Beverly Benson
Mary P. Deming
Debra Denzer
Maria Valeri-Gold

A COMBINED BASIC WRITING/ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE CLASS: MELTING POT OR MISHMASH?

ABSTRACT: *To better understand what differnces may exist between basic writers and ESL writers, a research study comparing the written products of both groups of students was conducted at a suburban two-year college located on the outskirts of a major southeastern urban area. Results of the study indicated that both groups used topic sentences and preferred exposition. Even though basic writers wrote longer compositions, they averaged fewer errors in the construction of verb tenses, the use of prepositions, articles, and diction than ESL students. The authors discuss implications for teaching and future research.*

  With the increasing diversity of students entering colleges and universities and the continuing focus on assessment, educators are concerned with the fairest and most effective instructional means for ensuring a desired standard of writing among various groups. Some think that two of these groups of nontraditional students, the

Mary P. Deming, assistant professor of Composition, and Maria Valeri-Gold, assistant professor of Reading, are both with the Division of Developmental Studies, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Beverly Benson, associate professor of English and ESL program director, and Debra Denzer, assistant professor of English, are both with the English as a Second Language Program at DeKalb College, Clarkston, GA.

basic writer and the English as a Second Language (ESL) writer, can be conveniently grouped in already existing developmental writing programs. At quick glance, ESL and developmental writing students do share many of the same writing problems. There is often a lack of coherent rhetorical structure, standard sentence construction, punctuation, and control over certain grammatical structures (Shaughnessy 1977; Santos 1988; Vann et al. 1988; Connors & Lunsford 1989). On the other hand, Kroll (1990) notes that there is a similar variation in performance in the writing of ESL students themselves and that they operate within a complicated system of language rules to which they have had limited exposure and at best have only partially mastered. In an effort to better understand what differences may exist between basic writers and ESL writers, a research study comparing the written products of basic writers and ESL students was conducted at a suburban two-year college located on the outskirts of a major southeastern urban area.

The enrollment in the college was over 12,000: 24% minority, 5% out-of-state, and 5% international students from 92 countries. Approximately 50% of the students attending this commuter campus worked 20 or more hours a week. Fifty-seven percent of the total student body were day students, while 43% were night students. Within the ESL program, 52% were female, 26% had F-1 student visas, 60% were permanent residents, and 14% were citizens of the United States. Twenty-eight percent took night classes, and 45% took developmental math classes. Forty-two percent graduated from high schools outside the United States; the non-native English speakers participating in the study have lived in the United States an average of four years.

Of the entire student body population, 27% were categorized developmental studies students (enrolled in more than one developmental studies class), and 48% of the entire population were required to take at least one developmental studies class. The developmental studies population of the college was comprised of 43% males and 57% females. SAT verbal scores for developmental studies students ranged from 200–390.

In particular, this research examined topic development on an assigned topic and analyzed students' essay organization, content, and length. It also investigated essay structure particular to each group by noting grammatical and sentence-level characteristics. The purpose of this essay will be to share the results of this study and to discuss other possible research avenues. More importantly, however, we will suggest pedagogical implications for curriculum development and teaching techniques to help meet the needs of these two diverse groups.

Method: Subjects, Materials, and Procedures

One hundred and twelve freshmen participated in this study, which included 56 basic writers and 56 ESL students. The basic writers were enrolled either in English 98 or English 99, the two-sequence developmental studies writing classes. The ESL students were enrolled in either ESL 15 or ESL 17, the two-sequence ESL writing classes. Developmental Studies classes are offered in mathematics, reading, and composition for students who need to polish their skills before enrolling in regular collegiate-level classes. ESL classes in reading and composition are provided for non-native speakers to improve their skills in English. Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) verbal scores for the basic writers in the first-level writing class, English 98, were below 320, and scores for students in the second-level writing class, English 99, ranged from 330–390. ESL students in this study scored more than 460 on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) or the equivalent on a state placement examination and less than 400 on the SAT verbal section. The Developmental Studies students scored less than 75 on the statewide college placement examination in English (CPE), and the ESL students placed into ESL classes rather than into regular freshman English courses based on a writing sample. Consequently, both groups of students were enrolled in either developmental studies or ESL pre-freshman composition courses.

The basic writer sample consisted of 24 males and 32 females with an average age of 19.2 years. The ESL writer sample included a slightly older group of college students: the 36 males and 20 females averaged 21.5 years. The subjects indicated a variety of college majors; while business majors predominated, many students in each of the four courses were undecided. All of the basic writers were American-born whose majors included: business-related fields, 18; medical-related, 12; education, 4; humanities, 3; science-oriented, 3; criminal justice, 2; pre-law, 1; and undecided, 13. Over one-half of the ESL student population (27) planned to major in business-related fields. Other ESL majors were: medical-related, 5; education, 1; humanities, 1; science-oriented, 4; pre-law, 2; and undecided, 16.

The 56 ESL subjects spoke 18 different native languages (Amharic, Arabic, Cambodian, Chinese, Farsi, French, Gola, Gujartic, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, Somali, Spanish, Tagalog, Thai, Tigringa, and Vietnamese) and came from 26 different countries (Brazil, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Haiti, Hong Kong, India, Iran, Jamaica, Japan, Korea, Laos, Lebanon, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Philippines, Puerto Rico, Taiwan, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Vietnam). There were

44 permanent residents or U. S. citizens in the group and 12 on F-1 student visas. Thirty-six had graduated from American high schools. In the ESL population, students' length in the United States ranged from 8 to 18 years: 17 students with less than one year, 18 students with 2 to 5 years, 8 students with 6 to 10 years, and 9 students with more than 10 years.

During the first week of the Fall academic term, students were requested to complete permission forms and personal information surveys. Then, they were asked to write a composition on the topic, "Describe the qualities of a good parent." Subjects were given 30 minutes to complete the tasks; this time frame was chosen because it is used by the Test of Written English (TWE) portion of the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). No dictionaries were allowed, and subjects were given no additional instructions other than those on the written instruction page. This topic was chosen in the belief that it might reveal cultural differences, yet not hinder either group because of a hidden cultural bias.

In order to examine the writing differences between basic writers and ESL students, this study analyzed overall structure and topic sentence usage and location. In addition, students' choices of rhetorical modes (expository, narrative, or mixed) were examined. Composition length and use of first, second, or third person were also tallied. The qualities of a "good parent" found in each essay were listed and categorized. Some students used examples to delineate a particular positive parental quality, and these were counted.

On the sentence level, essays were examined for their word count, number of sentences, number of words per sentence, sentence variety, and use of transitional expressions. Grammar and mechanical nuances were measured by noting errors in verbs, subject-verb agreement, prepositions, diction, articles, sentence structure, punctuation, and spelling. These grammatical and mechanical errors were chosen because they most often highlight the writing differences between basic writers and ESL students. (Sloan, 1979; Purves, 1986; Connors & Lunsford, 1988; Liebman, 1988).

Results

The results of the study were both expected and surprising. Even though these two groups have many characteristics in common, it is the differences that are more important in finally determining how the two groups should be taught.

Native speakers wrote longer papers, with basic writers

averaging 239 words, whereas the ESL writers averaged only 179 words. Advanced ESL writers wrote longer papers than intermediate ESL writers. Surprisingly, however, first-level basic writers composed longer papers than more advanced basic writers. This discrepancy might be explained by the placement procedures in developmental studies in which students are scheduled into their classes based solely on a language test instead of a writing sample as is the procedure in ESL. Another explanation why lower-level basic writers composed longer papers might be that they have yet to be influenced by the somewhat constraining requirements of formal academic prose taught in most college writing programs where emphasis on correctness is often more important than fluency and voice. Native speakers on average wrote five more words per sentence than ESL students, but they also wrote more run-ons and comma splices.

In the area of essay development, the four groups were similar in their use of topic sentences. Twenty-eight native speakers used topic sentences in contrast to 23 non-native speakers. Topic sentences are part of the English language tradition, and not necessarily part of the written culture of other languages. ESL writers who have not been taught about topic sentences might not be expected to perform as well in this area; however, their performance did not differ significantly from that of native speakers. This result may be explained by noting how many of the ESL students attended American high schools in which "topic sentences" and "five-paragraph" themes are in many cases the norm. In the selection of a rhetorical mode to develop topics, it might have been expected that both groups of students would use narratives to write their essays typical of lower ability students (Emig 1972; Perl 1979; Raimes 1985; Zamel 1987). However, when given the choice of writing in either the narrative or expository mode, both groups of students preferred exposition. Since students were not asked to describe their own parents, this strategy seems appropriatge as the topic lent itself more to exposition than narration. In addition, the four groups of writers evidenced inconsistency in their choice of person, with writers employing first, second, third, or a mixture of persons. This result confirms the work of earlier studies with basic writers (Hunter, Pearce, Lee et al. 1987; Deming & Gowen 1989). Both groups had problems with pronoun case and reference.

It is in the results of grammatical and usage errors that the greatest differences between these two groups surface even though in certain areas, the two have similarities. For example, in spelling, punctuation, and subject-verb agreement, there do not appear to be great differences between the two. However, in the construction of

correct verb tenses, use of prepositions, articles, and diction, the ESL students averaged far more errors than the native speakers. In fact, ESL students made *four* times the number of verb errors, more than *two* times the number of diction errors, and nearly *five* times the number of article errors when compared to basic writers. As expected, basic writers made many mistakes at the sentence level, but they made fewer sentence-level mistakes than ESL writers: ESL 15 writers made an average of 18 mistakes per paper; ESL 17, an average of 17; ENG 098, an average of 12; and ENG 099, an average of 11. It should be noted that ENG 098 and 099 students wrote longer papers, so the **frequency** of their errors is considerably lower than the frequency of errors written by students in ESL 15 and 17. (See Table 1 for the mistakes per paper averages of each of the four classes; averages are represented for the eight grammar/mechanical errors examined. For example, students in the ESL 15 class made an average of 3.4 verb errors per paper as compared to the average of 1.1 verb errors found in the students' essays in the English 098 class.)

TABLE 1

GRAMMAR/USAGE RESULTS*

$\overline{X}$ = Mistakes per paper

CLASS	V	S-V	PREP	DIC	ART	RO/CS FRAGS	PUNC	SP
ESL								
15	3.4	1.2	1.4	2.8	1.5	1.9	1.9	2
17	2.3	1.25	1.2	3.5	1.7	.75	3.32	2.4
ENG.								
098	1.1	.85	.31	.43	.25	.68	2.53	2.25
099	.39	1.02	.18	1.21	.43	.86	3.49	1.93

*(V = verb tense errors and wrong forms of the verb; S/V = subject-verb agreement errors; PREP = preposition errors; DIC = diction errors; ART = article errors; RO/CS/FRAG = run on sentences, comma splices and fragments; PUNC = punctuation errors; SP = spelling errors.)

Certainly ESL writing was characterized by error, its variety, and frequency. Verb problems, prepositions, and articles were areas of anticipated difficulty for non-native speakers because of the complexity of language transfer and interlanguage development (Vann et al. 1984; Santos 1988). Agreement and spelling errors were areas of anticipated difficulty for both groups.

The topic, "Describe the qualities of a good parent," was chosen as a neutral topic, hopefully one that would not create cultural problems for non-native speakers of English, but instead one which would reveal cultural differences between the two groups of subjects. Interestingly enough, the same four qualities appeared in the papers of both basic writers and ESL writers (love, understand, communicate, and spend time); however, the number of times each was used differed for the two groups. Basic writers wrote about love and understanding from parents; whereas, ESL writers most frequently described parents as teachers and providers.

Examining holistically a sample paper from each of the four groups helps provide some interesting content differences as well (see Appendix A). In the ESL 15 sample paper, the student early in

TABLE 2

QUALITIES OF A GOOD PARENT
(in rank order)

BASIC WRITERS	ESL WRITERS
1. love	1. teach
2. understand	2. provide for
3. spend time with	3. spend time with
4. discipline	4. love
5. communicate	5. communicate
6. give emotional support	6. understand

the paragraph promises to talk about the relationship between the parent and society, a concern not echoed in many of the basic writers' papers. Consequently, throughout the paper, there is this sense of "control" expected of a parent. According to this writer, parents shape their children's personality, provide educational opportunities, and monitor their children's friends. All these controlling actions will result in the betterment of society. The ESL 17 paper echoes that same type of "controlling" attitude, encouraging parents to be "demanding and tough." Parents should also read moral stories to their children. This sample paper reads like directions for following a recipe. Be aggressive if your children are out of control. Raise them properly by correcting their mistakes. Be caring, loving, and demanding.

Many of the basic writing essays, on the other hand, seem to emphasize more lenient and understanding characteristics than the two ESL samples provided in the appendix. In the sample English 098 paper, the student calls upon parents to be understanding and flexible, willing to break the rules if necessary. For this student parents should possess a sense of humor, be willing to talk things out, and not lose their tempers. "They should know that we (children) are not perfect, and we are going to make mistakes." For the English 099 student, understanding is the most important characteristic of a good parent. Good parents should be sensitive in case a child needs a man or a woman to talk to. Notice, however, that neither paper in the developmental study sample either directly or indirectly mentions the parents' role in relationship to society. These four papers, chosen at random, certainly encourage the research team in a future study to compare the content of the paragraphs written by each group of students.

In summary, ESL writers wrote shorter papers with more sentence-level errors. The usage of expository development and topic sentences was similar for both groups as were the topic choices students used to describe the qualities of a good parent.

Implications for Teaching and Research

Given the exploratory nature of this study, any teaching implications based on these preliminary findings should be treated with caution. Still, the results suggest some general implications for the classroom. For example, the results of this study call into question placement procedures based solely on standardized, multiple-choice scores. The basic writers in this study wrote longer

papers, averaging 239 words, whereas the ESL writers averaged only 179 words. What is interesting, however, is that first-level basic writers (English 098) students wrote longer papers than the more advanced basic writers (in English 099). Perhaps a writing sample administered before these students enroll in classes would better determine into which level students should be placed. Moving away from standardized language placement instruments or coupling such tests with a writing sample is becoming more commonplace as many authorities in composition instruction have questioned the validity of multiple-choice language skills tests in measuring students' writing abilities. For example, the SAT testing experts have recently designed a writing sample prompt for a written composition to accompany the verbal section of the college admissions instrument. Also, a writing sample, the Test of Written English (TWE), is now becoming a standard part of the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL).

In addition, given that this research has delineated differences between the writing of basic writers and ESL students, immediate attention must be given to the instructional materials for both groups in order to meet the teaching objectives and particular academic writing needs of each. In particular, close attention to choice of textbook is crucial. ESL textbooks which focus on second language difficulties are likely to be inappropriate for basic writers. ESL texts may stress issues more related to specific areas of grammar and diction, areas which may either have been covered repeatedly in elementary and high school for basic writers or have been part of the natural acquisition process. Being taught from developmental studies texts, ESL students, on the other hand, may find their areas of difficulty left unaddressed. Many current composition textbooks, including those for basic writers, now emphasize literature-based writing assignments, attention to rhetorical mode, or whole language writing assignments. Sentence-level editing, if covered at all, is relegated to chapters on proofreading or in traditional grammar handbooks. The emphasis in most non-ESL composition textbooks is on writing as one flowing process; not one which is to be separated into its parts or grammatical stages. Second language writers, while less able in the nuances of the English language, are frequently more sophisticated in terms of talking about language. They need an instructor who understands the second language acquisition process and how to communicate about language in the ways they, the writers, have learned language. Whereas current research in composition theory emphasizes the unification of the language arts (Bartholomae, 1979; Bartholomae & Petrosky, 1987), Kroll (1990) advocates the separating of writing components for ESL students.

At present, supplementary materials are more available for mainstream composition students including basic writers at the college level. Auxiliary materials such as teaching guides, transparencies, test packets, extra activities suggestions, and computer software programs are usually geared for the "middle of the road" composition student. Computer software designed for native speakers abounds, ranging from spell checks to word processing to organizational and developmental writing programs. For ESL students, in the area of computer software, we have found only two helpful computer software programs that students currently use in our college writing lab. These programs include grammar, vocabulary, and sentence-level exercises, and students are directed to specific exercises for additional work.

Feedback to the two different types of students might also differ. Willing (qtd. in Nunan) conducted a large-scale study investigating the learning styles of 517 adult immigrant learners of English as a second language in Australia. One finding of the study revealed that certain learning activities were popular with these students including error correction by teachers.

> It appears that error-correction is considered by learners to be a very important aspect of the teacher's role. It may be that the current selective practice of indicating errors only when these are "causing serious communication problems" needs to be re-examined. . . . Learners themselves seem to perceive the status implications of poor English, and correctly see that in the real world mistakes are a more serous matter than they often are in English class. (*Understanding Language Classrooms* 52)

In particular, non-ESL-trained instructors must carefully consider the role that culture plays in interpreting and discussing topics. More attention must be given to topics assigned to avoid topics that are culturally biased, loaded, or inappropriate for ESL students. Topics designed for native English-speaking American high school graduates may be unfamiliar, offensive, or just misconstrued by ESL students. Consider, for example, the Chinese student who dropped his freshman English class because the first assignment was to write a 500-word paper describing what he liked or disliked most about his last Christmas. The student was not raised in a Judeo-Christian culture, so he had no experience from which to draw. Even more so, his own culture made it impossible for him to question the teacher. Similar culture-bound topics have appeared on statewide writing proficiency tests:

Should prostitution be legalized?
Should sex education be taught in schools?
Each year, many teenagers run away from home. What do you think are the main causes?
Do you favor or oppose the goals of the women's liberation movement in the U. S.? Why?

Questions like these are as difficult for some ESL writers just as the following might be for an American native speaker:

Choose Baba Den, Setsubun, Hina Matsuri, or St. Nicholas Day and tell how you celebrate it.
How does reeducation improve our community?
Choose one sign of the Chinese zodiac and describe the characteristics of that sign.

Close attention to topic choice, organization, and development should be considered. Instructors must remember to offer more than one topic choice for each assignment. So too, ESL students should be advised to choose the topics that they are most familiar with or have the most experience in. For example, one of our international students failed a state-mandated, forced-choice, timed writing sample because she wrote an essay answering the prompt: "Should tipping be eliminated in restaurants or in other American service institutions? When asked if tipping was a practice in her country, Korea, she replied, "No," and admitted difficulty with the topic.

Since not all students are linear thinkers, a skill often required and valued in the American academy, teaching rhetorical modes frequently helps students focus on audience expectations. Basic writers as well as ESL students might need assistance in organizing and developing their topics. While English faculty can naturally provide this type of instruction, they are not always equipped to deal with ESL issues of articles, two-word verb combinations, and idiomatic usage. They may also be unaware that ESL students seeming to lack organization may actually be using an organization pattern transferred from their native languages. This is especially likely among ESL students who have been well-educated in their own countries.

While group work in which the students peer-edit is effective for both groups of writers, ESL students coming from more traditional cultures often believe that the authority in the classroom belongs to the teacher alone, and initially may resist various forms of group work. Furthermore, experience suggests that ESL peer work is best done at the meaning level. However, both groups can benefit from careful analysis of their learning and writing styles. Teachers who

recognize and celebrate the differences in both groups truly experience the cultural diversity available. Experience suggests that ESL students while lacking the fluency of native speakers often have, because of life experience, more sophisticated ideas to relate.

As a result of this study, a variety of future research besides pedagogical considerations is recommended. First of all, this investigation might be replicated with a larger sample utilizing the same variables. A similar research study should specialize in its analysis to examine certain types of errors particular to either ESL or basic writers. For instance, a careful analysis of verb errors between both groups might be revealing. Other areas of error analysis might include an in-depth study of sentence structure, diction, verb endings, or pronouns. Students' paragraphs should be examined carefully for content, structural patterns, and methods of development.

The results of our study have led us to believe that other variables might influence both groups of students' writing processes and products. Additional studies of inquiry might include the influence of gender, race, age, or culture on the writing processes of each group. For example, would a Black forty-year-old female from Jamaica have the same challenges in writing as an eighteen-year-old Cambodian male? To what degree do length and locale of residence in this country, time away from high school, and economic constraints affect the writing processes of members of both sample populations? Since this research has just begun to examine the influence of cultural differences on topic choice and development, more research on topics is needed. It might be interesting to substitute examples of culturally biased topics to compare the effect on both groups of students' writing. Research might also be conducted comparing students' development of narrative topics versus development of expository ones. Rater bias and writing quality are two other variables worthy of study. For example, why and how do regular English faculty members rate ESL or basic writers' papers differently than ESL faculty or developmental studies faculty (Santos 1988; Vann et al. 1984)? In addition, what is the best way, holistically or analytically, to evaluate the quality of student writing and is either method better suited for either group?

Or perhaps a more ethical question should be posed: Should composition instructors untrained in ESL be teaching ESL students or combined classes of ESL and basic writers? Are we confounding ESL students' difficulty when placing them in courses which cannot address their needs? The argument that English teachers can teach English to all students is just as fallacious as the one that states that any teacher who can read can teach reading.

Just as ESL and basic writers' writing processes differ, so too their preferred learning and study strategies might be dissimilar. Higginson, Stahl, Ming-Yi, and Lee (1989) examined the behaviors and attitudes toward learning by successful students enrolled in college course work in China, Korea, Scotland, and the United States using the Learning and Study Strategies Inventory (LASSI) (Weinstein 1987). Their research revealed significant differences in the learning and study skills strategies used by the students in the four countries. At this time, it appears that little research is being conducted comparing ESL students and basic writers in terms of their learning and study strategies.

Empirical research complemented by ethnographic research can study in greater detail particular differences in writing processes, learning styles, and study strategies of both groups. Interviews, journals, and write-aloud protocols can also contribute to the growing body of research in this area, augmenting empirical research.

Conclusion

This study suggests that it is better that English as a Second Language students and basic writers be taught by trained personnel in each area and with materials appropriate to their needs. While it may not always be feasible or desirable to separate the two groups, the students' differences are many, and the contrasts need to be handled individually. In some cases, as with this group, the issue of ESL versus developmental learning is compounded by ESL students who have been educated in U.S. schools and sometimes have the combined difficulties of second language and developmental students. Perhaps as both groups of students become prepared for regular collegiate English classes and academically and emotionally confident for success, they may be brought together through seminars, college orientation programs, and social activities to become integrated with the rest of the college community. For example, Hadaway (1990) paired ESL students with teacher preparation students in a university for a letter exchange program which ran for a minimum of one semester. As result of these pen-pal relationships, both pairs of students were able to overcome language and cultural barriers and in some cases establish supportive friendships. Finally, if academically well-prepared, both groups will have a chance to succeed in the often insensitive and fast-paced academic society.

SAMPLE PAPERS

ESL 15

I think parent has very important role to train his or her child because the first step, for learning how to deal in sociiey is accomplished by parents. So qualities of parent how to be good one is important. I would like to explain and describe more about a good parent.

A good parent should be concern about the chiled sinnce he or she is a real baby because chiled pesonality can be build up starting from 3-4 mounts of age. The parent should know or study about how to rais the child and teach the child the best personaiity in subconcios way. When the child reach to the school-age, the parent has to give the best opportunity to child to learn education. Also the parent has to be carefull about child's environment. for example with whom does he or she have a frindship? or is he/she safe from drug problem?

anothe aspect of training is family environment that parent(s) make sure have a peacfull and educational atmospher.

In the end I would like to emphecise the educational program of every aspect of life at chiled that is the future of socity.

ESL 17

Qualities of "Good Parent"

Being a Good Parent there are qualities thats requair. You have to be caring, loving and at the same time very demanding or tough. In oder for the children to be obiedeent to their parent, the parent must be a good parent. Spend a lot of time with them, show them that you care and that you are there when they need you. Give them hope and dream for future by reading a moral stories. Tell them constently that you love them. And show them what love is and meaning of love. Once in a while, take them to zoo in picnic; and buy things that they would like and hug them at least once a day and say "I love you".

But most difficult to be a "good Parent" when you have to pun-ish them for their mistake, by retricing some freedoms or by grounding for certain period of time. And be aggressive if they are going out of control by not following the restriction or punishment. It's important to be good parent by showing them that you care and love them, but it is also important that you are to raise them properly by correcting their mistakes and make them realize it by punishment....Carin, loving, and demanding, these qualities will definetly make a parent a good parent.

English 098

The qualities of a good parent should contain the following. They should be loving and caring, someone you can always turn to for love and affection. They should be very understanding in times when you have done good or bad. They should be hard-working in their job and parental life to have sucess in both their job and the parenthood. They should also set the rules for you when you are little and learn that as you grow-up the rules should be bent so they will accomadate both the child and the parent thru adolesence years. Your parents should be able to help you out in your social life and also with school needs. They should provide you with food to eat and clothes on your back. They should also provide a roof over your head. Another terrific quality of a good parent is when they have a great sense of humor. They should be witty when a joke is cracked even on them. They should learn to laugh with people and not about them. They should be able to fight to stand their ground in life. They should always be their when you need them. A parent should talk things out with you instead of always raising his or her voice. They should never lose their temper and do or say things which might hurt you mentally and physically. They should be able to have fun with you and learn to grow up with you. They should know we are not perfect and we are all going to make mistakes. They should be able to learn from our mistakes as well as their own. In an accident they should be able to accept it with a simple apology. I think these quali-ties make up a good parent: caring, loving, understanding, hardworking, witty, joyful, and be able to have fun.

English 099

The qualities of a good parent is understanding, trustworthy
and one that act their age. I feel if a parent is understanding, everything else will fall in place. In order to be understanding there must be love in a relationship. Like for example, if you have a teenage daughter or son and you let he or she borrow your car on a Saturday night. He or she was supposing to be home at 11:00 p.m., instead, they arrive at 12:00 p.m. If you were a understanding parent, you will not argue about bringing the car home late. Instead, you will sit your son or daughter down and ask the reason for bringing the car back late. You'll just tell them don't let it happen again. The other quality is to be trustworthy, let you child(ren) be able to talk to you as a friend and not a parent. If he need a man to talk too, or she need a woman to talk too, be that man or woman and not their father or mother. I believe this quality is most important. A child(ren) need an older role model to look up too. He or she do not need a girl or guy who they're in competition with. If they have parents with all of these three qualities, I feel you have everything in a parent that will welcome you home.

Appendix B

SAMPLES OF SPELLING PROBLEMS

ESL 15

arround
careing/carring
dellebrate
emberrass
environent
especial/espicially
igrorence
serval
therefor
togheter
understant
weekness

ESL 17

arested
consern
hobies
importent
obay
obiedent
parants
poputed
problelly
qualitie/qualite/qulities
requir
sevear

English 098

actpect/expect
appeache/apprecaite
becase
dicpline
expesslly/especially
exampels
furget
greatful
incourage
teech
thair

English 099

adequickly
boathering
childern
diffrent
disapline
dosen't
patients
perticapating
posative
quities/quaties/qualities
rember
violunce

Note

Works Cited

Banks, James A. and Cherry A. McGee Banks, eds. *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives.* Boston, MA: Allyn, 1989.

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

Bartholomae, David and Anthony Petrosky. *Facts, Artifacts and Counterfacts: Theory and Method for a Reading and Writing Course.* Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton, 1986.

Connors, Robert J. and Andrea A. Lunsford. "Frequency of Formal Errors in Current College Writing, or Ma and Pa Kettle Do Research." *College Composition and Communication* 39 (1988): 395–409.

Deming, Mary P. and Sheryl Gowen. "Gender Influences on the Writing Process of College Basic Writers." *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice* 14 (1990): 177–87.

Emig, Janet. *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders.* NCTE Report No. 13. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1971.

Hadaway, Nancy. "Writing Partnerships: Teaching ESL Composition through Letter Exchanges." *Writing Notebook: Creative Word Processing in the Classroom* 8 (1990): 10–12.

Higginson, Bonnie C., Norman A. Stahl, Yang Ming-Yi, and Sung-ho Lee. "An International Comparative Study of Students' Learning and Study Strategies." 33rd Annual Conference of the College Reading Association. Philadelphia, Nov., 1989.

Hunter, Paul, Nadine Pearce, Sue Lee, Shirley Goldsmith, Patricia Feldman, and Holly Weaver. "Competing Epistemologies and Female Basic Writers." *Journal of Basic Writing* 7.1 (1988): 73–81.

Kroll, Barbara. "The Rhetoric/Syntax Split: Designing A Curriculum for ESL Students." *Journal of Basic Writing* 9 (1990): 40–55.

Liebman, JoAnne. "Contrastive Rhetoric: Students as Ethnographers." *Journal of Basic Writing* 7.2 (1988): 6–27.

Nunan, David. *Understanding Language Classrooms.* New York: Prentice, 1990.

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

Purves, Alan C. "Rhetorical Communities, the International Student, and Basic Writing." *Journal of Basic Writing* 5.1 (1986): 38–51.

Raimes, Ann. "What Unskilled ESL Students Do as They Write: A Classroom Study of Composing." *TESOL Quarterly* 19 (1985): 229–58.

Santos, Terry. "Professors' Reactions to the Academic Writing of Nonnative-Speaking Students." *TESOL Quarterly* 11 (1988): 69–90.

Shaughnessy, Mina. *Errors and Expectations: A Guide for Teachers of Basic Writing.* New York: Oxford UP, 1977.

Sloan, Gary. "The Subversive Effects of an Oral Culture on Student Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 30 (1979): 156–60.

Vann, Roberta J., Daisy E. Meyer, and Frederick O. Lorenz. "Error Gravity: A Study of Faculty Opinion of ESL Errors." *TESOL Quarterly* 18 (1984): 427–40.

Weinstein, Claire E., David R. Palmer, and Ann C. Schulte. *Learning and Study Skills Inventory.* Clearwater, FL: H & H, 1987.

Willing, K. Qtd. in Nunan. 52.

Zamel, Vivian. "Recent Research on Writing Pedagogy." *TESOL Quarterly* 21 (1987): 697–715.22.