AN ANALYSIS OF CURRENT FRESHMAN ENGLISH PROGRAMS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
GORDON LEWIS HOLLAND
1970

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

AN ANALYSIS OF CURRENT FRESHMAN ENGLISH PROGRAMS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

presented by

Gordon Lewis Holland

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Education

James L. Page
Major professor

Date 2/24/70

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF CURRENT FRESHMAN ENGLISH PROGRAMS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

By

Gordon Lewis Holland

The study sought to determine and describe current trends in the teaching of freshman English as found in the colleges and universities of the United States, and to use that description to formulate a series of recommended improvements, to identify areas worthy of further study, and to serve as the basis for generating a lengthy list of onclusions which identify current procedures within the subject under study.

A nine page questionnaire--circulated to two hundred college or university English departments throughout the country--resulted in realization of one hundred and sixty responses to a total questionnaire return of exactly eighty percent. Data gathered from this source was descriptive of the major factors concerning individual policies and practices related to freshman English.

Findings indicated a wide degree of variation between individual freshman English programs, a failure to implement current instructional development practices, and a great contrast between what is too often reported as happening in freshman English as opposed to what is actually taking place.

The study reveals freshman English for the confused 'beast' that it is. Institutions are unable and/or unwilling to determine whether or not the program is needed. They certainly have not identified the basic nature of the subject to the point that one can correctly state what freshman English is and is not. There is little or no agreement as to how the subject should be taught or what it should be labelled. In keeping with this general state of uncertainty is the observation that there is lack of agreement concerning who should teach freshman English, to whom it should be taught, for what duration it should be taught, and at what point in a student's academic career it should be taught.

Failure to utilize instructional development practices wisely is seen in a general lack of experimentation and a gross neglect of principles of scientific evaluation, fostered in part by lack of training in such matters and in part by an unwillingness to seek the assistance of experts outside the English department. The most graphic illustrations of this general lack of proper instructional development may be seen in the failure to utilize newer media, a desire for but inability to obtain federal grants, and in the narrowness in training directors of freshman English programs.

The study also reveals that many commonly circulated statements about the current status of freshman English are often unfounded in fact. Primary of these current

misconceptions is the belief that many institutions are abolishing their freshman English or composition programs, a claim not borne out by this study.

Included here are eighty-six conclusions regarding current trends in freshman English drawn directly from the study. They involve such matters as abolition of freshman English, putting the subject on an optional basis, and sources of revenue for program development. Other areas included relate to course content, student load, program guidance, and general inner-departmental procedures.

Recommendations include both those originating in professional literature and supported by the findings of the study, and those originating with the study itself. The twenty-seven recommendations presented call for application of professional instructional development practices to freshman English programs (among other things). These recommendations deal with course objectives, experimentation, evaluation, staffing, training, finances, syllabus preparation and usage, leadership, waiver policies, and remedial programs.

The writer has indicated twenty areas recommended for further study. These recommendations for further study call for more investigation into the rationale behind freshman English procedures. Other areas included here are budget, faculty attitude toward teaching freshman English, acceptance and application of newer media, training of freshman English faculty, as well as other matters similarly

related to instructional development of freshman English programs.

The strength of the study is no doubt in the data gathered. The overwhelming reception to so extensive a questionnaire has been most gratifying and has provided a great deal of specific information, for it was from this source that the writer took guidance in formulating his recommendations and conclusions. A further indication of the worth of the data is seen in the number of requests for copies of at least portions of it. Many such requests have come from individual institutions and from interested agencies.

AN ANALYSIS OF CURRENT FRESHMAN ENGLISH PROGRAMS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

By

Gordon Lewis Holland

A THESIS

Submitted to

Michigan State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Education

1970

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to thank the chairman of his doctoral committee, Dr. James Page, for considerate counsel and assistance rendered during the preparation of this dissertation. Appreciation is also expressed to the other committee members, Dr. Dale Alam, and especially to Dr. James Pickering whose assistance during the early stages of the study was invaluable.

VITA

Gordon Lewis Holland

Candidate for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Dissertation: An Analysis of Current Freshman English Programs In Institutions of Higher Education

Outline of Studies:
Major: Instructional Development
Cognate: English

Biographical Items:
Born: July 7, 1938

Undergraduate Studies:
Northern Montana College, Havre, Montana, June 1961 to June 1964.
B.S. in Education with English and Social Science majors.

Graduate Studies:
Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, Sept. 1964 to June 1966.
M.A. in English.

Experience: Graduate Teaching Assistant (English) Purdue University, Sept. 1964 to June 1966.
Instructor of English, Northern Montana College, Sept. 1966 to Aug. 1968.
6-B Media Institute, Michigan State University, Sept. 1968 to Aug. 1969.
Assistant Professor of English, Northern Montana College, Sept. 1969 to June 1970.

Membership: Modern Language Association of America
Linguistic Association of America
Phi Delta Kappa
American Association of University Professors

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

> We live in changing times. The maturing of our society, the scientific bent of contemporary thought, and the advent of mass education in college are producing changes in our public, in our students, and in ourselves. Languages and literature may well be the most constant elements in a society, yet they are as various and mutable as life itself. "English" could not stand still, even if it wanted to. Ours, then, is the age old problem of an institution: that of trying to hold on to traditional values while adapting to a new situation.
>
> (Fisher, p. 11)

It is the purpose of this study to conduct an investigation of current national trends in the teaching of freshman English in colleges and universities. It attempts to describe freshman English programs as they are "adapting to a new situation." Impetus for the study is found in comments such as the following:

> Greater provision needs to be made for studying at a national level the experiments in English and the humanities which are already underway in various places. Careful evaluation of such programs by impartial observers and dissemination of results might prove especially fruitful. Too often, inadequate provisions are made for evaluating experimental projects, and the results (both negative and affirmative) remain unknown.
>
> (Squire, p. 8)

While reporting on and describing the current state of freshman English programs at a national level, the study attempts to identify strengths and weaknesses within these programs, presenting this evaluation in Chapter V.

The writer of the study is full cognizant of the fact that a single report cannot be expected to describe each and every aspect of freshman English programs in colleges and universities in the United States. In light of this fact, the writer has established a list of the major aspects which will be handled in the study. Those aspects which will receive particular emphasis in the study include:

1. presence or absence of tested hypothesis as rationale for the respective programs.
2. class size and program length.
3. types of materials used in the classroom.
4. instructors' teaching loads, their education, experience, and ranking.
5. program waiver policies.
6. propensity to change the program.
7. uses of the program director, his degree of involvement, and his education and experience.
8. opportunity for undergraduate follow-up courses of a similar but advanced nature.
9. attitude toward federal funds for program improvement.
10. forecasts of future trends.

Limitations of the Study

All research is capable of being conditioned to some degree by limitations imposed on it. This study is no exception. It is subject to the following limitations:

1. As the study included a questionnaire sent to a representative number of institutions, there was the unpredictable limitation in number of returns. While the writer made every effort reasonable to make a high return

of questionnaires likely, he realized that this limitation existed, demanding that he be alert to the make-up of the final sample in terms of type, size, and locality.

2. There is a certain limitation regarding the respondents. The writer had to be concerned with the respondents insofar as determining to what extent they could speak for their respective institutions. It was assumed, however, that respondents would be directors of freshman English programs and that in the matter under study they would be more able than any other person to speak for their respective institutions.

3. The questionnaire technique itself creates limitations, the extent of which is determined by the quality of the survey instrument. The writer attempted to keep these questionnaire-produced limitations at a minimum by striving to develop an instrument which is clear and concise, sufficiently objective, and free from wording which would unintentionally lead respondents to give biased answers.

4. Another limitation developed during the tabulation of responses when the writer had to interpret the data according to his own discrimination, judgement, and experience.

5. The study also includes the limitation represented by the respondents themselves. Their responses are somewhat affected by their professional prejudices, their vested interests, and the degree to which they are interested in the subject.

6. The type and number of institutions to be surveyed were limited by the investigator. Each institution contacted had to meet the following initial conditions:

1. each institution must offer at least the baccalaureate degree in teacher training and/or Liberal Arts.
2. each institution must be accredited by one of the six regional accrediting agencies in the United States.

7. The final limitation of the study concerns the time at which the freshman English programs were offered. For the sake of this study, freshman English programs investigated were limited to those which were in effect during the school year beginning September of 1968 and ending in August of 1969.

Sources

Data for this study was gathered in two ways. The first method used was the securing of data through a survey of existing literature pertinent to the study. The second method of data generation was through implementation of the questionnaire-survey technique.

The survey of the literature pertinent to the study was accomplished through investigation of what could be called major and minor sources. The major sources of data within the survey of existing literature were publications of associations directly involved with the subject under study. Included in this group are "The Publication of the Modern Language Association," publications from the National Council of Teachers of English, publications from the

Curriculum Center in English, and existing dissertations and theses in the field.

The minor sources of data within the survey of existing literature came from investigation of publications which include material of use here but which are not limited solely to the subject under study. Chief among these sources are the Educational Resources Information Center microfilms which provided information on pertinent articles, studies, and volumes directly or indirectly associated with the objective of this study.

A summary of existing literature pertinent to the study appears as Chapter II of this work.

The second method of data generation for the study--use of the questionnaire-survey technique--provided the most useful and directly usable data. Information gained from the survey of institutions was more closely associated with the objectives of this study and was more contemporary than that information secured through investigation of existing literature.

Each of the two hundred colleges and universities which received the questionnaire met the criteria previously established under limitation six. Also, the institutions surveyed were randomly selected from the total number of institutions which fall into two general categories. One hundred institutions were chosen from each of the following:

1. teacher training and/or Liberal Arts institutions which offer only the baccalaureate degree.
2. teacher training and/or Liberal Arts institutions which offer the Masters degree and/or Masters and Doctorate.

Justification

> There is an uneasy suspicion among those who teach freshman English that much of [their] success occurs in spite of rather than because of the organization and content of the course. Particularly in recent years directors and teachers of freshman English have been subjecting themselves to self-analysis and self-castigation. They have discovered paradoxes and contradictions at every turn.
>
> (Gorrell, p. 93)

As pointed out by Gorrell, freshman English teachers and directors are beginning to take a closer look at what they are doing. They are wondering which methods are best, and they are seeking answers to questions which they had previously failed to ask. Much of the current investigation of freshman English practices--as is also the case in many other academic areas--is fostered to a great extent by a new situation, namely great increases in enrollment. The number of students seeking instruction has increased greatly while the number of instructors has not.

> Colleges and universities, only just beginning to feel the impact of the swollen enrollments which have overwhelmed elementary and secondary schools for a decade, are becoming increasingly concerned about the expected shortage of well-educated college teachers of English in future years.
>
> (Special Studies, p. 2)

While student numbers increase and concern over an expected shortage of English teachers grows, the acquisition of communication skills, including those directly associated with freshman English, remains a vitally important matter to each and every student. Ability to communicate plays a major role in determining the student's success in college

and in post-collegiate situations. Becoming articulate and literate is an important part of the student's life. Therefore, freshman English programs are important as means of developing this desired articulation and literacy skill. Studies of freshman English programs are then of importance to students, instructors, and institutions alike. Studies such as this can become initial steps toward answering many of the questions already asked. Also, a study such as this one has the potential to identify and solve some of the problems facing freshman English, an area of study the nature and future of which are unclear, an area which boasts many approaches, some good and some bad (Archer, p. 81).

The extent to which a study grasps communication skills depends upon many factors, not the least of which is the curriculum under which he studies. Academic institutions should, therefore, make every effort to provide the students with the most suitable curriculum and the most effective methodology. Like any other course of instruction, freshman English sequences should have the benefit of careful analysis.

Perhaps more than any other subject, freshman English undergoes public scrutiny and must, therefore, provide the best instruction possible. Students participate in a freshman English program then go out into the world where they and the institutions from which they come are judged by the public. To meet the challenges contained in public

scrutiny, freshman English instructors must be aware of and be concerned for the quality of instruction they offer. For the most part they are aware and they are concerned.

> One of the important concerns of college instructors of English and the college instructional staff in general is the quality of the writing of college students. All too frequently the charge is made by college professors that, "these kids just can't write." Obviously, this is not completely true as evidenced by the many colleges and universities who offer honors courses in English composition to freshman students as well as the so-called remedial courses. It is true, however, that a large investment of time and money is being made toward helping the "poor writer."
>
> (Woodward, p. 1)

This investment of time and money to improve the writing of freshman students is very often a substantial undertaking. It may include careful analysis of a program's curriculum and methodology, a task that can prove to be an extensive one. But unless departments wish to set up their respective programs according to such guides as prejudice, bias, or untested hypothesis instead of sound instructional development procedures, they must make every effort to analyze the entire situation before devising a plan. In many instances, the time and money needed for such studies are not readily available.

> Funds are needed to support and encourage research related to many basic problems in English. For example, vitally needed is a study in classroom applications of recent research in language by psychologists, linguists, and specialists in methodology.
>
> (Squire, p. 10)

All is not bleak insofar as support for research in composition is concerned. There has been some hope for

improvement of freshman English instruction for institutions without the time and money to conduct their own research, "... reflected in the establishment of Project English under the United States Office of Education and the possibility of further federal encouragement for the teaching of English, especially composition" (Gorrell, p. 105). However, despite federal assistance in this matter--assistance which was welcomed but still less than what is needed--it remains that freshman English programs suffer where institutions do not have the wherewithal to subject their programs to proper instructional development. Too often the opposite attitude is evidenced when, "Across the country the freshman course is too often regarded as a place to economize..." (Hoblitzelle, p. 600).

Large universities have the advantages of larger staffs, graduate assistants, and full-time researchers in instructional development. It is not as difficult for larger institutions to undertake instructional development of their respective freshman English programs as it is for smaller colleges. Such being the case, large universities will benefit less from some parts of this study than will their smaller counterparts.

Although an institution may lack the wherewithal to undertake instructional development tasks, the students of that institution are as entitled to a sound education as are the students of a large university. Students attending small colleges with limited capabilities for instructional development may be subjected to courses of study which are

less than they could be, the students themselves will be held accountable for the inefficiencies of the institution which they attend, especially where their use of English is concerned.

> Freshman English has become an institution in American college education. Business and professional men look at the misspellings of their secretaries or the infelicities in the prose of bar examinations and ask that more composition and rhetoric be taught--or at least that the results be better.
> (Gorrell, p. 91)

Like all other students, students from institutions which are unable to subject their freshman English program to proper instructional development will draw the attention of "business and professional men." In light of this attention, the freshman English students at small colleges deserve more than a "shot in the dark" approach to the program. Their right to benefit from instructional development based on awareness of current trends and practices in freshman English serves then as a major justification for this study.

The study may be further justified on the grounds that all institutions, regardless of size and facilities, may make use of it in some fashion. The data herein may serve as a basis for bringing improved instructional development to their respective freshman English programs. They may accept the conclusions and recommendations of this study or they may draw their own conclusions from it. It is hoped that they may at least find it useful as a starting point in the process of developing a freshman English

program tailored to their particular needs and circumstances as they come to realize that they are not now dealing with what they once were under the heading of 'Freshman English.'

> Increased recognition of the importance of communication in modern society has strengthened approval for a course dedicated to producing accurate readers and graceful writers.... In a sense, freshman English is popularly regarded as a kind of capsule liberal education, a way of filling the gaps that appear as specialization increases.
>
> (Gorrell, p. 92)

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The basic nature of this dissertation is one of exploration, exploration into the general character of current freshman English programs in American colleges and universities. Primarily, this investigation was conducted through study of responses to a questionnaire sent to two groups of one hundred randomly selected institutions of higher education. The second area of exploration consisted of a study of existing literature in the field. A review of the research and writing related to this study is presented in this chapter.

The writer has made an effort to restrict the review of literature to those works dealing with freshman English programs as a whole. Such was not entirely possible, however, as relatively little has been written to the broad subject of freshman English while much of some worth has been written about the various single components which are most often parts of freshman English programs per se. In light of this situation, the writer deemed it important to review at least the most significant literature dealing with the single components of freshman English programs while

he was reviewing that literature concerned with freshman English as a whole.

Although freshman English programs have been with us for some time, they are not backed by the breadth or depth of actual scientific research which one might normally expect to find in support of so important an area of study. For this reason much of the literature related to this study was found to be other than research-based.

It is probable that diversity and complexity of freshman English programs across the country contribute greatly to the lack of scientific research in the field by making it difficult for researchers to isolate the typical freshman English program in order to scrutinize it properly. It is the sincere hope of the writer that this study will provide some basis for further investigation of the subject and in some small way contribute to the realization that freshman English is quite in need of increased scientific research.

Keeping this hope in mind, the writer has conducted the review of literature in such a way that it deals primarily with four aspects, each of which tends to overlap and disallow their being treated independently. Any or all of the four aspects treated here should prove worthwhile to anyone conducting future investigations into the character of freshman English programs. The four aspects dealt with are:

1. literature which is most directly applicable to this study in that it contains reports of previous investigations of freshman English programs as a whole at one or more institutions.

2. literature which reports on scientific research or validated experimentation with regard to various components of freshman English.

3. literature which is generally concerned with the subject under study but which is not the product of scientific investigation.

4. literature which considers curriculum revision from abolition of freshman English from the college or university to renewed dedication to the tried and tested methods.

While the abolition part of aspect four may actually be the antithesis of the intention of this study, the writer feels it should be reported here as it does represent a current trend in the treatment of freshman English. Actually, it had to be treated here. Had it not been, no information on this dramatic trend would have appeared as the questionnaire utilized in the study was designed on the premise that the polled institutions each have some form of freshman English program.

While little of the literature reviewed called for abolition of freshman English, much of it did call for upgrading existing freshman English programs. However, noticeably absent were specific methods by which this desired improvement could be brought about. Too often writers dealing with the subject indicated a need for change but at the same time failed to present specific means by which this change could come to be. This type

of literature has not been included save for a few instances where the writer felt a negative example served well as a foil to worthwhile studies.

The three most significant studies to be cited here are those of Albert Kitzhaber, Harrison Hoblitzelle, and Bonnie Nelson. Each of these studies is unique in its own way and deserves more than a fleeting glimpse in this chapter.

Kitzhaber's Themes, Theories, and Therapy, also known as the Dartmouth Project, sets forth a lengthy list of recommendations for freshman English, arrived at after a detailed study of the teaching of writing in college. Briefly, the writer will present Kitzhaber's recommendations as they appeared under the headings of "Administration," "Teaching," "Curriculum," "Recommendations for Writing After the Freshman Year," and "Exempting Students from Freshman English."

Administration:

> If composition is to be well taught, classes must be small, and the number of classes assigned to any one teacher must be carefully limited.
>
> No teacher should be given more than three--better, two--classes of composition in any one term, though he might be assigned one or two classes of something else to fill out his schedule; and no composition class should enroll more than twenty-five students--better, twenty.
>
> To make no provision at all for exempting unusually able students from freshman composition is both unreasonable and unrealistic.
>
> Correctness should be one of the aims but not only or even the chief aim. The course should

> endeavor instead to discipline the thought and written expression of the student through a study of the principles of rhetoric and logic through practice in applying those principles.
>
> No matter how large the university or how many advanced degree candidates it has who need subsedizing, no English department should use only graduate students and junior instructors to teach the freshman composition course. All the members of the department should teach a section of the course occasionally--not just honor sections populated by bright students but average sections as well.
>
> (Kitzhaber, pp. 131-133)

Kitzhaber's conclusions with regard to the administration of freshman English programs will be challenged at times by other authorities as this review continues.

Teaching:

> All teachers of composition should recognize that planning an assignment in writing is one of the most important aspects of teaching composition, and it should accordingly receive their closest attention.
>
> A college English department should agree on a policy governing the kind of writing to be assigned students in the required freshman composition courses, one that all members of the staff can subscribe to and will consent to abide by. In particular, the policy should specify the relation of the writing from assigned reading, and the predominant type of writing to be required.
>
> An English department should establish the policy that instructors consistently try to identify errors and weaknesses in student writing with as much precision as possible. The practice of using all-purpose symbols or abbreviations to indicate dissatisfaction with a word or passage should usually be avoided.
>
> Even though an English department already agrees reasonably well on standards for judging individual papers in the freshman English courses, it should continue to explore all possible measures to secure even closer agreement. One such measure is to schedule

> theme-grading meetings--at least one each term, and preferably two in the autumn term when new instructors must become acquainted with the standards and policies of the department.
>
> A college English department should adopt a clear-cut and severe rule with respect to misspelling in student compositions.
>
> A departmental committee might be given the job of defining what the staff agrees to regard as a 'gross' error in these matters.
>
> Students should be required to revise all papers and return them to the instructor. A student who merely has his errors pointed out to him but who is not asked to correct them will generally be slower to eliminate the errors from future papers than the student who is made to correct his mistakes at the time he commits them.
>
> In a required course taught in many sections by many different teachers, every effort should be made to maintain as close an agreement as possible on standards for reckoning course grades.
>
> (Kitzhaber, pp. 133-138)

Just as Kitzhaber's recommendations under "Administration" will in some cases be challenged later in this study, so will his recommendations listed under "Teaching."

More than either of the two previously considered headings, "Curriculum" contains recommendations which represent those which are either most strongly attacked or most strongly supported by other experts in the field. It is in this section of his study that Kitzhaber most abundantly relies on his professional biases, reliances which in some cases will not be able to stand intact in the face of scientific investigation.

Curriculum:

> It is time that the English departments of reputable four-year colleges and universities announce that elementary instruction in the details of correct grammar, usage, and

> mechanics is not a proper activity for college classrooms.
>
> If a principle aim of the required freshman English courses is to teach students to improve their ability to write expository prose, some provision should be made in these courses for explicit instruction in those principles of rhetoric that are especially pertinent to exposition.
>
> Like the principles of rhetoric, a few of the principles of logic ought to be made known to the student if he is to become a better writer of expository prose.
>
> Ideally, a freshman English program ought to contain a serious introduction to the study of language, with special attention to English.
>
> Meanwhile, desirable as it would be to incorporate in freshman English courses a major unit on language, and especially the English language, such a recommendation would at the present be unrealistic.
>
> It would be rash to try to prescribe dogmatically a certain kind of course or a particular pattern of courses in freshman English for all colleges. Colleges vary too much in size, in kind of students, in administrative structure, and in curricular organization for a single kind of course or sequence of courses to make equally good sense on every campus.
>
> (Kitzhaber, pp. 138-144)

The most dramatic section of Kitzhaber's entire study involves the best scientific research incorporated into the study. Kitzhaber reports on a study made of the rate of errors per one thousand words of writing by freshman, sophomores, and seniors at one particular institution. The findings of the error-rate study tend to downgrade the validity of Kitzhaber's other statements. They may go as far as providing fuel to the fire of those who would abolish freshman English entirely. "The figures look

discouraging. In the papers studied, sophomores made almost as many errors in their writing after a year and a half of college as freshman do at the beginning of English I and more than freshmen at the end of English I. Seniors are worse than sophomore, having made more errors in their papers than freshmen do at the beginning of English I," (Kitzhaber, pp. 108-109).

The complete results of the error-rate study are included in the List of Appendices.

Kitzhaber does not question the accuracy of the error-rate study but he does offer an explanation. "The explanation of this performance appears to simply be carelessness." (Kitzhaber, p. 109).

Overlooking the possibility that freshman composition just may not be able to do what we so often expect from it, Kitzhaber instead stands firm in his contention that carelessness is the cause of poor writing by upper-classmen. To counteract this carelessness, Kitzhaber has drawn up a list of observations and recommendations which he feels will be methods to curtail careless writing by upper-classmen.

Recommendations for Writing After the Freshman Year:

> The great majority of students who pass freshman English with grade of C or above at reputable four-year colleges and universities can write reasonably well or better when they know they must, but often they are reprehensibly slipshod.
>
> A steady pressure to write well must be exerted on college students throughout their undergraduate years; the more opportunities

> that can be provided for them to write careful prose, the better their chances of developing a decent prose style.
>
> Any writing that students do in a college course should be judged for its quality as English prose as well as for considerations that rise more directly from the demands of the subject itself.
>
> Poor writing should be penalized just as poor thinking is penalized; in most subjects the two are undistinguishable.
>
> More students who earn a pair of D's or a D and a low C in freshman English do not have a secure grasp on the technique of good writing and should be watched more closely during their remaining three years.
>
> A college or university faculty should endorse an official statement of policy on student writing.
>
> An institution-wide Committee on Student English, when strongly supported by the college or university administration and vigorously led by an able chairman, can have a salutary effect on the general quality of student writing after the freshman year even if it cannot hope to solve the problem of poor writing in any final sense.
>
> (Kitzhaber, pp. 150-156)

As an appendix, exemption policy again becomes part of Kitzhaber's study. "Freshman English," he reports, "is perhaps the likeliest of all the courses in the freshman year from which able students might seek to be exempted.... But in spite of pressure from Advanced Placement courses in English and the trend toward accelerating the education of bright students, there is still no sign among college English departments of a general agreement on what to do about exempting students from the freshman course" (Kitzhaber, pp. 157-158). While Kitzhaber speaks out for general agreement regarding

exempting able students from the freshman English sequence, it is worth noting here that this problem has been looked at on a state-wide basis, the verification of which appears later in this review.

The second major study of some quality to be reviewed here is that done by Harrison Hoblitzelle who described his study as follows:

> The study focuses upon certain representative public (in most cases, State) universities with selected student bodies: the University of California (Berkeley) State University of New York (Stony Brook), University of Oregon, University of Michigan, University of North Carolina, University of Virginia, University of Massachusetts, and The City College (New York). New York University is included, as are two other private institutions, Harvard and Stanford, insofar as new developments in their freshman programs may lend themselves to wide application.
> (Hoblitzelle, p. 596)

Remember that the institutions studied by Hoblitzelle were individually selected and not the products of random selection. Because of their respective financial capabilities, and type of student who normally enrolls at those institutions, the findings of Hoblitzelle's study are not necessarily a report on what <u>should be</u> as much as what <u>is</u> at selected institutions. No English department should accept these findings as law without first determining how applicable they are to the local institution.

The most significant findings of Hoblitzelle's study are as follows:

Class size ranged from seventeen to thirty with the average class being twenty-two. Sectioning of students was

done randomly. Six to eight percent of entering freshman were exempted from the freshman English sequence. Only one institution had special sections for English majors, and remedial sections were disappearing.

Course content varied somewhat. All schools reported some commonality in their respective programs, however. Each required a full year of freshman English, during which time the student was expected to write eight to ten thousand words. The first third of the year's study was normally devoted to composition with the second two-thirds adding a study of literature based on a strong thematic line insofar as the organization of the reading was concerned. Predictably, there were nearly as many favored texts as there were directors involved in the study.

Linguistics and language study came under scrutinty and it was determined that linguists have not yet come up with a good freshman text; therefore, linguistics is not really a part of the freshman English curriculum. For one reason or another, language study is not yet a part of the curriculum of the freshman English programs at the institutions studied.

There was a high degree of commonality with regard to grading in the respective freshman English programs involved. Most departments reported they called meetings to discuss themes in an attempt to reach a reasonably high degree of conformity in grading practices. Oregon reported a practice in grading which allows the teachers to non-grade themes during the first fewweeks of a term. Stanford has a

policy which allows election of non-graded themes all term where only a cumulative grade is given at the end of the year.

Staffing of freshman English courses at the institutions in question is quite different, one school to another. Overall, a very high percentage of all freshman English courses were taught by graduate assistants. More satisfactory staffing arrangements were reported from Berkeley, where several distinguished members of the department taught within the freshman English program; from New York University, where freshman English courses are taught primarily by full-time faculty, most of whom are instructors; and from City College of New York which reported the most desirable procedure of staffing their freshman English classes. At CCNY all members of the English department have at least one section of freshman English per year.

Some of the institutions polled provided a very rigid syllabus for freshman English while others were quite free insofar as the instructor was allowed to establish his own syllabus. In-service training for instructors varied from one institution to another as much as syllabus policy did. Special reference should be made, however, to the University of Massachusetts where workshops are held two to three days before the fall semester (Hoblitzelle, pp. 596-599).

Despite their respective sizes and financial capabilities, the institutions Hoblitzelle studied are not, in his opinion, teaching their freshman English courses to the

best possible advantage of their students. Hoblitzelle states, "Six of the nine universities studied here suffer in varying degrees from the failure of their administrators to accept what one might call the political significance, let alone academic importance of freshman English" (Hoblitzelle, p. 599).

Other studies in this review will to some degree reaffirm Hoblitzelle's observation about the laxity by administrators where freshman English is concerned. Too often administrators fail to provide funds enough for English departments to teach at the level they are capable of, and this same lack of support on the part of college administrators also shows itself as a prime reason so few English departments are able to undertake the instructional development tasks they are able to perform.

Easily the most prolific writer interested in the plight of freshman English in very recent years is Bonnie E. Nelson. Working under the auspices of the Modern Language Association, Nelson has conducted a number of studies of specific institutions' freshman English programs. Her review of freshman English programs, in its totality, includes sixty-six colleges and universities and is presented in the form of ten separate presentations. In some cases the reviews are quite brief and of little or no worth insofar as the individual institutions' programs are described; however, in other instances she has gathered relatively comprehensive descriptions of individual

institutions' freshman English programs. And while the Nelson reviews are descriptive only and are totally void of conclusions or recommendations by Nelson herself, the programs represented within them are deserving of comment at the descretion of the writer of this study. The writer will attempt to relate the information pertinent to this study in as brief a fashion as possible.

Some institutions' freshman English programs as described by Nelson will be given a great deal of space in this study while others will get little or no mention. Nelson treated the institutions serially, except for one presentation with a multi-institution generability, and the writer of this study will follow that same format.

Nelson's most generalizable piece concerns itself with statements of purpose from eight institutions regarding their introductory course in English. It was Nelson's aim to let the statements of purpose illustrate how local situations and attitudes toward the teaching of writing affect the make-up of these courses (Nelson, College, p. 2).

The reader will easily detect a divergence of purpose, content, and organization of the freshman English courses, again illustrating that there is not only no one freshman English course but that there is not even agreement insofar as intent of the courses is concerned.

The report from the University of Alabama states, "Since English programs are supposed to deal with language, composition, and literature, our course is planned to

provide instruction in all three, but the main emphasis will be upon composition" (Nelson, College, p. 2).

"The primary purpose of English," according to those in charge at John Carroll University, "is to enable the student to write clear, graceful, and effective expository prose" (Nelson, College, p. 3).

Working from experiences, a characteristic of many freshman English programs, is a major aspect at Purdue. Describing the Purdue freshman program, their director writes, "This course emphasizes the organization of the expository theme based on your experience. You will learn to isolate and describe the individual experience and to compare and contrast it with other experiences" (Nelson, College, p. 3).

"The freshman program [at the University of Tulsa] is a two semester sequence (two courses, three hours each) almost exclusively concerned with composition. We are able to presume a level of proficiency and go on from there to teach matters beyond correctness--style rather than simply writing" (Nelson, College, p. 3).

Another popular approach to freshman English, the genre approach, is employed by Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville Campus. Southern reports, "GSD 101b has a dual purpose: it serves as an introduction to the genre of drama, and it also serves as a course in freshman composition, particularly the preparation of a research paper," (Nelson, College, p. 3).

Rejection of the highly literature-based freshman course is seen in the English Department's brochure to entering freshmen at the University of Southern California. The freshmen are informed that, "In this one semester English 101 required course, the English Composition Committee has deemed it both wise and practical to have you concentrate on the practice of writing, as done both by professional writers and by you yourself, rather than on the subject matters of philosophy, literature, sociology, politics, current events, or what have you" (Nelson, College, p. 3).

Still another function of the freshman English course is noted in the report from Ohio State University, one of many institutions which include reading improvement as a goal of the freshman sequence. "The primary purpose of English 101 is to improve the students' skill in writing expository prose; the secondary--and ancillary--purpose of the course is to improve the students' skill in reading" (Nelson, College, p. 4).

Study of literary types is the backbone of many freshman English programs, including that of Marquette University where, "The aim of English 1 is to develop in the student a skill in the reading, analysis, appreciation and evaluation of two literary types (the short story and the novel) and also the skill of writing clear and effective expository prose which in content and form is considered at the level expected of a college student" (Nelson, College, p. 4).

Leaving institutions' specific objectives, Nelson, in the same report, comments on a number of current trends in freshman English courses across the country. The earlier part of Nelson's report showed lack of agreement as to just what the function of freshman English is, yet out of this state of affairs comes some homogeneity. "Emerging from the confusion, however, are three major concepts of the composition course, supported by practical, 'old liberal', and 'new liberal' arguments," (Nelson, College, p. 4). Nelson describes each of the three major concepts as follows:

> The practical or 'service' concept argues that the course remedies poor high school training and provides needed instruction to students whose lack of writing skills will hamper them in all courses.
>
> According to this view, [the old liberal] the primary purpose of the course is to teach fundamental principles of clear thinking and effecting writing and to provide opportunities for the student to improve his skills in these areas.
>
> The 'new liberal' concept of the composition course emphasizes both the student's 'growth in imaginative, intellectual and linguistic power' on 'the process involved in such everyday activities as talking and thinking things over.'
>
> (Nelson, College, pp. 4-5)

Nelson follows her course descriptions with a report from one university regarding a matter which is highly relevant to freshman English programs at larger universities, namely the graduate assistant situation. Using Duquesne University's study in this matter, Nelson presents an evaluation of the reasons behind one institution's decision to continue the practice of using graduate

assistants to handle the bulk of freshman English courses.

Duquesne had seventeen teaching assistants and one research assistant at the time of the study. The study group found that the average cost per section was five hundred and thirty dollars. If the existing system were dropped, one of four alternatives would have to be used, according to the study group. The alternatives were:

1. the present staff would take over those classes presently taught by the assistants.
2. the department would hire replacement faculty at the lowest paid academic rank.
3. team-teaching would be employed.
4. any combination of the first three would be adopted.

The first alternative was dismissed as being impractical as it would overload existing faculty members. Alternative two was ruled out when it was determined that it would increase department costs by at least twenty-two thousand dollars per academic year. The team-teaching alternative was rejected by the committee as simply inadequate.

The decision was made to keep the graduate assistant program in force but with certain modifications, foremost of which was to be an attempt to attract larger numbers of superior candidates. This up-grading of candidates was to be accomplished through revision of the graduate assistantship announcements, requiring prospective candidates to submit a sample of their writing along with their applications, and requiring a personal interview where at all possible (Nelson, College, pp. 19-25).

Moving to Nelson's reports on programs at specific institutions of higher learning, one can identify trends which seem fairly well established and one can identify innovative practices which are not as yet standard procedure with many schools. One of the current trends which is seen with some degree of regularity is the practice of allowing entering freshmen to choose one or two courses from a substantial list of courses rather than the mandatory sequence in composition.

An example of an institution which allows freshmen a choice of courses to satisfy the freshman English requirement is Washington University. One should be aware that the choices given by Washington University are typical of free-choice programs in that few of the courses included are ones which place emphasis on writing as such. The course titles indicate the breadth of choice freshmen at Washington University have.

> Traditions of Western Literature
> Autobiography
> Heroes and Anti-Heroes
> Experience and Expression (emphasis on writing)
> Innocence and Experience in Literature
> American Literature and Values
> Introduction to the Drama
> The Epic
> Satire
> An Introduction to the Reading of Poetry
>
> (Nelson, College, pp. 40-42)

A common variation of the free-choice of courses to satisfy the freshman English requirement is to make one or more courses mandatory then allow the student to choose freely from a list of other courses which will satisfy the

total requirement. The State University of New York at Buffalo uses this mandatory-courses-plus-free-choice-courses system. Freshmen at that institution are required to take at least one semester of courses titled:

Analytic Writing
Reading and Writing
Writing About Experience

The remainder of the freshman English requirement is made up of courses selected from a list of fifteen, a list which for the most part parallels that of Washington University (Nelson, Buffalo, pp. 1-8).

Freshman English programs, whether they offer free choice of courses or not, may or may not be products of outside influence. An example of a freshman English program designed to meet the pressures of persons outside the English department is that of the University of Hawaii. The main purpose of the program at that institution is to meet stated needs of others. A representative of that English department claims that their program aims to serve "...the purpose that the deans of the various colleges expect us to achieve--to help students learn to write good English expository prose" (Nelson, Hawaii, p. 14).

To achieve their desired end, the English Department of the University of Hawaii is deliberate in selection of staff. "The staff of freshman English consists almost entirely of full-time instructors. Only a few are taught by graduate assistants, all of whom work under close supervision. A few sections are taught by assistant

professors" (Nelson, Hawaii, p. 68). And in a further attempt to attain quality instruction in their freshman program, the University of Hawaii prepares a fifty page syllabus for the first semester. Control is relatively rigid, except that individual class assignments and readings are not set forth in detail. Also, despite the huge first semester syllabus, new staff members go through orientation before classes start in the fall, an orientation period which extends into the first two weeks of the semester. After that time, staff meetings are held approximately every two weeks (Nelson, Hawaii, p. 69).

Communications as the basis for freshman English programs is common enough, although not as common as it once was. Columbia Basin College is one of the institutions which still uses the Communications basis. Their freshman program "...includes study of basic language skills and analysis of public media" (Nelson, Tulsa, p. 14). The same program boasts still another practice which is gaining support across the country--multiple tracking. At Columbia Basin the freshmen are put into one of three tracks as a result of their performance on the Washington Pre-College Test. A diagnostic essay is given during the first week of classes to allow discovery of any obvious misplacements within the program (Nelson, Tulsa, p. 13).

Western State College of Colorado also stresses Communications in its freshman English program. The major difference between this program and that of the Columbia

Basin is that Western emphasizes oral communication (Nelson, Tulsa, p. 38).

Junior college first year English programs could well offer insights into current trends; however, such is not usually the case as their programs tend to be somewhat traditional. This contention is backed up by Bonnie Nelson's study of freshman English at fourteen two-year colleges.

Nelson found all fourteen two-year college programs fairly traditional, offering no surprises as such. Most of them use a two track system, with one track for terminal students and one for transfers-to-be. However, a few points brought up by Nelson are worthy of mention if for no other reason than to show the general type of thing being done in freshman English at junior colleges. For example, Amarillo College grants about twenty percent advanced standing as a result of pre-testing. Teachers there are responsible for as many as five sections of twenty students each, with ten themes a semester (Nelson, Fourteen, pp. 1-41). This high student-load is not an occurence unique to Amarillo and may be found in many junior colleges across the country. According to experts in the field, teachers with so many students in a composition program can hardly be expected to do their best.

Not at all typical of the too infrequent attempt to bring innovation to freshman English programs is that work being done by the University of Kentucky where innovations

already in effect are seen in the following from their director of freshman English:

1. Departmental Final Examination: all students are required to take the departmental final examination at the end of the first semester's course. Those receiving an E receive this grade for the course unless the student's instructor appeals for a review of the final and all written work. One other matter about the departmental final: it is graded by someone other than the student's regular teacher. In addition, experienced staff members grade the papers of students taught by graduate students who are teaching for the first time.

2. Student Profile Forms: all students have at least three conferences with their instructors. At the end of each conference, the instructor completes a student profile form to indicate the student's weaknesses and to make certain that at least some of the conference time is devoted to a review of the student's writing.

3. Statement of Standards: this statement has been developed to promote some uniformity in grading. In addition, next year I plan to circulate a theme every week and to follow it several days later with a detailed analysis and evaluation of it.

4. Next fall I will begin a team teaching television experiment in Freshman English. During the summer I plan to make a series of fifteen minute video tapes and to write a teachers' guides for them. This material will be used by graduate assistants, who will follow my television presentation with a thirty-five minute planned discussion of the points made.

(Nelson, Kentucky, p. 22)

As the student at Ohio State progresses through the two courses in the freshman English sequence, he is brought into contact with other objectives and other methods including argumentative and persuasive prose, and expository writing based on assigned readings for poetry, drama, and short fiction. One other aspect of Ohio State's program warrants

mention and that is the realization on the part of the program directors that too many teachers have a tendency to become more involved with the literature they assign than they are with the teaching of composition which is their first objective. In an effort to counteract this center-on-the-literature tendency, that institution's freshman English faculty is provided with a detailed syllabus which goes into length in suggesting ways in which literature can be used properly and effectively to assist in the instruction of composition (Nelson, Kentucky, p. 47).

The freshman English program at Purdue University serves as a good example of an institution's faculty being utilized to the maximum. The Purdue program calls for at least fifteen themes per semester. The concentration in the themes is on logical and rhetorical problems in writing discursive essays during the second term, preceded by a first semester emphasis on expository writing and personal experience (Nelson, Kentucky, pp. 60-64).

Purdue offers at least two avenues of advanced placement. If a student receives a grade of "A" in the first semester, he may obtain approval for taking an English literature elective instead of the normal second semester freshman course (Nelson, Kentucky, p. 60). Also, the Purdue English department clearly spells out another method of attaining advanced standing. The following

statement is part of that institution's prepared handout for entering freshmen.

> If you have indicated superior writing ability by your high school achievement and your score on the verbal section of the College Entrance Examination, you will be assigned directly to English 103. If you receive a grade of C or better, you will be given an additional three credits for English 101 and excused from English 102.
>
> If you are an English major, you will be required to take English 103. However you may be first assigned to English 101 and 102, as prerequisites, depending on your preparation and ability.
>
> (Nelson, Kentucky, p. 65)

The traditional freshman English course requires one full academic year to complete. However, some institutions have cut that requirement back to only one term while others have increased it to two academic years. The latter approach was taken by Southern Illinois University at Carbondale where the freshman English program has been replaced by a freshman-sophomore sequence called General Studies in English. Students at Southern Illinois are requested to complete three composition courses during their freshman year, to be followed by four literature courses their sophomore year (Nelson, Kentucky, p. 67).

Like Purdue, Southern Illinois has a liberal exemption policy which allows able students to by-pass much of the standard first year requirement.

> The first of a three-quarter composition sequence, 101 is required of all students scoring below the seventieth percentile in English on the ACT Test.

> Students who rank from 70 to 89% on the ACT scores are exempted from the first quarter and assigned to the second.
>
> Students who rank from 90 to 100% on the ACT scores are exempted from the first two quarters and assigned to the third course. (Nelson, Kentucky, pp. 70-79)

Particularly unique with the Southern Illinois freshman English program is a rule regarding in-service training for the instructors involved. "All new teaching assistants and instructors without teaching experience at the college level are required to enroll in English 585, which meets each Wednesday from 305. All new junior staff members are required to audit the course" (Nelson, Kentucky, p.92). The idea of requiring new faculty members to take a regularly schedule course is quite innovative and deserves consideration by other institution's English departments. Such a course would be especially beneficial where no other in-service training is offered on a regular basis.

Strict adherence to a constant theme during a freshman English course is exemplified by the program at Augustana College. There the emphasis in freshman English is "...on the craft of writing, on clear and effective thought and expression," and "the course will now focus on a central topic, 'The Measure of Man.' During the first semester students in Freshman English will read, hear and write about the ways in which man seeks to identify himself" (Nelson, Seven, p. 1).

The staggered year approach to freshman English is popular in the form employed at Central Washington State College. There the freshman English requirement in composition is spread out over three years. One quarter of sophomore composition is required, as is one quarter of composition in the junior year (Nelson, Seven, p. 2).

While most freshman English programs call for the students to write a research paper--either a controlled source paper or a library paper--King's College has made it standard practice to require both types of their freshmen. In the first term the students write a controlled source paper, and in the second term they write the library paper (Nelson, Seven, p. 30). One can readily see the advantage of the King's College requirement. Students there work with controlled sources as novices then move to the library to concentrate on research procedures once they have mastered the mechanics of writing research papers.

Another system for handling freshman composition classes is the lecture-tutorial method such as that employed by Bob Jones University.

> The Freshman English program at Bob Jones University uses a lecture-tutorial system of large lecture classes (from 120 to 180 students) and small tutorials (approximately 15 students). The large lecture classes allow...more experienced instructors to present the material and the small tutorials give...an opportunity to test the students, give them personal help, and answer questions on the lecture material

> and composition assignments. Many of these tutorials are taught by graduate assistants and other part-time personnel.
> (Nelson, Twelve, p. 8)

Bob Jones University also includes vocabular study in its freshman English program. Words for the vocabulary exercises are taken from the freshman history textbook (Nelson, Twelve, p. 8). Both lecture-tutorial systems and vocabulary study as part of freshman English will receive some individual attention later in this review.

Nelson's report on John Carroll University's freshman English program indicates the traditional approach for the most part. That institution has, however, made clear divisions in their syllabus. "The first half of the freshman year in English is differentiated into four levels--review, normal, and advanced, and honors; the second half is divided into normal, advanced, and honors" (Nelson, Twelve, p. 9). For subject matter, the Carroll freshman English sequence calls for a progression from poetry to the short story, then to the novel, and finally to the drama (Nelson, Twelve, p. 33).

Recognition of a common problem for freshman English instructors is made by the English department at the University of Mississippi. In the departmental instructions to the freshman instructors is the following:

> Remember that you are teaching freshmen. A few months ago they were in high school. Most of them have little idea of what is to be expected of them in the university. Explain what you expect to teach them and what you will require of them. Make your

> assignments clear and as much as possible in advance.
>
> (Nelson, Twelve, p. 46)

The above instructions are no doubt aimed at easing the anxiety of the freshmen students, but there is another reason for such a statement. At least partially responsible for the statement is an attitude which can be noted in that department's statement:

> Teaching freshman composition requires of the teacher first a precise definition of his objectives, and, second, firm discipline in following his planned program of instruction.
>
> (Nelson, Twelve, p. 46)

One should readily recognize that to be able to so completely inform the students of what is expected of them, the instructor himself must be organized and his lessons and assignments must be well planned. Therefore, the Mississippi statement to the faculty serves two worthwhile functions.

Contrasting the multi-course requirement of some institutions, Washington State University requires only one three-hour course to fulfill the composition requirements for graduation. Students in the Washington State freshman English program write ten to twelve graded assignments in that one course. The ten to twelve assignments total approximately four to six thousand words (Nelson, Twelve, p. 72). Washington State's one required course is representative of that practice as many other institutions also use a slightly modified version of the same system.

There are many yardsticks to measure a student's success in freshman English. Much too often a department will have no firmly determined criteria upon which a student is passed or failed. Not so at the University of North Carolina where "...the measure of students' achievement in English 1 or English 2 is based primarily upon how well they can write. Exercises, quizzes, and in-class and out-of-class themes will provide students with ample opportunity to develop and demonstrate their writing skills" (Nelson, Eight, p. 2). Simply stated, instructors at North Carolina pass or fail a student according to his writing ability and that alone.

While the University of North Carolina has stated criterion for determining a student's success in freshman English, their program has one other feature which interests the writer much more. The program calls for evaluation of the instructors by the students. The following is part of the announcement on evaluation which each instructor receives:

> Teacher Evaluation forms are...available to all instructors who wish, at the end of a semester, to get their students' impressions of their effectiveness as teachers. No one on the Freshman English staff is required to use these forms, but all instructors are encouraged to use them for their own information.
>
> (Nelson, Eight, p. 34)

Students at North Carolina and elsewhere would probably enjoy the opportunity to evaluate their instructors for the instructors will be evaluating the students at various times during the year. The students will spend varying

amounts of time preparing themselves for evaluation. And while the in-class time a student must spend is spelled out always, seldom are the students told how much is expected of them out-of-class. The University of Santa Clara is one institution which does set up standards regarding the amount of time a student should spend on his freshman English course in other than class hours.

> According to University standards, a student is to spend eight hours per week in study for this course. Approximately three to four hours should be spent in reading the material; the balance of the time in writing.
>
> (Nelson, Eight, p. 54)

Programmed instruction, a technique to be treated in more depth later in this review, is employed at South Dakota State University. That school also uses television in its freshman English program.

The South Dakota approach to freshman English calls for the students falling into one of four categories. First, a remedial clinic is operated and may be used by all students. Otherwise, the lowest 40% of students according to ACT scores taken English 103, the next 40% go directly to English 113, and the upper 20% of the students go directly to English 143. English 103 and 113 are taught one hour via television and two hours via live instructors each week. The advanced course, English 143 does not make use of television at all. Instead, 143 students receive three hours a week of live instruction (Nelson, Eight, pp. 59-60). It would seem to the writer

that the use of television is acceptable but that if any group needs live instruction more than another it is the group with the least ability, not the group with the most ability.

What the poorer students may need most, personal contact, is the strong point of many freshman English programs, including that of the University of California which uses the popular 'conference' technique. Some schools define the number of conferences and others do not--Southern California does. Student and instructor are to meet for three conferences during the semester in the Southern California program. The final conference takes place during the last week of the semester and it is at that time that the instructor is to tell the student what grade he will receive and why. This last conference becomes doubly important when one realizes that that institution has no final examination in freshman English, only a final conference (Nelson, Eight, pp. 69-70).

What is perhaps the most liberal freshman English program reported on by Bonnie Nelson is that of Tufts University. The following announcement from the Tufts English department explains:

> Beginning in the fall of 1968 the Department of English will introduce a new approach to the teaching of Freshman English. Instead of the department's attempting to organize a single program flexible enough to satisfy a variety of students' needs and instructors' talents, each teacher of Freshman English will design his own course. The only common element amount twelve to fifteen courses

> will be the continued emphasis on developing the students' competence in reading, writing, and thinking. As before, every student will write at least 7000 words each semester on a variety of topics, and will receive individual comments both in marginal notes and in private conferences with his instructor.
>
> (Nelson, Eight, p. 83)

Contrasting the freedom the instructors of Tufts enjoy is a rigid grading scale employed by Wake Forest. Instructors are given little freedom at Wake Forest insofar as determining the seriousness of a student error is concerned. That institution's English department has set down a series of common errors on freshman themes and has stated how much each error should be penalized.

> Two point errors:
>
> sentence fragment
> comma splice
> subject and verb disagreement
> gross illiteracies (had went, could of, etc.)
>
> One point errors:
>
> incorrect use of adjective and adverb
> case errors
> pronoun and antecedent disagreement
> failure to form proper possessive
> tense errors
> lack of coherence
> violation of parallelism
> faulty reference of pronouns
>
> One-half point error:
>
> misspelling
>
> (Nelson, Eight, p. 85)

With the points-per-error list goes instruction on how it is to be used in determining just how much to downgrade a theme with these errors in it.

> After the first two writing assignments, an excess of three points will mean an

> automatic F for the assignment; after the fourth assignment, an excess of two points will be an F. An exception will be made for in-class writing, where one additional point will be allowed.
>
> When, in the judgement of the instructor, a student has consistently eliminated from assignments recurrent errors causing F's, his failing papers will receive additional consideration.
>
> (Nelson, Eight, p. 85)

Here we see about the toughest system there is for grading freshman English papers. The writer must show some bias here by stating that many of nation's foremost thinkers would still be taking freshman English had they been subjected to the Wake Forest standards, and had those standards in fact been enforced.

The grading scale is not the only aspect of the Wake Forest freshman English program worthy of mention. That institution retains a practice one much more general than now--outlining. "All outside themes will be accompanied by outlines. In addition, two outside themes will be preceded by an outline, checked but not graded by the instructor" (Nelson, Eight, p. 87). Nelson's review did not suggest any method of determining whether Wake Forest students wrote their outlines before, after or during the writing of their themes.

Probably the most revolutionary trend in freshman English is the trend toward abolising it. Nelson devoted one study to a group of nine institutions which had reportedly eliminated the traditional course in freshman English. Each of these programs is important in its own right and will be dealt with individually.

The writer notes that in most cases the institutions have not really dropped the freshman English requirement and the major change is often only in course name and support subject matter. For example, Antioch College makes the following claim:

> ...in 1957, when the college adopted a new program in general education, the faculty agreed that everyone had a stake in the fostering of clear and persuasive writing in students. Forthwith, the Department of English became (and still is) the Department of Literature.
>
> (Nelson, Nine, p. 1)

Antioch makes the assumption that all students there know how to write. However, first term freshmen write a short essay during Orientation Week and only after a reader deems it satisfactory is the student free to choose his own courses. Students who fail to receive satisfactory scores on the essay must enroll in a course which demands a great deal of writing while working on an individual basis with a tutor (Nelson, Nine, p. 1). One can readily see that Antioch has not really abolished freshman English. They have merely affected a large scale exemption policy. Students who need freshman English are still required to take it.

The Antioch approach to freshman English could not work at all colleges and universities and the Antioch Department of Literature is quick to admit it. They state, "This system is possible in large measure because of high entrance requirements, and it might not work so well in another institution" (Nelson, Nine, p. 1).

Baker College, rather than actually eliminating freshman composition, has included it in another sequence under another name.

> We are eliminating our Freshman Composition 1 and 2 as such beginning in September. Theme writing will be incorporated in the three-year Humanities Core program. A Writing Laboratory will be set up to give special assistance to those students for whom the Core teacher's comments were insufficient.
>
> (Nelson, Nine, p. 2)

The free choice of subjects to satisfy the freshman requirement, very similar to the Washington University's program which was discussed earlier in this review, is the direction of Clark University with their freshman English program. Clark students make a choice of the following:

> The Individual and Society
> The Initiation Rite
> The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness
> The Hero and the Anti-Hero
>
> (Nelson, Nine, p. 3)

Students at Emory University are required to take three five-credit courses to meet the freshman English total. The courses are involved with poetry, fiction, and drama, respectively. Despite the subject matter used here, the Emory program is neither unique nor far afield from freshman programs in dozens of other schools, (Nelson, Nine, p. 9). Exerpts from the stated objectives of these three courses indicate how much the Emory program in fact parallels those of other institutions.

Poetry:

Emphasis upon growing maturity in the student's critical thinking and written expression.

Fiction:

Training in the elements of critical thought and the principles of techniques of composition.

Drama:

Continued emphasis on critical thinking and effective writing.

(Nelson, Nine, p. 9)

The University of Maryland is another institution which Nelson includes in her list of those which have eliminated the traditional course in freshman English. A closer examination, however, shows that such is not actually the case. What Maryland has done for the most part is change the name and numerical designation of the standard freshman course. Maryland has combined one part of the Antioch system and one of the Baker system, although the writer readily admits that there was likely no intentional borrowing of formats. The end products of the three universities have similar appearances, however.

Like Antioch, Maryland has affected a large scale exemption policy, and like Baker, Maryland has imposed a required number of hours in literature. But regardless of what it is called, Maryland maintains a freshman English requirements. If a student cannot gain exemption, he must take a course in composition. The following statement from Maryland University verifies the requirement and also reveals that the course has been given remedial stature:

> ...before a student is allowed to take any course above the 0100 level offered by the English Department he must either pass one of the three-hour English courses at the 0100 level (or equivalent), or receive the permission of the Co-ordinator for English.
> (Nelson, Nine, pp. 17-18)

The 0100 level course that must be passed carries the following instructions:

> ...in all 0100 level courses...the student writes eight papers, one of which may be an impromptu 'mid-term' paper, another of which may be an impromptu 'final' paper.
> (Nelson, Nine, pp. 17-18)

Despite the new labels, freshman English classes quite in the traditional sense do exist for those students who are unable to gain exemption at Maryland University.

There are included in Nelson's study, reports of two institutions which have indeed done away with freshman English. They are Swarthmore College and Tulane University. "Swarthmore does not require a composition course for entering freshmen nor is one offered" (Nelson, Nine, p. 24). And commenting on freshman English, Tulane officials maintain, "The fact is that virtually all applicants to Tulane today already possess the level of competence in general reading and writing skills which such a course is intended to cultivate and assure" (Nelson, Nine, p. 26).

Still another institution included in Nelson's list of those which have eliminated the traditional freshman program is Juniata College. At that institution there is an English composition competence required for graduation.

Said competence may be demonstrated in a formal class situation, highly supported by conferences, or he may demonstrate competence at any other time by satisfying a committee of advisors. Regardless of which method a student chooses to receive certification that he has met the competency requirements in English, competence is only a graduation requirement and does not carry any credit hours (Nelson, College, p. 13).

The freshman English program at Elmira College is different from most other freshman programs, not so much because it frees the student from writing training but because of the methodology used. Instructors there are given a free hand in determining the content of their particular sections. Classes are small and are as likely to meet in a recreation room, a lounge, or a faculty office as they are to meet in a classroom. But when all is said and done, the objectives of this program are not too different from others. The instructors still work on reading, writing and speaking. Students still write themes. Remedial help with writing is still very much available (Nelson, College, pp. 14-17).

In summary of Nelson's report on institutions which have abolished traditional freshman English, the writer wishes to reiterate an earlier remark. Although one may often hear of the current trend to drop freshman English, such is in fact not the case except in a very few institutions where entering freshmen bring to the college with

them a high degree of competence on writing. What is most often referred to as dropping freshman English is nothing more than a new package for the same old product.

Many of the programs reviewed to this point have placed varying amounts of emphasis on small classes. However, there are those who advocate and defend freshman English classes well in the hundreds at certain times. One such proponent of this system is Walter G. Praushitz who, after a study at Concordia, wrote the following:

> Provided the classroom facilities are equivalent (and provided the teacher makes the necessary adjustments in preparation), there is little difference between lecturing to 30 or to 300 students, except to the college treasurer.
>
> (Praushitz, p. 17)

The large lecture classes Praushitz is reporting on are too often rejected as a technique by English departments which have never tested it. Large lecture groups could well be the answer to some of the major logistic problems facing many freshman English programs today.

First-hand testing of hypotheses regarding the teaching of freshman English is being done in some quarters. A fine example of evaluation of freshman English is that one reported on by Braddock and Statler.

> Several years ago the University of Northern Iowa initiated a project to test the effectiveness of college-level instruction in freshman composition. Briefly, the experiment involved excusing from the freshman composition course at each of the five institutions during the academic year 1964-65 some 325 entering freshmen matched with other entering freshmen taking the course. The UNI experiment intended to reach some

> generalizations about the effectiveness of freshman composition courses in general.
> (Braddock, Evaluation, p. 1)

A synopsis of the conclusions and recommendations from the Braddock and Statler report is as follows:

> Unfortunately, the answers sought by the project were not obtained. The results of the experiment were inconclusive, most importantly, because the rating of the papers was not reliable. Several explanations for the unreliability seem apparent:
>
> 1. The two themes used as a basis for selecting raters were both 'C' papers. In addition to 'C' papers, clear examples of 'A' and 'F' papers should have been used. It may be that the fourteen raters tended to keep their ratings near a 'safe' average range and hence not to discriminate differences among papers.
>
> 2. The rereading of papers to determine rating reliability should have been more carefully planned.
>
> 3. When two or more pretest or two or more posttest themes are used...probably the same type of assignment should be employed for each theme.
>
> 4. More time should have been devoted during the rating period to the rating and discussion of themes carefully selected to exemplify certain kinds of problems.
>
> 5. It has been suggested to the authors of this report that it might have been better to use a rating scale ranging more widely than the scale normally used for instructional purposes.
>
> 6. One explanation for the low reliability of the rating may have been that the differences among the papers were in fact very small. If that were true, it could be attributed to the ineffectiveness of requiring freshman composition. Perhaps by the college freshman year, writing habits are so established that instruction can affect them but little.
> (Braddock, Evaluation, pp. 25-27)

What the Iowa study should be remembered for is not that it failed to meet its objectives but rather that it was tried at all. The willingness of those involved to attempt some kind of a scientific evaluation is to be commended. If nothing else, the persons involved in this study have illustrated that whereas evaluation of freshman English is highly desirable, it is not easy. The writer suggests that the Iowa project has the value of pointing out the importance of outside aid for English departments which intend to evaluate their respective programs. Such departments would do well to recruit the assistance of educational psychology experts as well as persons with competence in tests and measurements. Had experts in educational psychology and tests and measurements been involved in the planning stages of the Iowa experiment, it is quite likely that the results would have been more gratifying.

Not all research connected with freshman English is, however, subject to incompleteness. And where experiments are kept simple, the chances of success are high. A good example of such is a study done on vocabulary by Alvina Burrows. That study was concerned mostly with elementary and secondary education but it has some implications to college freshman English, especially when the reader recalls a point earlier in this review where vocabulary building was emphasized in freshman English at one particular institution.

Burrows claims that there are between two and three thousand known words of maximum frequency in the English language. "Beyond these known words of maximum frequency, the chance of needing one word rather than another is one out of an astronomical figure" (Burrows, p. 25). Not only does Burrows' study include the above statement regarding vocabulary, it also contains the following warning about investing time and effort in studying other than maximum frequency words: "Further, time spent on studying these words of low frequency is a hazardous investment" (Burrows, p. 25).

In an attempt to increase quality experimentation with regard to the teaching of English, a number of nation-wide conferences have been called. The fact that about eighty English department representatives from across the nation gathered at Allerton Park in December of 1962 to discuss current research in the teaching of English indicates a strong and active interest in the matter (Wasson, p. 1). But despite this interest, the writer of this review feels there is still not enough worthwhile experimentation being done. Because of this belief, the writer has decided to review a number of experimental studies which he feels are indicative of the type of research needed.

John C. Woodward has conducted an interesting and informative study at Miami University. He attempted to draw a verbal picture of the poor writer. Here are selected points from his conclusions:

The poor writer tends to:

- be male
- score lower in all areas of college aptitude tests
- not differ from other writing categories in intended course of study
- not differ in age from other writers
- not differ from other students in native backgrounds, foreign or American
- come from a private school other than parochial
- come from a town of less than 2,500 population
- not differ from other students for size of senior high school class
- have fathers who are in a semiskilled occupation
- not differ from other groups for father's educational background
- have read the daily newspaper in high school the same amount of time as other students except for those who read 20-30 minutes a day
- come from a home who regularly subscribed to as many magazines as the other writing categories
- come from homes with no home library
- have written just as many term papers in their senior year of high school as other students
- come from a high school where essays or themes were not required in the English Composition classes
- have not been required to read any books aside from textbooks during their senior year in high school
- not differ from other writing categories for the amount of time their high school English classes spent on formal grammar except for those who spent more than one-half time. Students who spent more than one-half time are found less frequently in the 'poor' category
- prefer to read the same kinds of books as other students
- attend movies the same amount of times each week as other groups
- view TV the same amount of time as other students
- not enjoy writing
- dislike English teachers, but not to a significant degree
- feel that writing is not as important as other skills
- spend 'no' time in preparation before writing a theme
- have career goals similar to other students

(Woodward, pp. 35-37)

Woodward's study is capable of rocking the very foundation of some of our prejudice and bias about teaching composition and why a poor writer is a poor writer. Clearly, each and every point made by Woodward warrants further investigation in the best interests of teaching composition. Out of these other studies would come usable methods to be employed in the face of so many poor writers at the college level.

An example of how each of Woodward's points could and should be subjected to deeper analysis is a report by Samuel Aven and Marvin Chrisp. While the reviewer has no evidence to link the latter two men to any knowledge of Woodward's study, they have nonetheless gone into depth on the first point made in the profile of the poor writer--he is male.

Initially in Aven and Chrisp's study, Woodward's first point is verified.

> ...a standardized English text was administered to 1341 college freshmen. The findings indicated that girls were significantly more proficient in English than boys after twelve years of public school. On the standardized English test administered in the study, significantly more boys than girls scored below the 50th percentile.
>
> (Aven, p. 2)

The beauty of the Aven-Chrisp study is not the preceding; it is in their reaction to their findings. They presented the following statement which is food for thought, to be sure, but also suggests the need for even more study regarding this single aspect of the poor writer. They

wrote, "Traditionally English has been taught the same way to girls and boys. It is time to consider the possibility of teaching differently to boys" (Aven, p. 2).

Still another highly innovative experiment in teaching freshman English is 'Voice Project' at Stanford University. At that institution, one hundred student volunteers were taught by a staff who were in their own right writers with varying degrees of success in many types of literature. The objectives of the Stanford experiment were:

1. to assist the students to discover and develop their own writing 'voice' as well as a personal prose style, be that prose expository or creative.

2. to get experienced writers, including novelists, poets, playwrights, and essayists involved in the teaching of writing.

3. to experience working at various educational levels, through involving the students and faculty in experiments in elementary and secondary schools.

4. to work with students from varied socio-economic backgrounds.

5. to encourage like experiments through involving other institutions of higher learning by visitations, exchanges, seminars, and demonstrations.

The volunteer students taught at local schools and were encouraged to write from their experiences at those schools (Hawkes, pp. 1-306).

Stanford's evaluation of their experiment contains the following interesting remarks:

> Throughout this year we stimulated interest in writing on the Stanford campus and in the

> local schools and involved many different kinds of teachers and students in our efforts.
>
> (Hawkes, p. xvi)

> Then, too, our efforts to help our Stanford students to function at least in part as teachers in the schools were sometimes less effective than they might have been due to the necessary flexibility and spontaneity of the first year. That is, some of the less structured teaching moments were difficult for the students and a more precise ordering of future materials is probably desired.
>
> (Hawkes, p. xvii)

> It goes without saying that the most important aspect of this project was the use of the concept of voice and the use of recording devices to help students at different educational levels and of different social backgrounds to write more effectively.
>
> (Hawkes, p. xvii)

> Despite this present year of Voice Project work, and all that we know about rhetoric as well as new developments in linguistics, it seems safe to say that there will never be any one way to teach writing, and further, that we really do not know very much about this process.
>
> (Hawkes, p. xviii)

Again we see a statement which claims that much more research must be done before we will better understand the writing process and the teaching of writing. Yet while much more research is warranted, many college and university English departments do no research at all with this regard. Rather than properly instructionally develop a sound freshman English program built on a foundation of scientific findings, English departments are too ready to continue to act on a trial and error system, a system which very often falls far short of the objectives set for it.

When an English department wants to determine the feasibility the using one approach to the teaching of freshman English as opposed to another approach which might be used, there is no room for guess work. Both programs should be tested. The department should attempt to determine which of the two systems best serves its interests and those of the students who look to that department for a sound English education.

An example of this type of comparative analysis is found in Lamore Carter's study in which he experimented to determine the initial and sustained benefits of two methods of teaching remedial English at the college level. The two approaches Carter worked with were (1) the conventional--which involved lectures, the use of a textbook, grammar drills, class discussions, and impromptu essays--was designed to emphasize the most frequently occurring errors of typical college freshmen; (2) the laboratory method, using specially structured, unrehearsed verbal recordings of classroom responses and mimeographed copies of the same material as teaching content to instill better student understanding and skills in English without the use of textbooks or workbooks. Carter's evaluation instruments--pretest, posttest, and persistency test--pointed out that the laboratory technique was superior only insofar as improvement of spoken English was concerned (Carter, pp. 1-96).

If one were to ask what implications Carter's study has to freshman English as a whole, it could be stated that the experimenter now knows the validity of his initial hypothesis regarding which of the two methods would be best. It is often just as useful to disprove an hypothesis as it is to prove it, and so it is with Carter's experiment.

Another freshman English experiment which in fact failed to substantiate an hypothesis is that one run by Melvin Wolf and others who were interested in determining whether or not it was fact that a student's writing proficiency increased according to his writing frequency. A well conducted experiment using no less than six freshman English sections indicated that no positive correlation can be made between writing frequency and writing proficiency (Wolf, pp. 1-59).

Not all of the Wolf study resulted in negation, however. An important and interesting side-experiment showed positive results. That second experiment within the study established that there is a significant correlation between a student's ability to successfully handle grammatical and mechanical aspects of writing and his ability to write well, writing being considered competence with regard to content, organization, development of ideas, style, and control of mechanics (Wolf, pp. 1-59).

It is interesting to note that the Wolf study is the second in this review which has directly linked the ability to write well with the ability to perform with grammatical

accuracy. Earlier, Woodward's "Profile of the Poor Writer" had noted a significant correlation between students' high school grammatical study and their likelihood of being or not being in the poor writer category. More research on this matter will have to be done before one may rightfully state that colleges and universities are not serving the best interests of the students when they fail to include any grammar in their freshman English programs. Nevertheless, some research indicates that may be the case.

Just as Wolf and his associates experimented with two approaches to teaching freshman English so did Rex Burns and Robert Jones. These men chose to compare two popular but still experimental approaches to teaching freshman English--the lecture-tutorial technique, and team teaching. The results of the team teaching half of the experiment will not be known until 1970, but the evaluation of the lecture-tutorial method is completed and the results are favorable. When the lecture-tutorial method was compared to the traditional classroom lecture method--just as the team teaching technique will be compared--it was found that the experimental approach saved time and resulted in a sharper focus on subject matter, not to mention greatly improved communication between pupil and teacher. This method proved to be popular with the faculty and with the students as well (Burns, pp. 1-13).

Experimentation can provide the answers to many questions concerning freshman English. One particular

question Stockton College wanted answered involved whether or not the English test they were using to pre-test freshmen could in fact serve as an adequate predictor of success or failure within their program. This question, or at least the answer to it, has far-reaching implications in that a multitude of colleges and universities use standardized tests to determine where each entering freshman should be placed within the English program, if he is to be placed in it at all. There is reason to believe that if the Cooperative English Test is in fact not a successful predictor of a student's success at Stockton, then maybe the test and others like it are not adequate predictors of a student's success and exemption policies based on those tests are not justified. The results of Stockton's experiment are as follows:

> Because the Vocabulary, Effectiveness, and Speed coefficients or correlation are so low as to indicate either no positive relationship with final semester grades or a very slight relationship, this study presents no evidence to support using those parts of the test for the purpose of determining which students shall be permitted or denied the opportunity of enrolling in Stockton College's English 1A - 1A71.
>
> (Barber, p. 17)

The one remaining part of the Cooperative English Test did, however, serve successfully as a predictor of success within the Stockton freshman English program. The contention that there is a significant correlation between ability to handle the mechanics of English and the ability to write well is reinforced in the following:

> The chi square and phi test indicate that the Mechanics part of the Cooperative English Test makes a reasonably good prediction of success in English 1A - 1A71. (Barber, p. 17)

Meanwhile other scientific experimentation similar to the Stockton study is being conducted into many other aspects of freshman English. Not all of these experiments are testing new methodology or newly derived hypotheses. Some are testing the effect of old educational techniques applied to current teaching. One such established educational practice recently injected into freshman English on an experimental basis was the notion of the correspondence course.

The University of Kansas recently completed a four-year feasibility study aimed at evaluating the worth of what they call the 'correspondence-tutorial' method of teaching freshman English. Under investigation was a program which called for the students to meet with their respective instructors only once a week; the rest of the requirement was to be completed in a correspondence course fashion (Willingham, pp. 1-15). When this new approach was compared to the existing conventional one, it was found that there was no significant difference between the two methods insofar as student success was concerned (Willingham, p. 14).

Willingham, author of the experiment report, is quick to point out, however, that while the two methods compared resulted in no significant difference, the correspondence-

tutorial method did have certain drawbacks which limited its acceptability. He wrote:

> The 'correspondence-tutorial' method, however, is not without its defects, which must not be minimized. After the first year of the program, attendance of this group was mandatory, because absenteeism was extremely high. As few as one-fourth of the students in the first year of the project attended the weekly tutorial sessions. ...Furthermore, although the 'correspondence-tutorial' mode eliminates the 'lockstep' of three meetings per week of the conventional Freshman Composition mode, in practice the 'lockstep' is still present in another form since students must hand work in and revise it at certain specified times. Failure to do so results in serious logistical problems of getting their work graded and handed back.
>
> (Willingham, p. 15)

Experimentation with another long-established practice, that having the English teacher correct each and every theme a student hands in was the target of a study by Howard Pierson. He chose to compare and contrast the value of peer correction versus that of teacher correction of writing. While the study is not conclusive, it certainly illustrates that teachers of English still do not really know whether or not they must correct their students' writing. In the following quotation one will note that although Pierson takes a strong stand one way, he prefaces his findings with those of Buxton, findings which are directly contrary to the theme of Pierson's work.

> Investigating freshman composition at the University of Alberta, Buxton learned that the teachers who corrected papers thoroughly, obtained better improvement in writing than the teachers who corrected papers scantily. However, no one else has found any good

> words to say for teacher correction. In comparing ninth graders in Iowa, Fellows arranged for some classes to have essays marked with letter ratings only. After this study ended, neither group wrote any better than the other. Recently, Arnold and Burton saw the same results when they had teachers in Florida mark tenth grade compositions with degrees of intensity.
>
> (Pierson, p. 1)

Pierson continues the question later in his report when he states:

> When Dora V. Smith used peer correction with large classes of ninth graders in Minnesota, she found that they were able to score as well on composition tests as small classes whose writings she corrected herself. With freshmen at Purdue, Maize got better results from a combination of peer correcting and teachers' correcting and infrequent writing. Freshmen in Oklahoma tested no differently regardless of whether teachers corrected their papers or whether they corrected one another's, according to Boyet. Sutton and Allen noted the same outcome in a study of Stetson University freshmen. Those few investigations suggest that the peer method is at least as effective as the teacher method.
>
> (Pierson, pp. 2-3)

The reviewer feels that other responsible researchers must evaluate the claims for peer correction made by Pierson and others. For if what Pierson claims is in fact true, it would mean a major revolution in the teaching of freshman English. At least it should have major impact upon those whose job it is to teach writing.

While Pierson attempts to shatter our belief that the English teacher must grade the students' writing, James Moffett is found attacking still another grass-roots belief of many teachers of writing. Moffett, unlike so many other

English teachers, refuses to believe that having students write and/or correct excerpts and brief statements is in the best interests of teaching writing. He leaves no room for doubt in the following remark:

> The word, the sentence, and the paragraph are all sub-structures lacking precisely that context of purpose and intent which is the heart of rhetoric. I do not see how a teacher can possibly be serious about rhetoric and continue to assign workbook exercises or the writing of isolated sentences and paragraphs. What for? This is not composition, it is decomposition.
> (Moffett, p. 115)

Be he right or wrong, Moffett has obviously ignored one major premise of his attitude. He has not, nor has anyone else, scientifically proven the case for rhetoric as a means to teaching writing. An attempt to do so comes from Edward Corbett who reports his discovery of rhetorical principles, how he used them to teach writing, and how doing so has made him a better teacher (Corbett, pp. 3-12). However, he presents no empirical support, nor does he account for the multitude of variables which could have come into play to make him a better teacher of writing, if in fact he did improve. Corbett is here playing the part of the traditional "expert," a being who has a tendency to make judgments according to his particular prejudice and bias at the time.

Corbett's handling of his report is unfortunate. What he claims may or may not be true. There are already too many unsupported hypotheses receiving lip-service in freshman English classrooms across the nation.

Basically, the hypothesis was not tested properly; the truth of it is obscure until it has been tested scientifically.

Earlier in this review the Concordia freshman English program was quoted as having tested the effect of teaching large classes via television, then breaking those large television lecture classes into smaller groups for discussion. But the Concordia report is not effective in commenting on the next 'grass-roots contention' to be dealt with in this review--the belief that freshman English classes should be limited to about twenty-five students per section. The use of television negates the Concordia program's value in this particular instance as the twenty-five to a class idea presupposes the unavailability of television.

Of the many studies done to determine whether or not large numbers of freshmen can be placed in the same room at the same time and still receive an education equal to that which they would have received had they been placed in smaller classes, probably the most relevant to this review is the one done by Harold Hopper and Helen Keller. Their study is most relevant here for two reasons: (1) They were directly concerned with the relationship of class size to effective learning in regard to writing skills only, and (2) their judgments were based in part on earlier studies, including those of Winslow Hatch,

Cammarosano and Santopola, Kenneth Anderson, Louis O'Shaughnessy, and Howard Bosley (Hopper, pp. 2-3).

The statement of Hopper and Keller's findings is as follows:

> The results unequivocably established that, given the same quality of instructors, program, and students involved in this experiment, class size up to 56 does not seem to be a significant variable, in the learning of writing skills.
>
> (Hopper, pp. 2-3)

The class-size study limits the number of students to fifty-six, not because that is the point at which it became ineffective, but because that was the largest class involved in the experiment (Hopper, p. 3). One cannot accurately predict what the results of the experiment would have been had the largest class numbered one hundred, one hundred and fifty, or even two hundred students.

Class size is no problem, however, for one of the most recent innovations in teach English--the programmed text. The effect of teaching English through programmed texts has been the topic of many studies. The following are two of the most representative of these studies. One is concerned with programming replacing class work; the second is concerned with programming to supplement classroom activities.

Martha Trimble conducted an experiment to determine the effectiveness of using programming instead of class time to teach spelling, diction, and sentence arrangement and paragraph coherence. Trimble was primarily interested

in evaluating the improvement in student language habits and in determining whether or not the method offered savings in time and personnel over the traditional method of teaching the same matter. The results were positive in all cases and the objectives of the experiment were met. However, Trimble withheld total support for the method after concluding that there was more contributing to the results than readily met the eye. She concluded that her experiment had shown that motivation was more important to the success of the study than was method (Trimble, pp. 1-107).

Jack Tohtz and Gerhard Lang conducted an experiment which compared programmed instruction homework assignments with normal homework assignments in teaching expository writing to freshman English students. The conclusions were that the programmed group did no better than the conventional group, and that the group receiving the programmed homework spent less time on their out-of-class assignments than did the conventional group. The study must not have been unrewarding to Tohtz and Lang for one of the recommendations was that programmed texts be developed for all aspects of English at the college level (Tohtz, pp. 1-147).

Another late entry into the freshman English classroom has been electrical devices such as tape recorders and dictating machines which have found a home in some

programs. But it is only recently that thorough investigation of their actual worth has been undertaken.

T. J. Kallsen completed a feasibility study aimed at determining the effects of using the dictating machine to act as a vehicle for transmitting teacher comments to students. Others use the tape recorder in a similar role. Unfortunately insofar as teacher work load is concerned, Kallsen concluded after an experiment involving six hundred freshman English students that the dictating machine technique did not aid the average student any more than normal on-the-paper comments. Superior students, however, were able to profit more from the experience, especially when the comments recorded had to do with content or organization of the student's paper (Kallsen, pp. 1-106).

As dictating machines and programmed instruction become a potential tool for improving instruction of freshman English, the most profitable arena for improvement is perhaps being overlooked. Too seldom do studies go back to the basics, back to the prime objectives of the course and the attitudes of the instructors. Perhaps the entire stance of the English teacher is wrong. At least that is what is intimated in articles by J. J. Lamberts and Wallace Karl.

Lamberts comments:

> In our eagerness to help our students we are often much too kind to them. The mischief begins in high school and even earlier than that. Teachers complain again and again that they have countless papers to take home

> and 'correct.' This is exactly the word they use, and they mean it. They suppose they need to edit the papers for the youngsters. That is preposterous.
>
> (Lamberts, p. 232)

What is important here is more than the question of whether or not a teacher needs to correct his students' papers. That problem was seen in the Pierson study; what we should be concerned with here is self-concept. One might ask the question, "What is the English teacher's concept of himself. How would he define his role in and out of the classroom?" It is possible that Lamberts' statement is as much interested in getting teachers to act upon new knowledge as it is to express an opinion regarding the correcting of papers. If that statement can be seen as coming from a recognition that English teachers are not keeping up with the times, the freshman English teacher's task is doubly difficult by increasing irrelevance in what could be the most relevant course at any institution.

Wallace Karl is of the opinion that English teachers have failed to move with the times. He pulls no punches when he charges that the practice of modern English teachers is to turn away from vital issues and thereby contribute greatly to the present undistinguished state of rhetoric teaching and its lack of relevance to life (Karl, pp. 384-391).

Where freshman English programs do make a conscious effort to keep up with the times, new things are tried and

some of the old ways of doing things are tried anew in another light. Examples of such would include language study as part of the freshman English program and verse writing to teach the principles of that art.

A report from Virginia Foscue relates:

> For three years at the main campus of the University of Alabama we have used a language reader in the first semester composition course for average freshmen. Our assumption has been that we are better prepared to teach the principles of language and literature than those of such subjects as psychology, political science, sociology, or philosophy. Our purpose in using the reader has been to help our students become observers of real language in actual use, which we feel is the only lasting way to make them better users of language.
>
> (Foscue, p. 1)

The basis for the Alabama attitude is proper utilization of faculty competency. To obtain best results from such a program the instructors must be prepared to deal with language per se. According to the Foscue report:

> ...the success of an English program such as ours, in which instruction in language is integrated with that in composition and literature, depends upon the training, experience, and enthusiasm of the instructors. Since many of our teaching assistants lack training and experience, we attempt to help them by providing in-service training and by assigning experienced instructors to advise them.
>
> (Foscue, p. 5)

The in-service training received by instructors at the University of Alabama very well may spell the difference between mediocre and superior instruction. Some writers have pointed out that in-service procedures comparable to

that mentioned above are paramount to the success or failure of any freshman English program.

A program need not go into language training to expose incompleteness in training of many freshman English instructors. As Dorothy Fordyce indicated in an article prepared for the National Council of Teachers of English, most freshman English teachers have had only their undergraduate freshman sequence to prepare them for dealing with themes. This insufficient training can, however, be made up through participation in in-service training programs (Fordyce, pp. 1-7).

A further example of an old thing being tried in another light is verse writing in the English class as attempted by Milton Kaplan. His philosophy in the matter was stated thusly:

> The attempt to write poetry, nevertheless, if properly directed can be a rewarding experience, for through the writing of poetic composition students become aware of the material and the nature of verse and thus gain an appreciation of poetry that is often missing in the high school class.
>
> (Kaplan, p. 880)

Kaplan's remark should be highly pertinent to those departments which incorporate literature study--and especially poetry--into their freshman English programs. There is also a possibility that student efforts with other types of literature would have the same effect on the students that poetry writing can have.

Summary:

This review of literature has served its purpose if it has made clear that when it comes to analyzing freshman English programs nothing is very clear at all.

There are almost as many different conceptions of what Freshman English is as there are institutions. This heterogeneity is fostered primarily by two factors: (1) program objectives vary so much from school to school, and (2) there does not seem to be a favorable attitude toward scientific research.

Program objectives are so different, one institution to the next, because of the types of students involved, the respective financial abilities of the institutions, and because program goals are often set by persons outside the department.

The less than favorable attitude toward scientific research reveals itself in unwillingness on the part of faculty members to investigate teaching rather than literature per se. It is further displayed by departments which seemingly ignore that research which has been done. It is a sad commentary on the investigative powers of freshman English personnel when one is able to charge that no one can really say how the course should or should not be taught.

In keeping with the disposition to ignore research findings--at least to a major degree--is the obvious lack of cooperation between the various departments within an

institution as well as a lack of cooperation of English departments within existing groups such as state associations. Too few state-wide studies have been done. Too seldom do institutions within a state act as centers of diffusion for research on freshman English. Studies such as Richard Braddock's, "How Iowa Colleges and Universities Will Deal With Students in 1966-67," or Richard Bessone's, "Remedial English Instruction in California Public Junior Colleges--An Analysis and Evaluation of Current Practices" are much too rare for the good of freshman English. National associations, such as the National Council of Teachers of English and the Modern Language Association cannot be expected to carry the full load. Neither can most state English associations. The responsibilities of these associations are manifold; they are not able to devote their major energies to freshman English as they must serve for the most part as vehicles for dissemenation of information on literature and the teaching of literature. Then too, like many academic associations, they are too often lofty and above the "gut-level" problems which face classroom freshman English instructors.

A more detailed summary of conclusions and recommendations either stated or implied in this review of the literature will be found in Chapter V.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

The Questionnaire Technique

> The questionnaire is a major instrument for data-gathering in descriptive-survey studies, and is used to secure information from varied and widely scattered sources.... The questionnaire is particularly useful when one cannot readily see personally all of the people from whom he desires responses or where there is no particular reason to see the respondent personally. This technique may be used to gather data from any aange of territory, sometimes international or national.
>
> (Good and Scates, pp. 606-607)

As educational research authorities Carter Good and Douglas Scates have indicated, the questionnaire technique facilitates data-gathering for descriptive-survey studies, particularly when the survey is to be administerd over a large range of territory such as was the case with this survey of colleges and universities in the United States. It was for this reason that the questionnaire approach was utilized in seeking information regarding freshman English programs in two hundred randomly selected American colleges and universities. The writer feels there was no other practical method of obtaining the information provided by this study.

Using the fall 1968 edition of the Directory of U.S. Institutions of Higher Education, the writer identified

each and every American institution of higher education which met the following initial criteria:

The institutions included must:

1. be accredited by one of the six regional accreditation associations.
2. be a liberal arts and/or teacher-training institution.
3. confer the bachelor's degree at least.

A thorough search of the listing of all colleges and universities in the United States yielded a total population of eleven hundred and fifty-four institutions which met the initial criteria.

The eleven hundred and fifty-four institution population was then divided into two groups. The first group was made up of institutions which offer the bachelor's degree only. The second group was made up of institutions which offer some type of graduate degree. Using the Directory, the investigator identified a total of five hundred and fifty-two institutions which met the criteria for inclusion in the first group. These institutions were each assigned a consecutive number from one to five hundred and fifty-two. The same procedure was used to identify the six hundred and two members of group two. Each of the six hundred and two institutions in group two was assigned a consecutive number from one to six hundred and two.

The investigator then followed instructions for selecting one hundred random numbers within each of the two population totals--five hundred and fifty-two; and

six hundred and two (Hays, pp. 334-337). From a table of random numbers (Hays, pp. 631-635), the investigator gleaned one hundred random numbers between one and five hundred and fifty-two, and one hundred random numbers between one and six hundred and two. Previously numbered institutions whose assigned number corresponded to the one hundred randomly selected numbers within each group were drawn from the two respective populations. The name and mailing address of each of the two hundred institutions to be used in the study was compiled (see Appendix) and a questionnaire was mailed to each.

In an attempt to secure a good percentage of returns and to insure accurate responses, the investigator consulted a number of sources for guidance in preparation and use of the questionnaire. The most beneficial sources at this point were: Planning of Experiments, by D. R. Cox; Basic Statistical Methods, by N. M. Downie and R. W. Heath; Statistics for Psychologists, by William L. Hays; and Methods of Research, by Carter Good and Douglas Scates.

The number of questionnaire returns and the lack of conflict within the responses indicates the instrument must have been sound. Therefore, the above-mentioned guiding sources were worthwhile as they appear to have aided greatly in minimizing difficulty in preparation of the questionnaire while maximizing the usability of the returns.

The Instrument

A nine page questionnaire was prepared for the purpose of surveying freshman English programs as they exist in two hundred randomly selected American colleges and universities. It contained sixty-seven questions. All of the one hundred and twenty individual responses on each questionnaire was constructed in nature and required the respondent to simply place and "X" at the appropriate place within the question. No question called for any response other than a simple "X", except where the respondent felt a particular question did not apply to his institution's freshman English program. Where a question did not apply, the respondent was instructed to mark it with a capital "NA."

The first mailing of the questionnaires took place on October 1 and resulted in 110 returns at the end of two weeks. On October 17 a second copy of the questionnaire was mailed to institutions which had failed to respond to the first mailing. This second mailing resulted in the return of 50 more completed questionnaires. In all--including first and second mailing--160 of the two hundred institutions responded. Stated otherwise, 79 percent of the institutions in group one responded (the bachelor's only group), and 81 percent of the institutions in group two responded (the graduate degree group).

This experience with the normative-survey technique has proven trying at times, to be sure. However, despite

the hardships of the technique, it has been a thoroughly worthwhile undertaking. Careful planning and some amount of patience enabled the investigator to avoid most of the pitfalls that so often entrap one using this technique, a technique described as one which, among other qualities,

> ...is relatively slow, requires a large investment of time on the part of the investigator, and often gives results that are highly disappointing because of their incompleteness, indefiniteness, and the generally hostile attitude of recipients toward the flood of appeals made for cooperation in answering questionnaires....
>
> (Good and Scates, p. 605)

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

Group One (institutions which offer four year degrees only)

This group consists of sixty-one institutions which completed the questionnaire and specifically met the established criteria. Other institutions which returned the questionnaire but failed in some way to fully meet the established criteria will be considered at the close of this chapter.

The breakdown of the sixty-one institutions whose answers to the questionnaire were compiled in this section of the presentation of data is as follows: thirty-eight (61%) of the institutions reported one thousand undergraduate students or less. Eighteen (29%) of the group reported undergraduate student populations between one thousand and two thousand. Two (3%) institutions were in the two thousand to three thousand category, and a like number of institutions in the three to five thousand and the five thousand to eight thousand undergraduate student group replied. There are no institutions of over eight thousand undergraduate students in this group.

In response to the question which sought to determine the length of time it has been since each freshman English

program underwent a major revision there came the following: twenty-seven (44%) of the reporting institutions replied that their program had undergone major revision in the past year. Five (8%) institutions reported revision two years ago, eleven (18%) reported a three year period since major revision, two (3%) institutions had not brought about a major revision for four years, and sixteen (26%) of the institutions reported that their respective programs in freshman English have not undergone major revision for five years or more.

Forty-five (74%) institutions in group one reported that their respective freshman English programs normally require a full academic year to complete. Sixteen (26%) of the institutions reported that their programs are not one full academic year.

Of those institutions which indicated that their freshman English programs are not one full academic year in length, three (33%) require one quarter, none require two quarters, six (67%) require one semester and none require one trimester.

Twenty-three (44%) of the institutions responding to the question which asked if that institution has any evidence that indicates most students would continue to benefit from a program of extended duration replied to the affirmative. Twenty-nine (56%) replied in the negative.

The group reported the make-up of their courses as follows: twenty-eight (48%) claimed grammar, composition and literature; four (7%) replied to grammar and composition, but no literature; and twenty-six (45%) replied to composition and literature but no grammar.

Of the six grading system choices offered, the A, B, C, D, F system received fifty-eight (95%) affirmations, one institution reported it used Pass-Fail, one institution uses the Credit-No Credit approach, and one uses a system other than those listed in the question. No institutions reporting use either the 4.0, 3.5, 3.0 etc. system or the Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory system.

The question regarding the average number of students per class within the various freshman English programs drew the following replies: no institutions reported classes of less than fifteen students. Twelve (20%) reported average classes of fifteen to twenty students. Twenty-eight (46%) claimed twenty to twenty-five as their average class size, twenty (33%) claimed the twenty-five to thirty average class size; none reported average classes of thirty to forty, and one institution reported average classes of over forty.

In response to the question which sought to determine the major factors used in determing the number of students per class within the various freshman English programs, the institutions replied: forty-one (85%) reported that they regard as a major factor a relatively firm predetermined

number; eight (15%) did not see this as a major factor within their programs. Forty (87%) maintain that the ratio of students to available staff is a major factor in determining class size at their respective institutions, and six (13%) did not accept this point. Twenty-three (68%) departments feel that the number of compositions an instructor can normally be expected to grade is a major factor while eleven (32%) did not.

The number of hours a week a freshman English class meets range from two to five. No institutions reported only one hour a week; six (10%) reported two hours of class a week; forty-five (74%) reported three hours per week; eight (13%) reported four hours per week; two (3%) reported five hours per week; no institution reported meeting freshman English more than five hours per week.

Twenty-one (34%) departments reported that they have a freshman English supervisor other than the department chairman; forty (66%) schools reported no supervisor of freshman English other than the department chairman.

Of those persons in charge of freshman English, not one teaches no hours a week; none teaches three or less hours per week; four (7%) teach four to six hours a week; twenty-three (38%) teach seven to nine hours per week; and thirty-three (55%) of the respondents to this question indicated that they teach over nine hours per week.

Within the above group of freshman English directors, fifty-two (88%) reported that they teach at least one

section of freshman English during the school year. Seven (12%) reported they do not teach at least one section during the year.

Those persons in charge of directing freshman English (either as Director of Freshman English or as Chairman) reported varying degrees of formal training in certain areas. Thirty-two (57%) replied that they have had learning theory; twenty-four (43%) have not. Fourteen (33%) replied 'yes' to the question as to whether or not they had formal training in tests and measurements; twenty-eight (67%) have not. Ten (23%) claimed formal training in statistics; thirty-three (77%) have not. One (3%) respondent claimed formal training in computer assisted instruction; forty (97%) did not. Twenty-four (48%) have had formal training in the use of new media; twenty-six (52%) have not. And twenty-one (41%) reported they have had training with regard to communication theory while thirty (59%) report they have not.

Freshman English directors (either Director per se or Chairman) show the following with regard to a question about their familiarity with five articles or texts directly related to their occupations. Thirty-two (57%) were familiar with Albert Kitzhaber's, Themes, Theories, and Therapy; twenty-one (43%) were not. Twenty-nine (59%) were familiar with Warner Rice's "A Proposal for the Abolition of Freshman English as it is Now Commonly Taught;" twenty (41%) were not familiar with the article. "Research in

Written Composition" by Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Shoer was familiar to fifteen (32%) respondents; thirty-two (68%) claimed no familiarity with it. The College Teaching of English, edited by John C. Gerber, was known to thirty-two (60%) of the respondents; it was not familiar to twenty-one (40%). Three (7%) reported familiarity with Harrison Hoblitzelle's "A Study of Freshman English, An Informal Study." Forty (93%) were not familiar with the Hoblitzelle article.

Federal funds for the improvement of freshman English programs went to one (1.69%) of the institutions which answered the question pertaining to receipt of federal funds; fifty-eight (98.31%) of those responding indicated they received no federal funds during 1968-69 for the purpose of improving the teaching of freshman English.

Of fifty-six institutions which responded to the question regarding whether or not they had applied for federal funds during the stated period, one (1.78%) replied in the affirmative while fifty-five (98.22%) replied to thennegative.

Forty-four (81%) respondents indicated that their institutions would welcome federal funds to be used solely for improvement of freshman English programs, and ten (19%) indicated they would not welcome such funds.

Of those institutions which indicated they would welcome federal funds for the stated purpose, twenty-one (58%) prefer said funds for independent use with no direct

cooperation with another institution; four (11%) would prefer such funds as part of a state-wide project; and eleven (31%) showed a preference for receiving federal funds as part of a cooperating group of institutions, the make-up of which the respondent would determine.

The directors were asked if they would allow the writer of this study to identify their responses to questions on federal funding in a proposal to the U.S. Office of Education, a proposal which would seek increased federal aid for development of improved freshman English programs across the country. Forty-three (84%) replied 'yes;' eight (16%) replied 'no.'

Fifty (83%) institutions reporting indicated that their English department offered an advanced composition course at the undergraduate level, not including honors courses; ten (17%) had no such course.

Fifty (83%) institutions maintain they offer a creative writing course at the undergraduate level, no including honors courses; ten (17%) do not.

A program-wide syllabus is employed by thirty (51%) of the responding institutions while twenty-nine (49%) do not have a program-wide syllabus for freshman English.

Where institutions do have a program-wide syllabus, the following is true: three (19%) report the syllabus is prepared by the director alone; fourteen (70%) indicated the syllabus is made up by a committee; and twenty (74%) reported the syllabus is revised at least annually. Active

instructors within the freshman English program contribute to the formulation of the syllabus at twenty-eight (97%) of the twenty-nine institutions which responded to this particular question.

Where a program-wide syllabus is used, the smallest unit of time for which the syllabus specified the material to be covered ranges from less than ten minutes to multi-week units. One (5%) institution's syllabus specifies less than ten minutes; one (5%) specifies from ten to thirty minutes of class time; seven (32%) specify for one full class period at a time; five (23%) specify the material for one week of classes as the smallest unit of time accounted for by the department syllabus; and eight (36%) reported their respective plans prescribe for one multi-week unit of classes.

And further, where a program-wide syllabus is used, twenty-one (88%) institutions reported that their syllabus prescribes for one term at a time while two (12%) reported it does not. Nine (53%) reported that their freshman English syllabus prescribes for the entire length of the program at one time while eight (47%) reported it did not.

When asked if instructors within the freshman English programs are allowed to establish their own objectives for their individual sections, forty-seven (82%) replied in the affirmative; ten (18%) replied in the negative.

Twenty-two (45%) of the responding institutions indicated that their department provides freshman English students

with a list of specific objectives to be met by the students. Twenty-seven (55%) reported no such practice.

The directors were asked if their respective departments attempt to group freshman English students in classes according to various criteria. The group responded in four cases (8%) the students were grouped according to stated interest; forty-six (92%) did not. Twenty-five (42%) reported the group students according to ability; thirty-four (58%) did not use ability as a criterion for grouping. Two (4%) institutions reported grouping students by their academic majors; forty-eight (96%) do not group freshman English students according to academic majors.

The pretest-posttest technique of evaluating students' comparative progress at the end of the term is used by nine (16%) of the institutions; forty-seven (84%) reported no such practice. Seven (13%) institutions use the pretest-posttest technique at the end of the program; forty-five (87%) indicated they do not use this technique to evaluate the students' comparative progress at the end of the program.

Fifty-five (92%) of the respondents reported that passing or failing a student within their respective programs is the result of evaluation by the student's classroom instructor only. Five (8%) indicated that someone other than the student's classroom instructor is also involved.

Twenty-two (39%) institutions indicated that a student's success within their respective programs is

normally compared to the prediction of his success according to entrance examination and/or other pre-enrollment examinations. Thirty-five (61%) indicated no such practice.

When asked if it is standard procedure within the various departments of English to provide the students with an opportunity to present a written evaluation of the freshman English course, twenty-three (40%) indicated it was; thirty-five (60%) indicated it was not.

Twenty-one (37%) institutions indicated that they can identify by name those high schools in their general area which tend to produce the better students for their respective programs. Twenty-five (43%) indicated they were unable to make that distinction.

Twelve (20%) departments reported they have tested the hypothesis that freshman English classes can be large lecture groups of one hundred or more without becoming less effective than the same instruction presented to groups of twenty to thirty students. Forty-eight (80%) institutions reported they have not tested this hypothesis.

Only one (1.8%) institution reports that they have run a comparative analysis of competency levels of their students in an attempt to determine which term benefits the students most in terms of the departmental objectives. The other fifty-three (98.2%) respondents reported following no such procedure.

Asked if they believe that the same written piece could receive three different grades if graded by three different instructors in the department, two (3%) schools replied 'no;' forty-six (77%) replied that 'it is possible;' and twelve (20%) replied that 'it was likely.'

From a question related to testing of incoming freshman students, the following results were obtained; seventeen (31%) attempt to determine if the students have experience with term papers; thirty-seven (69%) do not. Fourteen (27%) make the same type of investigation regarding correct dictionary usage; thirty-eight (63%) do not; History of the English Language experience is uncovered by nine (18%) of the institutions, forty-two (82%) do not attempt it; eleven (22%) departments attempt to determine the level of experience their incoming freshmen have had with introductory linguistics while thirty-eight (78%) do not; and thirty (57%) responding institutions claim to test entering freshmen regarding their experience with basic elements of logic while twenty-three (43%) do not.

The same matter treated differently is seen in the question which sought to determine which of the above areas of the discipline are included in the actual instruction. Forty-six (82%) include a unit on writing research papers while ten (18%) do not; fourteen (27%) have a unit on correct dictionary usage, and twenty (39%) do not; fifteen (31%) teach a unit on History of the Language while

thirty-three (69%) do not; introductory linguistics is included in freshman English at eleven (22%) of the reporting institutions and is not included at thirty-eight (78%) other reporting institutions. Thirty (57%) schools teach a unit on basic elements of logic. Twenty-three (43%) do not include basic elements of logic in their freshman English course.

No institution of the fifty-two responding indicated the use of closed circuit television in teaching freshman English. Programmed texts are used by nine (17%) of the schools; auto-tutorial facilities are employed by ten (18%) of the schools responding; no school of fifty responding indicated the use of computer assisted instruction; thirty-one (55%) reported the use of films; twenty-six (46%) use guest speakers; and eleven (21%) make use of field trips.

Some instruction in speech preparation and delivery is included in the freshman English programs of sixteen (27%) institutions. Forty-three (73%) schools reported that speech is not part of their program.

Instruction in poetry is part of the freshman English program at forty-nine (82%) responding institutions but is not part of the program at the other eleven (18%) schools which responded to this question.

Thirty-one (62%) of the institutions include instruction in drama (not meaning actual acting itself) in their

programs while nineteen (38%) indicated no such material in the course.

At thirty (52%) of the reporting institutions an honors course may be substituted for the standard freshman English course. Such is not the case at twenty-eight (48%) other institutions which reported.

Remedial courses for students not ready for the standard freshman English program are offered at twenty-five (42%) of the institutions but not at the other thirty-four (58%) reporting schools.

Forty-three (80%) departments report they make it possible for an entering freshman to be given advanced standing within the program or exemption from the program entirely. Eleven (20%) others who reported did not provide this option.

When a student is allowed to by-pass any or all of the freshman English program, he is required at twenty-seven (59%) institutions to make up an equal number of credit-hours in other classwork. Nineteen (41%) institutions do **not** make this stipulation.

Where a student must make up a number of credit-hours equal to those he by-passed, there are certain options open to him. Eighteen (67%) schools report he must make up the hours in English courses only. Twelve (55%) of twenty-two responding institutions indicated he may make up the credit-hours in English courses or any other courses.

Three (18%) of seventeen reporting institutions stipulate he must make up the hours by taking the honors course in English.

Eight (13%) of sixty reporting institutions revealed that they normally allow a student's written work to be graded by some person other than the student's classroom instructor. The other fifty-two (87%) schools do not follow this practice.

Part of a student's final grade in freshman English is based on his composition skills. Three (6%) schools base less than twenty-five percent on it; nine (18%) schools base between twenty-five and fifty percent of a student's grade upon his composition skills. Twenty-eight (55%) base between fifty and seventy-five percent on composition skills; and eleven (22%) schools base the student's grade over seventy-five percent on composition skills.

Part of a student's final grade in freshman English is also based on his literary interpretation skills. Seventeen (34%) institutions base less than twenty-five percent on the grade of literary interpretation skills. Twenty-two (44%) institutions base between twenty-five and fifty percent of the grade on literary interpretation skills. Eleven (22%) schools base fifty to seventy-five percent of a student's final grade on his literary interpreation skills. None of the fifty schools responding to this question indicated basing more than seventy-five

percent of the grade on the student's literary interpretation skills.

The approximate percentage of failing grades given each term by the schools responding to the questionnaire is contained in the following information which is broken down term by term. In the first term, seven (12%) schools reported a failure rate less than five percent. Eleven (19%) reported a ten to fifteen percent failure rate. Another eleven (19%) institutions reported a failure rate of fifteen to twenty percent. The twenty to twenty-five percent failure rate the first term includes four (7%) institutions; and two (4%) schools reported a failure rate of over twenty-five percent.

In the second term, twelve (21%) fail less than five percent. Twenty-two (39%) fail between five and ten percent. Fourteen (25%) reported a failure rate of ten to fifteen percent. No institution responded with a failure rate of over twenty-five percent during the second term.

Those institutions on the quarter system provide this third set of data regarding failure rates. In the third term, fifty-one (89%) reported a failure rate less than five percent. Four (7%) schools reported a failure rate of five to ten percent, and two (4%) reported rates of ten to fifteen percent. No school reported a failure rate of over fifteen percent during the third term.

The number of compositions a student is normally expected to write during his freshman English career ranges from less than ten to over thirty. Eleven (19%) departments reported requiring less than ten compositions. Twenty-one (36%) required between ten and fifteen. Sixteen (27%) required fifteen to twenty. Five (8%) schools required twenty to twenty-five; three (5%) required twenty-five to thirty, and another three (5%) required over thirty compositions.

Twenty-six (48%) English departments required that less than twenty-five percent of the compositions be written in-class. Twenty (37%) required twenty-five to fifty percent but not less than seventy-five percent in-class, and none required over seventy-five percent to be written in-class.

Excluding research papers, the approximate average length of compositions written by the students of those institutions responding to the questionnaire is treated as two categories--in-class and out-of-class compositions.

Five (9%) programs averaged in-class themes of less than two hundred words. Another five (9%) averaged between two hundred and four hundred. Thirty-four (60%) received in-class themes of four hundred to six hundred words. Ten (18%) averaged six hundred to eight hundred words, and three (5%) averaged over eight hundred words.

Ten (18%) institutions received out-of-class compositions averaging less than four hundred words. Five

(9%) average four hundred to six hundred words. Twenty-six (47%) averaged six hundred to eight hundred words. Thirteen (23%) received eight hundred to one thousand words, and three (5%) averaged over one thousand words per out-of-class composition.

Approximate percentages of all undergraduate hours taught by the various English departments responding as compared to the number of hours devoted to freshman English indicated that no school spent less than ten percent of its total department load on freshman English. Five (9%) reported freshman English takes between ten and twenty percent of available time. Nine (16%) report spending twenty to thirty percent on freshman English. Twenty-one (37%) spent thirty to forty percent, twelve (21%) spent forty to fifty percent, and ten (18%) reported they spend over fifty percent of their available department load time on freshman English staffing.

The following data came in response to a question which asked how many of the total full-time department members teach at least one section of freshman English during the year. Two (3%) institutions reported less than twenty-five percent of their members teach in the freshman English program. Six (10%) related that the number is between twenty-five and fifty percent. Eight (13%) reported fifty to seventy-five percent, and forty-five (74%) reported that over seventy-five percent of their

full-time department members teach at least one section of freshman English at some time during the year.

Of those persons who teach at least one section of Freshman English during the year, fourteen (27%) institutions revealed that less than ten percent have their doctorate. Eleven (21%) schools reported ten to twenty percent doctorates. Five (10%) schools said twenty to thirty percent; six (12%) reported forty to fifty percent, and eleven (21%) schools reported that over fifty percent of those persons who teach freshman English at some time during the year hold doctorates.

Those persons who hold a master's degree and teach freshman English are tabulated as follows: two (4%) institutions had less than ten percent of their freshman staff with master's degrees. The ten to twenty percent master's people category received no institution's claim, nor did the thirty to forty percent category. The twenty to thirty percent category, however, was reported by one (2%) school, and the forty to fifty percent category was supported by five (11%) schools. Thirty-seven (82%) institutions reported that their freshman English classes were taught by persons, over fifty percent of whom hold master's degrees.

For purposes of this study, academic rank of those who teach freshman English was broken first into three divisions--full professor, associate professor, and assistant professor.

Seventeen (41%) schools reported less than ten percent of those who teach freshman English hold the rank of full professor. Six (15%) reported ten to fifteen percent hold that rank. Eight (20%) reported fifteen to twenty percent full professors teaching freshman English. Two (5%) reported between twenty and twenty-five percent full professors, and eight (20%) reported that over twenty-five percent of those who teach in the freshman English program hold the rank of full professor.

Thirteen (25%) institutions reported that less than ten percent of those who teach freshman English hold the rank of associate professor. Fourteen (26%) reported ten to fifteen percent associates. Six (11%) reported fifteen to twenty percent associates. Another six (11%) indicated twenty to twenty-five percent of their freshman English staff held associate professorships, and fourteen (26%) reported that over twenty-five percent of their freshman English staff held the associate professor rank.

Six (12%) English departments reported that less than ten percent of their freshman English staff held the rank of assistant professor. Three (6%) indicated ten to fifteen percent assistant professors. Four (8%) claimed fifteen to twenty percent. Three (6%) reported twenty to twenty-five percent; and thirty-three (67%) reported that over twenty-five percent of their freshman English staff held the rank of assistant professor.

The rank of instructor was treated as a separate category and resulted in the following data: thirteen

(23%) schools reported that less than ten percent of their freshman English staff held the rank of instructor. Fourteen (25%) reported that ten to fifteen percent of their freshman English staff were instructors. Eleven (20%) were in the twenty-five to forty percent category. Another eleven (20%) were in the forty to sixty percent range. Five (9%) reported in the sixty to seventy-five percent range, and two (3%) institutions reported that over seventy-five percent of those persons who taught freshman English held the rank of instructor.

Twenty-three (39%) institutions reported they have analyzed their students' progress or some other factor in an attempt to identify their most effective teachers. Thirty-six (61%) had not done so.

Nineteen (34%) institutions reported they have analyzed their students' progress or some other factor in an attempt to identify their least effective teachers. Thirty-seven (66%) had not done so.

The first question regarding in-service training called for six separate responses. The results in each of the six response categories are as follows: four (8%) reported that their instructors received in-service training in learning theory. Forty-six (92%) reported they did not.

Three (6%) institutions reported their instructors in freshman English received in-service training in tests and

measurements. Forty-five (94%) reported their in-service did not include tests and measurements.

Twelve (23%) reported their instructors received in-service training in uses of newer media. Forty (77%) other institutions reported their instructors did not receive in-service training in newer media.

Three (6%) departments related that communication theory was part of the in-service training for their freshman English instructors. Forty-six (94%) reported no such material in their in-service program.

Seventeen (34%) institutions affirmed composition evaluation techniques as part of their in-service training program. Thirty-three (66%) indicated no in-service training in composition evaluation techniques.

Seventeen (34%) directors reported their freshman English instructors received in-service training in improved teaching techniques. Thirty-five (67%) reported no improved teaching material as part of their in-service program.

Where freshman English instructors receive in-service training, nine (40%) institutions reported the duration of training to be one day or less per term. Six (27%) schools indicated that in-service training amounted to two days per term. Two (9%) departments reported three days of in-service training per term, and five (23%) departments reported four or more days in-service training per term.

The number of graduate assistants employed in teaching freshman English at the member institutions of this group is as follows: fifty-three (95%) schools indicated they employed no graduate assistants in their programs. Three (5%) schools reported employing less than ten graduate assistants, and no member of this group of institutions reported using more than ten graduate assistants.

Group Two (institutions which offer a four year degree and some advanced degree)

This group consists of seventy-two institutions which completed the questionnaire and specifically met the established criteria. Eight other institutions which returned the questionnaire but failed in some way to fully meet the established criteria will be considered at the close of this chapter.

The breakdown of the seventy-two institutions whose answers to the questionnaire were compiled in this section of the presentation of data is as follows: eight (11%) of the institutions reported one thousand undergraduate students or less. Fifteen (20%) of the group reported undergraduate student populations between one thousand and two thousand. Ten (14%) institutions were in the two thousand to three thousand category; a like number of institutions were in the three to five thousand group, and the five thousand to eight thousand undergraduate

student group replied included fourteen (19%) institutions. There are fifteen (21%) institutions of over eight thousand undergraduate students in this group.

In response to the question which sought to determine the length of time it has been since each freshman English program underwent a major revision there came the following: twenty-seven (38%) of the reporting institutions replied that their program had undergone major revision in the past year. Seventeen (24%) institutions reported revision two years ago; twelve (17%) reported a three year period since major revision, five (7%) institutions had not brought about a major revision for four years, and ten (14%) of the institutions reported that their respective programs in freshman English have not undergone major revision for five years or more.

Fifty-two (72%) institutions in group one reported that their respective freshman English programs normally require a full academic year to complete. Twenty (28%) of the institutions reported that their programs are not one full academic year.

Of those institutions which indicated that their freshman English programs are not one full academic year in length, two (13%) require one quarter, five (31%) require two quarters, and eight (50%) require one semester and one (6%) requires a trimester.

Twenty-seven (42%) of the institutions responding to the question which asked if that institution has any

evidence that indicates most students would continue to benefit from a program of extended duration replied in the affirmative. Thirty-seven (58%) replied in the negative.

The group reported the make-up of their courses as follows: twenty-nine (44%) claimed grammar, composition and literature; five (8%) replied to grammar and composition but no literature; and thirty-two (48%) replied to composition and literature but no grammar.

Of the six grading system choices offered, the A, B, C, D, F system received sixty-seven (93%) affirmations, no institution reported it used a Pass-Fail, two (3%) institutions used the Credit-No Credit approach, and one (1%) used a system other than those listed in the question. Two (3%) institutions reported use of the 4.0, 3.5, 3.0, etc. system, and the Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory system was used by none of the respondents.

The question regarding the average number of students per class within the various freshman English programs drew the following replies: one (1%) institution reported classes of less than fifteen students. Six (8%) reported average classes of fifteen to twenty students. Thirty-five (49%) claimed twenty to twenty-five as their average class size; twenty-six (37%) claimed the twenty-five to thirty average class size; two (3%) reported average classes of thirty to forty, and one (1%) institution reported average classes of over forty.

In response to the question which sought to determine the major factors used in determining the number of students per class within the various freshman English programs, the institutions replied: fifty-six (92%) reported that they regard as a major factor a relatively firm predetermined number; five (8%) did not see this as a major factor within their programs. Thirty-one (76%) maintain that the ratio of students to available staff is a major factor in determining class size at their respective institutions, and ten (24%) did not accept this point. Thirty-two (80%) departments feel that the number of compositions an instructor can normally be expected to grade is a major factor while eight (20%) did not.

The number of hours a week freshman English classes meet range from two to five. No institution reported on one hour a week; one (1%) reported two hours of class a week; fifty-six (79%) reported three hours per week; eight (11%) reported four hours per week; six (8%) reported five hours per week; no institution reported meeting freshman English more than five hours per week.

Fifty (61%) departments reported that they have a freshman English supervisor other than the department chairman; twenty-two (39%) schools reported no supervisor of freshman English other than the department chairman.

Of those persons in charge of freshman English, not one teaches no hours a week; one (1%) teaches three or less

hours per week; twenty-four (33%) teach four to six hours a week; twenty-four (33%) teach seven to nine hours per week; and twenty-three (32%) of the respondents to this question indicated that they teach over nine hours per week.

Within the above group of freshman English directors, twelve (17%) reported they teach at least one section of freshman English during the school year. Fifty-nine (83%) reported they do not teach at least one section during the year.

Those persons in charge of directing freshman English (either as Director of Freshman English or as Chairman) reported varying degrees of formal training in certain areas. Thirty-four (49%) replied that they have had learning theory; thirty-five (51%) have not. Twenty-seven (41%) replied 'yes' to the question as to whether or not they had formal training in tests and measurements; thirty-nine (59%) have not. Thirteen (22%) claimed formal training in statistics; forty-seven (78%) have not. Three (5%) respondents claimed formal training in computer assisted instruction; fifty-four (95%) did not. Twenty-one (34%) have had formal training in the use of newer media; forty-one (66%) have not. And twenty-five (38%) reported they have had training with regard to communication theory while forty-one (62%) report they have not.

Freshman English directors (either Director per se or Chairman) show the following with regard to a question

about their familiarity with five articles or texts directly related to their occupations. Forty-two (66%) were familiar with Albert Kitzhaber's, Themes, Theories, and Therapy; twenty-two (34%) were not. Thirty-eight (63%) were familiar with Warner Rice's "A Proposal for the Abolition of Freshman English as it is now Commonly Taught;" twenty-two (37%) were not familiar with the article. "Research in Written Composition" by Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Shoer was familiar to twenty-seven (43%) respondents; thirty-six (57%) claimed no familiarity with it. The College Teaching of English, edited by John C. Gerber, was known to forty-four (67%) of the respondents; it was not familiar to twenty-two (33%). Twelve (21%) reported familiarity with Harrison Hoblitzelle's, "A Study of Freshman English, An Informal Study." Forty-five (79%) were not familiar with the Hoblitzelle article.

Federal funds for the improvement of freshman English programs went to two (2.8%) of the institutions which answered the question pertaining to receipt of federal funds; sixty-nine (97.2%) of those responding indicated they received no federal funds during 1968-69 for the purpose of improving the teaching of freshman English.

Of sixty-eight institutions which responded to the question regarding whether or not they had applied for federal funds during the stated period, two (2.9%) replied in the affirmative while sixty-six (97.1%) replied in the negative.

Fifty-three (83%) respondents indicated that their institutions would welcome federal funds to be used solely for improvement of freshman English programs, and eleven (17%) indicated they would not welcome such funds.

Of those institutions which indicated they would welcome federal funds for the stated purpose, thirty-five (69%) prefer said funds for independent use with no direct cooperation with another institution; three (6%) would prefer such funds as part of a state-wide project; and thirteen (25%) showed a preference for receiving federal funds as part of a cooperating group of institutions, the make-up of which the respondent would determine.

The directors were asked if they would allow the writer of this study to identify their responses to questions on federal funding in a proposal to the U.S. Office of Education, a proposal which would seek increased federal aid for development of improved freshman English programs across the country. Fifty-four (87%) replied 'yes;' eight (13%) replied 'no.'

Sixty-seven (96%) institutions reported indicated that their English department offered an advanced composition course at the undergraduate level, not including honors courses; three (4%) had no such course.

Sixty-six (93%) institutions maintain they offer a creative writing course at the undergraduate level, not including honors courses; five (7%) do not.

A program-wide syllabus is employed by forty-seven (68%) of the responding institutions while twenty-two (32%) do not have a program-wide syllabus for freshman English.

Where institutions do have a program-wide syllabus, the following is true: nine (28%) report the syllabus is prepared by the director alone; twenty-nine (81%) indicated the syllabus is made up by a committee; and thirty-nine (89%) reported the syllabus is revised at least annually. Active instructors within the freshman English program contribute to the formulation of the syllabus at forty (95%) of the twenty-nine institutions which responded to this particular question.

Where a program-wide syllabus is used, the smallest unit of time for which the syllabus specifies the material to be covered ranges from less than ten minutes to multi-week units. Two (5%) institution's syllabii specified less than ten minutes; three (7%) specifies from ten to thirty minutes of class time; thirteen (30%) specify for one full class period at a time; eight (19%) specify the material for one week of classes as the smallest unit of time accounted for by the department syllabus; and seventeen (40%) reported their respective plans prescribe for one multi-week unit of classes.

And further, where a program-wide syllabus is used, forty (95%) institutions reported that their syllabus prescribes for one term at a time while two (5%) reported it does not. Fourteen (70%) reported that their freshman English

syllabus prescribes for the entire length of the program at one time while six (30%) reported it did not.

When asked if instructors within the freshman English programs are allowed to establish their own objectives for their individual sections, forty (63%) replied in the affirmative; twenty-four (37%) replied in the negative.

Thirty-five (52%) of the responding institutions indicated that their department provides freshman English students with a list of specific objectives to be met by the students. Thirty-two (48%) reported no such practice.

The directors were asked if their respective departments attempt to group freshmen English students in classes according to various criteria. The group responded that in six (10%) cases the students were grouped according to stated interest; fifty-two (90%) did not. Thirty (45%) reported they group students according to ability; thirty-seven (55%) did not use ability as a criterion for grouping.' Five (9%) institutions reported grouping students by their academic majors; fifty-four (91%) do not group freshman English students according to academic majors.

The pretest-posttest technique of evaluating students' comparative progress at the end of the term is used by twelve (18%) of the institutions; fifty-five (82%) reported no such practice. Five (9%) institutions use the pretest-posttest technique at the end of the program; fifty-three (91%) indicated they do not use this technique to evaluate the students' comparative progress at the end of the program.

Sixty-nine (96%) of the respondents reported that passing or failing a student within their respective programs is the result of evaluation by the student's classroom instructor only. Three (4%) indicated that someone other than the student's classroom instructor is also involved.

Twenty-seven (38%) institutions indicated that a student's success within their respective programs is normally compared to the prediction of his success according to entrance examination and/or other pre-enrollment examinations. Forty-four (62%) indicated no such practice.

When asked if it is standard procedure within the various departments of English to provide the students with an opportunity to present a written evaluation of the freshman English course, twenty-seven (40%) indicated it was; forty-six (60%) indicated it was not.

Thirty-three (48%) institutions indicated that they can identify by name those high schools in their general area which tend to produce the least capable students in their respective programs. Thirty-six (52%) could not do so.

On the other hand, forty-two (62%) directors claimed they could identify by name those high schools in their general area which tend to produce the better students for their respective programs. Twenty-six (38%) indicated they were unable to make that distinction.

Twenty-nine (42%) departments reported they have tested the hypothesis that freshman English classes can be

large lecture groups of one hundred or more without becoming less effective than the same instruction presented to groups of twenty to thirty students. Forty (58%) institutions reported they have not tested this hypothesis.

Only seven (10%) institutions reported that they have run a comparative analysis of competency levels of their students in an attempt to determine which term benefits the students most in terms of the department objectives. The other sixty (90%) respondents reported following no such procedure.

Asked if they believe the same written piece could receive three different grades if graded by three different instructors in the department, two (3%) schools replied 'no;' fifty-four (76%) replied that 'it was possible;' and fifteen (21%) replied that 'it is likely.'

From a question related to testing of incoming freshmen students, the following results were obtained: nineteen (28%) attempt to determine if the students have experience with term papers; forty-eight (72%) do not. Fifteen (23%) make the same type of investigation regarding correct dictionary usage; fifty-one (77%) do not; History of the English Language experience is uncovered by ten (15%) of the institutions, and fifty-six (85%) do not attempt it; eleven (17%) departments attempt to determine the level of experience their incoming freshmen have had with introductory linguistics while fifty-six (83%) do not; and eight (12%) responding institutions claim to test entering

freshmen regarding their experience with basic elements of logic while fifty-nine (88%) do not.

The same matter treated differently is seen in the question which sought to determine which of the above areas of the discipline are included in the actual instruction. Fifty-six (81%) include a unit on writing research papers while thirteen (19%) do not; forty-four (69%) have a unit on correct dictionary usage, and twenty (31%) do not; twelve (18%) teach a unit on History of the Language while fifty-four (82%) do not; introductory linguistics is included in freshman English at twenty (30%) of the reporting institutions and is not included at forty-seven (70%) other reporting institutions. Forty-four (64%) schools teach a unit on basic elements of logic. Twenty-five (36%) do not include basic elements of logic in their freshman English course.

Two institutions of the sixty-seven responding indicated the use of closed circuit television in teaching freshman English. Programmed texts are used by twenty (29%) of the schools; auto-tutorial facilites are employed by nine (13%) of the schools responding; one (1%) school of sixty-eight responding indicated the use of computer assisted instruction; twenty-one (35%) reported the use of films; twenty-six (37%) use guest speakers; and nine (13%) make use of field trips.

Some instruction in speech preparation and delivery is included in the freshman English programs of ten (14%)

institutions. Sixty-two (86%) schools reported that speech is not part of their program.

Instruction in poetry is part of the freshman English program at five (73%) responding institutions but is not part of the program at the other nineteen (27%) schools which responded to this question.

Fifty (71%) of the institutions include instruction in drama, (not meaning actual acting itself) in their programs while twenty (29%) indicated no such material in the course.

At thirty-five (50%) of the reporting institutions an honors course may be substituted for the standard freshman English course. Such is not the case at thirty-five (50%) other institutions which reported.

Remedial courses for students not ready for the standard freshman English program are offered at twenty-one (29%) of the institutions but not at the other fifty-one (71%) reporting schools.

Fifty-five (85%) departments report they make it possible for an entering freshman to be given advanced standing within the program or exemption from the program entirely. Ten (15%) others who reported do not provide this option.

When a student is allowed to by-pass any or all of the freshman English program, he is required at thirty-two (52%) institutions to make up an equal number of credit-

hours in other classwork. Twenty-nine (48%) institutions do not make this stipulation.

Where a student must make up a number of credit-hours equal to those he by-passed, there are certain options open to him. Thirteen (48%) schools report he must make up the hours in English courses only. Twenty-two (88%) of twenty-five responding institutions indicated he may make up the credit-hours in English courses or any other courses. None of the sixteen reporting institutions stipulate he must make up the hours by taking the honors course in English.

Five (7%) of reporting institutions revealed that they normally allow a student's written work to be graded by some person other than the student's classroom instructor. The other sixty-seven (93%) schools do not follow this practice.

Part of a student's final grade in freshman English is based on his composition skills. One (2%) school base less than twenty-five percent on it; eleven (17%) schools base between twenty-five and fifty percent of a student's grade upon his composition skills. Twenty-four (36%) base between fifty and seventy-five percent on composition skills; and thirty (45%) schools base the student's grade over seventy-five percent on composition skills.

Part of a student's final grade in freshman English is also based on his literary interpretation skills. Twenty-nine (45%) institutuions base less than twenty-five

percent of the grade on literary interpretation skills. Twenty-two (34%) institutions base between twenty-five and fifty percent of the grade on literary interpretation skills. Eleven (17%) schools base fifty to seventy-five percent of a student's final grade on his literary interpretation skills. Three (5%) of the sixty-five schools responding to this question indicated basing more than seventy-five percent of the grade on the student's literary interpretation skills.

The approximate percentage of failing grades given each term by the schools responding to the questionnaire is contained in the following information which is broken down term by term. In the first term, nineteen (31%) schools reported a failure rate less than five percent. Twenty (33%) departments reported a failure rate of from five to ten percent. Nine (15%) reported a ten to fifteen percent failure rate. Another nine (15%) institutions reported a failure rate of fifteen to twenty percent. The twenty to twenty-five percent failure rate the first term includes two (3%) institutions; and two (3%) schools reported a failure rate of over twenty-five percent.

In the second term, twenty-one (41%) fail less than five percent. Nineteen (37%) fail between five and ten percent. Eight (15%) reported a failure rate of ten to fifteen percent. Two (4%) institutions responded with a failure rate of twenty to twenty-five percent; and one (2%) institution reported a failure rate of over twenty-five percent during the second term.

Those institutions on the quarter system provide this third set of data regarding failure rates. In the third term, six (60%) reported a failure rate less than five percent. Two (20%) schools reported a failure rate of five to ten percent, and two (20%) reported rates of ten to fifteen percent. No school reported a failure rate of over fifteen percent during the third term.

The number of compositions a student is normally expected to write during his freshman English career ranges from less than ten to over thirty. Six (9%) departments reported requiring less than ten compositions. Fourteen (20%) required between ten and fifteen. Thirty-four (49%) required fifteen to twenty. Ten (14%) schools required twenty to twenty-five; three (4%) required twenty-five to thirty, and another two (3%) required over thirty compositions.

Thirty-three (39%) English departments required that less than twenty-five percent of the compositions be written in-class. Twenty-six (38%) required twenty-five to fifty percent of all compositions be written in-class. Two (3%) required over fifty but not less than seventy-five percent in-class, and seven (10%) required over seventy-five percent to be written in-class.

Excluding research papers, the approximate length of compositions written by the students of those institutions responding to the questionnaire is treated as two categories--in-class and out-of-class compositions.

Two (3%) programs averaged in-class themes of less than two hundred words. Another thirty-nine (59%) averaged between two hundred and four hundred. Nineteen (29%) received in-class themes of four hundred to six hundred words. Six (9%) averaged six hundred to eight hundred words, and none averaged over eight hundred words.

Four (8%) institutions received out-of-class compositions averaging less than four hundred words. Twenty-one (44%) average four hundred to six hundred words. Thirteen (27%) averaged six hundred to eight hundred words. Eight (17%) received eight hundred to one thousand words, and two (4%) averaged over one thousand words per out-of-class composition.

Approximate percentages of all undergraduate hours taught by the various English departments responding as compared to the number of hours devoted to freshman English indicated that one (2%) school spent less than ten percent of its total department load on freshman English. Four (6%) reported freshman English takes between ten and twenty percent of available time. Eight (13%) report spending twenty to thirty percent on freshman English. Fourteen (23%) spent thirty to forty percent, twenty-one (34%) spent forty to fifty percent, and fourteen (23%) reported they spend over fifty percent of their available department load time on freshman English staffing.

The following data came in response to a question which asked how many of the total full-time department

members teach at least one section of freshman English during the year. Eleven (18%) institutions reported less than twenty-five percent of their members teach in the freshman English program. Eleven (19%) related that the number is between twenty-five and fifty percent. Fourteen (23%) reported fifty to seventy-five percent, and twenty-four (40%) reported that over seventy-five percent of their full-time department members teach at least one section of freshman English at some time during the year.

Of those persons who teach at least one section of freshman English during the year, eighteen (26%) institutions revealed that less than ten percent have their doctorate. Thirteen (19%) reported ten to twenty percent doctorates. Eleven (16%) schools said twenty to thirty percent; twelve (17%) said thirty to forty percent; eight (12%) reported forty to fifty percent, and seven (10%) schools reported that over fifty percent of those persons who teach freshman English at some time during the year hold doctorates.

Those persons who hold a master's degree and teach freshman English are tabulated as follows: two (3%) institutions had less than ten percent of their freshman staff with master's degrees. The ten to twenty percent master's people category received 1 (2%) institution's claim; seven (12%) reported in the thirty to forty category. The twenty to thirty percent category, however, was reported by three (5%) schools, and the forty to fifty

percent category was supported by four (7%) schools. Forty-one (71%) institutions reported that their freshman English classes are taught by persons, over fifty percent of whom hold master's degrees.

For purposes of this study, academic rank of those who teach freshman English was broken first into three divisions--full professor, associate professor and assistant professor.

Thirty-one (50%) schools reported less than ten percent of those who teach freshman English hold the rank of full professor. Fourteen (23%) reported ten to fifteen percent hold that rank. Three (5%) reported fifteen to twenty percent full professors teaching freshman English. Six (10%) reported between twenty and twenty-five percent full professors, and eight (13%) reported that over twenty-five percent of those who teach in the freshman English program hold the rank of full professor.

Twenty-nine (45%) institutions reported that less than ten percent of those who teach freshman English hold the rank of associate professor. Fifteen (23%) reported ten to fifteen percent associates. Five (8%) reported fifteen to twenty percent associates. Another five (8%) indicated twenty to twenty-five percent of their freshman English staff held associate professorships, and eleven (17%) reported that over twenty-five percent of their freshman English staff held the associate professor rank.

Ten (15%) English departments reported that less than ten percent of their freshman English staff held the rank of assistant professor. Ten (15%) indicated ten to fifteen percent assistant professors. Seven (10%) claimed fifteen to twenty percent. Seven (10%) reported twenty to twenty-five percent; and thirty-three (50%) reported that over twenty-five percent of their freshman English staff held the rank of assistant professor.

The rank of instructor was treated as a separate category and resulted in the following data: twelve (18%) schools reported that less than ten percent of their freshman English staff held the rank of instructor. Seventeen (26%) reported that ten to fifteen percent of their freshman English staff were instructors. Ten (15%) were in the twenty-five to forty percent category. Another fourteen (21%) were in the forty to sixty percent range. Nine (14%) reported in the sixty to seventy-five percent range and four (6%) institutions reported that over seventy-five percent of those persons who taught freshman English held the rank of instructor.

Twenty-five (41%) institutions reported they have analyzed their students' progress or some other factor in an attempt to identify their more effective teachers. Thirty-six (59%) had not done so.

Thirty-one (46%) institutions reported they have analyzed their students' progress or some other factor in an attempt to identify their least effective teachers. Thirty-seven (54%) had not done so.

The first question regarding in-service training called for six separate responses. The results of each of the six response categories are as follows: eight (13%) reported that their instructors received in-service training in learning theory. Fifty-five (87%) reported they did not.

Eight (13%) institutions reported their instructors in freshman English received in-service training in tests and measurements. Fifty-five (87%) reported their in-service did not include tests and measurements.

Thirteen (21%) reported their instructors received in-service training in uses of newer media. Fifty (79%) other institutions reported their instructors did not receive in-service training in newer media.

Seven (11%) departments related that communication theory was part of the in-service training for their freshman English instructors. Fifty-six (89%) reported no such material in their in-service programs.

Thirty-five (52%) institutions affirmed composition evaluation techniques as part of the in-service training program. Thirty-two (48%) indicated no in-service training in composition evaluation techniques.

Thirty-five (52%) directors reported their freshman English instructors received in-service training in improved teaching techniques. Thirty-two (48%) reported no improved teaching technique material as part of their in-service program.

Where freshman English instructors receive in-service training, seven (19%) institutions reported the duration of training to be one day or less per term. Three (8%) schools indicated that in-service training amounted to two days per term. Two (6%) departments reported three days of in-service training per term, and twenty-four (67%) departments reported four or more days in-service training per term.

The number of graduate assistants employed in teaching freshman English at the member institutions of this group is as follows: thirty (42%) schools indicated they employed no graduate assistants in their programs. Twenty-three (32%) schools reported employing less than ten graduate assistants. Eleven (15%) institutions indicated they employ between ten and twenty-five graduate assistants. Four (6%) schools use twenty-five to fifty graduate students. No institutions reported graduate students used totalling fifty to seventy-five or seventy-five to one hundred. However, three (4%) institutions indicated that they each employ over one hundred graduate students in their respective freshman English programs.

Group Three (the totals for group one and two combined)

This group consists of one hundred and thirty-three institutions which completed the questionnaire and specifically met the established criteria. Eighteen other institutions which returned the questionnaire but failed in some way to fully meet the established criteria will be

considered at the close of this chapter as was earlier forecast in reports on both group one and group two.

The breakdown of the one hundred thrity-three institutions whose answers to the questionnaire were compiled in this section of the presentation of data is as follows: fifty-six (42%) of the institutions reported one thousand undergraduate students or less. Thirty-three (25%) of the group reported undergraduate student populations between one thousand and two thousand. Twelve (9%) institutions were in the two thousand to three thousand category, and a like number of institutions in the three to five thousand category. The five thousand to eight thousand undergraduate student group included sixteen (12%) institutions. There are fifteen (11%) institutions of over eight thousand undergraduate students in this group.

In response to the question which sought to determine the length of time it has been since each freshman English program underwent a major revision there came the following: fifty-four (42%) of the reporting institutions replied that their program had undergone major revision in the past year. Nineteen (15%) institutions reported revision two years ago, twenty-three (18%) reported a three year period since major revision, seven (5%) institutions had not brought about a major revision for four years, and twenty-six (20%) of the institutions reported that their respective programs in freshman English have not undergone major revision for five years or more.

Ninety-seven (79%) institutions in group one reported that their respective freshman English programs normally require a full academic year to complete. Thirty-six (21%) of the institutions reported that their programs are not one full academic year.

Of those institutions which indicated that their freshman English programs are not one full academic year in length, five (20%) require one quarter, five (20%) require two quarters, fourteen (56%) require one semester and one (4%) program requires a trimester.

Fifty (43%) of the institutions responding to the question which asked if that institution has any evidence that indicates most students would continue to benefit from a program of extended duration replied in the affirmative. Sixty-six (57%) replied in the negative.

The group reported the make-up of their courses as follows: fifty-seven (46%) claimed grammar, composition and literature; nine (7%) replied to composition and grammar but no literature; and fifty-eight (47%) replied to composition and literature but no grammar.

Of the six grading system choices offered, A, B, C, D, F system received one hundred twenty-five (94%) affirmations, one (1%) institution reported it used Pass-Fail three (2%) institutions used the Credit-No Credit approach, and two (1.5%) used a system other than those listed in the question. Two (1.5%) institutions reported using the

4.0, 3.5, 3.0, etc. system and no school reported using the Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory system.

The question regarding the average number of students per class within the various freshman English programs drew the following replies: one (1%) institution reported classes of less than fifteen students. Eighteen (13%) reported average classes of fifteen to twenty students. Sixty-three (46%) claimed twenty to twenty-five as their average class size; forty-six (34%) claimed the twenty-five to thirty average class size; two (1%) reported average classes of thirty to forty, and two (1%) institutions reported average classes of over forty.

In response to the question which sought to determine the major factors used in determining the number of students per class within the various freshman English programs, the institutions replied: ninety-seven (88%) reported that they regard as a major factor a relatively firm predetermined number; thirteen (12%) did not see this as a major factor within their program. Seventy-one (82%) maintain that the ratio of students to available staff is a major factor in determining class size at their respective institutions, and sixteen (18%) did not accept this point. Fifty-three (74%) departments feel that the number of compositions an instructor can normally be expected to grade is a major factor while nineteen (26%) did not.

The number of hours a week freshman English classes meet range from two to five. No institution reported only

one hour a week; seven (5%) reported two hours of class a week; one hundred and one (77%) reported three hours per week; sixteen (12%) reported four hours per week; eight (6%) reported five hours per week; no institution reported meeting freshman English more than five hours per week.

Seventy-one (53%) departments reported that they have a freshman English supervisor other than the department chairman; sixty-two (47%) schools reported no supervisor of freshman English other than the department chairman.

Of those persons in charge of freshman English, not one teaches no hours a week; one (1%) teaches three or less hours per week; twenty-eight (21%) teach four to six hours a week; forty-seven (36%) teach seven to nine hours per week; and fifty-six (42%) of the respondents to this question indicated that they teach over nine hours per week.

Within the above group of freshman English directors, sixty-four (49%) reported they teach at least one section of freshman English during the school year. Sixty-six (51%) reported they do not teach at least one section during the year.

Those persons in charge of directing freshman English (either as Director of Freshman English or as Chairman) reported varying degrees of formal training in certain areas. Sixty-six (53%) replied that they have had learning theory; fifty-nine (47%) have not. Forty-one (38%) replied

'yes' to the question as to whether or not they have had formal training in tests and measurements; sixty-seven (62%) have not. Four (4%) respondents claimed formal training in computer assisted instruction; ninety-four (96%) did not. Forty-five (40%) have had formal training in the use of newer media; sixty-seven (60%) have not. And forty-six (39%) reported they have had training with regard to communication theory while seventy-one (61%) report they have not.

Freshman English directors (either Director per se or Chairman) show the following with regard to a question about their familiarity with five articles or texts directly related to their occupations. Seventy-four (63%) were familiar with Albert Kitzhaber's, Themes, Theories and Therapy; forty-three (37%) were not. Sixty-seven (61%) were familiar with Warner Rice's "A Proposal for the Abolition of Freshman English as it is Now Commonly Taught;" forty-two (39%) were not familiar with the article. "Research in Written Composition" by Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Shoer was familiar to forty-two (38%) respondents; sixty-eight (62%) claimed no familiarity with it. The College Teaching of English, edited by John C. Gerber, was known to seventy-six (64%) of the respondents; it was not familiar to forty-three (36%). Fifteen (15%) reported familiarity with Harrison Hoblitzelle's, "A Study of Freshman English, An Informal Study." Eighty-five (85%) were not familiar with the Hoblitzelle article.

Federal funds for the improvement of freshman English programs went to three (2%) of the institutions which answered the question pertaining to receipt of federal funds; one hundred twenty-seven (98%) of those responding indicated they received no federal funds during 1968-69 for the purpose of improving the teaching of freshman English.

Of one hundred twenty-four institutions which responded to the question regarding whether or not they had applied for federal funds during the stated period, three (2%) replied in the affirmative while one hundred twenty-one (98%) replied in the negative.

Ninety-seven (82%) respondents indicated that their institutions would welcome federal funds to be used solely for improvement of freshman English programs, and twenty-one (18%) indicated they would not welcome such funds.

Of those institutions which indicated they would welcome federal funds for the stated purpose, fifty-six (64%) prefer said funds for independent use with no direct cooperation with another institution; seven (8%) would prefer such funds as part of a state-wide project; and twenty-four (28%) showed a preference for receiving federal funds as part of a cooperating group of institutions, the make-up of which the respondents would determine.

The directors were asked if they would allow the writer of this study to identify their responses to questions on federal funding in a proposal to the U.S. Office of Education,

a proposal which would seek increased federal aid for development of improved freshman English programs across the country. Ninety-seven (86%) replied 'yes;' sixteen (14%) replied 'no.'

One hundred seventeen (90%) institutions reporting indicated that their English department offered an advanced composition course at the undergraduate level, not including honors courses; thirteen (10%) had no such course.

One hundred sixteen (89%) institutions maintain they offer a creative writing course at the undergraduate level, not including honors courses; fifteen (11%) do not.

A program-wide syllabus is employed by seventy-seven (60%) of the responding institutions while fifty-one (40%) do not have a program-wide syllabus for freshman English.

Where institutions do have a program-wide syllabus, the following is true; twelve (20%) report the syllabus is prepared by the director alone; forty-three (77%) indicated the syllabus is made up by a committee; and fifty-nine (83%) reported the syllabus is revised at least annually. Active instructors within the freshman English program contribute to the formulation of the syllabus at sixty-eight (96%) of the seventy-one institutions which responded to this particular question.

Where a program-wide syllabus is used, the smallest unit of time for which the syllabus specifies the material to be covered ranges from less than ten minutes to multi-

week units. Three (5%) institution's syllabus specifies less than ten minutes; four (6%) specifies from ten to thirty minutes of class time; twenty (31%) specify for one full class period at a time; thirteen (20%) specify the material for one week of classes as the smallest unit of time accounted for by the department syllabus; and twenty-five (38%) reported their respective plans prescribe for one multi-week unit of classes.

And further, where a program-wide syllabus is used, sixty-one (94%) institutions reported that their syllabus prescribes for one term at a time while four (6%) reported it does not. Twenty-three (62%) reported that their freshman English syllabus prescribes for the entire length of the program at one time while fourteen (38%) reported it did not.

When asked if instructors within the freshman English program are allowed to establish their own objectives for their individual sections, eighty-seven (72%) replied in the affirmative; thirty-four (28%) replied in the negative.

Fifty-seven (49%) of the responding institutions indicated that their department provides freshman English students with a list of specific objectives to be met by the students. Fifty-nine (51%) reported no such practice.

The directors were asked if their respective departments attempt to group freshman English students in classes according to various criteria. The group responded in that ten (9%) cases the students were grouped according to

stated interest; ninety-eight (91%) did not. Fifty-five (44%) reported they group students according to ability; seventy-one (66%) did not use ability as a criterion for grouping. Seven (6%) institutions reported grouping students by their academic majors; one hundred two (94%) do not group freshman English students according to academic majors.

The pretest-posttest technique of evaluating students' comparative progress at the end of the term is used by twenty-one (17%) of the institutions; one hundred two (83%) reported no such practice. Twelve (11%) institutions use the pretest-posttest technique at the end of the program; ninety-eight (89%) indicated they do not use this technique to evaluate the students' comparative progress at the end of the program.

One hundred twenty-four (94%) of the respondents reported that passing or failing a student within their respective programs is the result of evaluation by the student's classroom instructor only. Eight (6%) indicated that someone other than the student's classroom instructor is also involved.

Forty-nine (38%) institutions indicated that a student's success within their respective programs is normally compared to the prediction of his success according to entrance examination and/or other pre-enrollment examinations. Seventy-nine (62%) indicated no such practice.

When asked if it is standard procedure within the various departments of English to provide the students with an opportunity to present a written evaluation of the freshman English course, fifty (40%) indicated it was; seventy-five (60%) indicated it was not.

Fifty-four (43%) institutions indicated that they can identify by name those high schools in their general area which tend to produce the least capable student in their respective programs. Seventy-two (67%) could not do so.

On the other hand, seventy-five (60%) directors claimed they could identify by name those high schools in their general area which tend to produce the better students for thier respective programs. Fifty-one (40%) indicated they were unable to make that distinction.

Forty-one (32%) departments reported they have tested the hypothesis that freshman English classes can be large lecture groups of one hundred or more without becoming less effective than the same instruction presented to groups of twenty to thirty students. Eighty-eight (68%) institutions reported they have not tested this hypothesis.

Only eight (7%) institutions report that they have run a comparative analysis of competency levels of their students in an attempt to determine which term benefits the students most in terms of the departmental objectives. The other one hundred thirteen (93%) respondents reported following no such procedure.

Asked if they believe that the same written piece could receive three different grades if graded by three different instructors in the department, four (3%) schools replied 'no;' one hundred (76%) replied 'it is possible;' and twenty-seven (21%) replied that 'it is likely.'

From a question related to testing of incoming freshman students, the following results were obtained: thirty-six (30%) attempt to determine if the students have experience with term papers; eighty-five (70%) do not. Twenty-nine (25%) make the same type of investigation regarding correct dictionary usage; eighty-nine (75%) do not; History of the English Language experience is uncovered by nineteen (16%) of the institutions, and ninety-eight (84%) do not attempt it; nineteen (16%) of the attempt to determine the level of experience their incoming freshmen have had with introductory linguistics while ninety-nine (84%) do not; and seventy-four (61%) responding institutions claim to test entering freshmen regarding their experience with basic elements of logic while forty-eight (39%) do not.

The same matter treated differently is seen in the question which sought to determine which of the above areas of the discipline are included in the actual instruction. One hundred two (82%) include a unit on writing research papers while twenty-three (18%) do not; seventy-five (65%) have a unit on correct dictionary usage; and forty (35%) do not; twenty-seven (24%) teach a unit on

History of the Language while eighty-seven (76%) do not; introductory linguistics is included in freshman English at thirty-one (27%) of the reporting institutions and is not included at eighty-five (73%) other reporting institutions. Seventy-four (61%) schools teach a unit on basic elements of logic. Forty-eight (39%) do not include basic elements of logic in their freshman English course.

Two (2%) institutions of the one hundred nineteen responding indicated the use of closed circuit television in teaching freshman English. Programmed texts are used by twenty-nine (24%) of the schools; auto-tutorial facilities are employed by nineteen (15%) of the schools responding; one (1%) school of one hundred nineteen responding indicated the use of computer assisted instruction; fifty-two (45%) reported the use of films; fifty-two (41%) use guest speakers; and twenty (17%) make use of field trips.

Some instruction in speech preparation and delivery is included in the freshman English programs of twenty-six (20%) institutions. One hundred five (80%) schools reported that speech is not part of their program.

Instruction in poetry is part of the freshman English program at one hundred (77%) responding institutions but is not part of the program at the other thirty (23%) schools which responded to this question.

Eighty-one (68%) of the institutions include instruction in drama, (not meaning actual acting itself) in their programs while thirty-nine (32%) indicated no such material in the course.

At sixty-five (51%) of the reporting institutions an honors course may be substituted for the standard freshman English course. Such is not the case at sixty-three (41%) other institutions which reported.

Remedial courses for students not ready for the standard freshman English program are offered at forty-six (35%) of the institutions but not at the other eighty-five (65%) reporting schools. Ninety-eight (82%) departments report they make it possible for an entering freshman to be given advanced standing within the program or exemption from the program entirely. Twenty-one (18%) others who reported do not provide this option.

When a student is allowed to by-pass any or all of the freshman English program, he is required at fifty-nine (55%) institutions to make up an equal number of credit-hours in other classwork. Forty-eight (45%) institutions do not make this stipulation.

Where a student must make up a number of credit-hours equal to those he by-passed, there are certain options open to him. Thirty-one (57%) schools report he must make up the hours in English courses only. Forty-three (77%) of fifty-six responding institutions indicated he may make up the credit-oours in English courses or any other courses.

Three (9%) of thirty-three reporting institutions stipulate he must make up the hours by taking the honors course in English.

Thirteen (10%) of reporting institutions revealed that they normally allow a student's written work to be graded by some person other than the student's classroom instructor. The other hundred nineteen (90%) schools do not follow this practice.

Part of a student's final grade in freshman English is based on his composition skills. For (3%) schools base less than twenty-five percent on it; twenty (17%) schools base between twenty-five and fifty percent of a student's grade upon his composition skills. Fifty-two (44%) base between fifty and seventy-five percent on composition skills; and forty-one (35%) schools base the student's grade over seventy-five percent on composition skills.

Part of a student's final grade in freshman English is also based on his literary interpretation skills. Forty-six (40%) institutions base less than twenty-five percent of the grade on literary interpretation skills. Forty-four (38%) institutions base between twenty-five and fifty percent of the grade on literary interpretation skills. Twenty-one (19%) schools base fifty to seventy-five percent of a student's final grade on his literary interpretation skills. Three (3%) of the one hundred fifteen schols responding to this question indicated basing more

than seventy-five percent of the grade on the student's literary interpretation skills.

The approximate percentage of failing grades given each term by the schools responding to the questionnaire is contained in the following information which is broken down term by term. In the first term, twenty-six (22%) schools reported a failure rate less than five percent. Forty-two (36%) departments reported a failure rate of from five to ten percent. Twenty-seven (17%) reported a ten to fifteen percent failure rate. Another twenty (17%) institutions reported a failure rate of fifteen to twenty percent. The twenty to twenty-five percent failure rate the first term includes six (5%) institutions; and four (3%) schools reported a failure rate of over twenty-five percent.

In the second term, forty-three (37%) fail less than five percent. Forty-one (35%) fail between five and ten percent. Twenty-two (19%) reported a failure rate of ten to fifteen percent. Seven (6%) reported failure rates between fifteen and twenty percent. Two (2%) institutions responded with a failure rate of twenty to twenty-five percent; and two (2%) institutions reported a failure rate of over twenty-five percent during the second term.

Those institutions on the quarter system provide this third set of data regarding failure rates. In the third term, fifty-seven (85%) reported a failure rate less than five percent. Six (9%) schools reported a failure

rate of five to ten percent, and four (6%) reported rates of ten to fifteen percent. No school reported a failure rate of over fifteen percent during the third term.

The number of compositions a student is normally expected to write during his freshman English career ranges from less than ten to over thirty. Seventeen (13%) departments reported requiring less than ten compositions. Thirty-five (27%) required between ten and fifteen. Fifty (39%) required fifteen to twenty. Fifteen (12%) schools required twenty to twenty-five; six (5%) required twenty-five to thirty, and another five (4%) required over thirty compositions.

Fifty-nine (48%) English departments required that less than twenty-five percent of the composition be written in-class. Forty-six (38%) required twenty-five to fifty percent of all composition be written in-class. Ten (8%) required over fifty but not less than seventy-five percent in-class, and seven (6%) required over seventy-five percent to be written in-class.

Excluding research papers, the approximate length of compositions written by the students of those institutions responding to the questionnaire is treated in two categories--in-class and out-of-class compositions.

Seven (6%) programs averaged in-class themes of less than two hundred words. Another forty-four (36%) averaged between two hundred and four hundred. Fifty-three (43%) received in-class themes of four hundred to six hundred

words. Sixteen (13%) averaged six hundred to eight hundred words, and three (2%) averaged over eight hundred words.

Fourteen (13%) institutions received out-of-class compositions averaging less than four hundred words. Twenty-six (25%) average four hundred to six hundred words. Thirty-nine (37%) averaged six hundred to eight hundred words. Twenty-one (20%) received eight hundred to one thousand words, and five (5%) averaged over one thousand words per out-of-class composition.

Approximate percentages of all undergraduate hours taught by the various English departments responding as compared to the number of hours devoted to freshman English indicated that one (1%) school spent less than ten percent of its total department load on freshman English. Nine (8%) reported freshman English takes between ten and twenty percent of available time. Seventeen (16%) report spending twenty to thirty percent on freshman English. Twenty-five (23%) spent thirty to forty percent, thirty-three (30%) spent forty to fifty percent, and twenty-four (22%) reported they spend over fifty percent of their available department load time on freshman English staffing.

The following data came in response to a question which asked how many of the total full-time department members teach at least one section of freshman English during the year. Thirteen (11%) institutions reported

less than twenty-five percent of their members teach in the freshman English program. Seventeen (14%) related that the number is between twenty-five and fifty percent. Twenty-two (18%) reported fifty to seventy-five percent, and sixty-nine (57%) reported that over seventy-five percent of their full-time department members teach at least one section of freshman English at some time during the year.

Of those persons who teach at least one section of freshman English during the year, thirty-two (26%) institutions revealed that less than ten percent have their doctorate. Twenty-four (20%) reported ten to twenty percent doctorates. Sixteen (13%) schools said twenty to thirty percent; eighteen (15%) schools reported thirty to forty percent; fourteen (11%) reported forty to fifty percent, and eighteen (15%) schools reported that over fifty percent of those persons who teach freshman English at some time during the year hold doctorates.

Those persons who hold a master's degree and teach freshman English are tabulated as follows: four (4%) institutions had less than ten percent of their freshman staff with master's degrees. The ten to twenty percent master's people category received one (1%) institution's claim; the thirty to forty percent category included seven (7%) schools. The twenty to thirty percent category was reported by four (4%) schools, and the forty to fifty percent category was supported by nine (9%) schools.

Seventy-eight (76%) institutions reported that their freshman English classes are taught by persons, over fifty percent of whom hold master's degrees.

For purposes of this study, academic rank of those who teach freshman English was broken first into three divisions--full professor, associate professor, and assistant professor.

Forty-eight (47%) schools reported less than ten percent of those who teach freshman English hold the rank of full professor. Twenty (19%) reported ten to fifteen percent hold that rank. Eleven (11%) reported fifteen to twenty percent full professors teaching freshman English. Eight *8%) reported between twenty and twenty-five percent full professors, and sixteen (16%) reported that over twenty-five percent of those who teach in the freshman English program hold the rank of full professor.

Forty-two (36%) institutions reported that less than ten percent of those who teach freshman English hold the rank of associate professor. Twenty-nine (25%) reported ten to fifteen percent associates. Eleven (9%) reported fifteen to twenty percent associates. Another eleven (9%) indicated twenty to twenty-five percent of their freshman English staff held associate professorships, and twenty-five (21%) reported that over twenty-five percent of their English staff held the associate professor rank.

Sixteen (14%) English departments reported that less than ten percent of their freshman English staff held

the rank of assistant professor. Thirteen (11%) indicated ten to fifteen percent assistant professors. Eleven (9%) claimed fifteen to twenty percent. Ten (9%) reported twenty to twenty-five percent; and sixty-six (52%) reported that over twenty-five percent of their freshman English staff held the rank of assistant professor.

The rank of instructor was treated as a separate category and resulted in the following data: twenty-five (20%) schools reported that less than ten percent of their freshman English staff held the rank of instructor. Thirty-one (25%) reported that ten to fifteen percent of their freshman English staff were instructors. Twenty-one (17%) were in the twenty-five to forty percent category. Another twenty-five (20%) were in the forty to sixty percent range. Fourteen (11%) reported in the sixty to seventy-five percent range, and six (5%) institutions reported that over seventy-five percent of those persons who taught freshman English held the rank of instructor.

Forty-eight (40%) institutions reported they have analyzed their students' progress or some other factor in an attempt to identify their most effective teachers. Seventy-two (60%) had not done so.

Fifty (40%) institutions reported they have analyzed their students' progress or some other factor in an attempt to identify their least effective teachers. Seventy-four (60%) had not done so.

The first question regarding in-service training called for six separate responses. The results of each of the six response categories are as follows: twelve (10%) reported that their instructors received in-service training in learning theory. One hundred one (90%) reported they did not.

Eleven (10%) institutions reported their instructors in freshman English received in-service training in tests and measurements. One hundred (90%) reported their in-service did not include tests and measurements.

Twenty-five (22%) reported their instructors received in-service training in uses of newer media. Ninety-seven (78%) other institutions reported their instructors did not receive in-service training in newer media.

Ten (9%) departments related that communication theory was part of the in-service training for their freshman English instructors. One hundred two (91%) reported no such material in their in-service programs.

Fifty-two (44%) institutions affirmed composition evaluation techniques as part of their in-service training program. Sixty-five (66%) indicated no in-service training in composition evaluation techniques.

Fifty-two (44%) directors reported their freshman English instructors received in-service training in improved teaching techniques. Sixty-seven (66%) reported no improved teaching technique material as part of their in-service program.

Where freshman English instructors receive in-service training, sixteen (28%) institutions reported the duration of training to be one day or less per term. Nine (16%) schools indicated that in-service training amounted to two days per term. Four (7%) departments reported three days of in-service training per term, and twenty-nine (5%) departments reported four or more days in-service training per term.

The number of graduate assistants employed in teaching freshman English at the member institutions of this group is as follows: eighty-three (65%) schools indicated they employed no graduate assistants in their programs. Twenty-six (20%) reported employing less than ten graduate assistants. Eleven (9%) institutions indicated they employ between ten and twenty-five graduate assistants. Four (3%) schools use twenty-five to fifty graduate students. No institutions reported graduate students used totaling fifty to seventy-five or seventy-five to one hundred. However, three (2%) institutions indicated that they each employ over one hundred graduate students in their respective freshman English programs.

Institutions Which Responded But Failed to Meet Full Criteria Group One:

Ten institutions which returned the questionnaire would have been included in the data for group one except for four violations of the criteria. Three schools reported

that their freshman English program is now optional and the figures from those institutions are thereby incomplete. Three other institutions have moved their freshman English programs into a Humanities core and are not representative enough to be included in the data for group one. Two respondents reported the inclusion of freshman English in literature courses, negating the value of the responses. Three institutions returned the questionnaire blank and were not included in the data on group one from obvious reasons.

Group Two:

Eight institutions which returned the questionnaire would have been included in the data for group two except for five violations of the criteria. Two schools reported they have dropped freshman English (University of Colorado and Beloit College). Three institutions have moved their freshman English programs into a Humanities core and are not representative enough to be included in the data for group two. One institution reported the inclusion of freshman English in literature courses, negating the value of the responses. One institution returned the questionnaire blank and another reported they have not now or ever taught English composition (Hebrew Teacher's College). The latter two institutions were not included in the data for group two for obvious reasons.

Seven institutions from group one and two from group two responded too late to be included in the data.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Using the data contained in Chapter IV of this study as the basis for judgment, the writer has arrived at the following conclusions:

1. There is no indication of a general trend toward abolition of freshman English.
2. There is no indication of a general trend toward making the freshman English requirement optional.
3. There is some indication of a minor trend toward including the freshman English content in either a Humanities core or a literature course.
4. Very few institutions receive federal funds for the improvement of freshman English programs.
5. Very few institutions apply for federal funds for the improvement of freshman English programs.
6. The vast majority of institutions would welcome federal funds for the improvement of freshman English programs.
7. The majority of institutions would rather use federal funds provided for improvement of freshman English programs on an independent basis; less would prefer to use said funds in conjunction with a self-determined

cooperating institution, and very few would prefer to use the money as part of a state-wide project for the improvement of freshman English.

8. Most English departments are willing to be identified with their respective attitudes regarding receiving and spending of federal funds for the improvement of freshman English programs.
9. Most English department members can expect to teach at least one section of freshman English during the year. That expectation is significantly higher at group one institutions that at group two institutions.
10. The vast majority of freshman English programs do not make use of closed circuit television, programmed texts, auto-tutorial facilities, computer assisted instruction, or field trips. Only group two institutions have the distinction of using any closed circuit television or computer assisted instruction.
11. Freshman English programs make more use of films and guest speakers than any of the newer media. However, only group one institutions indicate the majority use films and guest speakers.
12. The average number of students per class in freshman English programs is most often between twenty and thirty. And within this average, more institutions have freshman English classes between twenty and twenty-five than have classes averaging between twenty-five and thirty.

13. The number of students per class within freshman English programs is determined most often by a predetermined number, very often by the ratio of students to available staff, and quite often by the number of compositions an instructor can normally be expected to grade.
14. Claims that grammar instructor is no longer a part of freshman English are not well founded as only one percent more institutions teach composition and literature only as compared to those who teach grammar, composition, and literature in freshman English.
15. Group one institutions are slightly more likely to include grammar instruction in their freshman English courses than are group two schools.
16. The vast majority of institutions include writing research papers in their freshman English programs.
17. The majority of institutions include correct dictionary usage in their freshmen English programs.
18. The vast majority of institutions do not include a unit on History of the English Language in their freshman English programs.
19. The vast majority of institutions do not include a unit on introductory linguistics in their freshman English prgrams.
20. The majority of institutions include a unit on the basic elements of logic in their freshman English programs.
21. The vast majority of institutions do not include some

instruction in speech preparation and delivery in their freshman English programs.

22. The majority of institutions include instruction in poetry in their freshman English programs.
23. The majority of institutions include instruction in drama, not including actual acting itself, in their freshman English programs.
24. The majority of institutions have a freshman English supervisor other than the department chairman.
25. Group two institutions are twice as likely as group one institutions to have a freshman English supervisor other than the department chairman.
26. Director of freshman English is not a full-time position and the person with that responsibility will teach no less than four hours per week but more likely seven or more hours a week.
27. Less than half of the directors of freshman English actually teach at least one freshman English class per academic year.
28. Directors of freshman English at group one schools are over four times more likely to teach at least one class of freshman English per year than are their group two counterparts.
29. Less than half the directors of freshman English are able to identify by name those high schools in their general area which tend to produce the least capable students in their program.

30. Directors of freshman English within group one are no better able than their group two counterparts to identify by name those high schools in their general area which tend to produce the better students in their programs.
31. Just over half the directors of freshman English have received formal training in learning theory.
32. Less than half the directors of freshman English have received formal training in the following: tests and measurements, statistics, computer assisted instruction, uses of newer media, and communication theory.
33. There is no significant degree of difference between directors of group one and group two institutions insofar as familiarity with published works in the area is concerned.
34. In the vast majority of institutions, passing or failing a freshman English course is the result of evaluation by one's classroom teacher only.
35. There is as much chance of a written assignment being differently graded by three members of group one institution as at a group two institution.
36. Seldom does an English department normally allow a student's written work to be graded by any person other than his classroom instructor.
37. Less than half the institutions provide their freshman English students with an opportunity to present a written evaluation of the course.

38. Just over half the institutions in each of group one and group two have no evidence which indicates that most students would continue to benefit from a program of extended duration.
39. The vast majority of institutions grade their freshman English assignments on the A, B, C, D, F system.
40. There is no data to indicate that there is a trend toward grading freshman English on a pass-fail basis.
41. A department is only as likely as not to provide the students with a list of specific objectives to be met by the students.
42. The majority of English departments base over fifty percent, if not seventy-five percent, of a student's final grade in freshman English on his composition skills.
43. The majority of English departments base less than fifty percent, if not less than twenty-five percent, of a student's final grade in freshman English on his literary interpretation skill.
44. The percentage of failing grades in freshman English falls off almost in direct ratio to which course in the sequence is involved so that the rate of failure falls off sharply the second term and then as dramatically again where a third term is required.
45. No freshman English class meets for less than two hours a week nor more than five with most courses running

four hours a week. Few freshman English classes meet five hours a week.

46. Instructors within the freshman English program at a group two institution receive a broader in-service training schedule.
47. Instructors within the freshman English program at a group two institution receive a lengthier in-service training schedule.
48. There is no significant difference in the percentage of staff with doctorates who teach freshman English within a group one institution as computed to group two institutions.
49. A group two institution is more likely to have over half of its freshman English staff with masters degrees than is a group one institution.
50. The vast majority of group two institutions offer an advanced composition course at the undergraduate level while only a simple majority of group one institutions offer an advanced composition course at that level.
51. The vast majority of group two institutions offer a creative writing course at the undergraduate level while only a simple majority of group one institutions offer a creative writing course at that level.
52. About four out of every five freshman English programs take one full academic year to complete.

53. Where the time required to complete the freshman English course is less than one full academic year, most courses require either one semester or two quarters.
54. Over half the freshman English programs in effect have undergone major revision within the last two years.
55. The freshman English program at a group two institution is less likely to undergo major revision during a specified period of time.
56. Remedial English at the college level is not a dead issue. Almost half the group one institutions and one third of the group two institutions have maintained a remedial course for students not ready for the standard freshman English program.
57. Seldom are freshman English students groups into classes according to their stated interests.
58. Grouping freshman English students into classes according to the respective abilities is practiced at almost half the institutions.
59. Rarely are freshman English students grouped into classes according to their academic majors.
60. Group two institutions are more likely to have adepartmental syllabus for freshman English than are group one institutions, yet over half of the combined groups work from a departmental syllabus.
61. Where an institution uses a departmental syllabus for the teaching of freshman English, group two schools are more likely to have that syllabus prepared by the director alone.

62. Almost all institutions rely on active instructors within the freshman English program to contribute to formulation of the departmental syllabus.
63. Where a departmental syllabus is used for freshman English, a small percentage of schools will prescribe for less than ten minutes of class time; not many more will prescribe between ten minutes and half an hour; about a third will prescribe for one full class period; one fifth will prescribe for a week at a time; and over a third will specify the material to be covered during a multi-week unit of classes as the smallest unit of time for which the syllabus accounts.
64. Freshman English syllabii will, as a minimum, prescribe for a whole term at once at a vast majority of institutions.
65. Freshman English syllabii will, as a minimum, prescribe for the entire length of the program at once at almost two-thirds of the institutions.
66. Almost three-quarters of the institutions allow instructors within their freshman English programs to establish their own objectives for their individual sections.
67. Group one institutions are more likely than group two institutions to allow instructors within their freshman English programs to establish their own objectives for their individual sections.

68. Very few institutions spend less than ten percent of their total undergraduate course-hours taught on freshman English.
69. Not even one-tenth of the institutions spend as little as ten to twenty percent of their total undergraduate course-hours taught on freshman English, and not even a fifth of the institutions spend less than thirty percent.
70. One-fourth of the institutions spend between thirty and forty percent of their total undergraduate hours staffing freshman English; a third spend forty to fifty percent, and almost one-fourth of the institutions devote over half their total undergraduate hours staffing freshman English courses.
71. At the majority of the institutions freshman English students will write less than twenty compositions during participation in the full freshman program.
72. Of all compositions written by freshman English students, just about half will be written in-class.
73. Group one institutions expect longer in-class and out-of-class compositions than do group two institutions.
74. The vast majority of institutions do not use the pre-test-posttest technique to evaluate freshman English student's progress at the end of a term, nor do they use the technique at the end of the respective programs.
75. Well over half the institutions do not compare their freshman English students' success within the program

with the prediction of his success according to entrance examinations and/or other pre-enrollment examinations.

76. Group two institutions are about two times as likely as group one institutions to have tested the hypothesis that freshman English classes can be large lecture groups of one hundred or more without becoming less effective than the same instruction presented to groups of twenty to thirty.

77. Only ten percent of group two institutions have run a comparative analysis of competency levels of freshman English students in an attempt to determine which term benefits the students most in terms of departmental objectives. This small percentage is, however, over five times larger than the percentage of group-one institutions which run the analysis.

78. Not even one-fourth of the institutions attempt to determine what percentage of incoming freshmen have had experience with the following: writing research papers, correct dictionary usage, History of the English Language, introductory linguistics, or the basic elements of logic.

79. Over half the institutions have not analyzed student progress or any other factor in an attempt to identify either their most effective or least effective classroom teachers.

80. Ninety-five percent of the group one institutions do not employ one graduate assistant within their respective

freshman English programs, and no institution employs over ten.

81. Almost three-quarters of the group two institutions employ less than ten graduate students within their respective freshman English programs, and only ten percent of group two schools employ over twenty-five graduate assistants.
82. There is no significant difference between the percentage of persons with the academic rank of Instructor who teach in the group one institutions' freshman English programs as compared with the percentage of Instructors teaching freshman English in group two institutions.
83. Half the institutions offer an honors course which may be substituted for the standard freshman English course.
84. The majority of institutions permit entering freshmen to be given advanced standing within the freshman English program or even exemption from it.
85. Just over half the institutions require a student to make up the number of credit-hours he by-passes by being waived from part or all of the freshman English requirement.
86. Where waiver of freshman English has been granted, the majority of institutions require the student to make up those hours in English courses or any other courses.

Recommendations

The writer feels that the eighty percent return on the questionnaire sent to two hundred college and university English departments is not only overwhelming numerically but that it reflects the current state of freshman English in America. Surely such a great return points to the existing crisis regarding the future of freshman English. The tremendous returns also indicate that many departments are interested in assuming a responsible role in any attempt to solve the many problems confronting the teaching of freshman English. Keeping this in mind, the writer offers the following recommendations, recommendations built on the premise that freshman English programs require responsible leaders. The recommendations are aimed directly at directors of freshman English, at potential directors, and at those persons whose duties include selection of a director.

1. Make some genuine effort to determine exactly what freshman English is and is not. You do your students no service by letting your decisions be made by what was done before. Think of yourself; come up with your own total picture.
2. Stop hampering the creative growth of your students by ramming commas and correctness down their throats. Give the students room for what is inside them. Strive for creativity and free expression. Forget any attempts to recreate freshmen English students in your own likeness. Deposit grammar and rhetoric where it belongs--in the

waste basket. You are working in a program which more than any other lends itself to relevance, to here and now. Accept this fact and you have the opportunity to change freshman English from a detested dinosaur ridden by novice comma splice seekers and veteran malcontents into a contemporary bird of beauty ridden by the university's most imaginative and substantial academic leaders.

3. As the director, it is your responsibility to determine what freshman English will be at your instituion. But make your decisions not on the background of the student insofar as certain traditional criteria are concerned but instead upon criteria determined by tomorrow's needs.
4. Determine the objectives of your freshman English program. Here you should involve other members of the faculty, students, and members of other departments. Be aware that to determine objectives does not mean to specify instruction in behavioral terms ala Magar. So far we cannot identify the individual components of creativity and imagination clearly enough to program such objectives. However, that is no excuse for entering the classroom totally unaware of how we intend to encourage the students to exercise their creative talents.
5. Keep the structure of the departmental syllabus loose enough to allow for individual differences on the part of the faculty. However, keep it partially structured to aid in avoiding academic freedom's being treated as scholastic anarchy.

6. Write the syllabus in such a way that it encompasses the entire academic year. As a result of planning ahead, instructors will be better able to grasp the individual parts of the whole picture, and department administrators will be better prepared to facilitate the behind-the-scenes functions they must perform.
7. As a director of freshman English, do not be afraid to make good use of the authority invested in you.
8. As the director, you must teach at least one class of freshman English per term. Relevance is the watchword, you have to be there to see it.
9. Consider your educational background. Study and continue to learn. Be an individual capable of working not only with members of the English department but also with representatives of other disciplines.
10. Get a budget for experimentation with creativity. Provide financial aid to student projects aimed at free expression.
11. Search out existing information, generate new information, and act upon that source rather than your own prejudice or bias.
12. Establish better liason with other departments within the institution, other similar institutions in the area, and with high school English departments in the general area. Get involved.
13. Staff the freshman English program with the best people available instead of being satisfied with just adequate

instructors. Your success as a director depends greatly on the caliber of those persons whose job it is to implement your program.

14. See to it that those persons working within the freshman English program will be on an equal basis with other department menbers insofar as promotions and other rewards are concerned.
15. Establish a substantial program of in-service training for all instructors involved in the teaching of freshman English. It is part of your job to keep **your** staff up to date on matters related to teaching freshman English.
16. Allow instructors time off regular duties in an amount equal to the time spent in in-service training. Do not try to get something for nothing.
17. Make in-service training sessions mandatory. No one is too good to get better, including yourself.
18. Let in-service sessions consist of information presented by members of the freshman English program, but rely heavily upon persons outside the department, including experts in learning theory, tests and measurements, elementary statistics, newer media, and communications theory.
19. Pretest all incoming freshman English students and place them only according to their respective abilities to satisfy the objectives of the program and not upon their respective abilities to score well in a general college entrance examination. Testing boards do not run your program; you do.

20. Section the students as far as is possible according to the students' interests or academic major. You work for their benefit. Do not have them working for your convenience.
21. Institute a total waiver policy for those entering students who are able to meet the program objectives. Make advanced or honors courses available to exempted students but do not make such courses mandatory substitutions for freshman English. Students who gain waiver will not know commas, they will come from a background which allowed them ample expression.
22. Instigate some form of remedial program where evidence indicates there is a need for it. Let need alone govern the creation of this branch of the freshman English program. Remedial instruction is often very much a part of the college scene if such is offered when warranted by student need. Such is seen especially with inner city students and others from culturally deprived areas. When remedial programs are required, be fully conscious that they are in no way freshman English. They are nothing more than service courses aimed at providing experiences with language which usually come before college age.
23. Establish a publicized avenue of two-way communication between students and instructors. This will be partly facilitated by encouraging the students to write an evaluation of the program. Another method to facilitate

this desired understanding is to publicly inform the students of the actual objectives of the program. Here one would be better to use behavioral terms instead of broad generalities.

24. If research into the various components of freshman English is hampered at your institution by lack of funds, it is your responsibility as the director, to make yourself aware of existing sources of funds. Also, knowing potential sources of funds is of little value unless application is made. For example, only three institutions in this study claimed they applied for federal funds. All three applicants received federal funding.

Recommendations for Further Study

The writer recommends that further study in their field should seek to answer the following questions:

1. What is the specific rationale behind an institution's decision to abolish the teaching of freshman English?
2. Why have so many institutions indicated they would welcome federal funds for the improvement of instruction within freshman English programs, yet so few even applied for said funds?
3. Would federal funds or any other major funds be better utilized insofar as improvement of freshman English programs is concerned if they were given for independent work or for cooperative work?

4. Where most members of the department teach at least one section of freshman English during the year, is instruction suffering as a result of attitudes against freshman English as an honorable course?
5. Why has the newer media been so slow coming to the assistance of freshman English?
6. To what extent is class ize within a freshman English program able to affect the quality of instruction?
7. Why do so many institutions find they must teach grammar at the college level?
8. What is the reason why the study of the history of the English language has not gained support in freshman programs? Why not linguistics?
9. Why do some schools employ a director of freshman English and others do not?
10. Exactly what type of training qualifies one to be a director of freshman English?
11. How is a department supposed to tell when a freshman English student is prepared?
12. Does the choice of grading system affect instruction in freshman English programs?
13. How should prospective freshman English instructors be trained?
14. Is there really a correlation between a quality freshman English program and its requiring one academic year to complete?

15. Will a student benefit more by taking freshman English at a large school or a small one?
16. How necessary are those units which now make up most freshman English programs in the country?
17. Do all academic majors require the same freshman English course?
18. How much of what we do in freshman English courses today is no more than unnecessary carry-over from the historical past of the course?
19. Whose job is it to set standards for freshman English programs?
20. What are the attitude changes that English teachers will have to overcome before freshman English can truly benefit from scientific instructional development?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Kenneth E. "Relationship Between Teacher Load and Student Achievement." School Science and Mathematics. Menasha, Wisconsin, June 1950.

Archer, Jerome, et al. "The Status of Freshman Composition." College Composition and Communication. Vol. 19, n. 1. Champaign, Illinois, Feb. 1968, pp. 81-85.

Aven, Samuel D. and Marvin Chrisp. English Proficiency of Males and Females--Is There a Difference? U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Washington, D. C., 1967.

Barber, Max and K. C. Beighley. An Analysis of the Cooperative English Test as a Predictor of Success in English 1A and English 1A71 at Stockton College. U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Washington, D.C., 1960.

"Basic Issues in the Teaching of English, The." Publication of the Modern Language Association. New York, New York, Sept. 1959.

Bessone, Richard M. Remedial English Instruction in California Public Junior Colleges--An Analysis and Evaluation of Current Practices. California State Department of Education. Sacramento, California, Sept. 1966.

Bormuth, John R. Readability in 1968. National Council of Teachers of English; Champaign, Illinois, 1968.

Bosley, Howard. "Class Sizes and Faculty--Student Ratios in American Colleges." Educational Record. Washington, D. C., 1962.

Braddock, Richard. "Advanced Standing Program: How Iowa Colleges and Universities Will Deal With Students in 1966-67." Iowa English Yearbook. n. 11, Iowa City, Fall 1966, pp. 13-19.

Braddock, Richard and Charles Statler. Evaluation of College-Level Instruction in Freshman Composition, Part II. U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Washington, D. C., April 1968.

Braddock, Richard, Richard Lloyd-Jones and Lowell Schoer. Research in Written Composition. National Council of Teachers of English; Champaign, Illinois, 1963.

Burns, Rex S. and Robert C. Jones. Two Experimental Approaches to Freshman Composition--Lecture-Tutorial and Team Teaching. U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Washington, D. C., 1967.

Burrows, Alvina T. What Research Says to the Teacher: Teaching Composition. National Education Association; Washington, D. C., April 1966.

Carter, Lamore J., et al. Comparison of Two Methods of Teaching Remedial English to College Freshmen. U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Washington, D. C., 1963.

Cammarosano, Joseph and Frank A. Santopola. "Teaching Efficiency and Class Size." School and Society. New York, New York; Sept. 27, 1958.

Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Corbett, Edward P. J. "The Relevance of Rhetoric to Composition." Kentucky English Bulletin. Vol. 17, N. 2, Lexington, Kentucky, 1967-68, pp. 3-12.

Cox, D. R. Planning of Experiments. New York, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

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

De Vane, William C. "The Study and Teaching of English." College Teaching of English. New York, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965, p. 26.

Downie, N. M. and R. W. Heath. Basic Statistical Methods. New York, New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Emig, Janet. "On Teaching Composition: Some Hypotheses as Definitions." Research in the Teaching of English. V. 1, N. 2. Champaign, Illinois, Fall 1967, pp. 127-135.

Evans, William H. and Michael Cardone. Specialized Courses in Methods of Teaching English. National Council of Teachers of English; Champaign, Illinois, 1964.

Farrell, Edmund J. English, Education, and the Electronic Revolution. National Council of Teachers of English; Champaign, Illinois, 1967.

Fisher, John H. "Prospectus." College Teaching of English. New York, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965, p. 11.

Fordyce, Dorothy W. NDEA English Institutes--Composition. National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Illinois, Nov. 1967.

Foscue, Virginia. Language Study as a Part of Freshman English. U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Washington, D. C., 1967.

Frazier, Alexander, ed. Ends and Issues, 1965-1966: Points of Decision in the Development of the English Curriculum. National Council of Teachers of English; Champaign, Illinois, 1966.

Freedom and Discipline in English. Commission on English, New York, New York: College Entrance Board, 1965.

Gleason, H. A., Jr. "What is English?" College Composition and Communication. Champaign, Illinois; Oct. 1962, pp. 1-13.

Good, Carter V. and Douglas E. Scates. Methods of Research. New York, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.

Gorrell, Robert M. "Freshman Composition." College Teaching of English. New York, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965, p. 91.

Hatch, Winslow. "Research in Class Size in Relationship to Effective Teaching." Junior College Journal. xxxll. Washington, D. C., Sept. 1961.

Hawkes, John. An Experiment in Teaching Writing to College Freshmen. U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Washington, D. C., Oct. 1967.

Hays, William L. Statistics for Psychologists. New York, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Hoblitzelle, Harrison. "A Study of Freshman English, An Informal Study." College English. Vol. 28, N. 8. Champaign, Illinois; May 1967, pp. 596-600.

Hodges, J. L., Jr. and E. L. Lehmann. Basic Concepts of Probability and Statistics. San Francisco, California: Holden-Day, Inc., 1964.

Hopper, Harold H. and Helen Keller. Writing Skills--Are Large Classes Conducive to Effective Learning? U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Washington, D. C., Oct. 1966.

Kallsen, T. J. Teachers' Use of Dictating Machines to Improve the Written Composition of College Students. U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Washington, D. C., 1965.

Kaplan, Milton A. "Verse Writing in the English Class." English Journal. Vol. 55, N. 7. Champaign, Illinois; Oct. 1966, pp. 880-884, 890.

Karl, Wallace. "Towards a Rationale for Teachers of Writing and Speaking." English Journal. Vol. 50, N. 6, Champaign, Illinois; Sept. 1961, pp. 384-391.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Lamberts, J. J. "Freshman Composition--When Do We Say We've Done The Job." College Composition and Communication. Vol. 18, N. 5. Champaign, Illinois, Dec. 1967, pp. 232-235.

Langer, Sussanne K. Problems of Art. New York, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967.

Marckwardt, Albert H. Linguistics and the Teaching of English. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966.

Mayor, John R., director. Accreditation in Teacher Education: Its Influence on Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Accrediting, 1965.

Meckel, Henry C. "Research on Teaching Composition and Literature." Handbook of Research on Teaching. ed. N. L. Gage. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963, pp. 966-1006.

Moffett, James. "Rationale for a New Curriculum in English." Rhetoric--Theories for Application. Robert H. Gorrell, ed. National Council of Teachers of English: Champaign, Illinois, 1967, pp. 1-127.

Nelson, Bonnie E. Freshman English at the State University of New York, Buffalo. New York, New York: Modern Language Association, 1968.

Nelson, Bonnie E. College Programs in Freshman Composition. New York, New York: Modern Language Association, 1968.

Nelson, Bonnie E. Freshman English at Eight Universities. New York, New York: Modern Language Association, 1968.

Nelson, Bonnie E. Freshman English at Fourteen Two-Year Colleges. New York, New York: Modern Language Association, 1968.

Nelson, Bonnie E. Freshman English at the University of Hawaii. New York, New York: Modern Language Association, 1968.

Nelson, Bonnie E. Freshman English at the University of Kentucky, Ohio State University, Purdue University, and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. New York: Modern Language Association, 1968.

Nelson, Bonnie E. Freshman English at Nine Institutions Which Have Eliminated the Traditional Course in Freshman Composition. New York: Modern Language Association, 1968.

Nelson, Bonnie E. Freshman English at Seven Colleges. New York: Modern Language Association, 1968.

Nelson, Bonnie E. Freshman English at the University of Tulsa, Columbia Basin College, and Western State College of Colorado. New York: Modern Language Association, 1968.

Nelson, Bonnie E. Freshman English at Twelve Universities. New York: Modern Language Association, 1968.

O'Shaughnessy, Louis. "The Size of College Classes and the Percentage of Failures." School and Society. New York, Sept. 14, 1929.

Park, Young. An Experiment to Determine the Effectiveness of One Hour of Supplementary Instruction in a Junior College Pre-Transfer English Composition Class. U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Washington, D. C., March 1968.

Petty, Walter C., Curtis P. Herold and Earline Stoll. The State of Knowledge About the Teaching of Vocabulary. National Council of Teachers of English; Champaign, Illinois, 1968.

Pierson, Howard. "Peer Correction VS. Teachers' Correction of Writing." National Council of Teachers of English; Champaign, Illinois, Address to the Annual Convention, 1967.

Praushitz, Walter C. "The Concordia Freshman English Program." Minnesota English Journal. Vol. 1, N. 1. Duluth, April 1966, pp. 14-20.

"Pursuit of Excellence--Education and the Future of America, The." Special Studies, Project Report V. Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1958, p. 2.

Sherwin, J. Stephen. Four Problems in Teaching English: Critiques and Research. National Council of Teachers of English; Champaign, Illinois, 1968.

Shugrue, Michael F. and Thomas F. Crawley. "The Conclusion of the Initial Phase: The English Program of the USOE." Publication of the Modern Language Association. New York, Nov. 1967, pp. 15-32.

Squire, James R., et al. The National Interest and the Teaching of English. National Council of Teachers of English; Champaign, Illinois, 1961.

Stauffer, Russel G. Language and the Higher Thought Processes. National Council of Teachers of English; Champaign, Illinois, 1965.

Tohtz, Jack E. and Gerhard Lang. Out-of-Class Programmed Instruction Compared with Conventional Homework Assignments in Teaching Expository Writing in Freshman English. U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Washington, D. C., 1963.

Trimble, Martha. Development and Demonstration of the Effectiveness of Using Programmed Material for Teaching Fundamental Tools and Techniques Required for English Composition at the University Level. U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Washington, D. C., 1965.

Wallis, W. Allen and Harry V. Roberts. Statistics: A New Approach. Brooklyn, New York: The Free Press, 1963.

Wasson, Richard. Proceedings of the Allerton Park Conference on Research in the Teaching of English, December 2-4, 1962. U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Washington, D. C., 1962.

Willingham, John R. A "Correspondence-Tutorial" Method of Teaching Freshman=College Composition. U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Washington, D. C., 1967.

Wolf, Melvin, et al. Effect of Writing Frequency Upon Proficiency in a College Freshman English Course. U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Washington, D. C., 1966.

Woodward, John C. "Profile of the Poor Writer--The Relationship of Selected Characteristics to Poor Writing in College." Report 10. Coral Gables, Florida: The University of Miami, Jan. 1965.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

A LISTING OF THOSE INSTITUTIONS IN GROUP ONE AND DESIGNATION OF THOSE WHICH REPLIED TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Here is a list of the two hundred institutions to which the questionnaire was sent.

An asterisk (*) beside the name of an institution indicates that institution replied.

Group One Institutions

1. Oakwood College
   Huntsville, Ala.

* 2. John Brown University
   Siloam Springs, Ark.

* 3. Claremont Men's College
   Claremont, Calif.

* 4. College of Notre Dame
   Belmont, Calif.

5. Imperial Valley College
   Imperial, Calif.

6. Pitzer College
   Claremont, Calif.

* 7. Regis College
   Denver, Colo.

8. Albertus Magnus College
   New Haven, Conn.

* 9. Trinity College
   Hartford, Conn.

*10. Dunbarton College of Holy Cross
   Washington, D. C.

*11. Flordia Southern College
   Lakeland, Fla.

*12. Agnes Scott College
   Decatur, Ga.

*13. Lagrange College
   Lagrange, Ga.

*14. Morehouse College
   Atlanta, Ga.

*15. Paine College
   Augusta, Ga.

16. Savannah State College
   Savannah, Ga.

*17. Aurora College
   Aurora, Ill.

*18. Barat College
   Lake Forest, Ill.

*19. Illinois Wesleyan Univ.
Bloomington, Ill.

*20. Monmouth College
Monmouth, Ill.

*21. North Central College
Naperville, Ill.

*22. Quincy College
Quincy, Ill.

23. Shimer College
Mt. Carroll, Ill.

24. Franklin College of Ind.
Franklin, Ind.

*25. Manchester College
North Manchester, Ind.

*26. Marion College
Marion, Ind.

*27. Wabash College
Crawfordsville, Ind.

28. Grinnell College
Grinnell, Iowa

*29. Wartburg College
Waverly, Iowa

*30. William Penn College
Oskaloosa, Iowa

*31. Bethel College
North Newton, Kan.

*32. College of Emporia
Emporia, Kan.

*33. Fort Hays Kansas State Col.
Hays, Kan.

*34. Tabor College
Hillsboro, Kan.

*35. Kentucky State College
Frankfort, Ken.

*36. Pikeville College
Pikeville, Ken.

*37. St. Mary's Dominican Coll.
New Orleans, La.

*38. College of Notre Dame
of Maryland
Baltimore, Md.

*39. Mount Saint Mary's Coll.
Emmitsburg, Md.

40. College of Our Lady of
the Elms
Chicopee, Mass.

*41. Hillsdale College
Hillsdale, Mich.

*42. Kalamazoo College
Kalamazoo, Mich.

*43. Mich. Tech Univ.
Sault Ste Marie, Mich.

44. Spring Arbor College
Spring Arbor, Mich.

*45. College of St. Scholastica
Duluth, Minn.

*46. Avila College
Kansas City, Mo.

*47. Evangel College of the
Assemblies of God
Springfield, Mo.

*48. Fontbonne College
St. Louis, Mo.

*49. Marillac College
St. Louis, Mo.

*50. Southwest Baptist College
Bolivar, Mo.

*51. Rocky Mountain College
Billings, Montana

*52. Midland Lutheran College
Fremont, Neb.

53. Peru State College
Peru, Neb.

*54. Bloomfield College
Bloomfield, N. J.

*55. Saint Peter's College
Jersey City, N. J.

56. Coll. of Mt. St. Vincent
Riverdale, N. Y.

*57. Keuka College
Keuka Park, N. Y.

*58. Lemoyne College
Syracuse, N. Y.

*59. Marymount Manhattan Coll.
New York, N. Y.

60. Mills College of Education
New York, N. Y.

*61. Nyack Missionary College
Nyack, N. Y.

*62. York College of City Univ. of N. Y.
Flushing, N. Y.

*63. Asheville Biltmore Coll
Asheville, N. C.

64. Pembroke State College
Pembroke, N. C.

65. Saint Augustine's College
Raleigh, N. C.

66. Winston Salem State Coll.
Winston Salem, N. C.

67. Valley City State College
Valley City, N. D.

*68. Ohio Dominican College
Columbus, Ohio

*69. Kenyon College
Gambier, Ohio

*70. Edgecliff College
Cincinnati, Ohio

71. Oklahom College of Liberal Arts
Chickasha, Okla.

*72. Mt. Angel College
Mt. Angel, Ore.

*73. College Misericordia
Dallas, Penn.

*74. Gettysburg College
Gettysburg, Penn.

*75. Holy Family College
Philadelphia, Penn.

*76. King's College
Wilkes Barre, Penn.

*77. Rosemont College
Rosemont, Penn.

*78. Barrington College
Barrington, R. I.

*79. Coker College for Women
Hartsville, S. C.

*80. Erskine College
Due West, S. C.

*81. Wofford College
Spartanburg, S. C.

*82. Huron College
Huron, S. D.

*83. Yankton College
Yankton, S. D.

*84. Lemoyne College
Memphis, Tenn.

85. Milligan College
Milligan College, Tenn.

*86. Angelo State College
San Angelo, Texas

*87. McMurray College
Abilene, Texas

*88. Texas Luthern College
Sequin, Texas

*89. College of Southern Utah
Cedar City, Utah

*90. Bridgewater College
Bridgewater, Va.

*91. Roanoke College
Salem, Va.

*92. Virginia State College
Petersburg, Va.

93. Fairmont State College
Fairmont, Va.

*94. Morris Harvey College
Charleston, W. V.

*95. Carroll College
Waukesha, Wisc.

96. Ripon College
Ripon, Wisc.

97. Northland College
Ashland, Wisc.

*98. Viterbo College
La Crosse, Wisc.

*99. Park College
Parkville, Mo.

*100. Bates College
Lewiston, Maine

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

A LISTING OF THOSE INSTITUTIONS IN GROUP TWO AND DESIGNATION OF THOSE WHICH REPLIED TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Group Two Institutions

*101. Alabama State College
Montgomery, Ala.

*102. Univ. of Alaska
College, Alaska

*103. Northern Arizona Univ.
Flagstaff, Ariz.

*104. State Coll. of Arkansas
Conway, Ark.

*105. Fresno State College
Fresno, Calif.

*106. La Verne College
La Verne, Calif.

*107. Mount St. Mary's Coll.
Los Angeles, Calif.

*108. Sonoma State College
Rohnert Park, Calif.

109. Univ. of Cal. Los Angeles
Los Angeles, Calif.

110. Univ. of San Diego for Men
San Diego, Calif.

*111. Univ. of San Francisco
San Francisco, Calif.

*112. Univ. of the Pacific
Stockton, Calif.

*113. Whittier College
Whittier, Calif.

*114. Colorado College
Colorado Springs, Colo.

*115. Univ. of Colorado
Boulder, Colo.

*116. Connecticut College
New London, Conn.

*117. Univ. of Bridgeport
Bridgeport, Conn.

118. Wesleyan Univ.
Middletown, Conn.

*119. Yale University
New Haven, Conn.

*120. Gallaudet College
Washington, D. C.

*121. George Washington Univ.
Washington, D. C.

122. Howard Univ.
Washington, D. C.

*123. Florida State Univ.
Tallahassee, Fla.

*124. Georgia Southern Coll.
Statesboro, Ga.

*125. Univ. of Georgia
Athens, Ga.

*126. West Georgia College
Carrollton, Ga.

*127. Bradley University
Peoria, Ill.

*128. Millikin Univ.
Decatur, Ill.

129. Rockford College
Rockford, Ill.

*130. Rosary College
River Forest, Ill.

*131. Southern Illinois Univ.
Carbondale, Ill.

*132. Purdue Univ.
Lafayette, Ind.

*133. Univ. of Evansville
Evansville, Ind.

*134. Valpariso Univ.
Valpariso, Ind.

*135. Morningside College
Sioux City, Iowa

*136. Univ. of Dubuque
Dubuque, Iowa

*137. Kansas State Teachers
College
Emporia, Kansas

*138. Union College
Barbourville, Ken.

*139. Univ. of Maine
Orono, Maine

*140. Goucher College
Towson, Maryland

141. Morgan State College
Baltimore, Md.

142. St. Johns College
Annapolis, Md.

*143. Eastern Nazarene College
Wollaston, Mass.

*144. Emmanuel College
Boston, Mass.

*145. Hebrew Teachers College
Brookline, Mass.

*146. Northeastern Univ.
Boston, Mass.

*147. Suffolk Univ.
Boston, Mass.

*148. Western New England Coll.
Springfield, Mass.

*149. Eastern Mich. Univ.
Ypsilanti, Mich.

*150. Northern Mich. Univ.
Marquette, Mich.

151. Univ. of Minn. Twin
Cities Campus
Minneapolis, Minn.

*152. Mississippi State Univ.
State College, Miss.

*153. Immaculate Conception
Seminary
Conception, Mo.

*154. Southwest Missouri
State Coll.
Springfield, Mo.

*155. Univ. of Missouri at
Kansas City
Kansas City, Mo.

*156. Eastern Montana College
Billings, Montana

157. Western Montana College
Dillon, Montana

*158. Concordia Teachers Coll.
Seward, Neb.

159. Wayne State College
Wayne, Neb.

*160. Drew Univ.
Madison, N. J.

*161. Rider College
Trenton, N. J.

*162. Trenton State College
Trenton, N. J.

163. Eastern New Mexico Univ.
Portales, N. M.

*164. New Mexico State Univ.
Las Cruces, N. M.

*165. Alfred Univ.
Alfred, N. Y.

*166. Cornell Univ.
Ithaca, N. Y.

167. Ithaca College
Ithaca, N. Y.

168. Long Island Univ.
Greenvale, N. Y.

*169. New York Univ.
New York, N. Y.

170. Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
Brooklyn, N. Y.

*171. State Univ. College at Oswego
Oswego, N. Y.

*172. State Univ. School of Industrial & Labor Relations
Ithaca, N. Y.

*173. Syracuse Univ.
Syracuse, N. Y.

*174. Appalachian State Univ.
Boone, N. C.

*175. East Carolina Univ.
Greenville, N. C.

*176. Minot State College
Minot, N. D.

*177. Central State Univ.
Wilberforce, Ohio

*178. John Carroll Univ.
Cleveland, Ohio

*179. Univ. of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio

*180. Phillips Univ.
Enid, Okla.

181. Linfield College
McMinnville, Oregon

*182. Oregon State Univ.
Corvallis, Oregon

183. Reed College
Portland, Ore.

*184. Gannon College
Erie, Penn.

*185. Swarthmore College
Swarthmore, Penn.

*186. West Chester State Coll.
West Chester, Penn.

*187. Furman Univ.
Greenville, S. C.

*188. Augustana College Assoc.
Sioux Falls, S. D.

*189. Middle Tenn. State Univ.
Murfreeboro, Tenn.

*190. Howard Payne College
Brownwood, Texas

*191. Midwestern Univ.
Witchita Falls, Texas

*192. Sul Ross State College
Alpine, Texas

193. Trinity Univ.
San Antonio, Texas

*194. Univ. of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas

*195. Westminster College
Salt Lake City, Utah

*196. Central Washington State
College
Ellensburg, Wash.

*197. Univ. of Puget Sound
Tacoma, Wash.

198. West Virginia Univ.
Morgantown, W. V.

*199. Beloit College
Beloit, Wisconsin

*200. Wisconsin State Univ. at
River Falls
River Falls, Wisc.

APPENDIX C

I anticipate that you may be less than anxious to fill out a questionnaire; therefore, I openly beg your cooperation and apologize for encroaching upon your time.

Sincerely,

Gordon L. Holland
Dir. of Freshman English
Northern Montana College
Havre, Montana
59501

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX D

A COPY OF THE SECOND COVER LETTER USED DURING THE SECOND MAILING OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON OCTOBER 17

October 17, 1969

Dear Chairman:

Earlier this month a copy of this questionnaire was sent to you in an attempt to secure data essential to an analysis of certain aspects of freshman English. Of the two hundred randomly selected institutions which received this questionnaire, well over one hundred have replied. In an attempt to increase the returns, I am again seeking your cooperation in this matter.

It is hoped that the questionnaire will be completed by the Director of Freshman English or by the department chairman at institutions which do not have a freshman English director or coordinator per se.

Individual responses within the questionnaire will be treated confidentially with two possible exceptions. You are given the choice of anonymity or not regarding two questions, each of which is concerned with federal funds for development and study of freshman English programs. No institution's individual responses will be cited without that institution's expressed permission to do so.

Upon completion of the questionnaire, simply re-fold it, staple it with the return address exposed, and drop it in the mail. It is hoped that all questionnaires which are going to be returned will be in the mail by the weekend of October 25.

If for any reason you are unwilling to or unable to fill out the questionnaire, please take a few seconds to refold and staple it and send it back blank except for identification of your institution.

Sincerely,

Gordon L. Holland
Dir. of Freshman English
Northern Montana College
Havre, Montana
59501

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX E

A SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETE WITH THE FINAL TOTALS

FROM INSTITUTIONS IN GROUP ONE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

All responses are constructed. At no time will you be required to write out an answer.

Place an "X" in the space provided for the answer to questions you are able and willing to answer.

Write "NA" in the space provided for the answer to questions which you feel do not apply to your institution.

Place no mark at all in the space provided for the answer to any question which you do not care to answer. You are not asked to explain this type of response.

Institution _____

Your name (optional) _____

1. What title do you hold?

____ Director of Freshman English (or equivalent) ___ Department Chairman

2. How many undergraduates are enrolled at your institution?

38	less than 1,000	2	3,000 to 5,000
18	1,000 to 2,000	2	5,000 to 8,000
2	2,000 to 3,000	0	over 8,000

3. Does your institution offer:

____ Yes	____ No	an undergraduate English major?
____ Yes	____ No	a Master of Arts in Teaching?
____ Yes	____ No	a Master's in English?
____ Yes	____ No	a Ph.D. in English?
____ Yes	____ No	graduate degrees but none of the above?

4. How long has it been since your freshman English program underwent what you would call a major revision?

27	1 year	2	4 years
5	2 years	16	5 years or more
11	3 years		

5. Does your standard freshman English program normally require a full academic year to complete?

45	Yes	16	NO

6. If your response to question five was No, how long does it normally take a student to complete your freshman English program?

3	1 quarter	6	1 semester
0	2 quarters	0	1 trimester

7. Do you have any evidence which indicates that most students would continue to benefit from a program of extended duration?

23	Yes	29	No

8. If any of the following approximately describes the make-up of your freshman English program, indicate which one.

28	grammar, composition, and literature
4	grammar,and composition but no literature
26	composition and literature but no grammar

9. Which of the following best describes your grading system?

58	A, B, C, D, F,	0	4.0, 3.5, 3.0, etc.
1	Pass-Fail	0	Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory
1	Credit-No Credit	1	None of these

10. What is the average number of students per class within your freshman English program?

0	less than 15	20	25 to 30
12	15 to 20	0	30 to 40
28	20 to 25	1	over 40

11. Do you regard any or all of the following as major factors in determining the number of students per class within your freshman English program?

41	Yes	8	No	a relatively firm predetermined number
40	Yes	6	No	the ratio of students to available staff
23	Yes	11	No	the number of compositions an instructor can normally be expected to grade

12. How many hours a week do your classes meet?

0	1 hour	8	4 hours
6	2 hours	2	5 hours
45	3 hours	0	6 hours or more

13. Does your freshman English program have a supervisor other than the department chairman?

21	Yes	40	No

14. What is the director of freshman English's (or chairman acting as director) normal teaching load per week including all subjects he or she teaches?

0	0 hours per week	23	7 to 9 hours per week
0	1 to 3 hours per week		
4	4 to 6 hours per week	33	over 9 hours per week

15. Does the director (or chairman acting as director) teach at least one section of freshman English during the school year?

52	Yes	7	No

16. Has the director (or chairman acting as director) received formal training in any or all of the following:

32	Yes	24	No	learning theory
14	Yes	28	No	tests and measurements
10	Yes	33	No	statistics
1	Yes	40	No	computer assisted instruction
24	Yes	26	No	use of newer media
21	Yes	30	No	communication theory

17. Are you familiar with any or all of the following:

32	Yes	21	No	Themes, Theories, and Therapy by Albert Kitzhaber
29	Yes	20	No	"A Proposal for the Abolition of Freshman English as it is Now Commonly Taught" by Warner Rice.
15	Yes	32	No	"Research in Written Composition" by Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Shoer.
32	Yes	21	No	The College Teaching of English, John C. Gerber, editor.
3	Yes	40	No	"A Study of Freshman English, An Informal Study" by Harrison Hoblitzelle.

18. During the 1968-69 academic year, did your institution receive federal funds to be used solely for improvement of your freshman English program?

1	Yes	58	No

19. Did your institution apply for federal funds to be used solely for improvement of your freshman English program during the 1968-69 academic year?

1 Yes 55 No

20. Would your institution welcome federal funds to be used solely for improvement of your freshman English program?

44 Yes 10 No

21. If your answer to question twenty was Yes, would you prefer the funds to be made available for use:

21 independently (in no direct cooperation with another institution).
4 as part of a state-wide project.
11 as part of a cooperating groups of institutions, the make-up of which you would determine.

22. Will you allow the writer of this questionnaire to identify your responses to questions 20 and 21 in a proposal to the U. S. Office of Education, a proposal which would seek increased federal aid for development of improved freshman English programs across the country?

43 Yes 8 No

23. Does your English department offer an advanced composition course at the undergraduate level? (Not including honors courses.)

50 Yes 10 No

24. Does your English department offer a creative writing course at the undergraduate level? (Not including honors courses.)

50 Yes 10 No

25. Are your freshman English classes taught according to a program-wide syllabus?

30 Yes 29 No

26. If your response to question 25 was Yes,

3	Yes	16	No	Is the syllabus prepared by the director only?
14	Yes	6	No	Is the syllabus prepared by a committee?
28	Yes	1	No	Do active instructors within the program contribute to formulation of the syllabus?
20	Yes	7	No	Is the syllabus revised at least annually?

27. Where a program-wide syllabus is used, what is the smallest unit of time for which the syllabus specifies the material to be covered?

1	Less than 10 minutes of class time.
1	10 to 30 minutes of class time.
7	One full class period.
5	One week of classes.
8	One multi-week unit of classes.

28. Where a program-wide syllabus is used, does that syllabus prescribe for:

21	Yes	2	No	one term at a time?
9	Yes	8	No	the entire length of the program at one time?

29. Are instructors within your program allowed to establish their own objectives for their own individual sections?

47	Yes	10	No

30. Does your department provide your freshman English students with a list of specific objectives to be met by the students?

22	Yes	27	No

31. Does your department attempt to group your freshman English students in classes according to:

4	Yes	46	No	their stated interests?
25	Yes	34	No	ability?
2	Yes	48	No	their academic majors?

32. Does your department use the pretest-posttest technique to evaluate your students' comparative progress:

9	Yes	47	No	at the end of each term?
7	Yes	45	No	at the end of the program?

33. Is passing or failing a student within your program the result of evaluation by the student's classroom instructor only?

55	Yes	5	No

34. Is a student's success within the program normally compared to the prediction of his success according to entrance examinations and/or other pre-enrollment examinations?

22	Yes	35	No

35. Is it standard procedure within your program to provide the students with an opportunity to present a written evaluation of the course?

23 Yes 35 No

36. Can you identify by name those high schools in your general area which tend to produce the least capable students in your program?

21 Yes 36 No

37. Can you identify by name those high schools in your general area which tend to produce the better students in your program?

33 Yes 25 No

38. Have you tested the hypothesis that freshman English classes can be large lecture groups of one hundred or more without becoming less effective than the same instruction presented to groups of twenty to thirty?

12 Yes 48 No

39. Have you run a comparative analysis of competency levels of your students in an attempt to determine which term benefits the students most in terms of your departmental objectives?

1 Yes 53 No

40. Do you believe that in your department the same written piece could receive three different grades if graded by three different instructors?

2 No
46 it is possible
12 it is likely

41. Does your department attempt to determine what percentage of incoming freshman students have had experience with:

17	Yes	37	No	writing research papers?
14	Yes	38	No	correct dictionary usage?
9	Yes	42	No	History of the English language?
8	Yes	43	No	introductory linguistics?
6	Yes	45	No	basic elements of logic?

42. Does your freshman English program include a unit on:

46	Yes	10	No	writing research papers?
31	Yes	20	No	correct dictionary usage?
15	Yes	33	No	History of the English Language?
11	Yes	38	No	introductory linguistics?
30	Yes	23	No	basic elements of logic?

43. Does your program normally make use of any or all of the following:

0	Yes	52	No	closed circuit television?
9	Yes	43	No	programmed texts?
10	Yes	45	No	auto-tutorial facilities?
0	Yes	51	No	computer assisted instruction?
31	Yes	25	No	films?
26	Yes	30	No	guest speakers?
11	Yes	41	No	field trips?

44. Does your freshman English program include some instruction in speech preparation and delivery?

16 Yes 43 No

45. Does your freshman English program include some instruction in poetry?

49 Yes 11 No

46. Does your program include some instruction in drama, not including actual acting itself?

31 Yes 19 No

47. Does your department offer an honors course which may be substituted for the standard freshman English course?

30 Yes 28 No

48. Does your department offer a remedial course for students not ready for the standard freshman English program?

25 Yes 34 No

49. May an entering freshman be given advanced standing within the program or exemption from the program as a result of:

43 Yes 11 No

50. When a student is allowed to by-pass any or all of the freshman English program, is he then required to make up an equip number of credit-hours in other classwork?

27 Yes 19 No

51. Where a student must make up a number of credit-hours equal to those he by-passed in freshman English, what options are open to him?

18	Yes	9	No	He must make up the hours in English courses only.
12	Yes	10	No	He may make up the credit-hours in English courses or any other courses.
3	Yes	14	No	He must make up the hours by taking the honors course.

52. Does your department normally allow a student's written work to be graded by any person other than his classroom instructor?

8	Yes	52	No

53. Approximately what percentage of a student's final grade is based on evaluation of his composition skills?

3	less than 25%	28	50 to 75%
9	25 to 50%	11	over 75%

54. Approximately what percentage of a student's final grade is based on evaluation of his literary interpretation skills?

17	less than 25%	11	50 to 75%
22	25 to 50%	0	over 75%

55. What is the approximate percentage of failing grades given:

(1st term)		(2nd term)		(3rd term if applies)	
7	less than 5%	12	less than 5%	51	less than 5%
22	5 to 10%	22	5 to 10%	4	5 to 10%
11	10 to 15%	14	10 to 15%	2	10 to 15%
11	15 to 20%	7	15 to 20%	0	15 to 20%
4	20 to 25%	0	20 to 25%	0	20 to 25%
2	over 25%	1	over 25%	0	over 25%

56. Approximately how many compositions would a student normally write during participation in the full freshman English program?

11	less than 10	5	20 to 25
21	10 to 15	3	25 to 30
16	15 to 20	3	over 30

57. Approximately what percentage of compositions are written in-class only?

26	less than 25%	8	50 to 75%
20	25 to 50%	0	over 75%

58. Excluding research papers, what is the approximate average length of compositions written by your students?

(In-class compositions)		(Out-of-class compositions)	
5	less than 200 words	10	less than 400 words
5	200 to 400 words	5	400 to 600 words
34	400 to 600 words	26	600 to 800 words
10	600 to 800 words	13	800 to 1,000 words
3	over 800 words	3	over 1,000 words

59. Approximately what percentage of all undergraduate hours taught by your department go toward teaching within the freshman English program?

0	Less than 10%	21	30 to 40%
5	10 to 20%	12	40 to 50%
9	20 to 30%	10	over 50%

60. Approximately what percentage of the total number of full-time department members teach at least one section of freshman English during the year?

2	less than 25%	8	50 to 75%
6	25 to 50%	45	over 75%

61. Of those persons who teach at least one section of freshman English during the year, approximately what percentage hold:

(Ph.D.)		(Master's)	
14	less than 10%	2	less than 10%
11	10 to 20%	0	10 to 20%
5	20 to 30%	1	20 to 30%
6	30 to 40%	0	30 to 40%
6	40 to 50%	5	40 to 50%
11	over 50%	37	over 50%

62. Approximately what percentage of those persons who teach at least one section of freshman English per year hold the rank of:

(full professor)		(associate)		(assistant)	
17	less than 10%	13	less than 10%	6	less than 10%
6	10 to 15%	14	10 to 15%	3	10 to 15%
8	15 to 20%	6	15 to 20%	4	15 to 20%
2	20 to 25%	6	20 to 25%	3	20 to 25%
8	over 25%	14	over 25%	33	over 25%

63. What percentage of your staff members who teach at least one section of freshman English during the year hold the rank of Instructor?

13	less than 10%	11	40 to 60%
14	10 to 25%	5	60 to 75%
11	25 to 40%	2	over 75%

64. Have you analyzed student progress or any other factor in an attempt to identify your:

23	Yes	36	No	your most effective classroom teachers?
19	Yes	37	No	your least effective classroom teachers?

65. Do instructors within your program receive in-service training with regard to:

4	Yes	46	No	learning theory?
3	Yes	45	No	tests and measurements?
12	Yes	40	No	uses of newer media?
3	Yes	46	No	communication theory?
17	Yes	33	No	composition evaluation?
17	Yes	35	No	improved teaching techniques?

66. If your instruction staff does receive in-service training, what is the duration of the training?

9	one day or less per term	2	3 days per term
6	2 days per term	5	4 or more days per term

67. How many graduate teaching assistants work within your program?

53	none	0	25 to 50
3	less than 10	0	50 to 75
0	10 to 25	0	75 to 100
		0	over 100

APPENDIX F

APPENDIX F

A SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETE WITH THE FINAL TOTALS FROM INSTITUTIONS IN GROUP TWO

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

All responses are constructed. At no time will you be required to write out an answer.

Place an "X" in the space provided for the answer to questions you are able and willing to answer.

Write "NA" in the space provided for the answer to questions which you feel do not apply to your institution.

Place no mark at all in the space provided for the answer to any question which you do not care to answer. You are not asked to explain this type of response.

Institution _____

Your name (optional) _____

1. What title do you hold?

____ Director of Freshman English (or equivalent) ___ Department Chairman

2. How many undergraduates are enrolled at your institution?

8	less than 1,000	10	3,000 to 5,000
15	1,000 to 2,000	14	5,000 to 8,000
10	2,000 to 3,000	15	over 8,000

3. Does your institution offer:

____ Yes	____ No	an undergraduate English major?
____ Yes	____ No	a Master of Arts in Teaching?
____ Yes	____ No	a Master's in English?
____ Yes	____ No	a Ph.D. in English?
____ Yes	____ No	graduate degrees but none of the above?

4. How long has it been since your freshman English program underwent what you would call a major revision?

27	1 year	5	4 years
17	2 years	10	5 years or more
12	3 years		

5. Does your standard freshman English program normally require a full academic year to complete?

52	Yes	20	No

6. If your response to question five was No, how long does it normally take a student to complete your freshman English program?

2	1 quarter	8	1 semester
5	2 quarters	1	1 trimester

7. Do you have any evidence which indicates that most students would continue to benefit from a program of extended duration?

27	Yes	37	No

8. If any of the following approximately describe the make-up of your freshman English program, indicate which one.

29	grammar, composition, and literature
5	grammar and composition but no literature
32	composition and literature but no grammar

9. Which of the following best describes your grading system?

67	A, B, C, D, F,	2	4.0, 3.5, 3.0, etc.
0	Pass-Fail	0	Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory
2	Credit-No Credit	1	none of these

10. What is the average number of students per class within your freshman English program?

1	less than 15	26	25 to 30
6	15 to 20	2	30 to 40
35	20 to 25	1	over 40

11. Do you regard any or all of the following as major factors in determining the number of students per class within your freshman English program?

56	Yes	5	No	a relatively firm predetermined number
31	Yes	10	No	the ratio of students to available staff
32	Yes	8	No	the number of compositions an instructor can normally be expected to grade

12. How many hours a week do your classes meet?

0	1 hour	8	4 hours
1	2 hours	6	5 hours
56	3 hours	0	6 hours or more

13. Does your freshman English program have a supervisor other than the department chairman?

50 Yes 22 No

14. What is the director of freshman English's (or chairman acting as director) normal teaching load per week including all subjects he or she teaches?

0	0 hours per week	24	7 to 9 hours per week
1	1 to 3 hours per week	23	over 9 hours per week
24	4 to 6 hours per week		

15. Does the director (or chairman acting as director) teach at least one section of freshman English during the school year?

12 Yes 59 No

16. Has the director (or chairman acting as director) received formal training in any or all of the following:

34	Yes	35	No	learning theory
27	Yes	39	No	tests and measurements
13	Yes	47	No	statistics
3	Yes	54	No	computer assisted instruction
21	Yes	41	No	use of newer media
25	Yes	41	No	communication theory

17. Are you familiar with any or all of the following:

42	Yes	22	No	Themes, Theories, and Therapy by Albert Kitzhaber
38	Yes	22	No	"A Proposal for the Abolition of Freshman English as it is Now Commonly Taught" by Warner Rice
27	Yes	36	No	"Research in Written Composition" by Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Shoer
44	Yes	22	No	The College Teaching of English, John C. Gerber, editor
12	Yes	45	No	"A Study of Freshman English, An Informal Study" by Harrison Hoblitzelle

18. During the 1968-69 academic year, did your institution receive federal funds to be used solely for improvement of your freshman English program?

2 Yes 69 No

19. Did your institution apply for federal funds to be used solely for improvement of your freshman English program during the 1968-69 academic year?

2 Yes 66 No

20. Would your institution welcome federal funds to be used solely for improvement of your freshman English program?

53 Yes 11 No

21. If your answer to question twenty was Yes, would you prefer the funds to be made available for use:

35 independently (in no direct cooperation with another institution).
3 as part of a state-wide project.
13 as part of a cooperating groups of institutions, the make-up of which you would determine.

22. Will you allow the writer of this questionnaire to identify your responses to questions 20 and 21 in a proposal to the U. S. Office of Education, a proposal which would seek increased federal aid for development of improved freshman English programs across the country?

54 Yes 8 No

23. Does your English department offer an advanced composition course at the undergraduate level? (Not including honors courses.)

67 Yes 3 No

24. Does your English department offer a creative writing course at the undergraduate level? (Not including honors courses.)

66 Yes 5 No

25. Are your freshman English classes taught according to a program-wide syllabus?

47 Yes 22 No

26. If your response to question 25 was Yes,

9	Yes	23	No	Is the syllabus prepared by the director only?
29	Yes	7	No	Is the syllabus prepared by a committee?
40	Yes	2	No	Do active instructors within the program contribute to formulation of the syllabus?
39	Yes	5	No	Is the syllabus revised at least annually?

27. Where a program-wide syllabus is used, what is the smallest unit of time for which the syllabus specifies the material to be covered?

2 Less than 10 minutes of class time.
3 10 to 30 minutes of class time.
13 One full class period.
8 One week of classes.
17 One multi-week unit of classes.

28. Where a program-wide syllabus is used, does that syllabus prescribe for:

40	Yes	2	No	one term at a time?
14	Yes	6	No	the entire length of the program at one time?

29. Are instructors within your program allowed to establish their own objectives for their own individual sections?

40 Yes 24 No

30. Does your department provide your freshman English students with a list of specific objectives to be met by the students?

35 Yes 32 No

31. Does your department attempt to group your freshman English students in classes according to:

6	Yes	52	No	their stated interests?
30	Yes	37	No	ability?
5	Yes	54	No	their academic majors?

32. Does your department use the pretest-posttest technique to evaluate your students' comparative progress:

12	Yes	55	No	at the end of each term?
5	Yes	53	No	at the end of the program?

33. Is passing or failing a student within your program the result of evaluation by the student's classroom instructor only?

69 Yes 3 No

34. Is a student's success within the program normally compared to the prediction of his success according to entrance examinations and/or other pre-enrollment examinations?

27 Yes 44 No

35. Is it standard procedure within your program to provide the students with an opportunity to present a written evaluation of the course?

27 Yes 40 No

36. Can you identify by name those high schools in your general area which tend to produce the least capable students in your program?

33 Yes 36 No

37. Can you identify by name those high schools in your general area which tend to produce the better students in your program?

42 Yes 26 No

38. Have you tested the hypothesis that freshman English classes can be large lecture groups of one hundred or more without becoming less effective than the same instruction presented to groups of twenty to thirty?

29 Yes 40 No

39. Have you run a comparative analysis of competency levels of your students in an attempt to determine which term benefits the students most in terms of your departmental objectives?

7 Yes 60 No

40. Do you believe that in your department the same written piece could receive three different grades if graded by three different instructors?

2 No
54 it is possible
15 it is likely

41. Does your department attempt to determine what percentage of incoming freshman students have had experience with:

19	Yes	48	No	writing research papers?
15	Yes	51	No	correct dictionary usage?
10	Yes	56	No	History of the English Language?
11	Yes	56	No	introductory linguistics?
8	Yes	59	No	basic elements of logic?

42. Does your freshman English program include a unit on:

56	Yes	13	No	writing research papers?
44	Yes	20	No	correct dictionary usage?
12	Yes	54	No	History of the English Language?
20	Yes	47	No	introductory linguistics?
44	Yes	25	No	basic elements of logic?

43. Does your program normally make use of any or all of the following:

2	Yes	65	No	closed circuit television?
20	Yes	50	No	programmed texts?
9	Yes	60	No	auto-tutorial facilities?
1	Yes	67	No	computer assisted instruction?
21	Yes	39	No	films?
26	Yes	44	No	guest speakers?
9	Yes	59	No	field trips?

44. Does your freshman English program include some instruction in speech preparation and delivery?

10 Yes 62 No

45. Does your freshman English program include some instruction in poetry?

51 Yes 19 No

46. Does your program include some instruction in drama, not including actual acting itself?

50 Yes 20 No

47. Does your department offer an honors course which may be substituted for the standard freshman English course?

35 Yes 35 No

48. Does your department offer a remedial course for students not ready for the standard freshman English program?

21 Yes 51 No

49. May an entering freshman be given advanced standing within the program or exemption from the program as a result of:

55 Yes 10 No

50. When a student is allowed to by-pass any or all of the freshman English program, is he then required to make up an equal number of credit-hours in other classwork?

32 Yes 29 No

51. Where a student must make up a number of credit-hours equal to those he by-passed in freshman English, what options are open to him?

13	Yes	14	No	He must make up the hours in English courses only.
22	Yes	3	No	He may make up the credit-hours in English courses or any other courses.
0	Yes	16	No	He must make up the hours by taking the honors course.

52. Does your department normally allow a student's written work to be graded by any person other than his classroom instructor?

5	Yes	67	No

53. Approximately what percentage of a student's final grade is based on evaluation of his composition skills?

1	less than 25%	24	50 to 75%
11	25 to 50%	30	over 75%

54. Approximately what percentage of a student's final grade is based on evaluation of his literary interpretation skills?

29	less than 25%	11	50 to 75%
22	25 to 50%	3	over 75%

55. What is the approximate percentage of failing grades given:

(1st term)		(2nd term)		(3rd term if applies)	
19	less than 5%	21	less than 5%	6	less than 5%
20	5 to 10%	19	5 to 10%	2	5 to 10%
9	10 to 15%	8	10 to 15%	2	10 to 15%
9	15 to 20%	0	15 to 20%	0	15 to 20%
2	20 to 25%	2	20 to 25%	0	20 to 25%
2	over 25%	1	over 25%	0	over 25%

56. Approximately how many compositions would a student normally write during participation in the full freshman English program?

6	less than 10	10	20 to 25
14	lo to 15	3	25 to 30
34	15 to 20	2	over 30

57. Approximately what percentage of compositions are written in-class only?

33	less than 25%	2	50 to 75%
26	25 to 50%	7	over 75%

58. Excluding research papers, what is the approximate length of compositions written by your students?

(In-class compositions)		(Out-of-class compositions)	
2	less than 200 words	4	less than 400 words
39	200 to 400 words	31	400 to 600 words
19	400 to 600 words	13	600 to 800 words
6	600 to 800 words	8	800 to 1,000 words
0	over 800 words	2	over 1,000 words

59. Approximately what percentage of all undergraduate hours taught by your department go toward teaching within the freshman English program?

1	less than 10%	14	30 to 40%
4	10 to 20%	21	40 to 50%
8	20 to 30%	14	over 50%

60. Approximately what percentage of the total number of full-time department members teach at least one section of freshman English during the year?

11	less than 25%	14	50 to 75%
11	25 to 50%	24	over 75%

61. Of those persons who teach at least one section of freshman English during the year, approximately what percentage hold:

(Ph.D)		(Master's)	
18	less than 10%	2	less than 10%
13	10 to 20%	1	10 to 20%
11	20 to 30%	3	20 to 30%
12	30 to 40%	7	30 to 40%
8	40 to 50%	4	40 to 50%
7	over 50%	41	over 50%

62. Approximately what percentage of those persons who teach at least one section of freshman English per year hold the rank of:

(full professor)		(associate)		(assistant)	
31	less than 10%	29	less than 10%	10	less than 10%
14	10 to 15%	15	10 to 15%	10	10 to 15%
3	15 to 20%	5	15 to 20%	7	15 to 20%
6	20 to 25%	5	20 to 25%	7	20 to 25%
8	over 25%	11	over 25%	33	over 25%

63. What percentage of your staff members who teach at least one section of freshman English during the year hold the rank of Instructor?

12	less than 10%	14	40 to 60%
17	10 to 25%	9	60 to 75%
10	25 to 40%	4	over 75%

64. Have you analyzed student progress or any other factor in an attempt to identify your:

25	Yes	36	No	your most effective classroom teachers?
31	Yes	37	No	your least effective classroom teachers?

65. Do instructors within your program receive in-service training with regard to:

8	Yes	55	No	learning theory?
8	Yes	55	No	tests and measurements?
13	Yes	50	No	uses of newer media?
7	Yes	56	No	communication theory?
35	Yes	32	No	composition evaluation?
35	Yes	32	No	improved teaching techniques?

66. If your instruction staff does receive in-service training, what is the duration of the training?

7	one day or less per term	2	3 days per term
3	2 days per term	24	4 or more days per term

67. How many graduate teaching assistants work within your program?

30	none	4	25 to 50
23	less than 10	0	50 to 75
11	10 to 25	0	75 to 100
		3	over 100

APPENDIX G

APPENDIX G

A SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETE WITH THE FINAL COMBINED TOTALS FROM INSTITUTIONS IN GROUPS ONE AND TWO

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

All responses are constructed. At no time will you be required to write out an answer.

Place an "X" in the space provided for the answer to questions you are able and willing to answer.

Write "NA" in the space provided for the answer to questions which you feel do not apply to your institution.

Place no mark at all in the space provided for the answer to any question which you do not care to answer. You are not asked to explain this type of response.

Institution _____

Your name (optional) _____

1. What title do you hold?

   ____ Director of Freshman English (or equivalent) ____ Department Chairman

2. How many undergraduates are enrolled at your institution?

56	less than 1,000	12	3,000 to 5,000
33	1,000 to 2,000	16	5,000 to 8,000
13	2,000 to 3,000	15	over 8,000

3. Does your institution offer:

____ Yes	____ No	an undergraduate English major?
____ Yes	____ No	a Master of Arts in Teaching?
____ Yes	____ No	a Master's in English?
____ Yes	____ No	a Ph.D. in English?
____ Yes	____ No	graduate degrees but none of the above?

4. How long has it been since your freshman English program underwent what you would call a major revision?

54	1 year	7	4 years
19	2 years	26	5 years or more
23	3 years		

5. Does your standard freshman English program normally require a full academic year to complete?

97	Yes	36	No

6. If your response to question five was No, how long does it normally take a student to complete your freshman English program?

5	1 quarter	14	1 semester
5	2 quarters	1	1 trimester

7. Do you have any evidence which indicates that most students would continue to benefit from a program of extended duration?

50	Yes	66	No

8. If any of the following approximately describes the make-up of your freshman English program, indicate which one?

57	grammar, composition, and literature
9	grammar and composition but no literature
58	composition and literature but no grammar

9. Which of the following best describes your grading system?

125	A, B, C, D, F	2	4.0, 3.5, 3.0, etc.
1	Pass-Fail	0	Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory
3	Credit-No Credit	2	none of these

10. What is the average number of students per class within your freshman English program?

1	less than 15	46	25 to 30
18	15 to 20	2	30 to 40
63	20 to 25	2	over 40

11. Do you regard any or all of the following as major factors in determining the number of students per class within your freshman English program?

97	Yes	13	No	a relatively firm predetermined number
71	Yes	16	No	the ratio of students to available staff
53	Yes	19	No	the number of compositions an instructor can normally be expected to grade.

12. How many hours a week do your classes meet?

0	1 hour	16	4 hours
7	2 hours	8	5 hours
101	3 hours	0	6 hours or more

13. Does your freshman English program have a supervisor other than the department chairman?

71	Yes	62	No

14. What is the director of freshman English"s (or chairman acting as director) normal teaching load per week including all subjects he or she teaches?

0	0 hours per week	47	7 to 9 hours per week
1	1 to 3 hours per week	56	over 9 hours per week
28	4 to 6 hours per week		

15. Does the director (or chairman acting as director) teach at least one section of freshman English during the school year?

64	Yes	66	No

16. Has the director (or chairman acting as director) received formal training in any or all of the following:

66	Yes	59	No	learning theory
41	Yes	67	No	tests and measurements
23	Yes	80	No	statistics
4	Yes	94	No	computer assisted instruction
45	Yes	67	No	use of newer media
46	Yes	71	No	communication theory

17. Are you familiar with any or all of the following:

74	Yes	43	No	Themes, Theories, and Therapy by Albert Kitzhaber
67	Yes	42	No	"A Proposal for the Abolition of Freshman English as it is now Commonly Taught" by Warner Rice.
42	Yes	68	No	"Research in Written Composition" by Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Shoer.
76	Yes	43	No	The College Teaching of English, John C. Gerber, editor.
15	Yes	85	No	"A Study of Freshman English, An Informal Study" by Harrison Hoblitzelle.

18. During the 1968-69 academic year, did your institution receive federal funds to be used solely for improvement of your freshman English program?

3	Yes	127	No

19. Did your institution apply for federal funds to be used solely for improvement of your freshman English program during the 1968-69 academic year?

3 Yes 121 No

20. Would your institution welcome federal funds to be used solely for improvement of your freshman English program?

97 Yes 21 No

21. If your answer to question twenty was Yes, would you prefer the funds to be made available for use:

56 independently (in no direct cooperation with another institution).
7 as part of a state-wide project.
24 as part of a cooperating groups of institutions, the make-up of which you would determine.

22. Will you allow the writer of this questionnaire to identify your responses to questions 20 and 21 in a proposal to the U. S. Office of Education, a proposal which would seek increased federal aid for development of improved freshman English programs across the country?

97 Yes 16 No

23. Does your English department offer an advanced composition course at the undergraduate level? (Not including honors courses.)

117 Yes 13 No

24. Does your English department offer a creative writing course at the undergraduate level? (Not including honors courses.)

116 Yes 15 No

25. Are your freshman English classes taught according to a program-wide syllabus?

77 Yes 51 No

26. If your response to question 25 was Yes,

12 Yes	49 No	Is the syllabus prepared by the director only?
43 Yes	13 No	Is the syllabus prepared by a committee?
68 Yes	3 No	Do active instructors within the program contribute to formulation of the syllabus?
59 Yes	12 No	Is the syllabus revised at least annually?

27. Where a program-wide syllabus is used, what is the smallest unit of time for which the syllabus specifies the material to be covered?

3 Less than 10 minutes of class time.
4 10 to 30 minutes of class time.
20 One full class period.
13 One week of classes.
25 One multi-week unit of classes.

28, Where a program-wide syllabus is used, does that syllabus prescribe for:

61	Yes	4	No	one term at a time?
23	Yes	14	No	the entire length of the program at one time?

29. Are instructors within your program allowed to establish their own objectives for their own individual sections?

87 Yes 34 No

30. Does your department provide your freshman English students with a list of specific objectives to be met by the students?

57 Yes 59 No

31. Does your department attempt to group your freshman English students in classes according to:

10	Yes	98	No	their stated interests?
55	Yes	71	No	ability?
7	Yes	102	No	their academic majors?

32. Does your department use the pretest-posttest technique to evaluate your students' comparative progress:

21	Yes	102	No	at the end of each term?
12	Yes	98	No	at the end of the program?

33. Is passing or failing a student within your program the result of evaluation by the student's classroom instructor only?

124 Yes 8 No

34. Is a student's success within the program normally compared to the prediction of his success according to entrance examinations and/or other pre-enrollment examinations?

49 Yes 79 No

35. Is it standard procedure within your program to provide the students with an opportunity to present a written evaluation of the course?

50 Yes 75 No

36. Can you identify by name those high schools in your general area which tend to produce the least capable students in your program?

54 Yes 72 No

37. Can you identify bynname those high schools in your general area which tend to produce the better students in your program?

75 Yes 51 No

38. Have you tested the hypothesis that freshman English classes can be large lecture groups of one hundred or more without becoming less effective than the same instruction presented to groups of twenty to thirty?

41 Yes 88 No

39. Have you run a comparative analysis of conpetency levels of your students in an attempt to determine which term benefits the students most in terms of your departmental objectives?

8 Yes 113 No

40. Do you believe that in your department the same written piece could receive three different grades if graded by three different instructors?

4 No
100 it is possible
27 it is likely

41. Does your department attempt to determine what percentage of incoming freshman students have had experience with:

36	Yes	85	No	writing research papers?
29	Yes	89	No	correct dictionary usage?
19	Yes	98	No	History of the English Language?
19	Yes	99	No	introductory linguistics?
14	Yes	104	No	basic elements of logic?

42. Does your freshman English program include a unit on:

102	Yes	23	No	writing research papers?
75	Yes	40	No	correct dictionary usage?
27	Yes	87	No	History of the English Language?
31	Yes	85	No	introductory linguistics?
74	Yes	48	No	basic elements of logic?

43. Does your program normally make use of any or all of the following:

2	Yes	117	No	clsed circuit television?
29	Yes	93	No	programmed texts?
19	Yes	105	No	auto-tutorial facilities?
1	Yes	118	No	computer assisted instruction?
52	Yes	64	No	films?
52	Yes	74	No	guest speakers?
20	Yes	100	No	field trips?

44. Does your freshman English program include some instruction in speech preparation and delivery?

26 Yes 105 No

45. Does your freshman English program include some instruction in poetry?

100 Yes 30 No

46. Does your program include some instruction in drama, not including actual acting itself?

81 Yes 39 No

47. Does your department offer an honors course which may be substituted for the standard freshman English course?

65 Yes 63 No

48. Does your department offer a remedial course for students not ready for the standard freshman English program?

46 Yes 85 No

49. May an entering freshman be given advanced standing within the program or exemption from the program as a result of:

98 Yes 21 No

50. When a student is allowed to by-pass any or all of the freshman English program, is he than required to make up an equal number of credit-hours in other classwork?

59 Yes 48 No

51. Where a student must make up a number of credit-hours equal to those he by-passed in freshman English, what options are open to him?

31	Yes	23 NO	He must make up the hours in English courses only.
43.	Yes	13 No	He may make up the credit-hours in English courses or any other courses.
3	Yes	30 No	He must make up the hours by taking the honors course.

52. Does your department normally allow a student's written work to be graded by any person other than his classroom instructor?

13	Yes	119	No

53. Approximately what percentage of a student's final grade is based on evaluation of his composition skills?

4	less than 25%	52	50 to 75%
20	25 to 50%	41	over 75%

54. Approximately what percentage of a student's final grade is based on evaluation of his literary interpretation skill?

46	less than 25%	22	50 to 75%
44	25 to 50%	3	over 75%

55. What is the approximate percentage of failing grades given:

(1st term)		(2nd term)		(3rd term if applies)	
26	less than 5%	43	less than 5%	57	less than 5%
42	5 to 10%	41	5 to 10%	6	5 to 10%
20	10 to 15%	22	10 to 15%	4	10 to 15%
20	15 to 20%	7	15 to 20%	0	15 to 20%
6	20 to 25%	2	20 to 25%	0	20 to 25%
4	over 25%	2	over 25%	0	over 25%

56. Approximately how many composition would a student normally write during participation in the full freshman English program?

17	less than 10	15	20 to 25
35	10 to 15	6	25 to 30
50	15 to 20	5	over 30

57. Approximately what percentage of compositions are written in-class only?

59	less than 25%	10	50 to75%
46	25 to 50%	7	over 75%

58. Excluding research papers, what is the approximate average length of compositions written by your students?

(In-class compositions)		(Out-of-class compositions)	
7	less than 200 words	14	less than 400 words
44	200 to 400 words	26	400 to 600 words
53	400 to 600 words	39	600 to 800 words
16	600 to 800 words	21	800 to 1,000 words
3	over 800 words	5	over 1,000 words

59. Approximately what percentage of all undergraduate hours taught by your department go toward teaching within the freshman English program?

1	less than 10%	25	30 to 40%
9	10 to 20%	33	40 to 50%
17	20 to 30%	24	over 50%

60. Approximately what percentage of the total number of full-time department members teach at least one section of freshman English during the year?

13	less than 25%	22	50 to 75%
17	25 to 50%	69	over 75%

61. Of those persons who teach at least one section of freshman English during the year, approximately what percentage hold:

(Ph.D.)		(Master's)	
32	less than 10%	4	less than 10%
24	10 to 20%	1	10 to 20%
16	20 to 30%	4	20 to 30%
18	30 to 40%	7	30 to 40%
14	40 to 50%	9	40 to 50%
18	over 50%	78	over 50%

62. Approximately what percentage of those persons who teach at least one section of freshman English per year hold the rank of:

(full professor)		(associate)		(assistant)	
48	less than 10%	42	less than 10%	16	less than 10%
20	10 to 15%	29	10 to 15%	13	10 to 15%
11	15 to 20%	11	15 to 20%	11	15 to 20%
8	20 to 25%	11	20 to 25%	10	20 to 25%
16	over 25%	25	over 25%	66	over 25%

63. What percentage of your staff members who teach at least one section of freshman English during the year hold the rank of Instructor?

25	less than 10%	25	40 to 60%
31	10 to 25%	14	60 to 75%
21	25 to 40%	6	over 75%

64. Have you analyzed student progress or any other factor in an attempt to identify your:

48	Yes	72	No	your most effective classroom teachers?
50	Yes	74	No	your least effective classroom teachers?

65. Do instructors within your program receive in-service training with regard to:

12	Yes	101	NO	learning theory?
11	Yes	100	No	tests and measurements?
25	Yes	90	No	uses of newer media?
10	Yes	102	No	communication theory?
52	Yes	65	No	composition evaluation?
52	Yes	67	No	improved teaching techniques?

66. If your instruction staff does receive in-service training, what is the duration of the training?

16	one day or less per term	4	3 days per term
9	2 days per term	29	4 or more days per term

67. How many graduate teaching assistants work within your program?

83	none	4	25 to 50
26	less than 10	0	50 to 75
11	10 to 25	0	75 to 100
		3	over 100

APPENDIX H

APPENDIX H

AN ANALYSIS OF THE TOTAL RESPONDENTS INSOFAR AS NUMBER, COMPLETENESS, AND REASONS FOR LACK OF COMPLETENESS ARE CONCERNED

Here is an analysis of the completeness of responses received from the one hundred and sixty institutions which replied to the questionnaire:

142 were filled out in full.

3 were left blank.

15 were filled out only in part and cited one of the following reasons for not completing the questionnaire:

- 3 made freshman English optional.
- 2 dropped all freshman English requirements.
- 6 now include freshman English in a Humanities core.
- 3 now include freshman English as part of a literature sequence.
- 1 does not offer English courses.

APPENDIX I

APPENDIX I

DUPLICATION OF KITZHABER's CHART REGARDING RATE OF ERRORS PER ONE THOUSAND WORDS OF WRITING BY COLLEGE FRESHMEN, SOPHOMORES, AND SENIORS

Rate of Errors per 1,000 Words of Writing:
Freshmen, Sophomores, Senior

Type of Error	English 1			English 2			Soph.	Senior
	th. 1	th. 2	th. 3	th. 1	th. 2	th. 3		
A. Focus and Structure	0.76	0.76	0.87	0.52	0.37	0.19	0.98	1.01
B. Material	3.53	3.24	2.75	2.30	1.87	1.97	2.75	4.89
C. Paragraphs	1.01	0.68	0.49	0.41	0.58	0.23	1.5	2.34
D. Sentences	4.84	3.57	2.30	3.27	2.97	2.56	5.99	8.24
E. Words	10.9	7.26	8.13	6.02	7.12	5.28	9.40	11.72
F. Grammar	1.17	0.82	0.76	0.56	0.43	0.36	0.79	1.56
G. Punctuation and Mechanics	4.79	3.55	3.37	3.16	4.22	3.47	5.01	7.99
H. Misspelling	3.62	2.59	2.33	2.28	3.01	2.16	3.21	4.22

(Kitzhaber, p. 109)