give Bill and their children in this transition in their lives.

However, depending on the budget, if the company does not wish to pay the extra expense of relocating Bill's family of four, we feel equally confident in recommending Scott Greers for the position.

We feel Scott's most desirable qualities are his excellent communication and interpersonal skills. As already stated, this is the most important quality we are looking for. He has been with our company for 8 years and has experience in the international market. He is bi-lingual, in excellent health, and has no other demanding responsibilities such as a family. Scott, as a single male, would make it less expensive for the company to relocate him. We feel Scott is the second best candidate for our company's position as Manager of Asian Marketing.

Amanda Fuentes is another impressive candidate for the position. She possesses excellent communication, interpersonal and technical skills. She speaks multiple languages including Korean and Japanese.

However, Amanda is limited by several factors. First, she has only acceptable managerial skills. We feel it is extremely important for the chosen candidate to have excellent managerial skills. Entering a foreign market is tough. A candidate with less than excellent skills would be at an immediate disadvantage. Secondly, she hasn't worked abroad. Since this market is so full of immediate potential, we feel it would be restricting to our company to send someone abroad who has no previous international experience. Amanda also has plans to commute every six weeks. While we understand the reason for this decision, we think it may distract her from her managerial responsibilities.

Adam Fong would be our next choice for this position. Adam's an excellent employee in all aspects. He has good technical knowledge of the products, excellent managerial and interpersonal skills and his communication skills lack but can be improved upon.

The major problem with Adam is his Asian decent. It is known in the Asian market that the age of the person outweighs their level of knowledge in placement within the firm. Since Adam's decent is of Asian background our concern is how the Asian workers will accept Adam's authoritative position.

Another concern is if Adam's wife accepts a position as a professor in the Asian area, what decisions will Adam make regarding our firm after the three-year appointment.
Considering the data given on Rachel Diamond, we do not feel she is the best candidate for this position. Rachel has many excellent qualities, however, studies have shown that women are not as well received and respected in business matters by the Asian culture. Although this seems unfair and may be changing, I don't feel pushing the matter is worth the risk of jeopardizing our fourth largest sales division. Rachel is a single parent of three children and we feel the responsibilities of this position would interfere with her time spent with her family.

Another consideration is that she has acceptable interpersonal skills, not excellent ones. We feel this is a deterrent since the ability to communicate well will be extremely important in this Asian market.

It is our hope that the above recommendation will lend some help to you as you make the final decision about which candidate will be most successful as Manager of Asian Marketing. We feel, that after many hours of debate, we have selected the most qualified person for this position.
APPENDIX C

Syllabi and Assignments: The 8:00 am Class
English 304C, Summer 1991

Office: 012 Dulles Hall, The Writing Center
Office Hours: Weds., 11-1, and Fri. 9-10
Office Phone: 292-5607
Home Phone: 291-9733

Required Texts

Business and Administrative Communication, Kitty O. Locker

A Macintosh disk.

Occasional Xeroxed readings

A 110C Macintosh Reference Guide
(Available at COP-EZ, in Bricker Hall)

Course Introduction

English 304C introduces the concepts and processes of Business Writing to juniors and seniors. Because "Business Writing" is a vast field, the course concentrates on the principles that enable successful business writing.

Because of the "C" attached to the course number, this class is taught in a "computer classroom." After the first assignment, all of your work for this course must be done on Macintosh computers, using "MacWrite II" software.

In addition to "C" for computers, "C" also stands for collaboration. Because so much real-world writing is done in group settings, 304C makes group work an important part of the course. As the course progresses, the ins and outs of collaborative writing will become a big focus of our attention.

Course Assignments

The grade breakdown and assignments for this course are as follows.

1. Introductory memo (individual) 5%
2. Introductory audience analysis memo 10%
3. Group Projects
   - Part 1 10%
   - Part 2 15%
4. Group Presentation 10%
5. Group Midterm 10%
6. Writing Logs 10%
Job packet (individual) 15%
Class Participation and Mac test 15%

These percentages and assignments are designed to enable a variety of writing experiences; however, if they appear to be unworkable, adjustments may be made as the quarter progresses.

Attendance

Because this course is a collaborative course, attendance is absolutely mandatory. As a general rule, each unexcused absence will lower your grade by 1%. Excused absences must be cleared with me before they occur. Any work due on a day you will be absent must be turned in before, not after, the day you will be gone.

Because much of this course involves responsibility to your group members, particularly when we begin working on group projects, absences will be taken seriously. Six absences, excused or unexcused, will automatically disenroll you from this course. Depending on the time of the quarter the sixth absence occurs, you may receive an "E" for the course.

Revisions and Late Papers

In order to give you every possible chance to improve both your writing and your grade, I will allow some revisions. Because of the number and variety of assignments in this course, I do need to limit revisions. You may revise one of your individual projects (except the job packet), and your group, if it so desires, may revise one of its projects. Even though I can't guarantee you a better grade on revisions, I can guarantee that revisions will not hurt your grade.

Late papers, particularly in a course this full, create difficulties for everyone involved. If you need an extension, I will occasionally grant it. However, for every day that I grant an extension, I will drop your grade one-half of a letter. If you do not request an extension, I will not accept a late paper. As a general rule, I will return final drafts between seven and ten days after I receive them. Because this is a relatively small class, I will probably return your papers more quickly. It's to your advantage, though, that I grade fewer papers at a time. It's easier to concentrate and to be helpful when I need to look at only three or four papers in a single sitting.

Drafting

Drafting is an essential component of good writing. Because the drafting process is individual and quirky, I will not look at every draft that you write. I will, however, look at at least one. When I read drafts, I am not looking toward a grade; I read
as an informed reader. I also prioritize when I read; if I notice six problems, I will concentrate only on those that are most important. I will also point out what I really like.

Another important part of drafting is peer response. At least part of your class participation grade will grow out of your willingness to attend to and respond to each others' work. Because you will read each others' work frequently, you will actually be more useful as responders than I will be. My job here is to be a resource-person and a facilitator; your jobs are to learn and help each other learn. And, an important part of that process is looking at each others' work.

Syllabus

Week I and II

Mon., 6-25—Introductions and Collaboration
Wed., 6-25—Introductory Memo due
          MBTI test
Fri., 6-25—Course syllabus Introduction
          Assignment #2 made

Mon., 7-1—Assignment #2, draft #1 due
          Peer Responding
          Chapter 7, BAG

This should get us through Monday; more will follow.
June 28, 1991

To: 304C Members

Subject: Assignment #1

In this first assignment, our goal is to find ways to identify problems and to identify the people most likely to respond to those problems. Briefly, your job is to create a memo, with me and your class members as its primary readers, that defines a problem and explains who should care and why.

Identifying the Problem

We all live very full and active lives, and this assignment asks you to focus on a small part of that activity. In your memo, define and analyze a problem in your community that you think needs serious attention. You may choose just about anything. Think of problems on campus; parking, registration difficulties, difficulties meeting academic requirements. Think of problems in your neighborhood; parking, recycling, zoning, etc. You can also think of problems in any organization you belong to; fraternities or sororities, professional or pre-professional groups, churches, clubs, etc.

You'll want to make sure that the problem is manageable in a three- to four-page (single-spaced) memo. If you write about recycling, for example, you will probably want to focus on recycling in a limited arena, such as your immediate neighborhood, or a similar area. You'll also want to make sure that you have enough information at your disposal. You'll need to do research eventually, both in interviews and from printed sources.

Identifying the Audience

For the second part of this assignment, you need to look at who could or would or should care about this particular problem. You need to show me the person or people who could do something about this problem; I need to know who these people (or person) might be, what their concerns are (or should be), and how much they may already know about this problem. For this section, Chapter Six, "Adapting Your Message to Your Audience," will prove useful. In your memo, you need to identify your audience in as much detail as possible. As a useful rule of thumb, at least to start off, too much detail is far better than none. Assume that your readers (me and the other class members) know very little about your problem or your audience. Even if you feel like you will insult our intelligence, give us detail.
Goal of this Assignment

Next week, when we move into our groups, your group will need to decide on a single problem for its focus. Your memo also needs to be something your group will care about. So, when you pick your topic, make sure that whatever problem you choose is large enough for four or five people to work on, and that it is something you may be able to convince your group to care about. You need to think carefully about why your group should care when you start this process. Your job will be to try and convince your group that this problem deserves four weeks of attention by four or five minds. So, when you write your memo, be thinking about ways that other people's input will be useful and important to the solution.

Format and Due Date

Please use the memo format, found on pages 588-591 of PAC.

A draft of this memo is due Monday, July 1; and the final draft is due next Friday, July 5.

Also, I need a volunteer to bring a copy of Monday's draft for the whole class. We need to start peer responding, and whoever volunteers will benefit.

Summary of Key Points

--Problem Memo: 1.) Define the Problem
2.) Define and Analyze the Audience

--Due Dates: 1.) Draft 1, July 1
2.) Final Draft, July 5

Be creative; this assignment can be a great learning experience.
Date: July 22, 1991

To: English 304C

From: 

Subject: Group Project #2

The Assignment

In this part of the quarter, I'd like you to expand the problem you've been working on. Up until now, you've focused on figuring out what the problem is, and who can act to change that problem.

Now, your goal is to come up with a solution. In this project, you have a new audience; Instead of writing to me and to the other class members, your audience must be the person or group of people who can enact change. In addition, you'll explore new formats for presenting information. In particular, you'll need to look at Chapter 20 on reports, and chapter 16 on Direct-Mail Strategies. Your decision on a format will be based on an audience. The more carefully you've defined your audience, the easier it will be to draft this solution.

You also need to concentrate on how you present your information. In particular, chapters 12, 14 and 15 provide ways to understand how to persuade an audience that it needs to examine and consider your solution. Make sure that you understand these chapter, since they'll also be important for your midterm.

Midterm

I've scheduled your mid-term for this Friday, July 26. In order to prepare you for it, I'd like you to look at Assignment # 14-11, on page 276 of BAC. As a group, you will be asked to produce a response to the assignment in class. You may, however, prepare for the assignment before Friday. Since I want you to do the actual writing in class, you'll need to bring your disks on Friday. Each group needs to produce one memo that answers the assignment; you may figure out what your options are before Friday.

Syllabus

Mon., July 22—group project #1 due
formatting description due
group work around chapters 12, 14 and 15 due.

Weds., July 24—group work day
(read chapter 9).

Fri., July 26—mid-term
Mon., July 29—draft of project #2 due
  group logs due
  peer response
Weds., July 31—Chapter 10, BAG
  planning a design
  Intro to MacDraw
Fri., Aug. 2—work day
  group log due

Mon., Aug 5—Chapter 24, BAG
  preparing oral presentations

Weds., Aug 7 and Fri. Aug 9—project #2 due
  oral presentations
August 6, 1991

To: Members of 304C

From:

Subject: Getting Us Through the Quarter

As I mentioned in Monday’s class, we need to make some syllabus adjustments and start thinking about the Job packet, our final project for the quarter. Here are these adjustments.

Final Drafts of Group Projects

Since all of your projects are progressing nicely, I thought I’d offer a few reminders on the final drafts.

First of all, I’d like you to include graphics, if at all possible. You can easily take a guided tour of MacDraw; discs are available in most labs. There really hasn’t been any class time available to look at MacDraw, so I will accept hand-drawn graphics if you must. On Weds., August 7, we’ll look at Chapter 11 in more detail.

Please make sure that you’ve double-checked your document’s format with the guidelines given in the appropriate chapter. All of you need to be fairly sure of Chapter 10. In addition, depending on your topic, Chapters 16 and 20 also provide guidelines that you need to observe. For quick overviews, check the outlines at the beginning of each chapter, and the highlights at the end.

Please print your final documents on a laser printer. There really won’t be any class time to do the printing on Aug. 14, the day that they are due. I’d like two copies of each group’s project.

In brief:

* Try to include graphics
* Check the document’s format against the appropriate chapter
* Two laser-printed copies due on Weds., August 14

Oral Presentations

Chapter 24, “Making Oral Presentations,” lays out the guidelines for you. Since we will spend class time discussing your presentations, I’d just like to highlight some information.

* Prepare what you will say. If you are comfortable speaking from notes or an outline, great. If you need to, though, don’t be afraid to write out your portion; just deliver it conversationally.
* **Use Visual Aids.** Remember, the more senses that you engage, the more effective your presentation. Visual aids provide a great way to help your audience remain engaged.

* **Participation.** Each member needs to present an equal part of the project. You decide how to split the information, but each presentation should take between 20 and 30 minutes.

* **Dress Appropriately.** After all, you will be doing a mock presentation of something you’ve worked very hard on. Let your appearance reflect the quality of your work.

You’ve done a great job on these projects so far; just make sure that the final steps keep up the good work.

**Final Group Log**

For your final log, I’d like a more detailed account of your group’s work together. In 1 and 1/2 to 2 pages, answer the following questions.

- How did you like doing the extensive group project?
- How satisfied were you with your performance, and the performance of other group members? Be as specific as possible here. Give reasons for your response. Honesty won’t hurt you in any way at all. Give a grade.
- What didn’t you like about the project or the assignment? What could I have done differently to make the project a better learning experience? (Note: I didn’t say anything about making it easier, just better).
- I’d like to hear anything else you have to say. I’ve enjoyed working with you, and I would really appreciate your input.

**Final Project: The Job Packet**

For your final in this course, I’d like you to come up with a resume and a solicited job letter. Page 552 of BAG details what you need to do (Assignment 28-4, option a).

For next week, you do need to get a job advertisement that you will be able to respond to. By next Friday (August 16), I want a draft of both the cover letter and the resume. So, you will need to have read both chapters 27 and 28 fairly carefully by the time you give me a draft.

Note: Graduating seniors, you may want to get me a draft at an earlier date so you have more time to respond to my response.
Day to Day Syllabus

Wed., Aug. 7—Chapters 11 and 24
Fri., Aug. 9—Planning Oral Presentations

Mon., Aug 12—Day 1, Oral Presentations
Wed., Aug 14—Day 2, Oral Presentations
Fri., Aug 16—Chapters 27 and 28
Draft of Job Packet due

Mon. Aug 19—Responding to Job Packet
**Graduating Seniors Revisions of Individual Project #2 due**
Wed. Aug 21—Job Hunting day
Read Chapter 26
Thurs., Aug. 22—**Graduating Seniors Job Packets due, 10:00 a.m.—my office**
Friday, Aug 23—Job Packets (final project) Due
All Revisions of Individual Project #2 Due.

Hopefully, this will get us through the quarter. As always, be prepared for revisions!
Date: July 22, 1991
To: 304C Members
From:
Subject: Physically Handicapped Accessibility on Campus

This memo focuses on the lack of physically handicapped accessibility offered by the Ohio State University in the areas of Traffic and Parking, as well as building accessibility. Personal interviews, information regarding federal laws, and University policy will expose the magnitude of this problem at Ohio State.

Identifying the Problem

The following headlines were taken from the Lantern this past spring quarter:

- "Illegal parking of bikes poses risk to blind."
- "Inconvenience is a battle for handicapped individuals."
- "Relocation leaves behind three disabled employees."
- "Lord Hall poses obstacle to disabled."

The problems of accessibility on the Ohio State campus for handicapped individuals obviously receive journalistic exposure. Why then have the obstacles for the handicapped not been addressed? The problems faced by the handicapped do not seem to be our problems. In this memo we will bring the distant up-close, and make the problems of a minority important to the majority.

This subject has had little attention on campus until recently, and even now the problem is not as important to University administrators as it should be. The problem really effects the whole university community on one level or another, and we feel it is an issue which needs to be a higher priority for the University Administration.

As able-bodied people we may see ramps, marked parking spaces and automatic doors and consider these facilities to be handicapped accessible. However, handicapped accessible means any individual, Andi, Debbie, Ernie, Michelle, and Steve July 22, 1991
Page 2
regardless of physical impairment, can use a particular facility with little or no aid from someone else. Very few of the University buildings and parking spaces actually meet that definition.

**University Policies on Handicapped Accessibility**

Warren King, Director of Disability Services was unable to give an accurate figure as to the total number of physically disabled persons on campus. Disability Services is run on a self-referral basis, therefore establishing a firm number of physically impaired individuals on campus is not possible.

The key problem of accessibility stems from the vague or inadequate policies developed for University buildings and parking lots.

**Policies of the Traffic and Parking Department**

Public parking areas are required by federal and state law to provide at least 2% of all parking for the handicapped. The University however, provides spaces on an as-need-basis due to the limited parking availability. At this time, out of 12,000 parking spaces, only 282 are marked "handicapped only", and only 72 are reserved for someone particular. Of the 282 spaces, only 3 actually meet the federal and state regulations in regard to size and clearance. Handicapped spaces need to be wider and longer than normal parking spaces.

Caleb Brunson, Director of Traffic and Parking, informed us that if a reserved space is for a person requiring a wheelchair, the individual is given a double space. However, this is inadequate when that space is located on a street such as 17th, 18th, or 19th Avenue. The spaces are difficult to access because there is not enough space on either side or the rear for a handicapped person to get in and out of his/her vehicle.

In order to comply with state and federal regulations, Traffic and Parking should make it a priority to bring the University up to code on requirements for handicapped parking. Each time a parking area is resurfaced or relined, the office should be required by Andi, Debbie, Ernie, Michelle, Steve
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department lobbies for more rights and power, the Administration
will eventually grant it. Minority Affairs, Gay and Lesbian
Support Group, and a host of other organizations within Ohio State
have all pushed for more decision-making power, and have all
gotten it. We feel Disability Services is an important part of
the University Community, and should lobby as these groups have,
for their fair share of power and autonomy.

The other major suggestion we have come up with, is to increase
even more the awareness of the non-disabled population of campus.
We feel the student body as a whole is still not understanding the

July 29, 1991

problems faced everyday by physically impaired people, and we feel
an increased awareness would help to be another catalyst for
change.

One way of accomplishing a greater awareness, would be for
Disability Services to sponsor Psychology 100 experiments. The
experiment could be patterned after one already in use at Bowling
Green State University. The students are required to spend one
full day as a physically impaired individual, and then prepare a
paper on their impressions of what it is like to be disabled.
Some may spend the day in a wheelchair, others may wear a blind
fold and use a cane to move around campus. We feel an opportunity
like this would prove invaluable to the students and to Disability
Services.
Date: July 29, 1991

To: Disability Services

From:

Subject: Physically Handicapped Accessibility on Campus

Recently, our group became interested in the trials and tribulations of the physically disabled on campus, and we were concerned about whether or not they had any difficulty accessing our old campus. As we were talking to different individuals, we found Ohio State is making good strides towards becoming more accessible. We also got suggestions for ways that the situation might be improved. With this in mind, our group has put together a list of possible ways to make changes and improve even more the accessibility of OSU. Along with this, we have also included some of the benefits these would provide to the whole campus community, not just those with physical impairments.

Suggestions for Changes

The suggestion we feel is most important, is to have your department lobby the University for more decision-making power. This would allow you more opportunities to make the changes your department feels are necessary. Instead of having each department and/or college within the University tell you what changes they are willing to make, you would be able to decide what changes were required, and then proceed with those changes.

This University has proven time and again, that if a group or
The primary audience is Disability Services. Currently, Disability Services advises architects working on renovations, and the office of Traffic and Parking. Ideally Disability Services would have the power to make the final decision on any modifications to buildings or parking areas.

According to the Director of Disability Services, Warren King, the organization fights the battles it believes it can win. For example, the Main Library needs full scale renovation in order to meet state and federal laws for handicapped accessibility. Due to the lack of funding, Disability Services realizes that these changes are unattainable right now. There are smaller battles though, within the library, that can be fought. The library requires double doors on all bathrooms. Disabled individuals find it difficult to maneuver through both doors, yet Disability Services has not pushed for the change.

The administration of this department should make it a priority to become familiar with what state and federal regulations require for accessible ramps, turning areas, entrances, and restrooms. Any planned modifications should be reviewed thoroughly by the staff to be sure all the guidelines are being met.

An important secondary audience is the state inspector's office. This is the office in charge of making the final inspection of any modifications. If the University departments miss something in the design or execution of a modification, the state inspector should be the one to catch it. The state regulations are written with definite specifications for slope, and width of ramps, size and placement of parking places, and a variety of other considerations regarding wheelchair accessibility, and the state inspectors should make sure these specifications are met.
Benefits to Disability Services

The benefits of these suggestions for Disability Services would be as follows:

• They would be able to get the things done they feel are most important, and the changes would be done the way they feel necessary.

• They would have more decision-making power.

• They would be able to push for more money, and more autonomy in the use of the funds, rather than relying on different departments within the University for funding.

• They could create an atmosphere of "good will" for the disabled population.

July 29, 1991

Benefits to the University as a Whole

There would also be important benefits for the University on a larger scale. These benefits would include:
A greater diversity of people on campus—the easier OSU becomes to access, the more the disabled population will expand. This creates diversity of ideas and backgrounds.

It helps OSU become a better place for handicapped students. Again, this generates "good will".

These changes would allow Ohio State to excel above the other major Universities in accessibility, and again, add to the prestige and diversity of this University.
English 304C
Summer 1991
Criteria for Project #2

1.) As thoroughly as possible, describe the group's problem and how the group intends to solve it, at least as you understand it.

2.) What kind of format did the group choose, and why did the group choose that particular format? How well does the draft meet the criteria laid out in your book? Give some specific ways to improve the format, and reasons why you think your ideas are an improvement.

3.) Who is the group's audience? Try and give a detailed description of who this group is writing to. Speculate on whether or not the group's solution is designed to appeal to the audience, and give specific and detailed reasons for your point of view.

4.) Look at the group's project as a piece of business writing. Give examples of places where the group uses positive emphasis, your attitude and reader benefits effectively. Point out places where they need to improve—also, look at organization. Does the group point the reader toward important parts of the text? How do they do or not do this pointing? Does the information seem to be "reader-friendly"? How are sub-headings used? Do they guide the reader's reading?
Date: August 14, 1991
To: Warren King, Director of Disability Services
From:
Subject: Handicap Accessibility on Campus

There are some activities that only an elite few can partake in. College football, for example, is played by big men with a lot of muscles...Chemistry is the life's work of a chemist and education...Well, there isn't anyone who has exclusive rights to an education.

A college education, however, is easier for some students to obtain than it is for others.

Recently, our group became interested in the trials and tribulations of the physically disabled on campus. We were concerned about whether or not they had difficulty accessing an old campus, like Ohio State.

Handicap accessible means that any individual, regardless of physical impairment, can use a particular facility with little or no aid from someone else.

The Current Situation

As we were talking to different individuals within the University, we found that Ohio State is making good strides toward becoming more accessible and has overcome many obstacles. The major problems faced currently by handicapped individuals are parking and building accessibility.

Traffic and Parking Policies:

Mr. Caleb Brunson, the Director of Traffic and Parking, informed us that the Ohio State University works on an as-needed basis.
Therefore, when a disabled individual comes to the Traffic and Parking department requesting a parking permit, they develop a new space for the individual, whether it be a general space or a reserved space.

Of the 12,000 parking spaces on campus, 282 spaces are designated "handicap only". Seventy-two of these spaces are reserved spaces for one particular individual. Therefore, only 210 spaces are for general use (refer to figure 1).

Although the system appears to be effective, it does not account for individuals visiting the campus, or construction that closes streets and parking areas.

Furthermore, most of the handicap parking spaces do not meet the federal and state regulations for length and width; therefore making it difficult for a wheel-chair bound individual to get into and out of his/her vehicle.

**Policies on Building Accessibility:**

Currently, Disability Services only acts as an advisor to the architects office. Consequently, Disability Services sits in on meetings discussing renovations on buildings and gives advice on how to make the building more accessible.

The prevailing system allocates left-over funds (if there are any) toward making needed improvements. Therefore, the architects office is not obligated to act on the suggestions of Disability Services.

Although most buildings on campus do have automatic doors, elevators, and handicap accessible restrooms, often they do not meet the needs of a handicap individual and are extremely difficult to access.

For example, the Main Library has double doors at the entrance to the
restrooms in order to reduce noise. However, the restrooms are located away from study areas. We even found it difficult to maneuver ourselves through the two doors, so we can imagine that it is almost impossible for a physically impaired individual.

Warren King, Director of Disability Services, pointed out during an interview, that the architects need to find more creative ways to make buildings more accessible. He also stated that due to the lack of funding there are several buildings that cannot be made accessible.

Mr. King explained that in order to make the Main Library accessible, the entire core of the building would have to be reconstructed to provide elevators that are wide enough for a wheelchair.

We realize that Ohio State is an old campus and that it is not economically feasible to make every building accessible. However, something could be done to insure that buildings and parking lots are made more accessible and brought up to federal and state regulations while they are being renovated.

Options for Change

As a group we developed three possible solutions that would help make Ohio State more accessible to handicapped individuals.

• Increase funding for renovating buildings and parking lots.

• Lobby for more decision making power within the Disability Services department.

• Increase student and community awareness.

As we discussed the first two options, increasing funding and changing the role of Disability Services, we realized that these were long term goals. In order to obtain these goals, we would first need a
foundation or base of support from the community. The logical first step is to publicize the problem: Handicap Accessibility on Campus.

An example of publicizing a problem to help elevate it is exemplified by the effect that the ABC World News Tonight program about the homeless in Columbus, Ohio had on the world. People from all over the country and world donated time and money to help these individuals.

Therefore, student and community awareness can foster future change.

Disability Awareness Week for Spring of 1992

Because Disability Services presently puts on programs for Disability Awareness Week, we concluded that this would be the opportune time to make students aware of the difficulties that handicapped individuals face everyday on campus.

In conjunction with the programs you put on that emphasize the similarities of the disabled and the non-disabled, you could incorporate activities that would point out buildings and parking areas that are inaccessible or difficult to access.

Options for Activities:

- Wheelchair Olympics—"The Good Wheel Games"—where the participants are non-disabled and the judges and referees are handicapped. There could be teams of disabled versus the non-disabled in wheelchair races or basketball.

- A Scavenger hunt that would point out specific deficit in accessibility, such as finding a handicapped parking space that meets the federal regulations for length and width.
• A Parade around campus. Something similar to the Ooda Parade. The weather will be warming up and people will be out around the Oval and Mirror Lake. A parade is fun and would be a nice break from studying and classes.

• Architectural Contest. Having a contest for the most creative plan for making a campus building more accessible would be a challenge for architecture students and would create the ideas that Warren King was looking for. A cash prize or electronic equipment would be a great motivator.

Sponsorship:

You may be thinking that we realize that you are probably thinking this is a great idea but it is a lot of work and besides we can't afford it and we won't be able to get people involved. That is where sponsors will be imperative.

• Contact the governing bodies of the Greek system and suggest that the fraternities and sororities be able to earn community service points for their involvement in Disability Awareness Week.

• Contact businesses around Columbus and the campus area. Not only would it be beneficial to the program for food and prizes, but it would be great publicity for the businesses involved.

• Get the media involved—from television and radio to the newspapers. This would put the issue into the hands of the entire Columbus community, not just the University.
Benefits to Disability Services:

• support and awareness from the campus and Columbus community.

• new and creative ideas on tackling the accessibility issue.

• media involvement and consequently more publicity.

• the campaign would make Disability Services more visible.

• the issues of accessibility would also be made visible to the community.

• it would build a sense of individual responsibility and awareness for all involved.

By making the student population more aware of the current accessibility issues faced by handicapped individuals everyday, you will be creating a foundation for future changes and will be one step closer to your long term goals.

You have done a terrific job of making your campus as accessible as it is already and we realize that Ohio State is an old campus, and therefore it is not realistic to see changes with a blink of the eye. We trust that you will face these issues with the same vigor and determination that you have used to make Ohio State an excellent example of handicap accessibility today.

With a little more work and a lot of fun along the way, you can make Ohio State stand above all others, not only in academics and sports, but also in accessibility.
Parking Spaces on Campus for Handicapped and Non-Handicapped
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