This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE IMPACT ON STUDENT

WRITING OF PEER EVALUATION

presented by

Thelma Ludwig Jones

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

_____Ph.D._____degree in _Education_

_____
Major professor

Date_Fall, 1977___

O-7639

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE IMPACT ON

STUDENT WRITING OF PEER EVALUATION

By

Thelma Ludwig Jones

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1977

ABSTRACT

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF THE IMPACT ON
STUDENT WRITING OF PEER EVALUATION

By

Thelma Ludwig Jones

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to explore the impact occur-
ring on student writing from the evaluation of the students' peers.
The researcher examined the impact of peer evaluation on narrative,
description, and analysis writing of male and female college-
oriented seniors and examined the impact within content, structure,
paragraph structure, sentence structure, diction, and mechanics.
The researcher further studied self-initiated student changes,
praise, and corrections remaining for instructor marking. Finally,
an inductively determined grouping of the student corrections was
included in this research.

Methods of the Study

A sample population of college-oriented high school seniors
was divided into groups and used a Check Sheet to evaluate their
peers' papers. These comments on the Check Sheet were then
recorded on note cards and computer cards, coded by student number
to indicate sex, hour, grade level (the few juniors in the class
were dropped from the study), type of writing, nature of response,

general category of the response (content, structure, paragraph structure, sentence structure, diction, mechanics, and a few special notations), and the specific response within the category. From two sets of papers from one class, an inductive grouping of the student responses was made. This information, arranged and totaled by the computer, was analyzed to answer nineteen questions.

The answers to these questions appear in "Major Findings of the Study."

Major Findings of the Study

1. Students accept more criticisms from their peers than they refuse.

2. Seventy-two percent of the criticisms accepted and acted upon resulted in an improved paper, and, for a description, the students acted for an improved paper upon 76 percent of the criticisms accepted.

3. About 60 percent of the self-initiated revisions resulted in an improved paper.

4. Approximately five errors remained on each paper for teacher correction.

5. The students, through peer evaluation or self-initiated revision, corrected about 60 percent of their own errors.

6. Females tended to give more criticisms, to respond more favorably to criticism, and to revise with greater care.

7. The largest number of corrections and revisions for improvement were in the category of diction.

8. Those individual students who gave the most criticisms tended to receive the most criticisms.

9. Although a student may initially refuse to accept criticisms, his peers patiently continued to correct his papers.

10. Males tended to correct by asking questions and females tended to rewrite for their peers. Although students usually accepted more corrections than they refused, they tended to refuse more the broad suggestions about thesis structure and content.

11. Several subjective observations devolved from this study. The researcher noted the enjoyment of the students as they shared their writings. Furthermore, their participation in peer evaluation freed the teacher for individual conferences. This inter-communication among students and teacher provided a pleasant, sharing, classroom climate.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

On some ancient Egyptian tomb a line of hieroglyphics sup-

posedly read, "This younger generation is going to the dogs." Other

lines, some place in the same tomb, unable to be translated or

crumbled with age, surely must have asked, "Why can't Johnny write?"

Various problems--the generation gap, or writing, or even peace--

continue to be recycled for each generation or period to face.

Today the attainment of composition skills, or the lack of writing

skills, challenges educators and citizenry alike, and the periodi-

cals and journals air the problem for all to consider.

> At the University of California at Berkeley . . . nearly
> half of last year's freshmen demonstrated writing skills
> so poor that they were forced to enroll in remedial
> courses . . . . At Temple University in Philadelphia, the
> proportion of freshmen failing an English placement exam
> has increased by more than 50 percent since 1968.[1]

Need for Research

The Education Commission of the States in its National

Assessment of Education Progress in 1969-1970 discovered among young

adults a strong reluctance to write at all; "twenty-nine percent of

those who agreed to take part in the overall assessment refused to

---

[1]Merrill Sheils, "Why Johnny Can't Write," Newsweek, Decem-
ber 8, 1975, p. 59.

attempt the writing exercise." The accompanying revelation in this
assessment of the lack of basic writing skills of those who did
attempt the writing exercises indicates a need for research in the
entire area of composition.[2] However, Edmund Farrell in reporting
on the results of the National Assessment of writing skills warned
against making definite judgments about the causes of these measure-
ments. He concluded rather that further studies about the process
of developing competency in various kinds of writing are needed.[3]

Furthermore, teaching of composition frustrates teachers.[4]
The frustrations and challenges of teaching composition may include
areas such as motivation, methods of teaching composition, and the
ever-present paper-commenting problems. Although Richard Braddock in
Encyclopedia of Educational Research does not tabulate hours spent
in preparation, he states that teachers tend to spend per week a
median of nine to twelve hours correcting papers and seventeen
to twenty hours in the classroom teaching.[5] Teachers feel encour-
aged to spend these hours on paper correction perhaps because

---

[2]"Writing Test Reveals Many Lack Basic Skills; National
Assessment Report," School and Community, LIX (October, 1972), 11.

[3]Edmund J. Farrell, Implications of National Assessment
Writing Results (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Educa-
tion and Welfare, 1971), p. 7.

[4]Lillian Schiff, "Teaching Composition," Convention Concerns,
Sixty-first Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of
English, ed. Stephen Judy (Urbana, Illinois: National Council of
Teachers of English, 1971), p. 18.

[5]Richard Braddock, "English Composition," in Encyclopedia of
Educational Research, ed. Robert L. Ebel, 4th ed. (New York: Mac-
millan Company, 1969), p. 449.

of the findings in certain research studies. Buxton, for example, states:

> College freshmen whose writing is graded and thoroughly marked and criticized and who revise their papers in the light of these matters can improve their writing more than college freshmen whose writing receives a few general suggestions but no grades or intensive marking and who do not revise their papers.[6]

Slow also notes:

1. Students in remedial English (college) wrote fewer class themes in high school that (sic) did students enrolled in regular English.
2. More remedial English students come from high schools in which teachers did not mark errors in themes.[7]

However, when teachers sense the magnitude of time involved in this intensive marking, they seek some relief.

Although evaluation of composition, most would probably agree, includes more than marking errors, students can catch and correct three-fifths of their own errors.[8] This peer correction alone may relieve some of the weekly hours of correcting papers, while at the same time freeing the teacher for small group instruction and individual help. Thus, within the broad areas of composition studies, the use of peer evaluation presents a possible opportunity for needed experimental and exploratory investigation.

---

[6]Richard Braddock, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer, Research in Written Composition (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963), pp. 69-70.

[7]Ralph Slow, "Influence of Writing Experience in High Schools on Presence of Students in Remedial College English Compositions," The Journal of Educational Research, LVII (July-August, 1964), 536.

[8]N. L. Gage, ed., Handbook of Research on Teaching (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963), p. 986.

Effective use of peer evaluation may help to obviate the frustra-
tions of composition teachers. However, since "teaching the universe
of discourse" involves writing for others, an exploratory study of
the effects of peer evaluation may contribute also to overcoming the
reluctance of people to undertake the task of writing. Thus,
studies in peer evaluation may reveal ways to relieve the teacher of
the burdens of correction, may free the teacher for individual stu-
dent conferences, may reveal some possibilities of study for
improving composition, and may contribute to the lessening of writ-
ing frustrations by increasing the joy of sharing communication.

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this research was to make an exploratory
study of the impact on student writing of peer evaluation. Earlier
research, discussed in Chapter II, Related Literature, shows that no
significant differences in the development of writing skill have
as yet been observed in comparing peer evaluation with teacher
evaluation procedures.

The purpose of this research was to explore the possibili-
ties of an impact occurring on the student's paper from the correc-
tions of his peers. Examination of the impact of peer correction
on various types of student writing, such as narrative, description,
and analysis, and in various categories such as content, structure,
paragraph structure, sentence structure, diction, and mechanics was
an additional purpose of the study. Sex of the student was another
variable considered. The research was also designed to explore

self-corrections made by the student in the revision process and the relationships of these corrections to the other variables, to explore the relationship of the teacher-determined errors remaining after peer correcting, student response, and revision to the other variables, and to explore the praise or commendation exchanged by the students.

The research may prove valuable for its analytical exploration of these possible peer variables on student writing. To the teacher, the value may lie in finding a way to get some relief in correcting student writing, in determining types of writing in which peer evaluation appears to have the greatest impact, and in a method of encouraging writing as communication. Since the researcher recognizes that any impact in writing observed may not necessarily be the direct result of peer evaluation, the research simply presents a procedure that was followed and the change, if any, that occurred.

The researcher also proposes to include case examples to illustrate the changes that occurred. The researcher's inclusion of an inductively determined list of items to be examined affords possibilities of additional observations and possible conclusions of the effect of peer evaluation.

The statistics gathered from this research offer possibilities for future additional research to determine possible impact on student writing in different areas and on various types of writing from editing of another's paper. Furthermore, hopefully this

exploratory study may generate additional experimental studies of the effectiveness of editing, studies of causality and correlation.

Objectives

The research had the following objectives:

1. To determine the extent of the impact of peer correction on twelfth grade student (male/female) writing.

2. To determine the extent of the impact on various types of writing (narrative, description, and analysis) of peer correction on twelfth grade (male/female) writing.

3. To determine on what type of writing and on what type of correction a teacher may expect peer evaluation to have the most impact.

4. To determine inductively the types of responses that students make.

5. To test further an instrument for peer correction for college-bound secondary students.

The "extent of the impact of peer correction on student writing" was acknowledged as a broad term. During the process of gathering the data the researcher recognized the extensive possibilities for use of the data. Therefore, as will be indicated in Chapter III, Research Procedures of the Study, Analysis of the Data, this present study focuses only on certain specific areas of the data relating to the objectives stated above.

Definition of Terms

Three broad terms used in this research need further delineation. These are grouping, peer evaluation, and writing.

"Grouping" here refers to organizing classes of twenty or more students into smaller groups of three to five. These smaller groups maintain their identities throughout the period of investigation. The grouping occurred within the classroom after some effort to develop a student's awareness and knowledge of his peers. These groups developed by student choice: no student was arbitrarily assigned to a group. The same groups basically remained intact throughout the research although some groups decreased in number. A student on rare occasions "crossed over" to evaluate papers from a student not in his own group.

In "peer evaluation" the evaluation is not a ranking or grading device. Rather, evaluation is "criticism with the intention of teaching individuals how to improve their written expression."[9] Using an analytic check sheet as the basis for examining each paper, each student in peer evaluation employs an analytic method of evaluation. This procedure, according to Cast, is almost uniformly the better method, since "general impression" evaluations tend to examine superficially.[10]

"Writing" for this research refers to expository or transactional writing which, according to Parker's definition, ". . . is writing that derives its validity from the evidence it presents about something, and so it is the typical language of science and of

[9]Dwight L. Burton and John L. Simmons, eds., Teaching English in Today's High Schools (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970), p. 375.

[10]Braddock et al., Research in Written Composition, p. 13.

intellectual inquiry, . . . of planning, reporting, instructing, informing, advising, persuading, arguing, and theorizing."[11] There are three sub-types of writing from which data for this research are drawn: narrative, description, and analysis.

Moffett in A Student Centered Language Arts Curriculum, K-13 defined a non-fiction narrative as a true story derived from sensations and/or memories. The narrative focuses away from the author and narrates another's experience or the narrative may be author centered.[12]

> Description . . . is the kind of discourse concerned with
> the appearance of the world. It tells what qualities a
> thing has, what impression it makes on our senses. It
> aims to suggest to the imagination the thing as it appears
> immediately before an observer."[13]

An analysis breaks a subject into its component parts. Anything that has parts may be analayzed, and all parts of the whole that are analyzed should be considered.

Limitations

Interactions which entail writing that arises from personal perceptions and experiences and the reading of that writing by a person with different perceptions and experiences do not fit with

---

[11]Robert P. Parker, Jr., "An American in London," English Journal, LXIV (April, 1975), 14-15.

[12]James Moffett, A Student Centered Language Arts Curriculum, K-13: A Handbook for Teachers (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973), p. 343.

[13]Cleanth P. Brooks and Robert Penn Warren, Fundamentals of Good Writing (New York: Harcourt Brace and Company. Inc.. 1950), p. 195.

ease into any objective mold. Even Educational Testing Service noted in 1947 that the reliability of the readings on their College Entrance examinations ranged generally on six different tests from .58 to .69.[14] The teacher and researcher also may bring personal biases into any examination of another's writing. The human element for students and researcher is a real limitation or qualification in this research.

The human limitations within this research involved first the student's selecting his critiquing peers. Second, the critiquing student faced two choices: whether or not to critique his peer's paper and how to critique it. Third, the receiver of the criticism chose to accept or to reject the criticism. Fourth, if the student chose to accept the criticism, he further decided how to respond to the criticism, how to change. Finally, the student determined whether or not to make changes on his own. Many factors such as time, emotions, and physical feelings contributed to these choices.

The gathering and compiling of the data led the researcher to self-examination and revealed human limitations in this area. First, the researcher evaluated the quality of the student changes made. This included considering the probing question: Was there a tendency to believe that any change was better than no change? Second, the researcher labeled a student's decision to reject the

---

[14]Fred I. Godshalf and Frances Swineford, The Measurement of Writing Ability (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966), p. 2.

change as wise or not so wise. Finally, the decision about further needed changes or remaining errors was made. Since writing evaluators traditionally rest on their developed and trained subjectivity, the researcher likewise trusted some eleven years of classroom experience in reading, training, and evaluating as the only available guide, limiting though it may be.

Nevertheless, writing is shared communication: the greater the similarity of perceptions, the clearer the understanding communicated. The need for further research on causality in peer correction includes a study of this understanding between peers and its consequences.

The population of this research was limited to above average, college-oriented high school seniors, and this was a significant objective limitation. Next, as an exploratory study only, a procedure was observed and events were recorded, but no causal relationships were proved. No comparisons were made to a control group.

The research had further objective limitations. First, the research explored peer evaluation in only the expository writing of narrative, description, and analysis papers. Second, a period of only eighteen weeks of writing was examined. And, third, this research was conducted in an "average" classroom situation; and, therefore, the reader must recognize the limitations and uncontrollable variables imposed by the traditional classroom, i.e., fire drills, drop-outs, lunch breaks, varieties in class size, and the "end-of-the-day" syndrome.

Procedures

The population for this research consisted of college-bound seniors. Those students at Loy Norrix High School, Kalamazoo, Michigan, who elected "Composition and Research Skills I" and were assigned by computer to the class in B-16 for the first semester of 1975-1976 composed the sample for the research. The sample was divided into three classes: first hour with twenty-six seniors, fourth hour with twenty-four seniors, and sixth hour with twenty-one seniors. Within each class the students were divided into critiquing groups which remained stable throughout the research.

Each student wrote a rough draft of a narrative, description, and analysis paper. After receiving peer corrections, each student revised his rough draft and wrote a final draft for each of the three papers. The papers varied in length from approximately two hundred to four hundred words. Work on all papers was preceded by instructional and motivational techniques, as will be outlined in Chapter III. Rough drafts, peer corrections, and final drafts were all handed in and examined as data for this research. A classroom teacher who chooses to employ peer correction as a classroom method would, of course, need to receive only the final drafts. For the purposes of this research into the impacts of peer correction, however, all the recorded data had to be collected and examined.

The critiquing involved the use of carbon impregnated Check Sheets (see Appendix A). Each of the students critiqued two to three papers while others, in turn, critiqued his. Whether a student critiqued two or three others depended on many factors, the

main one being the size of his critiquing group. Each student received back the original of the critiques which others made on his writing, and he returned the carbons of the critiques he had made on the other writers in his group. Therefore, each student made two or three critiques of the papers of the students in his group and received two to three critiques from his peers on each narrative, description, and analysis paper.

The major portion of the writing and critiquing was done in class. Since this research was conducted with an "average" sample of a population of college-oriented seniors, not all of the students always completed the writing assignments nor did each of the students always correct all of his peers' papers. Some variables influencing the students, in addition to their own choices, were such events as choir concerts, snow days, math tests, illnesses, and controlled organic chemistry experiments. Therefore, references to the numbers of papers written for each assignment and the numbers of Check Sheets completed for each assignment lack specificity throughout this paper. A comparison of the groups (see Appendix B) and of the corrections received (see Appendix C) shows the pattern of writings either completed or peer-evaluated for each student.

After all papers were collected at the end of the semester, the information was tabulated on computer cards using the following known items for input: (1) an identification number for the student who wrote the paper being criticized; (2) the sex of the writer; (3) grade level for the writer (but since only four juniors wrote, these were eliminated and only seniors participated);

13

(4) N (narrative), D (description), A (analysis) for identifying the type of paper written; (5) identification number for the student who gave the criticism; (6) sex of the critiquer; (7) grade level for critiquer (but juniors were eliminated from final observations); (8) the nature of the response made to the criticism (accepted or rejected) and the effect of that response; (9) the self-initiated changes of the writer of the paper; (10) the changes still needed, as noted by the researcher; (11) praise given by peers, if any; (12) traditional classification of corrections offered or made (content, structure, paragraph structure, sentence structure, diction, and mechanics); (13) a more specific classification of correction under the six major groups, i.e., spelling under mechanics or run-on sentences under sentence structure; and (14) an inductively determined list of types of corrections formed from two papers (narrative and description) in hour four.

A critique sheet (see Appendix A) was developed by the researcher, piloted during the fall term of 1974, and revised after student evaluation. The critique sheet is intended to aid students in analyzing the structure of their papers and in understanding and verbalizing grammatical structure. It is "reasonable that such an understanding of the structure of the language would enable a student to improve his writing skills."[15]

---

[15]Roy C. O'Donnel, "The Correlation of Awareness of Structural Relationships in English and Ability in Written Composition," The Journal of Educational Research, LVII (May-June, 1964), 466.

Summary

Thus, the ever present need to improve writing skills and to decrease the paper correcting load from the teacher may possibly receive some assistance from this exploratory study of the impact of peer evaluation on student writing. The researcher also sensed an improved classroom climate provided by the students' more active participation, through peer evaluation, in the learning and evaluation process. Further chapters discuss some of the literature pertinent to peer evaluation, offer an exploratory design for observing one model of peer evaluation, and analyze the information accrued in the study of the procedure. The final chapter considers some conclusions and implications possible from observing this study.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE RELATED TO PEER EVALUATION

Literature related to the impact of peer evaluation resides in several areas. First, an understanding of peer evaluation bears on cooperative learning experiences in small groups, which includes (a) workshop learning, or participatory learning, and (b) grouping. Second, understanding peer evaluation of composition entails a basic understanding of composition and group experiences within composition, or shared writing. Finally, literature about peer evaluation, in its various modes, furnishes additional specific information. Samples from each of the categories underscored above will be discussed in this chapter. The chapter closes with a summary.

Literature About Participatory Learning

Earl Kelley at Wayne State University magnified the workshop way of learning in teacher education. One of his six principles for favoring the workshop was the following: "Cooperation as a technique and as a way of life is superior to competition."[16] Kelley developed the workshop method because he wished to employ methods for instructing teachers that they might copy in their

---

[16]Earl Kelley, The Workshop Way of Learning (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), p. 6.

classrooms. Workshop cooperation generated interdependency and con-
fidence among the teachers: this type of cooperation builds con-
fidence among students, too.[17]

The workshop method or participatory learning is based on
one view of teaching and learning, terms which are often variously
defined. Carl Rogers sees an exaggerated emphasis on teaching and
prefers to emphasize learning. To him, learning occurs in a free-
ing climate. It is a natural process which best occurs when stu-
dents have the freedom and opportunity to learn.[18] Rogers believes
that

> . . . the goal of a democratic education is to assist stu-
> dents to become individuals who are able to take self-
> initiated action and to be responsible for those actions;
> who are capable of intelligent choice and self-direction;
> who are critical learners, able to evaluate the contribu-
> tion made by others; . . . who are able to cooperate effec-
> tively with others in their various activities . . . .[19]

Working together in workshops or groups is not teaching, but more
precisely a means of improving learning. The values of participa-
tory learning increase through adolescence because the adolescent
grows in use of the abstract. Therefore, his scope of participation
possibilities expands.[20] Participatory learning is a democratic

[17]Kelley, The Workshop Way, pp. 7-10.

[18]Carl Ransom Rogers, Freedom to Learn; a View of What Edu-
cation Might Become (Columbus, Ohio: C. E. Merrill Publishing
Company, 1969), pp. 125-26.

[19]Carl Ransom Rogers, Student Centered Teaching (Toronto,
Canada: Hogtown Press, 1972), p. 3.

[20]Herbert Ginsburg and Sylvia Opper, Piaget's Theory of
Intellectual Development, an Introduction (Englewood Cliffs, New
Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969), p. 227.

learning device particularly suited to allowing adolescents the freedom to grow, to develop.

Use of group or participatory learning increases the awareness and use of the often unrecognized variety of resources available in students. As the climate becomes freer, more democratic, more sharing, these resources grow through their use.[21]

Not only is participatory learning more successful because of the humanizing, free climate, but also it produces results--academically and socially. Cooperative learning, not competitive, is an important aspect of the academic achievement of the growing individual.[22] Peer evaluation, moreover, requires cooperation more than competition, for competition "breeds fear of failure."[23] The individual who actively participates in the learning situation learns more rapidly, and his learned response tends to be more stably developed.[24] Involvement in a task thus brings "about more rapid and more stable learning."[25] As quoted earlier, Rogers sees participatory learning developing "critical thinkers."[26] He also

---

[21]Richard A. Schmuck and Patricia A. Schmuck, A Humanistic Psychology of Education, Making the School Everybody's House (Palo Alto, California: The National Press Books, 1974), p. 23.

[22]Ibid., p. 101.

[23]C. H. Patterson, Humanistic Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973), p. 86.

[24]Gordon W. Allport, Pattern and Growth in Personality (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), p. 20.

[25]Ibid., p. 106.

[26]Rogers, Student Centered Teaching, p. 3.

states that "the only learning which significantly influences behavior is self-discovered";[27] students learn by doing, by participating responsibly.[28] In a review of an Ontario-Montclair Tutoring Program it was concluded that the strongest positive findings from the research were the positive academic gains of tutor and tutee.[29] Peer evaluation relates closely to tutoring and thus offers this same potential for academic gains, for learning growth.

A secondary value of participatory learning relating closely to peer evaluation is the effect of this learning on evaluation. When students are involved in evaluating their own work, they ultimately develop a more positive attitude about the entire evaluative process.[30] An evaluation process, which is not the prerogative of the teacher alone, involves the pupil, if it is meaningful.[31] Peer evaluation in this research also involves a measure of self-evaluation.

In addition to academic results, participatory learning enhances social relationships. Primarily, the very social relationship enacted with our fellowman determines our character as well as

---

[27]Rogers, Freedom to Learn, p. 153.

[28]Ibid., p. 162.

[29]Linda Devin-Sheehan, Robert S. Feldman, and Vernon L. Allen, "Research of Children Tutoring Children: A Critical Review," Review of Educational Research, XLVI (Summer, 1976), 357.

[30]Carolyn Logan, "Myth and Method," English Journal, LIX (April, 1970), 550.

[31]J. W. Patrick Creber, Sense and Sensitivity (London: University of London Press Ltd., 1965), pp. 222-23.

building relationships with peers.[32] Rogers, previously quoted,

states that democratic education builds effective cooperation with

others.[33] Educators like James sense that in education dialogue

with persons is always an underlying value.[34] "For students the

peer group constitutes one of the most important social forces."[35]

One of the highest levels of social relationships is the

I-Thou communion, as conceived by Martin Buber, which is opposed

to the more objective, the measurable, the tangible I-It relation-

ship. The I-Thou communion comes through grace, through relation.

The It offers many essentials, basic necessities. ". . . [W]ithout

It a human being cannot live. But whoever lives only with that is

not human."[36] Occasional glimpses of Buber's I-Thou relationships

appear through larger group interactions.[37]

The teacher endeavors to build the atmosphere to abet the

I-Thou actions. The teacher facilitates.[38] James calls the role

pastoral, and Dr. John F. A. Taylor in his philosophy of education

[32]Jack R. Frymier, "Teaching the Young to Love," Theory into Practice, XIII (December, 1974), 378.

[33]Rogers, Student Centered Teaching, p. 3.

[34]Charity James, Young Lives at Stake (New York: Agathon Press, 1972), p. 116.

[35]Schmuck, A Humanistic Psychology of Education, p. 170.

[36]Martin Buber, I and Thou, trans. Walter Kaufman (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970), p. 85.

[37]Schmuck, A Humanistic Psychology of Education, p. 194.

[38]Rogers, Freedom to Learn, pp. 125-26.

identifies the skill as midwifery. Regardless of the particular label, "[t]eaching requires that the teacher in some way involve the learner."[39]

Literature About Grouping

Herbert A. Thelen in his writings about grouping basically studies the grouping of school populations into classrooms. However, many of the same principles and problems apply to within-the-classroom grouping. Thelen recognizes that grouping presents some difficulties, particularly if "objectively definable groups" are desired. The present research employed "subjective" grouping, i.e., groupings determined by the students themselves. Thelen also believes that "grouping makes sense only when the teacher has a clear and accurate idea of what to do with the special group." Therefore, grouping occurs to meet conditions or needs established for effective learning.[40] Thus, although grouping offers some problems, it accomplishes several purposes.

Not only does grouping meet needs established for effective learning, but also grouping meets a basic human need--interdependency.[41] Through the group each member experiences personal

---

[39]Patterson, Humanistic Education, p. 94.

[40]Herbert A. Thelen, Classroom Grouping for Teachability (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967), pp. 188-90.

[41]Nathaniel Cantor, The Dynamics of Learning (Buffalo, New York: Foster Stewart Publishing Corporation, 1946), p. 58.

inquiry.[42] In peer evaluation, as each student reads the paper of
another, he makes personal inquiry about the strengths of his peer's
and of his own writing. Groups stimulate development of social
organizational skills because the group grows in competence as time
goes on.[43] One purpose of grouping, particularly in peer evaluation,
is to develop competence in evaluation; the pupil shares in the
evaluation process.[44] But the teacher helps the student to recog-
nize his need for interdependency and yet to employ self-criticism
and self-guidance,[45] important facets of self-evaluation.

What has the literature said about methods of grouping?
Ehly and Larson in their study about tutorial outcomes found that
sex, feelings of tutor and tutee for each other, and peer acceptance
or rejection were not factors that affected amount of learning or
learning efficiency. "Only the tutee's entry ability level was pre-
dictive of the amount of learning which resulted from the program."[46]
Whether the learning task demands grouping or an individual approach

---

[42]Herbert A. Thelen, Education and the Human Quest (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), p. 154.

[43]Ibid., p. 155.

[44]Creber, Sense and Sensitivity, p. 223.

[45]Cantor, The Dynamics of Learning, p. 179.

[46]Stewart W. Ehly and Stephen C. Larsen, "Tutor and Tutee Characteristics as Predictors of Tutorial Outcomes," Psychology in the Schools, XIII (July, 1976), 349.

depends upon the nature and complexity of the task and the nature and composition of the group.[47]

Once the need for grouping is determined, evaluating the effectiveness of grouping includes more than an objective measuring of academic success of the individual. Evaluation needs to consider the social interactions, for evaluation includes a look at activities that build social skills not just achieve grades.[48]

B. F. Skinner applies his response psychology to verbal behaviors. He finds that words are not used because those words earlier elicited punishment. But other words are selected because they were rewarded. Thus, in peer evaluation students learn the use of words to secure desired response both in their writing and in their criticism.[49] Kelly expands upon this:

> But every writer and every speaker needs an audience beyond the teacher, needs many responses to whatever he has to say on paper and in class. Everybody needs to be seen and heard by the group he is a member of; needs to feel that he is an identifiable and worthwhile member of that group.[50]

---

[47]S. S. Boocock, "Toward A Sociology of Learning: A Selective Review of Existing Research," Sociology of Education, XXXIX (Winter, 1966), 10.

[48]Janet Hanley Whitla, "Classroom-Centered Evaluation: A Humanistic Approach for the Social Studies," Social Education, XL (November-December, 1976), 568-69.

[49]B. F. Skinner, Verbal Behavior (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957), pp. 371-52.

[50]Lou Kelly, "Toward Competence and Creativity in an Open Class," College English, XXXIV (February, 1973), 648.

Literature About Shared Writing

> By being required to write only for an audience of one
> powerful adult, the student learns to write about whatever
> subjects and to use whatever language will please that
> adult. . . . [A]nd, indeed, if the medium is the message,
> he does not learn in school that writing is a means of
> sharing his own ideas and feelings in his own language
> with those peers who count most to the youngster every
> hour of the day except that spent in English class.[51]

The literature on composition continually emphasizes the
need of an expanded audience, and writers regularly recite their
various methods for having students share their writings. However,
before citing the uses and values of shared writing, some writers'
views on understanding composition, its instruction and its evalu-
ation, as it relates to shared writing or peer evaluation will be
examined.

James Moffett in _Teaching the Universe of Discourse_ dis-
cussed the verbal skills acquired by a person, beginning with speak-
ing and concluding with writing. ". . . [W]riting is learned in the
same basic way other activities are learned--by doing and by heeding
what happens."[52] Thus, as a child learns to speak by sensing the
reactions of his hearers, a child learns to write and to improve
his writing by heeding how his readers react.

The more one writes and the more one receives responses to
what one writes, it may be that the better he will write. The lit-
erature, however, differs on this point. McColly and Remstad claim

---

[51]R. Botts, "What Means This End? Some Unexamined Classroom
Practices," _English Journal_, LX (January, 1971), 89.

[52]James Moffett, _Teaching the University of Discourse_
(Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968), p. 193.

that it is "not tenable" that more writing means better writing.[53]

However, Lokke and Wykoff believe that if a person doubles the

amount of writing, he increases his writing achievement.[54]

Nevertheless, businessmen throughout the United States agree

that the ability to communicate is one of the most important assets

of a professional worker. Westinghouse leaders believe that a "con-

tinued upgrading of the general level of ability to utilize English

would serve the best interests of the nation." Yale and Towne

administration, according to Mersand, believe that "a love of Eng-

lish and a command of English are prerequisites to success."[55]

Mersand then turned to colleges and universities for suggestions

for achieving composition skill. More universities, from Alabama

to Yale, recommended "more writing in high school."[56]

How, then, may this "more writing in high school" be accom-

plished? Burton and Simmons recognize the need for further research

in these areas. They ask, "What approaches or methods in rhetoric

are most effective in developing skill in written composition?

. . . What are the conditions for effectively developing writing

---

[53]W. McColly and R. Remstad, "Comparative Effectiveness of Composition Skills Learning Activities in the Secondary School," Cooperative Research Project 1528 (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 1963), p. 62.

[54]Virginia Lokke and George Wykoff, "Double Writing in Freshman Composition--an Experiment," School and Society, XLVIII (November, 1948), 437-39.

[55]J. Mersand, Attitudes Toward English Teaching (Phila-delphia, Pennsylvania: Chilton Press, 1961), p. 293.

[56]Ibid., p. 295.

abilities?"[57] Teachers and researchers recognize "there are many

ways of teaching writing effectively,"[58] and that research in compo-

sition is especially difficult because of its subjective nature.[59]

A teacher of composition seeks "to cultivate in the student a

bafflingly complex intellectual skill. Instruction in it does not

proceed in a systematic sequential way, . . ."[60] Thus, shared wri-

ting, or peer evaluation, is only one of the methods possible, and

this research simply observes what happens in its particular use in

one situation.

In considering shared writing and peer evaluation, the

researcher also examined evaluation of writing. This, too, is a

complex subject, since it has been demonstrated that one paper

judged by five different people might possibly receive five differ-

ent grades.[61] Theories or methods of evaluation vary from holistic

to analytic. But the major question to which this study was seeking

an answer was: How does peer evaluation (and shared writing) aid

or contribute to evaluation?

---

[57]Dwight L. Burton and John S. Simmons, eds., Teaching English in Today's High Schools (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970), pp. 15-16.

[58]Glen A. Love, "World Views of Composition," College Composition and Communication, XXII (February, 1971), 33.

[59]J. J. DeBoer, "Composition, Handwriting, and Spelling," Review of Educational Research, XXXI (April, 1961), 161.

[60]A. R. Kitzhaber, Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1963), p. 89.

[61]Kitzhaber, Themes, Theories and Therapy, p. 69.

A first principle is that evaluation should apply to the here and now and avoid the idea of correcting in order to do "better next time." Judy maintains that directing evaluation toward the future may actually inhibit writing.[62] Peer evaluation is a "here and now" act which allows the student to receive immediate response from his peers about the effectiveness of his immediate communication.

Diederich in Measuring Growth in English found that teachers consider five areas significant in evaluating writing: (1) ideas; (2) sentence structure, which includes usage, spelling, and punctuation; (3) organization; (4) wording (vocabulary); and (5) style.[63] The present research examines the first four of these five areas.

Without an understanding of the evaluation process being applied to his writing, the student may develop frustrations which handicap his writing. By contrast, pupil correction through shared writing should help evaluation and help writing by increasing through direct participation an understanding of the evaluative process.[64]

If students are to write more, as the colleges and universities desire, the burden for evaluation is likely to devolve upon

---

[62]Stephen Judy, Explorations in the Teaching of Secondary English (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1974), p. 102.

[63]Paul Diederich, Measuring Growth in English (Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1974), pp. 7-8.

[64]Loren V. Grissom, "Student Leadership in Evaluating Composition," English Journal, XLVIII (September, 1959), 338.

the high school English teacher. Squire et al. have estimated that
if the students write once each week, approximately 250 words per
pupil, merely reading and grading one paper takes 3.5 minutes or
8.8 hours per week for 150 students. If the teacher marks to
encourage thinking, each paper requires 8.6 minutes or 21.5 hours.
Further, if the student revises (and he should), this additional
checking takes 2.8 minutes or seven more hours per week. After
adding to this the regular hours in the classroom and in other
teaching-related activities, Squire finds that "it would take about
seventy hours per week to do the job as it should be done."[65]

Various methods of employing shared writing procedures have
been offered. Edna McGuire questioned college freshmen about their
writing experiences by asking, "Should students read one another's
papers?" The students answered that this should be done only some-
times and anonymously. They felt that they could not catch the
errors and wished the teacher to mark after the student reading.[66]
However, James Moffett recommended using peer correction groups
without direct teacher supervision. Teacher-led class discussions
furnished a model for the peer groups and reinforced them.[67]
Karrfalt at Edinboro State College, Edinboro, Pennsylvania, used
groups for peer correction by having the group work alternately on

[65]James R. Squire et al., The National Interest and the
Teaching of English (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of
Teachers of English, 1961), pp. 92-94.

[66]Edna McGuire, "College Freshmen on Writing in High
School," English Journal, LI (April, 1962), 258.

[67]Moffett, Teaching the Universe of Discourse, p. 197.

one student's paper thoroughly and turn that paper in for a group grade.[68] Sauer used shared writing by anonymous duplication of each student's writing for consideration by the class.[69] Katz described a form of shared writing through workshops. The University of South Carolina provided tutors for aiding students. Some students came as often as forty or fifty times, but usually five visits were sufficient. The directors planned to explain the service to high school teachers and to expand the program at the university.[70] Bruffer directed the students to write evaluative critiques of each other's papers,[71] while Hawkins reacted to all student criticism after the student rewrote the paper.[72]

The experience of sharing student writing was instructive to their instructors. Bruffer felt that "[p]eople themselves learn when they teach others."[73] Hawkins found the group process an "enhancing environment for active, socially realistic learning,"[74]

---

[68]David H. Karrfalt, "Writing Teams: From Generating Composition to Generating Communication," College Composition and Communication, XXII (December, 1971), 377-78.

[69]Edwin H. Sauer, "The Cooperative Correction of Paragraphs," in Essays on the Teaching of English: Reports of the Yale Conference on the Teaching of English, eds. Edward Gordon and Edward Noyes (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1960), p. 139.

[70]Molly Katz, "A Blueprint for Writing," Change, VIII (November, 1976), 46-47.

[71]Kenneth A. Bruffer, "Collaborative Learning: Some Practical Models," College English, XXXIV (February, 1973), 638.

[72]Thom Hawkins, "Group Inquiry Techniques for Teaching Writing," College English, XXXVII (March, 1976), 641-42.

[73]Bruffer, "Collaborative Learning," p. 641.

[74]Hawkins, "Group Inquiry Techniques," p. 637.

and he felt that the students enjoyed the process.[75] Karrfalt stated that he could <u>show</u> only that attendance improved. He observed that the students seemed to open up and to experience a situation for writing that was social.[76] Morsey observed that students check for weaknesses and strengths, work better for a student audience, and improve their editing ability by reading capable writings of their peers.[77]

Hawkins offered the following specific instructions for shared writing: (1) Read the paper at least twice; (2) talk with your peers about the paper to determine the congruity of perceptions; (3) write the feedback and include the larger view and the smaller errors; (4) the student corrected rewrites the paper. He also recommended using the groups for other tasks, such as grammar study.[78]

Bruffer saw the teacher role in shared writing as an organizer of groups for the experience.[79] He recommended that the teacher help the students grow in shared learning by giving the groups problems of increasing generality.[80]

---

[75]<u>Ibid</u>., p. 641.

[76]Karrfalt, "Writing Teams," pp. 377-78.

[77]Royal J. Morsey, <u>Improving English Instruction</u> (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1965), p. 75.

[78]Hawkins, "Group Inquiry Techniques," pp. 641-42.

[79]Bruffer, "Collaborative Learning," p. 637.

[80]<u>Ibid</u>., p. 642.

Not only is shared writing used to achieve academic results but the process also offers other commendable values. James Coleman found traditional and highly structured schools conflicting and unsatisfactory. His ideal learning environment included these four points, all of which appear to inhere in peer evaluation: (1) Freedom to act and to make mistakes (students write); (2) feel consequences of mistakes (peers respond with criticisms or questions); (3) have consequences small enough not to discourage (peers do not have authority to grade); and (4) provide an environment to "induce the desired learning" (students rewrite with help of corrections).[81]

Moffett senses a strong student interest in the lives of their peers, a keen desire to know each other better. This social motive is tied to writing.[82] Shared writing stimulates the feelings of the student audiences and entertains them.[83] This audience response to a student's writing stimulates him to more writing.[84] Further, the group discussions and evaluations furnish material for class discussion of critical points.[85]

[81]James S. Coleman, Adolescents and the Schools (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965), p. 108.

[82]James Moffett, A Student Centered Language Arts Curriculum, K-13: A Handbook for Teachers (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973), p. 373.

[83]Herbert J. Muller, The Uses of English: Guidelines for the Teaching of English from the Anglo-American Conference at Dartmouth College (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967), pp. 100-1.

[84]Moffett, A Student Centered Language Arts, p. 386.

[85]Grissom, "Student Leadership in Evaluating," p. 339.

This sharing method which is used often in the primary schools should move into the secondary schools.[86] The workshop or shared writing helps the "pupils to realize that the excellence of their work must be measured in terms of the effect of their efforts upon their audience and point[s] out the causes of their (usually partial) success or failure."[87] Muller believes that students would possibly improve in their composition skills by working in groups, writing for one another; "but I suppose no experiment could conclusively prove this."[88]

Although Muller believes that no experiment could conclusively prove that a group writing process improves student writing, Lyman in an experiment showed that students found and corrected three-fifths of their errors, a partial improvement in the writing process.[89] However, Martin feels that student correcting offered "little or no gain in economy of time for the teacher, since he must check the corrections." But he feels that the students profit by editing their peers.[90] As one method of shared writing, Grissom

---

[86]John Dixon, Growth Through English (Edgerton, Huddersfield, Yorkshire, England: National Association for the Teaching of English, 1969), p. 98.

[87]W. W. Hatfield, Experience Curriculum (New York: Appleton Century, 1935), p. 136.

[88]Muller, The Uses of English, p. 102.

[89]R. L. Lyman, "A Cooperative Experiment in Junior High School Composition," School Review, XXXIX (December, 1931), 754.

[90]Freedom and Discipline in English, H. C. Martin, chairman (Princeton, New Jersey: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965), p. 101.

suggests that students work out their own criteria.[91] And Hayakawa

even recommends that "the grading be done by the student."[92] But

all see strong positive values for shared writing and peer

evaluation.

<center>Literature About Peer Evaluation
and Its Effects</center>

The literature examined in this section refers to several

controlled research projects on individual peer evaluation. Other

writings cited in this section include studies based on subjective

observations.

Researchers in peer correction differ on one positive value

of the process, improvement of writing achievement. In research

with freshmen at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, the

researchers concluded that a workshop instructional method affected

the writing achievement. The workshop method used by the experi-

mental group included "daily, intensively supervised writing prac-

tice." All themes were written in class. Instruction, which

usually occupied only the first ten to twenty minutes of the hour,

began with the word and moved to sentences and paragraphs with the

other basic rhetorical concepts added. The students then wrote an

assignment supporting the brief instruction while the instructors

worked individually. Small group assignments included reading

---

[91]Grissom, "Student Leadership in Evaluating," p. 338.

[92]S. I. Hayakawa, "Linguistic Science and the Teaching of
Composition," ETC: A Review of General Semantics, VII (Winter,
1950), 102.

papers of their peers, and the students were free to help one another while writing. Although this experimental/control research did not isolate peer evaluation as the sole factor in improved achievement, the research does suggest that the use of peer evaluation improves writing.[93]

Ray Maize in his experimental/control study at Purdue University included other variables in addition to peer correction and also clearly showed compositional superiority of the experimental group. His control group studied grammar and wrote fewer papers. The experimental group wrote more and the papers were "read and corrected during class time by the students under the guidance of the teacher."[94]

Sager's study involved sixth graders for a period of ten weeks. She concluded that overall the writing improved and that the girls improved more than the boys.[95] Her scale included four divisions which each student used in rating his peers. A student rated his peer from zero to three on each division with the highest possible total grade being twelve. Each section included helpful expansions of the division topic. For example, under "Elaboration"

---

[93]Virginia J. Haas et al., "English Composition by Workshop," The Journal of Experimental Education, XL (Spring, 1972), 33-34.

[94]Ray Maize, "A Study in Two Methods of Teaching Composition" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, 1952), p. 88.

[95]Carol Sager, "Improving the Quality of Written Composition Through Pupil Use of Rating Scale" (paper presented at the 63rd meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, November 22-24, 1973), pp. 4-5.

appeared the supporting explanation, "An abundance of related ideas."[96] The scale encouraged no individual comment or suggestions for improvement. Thus, each student received an "objective" evaluation from his peers.

Jean R. Lagana wished to individualize instruction and to reach students affectively through peer groups. Therefore, she developed a model for instruction using individual assignments to meet student needs discovered through the STEP Writing Test.[97] She also designed permanent peer groups based on student strengths and weaknesses. Each group chose its topic for writing, shared the writings, and graded each other's papers. The teacher arbitrated, when necessary.[98] Overall, the experimental group surpassed the control group, but the experimental group wrote more papers, also.[99] No emphasis was made on student rewriting of papers, and the students wrote the pre- and post-test on the same topic.

In his study for the University of Oklahoma, Bob W. Ford served as the only evaluator of his pre- and post-tests. He designed his research on peer editing to give teachers released time

[96]Carol Sager, "Improving the Quality of Written Composition Through Pupil Use of Rating Scale" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation--Chapter IV, Construction of the Revised Scale, on microfiche, National Council of Teachers of English Committee on Research), pp. 78-81.

[97]Jean R. Lagana, "The Development, Implementation, and Evaluation of a Model for Teaching Composition Which Utilizes Individualized Learning and Peer Grouping" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1972), pp. 4-5.

[98]Ibid., pp. 37-41.

[99]Ibid., p. 99.

in order to devote more time to student conferences and to allow students to write more.[100] In his experimental/control groups all instruction was the same except the experimental group had two sessions to train in theme rating.[101] The experimental group, which used peer editing, surpassed the control group on the Language Knowledge Test and on pre- and post-test themes.[102] The students used an evaluation check list which gave points and grades to the students.[103]

In 1955 Aggie Boyet found no significant growth in classes using student editing. However, she labeled her research inconclusive because of certain variables. She recommended that teachers grade after peers edit, that the students edit fewer themes (her structure called for editing five papers), and that students have a criteria for editing.[104]

Although Haas, Maize, and Sager concluded that students gained in achievement in writing, Pierson found no significant difference in writing achievement between peer correction groups and teacher-corrected groups. In his experimental/control study his

---

[100]Bob Wayne Ford, "The Effects of Peer Editing/Grading on the Grammar-Usage and Theme Composition Ability of College Freshmen" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Okalhoma, 1972), p. 28.

[101]Ibid., p. 50.

[102]Ibid., p. 73.

[103]Ibid., p. 118.

[104]Aggie Boyet, "The Effect of Student Group Editing of Themes on the Improvement of Writing in Freshman English Composition" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1955), pp. 106-7.

experimental groups were trained in correcting the papers of their peers and frequently used guide sheets for correction. His measurement device was the STEP essay test.[105]

Putz in her study in New York University asked the students to write eight compositions on ditto masters. These papers were then discussed in class in order, or the class selected the three best and the three worst and discussed in small groups. The students were pre-tested and post-tested by three papers for each test, and each paper was rated holistically on a scale from one to three. She found no measurable change in writing ability.[106]

Sutton and Allen in a Cooperative Research Project through Stetson University used peer evaluation, but they made "no controlled experimental studies on the variable of peer evaluation."[107] However, their hypotheses dealt with frequency of writing and peer evaluation. Their procedure used six pre- and post-tests. With so many tests without reenforcement, their student response on the

---

[105]Howard Pierson, "Peer and Teacher Correction: A Comparison of the Effects of Two Methods of Teaching Composition in Grade Nine English Classes" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1966), p. 79.

[106]Joan M. Putz, "When the Teacher Stops Teaching--an Experiment with Freshman English," College English, XXXII (October, 1970), 51-54.

[107]Joseph T. Sutton and Eliot D. Allen, "The Effect of Practice and Evaluation on Improvement in Written Composition," Cooperative Research Project 1993 (Delano, Florida: Stetson University, 1964), p. 9.

evaluation instruments lacked motivation. Motivation was lessened also because the topics were not student selected.[108]

In addition to the above research procedures, other instructors have tried different methods of using peer evaluation and have simply recorded their subjective observations. Snipes, with college freshmen, combined peer evaluation and student teaching. Each student served on a committee and was responsible for teaching a concept and for evaluating themes written by other students with final evaluation resting with the instructor. Snipes recommended attempting a process that removed evaluation from the instructor and placed it on a committee of five working with a student-developed evaluation scale.[109]

Witbeck used peer correction in teaching English to speakers of other languages. His procedure included, first, all students correcting one paper together. Second, students read papers of others and gave their peers the opportunity to correct before the teacher read the papers. Finally, on some occasions the teacher assigned specific errors to be searched for during the reading. He observed many positive but intangible results from his use of peer evaluation.[110]

---

[108]Sutton and Allen, "The Effect of Practice and Evaluation on Improvement in Written Composition," p. 51.

[109]Wilson Currin Snipes, "An Inquiry: Peer Group Teaching in Freshman Writing," College Composition and Communcation, XXII (May, 1971), 171.

[110]Michael C. Witbeck, "Peer Correction Procedures for Intermediate and Advanced ESL Composition Lessons," Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages Quarterly, X (September, 1976), 323-25.

38

In the Los Angeles City Schools' manual for instruction of composition, peer correction was recommended. Students were to organize themselves in groups to read each other's papers, and one paper was to be selected from the group to be read to the class.[111] The manual also included a highly structured check sheet with items to be marked with a plus or minus. The check sheet omitted any reference to lines to help locate the problem and also omitted any suggestions or comments.[112]

Dyess recommended students' reading their papers to their classmates while they use a check list based on items included in class instruction. He also suggested revision after the criticisms.[113] Hipple used smaller groups and suggested two possible procedures. First, the group might work on one paper for improvement. Or, the student might attach an evaluation sheet to his paper for all comments. Thus, a student not only commented on the original paper but possibly commented on the criticism of others.[114] Platt used individual groups meeting out of class with the instructor to

---

[111]Division of Instructional Planning and Services, Compose Yourself: A Plan for Instruction in Written Composition, Grades 7-12 (Los Angeles, California: Los Angeles City Schools, 1976), p. 61.

[112]Ibid., p. 66.

[113]Joseph T. Dyess, "Composing: Epiphany and Detail," College Composition and Communication, XV (December, 1964), 261.

[114]T. W. Hipple, "Grader's Helpers; Colleagues, Peers, Scorecards," English Journal, LXI (May, 1972), 692.

read a paper projected by means of an opaque projector. The students then corrected the paper.[115]

Not only did peer correction produce positive attitudes and some results indicating improved writing achievement, but also it produced other tangible by-products: various check lists, a conviction of teacher grading relief, a method of assistance to the beginning teacher, better attendance, and more writing. Nearly all the findings, except the check lists, were based primarily on subjective observations or perceptions.

The check sheet developed by Haas et al. was for the student's use while writing. It included seventeen questions or imperatives, such as "5. Do your sentences have continuity?" or "17. Omit unnecessary words."[116] The guide sheet recommended by Pierson varied according to the assignment, and the sheet was cooperatively developed by students and teacher. This instrument moved toward specifics by asking the corrector to cite numbers of the lines referred to.[117]

The Los Angeles Instructional manual contained a highly structured evaluation and check sheet. On this the reader simply checked the errors committee by the writer. The sheet made no

[115]Michael Platt, "Correcting Papers in Public and in Private," College English, XXXVII (September, 1975), 23.

[116]Haas et al., "English Composition by Workshop," p. 34.

[117]Howard Pierson, Teaching Writing (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972), p. 27.

reference to specifics by line and had no space for comments.[118]
Dyess also used a student check sheet containing lists of the major
topics taught in the class.[119]

Sager tested the effectiveness of her list with teachers and
students. This list provided four general areas and included guid-
ing questions. The reader scored each section from zero to three
with a maximum grade of twelve.[120]

The first check list published by Hipple in 1970 was an
interdisciplinary evaluation list used by teachers. This, he
believed, shortened the evaluation time by allowing the teacher to
simply note the number of the student's error. The student then
referred to the check list to understand the error.[121] In 1972
Hipple wrote only to English teachers and recommended simply attach-
ing a sheet for evaluation to the writer's paper. The readers
wrote about the paper on the evaluation sheets. They also might
write about the comments of others.[122]

Four of the studies or procedures noted the time-saving
characteristic of peer evaluation. Pierson found that "peer

----

[118]Division of Instructional Planning and Services, Compose
Yourself, pp. 63-66.

[119]Dyess, "Composing: Epiphany and Detail," p. 261.

[120]Sager, Chapter IV, Construction of the Revised Scale,
pp. 78-81.

[121]T. W. Hipple, "Student Compositions: A Schoolwide
Policy for all Written Work," The Clearing House, XLIV (May, 1970),
525.

[122]Hipple, "Grader's Helpers," p. 692.

Other tangible gains in peer evaluation include productivity and attendance. Maize believes that the students in peer evaluation groups wrote more[128] while Haas et al. noted an increase in attendance in the experimental group.[129] However, some of the specific instructions for those experimental groups might have pressured students to attend: only final drafts of the themes written in class could be made up and "those would have to be done under the instructor's guidance at school."[130]

The supporters of peer evaluation also observed certain intangible possibilities. Sutton and Allen believe that peer evaluation might be more potent in control over student's desire to improve than the comments of the teacher.[131] Hipple agrees that the peers' opinons might be considered more significant than the teacher's.[132] Nemanich felt that several peer notations of an error were more convincing than one teacher comment. He also felt that students liked to read what others do and liked to receive the reactions of their peers.[133] Evans noted that "careful analysis of

[128]Maize, "A Study in Two Methods of Teaching Composition," p. 88.

[129]Haas et al., "English Composition by Workshop," p. 36.

[130]Ibid., p. 34.

[131]Sutton and Allen, "The Effect of Practice and Evaluation on Improvement," p. 692.

[132]Hipple, "Grader's Helpers," p. 692.

[133]Donald Nemanich, "Preparing the Composition Teacher," College Composition and Communication, XXV (February, 1974), p. 48.

another's writing frequently gives a student insight into his own."[134] Platt felt that groups meeting and correcting each other's papers with the instructor present created a sense of fellowship and decreased the possible feeling of teacher as antagonist.[135] Sager found that peer evaluation used with sixth graders made rewriting an automatic process. She also felt that the process promoted security and confidence among students.[136]

Witbeck in using peer evaluation with English students who also spoke other languages listed four specific advantages. First, peer evaluation gave students necessary skills for self-editing and revising. (The present research also examines this question.) Second, peer evaluation promoted student-student and student-teacher oral communication.[137] (Moffett reminds us that talking precedes effective writing.)[138] Third, one student's correction of another's error expanded the first student's understanding of grammar. Finally, peer evaluation helped students see that "errors are . . . probably a necessary part of the process of learning rather than merely indications of failure to learn."[139]

---

[134]William H. Evans and Jerry L. Walker, New Trends in the Teaching of English in Secondary Schools (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966), p. 58.

[135]Platt, "Correcting Papers in Public and in Private," p. 25.

[136]Sager, "Improving the Quality of Written Composition," p. 5.

[137]Witbeck, "Peer Correction Procedures," p. 322.

[138]Moffett, Teaching the Universe of Discourse, p. 33.

[139]Witbeck, "Peer Correction Procedures," p. 322.

Summary

In their study of research in composition evaluation Jerabek and Dieterich note that classes receiving teacher correction by marginal comments show no gain. They observe that research and opinion deals with how (not whether) to respond. Teachers continue to believe that response is necessary. But the question how best to respond still persists.[140] The literature examined in this chapter argues for peer evaluation. Researchers found that writing achievement improved or that peer evaluation succeeded as well as teacher evaluation. Furthermore, the literature indicated tangible results such as check sheets, teacher time saved, more writing, and improved attendance. The users of peer evaluation also noted positive social and psychological results. The literature failed to point out that peer evaluation consumed in-class time. However, the effectiveness of the procedure to these writers appeared to merit the use of peer evaluation.

None of the existing studies to date appear to have investigated as yet the specific interactions which take place when one student evaluates and "corrects" another students' writing. What specific types of corrections do students' peers make on one another's papers? How frequently do student writers accept suggestions from their peers in making changes in their drafts? Do

---

[140]Ross Jerabek and Daniel Dieterich, "Composition Evaluation: The State of the Art," College Composition and Communication, XXVII (May, 1975), 183-84.

the accepted changes result, in fact, in improved drafts? If so,
how frequently?

These and other questions of similar specificity are the
concern of the present research. The following chapter discusses
the procedure used for this examination of peer evaluation.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Analyzing the data for this research involved identifying a population, developing a critique sheet for student use in peer correction, determining the methods for procuring and classifying the data from the critique sheets, and deciding upon procedures for analyzing the data. The analysis also involved labeling of the critiquing responses of the students on the writings of their peers.

This chapter examines in detail each step of this process.

Identification of the Population

The population for this study included high school seniors who were college oriented. College in this research generally referred to a four-year institution. However, students inclined to a community or junior college were not necessarily eliminated. This population included students interested in composition for its primary value or for its secondary value in furthering achievement in other fields.

The sample population for this study included those seniors electing through personal choice or counselor guidance Composition and Research Skills I (now College Composition and Research Skills I) at Loy Norrix High School, Kalamazoo, Michigan. The sample was

narrowed further to include those assigned by computer to the researcher's classes in the fall semester of 1975-1976. Although eight juniors were included in the original assignment, the sample was limited finally to seniors only because four of these eight juniors did not write any of the papers assigned for the research.

The sample of the population met the class during first hour (twenty-six seniors), during fourth hour (twenty-four seniors), and during sixth hour (twenty-one seniors). The class met every weekday for fifty-five minute periods. For purposes of critiquing, each class was divided (by a procedure to be discussed later) into small groups of four or five (see Appendix B).

Development of Instrument

The critique sheet used by the sample in the evaluation of their peers' writing was developed by the researcher in the fall of 1974 and piloted by the students in the Composition and Research Skills classes in the fall semester of that year. The original sheet was developed from the researcher's revision of a check list by T. W. Hipple in "Student Compositions: A Schoolwide Policy for All Written Work," The Clearing House, May, 1970 (see Appendix D).[141] The researcher grouped the items into categories for the first check sheet (see Appendix E). The positive response of these three classes from the fall semester of 1974 sparked the determination to pursue the research. These classes further offered suggested

---

[141]Hipple, "Student Compositions," p. 525.

revisions of the critique sheet. The final model "Check Sheet" was developed and used (see Appendix A).

The Check Sheet is carbon impregnated, NCR paper, for the purposes of this study. The top or original copy was given by the person correcting to the student whose paper he corrected. The student correcting kept the carbon and submitted it to the researcher as part of the student's materials which he handed in.

Although the carbon copy is not a necessity, it offers several advantages. First, the second copy is available if the first is lost. Second, the second copy gives the corrector the opportunity to examine his own corrections when he begins revising his paper. Third, the instructor who desires may examine readily the corrections given and the corrections received by any one student, if the carbon sheets are used. This further encourages peer participation. However, if cost is a factor, as it often is, the second copy is not mandatory. A teacher using peer correction could dispense with these carboned records.

The Check Sheet attempts to encourage positive responses and specificity. The suggested questions and divisions are merely guides. No student is expected to answer all questions. Therefore, the response columns are separated from the questions to encourage free response. Often the student thus develops his own pattern of peer evaluation, completely divorcing himself from the divisions on the left. The questions often serve as only a beginning aid.

Method of Procuring Data

This section of Chapter III, procuring the data, includes the methods of developing an open, communicating atmosphere, the process of grouping itself, the initial or "trial-run" for the use of the Check Sheet in grouping, and the in-class activities with the types of assignments given. After writing and after receiving the Check Sheets from their peers, students made their final drafts and, in most cases, made their own corrections.

Then the second stage--out-of-classroom data collection and classifying--began. These data, rough draft, check sheets from their peers, and the final draft, had to be recorded by the researcher, grouped, and recorded for the computer. The data collection procedure also included a secondary grouping and the procedure of developing questions for the computer.

Method of Developing an
Open Atmosphere

Developing a warm classroom atmosphere often challenges teachers at the beginning of a new semester, and many activities enhance this communication. The researcher uses the traditional devices to encourage sharing, but "A Cocktail Mixer" also adds to the regular "tell the class one thing about yourself" format. This procedure allows free and relaxed mixing as well as conversational groupings. (See Appendix F.)

Grouping Methods

After the class members developed a measure of relaxation with their peers, the instructor explained peer correction by referring to research by Pierson and others giving evidence that students whose papers were corrected by their peers improved as much as students whose papers were corrected only by their teacher. The students were also told, however, that the instructor also read their papers; therefore, they were told that they had a double opportunity to improve their writing skills. The instructor also reminded the students that peer correction increased their audience, challenged their communication skills, and made their writing, thus, more worthwhile. Furthermore, the students received the opportunity to see how others wrote, which also is a learning experience.

Since some students were sensitive about who read their papers, they selected their own peer critiquing groups. The instructor simply circulated a sheet, and the students signed. Cross-group peer correcting was discouraged, although such peer interaction did occur. Some students "dropped out" and some shifting during the term had to be made. (See Appendix B.)

Critiquing: A "Trial Run"

To insure greater ease in using the Check Sheets, the instructor staged a "trial run" early in the fall of 1975 with the students writing and critiquing a definition paper. This type of writing was not included in the writings examined for this research. The students wrote a paper in class following classroom instruction.

The students returned to class the next day and received their own papers and a Check Sheet.

Following the instructions on the Check Sheet, the instructor noted the need for numbering lines and the initial directions encouraging positive responses as well as corrections and encouraging specific comments. The instructor elicited examples of positive comments and of specific comments. After reviewing the questions on the Check Sheet the instructor reminded the students that all questions were not to be answered for each paper. The questions were to serve as guides. The instructor also recognized that a comment, such as "line 15, doesn't sound right," was appropriate. The instructor further explained that all correcting goes on the Check Sheet. The instructor then fielded any questions and reminded the students that more than one reading of a paper often was necessary.

The students began correcting in a manner comfortable to them. Some collected together in groups because they thus were free to question legibility or to exchange sheets with greater ease. Talking about the corrections was discouraged, not only for the sake of the research, but also for the sake of writing the correction and thus preserving it: a spoken correction is often lost by busy memories.

Because some students were absent, because not all students worked at the same speed, and because some papers demanded more time than others, an arbitrary system was established for the mechanics of correcting, rewriting, and turning in. No paper was ever "late." (The instructor felt that no student should be punished for the

problems of another.) Some papers were critiqed out of class. But two hours of class time were set aside for critiquing, revising, and rewriting. Flexibility was necessary, but papers were expected in before the next paper was assigned. Since the students were basically responsible, busy students, the "system" worked well.

Since the sample was not atypical of a population of college-oriented seniors, some students failed to complete the assignment, and some neglected to critique all of their peers' writings. Therefore, references to numbers of papers written and total numbers of Check Sheets completed lack specificity. Appendix C shows the criticisms received by each of the students for each of the assignments, but the Appendix does not show the reasons for a zero in the column.

1975-1976 Assignments, From Which Data Were Drawn

The assignments critiqued and classified for this research included a narrative paper for hours one, four, and six; a description paper for hours one, four, and six; and an an analysis paper for hours four and six. In addition, the students wrote and critiqued an argumentative/persuasive paper. The other class assignments included about thirty-six journals, two book reviews (written in class), and two research papers (the first, a thesis paper, and the second, a problem-solving paper).

Instruction for the narrative writing acquainted students with the concept of literary point of view, use of tense and voice in verbs, and above all, intent, for "you cannot separate the tale

from the telling. Beneath the content of every message is intent. And form embodies that intent. Intuitively or not, an author chooses his techniques according to his meaning."[142] Motivation for the narrative included telling experiences, viewing those experiences from different points of view, and then alternating the points of view to fit the intent of the story for varied audiences. Finally, models of narratives were used as materials which might also motivate.

The assignment directions imposed only one limitation: the intent of the story encompasses not only the simple reporting but also the evoking of a specific response, emotion, or reaction. The instructor, without apology, varied approaches to the different classes, drawing experiences from the students and selecting those models, whether from the Atlantic, from texts, or from Xeroxed materials, that seemed most appropriate to the students.

For writing a description, instruction included movement through a ladder of abstractions with several general words, group practice in narrowing subject and sharpening focus, clarification of connotation and denotation of words, and study of models to observe selection of impressions for effect. Motivation further included listing many descriptive words for an object and then selecting the groups that could be used for a desired effect, mood, tone, or sense stimulation. Again, the instructor varied the approaches for the three different classes to adapt to the needs of the students. Furthermore, the instructor found that attempting

---

[142]Moffett, Teaching the Universe of Discourse, p. 145.

to repeat the same thing the same way was not only impossible but also tended to be deadly.

Preparation for the analysis paper began with three basic steps in an analysis: finding a clear basis of division; following the basis of division consistently; and carrying out the division until it includes all the basic parts. This also led to the realization that any whole can be analyzed in different ways, depending on how it is seen. The next instructional step was listing typical subjects for analysis. Perhaps the best motivational technique for an analysis was to organize as a class one or two stimulating subjects similar to the following: steps in explaining a speeding ticket (crushed fender) to Dad; reasons <u>Playboy</u> should be sold in the school store; or the causes of the Civil War.

For pre-writing on all papers the students prepared a modified outline page which included the central purpose or impression to be communicated, the basic topic ideas in each paragraph, and the structure or oganization to be used in that paragraph. The instructor periodically checked these pages to insure thought and preparation for writing. Changing outlines was perfectly acceptable, but the paper was to follow the outline and to accomplish the purpose stated.

Critiquing, Revising, and Rewriting

The students followed the critiquing procedure discussed in Critiquing: A "Trial Run." When each student received the correction sheets from the members of his group (and, in turn, distributed

his corrections to his peers), the student was ready to consider the corrections, to accept them, to reject them, and/or to make further corrections on his own.

If the student accepted a peer correction, he accepted it in one of several possible ways. First, his correction possibly resulted in an improved paper. Second, the change perhaps made no significant difference. Finally, changing because of the suggested correction possibly created a greater deficiency in the paper. This deficiency perhaps occurred because of the inadequate criticism of the corrector, the inadequacy of the writer, or a combination of both.

A second possibility was rejecting the criticism. Here the student perhaps determined that the original writing was adequate. Either the student's rejection was wise: his original writing was adequate. Or the rejection was unwise: his peer's suggestion, although rejected, offered an opportunity for improvement.

Further, while re-reading his rough draft, the student possibly noted other areas, not noted by his peers, where he now deemed change might be desirable. He sometimes made a change, which either improved the paper, made no significant improvement, or degraded the paper.

Method of Classifying Data

At the close of the semester the researcher collected all the papers, rough and final drafts, and peer correction sheets, and

grouped the papers by hour and by type of writing: narrative, description, analysis. The researcher recorded for each student for each type of paper all corrections given and received on a large five inch by eight inch file card. Each peer correction for each paper was recorded on a small note card.

The information on the large card included a summary of the corrections and response codes noted on the small cards. This summary provided a valuable check to ascertain the recording of all information.

This information also offered possibilities for comparing criticisms given and received for any one student. However, this information is not part of this research; therefore, the appendices include no sample and this discussion contains no further reference to this large card.

The information for peer corrections recorded on the small note cards included the student numbers for the student giving and for the student receiving the correction (see Appendix G). The correction made received a label for the type of correction, such as content, structure, paragraph structure, sentence structure, diction, or mechanical error. The researcher also coded the response according to the coding in Table 1. The researcher also recorded on the card the suggestion made by the critiquer, the passage referred to as it appeared in the rough draft, and the change, if made, in the final draft. In addition, the researcher wrote other clarifying remarks, such as "Making and trying out are not the same." (See Appendix G for samples for each coded type.)

TABLE 1.--Code of Responses.

Code	Meaning
A1a	Response accepted for improved paper
A1b	Response accepted; no significant change
A1c	Response accepted to detriment of paper
A2a	Response refused to detriment of paper
A2b	Response refused, wisely
B1	Student initiated response for improved paper
B2	Student initiated response; no significant change
B3	Student initiated response to detriment of paper
C	Teacher corrections made on final draft
D	Praise given by peer

The students themselves often made corrections acting independently without any recorded comments from their peers. These corrections were labeled B, coded according to Table 1, and put on cards with the number of the student making the change. The information on the card included the type of correction, the passage or word from the rough draft, and the change made on the final draft.

In addition, those corrections which in the researcher's judgment still needed to be made were recorded by the researcher and were labeled C. The instruction included rules for formal writing and close punctuation. Errors were so noted according to these rules. The card noted the student number, the type of correction, a sample of the word or passage, and a comment on the needed change.

Finally, the students often complimented their peers. This, too, was recorded by student number of student giving and receiving the compliment and with the comment of the student.

Next, information on the small cards was coded and recorded on computer sheets. The responses were grouped into six broad types of corrections as noted above: content, structure, paragraph structure, sentence structure, diction, and mechanics. Under these broad categories the corrections were put into an inductively developed code sheet. (See Appendix H for code sheets.)

Finally, the cards for the narrative and description papers of the fourth hour class were arbitrarily selected for a further grouping based on the nature of the response given. The responses grouped themselves into four broad categories: recommended mechanical changes, suggested stated revisions, broad declarative suggestions, and questions. The broad declarative suggestions seemed to divide further into statements about content, statements about confusion, lack of clarity or need to define terms, comments about thesis and other organizational or structural areas, comments about redundancy and repetition, suggested single word changes, comments about sentence structure, and comments about paragraph structure. (See Appendix I for samples of above.) These divisions were then coded for computer processing.

Analysis of the Data

The amount of data collected afforded monumental analysis possibilities because of the numerous variables. The problem lay

in determining the most significant to the researcher. Other possible questions were set aside for further research.

The following major questions developed:

1. What were the total number of peer suggestions made and accepted and made and refused for narrative, description, analysis?

2. Of the total number of suggestions made and accepted what percentage of these resulted in an improved paper, according to the teacher judgment, for a narrative, for a description, and for an analysis?

3. What was the total number of self-initiated changes made by the students for a narrative, for a description, for an analysis? What percentage of these changes resulted in an improved paper?

4. How many corrections remained for the teacher to identify?

5. What percentage of the total corrections were the students able to correct?

6. Do males more than females give corrections that their peers act on for the improvement of their paper?

7. Do males more than females receive corrections that their peers act on for the improvement of their paper?

8. Do males make a larger number of self-initiated changes during the revision process?

9. Do males leave a larger number of remaining possible corrections?

10. Are males or females more generous in their praise?

11. In which categories do students receive criticism and act to improve their papers more?

12. On what specific types of correction in these categories do students receive the most correction and act for improvement?

13. In what categories do students make the most self-initiated corrections that result in an improved paper?

14. On what specific types of corrections in these categories do students make the most self-initiated corrections that result in an improved paper?

15. Do those students who give the most criticisms that are acted upon for an improved paper receive the most total criticism, give or receive the most praise from their peers?

16. Do those students who receive criticism and do not choose to act upon it (A2a) on a narrative continue to receive criticism from their peers on subsequent papers?

17. Do those students who receive criticism that they accept for the improvement of their paper also make a large number of self-initiated changes?

18. Do those students who give the most criticisms also make the most successful self-initiated changes?

19. Do those students who make the fewest improvement corrections receive the most praise?

20. What other relationships may be noted by observing totals of various variables?

Data securing involved basically an observation of totals of types of corrections for each type of paper, totals of responses of students to the corrections, totals of pupil initiated change, of praise, and of teacher corrections. Percentages which may be employed on any variable were used on some. Sex differences were noted. But no statistical analysis of correlations involving any formulas were employed.

Summary

The research procedures of the study included identifying the sample as college-oriented seniors; the sample included those enrolled in the researcher's Composition and Research Skills classes during the fall of 1975-1976. The students were divided into peer

correcting groups. The researcher compiled the Check Sheets used by the students in correcting the narrative, description, and analysis papers of the peers in their critiquing group. Corrections suggested, the response, the students receiving and making the corrections, a classification of the response, self-initiated corrections, and peer praise were all noted on note cards and then transcribed to computer cards. After the critiquing, revising, and rewriting of the students and after the notations of these processes by the researcher on note cards and computer cards, the information was given to the computer and the variables were grouped and totaled. These statistics furnished the answers to certain basic questions.

Chapter IV will look closely at these analyses and at the answers received from a study of these statistics.

CHAPTER IV

REPORTING AND ANALYZING THE DATA

Introduction

Out of the chaos of the multiplicity of variables the researcher attempted to order a cosmos, not determined by divine plan, but determined by the subjective interests of one classroom teacher. Therefore, from the many possible groupings of variables, the researcher analyzed only those necessary to answer the questions considered in Chapter III.

Summary of Design and Procedure

The research involved a selected population, college-oriented seniors, who formed critiquing groups of four to five students within the classroom. The size of the groups varied according to the size of the class. For example, for a class of twenty-fix, there were four groups of four in each group and two groups with five in each group (see Appendix B). These students used a Check Sheet (see Appendix A) to comment on the narrative, description, and analysis writings of their peers. From these papers and critique sheets the researcher recorded the criticisms, the responses, the praise, the self-initiated changes, and the needed corrections remaining. This information was key-punched, programed for the computer, and analyzed.

Population and Sample

The population was limited basically to college-oriented seniors, although some of the tables recorded in this research include information received from juniors. The sample included seventy-one seniors assigned to the researcher for three different periods during the fall semester of 1975-1976. These students selected and formed within the classroom peer groups of four to five members. The size of the groups varied (see Appendix B). The consistency of the performance of each student in writing and in critiquing varied also (see Appendix C).

The Instrument

The Check Sheet developed by the researcher included questions to guide the student in the correction of his peers' papers and space for specific student criticism and praise. The student correcting retained the carbon and gave the original of the Check Sheet to the student whose paper he had corrected. Therefore, for this research each student was assigned a narrative, description, and analysis (Hours Four and Six only), a rough draft, a final draft, three Check Sheet originals received from his peers, and three carbons of the Check Sheet from the students whose papers he had corrected.

Methods of Procuring Data

The student groups were formed after several introductory, sharing activities. To acquaint the students with the use of Check Sheets, the researcher used a definition paper as a trial run for

the peer evaluation process. This paper was not a part of this research. The instructor also graded all papers after peer evaluation and student revision.

Two days of class time were set aside for peer evaluation and rewriting for each paper. Papers were turned in when peer evaluation and revision were completed. No paper was ever penalized for being late, and some papers were evaluated out of class. However, each paper was expected before the next assignment, and the students basically cooperated well.

The assignments for the writing included initial classroom instruction for the narrative, the description, and the analysis. Each student also generally organized before writing. Writing was done in class.

When each student received the corrections from his peers, he decided to accept or to reject the criticism. His acceptance possibly improved the paper, made no significant change, or acted to the detriment of the paper. His refusal to accept the criticism was wise or unwise. The student then revised the paper, making any changes he deemed necessary. (See Appendix J for a sample rough draft and final draft.)

Method of Classifying the Data

The data from the Check Sheets and from the papers were recorded on small note cards, and the student response was coded according to Table 1, Chapter III. The notations were further coded by type of correction: content, structure, paragraph structure,

sentence structure, diction, mechanics, and special problems. The responses for the narrative and description papers for Hour Four were inductively grouped into four broad categories: recommended mechanical changes, suggested stated revisions (rewriting), broad declarative suggestions, and questions (see Table 20). All this information was coded, key-punched, and analyzed according to the items listed in Table 2.

TABLE 2.--Computer Code Items.

Item No.	Identification of Item
1	Identity of student receiving criticism or praise or making self-initiated changes
2	Sex of student in item 1
3	Hour of student in item 1
4	Grade level of student in item 1
5	Paper type: narrative, description, or analysis
6	Identity of student giving the criticism or praise
7	Sex of student in item 6
8	Grade level of student in item 6
9	Response code: see Table 1
10	General category of correction: content, structure, paragraph structure, sentence structure, diction, mechanics, special problems
11	Specific correction under item 10. Example: spelling under mechanics
12	Inductively determined grouping. See Table 20.

Analysis of the Data

The program for the computer was divided into six parts. Part one examined each coded response (item 9), as coded in Table 1, with the variables of sex (item 3), type of paper (item 5), type of correction (item 10), and grade level (item 4). Part two examined each response (item 9), with the variables of sex (item 7), type of paper (item 5), type of correction (item 10), and grade level (item 8). Part three again looked at the response (item 9) with the type of correction (item 10) and the specific correction error (item 11). Part four looked at each student individually (item 1), considering response code, type of paper, type of correction, and grade level. Part five examined each student individually (item 6), considering response code, type of paper, type of correction, and grade level. Part six showed the inductive grouping of item twelve by sex, grade level, type of paper, and response code.

An Analysis of Question One

> What was the total number of peer suggestions made
> and accepted and made and refused for narrative,
> description, and analysis?

Table 3 indicates that students accept more criticism from their peers than they refuse, that they generally make changes that seem to improve the paper, and that their refusals to accept the criticism balance between the wise and the unwise. Students noted more errors per paper that were accepted for the improvement for the analysis papers than for the description or narrative papers.

TABLE 3.--Response to Evaluation.

Type of Paper	Criticisms Made and Accepted				Criticisms Made and Refused		
	A1a	A1b	A1c	Total	A2a	A2b	Total
Narrative (N=71)	334	109	21	464	183	188	371
X̄	5.03	1.54	0.30	6.54	2.58	2.65	5.23
Description (N=71)	324	109	26	423	168	148	316
X̄	4.32	1.03	.37	5.96	2.37	2.08	4.45
Analysis (N=45)	320	126	19	465	154	129	283
X̄	7.11	1.77	0.38	10.3	3.42	2.87	6.29

An Analysis of Question Two

Of the total number of suggestions made and accepted, what percentage of these resulted in an improved paper, according to teacher judgment, for a narrative, for a description, and for an analysis paper?

A study of Table 4 shows that although efficiency in finding errors and accepting the criticism may have increased from a mean of 5.96 for description to a mean of 10.3 for analysis, as shown in Table 3, the percent response for an improved paper decreased slightly from description to analysis. An examination of Table 3 shows that one reason may be the increase in (A1b), viz., those corrections which were accepted but which made no significant change in the quality of the paper. Nevertheless, the students accepted 72 percent of the criticisms for the improvement of their

papers, and description receives the highest percent, 76.6 percent. It may be that students respond no better than this to corrections which come solely from their teachers.

TABLE 4.--Percent of Corrections for Improvement.

Type of Paper	Total Criticisms Made and Accepted	Number Accepted for Improved Grade	Percent
Narrative	464	334	71.9
Description	423	324	76.6
Analysis	465	320	68.8
$\overline{X}$			72.4

An Analysis of Question Three

> What was the total number of self-initiated changes made by the students for a narrative, for a description, for an analysis? What percent of these changes resulted in an improved paper?

An observation of Table 5 shows that students who critique their own papers do revise them, and that about 60 percent of these changes are, according to teacher judgment, to the improvement of their papers. The researcher notes, in addition, that peer evaluation provides the structure that demands revision. This enforces Buxton's conclusion in his research, as recorded by Braddock, that revision is one component, along with careful marking and criticizing, that improves writing.[143]

---

[143] Braddock, Research in Written Composition, pp. 69-70.

TABLE 5.--Self-Initiated Changes.

Type of Paper	B1	B2	B3	Total Self-Initiated Changes	Percent of Self-Initiated Changes for an Improved Paper	
					$\frac{B1}{Total}$	$\frac{B1 + B2}{Total}$
Narrative (N=71)	177	84	38	299	59.2	87.3
$\overline{X}$	2.49	1.18	0.54	4.21		
Description (N=71)	88	27	21	136	64.7	84.6
$\overline{X}$	1.24	.38	.30	1.92		
Analysis (N=45)	85	46	22	153	55.6	85.6
$\overline{X}$	1.89	1.02	.49	3.4		
$\overline{X}$					59.8	85.8

An Analysis of Question Four

How many errors remained for teacher correction?

Although the total of the errors remaining seems large, the mean places the total in perspective, as Table 6 shows. Teachers usually rejoice at only approximately five errors per paper. The larger number of errors may have remained on the analysis papers because of the increased difficulty and increased length of this assignment. Similarly, the description may have had the fewest remaining errors because of its general brevity.

TABLE 6.--Corrections Needed After Evaluation and Revision.

Type of Paper	Number of Corrections Needed After Revision	$\bar{X}$
Narrative (N=71)	388	5.46
Description (N=71)	277	3.90
Analysis (N=45)	279	6.20

An Analysis of Question Five

What percent of the total errors were the students able to correct?

Table 7 supports the results of the experiment conducted by Lyman and also recorded in Gage, Handbook of Research on Teaching.[144] Students can find and correct about three-fifths of their own errors. One may also question whether students would correct and revise without some structure, such as peer evaluation.

TABLE 7.--Percentage of Errors Student Corrected.

Type of Paper	A1a	B1	A1a+B1	C	Total Corrections Needed A1a+B1+C	Percent of Corrections Made by Students $\frac{A1a+B1}{A1a+B1+C}$
Narrative (N=71)	334	177	511	388	899	56.8
Description (N=71)	324	88	412	277	689	59.8
Analysis (N=45)	320	85	405	279	684	59.21

---

[144]N. L. Gage, ed., Handbook of Research on Teaching (Chigo: Rand McNally and Company, 1963), p. 986.

An Analysis of Questions Six
and Seven

Do males more than females <u>receive</u> corrections and act for the improvement of their papers?

Do males more than females <u>give</u> corrections that their peers act on for the improvement of their papers?

Although an observation of the totals in Tables 8 and 9 may seem to indicate that females receive and give more corrections than males, tests of statistical difference failed to support this. A t-test was performed, and the mean difference was found to be not significant at the .05 level for both corrections received and given.

TABLE 8.--Male/Female Corrections Received for Improvement.

Sex	Total Corrections Accepted for Improvement	Mean $\overline{X}$
Male (N = 35)	446	14.86
Female (N = 30)	532	15.2

TABLE 9.--Male/Female Corrections Given for Improvement.

Sex	Total Corrections Given That Were Accepted for Improvement	Mean $\overline{X}$
Male (N = 38)	506	13.32
Female (N = 33)	442	13.39

An Analysis of Question Eight

Do males make a larger number of self-initiated changes during the revision process?

Again, although an observation of the means as shown in Table 10 seemed to indicate that females made a larger number of self-initiated changes during the revision process, a statistical analysis was made. A t-test was performed, and the mean difference was found to be not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 10.--Male/Female Self-Initiated Changes.

Sex	Self-Initiated Changes for Improvement	Self-Initiated Changes: No Significant Improvement	Self-Initiated Changes: To Detriment of Paper	Total
Male (N=35)	177	79	43	299
$\overline{X}$	5.06	2.26	1.23	8.54
Female (N=30)	173	78	38	289
$\overline{X}$	5.77	2.6	1.27	9.6

An Analysis of Question Nine

Do males leave a larger number of errors for teacher observation?

Here, too, a t-test was run, and the difference between the male and female means shown in Table 11 was statistically significant at the .01 level. The females left fewer errors for teacher correction.

TABLE 11.--Needed Corrections Remaining.

Sex	Total Corrections Needed After Rewriting (C)	Mean
Male (N = 35)	565	16.14
Female (N = 30)	383	12.77

A study of Tables 8, 10, and 11 tends to reinforce Sager's research in which she concluded that in the sixth grade girls improved in composition more than their male peers. Although this research makes no effort to determine improvement of writing, females accept the corrections of their peers for the improvement of their papers and revise the papers on their own; and, thereby, the difference between the male and female corrections remaining for teacher correction is statistically significant. It appears that females leave a paper with fewer errors, or more improved, than their male peers.

An Analysis of Question Ten

Are males or females more generous in their praise?

TABLE 12.--Praise Given by Male/Female.

Sex	Total Commendations Given	Mean
Male (N = 38)	229	6.03
Female (N = 33)	250	7.56

A t-test was performed on the data in Table 12, and the mean difference was found to be not significant at the .05 level.

An Analysis of Questions Eleven and Twelve

> In which categories do students receive criticism and act to improve their papers more?

> On what specific types of corrections in these categories do students receive the most corrections and act for improvement?

Table 13 shows that students made suggestions that their peers acted upon for an improved paper most often in the general category of diction. Within this broad category they most often noted and received a correction response with regard to the need for more precise wording. The researcher questions whether this same pattern would occur in other samples. Or does teacher emphasis influence here?

In the category of mechanics, 70 divisions were listed (see Appendix H, Code Sheet 6). For example, spelling was narrowly classified into eight separate categories. The one category, spelling-incorrect, with a total of 89 errors noted and corrected outranked all other errors. However, all spelling errors, noted and corrected, combined, totaled 105. Note, too, that all comma errors, noted and corrected, combined, totaled 35.

The special problems category include diverse communications such as student 65's comment to student 80 about the condition of her pretty legs or student 26's promise to explain orally a correction. Another special problem was the conflicting criticism of two peers on the paper of a third member of their group.

TABLE 13.--Peer Corrections for Improvement by Category.

Category	Total Corrections for Improvement	Percent	Three Types in Category Most Often Noted	Number of Each Type
Content	141	13.68	More facts needed to support content	62
			Unnecessary content	32
			Needs correct content	19
Structure of paper	59	5.72	Conclusion needed	13
			Point of view; instruct to use third person	12
			Point of view used cannot know this	10
Paragraph structure	104	10.08	Topic sentence; vague, imprecise	17
			Shifts verb tense	16
			Ideas fail to follow logically	9
Sentence structure	196	19.01	Awkward	19
			Run-on sentence	19
			Content unclear	16
			Fragment	16
Diction	305	29.59	Poor word choice; imprecise	30
			Poor word choice; wrong image	30
			Excess words	25
Mechanics	223	21.63	Spelling incorrect	89
			(Total spelling errors)	105
			(Total comma errors)	35
			Pronoun--no antecedent	8
			(Total errors, pronouns)	19
			Subject-verb agreement	11
Special problems	3	.29	Conflict of suggestions between peers	1
Total	1,031			

An Analysis of Questions Thirteen and Fourteen

In what categories do students make the most self-initiated corrections that result in an improved paper?

On what specific types of corrections in these categories do students make the most self-initiated corrections that result in an improved paper?

Not only do the students receive comments and respond for the improvement of their papers in the general category of diction, but they also make the most self-initiated corrections for the improvement of their papers in this category, as shown in Table 14. However, the category that receives the second largest number of self-initiated changes for improvement is content, with the specific category most often revised being the adding of supporting details.

The special problem here was a completely rewritten second rough draft and a final draft based on the second rough draft. However, all student check sheets responded to the initial rough draft.

An Analysis of Question Fifteen

Do those students who give the most criticisms that are acted upon for an improved paper receive the most criticisms? Do those students who give the most criticisms that are acted upon for an improved paper give or receive the most praise?

A tenuous observation appears from an examination of Table 15. Those students who give the most criticisms that are acted upon for an improved paper tend to receive the most criticisms. No relationship appears to exist between the other variables. A comparison of Table 15 with Appendix B shows that students 40, 45, and 56 are members of the same peer group during fourth hour and that students

TABLE 14.--Self-Initiated Changes for Improvement by Category.

Category	Total Self-Initiated Changes for Improvement	Percent	Three Types in Category Most Often Noted	Number of Each Type
Content	88	25.14	More facts needed to support content	59
			Unnecessary content	16
			Needs correct content	6
Structure of paper	15	4.29	Needs to be organized chronologically	2
			Needs to be organized logically	2
			Conclusion needed	2
			Conclusion too abrupt	2
Paragraph structure	21	6.0	Lacks topic sentence	4
			Two ideas in one paragraph	3
			Needs transitions within paragraph	3
			Shifts verb tense	3
Sentence structure	73	20.86	Wordy	10
			Sentences choppy; combining needed	10
			Sentence order	10
Diction	115	32.86	Poor word choice; imprecise	42
			Lack of precise verb	22
			Excess words	8
Mechanics	37	10.57	Spelling--incorrect	15
			Use words for signs ($, ¢)	4
			Comma fault	2
			Comma for emphasis	2
Special problems	1	0.29	Paper completely rewritten for rough and final draft	1
Total	350			

58, 65, and 80 are members of the same peer group during sixth hour. Therefore, one may observe that those students cooperated closely in peer evaluation.

TABLE 15.--A Comparison of Criticism and Praise.

Gave Criticisms Acted Upon for Improvement		Total Criticisms Received		Praise Received		Praise Given	
Stu-dent No.	Mean of Criticism Given for Improvement	Stu-dent No.	Mean of Criti-cisms Rec'd	Stu-dent No.	Mean of Praise Rec'd	Stu-dent No.	Mean of Praise Given
1	11	12	21	8	7	8	6.5
14	11	22	15	9	7	9	55.5
26	10.5	24	17	13	4	10	5.5
40	9.6	28	24.3	19	7.5	12	5
44	11.3	33	22	34	4.6	19	9.5
46	15.6	36	21	49	8	36	4.6
56	13.6	40	25	50	12	43	4
58	18.3	42	30.6	58	12	49	6.6
65	13.6	46	22.6	70	4.6	52	5
74	9	56	20			54	4
79	9	58	25.3			59	4
80	10.6	77	25.6			65	4.3
		80	31.6			80	4.3

An Analysis of Question Sixteen

> Do those students who receive criticism and do not
> choose to act upon it (A2a) on a narrative continue
> to receive criticism from their peers on subsequent
> papers?

The researcher asked this question to ascertain if a student
who refused to accept the criticism of his peers was snubbed by them
on the following papers. The figures in Table 16 seem to show con-
tinued peer support and criticism, although the criticism on the
first paper was generally ignored.

TABLE 16.--Results of Ignoring Peer Criticism.

Student No.	Number of Criticisms Received and Ignored on Narrative	Total Criticisms Received on Description	Total Criticisms Received on Analysis	Comment
3	7	4		Analysis not checked for
17	7	8		Hour One
29	16	5	4	
36	7	29 (1A1a)	29 (16 A1a)	A1a = criticism accepted for improved paper
38	7	20	25	
41	8	14	14	
53	14	19	--	No critique of analysis
58	8	25	22	
78	8	13	8	No criticism unwisely ignored on analysis

A subjective examination of several students offered some interesting observations. For example, student 36 waited until the analysis paper and then used peer suggestions extensively for the improvement of the paper. Student 78 followed the same pattern, but student 41 continued to ignore peer suggestions. However, in most cases, students patiently continued to correct their peers.

An Analysis of Questions Seventeen and Eighteen

Do those students who received criticism that they accepted for the improvement of their paper also make a large number of self-initiated changes?

Do those students who give the most criticism also make the most successful self-initiated changes?

An observation of Table 17 shows that out of the 28 students listed who have the highest mean in one of the three categories to be observed that only one student ranks in the top ten in all three categories and only six students rank in the top ten in two categories. Of these six students who rank in the top ten in two categories, four of them are in the top ten in criticisms received for an improved paper and in total criticisms given. Two students, numbers 13 and 74, are in the top ten in criticisms given and self-initiated changes. Therefore, no significant discernible pattern appears in ability of this sample to give criticisms to their peers, to act on their peers' evaluation for improvement, or to make self-initiated changes.

TABLE 17.--Observations of Ala* Received, All Criticisms Given, and Bl**.

Student Number	X̄ of Ala Received	X̄ of Total of All Criticisms Given	X̄ of Bl
1	7	15.5	2.5
5	5	11	4.0 +
12	11 +	5	2
13	5.5	19	4.0 +
14	5	16	3
18	6	7	4.0 +
24	9	3.5	1
28	12.6 +	14.6	2.3
30	8.3	6.6	2.6
33	9.3	18.3	4.3 +
34	8.3	13.6	1.3
37	1.6	10.3	4.0 +
40	13.6 +	19.0 +	3.6 +
42	11.3 +	15.0	.3
43	6	22.6 +	3.0
44	8	30.3 +	.3
46	10.3	34	2.0
54	4.0	7	6.0 +
55	3.0	15	8.3 +
56	9.6 +	24.3 +	1.3
58	10.6 +	32.3 +	2.3
65	8	31.3 +	2.0
72	8	13	3.3
74	8	19 +	3.6 +
75	8.3	16	6.0 +
77	10.6 +	12	2.3
79	11.3 +	17	3.3
80	19.6 +	22.6+	0.0

*Ala = Criticisms given and accepted for an improved paper.
** Bl = Self-initiated changes for an improved paper.
 + - Those in top ten in each category are marked by a +.

82

An Analysis of Question Nineteen

Do those students who make the fewest improvement corrections receive the most praise?

In Table 18 of the six students in Hour One who made the lowest responses to peer corrections for improvement, three received above the mean of praise. Their mean for praise was the highest in Hour One while their correction response to the criticism was the lowest. However, no conclusions can be reached from these observations because of the number of possible reasons for this occurrence.

TABLE 18.--Observations for Criticisms for an Improved Paper and Praise.

Student Number	X̄ of Criticisms Acted on for an Improved Paper	X̄ of Praise Received
3	2	2
8	2	7
9	0.5	7
11	0.5	3
19	2	7.5
27	0.5	0.5
37	2.5	2.3
49	4	8
52	2.5	2
61	0.5	3.6
71	3	3
76	1	3
78	2.3	1.6

Average of the Mean for Hour 1 = 3.5,
for Hour 4 = 3.8,
for Hour 6 = 3.8.

In Hour Six the student with the lowest mean number of corrections acted upon for an improved paper received slightly less than the mean for praise given. The student who received the highest amount of praise in Hours Four and Six had only a mean of four corrections acted upon for an improved paper while Table 17 reveals that the highest mean was 19.6. Again, no conclusions are possible.

The researcher proposed this question because she hypothesized that the weaker students received extensive encouragement and praise from their peers. However, few corrections acted upon for an improved paper may occur because of the paucity of corrections needed. Therefore, the hypothesis seems to have no basis, and no conclusions are possible.

Analysis of Inductive List of Corrections

The researcher selected the cards giving criticisms in Hour Four for narrative and description papers and observed the types of comments made. These comments seemed to group themselves, as shown in Table 19, into four broad categories: suggested stated revisions (rewriting for peer); questions; mechanical corrections; and broad declarative suggestions. The last two categories were further grouped into specific areas (see Table 20). Appendix I gives samples for each of these categories.

An examination of Table 19 presents some interesting observations. Males tended to offer their suggestions by asking questions while females tended to revise for their peers. One notes

TABLE 19.--Inductive Analysis of Corrections by Sex, Response, and
Paper.

Category of Correction	Sex		Response			Paper	
	M	F	Accept	Refuse Wisely	Refuse Unwisely	Nar.	Des.
Mechanical corrections	95	48	82	40	21	60	83
Broad declarative suggestions	280	175	248	103	114	228	227
Stated revisions (rewriting)	11	29	23	7	10	25	15
Asks questions	38	11	28	12	9	25	24

also that only the mechanical corrections increased from the narrative to the description paper.

An examination of Table 20 shows that some types of corrections were more often refused than accepted for an improved paper. These include under mechanical corrections "grammar (3)" and "point of view," and under broad declarative suggestions "sentence structure," "paragraph structure," "thesis structure for entire paper," and "content." Suggested revisions (rewriting) are also more often refused than they are accepted for an improved paper. This tendency to refuse more corrections than are accepted contradicts the general trend (students tend to accept more criticisms than they reject) noted in Analysis of Question One.

TABLE 20.--Specific Inductive Analysis of Corrections by Sex, Response and Paper.

Specific Category, Computer Coded	Sex		Response			Paper	
	M	F	Accept/ Improve.	Refused Wisely	Refused Unwisely	Nar.	Des.
1 Verb tense	14	2	11	3	2	11	5
2 Spelling	35	15	26	18	3	21	29
3 Punc., cap., grammar	29	17	19	10	11	18	28
4 Change words	39	34	35	16	15	26	47
5 Sentence structure	48	31	21	19	24	44	35
6 Paragraph structure	32	17	19	10	13	31	18
7 Transi- tions	2	4	4	2	0	5	1
8 Point of view	15	10	10	7	5	5	20
9 Thesis structure	23	21	10	14	12	24	20
10 Content	41	12	11	17	18	26	27
11 Confusing, unclear	36	29	33	8	19	33	32
12 Not needed, redundant	61	31	49	19	13	44	48
13 Suggests revision	11	29	12	7	10	25	15
14 Asks questions	38	11	23	12	9	25	24

Mechanical corrections: 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8.
Broad declarative suggestions: 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, and 12.

The increase in total number of corrections noted in point of view from the narrative to the description paper perhaps occurred because the assignment for the description required the writers to remove themselves from the thing described, i.e., to avoid first person. This task proved difficult.

A Subjective Analysis of the Academic and Social Learning

Although few definitive observations were made, the researcher continues to believe that peer evaluation enabled the students to grow academically. In addition, groups that began as critiquing groups to fulfill a classroom assignment continued beyond the classroom in some cases, and the learning atmosphere appeared warmer and more relaxed. However, no opinion survey was made of the classes asking for their reactions to peer evaluation.

An academic survey of this class list shows some of the students enrolling out-of-state at Ball State, Williams College, Intermont College in Virginia, Oberlin, Syracuse, Iowa State University, University of Indiana, and University of Arizona. All of these out-of-state alumni have "checked in" with the researcher sometime in the intervening year and have reported success (B or above) in their English classes. (The researcher recognizes, of course, that these students were high achievers and highly motivated before contacting peer evaluation.) Within the state, Michigan State University received eight, and the University of Michigan received at least five. Four attended Kalamazoo College. Most of the

others went to Western Michigan University and other smaller colleges within the state.

The students during the semester had often engaged in heated defense of the content of their papers. Thus, instead of discussion moving back and forth in one direction--teacher to pupil to teacher--the interaction was widespread and, presumably, so were the learning experiences. This interpersonal contact continued; when the students returned for a visit to the researcher, often they came with those who had been in their peer evaluation group, or they asked about them.

Summary

The observation of the impact on student writing of peer evaluation supported two earlier researchers by showing that students can correct as much as three-fifths of their own errors and by showing that girls, because they leave fewer needed corrections on their papers, tend to improve their papers more than males.

The answers to the questions asked in Chapter III yielded some new observations. These are discussed in the Summary in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS,

AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study proposed to explore the impacts on student writing of peer evaluation. Demands of popular magazines, educational journals, and citizens at large on the schools to improve writing represent currents of pressure which encouraged this research. Some of the literature indicated that increased writing experience improved achievement. Requiring more writing, however, generates the need for relief for the teacher from the burden of additional paper marking duties arising from increased writing assignments. Furthermore, the researcher sought to meet a need for shared peer learning and to create a superior classroom climate, and some of the literature had indicated that students also need a wider audience for their writing. A study of the impact of peer evaluation on student writing appeared to offer some new directions for advancing practices on these concerns.

The literature pointed to peer evaluation as a way for improving writing and for relieving teachers of some grading chores by allowing students to discover their own errors. Other literature supported participatory learning, and many teachers had shared their feelings of success with various modes of peer evaluation.

Conclusions

The research tends to support the following generalizations:

1. Students accept more criticism than they refuse, and their refusals generally balance between wise and unwise.

2. Of all the criticisms accepted and acted upon, 72 percent result in an improved paper. The highest rate of acceptance of suggestions for improvement was observed for descriptive writing-- 76 percent.

3. After peer evaluation and during revision, the students also make self-initiated revisions. About 60 percent of these revisions result in improvement of the paper.

4. An average of approximately five errors remain per paper for teacher correction after peer evaluation and student revision.

5. The students, through peer-evaluation or self-initiated revision, are able to note and to correct about 60 percent of their errors.

6. Females generally give more criticisms, respond more favorably to criticism, and examine their own papers with greater care, leaving fewer errors.

7. Students seem to note changes needed in diction more than in any other category in the papers of their peers and on their own papers and to accept these criticisms more and to make more changes for the improvement of their papers with respect to diction.

8. Those individual students who give the most criticism acted upon for an improved paper tend slightly to receive the most criticism.

9. Although a peer may initially refuse to accept correction, his peers nevertheless continue to correct his papers as carefully as they do the papers of students who accept their suggestions.

10. An observation of an inductively grouped list of corrections showed that males tended to correct by asking questions while females tended to rewrite for their peers. Students tended to refuse more than to accept broad suggestions about thesis structure and content, although, as noted in Observation One, students tend to accept more suggestions than they refuse.

11. No definitive generalizations, however, are yet possible from these data on individual impact of peer evaluation. There remain a multiplicity of possible variables as yet uncontrolled which may be operating. Nevertheless, the above generalizations do appear to represent an advance in level of specificity regarding description of the processes of interaction involved.

A student using peer evaluation begins his writing assignment with an awareness of a wider audience. Therefore, the composing process considers not only the teacher reaction but also the peer response to his content. These broader communication demands tend to expand and to increase the writing skills of the student.

However, simultaneously with the demands incurred from the expanded audience comes the assurance that this writing is the rough draft; his peers are a source of assistance for improvement. He knows the possible strengths of his peers and can somewhat rest upon their ability to shore up his weaknesses.

The critiquing process affords to each student more than an exercise in correcting, however. Peer evaluation opens to the student a slice of another's life. He learns the views, feelings, and values of his peers. In addition, he readily and often sees his writing in comparison to his peers' writing. He thus strengthens his overall evaluation skills and grows in self-evaluation. Too, he has the opportunity to further his development, his knowledge, and his personal relationships.

Peer evaluation is a vehicle moving the writer toward increased communication skills. As the student notes the differing styles of his peers, he questions them. Conversation ensues. Too, using the peer group in pre-writing exercises or in grammar practice further enhances these communication skills.

The habit of peer evaluation is a worthy one to consider carrying throughout further education and in most communication experiences. Testing ideas and modes of expressions on peers before facing the supreme "trial by fire" of that important paper or speech is generally a wise practice.

Through peer evaluation a student learns that others express their ideas differently, and he tends to accept their suggested changes. After his peers' evaluations the student then revises on his own, and this, too, generally improves the paper. Why this procedure tends to show these results is not known. But an observation of peer evaluation groups at work shows students busily reading, recording, revising, and rewriting. They appear to work purposefully. They seem to take pride in their work, and their

determination to save their papers for future use seems to acknowledge this pride. Further evidences of their personal satisfaction and of their delight in continued accomplishment are evidenced by their return to report their successes.

Implications of This Research

Since this research employs exploratory observation only, any statement of implication must be taken as tenatative. Nevertheless, the following comments appear worthy of consideration.

First, the composing process, the peer evaluation, and personal revision of the composition can occur productively in large groups with little teacher supervision. Dora Smith originally reported on this fact in 1931.[145] If one adds to these processes audio-visual material for instruction and assignment, the use of lay readers, and clerical help, one teacher can effectively instruct a large group in composition. If peer evaluation includes peer grading, the lay readers may not be necessary.

However, using the large group process tends to remove the teacher from participation in shared learning and from the student's affective experience. One might question the value of so doing. The teacher has a significant contribution to make to the dialogue which is necessary before beginning writing.

Second, peer evaluation used with flexibility offers many varieties for meeting individual student needs and particular

---

[145]Dora Smith, Class Size in High School English (Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1931), p. 82.

teacher capabilities. A teacher may simply use peer evaluation as a sharing or discussion device for reviewing papers, or a teacher may use a model similar to the one in this research. Adding the evaluation of the correction instrument is another possibility. Or, as some literature recommends, the students may complete evaluations and grade their peers' papers. The writing of group papers is an additional way for making use of peer evaluation.

This study shows that peer evaluation can succeed with college-oriented high school students. One implication may be that other students at other ability levels and at other grade levels may possibly use it fruitfully, too. Some research has been done in this area which indicates promise in wider uses of peer evaluation procedures.

The final two implications to be cited here are wholly subjective in nature. First, students appear to wish to participate actively in the learning process. They enjoy evaluation, they grow through using it, and they benefit from aiding one another. Second, learning is not easily divided into closed compartments. The students wrote about many issues--social, economic, and even chemical issues. The spoke intently to each other. Their perceptual fields expanded, touched, and overlapped. Yet the class was in the English Department and was labeled Composition and Research Skills I.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. More research is needed to determine still further the effectiveness of peer evaluation methods, coupled with a composition model including individualized instruction, lay readers, and clerical help, in teaching composition to large groups. Any evaluation of such a process needs to include an examination of the affective growth in such a classroom situation. Dora Smith's study, for example, needs updating.

2. The use of peer evaluation methods at several levels of ability and several grade levels needs to be researched. Some of this has been done but more definitive work is needed.

3. Development of other instruments or check sheets is probably needed to meet the abilities of learners at different levels. Terms like transition, subordinate, or cliché possibly need rewording for these learners.

4. If peer evaluation is used at various grade levels, investigation of a developmental program of peer evaluation from grade nine/ten through twelve is also a possible need.

5. Are two levels of instruments perhaps more effective than one? Would the students perhaps polish their critiquing skills by first using an instrument to evaluate content and organization thoroughly and then using a second instrument to evaluate paragraph structure, sentence structure, diction, and mechanics? Research is needed here.

6. Further research is needed in the use of peer evaluation for grading. Can students develop their own criteria and reliably and validly grade their peers?

7. Many varieties of peer evaluation have been used, such as conference and group writing. Controlled studies are needed to investigate the relative effectiveness of different methods.

8. Some students responded with excitement and zeal to the peer evaluation process. Can research show the causes why peer evaluation succeeds with some and not with others?

9. Research is needed to determine the types of classroom instruction needed to increase the ability of the students to correct their peers.

10. The personalities of the group are crucial in peer evaluation. Therefore, research is needed into more effective peer grouping.

Writing and research on peer evaluation have been quite extensive for several years; yet so far the studies--including this one--have barely "touched the hem of the garment."

Reflections

A researcher often raises more questions than he answers. Many avenues for consideration, too, were only glimpsed by the researcher in this study, but various satisfactions were also gained.

The study of literature gave practical variations of peer evaluation and composition instruction methods. But, more

significantly, reading literature allowed the researcher to touch
hands with those who have committed, with integrity, their time and
their being to that sometimes mystical experience, teaching composi-
tion. Hopefully, this research provides similar satisfaction to the
reader.

The collection process afforded a sense of accomplishment
to the researcher, because the students evidenced enthusiasm and
pleasure growing with each peer evaluation experience. They enjoyed
both the mechanics of the process and the exchange of the content.
Spending the classtime in peer evaluation freed the teacher for
individual contacts. And, the papers, after peer evaluation and
student revision, were easier to read.

The completion of this research also opens new challenging
areas. Since peer evaluation is effective, how may one best share
the procedure with others who may teach similar college-oriented
students or who may teach students of differing abilities? In a
peer evaluation inservice, the teachers need to examine first the
motivational level of the students, and the students need the moti-
vation to write before they need the motivation to evaluate. Once
this concept is hurdled, the teachers are ready to continue
inservice in peer evaluation.

Although asking teachers in an inservice program to write a
paragraph or a brief essay offers certain trepidations, such a pro-
cedure is more desirable. A second possibility is dividing the
teachers into groups of four each, furnishing each "peer evaluation"
group with four sample student compositions, and then asking the

teacher members of each group to go through the critiquing process. This, then, generates the same desired shared communication experiences of the students. Samples shared further by use of an overhead projector continue the sharing process. The challenge of exploring this inservice area is a future possibility.

The researcher in a peer evaluation is offered the challenges of refining the process, of adapting the procedure to different grade and ability levels, and of sharing the procedure with others. Its use provides students with a variety of participatory learning experiences. Peer evaluation provides warm personal interaction through helping peers and through sharing ideas. And the process offers to the teacher not only academic gains but also the satisfaction of observing these participatory learning experiences.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CHECK SHEET

APPENDIX A

CHECK SHEET

Your name ....

Date..

Paper written by ....

Paper written on (date) ....

Note the good first; then comment on suggested improvements and corrections. Be specific. Refer to line number or paragraph number in the paper.

CONTENT: What is the purpose/direction of this paper? Is subject discussed intelligently and logically? Generalizations supported? Terms defined? Sensitive to audience? Other? Make specific suggestions and give your personal reactions to content.

STRUCTURE: Organized effectively? Ideas presented in logical order? Are lesser ideas subordinate? Are transitions effectively used? Others? Note needed changes.

PARAGRAPH: What is the topic sentence? Is paragraph developed with logic, conciseness, and unity? Is there a variety of paragraph structure? Note needs for correction, if any.

SENTENCE: Which sentences seem well constructed. Note need, if any, for variety of sentence patterns and for changes in sentence construction.

DICTION: Note words particularly appropriate for audience and topic. Note changes that may be needed for appropriateness. Note, if any, clichés used.

MECHANICS: Note errors, if any, in spelling, capitalization, and punctuation.

100

APPENDIX B

PEER CORRECTION GROUPS

APPENDIX B

PEER CORRECTION GROUPS

<u>Hour One</u>

Group A

    Student #3 - Male

        #6 - Male

        #16 - Female

        #22 - Female

Group B

    Student #19 - Female

        #5 - Male

        #7 - Male

        #8 - Female

        #9 - Male

Group C

    Student #10 - Female

        #13 - Female

        #12 - Female

        #2 - Female

        #14 - Female

Group D

    Student #4 - Male

        #11 - Male

        #15 - Male

        #21 - Male

Group E

    Student #25 - Female

        #26 - Female

        #24 - Female

        #1 - Female

Group F

    Student #27 - Female

        #17 - Male

        #18 - Male

        #20 - Male

Hour Four

Group A

    Student #29 - Male

           #54 - Female

           #55 - Female

           #47 - Male (Junior)

Group B

    Student #35 - Female

           #42 - Female

           #43 - Female

           #51 - Female (Junior)

Group C

    Student #46 - Male

           #28 - Male

           #40 - Male

           #56 - Male

Group D

    Student #30 - Male

           #32 - Male

           #31 - Male (Junior)

           #48 - Male

Group E

    Student #33 - Male

           #34 - Female

           #36 - Female

           #44 - Male

Group F

    Student #53 - Male

           #41 - Male

           #50 - Male

           #52 - Female

Group G

    Student #49 - Female

           #37 - Female

           #38 - Male

           #39 - Male

Hour Six

Group A

    Student #70 - Female

          #59 - Male

          #61 - Male

          #63 - Female (Junior)

          #76 - Female

Group B

    Student #78 - Male

          #68 - Male

          #69 - Male

          #71 - Male

Group C

    Student #79 - Female

          #75 - Female

          #77 - Male

          #66 - Female

Group D

    Student #57 - Male

          #60 - Female

          #72 - Female

          #74 - Male

Group E

    Student #58 - Male

          #67 - Female (Junior)

          #80 - Female

          #65 - Male

APPENDIX C

CRITICISMS AND PRAISE RECEIVED AND

SELF-INITIATED CHANGES MADE FOR

AN IMPROVED PAPER

APPENDIX C.--Criticisms and Praise Received and Self-Initiated Changes Made for an Improved Paper.*

Student No.	A1a N	A1a D	A1a A**	A1b N	A1b D	A1b A	A1c N	A1c D	A1c A	A2a N	A2a D	A2a A	A2b N	A2b D	A2b A	Total	B1	D
1	5	9		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	19	5	5
2	3	5		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	14	1	11
3	1	3		1	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	13	7	4
5	9	1		4	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	18	8	9
6	0	8		0	1	0	2	1	0	4	0	0	2	5	0	23	0	5
7	6	0		4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	14	4	5
8	4	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	11	2	14
9	1	0		3	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	6	1	0	17	1	14
10	5	0		1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	10	5	5
11	0	1		2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	1	0	10	2	6
12	13	9		7	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	42	4	2
13	5	6		1	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	4	0	22	8	12
14	5	5		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	5	0	20	6	11
17	5	6		2	0	0	0	1	0	7	1	0	0	1	0	23	1	8
18	12	0		3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	19	8	0
19	0	4		1	1	1	0	0	0	5	2	0	6	1	0	20	5	15
20	5	2		1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	13	5	10
21	7	1		1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	14	2	2

APPENDIX C.--Continued.

Student No.	A1a N	A1a D	A1a A**	A1b N	A1b D	A1b A	A1c N	A1c D	A1c A	A2a N	A2a D	A2a A	A2b N	A2b D	A2b A	Total	B1	D
22	3	9		0	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	5	3	0	30	0	8
24	7	11		2	4	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	5	0	0	34	2	3
25	0	9		0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	13	0	4
26	8	8		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	19	9	7
27	0	1		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	1
28	9	12	17	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	3	7	10	73	7	6
29	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	2	3	1	2	1	26	0	5
30	4	10	11	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	8	5	2	4	52	8	5
33	12	11	5	4	0	8	0	1	2	2	2	9	3	3	4	66	13	11
34	5	7	13	1	6	1	0	1	2	1	2	0	4	5	2	50	4	14
35	7	2	6	1	5	1	1	2	0	1	5	5	6	1	4	47	2	7
36	1	1	16	1	0	9	4	0	0	7	15	1	1	4	3	63	2	9
37	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	10	12	7
38	0	8	5	0	4	9	0	0	1	7	5	8	0	3	2	52	1	7
39	5	5	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	5	4	3	2	36	6	10
40	10	12	19	6	2	5	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	9	75	11	6
41	2	5	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	7	9	2	1	1	41	8	6
42	8	14	12	7	3	14	1	2	1	2	2	14	7	3	2	92	1	7
43	4	7	7	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	5	30	9	11

APPENDIX C.--Continued.

Student No.	A1a N	A1a D	A1a A	A1b N	A1b D	A1b A	A1c N	A1c D	A1c A	A2a N	A2a D	A2a A	A2b N	A2b D	A2b A	Total	B1	D
44	15	9	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	3	6	0	0	2	0	39	1	4
46	7	9	15	0	1	11	0	0	2	3	2	8	5	1	4	68	6	9
48	3	4	5	1	2	1	0	0	0	4	2	3	4	2	9	40	5	7
49	4	5	3	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	7	6	36	8	24
50	3	6	5	0	1	2	0	0	3	2	8	2	3	4	2	41	5	12
52	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	1	0	5	19	1	4
53	1	6	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	14	3	0	5	7	0	39	2	2
54	9	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	2	4	1	26	18	6
55	3	4	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	1	7	0	2	1	0	25	25	9
56	8	9	12	1	2	7	2	0	2	4	0	3	2	4	4	60	4	11
57	9	0	0	3	0	0	4	0	0	5	0	0	2	0	0	23	1	1
58	9	13	10	5	2	4	0	1	0	8	4	4	7	5	4	76	7	12
59	0	0	8	2	2	9	0	1	0	1	4	2	2	3	0	34	7	7
60	3	0	8	1	3	0	2	0	0	6	9	1	4	2	1	40	2	8
61	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	7	1	7	29	0	11
65	15	0	9	3	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	5	0	3	46	6	11
68	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	9	5	3
69	2	0	8	4	0	3	0	0	2	6	4	2	4	5	0	49	7	8
70	4	0	6	0	2	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	2	0	23	4	14

APPENDIX C.--Continued.

Student No.	A1a N	A1a D	A1a A	A1b N	A1b D	A1b A	A1c N	A1c D	A1c A	A2a N	A2a D	A2a A	A2b N	A2b D	A2b A	Total	B1	D
71	2	0	4	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	11	16	7	2	4	52	4	9
72	8	5	11	4	0	1	1	0	2	1	3	0	5	1	2	44	10	3
74	9	7	9	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	3	43	11	5
75	6	0	12	2	0	9	0	0	0	3	0	0	6	4	2	44	18	6
76	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	7	4	0	0	2	18	0	6
77	7	14	11	4	5	3	0	3	0	3	7	2	2	4	6	71	7	3
78	0	3	4	3	0	1	0	1	0	8	7	0	3	2	3	35	7	5
79	9	6	19	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	3	1	1	10	58	10	5
80	19	10	29	3	0	4	0	0	1	4	2	7	6	8	2	95	0	6

*See Table 1 for correction code.

**The analysis paper for Hour 1 was not coded.

N = Narrative

D = Description

A = Analysis

APPENDIX D

COMPOSITION CHECK LIST FOR

. . . . .. HIGH SCHOOL

APPENDIX D

COMPOSITION CHECKLIST FOR . . . . . HIGH SCHOOL

        The numbers placed on your written compositions will indicate that you have made the errors mentioned in the corresponding questions below. It is suggested that you go over these questions prior to completing thefinal copy of your paper. These numbers will be used throughout the school.

1. Does your paper have a title? Should it have one?

2. Have you introduced your topic adequately?

3. Is each paragraph of your paper unified? Does each state and develop one central idea?

4. Are your ideas arranged in a logical way?

5. Do you have transition
    (a) between paragraphs?
    (b) within paragraphs?

6. Is your paper complete? Have you included all necessary references, sources of data, tables, etc.?

7. Have you worded each sentence so that your reader cannot possibly misunderstand your meaning?

8. Have you carelessly run two sentences together?

9. Have you any sentence fragments?

10. Have you varied the sentence structure, length, and beginning?

11. Have you avoided trite words ("nice," "a lot") and trite phrases ("one can plainly see," "all in all")?

12. Have you considered alternative word choices?

13. Does each of your verbs agree with its subject?

14. Does every pronoun agree with its antecedent?

112

15. Is the reference of each pronoun (especially "this," "they," and "it") to its antecedent clear?

16. Have you selected the appropriate form of homonym--"to," "too," "two" and "their," "there"?

17. Have you used the appropriate form for pairs of words which are confusing?

18. Have you looked up the spelling of any word about which you are doubtful?

19. Have you placed the correct mark of punctuation at the close of each sentence?

20. Have you used an apostrophe to show possession and to indicate contractions?

21. Have you used a comma
    (a) to set off terms in a series?
    (b) to set off an introductory adverb clause or participial phrase?
    (c) before the conjunction joining the two parts of a compound sentence?
    (d) to set off interrupting words like "however," "nevertheless," etc.?

22. Have you proofread?

SOURCE: Theodore W. Hipple, "Student Compositions: A Schoolwide Policy for All Written Work," The Clearing House, XLIV (May, 1970), 525.

APPENDIX E

CHECK SHEET--FALL 1975

PLEASE NOTE:

Page 114 has very light and
indistinct print. Filmed in
the best possible way.

CHECK SHEET

Your name _____   Paper written by _____

Date _____   Paper written on (date)___ _____

Note the good first; then comment on suggested improvements and corrections. Be specific. Refer to line number when possible.

CONTENT:

Paper have purpose and direction?_____

Subject discussed intelligently? _____

Generalizations supported? _____

Terms defined?_____

Originality? _____

Aware of audience? _____

STRUCTURE:

Organized effectively? _____

All ideas relevant? _____

Ideas presented in logical order?_____

Are lesser ideas subordinate?_____

Transitions?_____

PARAGRAPH:

Focusing sentence?_____

Developed logically?_____

Unity?_____

Variety of paragraph structure?_____

SENTENCE:

Grammar?_____

Variety of sentence patterns?_____

DICTION:

Clichés? _____

Variety of words used?_____

Appropriate words?_____

MECHANICS:

Capitalization?_____

Spelling?_____

Punctuation? _____

APPENDIX F

WHO AM I?--A COCKTAIL MIX

APPENDIX F

WHO AM I?--A COCKTAIL MIX

Time required: approximately 20-30 minutes.

Materials used: paper, pin or paper clip for each participant.

Process: 1. Participants receive the materials and are allowed five or ten minutes in which to write four or five things about themselves that will help others begin to know a little about them. Hobbies, interests, likes and dislikes are possible topics. Each participant's name should be at the top of his list.

2. The completed lists are pinned to the front of each participant.

3. As soft music plays in the background the participants circulate in a cocktail party fashion but without speaking. Participants should be encouraged to read everyone's list.

4. After this nonverbal phase, the participants are told to return to two or three different people they thought would be interesting. They may now speak to each other.

5. A general discussion following the exercise could be used to share reactions to the experience the group has just had.

SOURCE: J. William Pfeiffer and John E. Jones, A Handbook of Structured Experiences for Human Relations Training, Volume 1 (San Diego, California: University Associates Press, 1974), pp. 19-20.

APPENDIX G

SAMPLES OF NOTE CARDS RECORDED

FROM PAPERS

APPENDIX G

SAMPLES OF NOTE CARDS RECORDED FROM PAPERS

40D   Diction - from 56   A1a

"Being in a hurry does not necessarily mean anger." - from check sheet

Rough draft: "He was in a hurry and the fiery red bulb above him only increased his anger."

Final draft: "Roger could not help <u>feeling</u> anxious for the light to turn green."

34D   Sentence Structure - from 33   A1b

"Structure of line 5 sentence is awkward" - from check sheet

Rough draft: "Likewise, when eaten it serves not merely as a 'filler' but a treat to enjoy."

Final: Likewise when eaten it serves not merely as a 'filler' but an enjoyable treat.

Further changes needed. - teacher comment

49D   Content - from 37   Alc

"1. 34 - sentence is confusing" - from check sheet

Rough draft: Smiling paper faces hide under inked stars.

Omitted in final draft.

Teacher comment: Really adds to nostalgia of details of old elementary papers with smiley faces and stars.

58A   Paragraph Structure - from 80   A2b

Par. 2 - thesis is not thoroughly supported by paragraph. Change thesis to more of the physical aspects of the start.

Thesis: Backstroke start differs tremendously from those of the . . . strokes.

(Par. continues by giving position of body, listening for gun, beginning - concluding sentence - A fast start will usually propel one into the lead within a few short seconds.)

63A   Diction - from 61   A2a

Look for better choice of words. Dough gets to be a little repetitious.

(No changes made in word use in final draft. Yes, changes are needed.)

65A   Adds   B1

Rough: As a person becomes more experi-
enced . . . more weight can be added
. . . . it isn't a bad idea to push
yourself slightly . . . . (Adds) Only the
individual knows how he feels and what he
is capable of doing.

72A   Diction   B2

1. 102 These can be gained by being an
         outstanding athlete in a certain
         sport.

                 to

         . . . by being a good athlete
         . . . .

60A   Paragraph Structure   B3

In rough draft one paragraph discussed
walking a horse and a new paragraph dis-
cussed trotting. In final draft both are
combined. Should not have been.

43D   Punctuation Needed   C

Stillness filled the field enclosing the
area like a sanctuary against the outside
world.

Comma needed after field.

56D   - from 40   D

"Extremely well done. Tension builds
inside a person. Ends abruptly. Good."

APPENDIX H

INDUCTIVELY DEVELOPED

CODE SHEETS

INDUCTIVELY DEVELOPED CODE SHEETS

FOR: <u>Content - 01</u>

BLANK _____

01 <u>Needs more content; points not considered D = good</u>

02 <u>More facts needed to support content D = good</u>

03 <u>Needs correct content</u>

04 <u>Unnecessary content present</u>

05 <u>Boring</u>

06 <u>Suggested criticism too indefinite</u>

07 <u>Thesis stated; more unnecessary</u>

08 <u>Suggested criticism contradictory</u>

09 <u>Audience awareness</u>

10 <u>Repetitious</u>

11 <u>Well developed and supported (D)</u>

12 <u>Informative and interesting (D)</u>

13 <u>"Good - - -" (D)</u>

14 <u>Lacks feeling and life (D = good)</u>

15 <u>Title</u>

16 <u>Good description</u>

17 <u>Has feeling, mood, life (See 14)</u>

18 <u>Show; don't tell</u>

19 <u>Tells actions - no feelings</u>

20 <u>Difficult to understand (D = good)</u>

21 <u>I liked it</u>

22 <u>Facts best stated elsewhere</u>

23 _____

24 _____

25, etc.

FOR: <u>Structure of entire paper (02)</u>

BLANK _____

01 <u>Suggested criticism too indefinite</u>

02 <u>Needed thesis (D = good)</u>

03 <u>Needs new outline</u>

04 <u>Needs further developing (D = good)</u>

05 <u>Changes from thesis stated</u>

06 <u>Needs to be organized by time (D = good)</u>

07 <u>Needs to be organized by spatial (D = good)</u>

08 <u>Needs to be organized by logic (D = good)</u>

09 <u>Organized in wrong order (D = good)</u>

10 <u>Lacks unity</u>

11 <u>Lacks purpose and direction (D = good)</u>

12 <u>Contradictory points</u>

13 <u>Point of view shifts (D = maintained)</u>

14 <u>Point of view can't know this</u>

15 <u>Conclusion needed (D = good)</u>

16 <u>Point of view - instructed to use 3rd</u>

17 <u>Fails to follow outline (D = follows)</u>

18 <u>Point of view - you</u>

19 <u>Smooth and clear (D)</u>

20 <u>Best paper written by you</u>

21 <u>Written well</u>

22 <u>Needs organization</u>

23 <u>Limit subject</u>

24 <u>Generalizations need developing</u>

25 <u>Introduction needed (D = good)</u>

26 <u>Conclusion too abrupt</u>

27 <u>Too broad</u>

28 _____

29 _____

30 _____

31 _____

32, etc.

FOR: <u>Structure - Paragraph - 03</u>

BLANK _____

01 <u>Suggested criticism too indefinite</u>

02 <u>Two ideas in one paragraph</u>

03 <u>Repetitious</u>

04 <u>Lacks topic sentence</u>

05 <u>Needs transition at beginning (D = good)</u>

06 <u>Needs transition within paragraph</u>

07 <u>Ideas fail to follow logically (D = good)</u>

08 <u>No variety in paragraph structure (D = good)</u>

09 <u>Lacks unity</u>

10 <u>Shifts verb tense (D = good)</u>

11 <u>Two ideas in thesis</u>

12 <u>Needs developing (D = developed)</u>

13 <u>Topic sentence vague, imprecise (D = good)</u>

14 <u>No new paragraph needed</u>

15 <u>Good (D)</u>

16 <u>Clear (D)</u>

17 <u>Worded well (D)</u>

18 <u>Concluding sentence (D = good)</u>

19 <u>Paragraph too long</u>

20 <u>Not structured as outline states</u>

21 <u>Paragraph for each speaker in dialogue</u>

22 <u>Organized</u>

23 _____

24 _____

25 _____

26 _____

27 _____

28 _____

29 _____

30 _____

31 _____

32, etc.

FOR: <u>Sentence structure - 04</u>

BLANK _____

01	Suggested criticism too indefinite
02	Awkward
03	Confusing
04	Content unclear
05	Dangling modifier
06	Misplaced modifier
07	Not parallel structure
08	Adj. clause; make an adj. or prep. phrase
09	Verb phrase; make an adjective
10	Make lesser idea subordinate
11	Run-on sentence
12	Two sentences needed
13	Fragment
14	Compound verb; needs two clauses
15	Should use active, not passive, verbs
16	Use passive verb; active shifts force
17	Use more precise verbs
18	Avoid beginning sentence with "it"
19	Avoid beginning sentence with "there"
20	Wordy
21	No variety in sentence structure (D = good)
22	Compound verb; should be two clauses (see 14)
23	Verb phrase - should be adj. clause
24	Excess use of will, could, would, should; should use pres. or past
25	Sentence too long
26	Sentences choppy; combining needed
27	Sentence order (D = good)
28	So
29	Adv. clause after linking verb
30	Specific
31	Conjunction at beginning
32	Add words
33	Irrelevant parts
34	Too many subordinate conjunctions
35	Use of question for effectiveness
36	Use of dialogue - cut
37	Wrong verb tense
38	Good
39	Use an appositive
40	Not needed
41	Effective short sentences; forceful
42	Add words to sentence (see 32)
43	Verb phrase as adj.; should be adv. clause
44	Prepositional phrase to adj.
45	Needs developing
46	
47	
48, etc.	

FOR: <u>Diction - 05</u>

BLANK _____

01 <u>Suggested criticism too indefinite</u>
02 <u>Purple passage (too impressive)</u>
03 <u>Redundant</u>
04 <u>Excess words</u>
05 <u>Verbose</u>
06 <u>Poor word choice - imprecise (D = good)</u>
07 <u>Wrong word form</u>
08 <u>Poor analogy (D = good)</u>
09 <u>Word omitted</u>
10 <u>Cliche (D = good)</u>
11 <u>Sort of, kind of</u>
12 <u>a lot</u>
13 <u>Generalization - needs tentative word</u>
14 <u>Slang</u>
15 <u>Overuse of one word, phoneme</u>
16 <u>Uses form of word to define word</u>
17 <u>Awkward</u>
18 <u>Overuse of the pronoun "one"</u>
19 <u>Lack of precise verb (D = good)</u>
20 <u>Poor word choice - wrong image (D = good)</u>
21 <u>Avoid contractions</u>
22 <u>Variety</u>
23 <u>Avoid overuse of to be</u>
24 <u>Avoid judgmental words</u>
25 <u>Wrong conjunction</u>
26 <u>Mixed metaphors</u>
27 <u>Wrong pronoun</u>
28
29 <u>Too many pronouns</u>
30 <u>Difficult to understand</u>
31 <u>Too descriptive</u>
32
33 <u>Good adjectives</u>
34 <u>Seemed to</u>
35 <u>Too professional sounding</u>
36 <u>As/like</u>
37 <u>the fact that</u>
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48, etc.

FOR: <u>Mechanics - 06</u>

BLANK _____

01	Criticism too indefinite
02	Pronoun agreement - case
03	Pronoun agreement - number
04	Pronoun - no antecedent
05	Pronoun - incorrect antecedent
06	Subj.-verb agreement - number
07	Capitalization - not needed
08	Cap. needed - sentence beginning
09	Cap. needed - proper nouns
10	Spelling - i.e., words
11	Sp. - there, their, they're
12	Sp. - plural incorrect
13	Sp. - plural not made
14	Sp. - a lot
15	Punc. - no apostrophe; should be
16	Punc. - apostrophe used unnecessarily
17	Punc. - comma fault
18	Punc. - comma after two + intro prep. phrases
19	Punc. - comma after intro ad clauses
20	Punc. - comma before and in series
21	Punc. - comma used for no reason
22	Punc. - comma for appositive
23	Punc. - comma for dates
24	Punc. - comma for addresses
25	Punc. - period used for comma
26	Punc. - no period; should be; sentence
27	Punc. - period needed for abbreviation
28	Punc. - colon needed after following
29	Punc. - colon needed in sentence
30	Punc. - colon incorrectly used
31	Punc. - semi-colon needed; two ind. clauses
32	Punc. - semi-colon needed; series
33	Punc. - semi-colon incorrectly used
34	Spelling - incorrect
35	Spelling - where, were
36	Punc. - comma, gerund phrase
37	Use words for signs, some numerals
38	Comma for emphasis
39	Comma for parenthetical expression
40	Use of preposition for conjunction
41	Comma and conj. for two independent clauses
42	Spelling for to, too, two
43	Possessive before gerund
44	of for have
45	Comma for words, adjectives in series
46	No ( ) (see 50)

FOR: <u>Mechanics - 06, continued</u>

47　Improper word division
48　Add commas (see 38)
49　Comma before dialogue
50　Use ( )　(see 46)
51　Use " " or not?
52　?
53　Off of
54　Split infinitive
55　Comma - intro participial phrase
56　Comma - intro infinitive phrase
57　Correction due to illegibility
58　Period
59　Pronoun - antecedent ambiguous, unclear
60　Use of hyphen
61　Excessive exclamation points
62　Verb - subjunctive
63　No comma needed (see 21)
64　Period within ( ) or " "
65　Mechanics - good (D)
66　No abbreviation
67　Dash
68　Etc.
69　Apostrophe misplaced
70　Comma misplaced
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91, etc.

129

FOR: Special - Unclassified information - 07

BLANK _____

01 Extraneous, unrelated comments

02 Shows oral help

03 Completely rewritten rough draft and final draft

04 Conflict of suggestions between two peers

05 _____

06 _____

07 _____

08 _____

09 _____

10 _____

11 _____

12 _____

13 _____

14 _____

15 _____

16 _____

17 _____

18 _____

19 _____

20 _____

21 _____

22 _____

23 _____

24 _____

25 _____

26 _____

27 _____

28 _____

29 _____

30 _____

31 _____

32, etc.

APPENDIX I

SAMPLES OF INDUCTIVELY DEVELOPED GROUPING

OF NOTE CARDS FROM HOUR FOUR NARRATIVE

AND DESCRIPTION PAPERS

APPENDIX I

SAMPLES OF INDUCTIVELY DEVELOPED GROUPING

OF NOTE CARDS FROM HOUR FOUR NARRATIVE

AND DESCRIPTION PAPERS

33D   Verb form - from 36   Ala

line 8 - penetrate should have 's' added.

33 add 's' to penetrate.

Mechanical Corrections - Spelling

30D   Spelling - from 48   Ala

   Rough   Final

   1. 5 though - - - - - - - - - thought
   1. 9 climed - - - - - - - - - climbed
   1. 11 inocent - - - - - - - - innocent

Mechanical Corrections - Capitalization
                         punctuation
                         grammar errors
51D   Punctuation - from 35   Ala

1. 36 - You need a comma after the word courtyard.

In classes overlooking the courtyard windows
rattled.

(Comma added.)

Mechanical Corrections - Transitions   A1a

49D   Transition - from 37   A2a

Last Paragraph - transition could be made a little
smoother.

(No transition - paper just jumps from top of desk
to drawers.)

Mechanical Corrections - Point of View

46D   - from 28   A1a

"When I see limited omniscient and you're using
we, I immediately think you will tell another
persons (sic) thoughts by what they have told
you." (But he doesn't.)

(In final draft all we's and other first person
pronouns are omitted.)

2   Makes Broad Suggestions - Word Changes

28D   Diction - from 46   A1a

1. 19 - "boulders" - #46 says to "try something
else that's soft!"

(#28 changes and uses 'globs')

Makes Broad Suggestions - Sentence Structure

30D   Sentence Structure (Fragment) - from 48   A1a

1. 6 - "Sentence starting line 6 is not complete -
should be put with preceding sentence by a comma."

Rough: "Just relaxing, no pressures, nothing to
do . . . ."

Final: "He could just relax, no pressures, noth-
ing to do . . . ."

Makes Broad Suggestions - Paragraph Structure

41D   Paragraph Structure - from 50   A1a

Topic of your first paragraph is oil and then the
popcorn but in your first sentence that break
isn't noticeable.

(First with and then with, transitional words,
are added to first sentence to make division of
content clear.)

Broad Declarative Suggestions - Thesis

44N   Structure - from 34   A2a

Might want to have an introductory paragraph to
introduce subject to the audience.

(Would strengthen paper, but 44 does not.)

Broad Declarative Suggestions - Content

46N   Content - from 40   A1a

"Rather technical in parts - I think you assumed
reader should know that you're talking about."
Rough: "Since they were the affirmative team,
         they were first . . . ."

(This is changed. This eliminates presupposition
that reader knows order of debate.)

Broad Declarative Suggestions - Confusing,
Unclear

40N   "Confusing" - from 46   A1a

Paragraph 5, 11. 10-11 -
Rough: "Even though I like the job so very much,
         I will still have to do it."
Final: Sentence omitted.
(This was part of 40's attempt at sarcasm. Best
omitted.)

Broad Declarative Suggestion - Redundant

33N   Diction - from 34   A1a

"Talk to me, not see me - see me repetitious - "

Rough: . . . Mr. Sikkema comes in and asks to
         see me. I didn't have the foggiest notion
         why he would want to see me.
Final: . . . came in asking to speak to me . . . .
         didn't . . . to see me.

Suggests Rewording; Stated Revisions

35N   Word Order - from 51   A1c

51 says - "Put 'without looking up' before 'I
finally.'"

Rough: I finally got my feet together and begin
         (sic) to make my way across the street,
         without looking up.
Final: I finally . . . street.

(Leaves out "without looking up" which, as written
in rough, adds to embarrassment.)

Asks Questions

44N   Detail Needed - from 33   Ala

In paragraph 3, "what is second thing you try
to accomplish?"

Rough: There are two things . . . to accom-
         plish . . . . The main thing . . . is
         pickups . . . .

Final: Upon arrival at Fair Oaks, two final steps
         of preparation were necessary before the
         repeats. Approximately five pickups were
         done alternately with calisthenics.

APPENDIX J

SAMPLE DRAFTS OF PAPER

APPENDIX J

SAMPLE DRAFTS OF PAPER

Rough Draft of Description Paper of Student Fifty-Eight

The first rays of light parted the early morning fog and the massive creature was revealed. Indeed so enormous that men surrounding the structure were dwarfed. Lifelessly the airplane rested, bound by the pull of gravitation to the earth. A true miracle would be required to lift the sullen mass of sheet metal into space. The formation of the plane was amazing. The structure was long, oh how very long, so long that one thousand men could be placed side by side and still not equall the length. The heighth of the plane made it reach seemingly forever in the heavy morning air. What little light there was became dissapated in the dull sheen of metal.

Amazingly the plane progressed forward, enough so the many intricisies of the exterior could be observed. Row on row of bolts flashed by and the entire framework seemed to depend on each tiny bolt. The exact placement of the parts matched the most magnificent of spider webs. Up close it was possible to see each tiny scratch on the plane, which was many. The large vehicle no longer gleamed but emitted a strange glow. As the plane moved the many joints moaned and screeched [word illegible].

Suddenly with a burst of light overwhelming everything in the vicinity the plane came alive. The roar was equal to the roar of Niagra Falls only much more intense and concentrated.

Final Draft of Description Paper of Student Fifty-Eight

Pre-dawn Flight

The first rays of light parted the early morning fog and the massive creature was revealed. The surrounding men were dwarfed by its enormous size. Lifelessly the airplane rested, bound by the pull of gravitation to the earth. A true miracle would be required to lift the sullen mass of sheet metal airborne. Long and sleek with rounded curves, sharp angles, and jutting corners, the structure of the machine was not lacking in beauty. The dull sheen of metal dissapated what little light materialized from the horizon.

Amazingly the plane progressed forward, enough so that the many intricisies of the exterior could be observed. Row on row of bolts flashed by and the complex arrangement of the parts equalled the most magnificent of spider webs. From a short distance the finish of the metal appeared to be worn and scratched. The many joints moaned and screeched in harmony with the motion of the plane.

Suddenly with an immense outburst of energy the plane came alive. The sound was deafening and the light intensity was blinding. The black stubby nose of the plane thrust itself forward and the magnificent machine accelerated into a streaking blur of silver and grey. In a final gesture of supremacy, the tiny wheels departed from solid concrete to be lifted into a misty morning sunrise.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allport, Gordon W. _Pattern and Growth in Personality_. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Boocock, S. S. "Toward a Sociology of Learning: A Selective Review of Existing Research." _Sociology of Education_, XXXIX (Winter, 1966).

Botts, R. "What Means This End? Some Unexamined Classroom Practices." _English Journal_, LX (January, 1971), 88-92.

Boyet, Aggie. "The Effect of Student Group Editing of Themes on the Improvement of Writing in Freshman English Composition." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Okalhoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1955.

Braddock, Richard. "English Composition." _Encyclopedia of Educational Research_. 4th ed. Edited by Robert L. Ebel. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969.

Braddock, Richard; Lloyd-Jones, Richard; and Schoeb, Lowell. _Research in Written Composition_. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

Brooks, Cleanth, and Warren, Robert Penn. _Fundamentals of Good Writing_. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, Inc., 1950.

Bruffee, Kenneth A. "Collaborative Learning: Some Practical Models." _College English_, XXXIV (February, 1973), 634-43.

Buber, Martin. _I and Thou_. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970.

Burton, Dwight L. "Some Important Research Gaps in the Teaching of Secondary School English." _Needed Research in the Teaching of English_. Proceedings of a conference held at Carnegie Institute of Technology, prepared by Edwin R. Steinberg, May 5-7, 1962.

Burton, Dwight L., and Simmons, John S., eds. _Teaching English in Today's High Schools_. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Cantor, Nathaniel. The Dynamics of Learning. Buffalo, New York: Foster Stewart Publishing Corporation, 1946.

Coleman, J. S. Adolescents and the Schools. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.

Creber, J. W. Patrick. Sense and Sensitivity. London: University of London Press, Ltd., 1965.

De Boer, J. J. "Composition, Handwriting, and Spelling." Review of Educational Research, XXXI (April, 1961), 161-72.

Devin-Sheehan, Linda; Feldman, Robert S.; and Allen, Vernon L. "Research of Children Tutoring Children: A Critical Review." Review of Educational Research, XLVI (Summer, 1976), 355-85.

Deiderich, Paul B. Measuring Growth in English. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1974.

Division of Instructional Planning and Services. Compose Yourself: A Plan for Instruction in Written Composition, Grades 7-12. Publication No. SC-741. Los Angeles, California: Los Angeles City Schools, 1976.

Dixon, John. Growth Through English. Edgerton, Huddersfield, Yorkshire, England: National Association for the Teaching of English, 1969.

Dyess, Joseph T. "Composing: Epiphany and Detail." College Composition and Communication, XV (December, 1964), 260-2.

Ehly, Stewart, and Larsen, Stephen C. "Tutor and Tutee Characteristics as Predictors of Tutorial Outcomes." Psychology in the Schools, XIII (July, 1976), 348-9.

Evans, William H., and Walker, Jerry L. New Trends in the Teaching of English in Secondary Schools. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.

Farrell, Edmund J. Implications of National Assessment Writing Results. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1971.

Ford, Bob Wayne. "The Effects of Peer Editing/Grading on the Grammar Usage and Theme-Composition Ability of College Freshmen." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1972.

Frymier, Jack R. "Teaching the Young to Love." Theory Into Practice, XIII (December, 1974), 376-79.

Gage, N. L., ed. Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago:
    Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Ginsburg, Herbert, and Opper, Sylvia. Piaget's Theory of Intel-
    lectual Development, An Introduction. Englewood Cliffs,
    New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

Godshalf, Fred I., and Swineford, Frances. The Measurement of
    Writing Ability. New York: College Entrance Examination
    Board, 1966.

Grissom, Loren V. "Student Leadership in Evaluating Compositions."
    English Journal, XLVIII (September, 1959), 338-39.

Haas, V. J.; Childers, Perry R.; Babbitt, Elizabeth; and Dylla,
    Sandra M. "English Composition by Workshop." The Journal
    of Experimental Education, XL (Spring, 1972), 33-37.

Hardaway, Francine. "What Students Can Do to Take the Burden Off
    You." College English, XXXVI (January, 1975), 577.

Hatfield, W. W. Experience Curriculum. New York: Appleton Cen-
    tury, 1935.

Hawkins, Thom. "Group Inquiry Techniques for Teaching Writing."
    College English, XXXVII (March, 1976), 637-46.

Hayakawa, S. I. "Linguistic Science and the Teaching of Composi-
    tion." ETC: A Review of General Semantics, VII (Winter,
    1950), 97-103.

Hipple, T. W. "Grader's Helpers; Colleagues, Peers, Scorecards."
    English Journal, LXI (May, 1972), 690-3.

_____. "Student Compositions: A Schoolwide Policy for All
    Written Work." The Clearing House, XLIV (May, 1970), 523-26.

James, Charity. Young Lives at Stake. New York: Agathon Press,
    1972.

Jerabek, Ross, and Dieterich, Daniel. "Composition Evaluation;
    The State of the Art." College Composition and Communica-
    tions, XXVII (May, 1975), 183-86.

Judy, Stephen. Explorations in the Teaching of Secondary English.
    New York: Dodd, Mead, 1974.

Karrfolt, David H. "Writing Teams: From Generating Composition to
    Generating Communcation." College Composition and Communi-
    cation, XXII (December, 1971), 377-78.

143

Katz, Molly. "A Blueprint for Writing." Change, VIII (November, 1976), 46-47.

Kelley, Earl. Workshop Way of Learning. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Kelly, Lou. "Toward Competence and Creativity in an Open Class." College English, XXXIV (February, 1973), 644-60.

Kitzhaber, A. R. Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.

Lagana, Jean Remally. "The Development, Implementation, and Evaluation of a Model for Teaching Composition Which Utilizes Individualized Learning and Peer Grouping." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1972.

Logan, Carolyn. "Myth and Method." English Journal, LIX (April, 1970), 548-50.

Lokke, Virginia, and Wykoff, George. "Double Writing in Freshman Composition - An Experiment." School and Society, XLVIII (November, 1948), 437-39.

Lyman, R. L. "A Cooperative Experiment in Junior High School Composition." School Review, XXXIX (December, 1931), 748-57.

Maize, Ray. "A Study in Two Methods of Teaching Composition." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, 1952.

Martin, H. C. Freedom and Discipline in English. Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965.

McColly, W., and Remstad, R. Comparative Effectiveness of Composition Skills Learning Activities in the Secondary School. Cooperative Research Project 1528. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1963.

McGuire, Edna. "College Freshmen on Writing in High School." English Journal, LI (April, 1962), 256-58.

Mersand, J. Attitudes Toward English Teaching. Philadelphia: Chilton Press, 1961.

Moffett, James. A Student Centered Language Arts Curriculum, K-13, A Handbook for Teachers. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1973.

_____. Teaching the Universe of Discourse. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Morsey, Royal J. Improving English Instruction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1965.

Muller, Herbert J. The Uses of English: Guidelines for the Teaching of English from the Anglo-American Conference at Dartmouth College. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Nemanich, Donald. "Preparing the Composition Teacher." College Composition and Communication, XXV (February, 1974), 46-48.

O'Donnell, Roy C. "The Correlations of Awareness of Structural Relationships in English and Ability in Written Composition." The Journal of Educational Research, LVII (May-June, 1964), 464-67.

Parker, Robert P., Jr. "An American in London." English Journal, LXIV (April, 1975), 14-15.

Patterson, C. H. Humanistic Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Pfeiffer, J. William, and Jones, John E. A Handbook of Structured Experiences for Human Relations Training. Volume 1. San Diego, California: University Associates Press, 1974.

Pierson, Howard. "Peer and Teacher Correction--A Comparison of the Effects of Two Methods of Teaching Composition in Grade Nine English Classes." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1966.

_____. Teaching Writing. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1972.

Platt, Michael. "Correcting Papers in Public and in Private." College English, XXXVII (September, 1975), 22-27.

Putz, Joan M. "When the Teacher Stops Teaching - An Experiment With Freshman English." College English, XXXII (October, 1970), 50.

Rogers, Carl Ransom. Freedom to Learn; A View of What Education Might Become. Columbus, Ohio: C. E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969.

_____. Student Centered Teaching. Toronto, Canada: Hogtown Press, 1972.

Sager, C. "Improving the Quality of Written Composition Through Pupil Use of Rating Scale." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, 1973, Boston University.

Sauer, Edwin H. "The Cooperative Correction of Paragraphs."
     Essays on the Teaching of English: Reports of the Yale
     Conference on the Teaching of English. Edited by Edward
     Gordon and Edward Noyes. New York: Appleton-Century-
     Crofts, 1960.

Schiff, Lillian. "Teaching Composition." *Convention Concerns.*
     Sixty-first Annual Meeting of the National Council of
     Teachers of English. Edited by Stephen Judy. Urbana,
     Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1971.

Schmuck, Richard A., and Schmuck, Patricia A. *A Humanistic Psy-*
     chology of Education, Making the School Everybody's House.
     Palo Alto, California: The National Press Books, 1974.

Sheils, Merrill. "Why Johnny Can't Write." *Newsweek*, December 8,
     1975, pp. 59-66.

Skinner, B. F. *Verbal Behavior.* New York: Appleton-Century-
     Crofts, 1957.

Slow, Ralph. "Influence of Writing Experiences in High School on
     Presence of Students in Remedial College English Composi-
     tion." *The Journal of Educational Research*, LVII (July-
     August, 1964), 534-37.

Smith, Dora. *Class Size in High School English.* Minneapolis,
     Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1931.

Snipes, Wilson Currin. "An Inquiry: Peer Group Teaching in Fresh-
     man Writing." *College Composition and Communication*, XXII
     (May, 1971), 169-74.

Squire, James R., et al. *The National Interest and the Teaching of*
     English. Report of the Committee on National Interest,
     National Council of Teachers of English. Champaign,
     Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1961.

Sutton, Joseph T., and Allen, Eliot D. "The Effect of Practice and
     Evaluation on Improvement in Written Composition." *Coopera-*
     tive Research Project 1993. Delano, Florida: Stetson
     University, 1964.

Thelen, Herbert A. *Classroom Grouping for Teachability.* New York:
     John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.

_____. *Education and the Human Quest.* New York: Harper and
     Brothers, 1960.

Whitla, Janet Hanley. "Classroom-Centered Evaluation: A Humanis-
    tic Approach for the Social Studies." Social Education, XL
    (November-December, 1976), 568-73.

Witbeck, Michael C. "Peer Correction Procedure for Intermediate
    and Advanced ESL Composition." Teachers of English to
    Speakers of Other Language Quarterly, X (September, 1976),
    321-26.

"Writing Test Reveals Many Lack Basic Skills: National Assessment
    Report." School and Community, LIX (October, 1972), 11.