Linda Hanson Meeker

PRAGMATIC POLITICS: USING ASSESSMENT TOOLS TO (RE)SHAPE A CURRICULUM

In 1963 Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer concluded that teaching formal grammar had no effect on the quality of their students' writing. Hillocks in 1986 reported in his meta-analysis that subsequent research urges a stronger conclusion, that there is a negative correlation between teaching formal grammar and improving students' writing skills. Yet 25 years after Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer's study, Trimmer's survey reveals that many basic writing programs still place inordinate emphasis upon discrete grammar instruction. Not all the teachers who insist on teaching formal grammar as the bedrock of writing skills are uninformed or unaware of the research, however; many are teaching in programs that employ competency testing in grammatical skills. The very presence of such a test at the conclusion of a course implies that the skills it presumes to test are important and that instruction time should be devoted to such skills. Coordinators and directors of such basic writing programs can at best appear ambivalent when we endorse grammar-skills workbooks as texts, uphold grammar

---

Linda Meeker, coordinator of the Basic Writing Program at Ball State University, is a member of the graduate faculty in Composition and Rhetoric, and assistant chair of the English Department. She has used computers in her writing classrooms since 1981, regularly examining computers' impact on students' writing, their composing behavior, and the classroom environment, aided in part by grants from Digital Equipment Corporation and AT&T. She and Barbara Weaver are codirectors for one of the fifteen sites participating in the National Project on Computers and College Writing.

DOI: 10.37514/JBW-J.1990.9.1.02

competency testing, and simultaneously urge teachers to place grammar instruction in the context of writing instruction. If we are ever to create a positive public and legislative perception of basic writing courses—as developmental rather than remedial; as a complex integration of listening, speaking, reading, thinking, and writing skills rather than as a simplistic parceling of grammar, sentence construction, and paragraph construction—we must reshape the public messages we send. Primary among those messages are assessment tools: course title and catalog descriptions, program descriptions, text selection, and even the leanest syllabi will reflect the values inherent in a program's assessment tools.

Old Program

When I became Coordinator of the Basic Writing Program at Ball State University in the Fall of 1985, I inherited a smoothly running program. The approximately 1100 students we were serving each year (27% of the incoming class) were identified by SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) verbal scores of 360 or below, TSWE (Test of Standard Written English) scores of 36 or below, or ACT (American College Test) English scores of 15 or below. The course itself, ENG 099, was publicly described in *The Writing Program,* a booklet containing syllabi, departmental placement and grading standards, information about tutoring and manuscript preparation, and sample student essays for all four courses included in the General Studies Writing Program. The published syllabus described ENG 099, Fundamentals of English Composition, as "a remedial course in expected, basic competencies in writing, designed to prepare students to do the college level work required of them in ENG 103 and subsequent courses both in the English Department and at Ball State University in general." It focused on "the fundamentals of English Composition, with special attention to the problems of grammar and mechanics." Requirements for course credit included three "C" level essays written in class at the end of the quarter and competency level scores on spelling and language skills tests. Although the specific course objective was "to improve the students' writing abilities so that they will be successful in ENG 103" (*success* being defined as earning the required minimum grade of C), a description of the course content appeared weighted toward grammar and mechanics (9 items listed) and sentence construction (5 items listed). "Paragraph construction" and "theme writing" warranted but a single listing each, although a separate listing of requirements did include a diagnostic and final theme, four short papers (frequently interpreted as single paragraphs of 150–200

words), and three regular themes (300 words) as well as the pre- and post-language skills tests and pre- and post-spelling tests. The required texts were either the departmental favorite, Fawcett and Sandburg's *Evergreen: A Guide to Basic Writing,* which concentrates on paragraph development through rhetorical modes, or Sieben and Anthony's *Composition Five: Skills for Writing* which, although trying to integrate reading and writing, conveys by 2 to 1 bulk the message that grammar, mechanics, and spelling are more important than the reading skills and writing instruction offered in each chapter.

By assuming responsibility for the program, I was assuming responsibility for the message that instruction in basic skills constituted instruction in basic writing, and that made me uncomfortable. As a teacher in the program, I had not shouldered such responsibilities. When I had reluctantly walked back into a basic writing classroom in 1979 after avoiding such teaching assignments for six years, I was determined that I would make a significant difference in my basic writers' proficiency with language—not the demonstrable difference that our testing of discrete subskills could reveal but the difference that is gauged by a writer's ability to respond effectively to a variety of writing tasks in a variety of contexts. Even a class limited to 18 students (currently 15) would inundate me with paper and demands for time if I individualized their instruction the way I did for occasional weak students in my regular classes. Yet I would not forego journals, or the graduated writing assignments that prompted students to discover a variety of writing contexts, or written responses to their peers' writing, or the production of texts that exceeded the lengths required by the program and suggested by our textbooks. My classroom was process-driven. I could not in good conscience spend time on formal grammar instruction with students for whom such an approach to writing had not been successful. There was little reason to assume that in just one more term these students would magically integrate the declarative knowledge necessary for grammar and the procedural knowledge of sentence combining and construction necessary for writing if the two were taught separately to prepare students for exams. So, as I devised and borrowed methods for handling the paper load, I relegated any grammar instruction that was not related to individual students' writing to recommended but optional CAI (Computer Assisted Instruction) grammar modules on our university mainframe computer. And aside from one class discussion about the linguistic patterns evident in the errors students had made on the spelling pretest, I made spelling improvement the students' responsibility as well.[1] My

students' scores on the posttests for spelling and language skills did not drop off as I had feared they might; the spelling scores, in fact, improved so that I rarely had students earning scores below 90. I became comfortable with my compromise with the stated objectives for the course; but when I assumed responsibility for the program, I could no longer sanction the discrepancy.

Working with the basic writing faculty, I sought first to shift their attitudes toward the course and their basic writers. The basic writing faculty at Ball State University are a select group of experienced writing teachers whose flexibility in responding to individual students' differences initially recommended them for basic writing assignments. But the remedial, basic skills image so long associated with the course and inherent in the course description and assessment procedures proved difficult to shatter. Interfering, too, were vestiges of Ball State's infamous "limiter system" of grading writing (a single "serious" error limited an essay grade to a C in a regular writing class, 2 to a D, 3 to an F). In faculty workshops we discussed the relationship between the competency requirements and the stated objectives, tinkering with the stated objectives so as to emphasize a whole-process approach to writing. Without immediately altering the assessment tools, I wanted the individual faculty members themselves to recognize that their considered judgments were the final measure of a student's writing proficiency and potential for success in ENG 103. By consensus we raised the cutoff scores required to certify competency in spelling and language skills to convey the message to students that we were looking for more than minimum competency, but simultaneously I was encouraging faculty not to teach to the tests, not to dictate spelling words each week, not to spend time teaching formal grammar. We altered our criteria for selecting textbooks, eliminating first the spiral bound or tear-sheet workbooks that reinforced instruction in discrete subskills, then the texts with reams of blank pages to be filled in a linear writing sequence. The available textbooks, however, while responding to the terms *basic writer* and *developmental* rather than *remedial,* still reflected a basic skills mentality. Clearly, the smoothly running program contained a number of incompatible demands on teachers and students alike. The program had to be redefined.

The Climate for Change

The climate in which I sought to alter the program was determined by legislative demands at the least for accountability and at most for the elimination of remedial courses at the university

level,[2] a dean and a provost whose orientations were quantitative, and a program with a successful track record: for ten years our graduates had been averaging a C+ in ENG 103, a full half-grade higher than students placing initially in this first of two required writing courses. That track record, projected into the future, could satisfy demands for accountability. So why tamper with success? Because the basic writing teachers who were committed to empowering their students, to providing academic outsiders the tools for succeeding in an academic community, found themselves serving a schizophrenic master: public perception of the course allowed them some flexibility in writing instruction, but it *demanded* instruction in grammar and spelling. Pedagogically, the formal grammar instruction was unsound. Publicly, we were perceived as teaching students to produce correct texts. Politically, then, we needed quantitative data both to demonstrate the irrelevance of formal grammar instruction to writing improvement and assessment, and to shift the public perception of the course from "remedial" (only one step more enlightened than "bonehead English") to "developmental," not different in type from our required writing courses. The course did not belong in the profile of "remedial" courses the legislature was seeking to eliminate from university level education. Our public messages had to change.

The fullest public message was the course description in *The Writing Program* pamphlet that each student was required to purchase. The stated goal of the course was to teach students to write. If we were to consider the description to be articulation of what it means to teach students to write, the lists of grammatical and mechanical teaching objectives suggested it meant providing students instruction that would lead them to master discrete skills. By contrast, I saw teaching students to write as encompassing full composing processes; Flower and Hayes' and Sondra Perl's work had made apparent the complexity of our task. Our goal was to enable students to understand their own composing processes and thereby take ownership of their texts, to generate text marked by both focus and amplitude, to see and act on what Shaughnessy calls the "intelligence" of their mistakes, and to revise and edit effectively to demonstrate awareness of audience and purpose. The conflict was aggravated by our assessment practices: the diagnostic and final testing in language skills and spelling encouraged both students and instructor to see those skills as independent from the skills necessary to revise and edit the essays composed during the term.

The competency tests I inherited were established to satisfy two goals: to assess competency in the skills areas tested, and to predict

success in the subsequent courses, ENG 103 and 104, both of which require a grade of C for credit. The second goal, however, contains inherent questions about the first and about the assumptions underlying the selection of skill areas to be tested. The very assessment process sends messages to students and faculty about the relative importance of the skills being tested and about the emphasis to be placed on those skills during the term. The language skills tests required recognition, identification, and correction of errors in grammar and mechanics; the spelling tests required students to master 100 of the most frequently misspelled words in English. Inevitably, the assessment process prompted instructors to "teach to the test," in our case by providing units on grammar and spelling discrete from the writing units.

Students' scores on their language skills tests, however, frequently were inconsistent with their essay grades, placing instructors in a dilemma about giving the students credit for the course. Our policy ultimately was to rely upon the students' essay grades and performance during the term to determine whether the student would succeed in ENG 103; but by making the cutoff score on the language skills test flexible, we essentially undermined the stated requirements and sent out an ambivalent message to both faculty and students. To resolve those problems, I began to look at the data we had and the internal and external expectations for the course.

Data for approximately ten years indicated significant correlations for both spelling scores and essay grades with subsequent course grades; language skills test scores showed no such correlation. The data suggested our competency testing components were not actually measuring competencies required in subsequent courses. Requiring competency testing that bore no relation to success in subsequent courses could only have a negative impact on instruction in ENG 099, on the students' expectations as they progressed into ENG 103 and 104, and residually on their assumptions about the writing competency exam they would face as juniors or seniors.

The politics of accountability, however, both at the institutional and at the state legislative levels, made dropping the language skills tests a dangerous proposition; our competency testing must yield easily quantifiable results. Like the IRS, administrators and legislators must see the numbers. Despite the weight of research on formal grammar instruction,[3] my own experience and classroom research, and studies of assessment practice,[4] I could not immediately abandon the objective testing. Changing the form and emphasis of the tests, then, appeared to be an alternative that could

reduce the amount of formal grammar instruction in the classroom and yet provide the program with an assessment tool that would satisfy both the need for program accountability and for a more relevant measure of students' ability to use the language with conventional accuracy.

To provide justification for altering the language skills tests, we had the precedent set by the Educational Testing Service when they scrapped a model similar to ours a number of years ago (Diederich, *Measuring Growth*). But the models used by the TSWE suggest that students can at least recognize where an error is located and can recognize appropriate corrections from multiple choice options. To determine, then, whether any part of our test format was valid and worth retaining, first we needed to evaluate the two components of the test, recognition and correction, which measured students' ability to identify errors with terminology and then to correct errors. Looking separately at the two skills measured on our language skills test, I questioned whether either component of our language skills test, recognition or correction, would correlate significantly with subsequent course grades. I assumed that we would find no significant correlation between identification of errors and subsequent course grades, but I was less sure about correlations between editing ability and subsequent course grades.

Competency Criteria Study

With support during the latter stages from The Center for Teaching and Learning and from the acting Dean of Sciences and Humanities, I began gathering data. The subjects of this study were students enrolled in the basic writing course, ENG 099, from Autumn 1985 to Spring 1987. The two-and-a-half years' accumulation of data in this study included students' SAT verbal and math scores, TSWE scores, high school rank, scores on pre- and post-spelling and language skills tests, final three essay grades (used as a single average for the analysis), grades in ENG 099 and the subsequent ENG 103 course, and language skills test scores divided into recognition and correction components. In addition to providing us the predictive value of SAT and TSWE scores and high school rank for placement, the analysis allowed us to examine earlier correlations between performance on spelling and essays and subsequent course grades, and to judge formal grammar instruction separately from instruction in revision and editing on the language skills test.

Results

I used two methods, multiple correlation models and regression tests, to examine the data with SPSS-X, a statistical analysis program available from Digital Equipment Corporation for their VAX computers. My goal was to determine the degree of correlation between the individual competency components and students' ENG 103 grades; in other words, I wanted to know how accurately students' scores on the language skills and spelling tests and their grades on their final three papers in ENG 099 would predict their final grade in ENG 103.

First, to examine the various components' contributions to an accurate prediction and to keep from inflating the probability of error, I created four different multiple correlation models. Since previous data had indicated that the essay average score and the spelling posttest score show a significant correlation with ENG 103 grades, I entered those two variables in the first equation with the dependent variable of ENG 103 grades. I added the language skills test score in the second equation, and the recognition and correction subscores of the language skills test in the fourth equation. The third equation included all the variables but the language skills test score. As the earlier data suggested, the essay average score correlated most significantly (see Figure 1). In other words, ENG 099 essay grades can predict ENG 103 grades; we cannot, however, claim such predictive value for scores on the other competency components.

In the second method, regression tests using backward elimination revealed that recognition of errors (identifying errors with terminology) had least relevance to success in ENG 103. Remaining variables contributing least to the model were removed by SPSS-X in the following order: spelling posttest, language skills test (both recognition and correction components), and correction of errors (see Figure 2). The language skills tests explained so little of the variance in ENG 103 grades as to be negligible in effect as a predictor of students' success. In fact, the set of skills represented by the recognition and correction subscores was negatively related to students' success in ENG 103 (see Beta columns, Figures 1 & 2). Most of our basic writing faculty had been devoting at least twelve hours of instruction each quarter to a set of skills that proved to have no predictive worth to the program.

The elimination of the spelling score in Step 2 (see Figure 2) puzzled me. Since the previous ten years of data had consistently demonstrated a significant correlation between the spelling score and ENG 103 grades, despite shifts in the cutoff score, I examined the degree of improvement between pre- and posttests on spelling

FIGURE 1

MULTIPLE CORRELATION

Dependent variable: ENG 103 grade

	VARIABLES	Beta	Sig T
Equation 1:	Essay Average	.135906	.0000*
(Signif F = .0000)+	Spelling Post	.034140	.2984
	(constant)		.0000
Equation 2:	Language Skills	.033360	.3393
(Signif F = .0000)+	Spelling Post	.027329	.4159
	Essay Average	.125323	.0003*
	(constant)		.0001
Equation 3:	Correction	-.012230	.9248
(Signif F = . 0001)+	Spelling Post	.036449	.2682
	Essay Average	.140575	.0000*
	Recognition	-.029509	.8191
	(constant)		.0000
Equation 4:	Language Skills	.050458	.1712
(Signif F = . 0001)+	Recognition	-.003776	.9769
	Spelling Post	.026438	.4328
	Essay Average	.127458	.0003*
	Correction	-.050784	.7017
	(constant)		.0001

*Indicates significant correlation.

+Indicates that the equation itself is significant.

FIGURE 2

REGRESSION TESTS, BACKWARD ELIMINATION

VARIABLE REMOVED	VARIABLES	Beta	Sig T
Step 1: Recognition	Language Skills	.050612	.1652
(Signif F = .0000)+	Spelling Post	.026358	.4324
	Essay Average	.127559	.0002*
	Correction	-.054500	.1042
	(constant)		.0001
Step 2: Spelling Post	Language Skills	.056570	.1128
(Signif F = .0000)+	Essay Average	.132322	.0001*
	Correction	-.054968	.1011
	(constant)		.0000
Step 3: Language Skills	Essay Average	.150891	.0000*
(Signif F = .0000)+	Correction	-.039345	.2198
	(constant)		.0000
Step 4: Correction	Essay Average	.144843	.0000*
(Signif F = .0000)+	(constant)		.0000

*Indicates significant correlation.

+Indicates that the model itself is significant.

and found it to correlate with the ENG 103 grades. In other words, the degree of improvement basic writers demonstrated in mastering

the list of 100 words is one of the predictors of their success in the subsequent writing course.

The analysis, then, provided us two conclusions important for assessment: it validated the earlier correlations noted between performance on spelling and essays and subsequent course grades; and it confirmed that there was no significant correlation between the language skills testing and subsequent course grades. These findings concur with the conclusions Hillocks reaches on the relationship between teaching formal grammar and teaching writing.

Effects

The timing for this study was fortuitous since our recent switch to semesters created an atmosphere for positive, cooperative change. As a result of this study, an earlier study proposing a five-step formula using TSWE scores and high school class rank for placing students in Writing Program courses was approved by the department and, with additional impact studies, is university policy for students matriculating in Fall 1989 and thereafter; course objectives have been redefined and published in *The Writing Program* pamphlet; text choices reflect the new objectives; new assessment tools are in place; and through in-service workshops and informal consultations with basic writing faculty I am already seeing efforts to reduce the negative effects of isolated grammar instruction.

New Course

To strengthen the credibility of our Basic Writing Program, we are relying not only on the data we can present but also on published material that shapes the perception of the course as an integral, respectable component of the Writing Program. In *The Writing Program* pamphlet, the course content description now recognizes grammar and mechanics as "editing skills" within the writing process, and the stated objective of the course, "to improve the students' writing abilities so that they will be successful in ENG 103," has been expanded to articulate criteria for judgment that parallel those for ENG 103 and 104:

> In this course students should
>
> a. begin to acquire habits of accuracy and clarity in composing sentences and paragraphs

b. understand and practice the organizational concepts of focus and development in writing essays
c. understand and practice the narrative, descriptive, expository, and persuasive forms of writing
d. demonstrate understanding of the integration of reading and writing processes
e. understand and practice informal methods of research
f. develop editing skills regarding grammar, mechanics, and English usage appropriate to various contexts

The criteria that the basic writing faculty developed to select texts in the Spring of 1988 even more clearly mark a departure from teaching discrete subsets of skills. To be selected, texts had to demonstrate "an integration of reading and writing processes, with specific attention to audience"; treat writing as a "goal-directed process," rhetorical "modes as generative strategies and organizational aids," and "grammar as part of the revising and editing process, not as an end in itself"; include suggestions for "informal research"; and as "desirable but not essential," include instruction on word processing. The three texts chosen and reaffirmed for 1989–90 were Anson and Wilcox's *Writing in Context,* McCleary's *Writing All the Way,* and Tyner's *Writing Voyage.* For the first time, an optional reader was selected as well, Presley and Prinsky's *The World of Work.*

Most significant, however, is a redefinition of the course in terms of our assessment tools:

> Competency requirements reflect classroom emphasis on an integrated writing process. Components for competency assessment are given the following weight:
>
> 60% portfolio of three fully revised essays to be graded by the classroom teacher and adjudged at the C level or above.
>
> 25% a fifty-minute writing sample to be graded holistically by at least two other ENG 099 faculty.
>
> 15% a 90% performance level on the final test in spelling.
>
> A student must achieve 75% to receive credit in ENG 099.

The portfolio requirement clearly articulates an endorsement of the process-driven classroom. Guidelines for the basic writing faculty expand that endorsement to include peer response and collaborative writing as means of empowering student writers, of

enabling them to take ownership of their own texts. Awareness of an audience for their writing, of their roles as both writers and readers, and of their own writing processes is integral to the course objectives that we see matched by the portfolio component of assessment. For the portfolio students are encouraged to select their best writing based upon self-evaluation, peer evaluation, and teacher response. Each portfolio includes not only the student's three fully revised essays but the drafts with comments by peers and teacher. It is on the portfolio that the weight of competency assessment rests; and it is with the classroom teacher that the final assessment of a student's writing competency remains.

The basic writing faculty do not function in a vacuum, however. The vitality of the program emerges as we work with the writing sample each term in a collaborative effort that is providing an invaluable opportunity for faculty development. All faculty teaching in the Basic Writing Program are involved in the one-day grading sessions at the end of each term so no teacher reads papers from his or her own students, and each benefits from hearing colleagues' judgments about proficiency levels.[5] All papers receive at least two readings; a third is warranted if raters disagree by more than one point on a six-point scale. The results are not binding on the teachers since the competency components are weighted, so the faculty have a positive attitude toward the writing sample that they convey to their students. Both can recognize that the variability in a writer's production of text means that no single measure of writing could be used to certify competency. The training-and-grading sessions not only ensure interjudge reliability in holistic scoring, then, but they also reinforce whole-process instruction and encourage program-consistent evaluation of the portfolios.

Faculty are involved as well in developing the topics for the writing sample so that we draw on their experience and prompt writing that is consistent with instruction. The format for the writing prompts requires students to respond to a situation, evaluate information, and act. They are provided a specific rhetorical context, audience, and purpose in order to approximate real rhetorical situations as closely as possible. Classroom preparation, however, will already have included discussion about the academic, "*real* rhetorical situation" that Hoetker urges us to acknowledge (387), so students will be fully aware of a primary audience beyond their classroom. Despite Brossell's findings that prompts with "moderate information loads" produced essays with "a higher mean score and a greater mean length than essays written" in response to prompts with "low" or "high" information loads (172), this first year we followed Odell's guidelines and the example

of the National Assessment of Educational Progress: we provided students the full rhetorical situation in the writing prompt. This next year we anticipate studying the effects of various levels of rhetorical "information load" in classroom writing sessions so that we can better determine the optimum information load for our writing sample prompt.

The spelling test remains among our assessment tools not as a deterrent to credit but as a component of the evaluation over which students can have control. Circumstances may work against their satisfactorily passing the writing sample, but with an acceptable portfolio and motivation to pass the spelling test, they can still earn credit in the course.

The examination of our assessment criteria has prompted fruitful, continuing program evaluation. Specifically, it has provided us information useful for our goal of creating more accurate and relevant tools for competency assessment, tools that must reflect the objectives of ENG 099, function reliably to place students for success in ENG 103, provide data to satisfy the need for institutional accountability, and begin to reshape the public perception of the course itself.

Notes

[1] See Kristine Anderson's "Using a Spelling Survey" for an effective method of tying spelling to a whole writing process.

[2] Between accountability and elimination of remedial courses was a compromise position that recognized the state's lack of a junior or community college system and that yet would reduce the state's investment in remedial programs at the university level by designating a single institution to provide such programs. Ball State University's commitment to provide advising and tutoring support in University College for students who are underprepared or who have not declared a major would have made Ball State the likely candidate for such designation and ensured continuation of the Basic Writing Program. See Gail Stygall's "Politics and Proof in Basic Writing" for further discussion of the political climate surrounding basic writing programs in the state of Indiana at the time of this study. For an excellent perspective on the national political context for basic writing programs, see Andrea Lunsford's "Politics and Practices in Basic Writing."

[3] For reports of research and the continuing controversy over formal grammar instruction and its alternatives, see Bartholomae; Bowden; Connors; Daiker, Kerek, and Morenberg; DeBeaugrande; D'Eloia; Hartwell; Hillocks "Responses" and "What Works"; Kahler; Loban; Maimon "Measuring" and "Words Enough"; Matsuhashi; Mellon "Issues"; Mulcahy;

Neuleib; O'Hare; Shaughnessy; R. H. White; Whitehead. For an especially balanced and sensible approach to grammar instruction for writers, see Neuleib and Brosnahan.

[4] See Braddock; Brossell "Current Research"; Brown; Diederich *Measuring Growth* and "Problems and Possibilities"; Godshalk, Swineford, and Coffman; Lathrop; Mellon *National Assessment;* Presley; Thompson; Edward M. White.

[5] See Jon Jonz, "Using Pooled Judgments," for similar collaborative assessment procedures.

Works Cited

Anderson, Kristine F. "Using a Spelling Survey to Develop Basic Writers' Linguistic Awareness: A Response to Ann B. Dobie." *Journal of Basic Writing* 6.2 (1987): 72–8.

Anson, Chris M., and Lance E. Wilcox. *Writing in Context.* New York: Holt, 1988.

Bartholomae, David. "Teaching Basic Writing: An Alternative to Basic Skills." *Journal of Basic Writing* 2.2 (1979): 85–109.

———. "Yes, Teaching Grammar Does Help." *English Journal* 73 (1984): 66–69.

Bowden, S. P. "The Effects of Formal, Traditional Grammar Study on the Writing Ability of Secondary School Students." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 40 (1979): 1389–A.

Braddock, Richard. "Evaluation of Writing Tests." *Reviews of Selected Published Tests in English.* Ed. A. H. Grommon. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1976. 118–26.

Braddock, Richard, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer. *Research in Written Composition.* Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1963.

Brossell, Gordon. "Current Research and Unanswered Questions in Writing Assessment." *Writing Assessment: Issues and Strategies.* Eds. Karen L. Greenberg, Harvey S. Wiener, and Richard A. Donovan. New York: Longman, 1986. 168–182.

———. "Rhetorical Specification in Essay Examination Topics." *College English* 45 (1983): 160–173.

Brown, Rexford. "Choosing or Creating an Appropriate Writing Test." *Basic Writing: A Collection of Essays for Teachers, Researchers, and Administrators.* Eds. Lawrence N. Kasden and Daniel R. Hoeber. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1980. 105–116.

Connors, Robert J. "Mechanical Correctness as a Focus in Composition Instruction." *College Composition and Communication* 36 (1985): 61–72.

Daiker, Donald, Andrew Kerek, and Max Morenberg. "Sentence Combining and Syntactic Maturity in Freshman English." *College Composition and Communication* 29 (1978): 36–41.

DeBeaugrande, Robert. "Forward to the Basics: Getting Down to Grammar." *College Composition and Communication* 35 (1984): 358–67.

D'Eloia, Sarah. "The Uses—and Limits—of Grammar." *Journal of Basic Writing* 1.3 (1977): 1–48.

Diederich, Paul B. *Measuring Growth in English.* Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1974.
———. "Problems and Possibilities of Research in the Teaching of Written Composition." *Research Design and the Teaching of English: Proceedings of the San Francisco Conference.* Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1964. 52–73.
Fawcett, Susan, and Alvin Sandberg. *Evergreen: A Guide to Better Writing.* 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton, 1984.
Flower, Linda S., and John R. Hayes. "The Dynamics of Composing: Making Plans and Juggling Constraints." *Cognitive Processes in Writing.* Eds. L. W. Gregg and E. R. Steinberg. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1980. 31–50.
Godshalk, Fred I., Frances Swineford, and William E. Coffman. *The Measurement of Writing Ability.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.
Hartwell, Patrick. "Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar." *College English* 47 (1985): 105–127.
Hillocks, George, Jr. *Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching.* Urbana, IL: ERIC/RCS, 1986.
———. "The Responses of College Freshmen to Three Models of Instruction." *American Journal of Education* 89 (1981): 373–95.
———. "What Works in Teaching Composition: A Meta-Analysis of Experimental Treatment Studies." *American Journal of Education* 93 (1984): 133–70.
Hoetker, James. "Essay Examination Topics and Students' Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 33 (1982): 377–92.
Houlette, Forrest, K. Terry Schurr, and Arthur S. Ellen. "Personality and its Effect on Placement and Grading in Freshman English." Unpublished study, Ball State University, 1984.
Jonz, Jon. "Using Pooled Judgments to Develop Tests of Basic Writing." *Journal of Basic Writing* 6.2 (1987): 16–25.
Kahler, A. D., Jr. "The Effects of Programmed Grammar and Journal Writing on Student Writing Ability: An Exploratory Study." *Dissertation Abstracts* 27 (1966): 74–A.
Lathrop, Robert L. "Practical Strategies for Dealing with Unreliability in Competency Assessments." *Journal of Educational Research* 79.4 (1986): 234–37.
Loban, Walter D. *Language Development: Kindergarten through Grade Twelve.* Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1976.
Lunsford, Andrea. "Politics and Practices in Basic Writing." *A Sourcebook for Basic Writing Teachers.* Ed. Theresa Enos. New York: Random, 1987. 246–258.
Maimon, Elaine P., and Barbara F. Nodine. "Measuring Syntactic Growth: Errors and Expectations in Sentence-Combining Practice with College Freshmen." *Research in the Teaching of English* 12 (1978): 233–44.
———. "Words Enough and Time: Syntax and Error One Year After." *Sentence Combining and the Teaching of Writing.* Eds. D. Daiker, A. Kerek, and M. Morenberg. Conway, AK: U of Akron and U of Central Arkansas, 1979. 101–8.
Matsuhashi, Ann. "Explorations in the Real-Time Production of Written Discourse." *What Writers Know: The Language, Process, and Structure of Written Discourse.* Ed. M. Nystrand. New York: Academic P, 1982. 269–90.
McCleary, William J. *Writing All the Way.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1988.
Mellon, J. C. "Issues in the Theory and Practice of Sentence Combining: A

Twenty Year Perspective." *Sentence Combining and the Teaching of Writing.* Eds. D. Daiker, A. Kerek, and M. Morenberg. Conway, AK: U of Akron and U of Central Arkansas, 1979. 1–38.

———. *National Assessment and the Teaching of English.* Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1975.

Mulcahy, G. J. "A Comparison of the Traditional Methods Approach and the Linguistic Methods Approach to the Teaching of English Grammar and Composition to College Freshmen." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 34 (1974): 5487–A.

Neuleib, Janice. "The Relation of Formal Grammar to Composition." *College Composition and Communication* 23 (1977): 247–250.

Neuleib, Janice, and Irene Brosnahan. "Teaching Grammar to Writers." *Journal of Basic Writing* 6.1 (1987): 28–35.

Odell, Lee. "Defining and Assessing Competence in Writing." *The Nature and Measurement of Competence in English.* Ed. Charles Cooper. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1981. 95–138.

O'Hare, Frank. *Sentence-Combining: Improving Student Writing without Formal Grammar Instruction.* Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1971.

Perl, Sondra. "The Composing Processes of Unskilled College Writers." *Research in the Teaching of English* 13 (1979): 317–36.

Presley, John. "Evaluating Developmental English Programs in Georgia." *Writing Program Administrator* 8 (1984): 47–56.

Presley, John, and Norman Prinsky. *The World of Work: Readings for Writers.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice, 1987.

Schurr, K. Terry, L. W. Henriksen, and Virgil E. Ruble. "The Use of the College Board Classification of High Schools in Predicting College Freshman Grades." Unpublished study, Ball State University, 1988.

Shaughnessy, Mina. *Errors and Expectations.* New York: Oxford UP, 1977.

Sieben, J. Kenneth, and Lillian Small Anthony. *Composition Five: Skills for Writing.* 2nd ed. Glenview, IL: Scott, 1985.

Stygall, Gail. "Politics and Proof in Basic Writing." *Journal of Basic Writing* 7.2 (1988): 28–41.

Thompson, R. F. "Is Test Retest a Suitable Reliability in Most Composition Studies?" *Research in the Teaching of English* 14 (1980): 154–56.

Trimmer, Joseph. "Basic Skills, Basic Writing, Basic Research." *Journal of Basic Writing* 6.1 (1987): 3–9.

Tyner, Thomas E. *Writing Voyage: An Integrated, Process Approach to Basic Writing.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1985.

White, Edward M. *Teaching and Assessing Writing.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

White, R. H. "The Effect of Structural Linguistics on Improving English Composition Compared to That of Prescriptive Grammar or the Absence of Grammar Instruction." *Dissertation Abstracts* 26 (1966): 5032.

Whitehead, C. E., Jr. "The Effect of Grammar-Diagraming on Student Writing Skills." *Dissertation Abstracts* 26 (1966): 3710.