1998

African American Student Code-Switching in Freshman English Composition

Melanie A. Lewis

The University of San Francisco

African American Student Code-Switching in Freshman English Composition

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the School of Education

International and Multicultural Education Program

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by
Melanie A. Lewis

San Francisco, California
December 1998

This dissertation, written under the direction of the candidate's dissertation committee and approved by the members of the committee, has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education. The content and research methodologies presented in this work represent the work of the candidate alone.

Candidate — Date: December 1998

Dissertation Committee

Chairperson — December 1998

Second Reader — December 1998

Third Reader — December 1998

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to thank my Heavenly Father for blessing me with the patience, courage, motivation, and strength to pursue my dreams and trust in His Word.

I extend my heartfelt appreciation to my second and third readers, Dr. Mary L. Newling and Dr. Betty Taylor, for their wisdom and encouragement.

Dr. Anita P. DeFrantz: compassionate, nurturing, loving, caring, supportive, spiritual, encouraging, wise, wonderful. Thank you for shining your light on me. You give so much of yourself to your students. I am so thankful for you. Thank you for guiding me through this process, and exemplifying the meaning of scholar. I believe that I speak for the many students you touch when I say, thank God for you.

I would be remiss if I did not thank my many friends for the "therapy" sessions. Thank you for sharing the laughs, tears, and overwhelming joy. Thank you for convincing me that the "light at the end of the tunnel" was not a train. I will always love and cherish you all.

I thank my sisters, Robbin, Miriam, and Constance, for loving me, believing in me, and, when I was a little girl, telling me that I would succeed beyond my expectations.

Lastly, I would like to dedicate this academic work to my parents, James and Dolores Lewis, for believing in me when I did not believe in myself. I thank you, Mom and Daddy, for teaching me courage, confidence, and what love really means. Thank you for teaching me to trust the Lord in everything I do, to put Him first in my life, and to have faith in His promises. Thank you for encouraging me to strive for the highest educational degree, and for supporting me in becoming the first Doctor in our family. The smiles on your faces and the joy in your hearts are my reward. Thank you for your guidance and wisdom, and for the priceless lessens you have taught with me. I am so very blessed and proud to have you both as parents. Thank you, for everything.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE STUDY

Statement of the Problem

What is "good" writing? Many researchers (Axelrod & Cooper, 1994; Bruder & Hayden, 1972; Dietsch, 1998; Freigenbaum, 1975; Hart, Reinkling, Von Der Osten, 1996; Hoffman & Yarbes, 1996; Krapp, 1962; Labov, 1970) would assert that good, or effective, writing is fluid, grammatically and structurally correct, makes easy transitions from one paragraph to the next, is coherent, concise, strategic in purpose, eloquent in prose, descriptive, focused. "Bad," or ineffective, writing, is usually associated with the exact opposite of the above mentioned characteristics (Chapman & Waller, 1994; DiYanni, 1985; Feigenbaum, 1975; Macrorie, 1984). Bad writing, thus, is unclear, unorganized, lacking in fluidity, focus, and coherence. Unfortunately, second language speakers have been stigmatized as poor writers, but for very unique reasons. When students "change" linguistic patterns, or, rather, when they "code-switch" into their "first" linguistic system, the writing becomes "bad." The writing is discredited; the students' language is lost. Feigenbaum (1975) asserts that "the term 'different' does not mean 'right' or 'wrong.' There is no linguistic criteria by which a given language or dialect of a language can be proven 'more wrong' than another" (p. 144). Feigenbaum goes on to state that "no language system can be proven more or less valid than another" (p. 144). The only criteria for selecting "one language or dialect for use in a given situation is 'appropriateness'" (p. 144). All students are in a special position to provide their experiences as part of their linguistic system; only they can provide this information. The concern is that if student code-switching is not validated as a beneficial learning tool in writing, the chances of these students achieving competency in freshman English composition will be lessened.

What challenges do African American students, in particular, face in freshman English composition courses? Do the challenges result from fear of the college environment, or from an embedded notion that their thoughts and ideas will not be recognized? Or could the issue be culturally based? What role does language play in the success or failure of African American students in composition courses? The real issue seems to be whether or not the student is being equipped with the tools needed to succeed in freshman English composition. All African American students do not need to "add" formal English to their repertoire; many students currently speak and write using formal English; however, African American students will need to add a more formal English register to their written communication in order to write more effectively. The difficulty occurs when students have trouble communicating a particular thought or idea in written work. African American students will "switch" to a more familiar linguistic system to convey their thoughts. Typically, the linguistic system used is not considered formal although many features in Africanized English are recognizable in formal English. Therefore, the students "add" a different way to express the same idea, another linguistic system which will add clarity to their meaning. African American students will add to the linguistic skills they already possess, incorporating additional skills to express themselves from a cultural linguistic perspective. African American students will recognize when and why they are switching to their "home" language, and learn to transition those thoughts to formal English, the accepted linguistic form in college composition.

This descriptive, quasi-experimental study investigated code-switching of African American students in freshman English composition. An effort was made to show how code-switching affects the writing of students because students tend to write as they speak. Since writing is a form of communication, this study analyzed the importance of such communication and examined how neglecting Africanized English, or, rather, "nonstandard" English, could have detrimental effects on the students' academic achievement. Smitherman (1977) believes that the Black communication theory which

asserts that the linguistic system is noncommunicative is a misrepresentation of fact, that anything nonstandard is deficient is an incorrect notion.

An investigation was conducted on teaching strategies, showing how the use of more effective teaching strategies helped the African American students in this study transition from their linguistic system to formal English. Results of this study not only showed the legitimacy of linguistic systems other than formal English, but also identified code-switching in composition, which aided students in transitioning their writing to formal English when code-switching occurs. The investigation rendered improved written communication systems for students to express themselves in college composition, in other words, saying what the students want to say, using effective writing strategies.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify that code-switching does occur in the writing of freshman composition students, to identify when it occurs, why it occurs, and to help students transition their writing to formal English without losing their original meaning. This study identified code-switching in the composition writing of African American students as having significance in the framework of college writing. Of the many challenges African American students in the college environment face, perhaps neglect of their linguistic system as a legitimate language is the most troubling; thus, this study attempted to alleviate this problem by identifying code-switching in composition as having linguistic significance, and examined how African American students can be taught to retain their linguistic system while transitioning to formal English. Fromkin and Rodman (1998) assert the following:

> There are critics who attempt to equate the use of African American English (AAE) with inferior genetic intelligence and cultural deprivation, justifying these incorrect notions by stating that AAE is a 'deficient, illogical, and incomplete' language. Such epithets cannot be applied to any language, and they are as unscientific in reference to AAE as to Russian, Chinese, or Standard American

> English. The cultural-deprivation myth is as false as the idea that some dialects or languages are inferior (p. 413).

Valdes-Fallis (1978) defines code-switching "as the alternating use of two languages on the word, phrase, clause, or sentence level" (p. 1). The author asserts that "in essence, code switching involves introducing into the context of one language stretches of speech that exhibit the other languages' phonological and morphological features" (p. 1). When a bilingual speaker of Spanish, for instance, uses "a word, phrase, or clause of a sentence that is recognizably English (in both pronunciation and form)" (p. 1), the person has code-switched into English, and vice versa. When a speaker code-switches into another language, the language and meaning used are exactly the same as in the original language. Nothing is altered when switching from one language to the other.

Many African American students have a firm grasp of "standard" English, as English *is* among their "first" languages. Although "Black English" is seen as a "dialect" of formal English, the system has specific features unique to the language. Due to the similarities in the linguistic system, African American students are often times unaware when they switch codes in written composition. The students will "write" as they "speak" in more relaxed environments (e.g., at home, with friends, etc.). The linguistic system which is used is valid and has historical significance, but is not accepted in formal composition writing, nor in the "professional" environment. This study sought to show the significance of Africanized English and how identifying the linguistic system can help students transition to formal English in their writing. The key issue was to recognize that African Americans have a language which is embedded in their culture. Denying the language in turn denies the culture. Validating the linguistic system and using teaching techniques which encourage students to use their language system as a means of learning formal English will lead to a greater sense of belonging in the classroom and in society. Tollefson (1991) asserts that "the term 'mother tongue' is normally used...to refer to the

first language acquired by children" (p. 46); thus, African American students' language should be validated as their first, *cultural* linguistic system. Code-switching can affirm this fact. Results of the study have implications that acknowledging code-switching as a common occurrence in composition leads to a greater understanding of the difficulties students face in freshman English composition, and determining more effective ways to teach writing to students at the college level.

The Researcher recognized evidence of code-switching in her own writing, and realized that her linguistic system was devalued throughout her educational career (a detailed biography of the Researcher is provided in Chapter III, the Methodology). The Researcher also recognized that the code-switching of her freshman English composition students occurred throughout their essays until these students were "taught" how to transition to formal English. The Researcher encouraged students to switch without losing their meaning--validating their unique ideas, as well as legitimizing their linguistic system. Thus far, the Researcher has been successful with her strategies. The Researcher plans to continue developing and researching teaching strategies for more effective college writing. The Researcher has developed her own strategic method of student evaluation used to determine the performance levels of freshman composition students. The Lewis Model of evaluation consists of three parts which was explained further in Chapter II, the Review of the Literature: a syllabus examination; an in-class, timed written exam; and a two-page composition assignment. The Researcher included the Lewis Model in the Review of the Literature as an example of an effective teaching strategy and as an effective tool for evaluation. The Model is not used in the actual study. This model is intended to show how identifying the code-switching features in student writing can benefit both the instructor and the student.

Research Questions

The specific areas of investigation for this study included: analyzing the speech patterns of African American students evident in the written communication; recognizing the various forms of code-switching; identifying code-switching on many levels, including grammatical, meaning, and word choice; and reviewing the effects of teaching code-switching to the experiment group over a period of time.

Hypothesis: Code-switching is not recognized or utilized in teaching English composition; thus, the treatment the Researcher provides for students demonstrating code-switching behavior can be used to help them produce meaning in formal English.

The research questions for this investigation are as follows:

1. How were the types of code-switching in freshmen English composition detected, observed, and identified?
2. What were the features of code-switching in freshman English composition classes demonstrated by African American students?
3. What were the semantic transitions in code-switching identified in the English composition writing of African American students?
   A. What do African American students accomplish by code-switching in compositions?
   B. Does code-switching in English compositions lead to more effective communication, or does code-switching lead to miscommunication?
4. Which features reflected code-switching speech patterns?

Definition of Key Terms

Terms used in this study were operationally defined. These terms included:

1. **Africanized English:**

As mentioned by DeFrantz (1995), Africanized English are those "languages of Africans in Diaspora" (p. 57). The term has been identified in the literature as "nonstandard," "Black

English," "Black American English" (BAE), "Black Dialect," (Dandy, 1991), and, most recently, "Ebonics", which means "Black Sounds." Linguistic features specifically used by African American peoples, including specific phonologic and morphologic features. Specific features and usage are discussed in Chapter II, Review of the Literature.

2. **Effective Writing:**

Effective writing is clear, concise, coherent, fluid, mature, grammatically and structurally correct; clear focus, purpose, intent, strategy. Effective writing is not only consistent with the method, style, and format of formal English, but also expresses what the writer truly intends to say, not a tainted version of what the writer "thinks" the reader wants to read. Effective writing is the voice of the writer.

3. **Formal English:**

This is the most accepted term to "standard" English. "Formal" English is by no means the most appropriate term, but the term is more consistent with the true definition of the accepted language in academe and in American society.

4. **Standard American English:**

The accepted term used to define the appropriate way to speak and write in academe and in American society. Fromkin and Rodman (1998) define Standard English as "An idealized dialect of English that is considered by some prescriptive grammarians to be the proper form of English" (p. 537). The language is consistent with European, or "white", notions of what is acceptable linguistic patterns of speech and writing. Standard English is the legislative "official" language of the United States of America, and is recognized around the world as the official language of America. Wardhaugh (1993) asserts that "Standard English is codified to the extent that the grammar and vocabulary of English are much the same everywhere in the world English is used" (p. 32).

5. **Nonstandard English:**

If, as Fromkin and Rodman (1998) assert, "standard" is "the dialect (regional or social) considered to be the norm" (p. 537), nonstandard must have an opposite meaning. This is

the accepted term referring to all linguistic systems other than standard English. Such languages include Africanized English, Asian American English, Mexican American English, Native American English, and so forth. The linguistic systems of people of color are typically labeled as nonstandard. Wardhaugh (1993) asserts that nonstandard "can connote various degrees of inferiority, with that connotation of inferiority carried over to those who speak a dialect" (p. 25).

6. **The Researcher:**

I have chosen to use the term the "Researcher" capitalized to identify myself. Lower case "researcher" is used to identify researchers cited in the Review of the Literature.

NOTE: Fromkin and Rodman (1998) define code-switching as, "The insertion of a word or phrase of a language other than that being spoken into a single sentence, or the movement back and forth between two languages or dialects" (p. 522). Hymes (1980) asserts that "the changing intellectual context of the human sciences as a whole introduces new questions and courses of diversity" (p. 88). The Researcher's analysis of the code-switching features and patterns of Africanized English speakers has lead her to the following definition of the term: The alternate use of two legitimate linguistic systems.

Significance of the Study

This research comes at an interesting time in history. The Oakland Unified School District courageously addressed the issue of African American language by using the term "Ebonics", or, rather, "Black sounds." DeFrantz (1979) ascribes the following definition to Ebonics for her critique: "That oral language used by African-Americans with linguistic features which differed from European or British English in phonological, syntactical (grammatical), and lexical forms" (p. 384). The Ebonics issue focused primary on the oral language of Africanized English users, yet this study focuses primarily on the writing of the language, as well as its connection to oral speech. Regardless of the aftermath to the announcement and the criticism that ensued, the District's premise was clear: to reinforce

the distinct linguistic system of African Americans, and the need to help students transition from their linguistic system to formal English. The media backlash on the issue of Ebonics stemmed from misinformation, not from well-informed linguists trained to identify language systems. This was by no means a mistake. One of the challenges second language speakers face is not having their language validated by the "mainstream." The School Board had all the right intentions, but the conveyance of the information led to confusion.

This research examined what happens when the verbal language is transferred to the written language, and how the negative impressions of African American oral speech also occur in freshman English composition. Although the subject of code-switching in composition has been explored in the past, much more research is necessary--the subject has been abandoned, and the time has come to resurrect it. This research attempted to validate the language of African American students and showed how these students switch from one linguistic system to the other. As Holiday (1991) asserts, Africanized English "is a language with its own rules, structure, and meaning" (p. 8). If the language system is not considered in the teaching of formal English, students will not learn the similarities and differences of formal and "non-formal" English, placing these students at a disadvantage in written communication. This research was significant as it addressed the historical significance of Africanized language, code-switching in composition, and the strategies teachers can use to help students learn formal English for college writing. This research should ultimately assist not only African American students at the college level, but all students at every educational level.

Assumptions and Limitations of the Study

The Researcher assumed that by acknowledging linguistic systems other than formal English as having validity, these language systems could be used as learning tools to promote better understanding and usage of formal English in written communication.

The Researcher also assumed that using quasi-experimental methodology would prove beneficial in identifying code-switching in student writing.

Some possible limitations of the study were as follows:

1. Limited number of subjects.
2. Extraneous variables (e.g., students' persistence in courses, motivation, other unforeseen circumstances, illness, etc.).

The major limitation of this study rested in the extraneous variables, those unforeseen circumstances that the Researcher cannot control. One such variable was persistence of the students in both the experimental and control groups. As public colleges are reasonably inexpensive, students, for whatever reason (e.g., personal issues, low grades, employment issues) might drop the class, reducing the sample size. The Researcher had no control over such circumstances, yet with this study, the research could lead to results which could help increase persistence of African American students in freshman English composition. The Researcher was fortunate in that no African American students dropped any of the three courses selected for study.

Therefore, the main concern was sample size. The Researcher chose an institution with a high African American student population as freshman English composition classes are usually not impacted with African American students. The three instructors who participated in the study are: Chairman of the Humanties Department, Dr. Keflyn Reed; English Instructor, Mrs. Dowartha Davis; and English Instructor, Ms. Shiela Hall.

Summary

This introductory section of the study covered the significance of the study, the problem to be addressed, the assumptions and limitations, the definition of terms applicable to this study, and the Researcher's motivation for conducting this study of African American student code-switching in freshman English composition. Chapter II, the Review of the Literature, supports the importance of this study and solidifies a premise

on which to conduct quasi-experimental methodology. Although the need for this study has been thoroughly explained, much more supporting evidence was needed to reinforce the importance of validating various linguistic systems found in college composition courses and using these systems as learning tools. The research documents that code-switching is a helpful device, not a hindrance to students, and that students who can effectively use their cultural linguistic system as a learning tool can increase their written communication skills, and possibly, their overall academic performance.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This study was concerned with exploring the significant implications of code-switching of African American students in freshman composition classes. The investigation covers the historical significance of Black American linguistic patterns and how the recognition of the system as a distinctive language can be used to increase the competency of African American students' writing at the college level. This investigation explores several areas in the literature of code-switching: linguistics, bidialectalism, bilingualism, and the teaching of writing; evidence of the link between Africanized English and formal English; the unique characteristics of Africanized English; and teaching strategies when code-switching occurs in freshman composition writing.

Historical Significance Background of African American Limguistic System

Most educators support the use of formal English in the educational system. In order for a composition paper to receive a passing grade, the language usage must meet the criteria established by the administration, which is, without question, "standard" English. Although some educators have called for the eradication and dismantling of "nonstandard" English language or "dialect" usage in order to reinforce the importance of fluency in formal English, other educators seek to emphasize the importance and validity of nonstandard English use in the classroom as a learning tool. In order for proponents of code-switching, mixing, or choice of Africanized English to establish legitimacy, a review of the historical background is needed to support the linguistic system, a study Dillard (1972) asserts as "irresistible" to some linguists and historians.

Turner (1969) asserts that people interested in studying, interpreting and identifying the foundations of Africanized English should do the following:

> Acquire some acquaintance with several languages spoken in those sections of the West Coast of Africa from which the Negroes were brought to the United States as slaves. The Negro dialect known as Gullah or Geechee is spoken by the ex-slaves and their descendants in that part of its region which extends along the Atlantic coast approximately from Georgetown, South Carolina, to the northern boundary of Florida. It is heard both on the mainland and on the Sea Islands near by (p. 1).

Turner continues with the following historical perspective:

> If one were to give a conservative estimate of the number of slaves imported direct from Africa to South Carolina and Georgia during the one hundred years prior to 1808, it would be at least 100,000. After January 1, 1808, when the Slave Trade Act became operative, slave-traders continued to bring Negroes direct from Africa, though to do so was illegal. As late as 1858, approximately 420 Negroes direct from Africa were landed near Brunswick, Georgia. Information as to how many of these 'new' slaves, i.e., those who had come direct for Africa, remained in coastal South Carolina and Georgia and how many other 'new' slaves from Virginia and other colonies joined them is not available; but if there is any correlation between the number who settled there and the extent to which African customs and speech habits have survived in that area, then the 'new' slaves must have constituted a considerable part of the slave population of coastal South Carolina and Georgia" (p. 1).

Anderson (1976) asserts that Africanized English is valid, legitimate, has its own linguistic approaches, and could be used to enhance the competency of all students in composition courses. Anderson states that "In America one often feels a definite need to speak and to write in Standard American English which is the acceptable form of communication in our complex society and which affects one's success in a given social, educational, cultural, and occupational environment" (p. 4). Standard English is the only linguistic system which is recognized throughout the world as the accepted language of the United States. Standard English is also the language accepted by the multitude of American citizens as being the "correct" form of speaking and writing.

Over the past several years, increased immigration, as well as established regional variations of English (dialects), have increased the number of non-standard English systems spoken by various groups. Anderson asserts the following:

> Black American English which is basically and often called 'Negro Dialect', 'dialect', 'street talk', 'gutter talk', 'ghetto talk', 'Non-standard Negro English', 'ghettoese', or 'bad grammar', is one of these dialects that is especially non-acceptable in many American circles and in many American schools although it is regularly used by most of the people who are in America's largest minority group (p. 4).

The term "Black American English", Anderson asserts, "includes an entire linguistic system--a variety of Standard American English distinguished from Standard American English by features of grammar, phonology, and vocabulary, and used by a group of people who are socially set off from other speakers of Standard American English" (p. 4-5). Black English is not spoken by all members of the ethnic group, but has incorrectly been labeled as the language of "lower-class," "underprivileged," and "undereducated" African American people in the "inner city" who are too disenfranchised to learn the type of language needed to survive in "mainstream" society. Holiday (1991) reinforces this theory by stating "do not expect *all* Black English speakers to use *all* these patterns *all* the time" (p. 7). Use of Africanized English is linked to the inability to adapt to societal norms. If this is the case, why, then, do many educated African American people in middle to high income brackets use Africanized English? Regardless of socioeconomic status, African American people are able to "smoothly shift to Standard English when the need arises or in appropriate environments" (p. 5), as the linguistic system "is not an indicator of their intelligence," but a language embedded in the culture. As DeFrantz (1995) mentions, "language and culture are inextricably intertwined," and Bruder (1972) asserts "that language and culture are inextricably mixed, so that to eradicate one is to negate the other" (p. 5).

As with the various dialects in the United States, Anderson (1976) asserts that "Black American English is a legitimate communication device that has logic, coherence, and grammaticalness" (p. 5). Some theorists have tried to negate the language, yet many linguists continue to support the language system as legitimate. DeFrantz (1995) asserts that "In order for the language of African-ancestry people to become recognized as a

positive, cultural attribute, it must be addressed as a respected, positive, cultural attribute" (p. 62). It is important to note that historically, African Americans have had to develop survival skills other ethnic groups have not needed to develop. African Americans' lives have been dictated by hundreds of years of struggle, plight, degradation, oppression, and transgression other groups have not experienced. The resilience of African Americans is evident in folk literary traditions, song, ballads, poetry, and other forms of communication and traditions. Use of these traditions as tools for more effective teaching will be discussed later in the Review of the Literature ("Teaching Strategies").

Because of the preventative measures taken to prohibit African ancestry people from reading and writing, many cultural traditions, including remnants of original language systems, have been, as Dandy (1991) asserts, preserved in oral tradition to assure communication, both verbal and nonverbal. The communicative practice of Africanized English users has been preserved through "music, stories, folk sayings, jokes, food, and most especially in the ways words are used" (p. 20). Dandy continues with the following assertion:

> Black communications, as it exists, today, probably developed through a sort of leveling process as a result of cultural contact and interaction: 1) cultural transmission among the enslaved Africans who, before they came to America, devised bridge-languages to communicate among various tribes; and 2) contact among language different speakers from communities throughout Africa--some of whom were deposited in the West Indies and later brought to this country and European slave traders and settlers from Portugal, Holland, France and England, who colonized parts of Africa, South America, the West Indies, and the New World (p. 20).

Anderson (1976) asserts that the development of Africanized English "differed from that of other American social and regional dialects" (p. 9), that "it came about as a result of the pidgionization-creolization process that started with the slave trade of West Africa" (p. 9). This particular region is not the only region which provides the linguistic foundation for African American language, but researchers note that this region could have been the first which helped establish the current language system.

The initial language system used by African Americans has been a source of speculation for many years. Most early research is not supported by evidence, leaving many theories unsupported. Anderson notes that more recent research has been supported by more concrete data. He states the following influences as the basis for present-day African American linguistic patterns: West African (language) influences, the United States slave trade influences, enslavement in the United States, isolation of African American people in the United States (on plantations and later in ghettos), and Southern (U.S.) white influences (p. 11). Such influences have been challenged by writers who have stigmatized the language and created negative images of African American language. These writers assume that Black *dialect* "evolved from 17th and 18th century British dialects spoken by overseers and masters to communicate with slaves" (p. 12). These researchers negate the fact that the languages actually originated from African language influences.

Enslaved Africans brought with them to America their native languages. The countries from which many Africans were captured were West African countries, as well as countries further inland, the West Indies, and islands in the Caribbean, as supported by Dandy (1991). As a component of colonization, one of the first methods of conquering a people is to strip them of their language. The colonizers were interested in "getting work done" (p. 12), not teaching African ancestry people the English language. Anderson (1976) cites many of these languages as Twi, Yoruba, Ibo, and Ga. Gullah, spoken today around the Southern Coastal islands and corroborated by Turner (1969), is a language responsible for many of the linguistic patterns of Africanized English. Black American English, Anderson asserts, has also contributed much to various white American dialects. This Researcher has found evidence of this phenomena in the writing of the respondents in this study, as well.

Anderson (1976) cites much history in his analysis of the origins of Africanized English, and uses prominent writers to support his theories. A further study of the origins

is needed, however, to study the origins and development of Africanized English. One major component which is not addressed in this study is evidence of other African languages brought to this country by enslaved people. West Africa, to be sure, was not the only region in which Africans were captured. West Africa may have been the region where the first Africans were captured; thus, helping to establish Africanized English--this fact should be noted. What also must be considered are the languages not mentioned in this study. A more conclusive investigating of all languages which contributed to the African American linguistic system is needed.

Burkett (1978) discusses the perceived notions of the definition of dialect. Since Africanized, or "Black," English is commonly assigned the label of a dialect of English, Burkett's discussion is applicable here: "To some people dialect means the speech of the uneducated, or the speech of a person from another section whose pronunciation and word choice differ from their own, or the speech of someone who is speaking a language not his native one" (p. 3). If this definition is justified, then there exists several dialects of English, including dialects of British and American English, regional and social dialects, and subdivisions of practically every known dialect. Unfortunately, many people who have historically ascribed the term dialect to language systems do not accredit the "dialects" as legitimate linguistic systems; example, Africanized English.

Bickerton (1981), in a study establishing the Africanized system of Creole as developed from one of the most technologically and descriptive cultures of the day, and included what the author calls the "horrendous complexity of language and culture" of the "hunting and gathering" cultures, the author contributes the following to the understanding of racist views of languages other than "Western":

> What linguistics will have to change is not the generative theory, in its essential rather than accidental aspects, but a set of much more widely held beliefs, central to which is the belief that all existing languages are at the same level of development. Beliefs that have no empirical foundation generally stem from some kind of political commitment, and I am sure that this one, often expressed as

> 'there are no primitive languages,' arose as a natural and indeed laudable reaction to the claim that thick lips and subhuman minds underlie the characteristics of both creole and tribal languages. According to 19th-century racists, languages and people alike were ranged along a scale of being from the primitive Bushman with his clicks, grunts, and shortage of artifacts, to the modern Western European with his high brow and plethora of gadgets. That was when everyone, racist or anti-racist, did believe that Western man was superior; the only argument was about how nasty this superiority permitted him to be toward 'lesser' breeds. Now that we are rapidly disabusing ourselves of this kind of mental garbage, it becomes possible to uncouple language from 'level of cultural attainment' and look at it developed mentally without any pejorative implication (p. 299).

Bickerton denounces racist theory and supports recognition of complex, rule-governed languages, and reinforces his analysis with historical fact.

Rickford (1987) suggests that the first Africanized English speakers who had significant interaction with slave holders learned English gradually. Enslaved Africans' learning process, Rickford asserts, could have initially been comparable to those persons enslaved in the fields who had less contact with English speakers, and their subsequent progression may have been comparable to the language progression of field slaves in latter years. The author acknowledges that "Given that field slaves had less exposure to and interaction with native English speakers than house slaves did, the structural stages by which these groups acquired English probably differed in some respects" (p. 34). Acknowledging that this progression is tenable, we cannot make drastic assumptions on the actual language learning dynamic in the early years of enslavement.

Burling (1973) associates our use of language with the class system and class division in America. Historically, Burling asserts, the people in power have established the standards in society, including language usage. The language of those people with money, education, power, prestige, and high social status in our society has come to be regarded as the best (p. 27). Burling also feels that other sociological distinctions are likely to be reflected in language, such as the way adolescents use language and set the standard for their peers, the way language is used in the family as a way to communicate special meaning to one another, and the way women and men communicate. When these

language patters are communicated and accepted, the "prestige" of language use and imitation becomes the standard. Yet if we are to change perceptions of language usage in our society, especially the language of African Americans, Burling suggests the following:

> By our language we define the groups to which we belong. We define certain people inside the group, and we leave others out. Language comes to be an accurate map of the sociological divisions of a society...Once we recognize how readily social divisions come to be marked by linguistic variables, it is natural to wonder whether the deepest and most persistent division in American society, the gulf that has always separated blacks from whites, is not also linguistically marked. One would expect the division to be marked simply because it is so deep. People sometimes hesitate to consider this question for fear that if differences are found, it will imply that the speech of blacks is inferior; and yet if we shrink from examining this subject, we run the risk of obscuring features that bear upon the education of black children. We may have to take dialect differences very seriously if all Americans are to derive the full benefits of our educational system (p. 27).

Features and Evidence of Code Switching

Myers-Scotton (1993) asserts the following theory to code-switching:

> The dominant view of CS [code-switching] was simply that it did not exist, least of all as a research topic. If they treated CS at all, ealier studies of language in contact largely considered CS as an interference phenomenon, with 'interference' interpreted in its most literal sense. That is, CS was considered part of the performance of the imperfect bilingual, motivated by inability to carry on a conversation in the language on the floor at the moment (p. 47-48).

Valentine (1994) provides a foundation for code-switching by using the linguistic system of a Severn Ojibwe community. The findings of the study illustrate the relevance of second language acquisition and maintenance of native tongue. This study is a working example which provides concrete data used in identifying several features of switching, including phonological, lexical, metaphorical, and situational code-switching. The study is important as the findings are relevant for studying code-switching of other ethnic groups, including African American. Recognizing code-switching as a legitimate linguistic device is the key to identifying how code-switching can be used effectively in cross cultural communication.

The sample size of the study is crucial in examining its relevance. Lynx Lake, a small, isolated community located in Manitoba, Canada, provided important findings for Valentine. Since the community is isolated, the study of the language yields more concrete results regarding the social relations and communal interactions of language and culture of the Severn people. Within the community of three hundred citizens, "one finds two subdialects of Severn Ojibwe, three dialects of Cree..., and at least two varieties of English regularly employed as linguistic resources" (p. 115). Again, the sample size may seem small, but the limited population is important as the community is isolated; thus, the use of language is authentic. This study also indicates that people of color, in general, are isolated to certain degrees if their linguistic patterns are not the "accepted" patterns of larger society.

Valentine asserts that "most code switching research has involved groups living in industrialized societies where two or more speech communities exhibit extensive, daily contact" (p. 115). Most of these studies revolve around languages based in the European linguistic system and languages closely related, the author asserts. Valentine states that in the small number of studies on nonindustrialized communities, code-switching has been viewed from the perspective of language shifting from the minority language to the majority language (p. 116). This study examines a completely stable and viable linguistic system in which the community code-switches from one Native American language to the other, and where there is no threat by the European language to the overall linguistic system of the indigenous system. In other words, the native linguistic system remains intact.

Important observations can be made from the data collected for this study. The researcher has collected data which is primarily monologic, or, rather, oral translation which controls for such variables as "participant, role, setting, and even genre" (p. 116). The author asserts that using this unique form of data collection, and by using only two speakers to identify code-switching, will show the "elaborately structured relationships in

the use of multiple varieties of these languages, relationships which are consistent with the general pattern of language in Lynx Lake" (p. 116).

Three separate monologues were used for the study: the first, a radio program which provided information regarding situational code-switching; the second, a sermon delivered by a prominent Native Anglican archdeacon; and the third, a monologue delivered via radio by the same archdeacon five years later.

Valentine examined the role English plays as an interface between "bureaucratic agencies" and "those in administrative roles in the land" (p. 117). The author notes that English is an important communication tool, yet within the group, "nonstandard" English is the "primary vehicle" of communication. Thus, the linguistic system is not lost. The author identified situational code-switching "where the presence of particularly salient aspects of the situation provide motivation for the shifts" (p. 117); in this case, shifting from Severn Ojibwe to English. Gibbons (1987) further identified situational code-switching as, "choice of code wither the speech repertoire is influenced by such socio-situational factors as physical context, what is happening, participants, and topic. Interaction proceeds in a single code until one of these factors is changed" (p. 79). The participants in the study seemed to "switch" codes for a few reasons: the caller spoke English, the message was written down in English, or the person lacks a proficiency in English. Second language users often feel uncomfortable using another language when the second language incorporates terms or patterns which are difficult to grasp. For instance, in the Ojibwe language, the numeric system only goes up to twenty; thus, the speaker may have trouble communicating higher numbers in either language. Since many Ojibwe people, in the Lynx Lake community, lack proficiency in English, communication in the switching of languages could be confusing. The result could be miscommunication between speaker and listener, or writer and reader.

Valentine also indicates the importance of metaphorical code-switching. As situational code-switching requires the person to switch codes depending on the situation,

metaphorical code switching requires the speaker (or writer) to switch depending on the topic (Wardhaugh, p. 106). Valentine found that the radio station was treated as a "wholly Native medium", in which the English language, unless intended, does not obscure the use of the native language. Metaphorical code-switching was found useful when topics were difficult to communicate in one language, easier to communicate in the other. The subsequent monologues also used metaphorical code-switching as certain aspects of the linguistic system can only be communicated in the language native to the speakers. Humor, another component, is also used when speakers attempt to switch to another language. Examples of such use will be discussed in later sections dealing primarily with Africanized language speakers.

The author notes the importance of second language acquisition and recognition, because even in the small Lynx Lake community, the English language is important for outside communication. The people of this community needed English for their jobs both inside and outside of the community, but their native tongue remained undisrupted, proving that two or more languages can benefit the speaker--the speaker has the advantage of communicating with at least two groups of people, switching codes when necessary or appropriate, but retaining the native language. Valentine states that "functional bilingualism is becoming more and more a necessity" (p. 124). Knowledge of two or more languages and the ability to switch from one to the other can prove beneficial to the speaker of those languages.

The author showed that layers of code switching exist, "including phonological and morphological shifts along with lexical substitution as opposed to insertion, which occurs when there is no native equivalent" (p. 128). As seen in several studies, these components are important in understanding the system of a language. Occasionally, phonological systems are similar which makes it difficult to decipher the language system being used. The point of this is that every language system uses features similar to that of

other languages, and that over the course of time, the linguistic system basically remains the same.

Valentine acknowledges that further research is needed on this particular community, but identifies code-switching on many levels. The importance of cross cultural communication is examined as well as the importance of retaining native languages. Although this study focuses on a Native American group, all groups can benefit from the results. A larger sample size could have supplied even better results, as well as similar finding from studies on other ethnic groups. This study, however, reveals many observations which match those to be discussed regarding the language of African ancestry people. This study helped solidify code-switching as a viable resource for speakers, and thus, writers, of more than one linguistic system.

Hispanic Americans have been labeled much the same as African American as "outcast" minorities. Unlike African American people, however, Hispanic people have a recognized linguistic system, Spanish. Although Spanish is a recognized language, the system has been stigmatized in many mediums, from the classroom to the telecommunications industry. The following study examines code-switching as it relates to Spanish speakers. The implications of the findings provide valid information on the code-switching of Spanish speakers which prove useful in understanding African American code-switching.

Valdes-Fallis (1978) examines code-switching as it relates to Spanish/English bilingualism. The key issue identified in the research is that code-switching is significant for second language speakers and is an important communication tool. The author defines code-switching "as the alternating use of two languages on the word, phrase, clause, or sentence level" (p. 1). As mentioned earlier, the author asserts that "in essence, code switching involves introducing into the context of one language stretches of speech that exhibit the other languages' phonological and morphological features" (p. 1). The author uses many examples of how a speaker may begin a sentence in Spanish and end it with an

English word or phrase, for instance. When a speaker code-switches into another language, the language and meaning used are the same as in the first linguistic system used; nothing is altered when switching from one language system to the other.

Valdes-Fallis states that "all natural bilingual situations have in common the fact that bilingualism will occur at those times when the speakers' first language will not meet all their communication needs" (p. 3). Bilingual speakers sometimes cannot find the appropriate word, phrase or clause to effectively articulate their meaning; thus, code-switching becomes necessary. Yet in order for survival in a system which dictates the use of formal English in most environments, bilingualism becomes mandatory. Bilingual, as used by the author, means "varying degrees" in the proficiency of two languages, yet it does not mean that the speaker knows both languages exceptionally well, but that they have a working knowledge of two languages, and can "function, to whatever degree, in more than one language" (p. 4).

The author also makes the distinction between the "academic" bilingual and the "natural" bilingual. The "academic" bilingual becomes bilingual by choice, by studying the language in school or learning the language via travel, for instance. The latter is "a product of a specific linguistic community that uses one of its languages for certain functions and the other for other functions or situations" (p. 4). Wardhaugh (1992) defines situational code-switching as occurring "when languages change according to the situations in which the conversants find themselves: they speak one language in one situation and another in a different one" (p. 106). Dulay (1982) asserts that bilinguals are able to "code switch when the situation demands it" (p. 100). Metaphorical code-switching occurs when the topic of conversation controls the linguistic system used. Natural bilinguals are products of their environment, meaning the linguistic system used was learned via family, friends, and social interactions. Natural bilinguals usually interact with speakers who use the same language, yet they are also able to converse with monolingual speakers of their same group.

In linguistic systems, certain rules are acknowledged. These "rules" of the language encompass the groups' belief system. Valdes-Fallis states that "part of belonging to a speech community involves knowing what to say, when to say it, how formal, friendly, or intimate to be, and under which circumstances to speak or to remain silent" (p. 4). Since language and culture are intertwined, the rules of the culture are also displayed in the language. These rules are sociolinguistic, or, rather, dictated by the social norms of the culture using the language.

The author also asserts that the language patterns used by a group are learned in childhood. The appropriateness of language usage, the conditions to which certain speech is used, and the tone used when communicating is important. We are raised to know what language is appropriate at home and which is appropriate for school or work. Resistance to the second language is also a factor in this area. Some members of a community are encouraged to "resist" the native language and encouraged to use the second language, negating the original language. However, most bilinguals will retain the first language for communication with other community members, especially elders.

The author mentions a feature of language cited as "language contact," in which "two languages...are used alternately by the same speakers" (p. 5). When bilingual speakers use two different languages, a situation called "interference [occurs when there is] a momentary transfer from one language to another of elements from one of the languages spoken by the bilingual" (p. 6). This situation exists regardless of the dominant language.

Integration, the author states, is another condition found in bilingual conversation. Integration involves using certain terms, for instance, regularly from one language to another. As mentioned earlier, some language systems will use certain words, phrases or terms to illustrate something they cannot describe using the second language. At this point, regular use of certain terms will be used when a second language term does not

adequately describe the speaker's meaning, or when the second language term takes on a completely new meaning.

Code-switching, as mentioned earlier, can be advantageous to speakers of two languages, the bilingual. The author examines several questions which cover the area of code-switching:

1. Is code switching random and meaningless?
2. Is social information conveyed by a change in language?
3. Is code switching used stylistically by speakers, that is, to add color to speech or for emphasis?
4. Is code switching related to the relative proficiency of bilingual speakers in each of their languages?
5. Is code switching rule governed, that is, do syntactic constraints operate on code switching on the word, phrase, and clause levels?
6. How do each of the above factors interact in the use of this verbal strategy by individual speakers? (p. 7-8).

The author notes that code-switching is not random or meaningless, and that the social information is conveyed through this medium. Situational and metaphorical code-switching are important in that "code switching...can signal the fact that two bilinguals are shifting their role relationship with regard to one another, are shifting topics, or are responding to the particular characteristics of the setting" (p. 8). For instance, when two people are conversing using one language, one party switches to the second language to convey a certain meaning (e.g., for emphasis or illustration).

The author explores all of the questions and finds that code-switching is not only a stylistic process, but can also aid in the proficiency of *both* languages, both in and out of the classroom. Finally, the researcher found that individuals who code-switch can benefit from both languages personally, educationally and professionally.

Valdes-Fallis' research targets the main characteristics of code-switching by using Spanish as the first language, English as the second. Citing specific experiments on language usage would have been helpful, but with this kind of research, statistical data might prove obsolete. The important definitions are covered and thoroughly explored in this study, establishing a valuable foundation which future researchers can use to examine code-switching in other environments, cultures and languages.

Bidialectalism falls under the same umbrella as code-switching, in a sense, as the phenomenon relates to the alternate use of language; in this case, two dialects. Campbell (1994) poses an interesting argument to refute definitions and interpretations of bidialectalism. Campbell believes that the term is simply another euphemism used to demean and subjugate African American people, their culture, their language. To summarize, bidialectalism is a way for white Americans to acknowledge that African ancestry people have their own speech patterns, that this original linguistic system should remain in place, but that African American students should acquire the more formal standard, known as "standard English." The author believes that the term bidialectalism refers primarily to Africanized English although the term has been used by and for other groups as well. Ironically, bidialectalism may be a powerful entry point for what the author states as "peaceful cohabitation" between Africanized English and formal English.

Bidialectalism can also serve as a useful tool if used as an effective strategy. Bruder (1972) conducted a study in which bidialectalism served as a useful teaching tool. Bruder states that "a bidialectal approach recognizes the fact that control of a variety of language styles is a useful tool" (p. 3). This approach recognizes that the student understands her own culture as reflected in her language as well as that relationship for the second language. The emphasis seems to be the appreciation and legitimacy of both linguistic systems. This student "adds a language system and knowledge of a different culture to his skills" (p. 3). Bruder concludes findings similar to other researchers, "that productive competence of formal composition style is a mandatory skill for those who

wish to obtain a university degree in this country" (p. 4). The author could go further and assert that competence in the "accepted" style of communication is vital to the educational survival of students at all levels. If students are not taught how or when to switch into formal English, the likelihood of the students' effectiveness in society is lessened. Bruder found that "the bidialectal approach offers the greatest opportunity for the students to add to their language skills without demeaning their present repertoire" (p. 5).

Bruder used a variety of teaching techniques in the bidialectal approach, including historical implication of both standard and Africanized English, reinforcing the distinct African culture; solidifying the relationship between language and culture; and the difficulties with learning a second dialect. Bruder's analysis confirmed that, although not perfect, the bidialectal approach had a highly motivational affect on the students (p. 19). There was a steady improvement in the written compositions of the students.

Bruder's analysis challenges the negative views of bidialectalism, which in many ways is similar to switching codes. Bruder provides solid teaching strategies which can work at all educational levels. Her study does not, however, provide statistical data to confirm her findings, nor does she confirm her sample size or other applicable data. However, in a study such as this particular one, statistical information would have been difficult to gather. Bruder's overall findings provide a positive step toward recognizing and validating Africanized English.

Auer (1984) ascribes the notion of "conceptualization" to code-switching dynamics. The author determines that code-switching is a "consequence of the change of topic" (p. 19), which he asserts as a "change of footing." Yet code-switching seems to be more than just a change of footing, and more than mere conceptualization, which Auer defines as "participants' joint efforts to establish and make relevant contexts" (p. 19). Users of a language incorporate more than context into their communicative forms, but their cultural notions, as well.

Auer supports the theory that language usage is not limited to verbal communication, but that physical communication is also used to "switch":

> In addition to verbal means, contextualization strategies rely on prosodic cues (intonation, rhythm, accent, etc.), gestural and kinesic cues, eye contact, etc. Code-switching is one of these cues which, for instance, can signal that one topic is terminated and another one about to begin. Generally, it is one way of contextualizing verbal activities, that is, of informing co-participants about the ever-relevant question 'what are we doing now?'--even though its contribution to answering it may be restricted to the information 'something different than before.' Switching is, in this sense, very similar to other contextualization strategies such as lowering or heightening of pitch level, change of posture (e.g. leaning back, leaning forward), change of speed of utterance delivery (lento vs. allegro speech), and some others (p. 18).

Lipski (1985) confirms that "code-switching is a rule-governed form of linguistic behavior, and not an unprincipled confusion" (p. 1). The challenge, Lipski asserts, in confirming further the use of two alternating linguistic systems is both obtaining actual language-switched utterances congruent with those seen in spontaneous speech, but also the representation of the two linguistic systems with recognizable mechanisms and speech patterns. Lipski asserts the following:

> Bilingual code shifting is one of the most striking bits of evidence which may be adduced in favor of the hypothesis that bilingual speakers, at least those who are sufficiently proficient in both languages to engage in spontaneous switching have, in addition to two possibly distinct grammars, a mechanism which fully integrates the two, to the point where it becomes more useful to speak in terms of a bilingual grammar. Precisely the recognition of an internal structure for bilingual language shifting militates in favor of such a systematic integration, since without a structured basis for language shifting, one is free to simply postulate random interferences resulting for imperfectly learned systems" (p. 2).

Lipski introduces another type of code-switching, intersentential language shifting, which is "shifting languages at sentence boundaries which are frequently principal discourse boundaries" (p. 2). With this type of code-switching, the speaker does not need to be fluently bilingual in order to engage in this language behavior. In intrasentential language shifting, the user of this type of code-switching form can shift "in the middle of a sentence, often with no interruptions, hesitations, pauses, or other indications of a major

categorical shift" (p. 2). Lipski notes the differences between "inter" and "intra" shifting: "Language switching is frequently taken as a sign of ingroup solidarity and monolingual discourse may be triggered by the appearance of a speaker who is unknown to the participants, whose bilingual abilities are either unknown or in doubt, or who is identified with only one of the two language domains" (p. 10). Intrasentential shifting is the form of code-switching which the respondents in this study use, and will be discussed in Chapter IV, the Findings.

Lipski further states the following:

> Mere bilingualism of the interlocutor may not be sufficient, since code shifting often conveys connotations of ingroup identity, ethnicity and solidarity. In particular, membership in the ethnic group characterized by code switching is frequently a necessary ingredient for code switching to be used. When the listener is not part of the ethnic group, no matter how fluent in Spanish or how functionally bilingual, spontaneous code switching is inhibited or entirely suppressed. If the listener is of Anglo American background and/or identified with a professional domain (teachers, social workers, psychological investigators, etc.), the element of formality may be foremost, while in other less formal situations in dealing with Anglo Americans or non-United States Hispanics, lack of code switching may be due to perceived norms of courtesy (p. 10).

Lipski's theory, as will be shown in the Findings, connotes similarities with African American code-switching.

Fishman (1971) asserts that speech communities have rules and forms which control language behavior and show the intricate value of the language varieties used by its speakers. Fishman asserts the following regarding speech variation: "Any speech community of even moderate complexity reveals several varieties of language, all of which are fundamentally differentiated from each other" (p. 219), meaning language styles and usage are complex, rule-governed systems. Fishman continues by stating that "The fundamental fact about language is its obvious diversity. Moving from country to country, region to region, class to class, and caste to caste, we find changes in language. Linguistic diversity apparently is related to social interaction" (p. 63). Myers-Scotton (1993) asserts

the following as this form of language relationship: "Language-contact phenomena such as CS seem best accommodated if one thinks of the grammar of a linguistic variety as a set of lemmas, with the conditions on accessing or modifying members of some subsets more limited than that for others" (p. 239).

Bickerton (1975) suggests the theory that code-switching occurs naturally, spontaneously, and situationally. He asserts the following: "The amount of variation in any given language may vary from epoch to epoch, but is always present in some degree, and continually shifts its locus; if the feature that is variable today was often invariant yesterday, it is equally often true that today's invariant was yesterday's variable" (p. 60).

Fishman (1991) asserts the following regarding language shift:

> It is necessary to add that most cultures reveal the 'domino principle' in operation and when any of their many props, such as language, are lost, most other props are seriously weakened and are far more likely to be altered and lost as well. Ultimately, therefore, RLS [reverse language shift] and language maintenance are not about language *per se*; they are about language-in-culture. RLS is an attempt to foster, to fashion, to attain and to assist a particular language-in-culture content and pattern (p. 17)

Although the term "reverse language shift" sounds threatening, the theory described above connotes an effort to aid in the preservation of threatened linguistic system, such as Africanized English.

Dulay (1982) asserts the following as the premise of code-switching:

> Borrowing and code switching are additional areas where L1 (language #1) and L2 (language #2) interact. Borrowing, the incorporation of linguistic material from one language into another, is an extremely common phenomenon observed in languages throughout much of the world. Code switching refers to alternating between one language and another among bilinguals. It is a normal consequence of the natural contact of languages in multilingual societies (p. 119).

Dulay's theory echoes Lipski's in that language switching and shifting involve natural contact and occurrences in linguistic systems.

Features of "Black English"

Having established code-switching as a dynamic component in language usage, the features of African American linguistic patterns must be discussed. Like other cultural groups, African Americans possess a specific linguistic system embedded in Black culture. Although not all African American people use their language all of the time, the characteristics and features are an integral part of the culture. African American people can effectively code-switch from formal English to Africanized English at will, as other bilingual speakers do, on a regular basis. By establishing the known characteristics of Africanized English, the teaching strategies as to how African American students, and all students, in freshman composition can transition to formal English can be reviewed.

Dandy (1988) discusses the features of African American language by asserting that the language is a legitimate linguistic system that should be recognized and validated. The author cites Hoover (1985) who labels the language "Black Communication," as it encompasses more than just speech communication. Black communication consists of the following:

1. A speech code with grammar, phonology, lexicon, intonation, and semantics,
2. Speech acts such as testifying, sounding, marking, signifying, and rapping, which initially was language used for power exchange--Black talk from a Black man to a Black woman for the purpose of winning her emotion and sexual affection,
3. Style that includes call and response, dramatic repetition, as in Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech,
4. Nonverbal behavior such as silence in response to a ridiculous question, kinesics [nonlinguistic body motions]...or eyerolling, and,
5. Sociolinguistic rules for speaking such as the avoidance of the use of "boy" for a man and "girl" or "gal" used to refer to a maid or the term "you people" to refer to Blacks (Hoover, 1985).

In other words, the linguistic system, as mentioned before, encompasses the culture of the people. Other important markers of the language include:

1. Not all Blacks speak this dialect all of the time. Many Blacks are bidialectal, for they engage in code switching or code shifting.
2. Black English shares many features with other dialects of English.
3. Black English is rule-governed--it is a legitimate linguistic system that has rules (Dandy, p. 3).

As seen in the study of other linguistic systems, Africanized English has rules which govern the use and appropriateness of the language. Labov (1970) reinforces this theory by asserting that "nonstandard" systems are rule-governed, coherent linguistic systems and that they are not inferior to other linguistic systems. These rules are not inherent, but learned within the culture. The term "dialect" is troubling here, however, in that Africanized English language has been and still is stigmatized as a dialect and not as a legitimate language. Therefore, more current research should authenticate that Africanized English shares many features with other linguistic systems.

Dandy addresses the phonological features, or, rather, the "sound," of Africanized English as being distinct from other linguistic forms. Ebonics, or Black Sounds, stems from similar findings. The final consonant ending of words are examples of the sound features such as:

test --- tes

desk --- des

wasp --- was (p. 4).

Pluralized, the author states, the language can cause the speakers to be labeled "ignorant" or "dumb," e.g., tesses, desses, and wasses, but the language is "rule-governed," meaning the use of the words, phrases or clauses is clear to the speaker--the orator knows what she is attempting to convey. Other members of the culture, regardless of resistance or denial,

and regardless of whether or not they use the language themselves, can understand the meaning, as well.

Dandy also acknowledges the pronunciation of ask, pronounced ax, which is a common feature of both oral and written Africanized English:

> Ax appears clearly in Gullah as well as in Black English. The Oxford English Dictionary, Volume 1, page 488, affirms that until 1600 AD the literary form (appropriate to literature as opposed to everyday speech or writing) was ax. In fact, ax is still used in England today everywhere in midland and southern dialects and also in Ulster, a province of northern Ireland (p. 4).

The author identifies that one of the most identifiable features of Africanized English is the use of the verb to be. The verb is used "habitually, and it is omitted if the condition is not repeated or recurring" (p. 4):

The coffee bees cold.	Everyday the coffee is cold.
The coffee cold.	The coffee is cold today. It might not be cold tomorrow (p. 4).

In addition, Holiday (1991) asserts that the verb is often deleted in Africanized English (p.2).

Dandy illustrates that Africanized English does have legitimacy, and is related to many other *dialects* of English. The researcher could have used more illustrations in this particular section to give the reader a clear understanding of the theory behind the linguistic pattern of African ancestry people. And again, the use of the term *dialects* should be clarified. The primary points remain convincing and give the reader a platform on which to explore deeper into this area of research.

Alexander (1985) asserts that many African Americans are "bidialectal," that they have control over or can use two different linguistic systems. Bidialectalism appears to be another term for code-switching, in that the speaker uses "nonstandard" English in less formal settings, "standard" English in more formal settings. The implication here is that the speaker is in control of the language pattern used, and can shift or switch when

appropriate. Formal English, the most recognized and accepted language of the United States, is used by those in the "mainstream," e.g. governing bodies, educational systems, and the overall establishment. As with many nonstandard elements in society, myths and facts plague the language argument. Anderson asserts the following myths about Africanized language:

1. Before being brought to the Western hemisphere, blacks spoke "savage gibberish" (Taylor, 1971).
2. Increased contact with whites enables blacks to speak in a more "civilized manner" (Taylor, 1971).
3. Due to physical and cognitive deficiencies, blacks could not learn English properly.
4. Black dialect is part of the pathology of cultural deprivation.
5. Children's ability to learn is retarded because of the use of illegitimate linguistic systems such as black English.
6. Black English dialect is an inferior linguistic system.
7. Blacks are nonverbal (p. 21).

Of course, these misconceptions are fueled by racist assumptions about the entire culture of African ancestry people.

The following are facts regarding Africanized English:

1. Black people who use a form of black dialect do not use all of the black dialect features at all times. Use of the features may vary from sentence to sentence.
2. The type of black English used is determined by sex, age, socioeconomic status, geographical area in which one spent formative years, the speaker's purpose, setting, topic, and audience.
3. Black English dialect is a legitimate linguistic system with rules (p. 22).

The features of Africanized English certainly support the theories behind code-switching. It is also important to note here that the literature reviewed uses the term "Black English" to identify the linguistic patterns of African Americans. Most of the authors do not intend to demean the language at all; instead, most authors, such as Anderson, choose to use this terminology--the term is not derogatory when used by a researcher who knows the importance and relevance of the linguistic system.

Phonology

A distinguishing feature of Africanized English is the way it "sounds." Alexander notes that the final letter of many words is dropped in the linguistic system, for example "soft" is pronounced "sof"; ask is "as" or "ax"; adopt is "adop", and so forth. The "th," which is voiced, is pronounced "d," for example "dis" or "dat." Both phonological features are also found in other dialects, such as in the British Cockney (p. 22).

Dulay (1982) contributes the following to phonological dynamics:

> The processes used in children's acquisition of L2 (the second language) phonological structures appear to be similar in many respects to those childrens' use in learning their L1 (the primary language), suggesting the existence of a set of natural processes of phonological acquisition. In contrast to the acquisition of grammar, however, the learner makes extensive use of first language phonological structures as a communicative strategy in the early stages of L2 acquisition. The new phonology is built up using L1 phonology as a case. Because the L2 learner already has an L1 phonology, and uses it as a foundation for further learning, the learner's L2 speech will have a substratum of L1 sounds (p. 112).

Dulay's theory supports the development of Africanized English phonology.

Other examples of voiced distinction in the language considers the use of the letter "e," sounded as "i." For example, "pen" is pronounced "pin," "bet" is pronounced "bit," "yet" is "yit," and so forth. The features can also be found in the "American South and southern Midwest" (p. 22), which shows the similarities in linguistic systems and helps support the origins of Africanized languages.

Syntax

Syntax is defined as the arrangement of phrases or words in a sentence. Sutcliff (1992) goes further with an explanation as the following: "the surface formations of word order are one thing and the deeper grammatical relations of the syntactical system are quite another (p. 30). As phonology is sound, what one hears, syntax can also be heard; syntax and phonology can also be written, as in composition work. The distinguishing syntactical feature in Africanized English is the use of the copula "to be." Alexander notes that "the variant form of 'be' is used to denote habitual action or something ongoing" (p. 22). Some examples are: we be playing (formal English, "we are playing" or "we play often"); or, they be acting crazy (formal English, "they frequently act crazy" or "they regularly act crazy").

The pronoun "it" is often used "to denote presence, or to introduce statements" (p. 22). The author emphasizes that "it is" used in introductory statements is also found in an Irish dialect.

An example of Africanized English also found in Middle English is the use of multiple negation, or double negatives. For example, "I don't know nobody like that" in formal English translates to "I do not know anyone like that." Plural markers (three back*pack*), possession (she dress nice), and subject stress (my mom, she cooks good), are also features of the language.

Finally, the author notes lexical features, or, rather, vocabulary/word usage as having distinguishing markers. Alexander notes that as the vocabulary of formal English is in a constant state of change, so is Africanized English vocabulary. As DeFrantz mentions, "Languages change over time, and the changes that take place are related directly to the context experienced by the members of the culture who use the language" (p. 59). The lexical system also contributes to other languages; some features of Africanized English vocabulary are adopted by larger society and "shifts appear in the black lexicon so that the meanings of the words may vary in the two communities" (p. 23), both African American culture and in "mainstream" society.

The style of Africanized language gives the speaker power and control of language usage as well. Holiday (1991) asserts that the "language is used as a means of survival" (p. 1). The way in which the language is spoken, the emphasis on certain words, and the tone help "denote different meanings for the same word sound" (p. 24). Some Chinese dialects show similarities in this pattern and communication device.

Although the author clarifies the use of many grammatical features of Africanized language, he oversimplifies its usage and conveys questionable theories. For instance, referring to "loud talking" as a way to challenge teachers is not exclusive to African American people. The author notes, "It's great fun seeing a teacher lose self-control" (p. 23). Though this may be true, the statement reflects negatively on the African American language user. In order to establish validity to the language, more positive images should be portrayed. The author could have gone further in the analysis of the features of Africanized language, as well. More discussion of how Africanized language speakers can use their linguistic system as a learning tool to propel themselves academically would be beneficial for future study.

Mitchell-Kernan (1986) makes an important observation in stating the following regarding the language of Africanized English users:

> It has been shown, e.g., that the language of urban blacks is not, as some have implied, simply a random collection of features deviating from the standard but rather an independent dialect of English. Like other dialects of English, it has its own rules of grammar and pronunciation, rules which are explainable in terms of the history of its speakers in much the same way as rules of other English language dialects (p. 161).

The author attempts to address Africanized English, but as is consistent with a host of researcher's, the language is not considered a legitimate language, but a dialect, a subdivision of formal English.

Bailey (1971) denounces original theories on Black language by asserting that original notions are "linguistically-naive." Bailey asserts that if the historical background

of the language is analyzed, the perceived notions of "Black English" would be defused. The author states that the "dialect" has only "recently been granted the autonomy which structuralism so freely accorded to exotic languages and dialects in other parts of the world" (p. 38). Africanized English remains the "stigmatized" language and "unwanted poor brother" of formal English. As this language is used by a large portion of the American population, looking at the real facts, the author asserts, will give clarity to the importance of the linguistic system.

Bailey, as with many researchers, attached the language to a pidgeonization and creolization process derived from not only African languages but also from some European languages. The examples the author uses deal mostly with verb usage. She also asserts, as mentioned earlier, that the speakers of this language are "bidialectal." As many people speak more than one dialect, "we are faced with the realization that our populations indulge in considerable code-switching, and consequently it is very difficult to find informants who do not switch codes to suit the occasion" (p. 140). If this is true, code-switching has been used as a communication tool throughout history by people of African decent and other cultures.

Bailey uses a hypothetical language system found in Miller's The Cool World, analyzing the "Cool World" language, which appears to represent Africanized English. The author also analyzes formal English and her native Jamaican Creole. Throughout the analysis, similar findings are cited regarding absence of copula, e.g. adjectives, adverbs, prepositional phrases, pronoun negation, possessive usage, and so forth. There are noticeable similarities in the language systems; when examined, the meanings are relatively clear, for example, "everybody look down at they feet" (p. 49), translated, "everybody looks down at their feet." The meaning is clear, both orally and written.

The author uses creativity to analyze Africanized English, challenging perceived notions of the linguistic system. Many examples are presented, but the author confines her study of Africanized English to the American South. A more informed study might

include more regional variations of the language. The author also used the term "subsystem" to refer to "dialects" of English. By doing so, the author may be unconsciously continuing the stigmatization of the language. Solid background and analysis is presented, but further study is needed on the "deep structure" of Africanized English.

Anderson (1976) continues an analysis of the features of Africanized English. In the Gullah dialect, as well as in West African languages and Africanized English, the use of the verb "to be" shows present, past and future tense, i.e., "I be tired after I work at night"; "She be here all day"; "They be at school regularly" (p. 18). Word order is another feature which varies depending on the meaning, i.e., "He workin'", "My name Joe", "She going with you?" (p. 19). Word order usage by African Americans is also found in many African languages as well as use of morphology, or nouns, pronouns, and verbs, i.e., "I got five sister" (p. 20). The author cites "the absence of the 3rd person singular markers *s* or *es*" (p. 20), as well as the possessive marker *'s*. The language uses many methods of forming words frequently found in formal English, for example, the use of the double negative, as mentioned earlier. Reduplication of words is also found in Gullah and many African languages, used for intonation and clarity purposes. Phonology and intonation are also features with unique roles in the language.

The author notes that this linguistic system is not the language of "ignorant savages," but a legitimate linguistic system. Research has dispelled many negative notions and representations about the language, but in order to do further research and analysis, one must work to dispel "deceptive and misleading as well as slanted information and negative notions" (p. 24) as researchers continue to reinforce the use of language as pertinent to, beneficial to, and rooted in culture.

Farr (1985) questions the validity of bidialectalism and linguistic change. From her analysis of the literature, a parallel between oral bidialectalism and written bidialectalism is apparent. Advocating bidialectalism assumes two things: that "non-mainstream" English

is as important as "mainstream" English, and bidialectal students have the advantage of calling on two linguistic systems for both oral and written communication. This theory can be supported and is based on bilingualism, or, rather, knowledge of two languages. The troublesome phrase here, however, is the author's interpretation of "dialect." Farr states that everyone "speaks one dialect or another" of their language; dialect being the features of one's linguistic system. She notes that not all speakers of the language use all features all of the time, and that some speakers use the features more often than others. The problem here is that many researchers have labeled Africanized English a "dialect," or "vernacular" as opposed to a legitimate language. Also, Farr's example (e.g., "We ain't had no trouble about none of us pullin' out no knife or nothing") seems like a racist stereotype of African American people.

Farr's analysis, however, does have redeeming value. The notion of losing one's identity in the "switching" process is addressed. Since teaching effective writing skills is "teaching the linguistic pattern of standard English," the student runs the risk of losing her original language, the communicative device used with members of her culture. As Farr states, "It is important, therefore, regardless of political stance, to acknowledge the potential linguistic and social ramifications of effective writing instruction" (p. 214).

Farr suggests that in order for students to both maintain their linguistic system and shift to formal writing, meaningful and frequent interaction with speakers of formal English must be established. If effective teaching strategies were in place, there would be no need for students to interact with formal English speakers, only with formal writing techniques. The assumption that in order for students of color, in particular African American students, to succeed, they must have meaningful interaction with standard English speakers should be dispelled. These students are perfectly capable of transitioning to formal English with the guidance of educators willing to teach them the language without devaluing the students' linguistic system (hand-holding by mainstream educators is not necessary).

Walker (1977) emphasizes that, in a survey, respondents confirmed specific features of Africanized English. Recognition of the linguistic system establishes that the features are not only identifiable, but when identified, can be used in developing programs to help African American students switch to formal English. Walker identified "the substitution of 'f' for 'th' ('toof' for 'tooth'); the absence of the final member of consonant clusters ('dess' for 'desks')" (p. 4); noun-verb agreement ("he busy" for "he is busy"); third person disagreement ("he act" for "he acts"); and the informal use of the verb to be ("he be" for "he is") in the speech patterns of students. If these features are consistent in speech patterns, one should assume that the patterns will remain consistent in the written work, as well. However, Walker observed that this is not necessarily the case. Those surveyed indicated that the speech and written patterns of the English composition students were not consistent, that "white students," and other ethnicities as well, showed comparable features in their writing. In other words, the respondents observed that all students make similar errors when learning competency in composition, and that they are aware that their "habits deviate from Standard English usage" (p. 5). Although this analysis may have some merit, it does not explain why the respondents were able to identify the specific features of Africanized English without attributing the features, initially, to any other ethnic group, including white students.

A more general analysis of the respondents was cited in the written communication of African American students as the following:

- omission of past tense markers (absence of "ed");
- omission of possessive marker (absence of apostrophe "boy's hats");
- omission of plural marker (absence of "s" or "es");
- double subjects ("the boy he");
- sentence fragments (incomplete sentences);
- structures not parallel (inconsistent use of suffixes, such as "ing");
- comma splices (misplaced commas);

- lack of subject and verb agreement ("he give" for "he gives");
- phonological confusion stemming from homophonous words ("alone" for "along", "doing" for "during") (p. 5).

If, indeed, these were the criteria used to identify Africanized English features, the respondents are correct in their assessment that most students make similar errors when learning formal English. But the respondents fail to make the distinction between general errors and a groups' linguistic patterns. A more thorough study would have compared these features with what is perceived to be Africanized English features. Also, background on the origins of the language would have strengthened the study, and possibly informed those surveyed that these language patterns are embedded in the culture of African ancestry people.

Labov (1970) creates an illusion of the dynamics of Africanized English. On the surface, his theories seem relevant and can even be justified and supported. But further analysis shows that his theories are misconceptualized, that the features, reasons, and occurrences of Africanized English are over-simplified. Labov's critique of other researchers appears to be hypocritical and self-serving in nature. Labov's initial error is to label African English as "nonstandard" and proceed to note the vast differences between "standard," or formal English, and "nonstandard" Africanized English. Labov continues by enforcing that Africanized English "dialect" is an "extension" of the standard rules of English literacy (p. 40), as opposed to establishing that Africanized English is a legitimate, authentic linguistic system of its own. Labov asserts that "Nonstandard Negro English represents some radical departures from standard English, in that certain general rules of English are extended far beyond the environments and frequencies at which they operate in other dialects" (p. 41). This notion leads one to believe that Africanized English is "foreign" in concept to other "dialects," and not a legitimate system.

Labov continues by posing the question: Is nonstandard English illogical? (p. 46) Labov asserts that nonstandard and standard English have obvious surface differences, but

are "based upon the same underlying logical propositions" (p. 46-47), meaning, that both linguistic systems are logical. The author also reinforces the notion that an investigator's (reader's, educator's, observer's) preconceived notions and stereotypes of linguistic patterns can affect her analysis of verbal and logical capacities. Labov does make a valid assessment here in that Africanized English speakers have been ostracized for their use of their first language. But researcher's, such as Labov, must go further in their assumptions and legitimize Africanized English as not simply a "dialect," but as a language. The fear in doing so appears to be that if the language was legitimized, then other aspects of cultural significance must also be accounted for. Many researcher's and educator's are not yet willing to identify the importance and significance of Africanized English.

Mitchell-Kernan (1986) offers a theory of hope in the preservation and semantic representation of Africanized English:

> It is this focus in black culture--the necessity of applying sociolinguistic rules, in addition to the frequent appeal to shared background knowledge for correct semantic interpretation--that accounts for some of the unique character and flavor of black speech. Pure syntactical and lexical elaboration is supplemented by an elaboration of the ability to carefully and skillfully manipulate other components of the speech act in order to create new meaning (p. 179).

The focus in the speech will prove in accordance with the written communication, as well.

Challenges in Composition Writing

Hymes (1996) asserts the following, which may help to explain the challenges in written and spoken language:

> A major contribution of linguistics is to shed light on the relations between spoken and written uses of language, between oracy and literacy. When these problems came to the fore a decade or two ago, even some linguistics were subject to the culture's inherited simple-minded dichotomy between the two, as if oracy and literacy had each an inherent nature everywhere and always the same. It is now more common to speak plurally of *literacies*, and to recognize the shaping forces of cultural tradition and social occasion. Ethnopoetics [the verbal art of other societies] helps us to see more of what is there. It can bring to light kinds of

> organization in oral discourse not hitherto recognized. The vital point is that speech and writing may contrast, not only in terms of elementary units of composition, lines as opposed to sentences, but also in terms of larger units, verses and stanzas, as opposed to paragraphs. And where oral discourse shows only rudiments of such architecture, or presence of such architecture only in restricted circumstances, linguistics may offer evidence of social change and cultural loss. When schools seek to develop in students a personal voice in writing, they seek to reintroduce a capacity that through most of human history has come into being with mastery of speech itself (p. 182).

Baron (1975) examines the challenges African American students face in the composition classroom. The author examines the relationship between oral and written codes. She observes the "elitist" theory of formal English, and questions whether or not African American students are being told that the only way to succeed is to conform to formal English.

Baron suggests that the structure of oral communication consists of "speaker, message and audience" (p. 177). The "spoken code," the author asserts, is often less formal; thus, we expect less from the orator. Yet the written code is held at a much higher standard. In college composition courses, instructors assert that writing is a process; that by drafting and revising, writing skills should improve and the final product should reflect these skills. Role switching, where the author of the composition and reader "switch" roles, is fairly common in spoken codes. However, role switching in writing, Baron asserts, is more difficult as there may be a "delay" in message-to-response. Again, we think less of the orator; we can question the information provided by a speaker immediately after the information is spoken. But we more ardently scrutinize the writer; we have time to analyze and assess the information. If we cannot understand the writer, as instructors, we view the work questionably or negatively. In other words, we do not understand the *code*.

Baron suggests that "language is an efficient system, and communication will take place in a speech event...if the participants are able to reach a linguistic equilibrium"

(p. 178). If the writer and the reader are not on the same accord, or, rather, do not speak (write) the same language, the equilibrium is thrown off. The author asserts that *nonstandard* English speakers have more difficulty with concordance as they are not generally encouraged to use their language system in school or in life. They are generally forced to use formal English, which often times is their "second" language. Labov (1977) asserts that when nonstandard English speakers are thrust into conversation with a standard English speaker, the rules of the standard apply. This is not always the case, however. Hyper-correction (an exaggeration) may occur, but the shifting or switching may not interfere with the speakers' meaning. The rules of grammar, as Labov asserts, may not automatically shift to the "standard," yet the meaning could still be conveyed.

Baron asserts that Africanized English has been branded as the epitome of nonstandard English. The language is not only a legitimate system, but the author asserts that it is a "focus of social cohesion and ethnic pride" (p. 179) for African Americans. A challenge the African American writer faces, whether professional or academic, is "translating" the language into a written code which does not match his oral language. As the language is rule-governed and logical (p. 179), making the switch into another linguistic system can be a confusing and arduous task.

Baron acknowledges that language is a communication device of a people, a culture. Users of that language are able to convey the same kinds of information to other members of the community as speakers of formal English. Although there is no "linguistic" need to ignore or abandon one's native language in favor of formal English, the author asserts that there is much "social pressure" to do so (p. 179). The pressure can be seen in the composition classroom. The author notes that the written code is often emulated as a higher standard of communication, that students are required to "change their language or drop out" (p. 180); some authors assert that freshman composition is a "flunk out" or "weed out" course. It is no wonder that many the writing of *nonstandard* English users is under continued review and scrutiny by instructors.

Baron asserts that most people have a tendency to write as they speak; thus, the instructor must understand the difficulties students face in the translations of what can appear to be a "foreign language." Baron suggests that teachers should "focus the students' attention on the intelligibility requirements of the written code, rather than to attack the students' use of language" (p. 182). If the instructor understands what the student is trying to say, but observes errors in the mechanics of the piece, communication is made. Errors in the writing itself interfere with the meaning being conveyed. The author concludes by stating that "imprecise writing does not necessarily indicate imprecise thinking...assume the student has some control over what he is doing" (p. 183). She suggests a course geared toward practical uses of language, a course which could instill a sense of self-confidence in the student.

Baron makes a good point in asserting that composition courses are "expected to service courses for all departments" (p. 183). If the student cannot switch to the formal code in freshman composition, she will most likely have trouble in other courses as well. Baron's analysis of written and spoken codes is important in understanding the challenges African American students in composition classes face. Future research on how to help African American students transition their language to formal English without losing their meaning would be a helpful strategy. Also the author could have included a sample curriculum for instructors concerned with aiding students in learning formal English.

Rosu (1988) discusses the two layers of meaning in composition writing: the semantic, or abstract meaning, and the meaning which must be translated by the writer and interpreted by the reader. Like Baron, Rosu asserts the importance of teaching effective writing by first acknowledging the cultural differences of each student. In many ways, imposing the formal writing skills threatens the identity of the student if the instructor forces the student to change her meaning. When the students' writing is questioned (e.g., content of writing), so is the students' belief system, values, and in turn, identity.

Rosu finds that the meaning in writing is often produced, not by the writer, but the reader. Rosu wonders what happens when the writer's culture is different from the reader's, and if it is "justifiable to eradicate" the writer's culture and impose the reader's (banking methods). If writer and reader are not on the same accord, communication may be lost, and the result could have detrimental affects on the writer.

Rosu asserts that "most of these students may become failures because they do not understand what is required of them, but more importantly because they cannot make us understand what they think" (p. 3). Although both writer and reader (teacher and student) speak the English language, "communication is impaired" (p. 3), as if two completely separate languages are spoken. As mentioned earlier, many researchers have labeled those who speak two dialects as bidialectal. The breakdown in communication can lead to failure in writing courses, as they will lose confidence in themselves and their writing abilities. Rosu states, "Little do we care that the successful students have had to give up their values, habits of thought, their ways of expression, and with those, part of their creativity" (p. 3). What the author does not mention here is the student's sense of self, self concept and self esteem are also threatened. The students sacrifice themselves to conform to what the instructor wants, which is a reflection, most often, of the *instructor's* culture, which may be different from the student's culture.

In addition to devaluing the student's heritage, neglecting language may "silence the message" (p. 5). Rosu states that to instructors, "different" translates to "incorrect, substandard, bad language, and sometimes we do not hesitate to call it so" (p. 5). As a result, students resist instruction. Those most resistant, to Rosu, are African American students, especially those who believe they belong to another culture. This statement seems questionable, as to whether or not African American students realize that they have a different culture; they do realize that they are "different" in many ways. Rosu states the following: "They [African American students] are rarely told that they speak another language, for we call their English incorrect or substandard. Consequently, they need to

be made aware not only that they can translate, but that they have something to translate" (p. 6). The author could go further here by showing examples of ways in which English composition instructors can aid students in translating, or "switching," to formal English while maintaining and validating their linguistic system. Rosu suggests that instead of systematically correcting grammar orally, the instructors should also correct grammar in the writing students have produced as a way for the student to see the error and negotiate the meaning. It would be helpful for the author to provide an example of process because the manner in which the text is analyzed can be either productive or counterproductive. Slashing papers with red ink indicating grammatical, lexical and other errors is not an effective method. More exploration of motivational teaching strategies is needed.

Rosu asserts that "language is a complex phenomenon profoundly interrelated with the way we think about the world, the way we judge and value things. To speak a language means to belong to a culture and to have an identity" (p. 6). If the linguistic system is devalued, the research shows that the student's culture is also devalued. The author asserts that in order to teach effective writing, we much become better readers. The solution seems clear: more teacher training in the writing styles and process of bilingual, bidialectal, second-language and "nonstandard" writing of students in college composition courses is paramount.

Farr (1985) analyzes the difficulty students face when learning to write as opposed to learning to speak. She also questions whether or not "students from ethnic minority communities generally have even more difficulty in this process than middle-class, 'mainstream' students" (p. 195). Farr concludes that exploration of these issues is important because a framework is built on which future research on the "cultural aspects" of writing can be formulated, and "knowledge about variation in language, both oral and written, has significant implications of the teaching and learning of writing" (p. 195). Farr asserts the following:

> Writing is seen as one mode of language and as one way in which a language user can use his or her communicative competence. Furthermore, writing is seen not as a single entity (e.g., a single set of cognitive skills) that can be used in various contexts, but, rather, as a multifaceted way of using language, which in fact, is defined variously in different contexts (p. 217).

In formal English, there appears to be a "unified written standard" which is labeled "good" writing. On the other hand, nonstandard writing is labeled "bad." When we teach writing, Farr asserts, we are actually teaching a standard, which translates into "avoidance of nonstandard dialect features" (p. 200). By doing this, we impose our prescribed notions, beliefs, and values onto the students (banking methods) and ask the students to accept our views as their own. As mentioned before, students may choose to drop out because the personal sacrifices of conforming to another culture ('mainstream') are too costly.

Farr explains that there is a difference between writing and speaking, as "speaking is contextualized and writing is decontextualized and, therefore, more difficult to generate" (p. 202). Whereas nonstandard oral language is not accepted, or at least disregarded, written form is heavily scrutinized. Farr also notes that if these students are able to learn the communication system of their culture, they are equipped to learn formal English, both oral and written. The author cites "the way people use both oral and written language is inextricably bound up with other patterns characteristic of their culture" (p. 203). Understanding this, the writing instructor can better assess the differences in the way writing patterns of non-mainstream students develop.

Farr explores effective teaching methods for non-mainstream students. Studies have shown that more inclusive approaches to writing, incorporating a skills approach to the writing process, proves beneficial to students. Through specific instructions, meaningful interaction (which remains a questionable notion to the Researcher), student teacher conferences, and freewriting (e.g., in journals), the author asserts that students will learn the skills needed to "switch" to formal English writing. These effective methods reinforce the theory of writing as a form of language.

Farr's review considers many facets of both oral and written language, and considers effective teaching methods to help students switch to formal English. She recognizes that further study is needed to determine more effective approaches to writing. One consideration should be the homogeneity or heterogeneity of the populations studied. For instance, African American students in a predominately white classroom may have inhibitions with free thought in the writing process, as their linguistic system may have been ridiculed in the past. In such cases, the writing topic should be considered and framework provided which would generate responses from all students. Also, both oral and written exercises might be an effective tool in the writing process. All students can benefit from recognizing and evaluating code-switching in their writing, not merely students of color.

Fowler (1980) concludes that the "degree" to which speakers of Africanized English are users of the language influences "the amount of time spent on writing assignments, the number of words produced and the amount of translations from black dialect to standard English" (p. 186). If we determine that writing as a process is unique to each individual student, then the strategies applied by the students should be examined.

In a case study investigation, Fowler examined the writing behaviors of three "degrees" of African American student writing. Each degree represents that number of "predetermined" features which occur in a diagnostic composition. Fowler does not list the specific features, which would have strengthened this study. Fowler does, however, list the three degrees as follows: 1-2 features present--low dialect use; 3-5 features--moderate use; 6 and above--high usage. Fowler cites Bitton et al (1975) as outlining low, moderate, and high "nonstandard English composition in the transactual, expressive, and poetic modes" (p. 182). The students were examined in two stages: by observing their "prewriting" activities and their intellectual process. Subjects were assigned six compositions and were examined in terms of specific writing factors: time, revision, translation, fluency, omission, and production.

Fowler found that the low and moderate nonstandard English users had more ease with writing that the high dialect user. The low dialect user wrote more in less time whereas the high dialect user spent more time trying to write the "right" way, making more pauses in the writing process than the low dialect users. The low and moderate users seemed to make mental outlines before writing; most likely a form of prewriting. Fowler found that high dialect users "switched" back and forth between nonstandard and standard English while low dialect users switched less often. Both sets of students placed much emphasis upon "grammatical revisions," indicating awareness of features such as subject-verb agreement.

Fowler asserts that by examining the process of African American writers, researchers can determine what African American students actually do when they write rather than devaluing what they have written--their thoughts, analysis, and meaning.

Epps (1994) asserts that African American students are not being taught to write effectively in the English composition class. The author asserts that there is power in the written word, and that African American students are being denied access to this communication tool on a number of levels and for several reasons. The American educational system uses tactics similar to enslavement to prevent African American students from obtaining true literacy in the composition classroom, which affacts all other courses which require composition skills. True literacy "would necessitate an analysis of who we are and would point a critical finger at the continued racist and classist nature of America" (p. 155). Students learn enough to "get by," but are not encouraged to apply critical thinking skills which could propel their overall performances in the composition classroom. Students, instead, are subjugated to inferior standards of development and disillusionment. Epps cites Woodson (1933) who refers to "controlling a man's thinking" as a way of controlling his actions. Writing has been the main source of this control: "composition is the gatekeeper of the inequities perpetuated in the American system" (p. 155).

Epps maintains that those in the English profession believe composition, a "skills-oriented, grammar course," equips students with the means to succeed in society. Yet this elitist view of writing has served as a catalyst for maintaining class and race divisions in the educational system. Whereas privileged, white youth are encouraged to express ideas and thoughts, African American students have been told that their ideas are not worth sharing. Composition, then, "is one of the most effective instruments in perpetuating an oppressed and impoverished status in society" (p. 156). The main purpose of writing courses is invariably lost as students search for their "fit" in the composition classroom. Epps suggests that in order for students to succeed in composition courses, the following must occur:

> It is crucial that we develop within our students critical thinking skills and a respect for their own personal experience and those of their people as well as create opportunities for self-development. Unless writers believe that they have something worthwhile and important to say, unless they feel that they are important enough to say it, and unless they have faith that saying it will somehow make a difference, they may see--and justifiably so--no real need to put forth the kind of effort required to improve their ability in writing (p. 156).

Epps asserts that "the language black students speak and write is thought to be deficient" (p. 157). If African American students' language reflects their culture, devaluing the language invariably devalues the whole student, not simply their writing. Invalidating the language of students invalidates the students. Such invalidation is yet another way of oppressing African American students in the classroom.

Epps reinforces the need to encourage and validate all students, especially students who have been historically oppressed in the composition classroom. One suggestion Epps mentions is to focus on the ideas, or rather, meaning, in student writing, and less on the skills. If students feel that they have something to say (write) and that their voices will be heard, they will be more motivated to grasp the skills needed to write more effectively. But if composition instructors continue to apply racist, separatist tactics, stemming from

slavery, in the classroom, African American students will continue to lose the battle of mastering the skills needed to succeed in American society.

One of the significant challenges Africanized English speakers face in the composition classes is invalidation of their linguistic system by those analyzing their work. Many educators continue to view Africanized English as a "dialect" and not as a legitimate linguistic system. Some educators do recognize and can note specific features in African American student writing, which shows familiarity with the language. In some cases, this recognition could serve as validation for the language system; however, with Africanized English, recognition of the features of the language does not, in the minds of many educators, validate the language.

Walker (1977) conducted a study in the Southern Regional Education Board locale, using questionnaires to analyze educators' attitudes toward "Black English" and the instructional programs developed to aid students in writing more effectively. In a survey of seventy-seven respondents, Walker asked what factors contribute to what is perceived as "deficiencies" in African American students' communication skills. One group surveyed contributed attitudes, where the students resent the "established" language. Another group mentioned societal factors, that students who possess different linguistic patterns are viewed as suffering a "communication deficiency" (p. 6). Yet another group asserted that "inexperience with the more literate segments of society" (p. 6) is a major contributing factor to communication difficulties. Eighty percent of the respondents mentioned that they would use all available resources and methods (e.g., reading, listening, drills both spoken and written, laboratory exercises, etc.) which would focus on improving the communication skills of African American students. These methods would include redesigning English programs at the institutional level and encouraging all faculty to help develop programs which would prove useful to students in their communication development. Many respondents reflected that an increasing number

of students from all ethnicities are experiencing communication difficulties; thus, more effective instruction techniques must be implemented for all students.

Although eighty percent of the respondents in Walker's survey recognized Africanized English as a structured system of language, there continues to exist a hesitancy to completely validate the language. The respondents were reluctant to identify the linguistic system with the term "Black English" since "even though they recognize Black English as being legitimate, 60 percent believe that speaking Black English interferes with the development of Standard English skills" (p. 8). Thus, students are restricted to use their language outside of the classroom and, most likely, away from "professional" or other scholastic environments. What these respondents fail to realize is that Africanized English can be used as a learning tool for students. Their language can be used as a transitional model which would enable students to maintain their language while learning a more formal register. Recognition of the language is the first step; utilizing the features of the language is the next.

Walker asserts that there exists a conceptualization of the challenges faced by African American students who have not obtained formal English skills and the potential impact such difficulties can have on academic progress: "It is important also to realize that the students' attitude toward themselves and toward society are major considerations in the acquisition of Standard English skills" (p. 8).

Walker's study did not emphasize the need to recognize the students' culture. We must be mindful that the study of language is also the study of a people's culture. Ascribing the term "bad" to a language attributes that ideal to the culture. We must recognize the whole student, meaning, both the language and the culture, in order to adequately confront the numerous challenges African American students face in an ever-changing educational system.

Composition Teaching Strategies

Creating more effective teaching strategies for college composition courses can be a time-consuming and arduous task, especially if the instructor is unfamiliar with the specific needs of each individual student and the needs of the class as a whole. Regardless of the difficulty in exercising this task, teaching strategies should be modified to recognize the changing educational environment. Academe is no longer comprised of European men only. Today, students from various ethnicities are now included in the educational process. The plethora of cultures included in the educational system includes many different linguistic systems. Not all students have been taught formal English. More importantly, those students who have been taught formal English may have been forced to use this language instead of their own. A more effective, inclusive approach should be to, (1) understand that different linguistic systems exist, (2) validate and legitimize those linguistic systems, (3) aid the student in learning, adding, or transitioning to formal English without forcing the student to lose her meaning, and (4) reinforce to students that the ability to switch back and forth between two or more linguistic systems could be an important learning tool. Campbell (1994) asserts that teachers must be careful not to homogenize or devalue students, as doing so would threaten their identity and negatively affect their learning process. A noteworthy point is that the instructor can use a code-switching strategy to aid all students, using a variety of code-switching examples from various ethnicities as an instructional tool in learning English skills.

In order to aid students, instructors could attempt to assess the students' needs early in the semester, which will benefit both instructor and student throughout the course. The Researcher has developed a method which helps her identify students' needs sooner rather than later. The Researcher has found that a series of "diagnostics" give the Researcher an idea of where the students are scholastically at the beginning of the semester. As some students have had more preparation for academic writing than others, the Researcher's method aids in detecting potential problems students could encounter in

freshman English composition. Since freshman composition is the main feeder writing course for other departments on campus, early detection of potential difficulties in writing is important. Again, early analysis services both the instructor and the student, and could ultimately increase the students' productivity in other courses, as well.

The Researcher uses what she calls the Lewis Model, a three-part assessment of the students' preparation for freshman English composition. These three parts consist of: (1) a syllabus examination, (2) an in-class, timed essay examination, and (3) a two-page written essay. The Researcher uses these components not only to test the preparedness of her composition students, but also to check for evidence of code-switching in the students' writing early in the semester.

The purpose of administering a syllabus examination is to establish an agreement between the instructor and the student. The syllabus is a "contract" between student and instructor, which establishes and outlines the course requirements, objectives, methods of instruction, grading policies, and so forth (APPENDIX C). If the student passes the syllabus examination, the assumption is that the student understands what is required of her in the course and the guidelines which she must follow in order to succeed in the course. Although the writing itself is not closely examined, the instructor looks for evidence of code-switching. The Researcher has witnessed several occurrences of code-switching in syllabus examinations. This examination also gives the instructor an idea of how well students can prepare for memorization-type examinations.

The second component in this series is an in-class, timed essay examination which allows the instructor to analyze the students' preparedness for timed-essay examinations. This component is a critical piece in assessing whether students can read a document, interpret the meaning, critically analyze the information, compose an outline to focus their ideas, use the author's ideas to support their analysis, think of possible topics for the examination, and finally, write an effective essay in a limited amount of time. The Researcher assigns a brief reading assignment (APPENDIX D) most students can relate

to, and gives the students study guidelines for the examination (APPENDIX F). On the day of the examination, the instructor hands out the essay topic in class (APPENDIX E), a clean copy of the reading assignment, and an additional set of instructions. In reviewing the results of the examination, the instructor can analyze how prepared students are for timed-essay examinations (e.g., the final examination) and also test for code-switching. The instructor can then document areas in which students are proficient and areas of concern.

The final element in the Lewis Model is the two-page essay. The essay topic is usually as basic as "Why I Chose Community College," as the Researcher is a community college instructor. This topic generally evokes eagerness in the students as they are rarely asked to examine their directions in life. This topic gives students an open forum in which to examine themselves and their goals. This topic often relaxes the students, as opposed to assigning a topic which requires, for instance, research at the beginning of the semester. The instructor can use these essays to teach acceptable writing format, the difference between personal (subjective) and objective essays, and the importance of voicing one's experiences. The instructor can also check for evidence of code-switching, which is frequently detectable in preliminary work. This essay does not need to be graded; instead, the instructor can use this piece as a springboard to discuss more effective writing, addressing both the strengths and weaknesses of the students' writing at the beginning of the term. Again, the instructor can document evidence of code-switching which occurs at the beginning of the term and reflect on these initial findings later in the term. Showing the overall improvement to the students could help build their confidence and motivational levels.

If students perform satisfactorily on all three parts of the Lewis Model, the Researcher concludes that they are ready to take the course. If a student performs poorly in one area, but scores satisfactorily in the other two areas, the Researcher may assume that the student has not had adequate preparation in that area. If the student performs

poorly in two or more areas of the Model, the Researcher confirms that the student is not ready for college composition.

The Lewis Model, although new, is a promising procedure for freshman composition instructors, as well as instructors in other disciplines, to assess the readiness of their students. The Model also allows students to determine their own readiness for freshman composition. Although many institutions give instructors autonomy in ultimately deciding if students are prepared for their classes, students could challenge this process, especially if they have already passed the institution's assessment/placement test, or if they passed the prerequisite class which enables them to advance to the next level. Regardless of the challenges, instructors know the importance of being prepared for advanced instruction. As freshman composition is a rigorous course, preliminary work is advisable.

The Lewis Model was created to detect possible writing challenges early in the semester. The Researcher plans to seek validation from three experts in the fields of linguistics, English, and research, for validation of the Model's content validity and construct validity. The Researcher did not use the Lewis Model in this study, but included this description of the Model as an example of an effective teaching strategy.

Campbell (1994) cautions that English instructors should tread lightly before criticizing the students' home language. She asserts that the instructor who does so, "has a greater risk of alienating and offending than a chance of gaining enthusiastic participation and acceptance" (p. 8). Campbell believes that acknowledging the students' home linguistic system while encouraging proficiency in formal English promotes empowerment and freedom of expression, two powerful tools in academic growth and success. Campbell also mentions that encouraging such "code-switching" will also benefit the instructor struggling with teaching in diverse environments.

Campbell asserts that the ethnic identity of students could be threatened if the home language is ignored:

> The threat of homogenization and loss of identity emerges as motivation for not only the retention of, but pride in, the identity by non-standard speech. This creates a set of reasons for the continued use of BE [Black English], and a conflict for these who choose to utilize SE [Standard English] (p. 9).

Campbell reinforces the fact that if students are not validated in their scholastic environments by the instructor, their performances, as well as their feelings about themselves, could be jeopardized:

> As long as students feel that the school environment not only does not understand them but also does not value them, they will not be inclined to remain in the negative atmosphere. In schools such as the [school in the study], where the potential drop-out criteria identify nearly half the entire student body, a significant part of the teachers' responsibility is for acknowledgment and validation of individual significance" (p.12).

Campbell's analysis focuses on de-stigmatizing Africanized English and incorporating formal English in a less offensive manner. Campbell reinforced the notion that acquisition of formal English is imperative to the academic success of students, but devaluing the home language is not necessary, not required, and does more harm to the performance and esteem of students. In essence, Campbell applies teaching methods which reinforce code-switching as a significant learning tool for African American students. Campbell's analysis assumes the following:

- A validation of the students' home dialect as well as the commonly accepted standard dialect;
- A recognition of the right to use the home dialect;
- Encouragement to fully develop the ability to change register between the home dialect and standard English (p. 15).

Using a school with a large African American students population (81 percent) and a low retention rate, Campbell used twenty-one students in a speech and debate class to openly discuss the roles and implications of both Africanized English and formal English.

Campbell found that acknowledgment of the home linguistic system helped students recognize their personal value and strengths; thus, creating more confident students.

Although there exist several strategies used to aid student performance in composition, recognizing the specific needs of students is most important. As revealed earlier, African American students have needs different from other groups. In order for these needs to be met, more innovative, constructive teaching methodology must be explored.

Bibb (1994) suggests a feedback-oriented approach to assist students. Bibb asserts that if students co-operate with this strategy, it works ninety five percent of the time. Along with student participation, Bibb admits that teacher endurance level must also be high. Bibb asserts that a combination of written comments on mechanics and content, student-written responses to instructor's verbal comments in individual sessions, and verbal comments to the entire class (p. 239) are also useful strategies in promoting more effective writing.

Bibb found that this interactive strategy helps students control writing while giving them the freedom to explore language usage. This process also allows the instructor to better understand the students' meaning by their comments and suggestions, helps to clarify the instructor's comments, and helps to increase the critical rapport between student and instructor "for the sake of learning and thinking critically" (p. 240).

Perry (1994) asserts, "to deny the students' language is to deny the student, for language is a major part of one's total self" (p. 73). Three criteria listed as important in learning formal English while validating the students are the following:

- The willingness for change at all educational levels;
- Instructors knowledgeable about language learning and programs should evaluate these educational techniques; and
- Students must consider "some alternate ways of communicating to a wider audience now and for the rest of their lives" (p. 73).

Perry could have gone further here and offered ways of identifying specific features in the language in order to assess the specific needs of students.

Fowler (1980) suggests that prewriting activities can be beneficial to speakers, and writers, of Africanized English. The more time spent on the writing process can yield more attention to writing in a more formal style acceptable for academic work. Fowler implies that the greater the degree to which non-standard English speakers use the language, the more they will tend to write in that language; thus, more time (meaning the process of prewriting, actual time spent writing, or a combination of both) should be allowed to the students for development of compositions. Instructors should be particularly aware when assigning timed writing exams, as Africanized English users generally struggle with how to put their thoughts on paper the "right" way. This notion is also true for all students.

Fowler suggests that instructors should consider not only time factors (encouraging freewriting to reduce anxiety; drama activities to provide ideas for writing), but revision factors, which encourage students to grasp the "meaning" first, then tackle grammatical features. Methods which could be applied here are freewriting, subjective emphasis (tone, style, audience), and sentence-combining exercises (p. 184). Fowler also mentions translation factors, or rather, code-switching by Africanized English speakers. Fowler asserts that more switching will occur with students who are "high" dialect users than with "low" users. Fowler, again, suggests freewriting and role-playing, in which the student must converse in formal English. Fowler suggests that students can use "thought groups," which focus on word groups, to increase fluency in writing, and peer evaluation exercises to decrease omissions (e.g. words, phrases, etc.) commonly found in African American students writing.

Bowie and Bond (1994) believe that teachers' attitudes must change toward speakers of Africanized English. A change in attitude could prove a critical first step in creating more effective teaching strategies. Seventy-five pre-service teachers from an

urban university were asked their attitudes towards Africanized English, the usefulness of the language, and the reactions to accepting and applying the language in a school setting. It is noteworthy that eighty-six percent of the participants were white, ninety-two percent were women. The results of the study were astonishing. Using the Language Attitude Scale (LAS), the researchers measured both favorable and negative responses. The majority of the respondents reacted negatively toward the sound of Africanized English (75%) while a large percentage also stated that the language operated under a "faulty" grammatical system. Although the respondents agreed that rejecting the students' native language could prove harmful to the students, the majority consistently preferred formal English. Exposure to the topic of Africanized English seemed to influence the respondents; more exposure seemed to yield more favorable responses to the acceptance of Africanized English. The authors admit that "in spite of decades of research supporting the legitimacy of the Black English dialect, attitudes toward Black English have yet to improve greatly" (p. 115). As traditional teacher education has not made a significant enough impact on teacher's attitudes, the authors assert, further study of multicultural education approaches might be useful. A more enlightened teaching force could help redefine "standard," appropriate, and acceptable.

Alexander (1985) reinforces the theory that early detection of writing challenges is the key to student effectiveness in the composition classroom: "It is a good idea to get writing samples from students early in the school year and analyze them for the linguistic features which should be taught" (p. 26). Alexander concludes by asserting that students cannot learn formal English unless they are taught, meaning English educators must go further in recognizing writing challenges of all students and develop strategies to teach all students the constructions of formal English.

Hunt (1985) suggests peer critique as a way to generate beneficial results from African American college composition writers. Hunt asserts that peer evaluation and "criticism as well as student/teacher conferences have proved successful as a component"

in the composition class. Students are able to examine not only their own writing behaviors, but also the writing behaviors and strategies of other students. The method seems logical for any composition class, regardless of the ethnic population of the class. A more effective approach would be to incorporate code-switching strategies to aid students in learning formal English competency.

Ramsey (1985) makes interesting observations on how to teach, and how not to teach, Africanized English speakers. Ramsey found that the question was not how to teach Africanized speakers to write, but how to teach any student to write. The author asserts that the issue with Africanized English users is not so much a "dialect" problem as it is a "writing" problem. According to the author, writing problems of African American students are often assumed to be attributed to dialect use, as opposed to severe writing problems with their thesis statement (controlling idea) and organization, for instance. English instructors will use this argument in an effort to "not" teach African American students formal English, attesting that "they," "them," "Black students" have dialect problems and cannot learn formal English. Instructors will use this idea as an excuse not to teach the "exotic" African American student. Ramsey ascribes such rationale to racist theories, which are seen in the volumes of literature which have surfaced and continues to surface on "Black dialect" speakers.

Ramsey asserts that the goal is not necessarily to change the attitudes of African American students toward Africanized English use, but to change the attitudes of the white students, those students who will be in positions of power, of whom African American students "will need to speak and write for" (p. 160).

Ramsey concludes with the idea of respecting dialects. The idea of universal respect for all "dialects" is "revolutionary," as the author asserts, but unlikely. The author reinforces the need to teach students, all students, to write more effectively. The problem is that Africanized English users have not been taught; therefore, these students have no leverage on which to strengthen their skills. Not only do we need to teach students

effective writing skills, but we also need to validate the students' first linguistic system. We need to take this idea one step further, as well, and incorporate strategies geared toward aiding Africanized English speakers in transitioning their writing to formal English without requiring or forcing them to lose their intended meaning.

In an effort to de-conceptualize the "invisible" rules, conditions, and features of "appropriate," formal English communication, Hindman (1993) developed six strategies to aid students in communicative effectiveness:

- Use of genres assessable to the student population of the course.
- Adapt your [the instructor] approach according to the roles you [the instructor] can play and that your students can also assume.
- With students, develop vocabulary that delineates different aspects of issues of race.
- Reverse the fore- and background of discussions on racism.
- Capitalize on "commutative trouble" as a means of exposing implicit rules governing appropriate terminology.
- Create writing assignments that require students to situate themselves and their reading and writing assignments in context (pp. 4-11).

Hindman asserts that "the evaluation and appropriateness of any particular style is not 'universal' or 'obvious' or 'national' but rather culturally bound" (p. 14), meaning that evaluators of writing should consider the "whole" student and address students' needs appropriately.

Royster (1985) asserts that educators have the charge of developing innovative approaches and strategies to teach writing at the college level. Royster mentions that the system has been at fault in the labeling process of African American students, ascribing the "nonstandard," "atypical," "different" titles to African American students. In fact, African American students are different, their economic, social, epistemological experiences are historically different from other students. The author asserts, however, that although these factors should be considered, the more pressing problem of moving beyond the past,

increasing the writing skills of African American students, and developing effective writing strategies should be central issues. The author asserts that although much literature had been published in the 1960s and 1970s supporting the language and features of African American students' speech and writing, the research does not go far enough as African American students continue to struggle with composition writing. This theory assumes that either the data is wrong, or the information is inaccurate. The author proposes that educators and researchers explore further the dynamic of effective writing as we do not yet know enough to make accurate assessments.

Royster, as with other authors, contributes the following suggestions for more effective writing from African American students, and all students. Royster acknowledges that "if students are not able to write effectively, then perhaps it's time to change the perspectives. Perhaps it's time to redefine the parameters, to take a closer look at our own discipline and a closer look at ourselves to see if perhaps some of the coordinates which have been programmed into current mechanisms might not be wrong" (p. 162). The author suggests the following strategies: finding out who the students are and the mechanisms previously used and redirect and expand the development of strategies, encouraging students to formulate questions about the material presented, brainstorming activities, drafting and revising, and peer evaluation.

Royster asserts the following regarding process-oriented strategy:

> The fundamental point to be made is that a process-oriented approach to the development of the writing skills of black students has the same potential that it has for the skill development of other students. If we do indeed move in this direction, what we will have to acknowledge first is that even though black students may be different from other students in a variety of ways, the process for educating them may be essentially the same as the process for students in general. We, then, might be in a position to stop identifying black students as forever atypical and to start concentrating our attention on the pressing battle to determine how children with all of their individual differences learn--and how and when we as educators can intervene positively in the learning process (p. 166).

Royster continues by asserting the following:

As educators concerned with academic excellence for all, if we can stretch beyond customary limits...if we can find ways of looking which nurture and sustain the minds placed in our charge, if we can reorder priorities, readjust perspectives, broaden concepts and definitions of the who, what, how, where, and why of skill development, maybe our theoretical frameworks can serve us better so that the strategies which grow out of them can be more productive in eliciting from any student the types of writing behaviors which we find more acceptable (p. 166).

Summary

There is much literature attesting to the language usage, both oral and written, of African American students, as well as all students at the college level. Researchers concerned with exploring the code-switching dynamic in freshman composition offer substantial support for furthering the research needed for aiding students with their written communication. Not much research has been done regarding code-switching in freshman English composition; much more research is needed. An important starting point rests in the notion of more effective teaching practices, acknowledging the "whole" students, including the students' historical background, the students' preparation for college writing, and the specific strategies which could aid students in transitioning to formal English without losing their meaning and without devaluing their linguistic system if different from formal English. As Fanon (1967) asserts, "To speak a language is to take on a world, a culture" (p. 38). Several authors have made varying suggestions, from an oral history approach (Bradford and Taylor, 1985), to a folk literature method (Anderson, 1985). As all students "switch" to a certain degree, further research on this topic is important. Current research suggests that more effective teaching strategies for college composition are needed in order to promote equity in the classroom and beyond. These research findings presented offer both support and hope for future research. As Hindman and Robinson (1994) report, "If we want to use the composition classroom as a place to acknowledge that all voices are accented and to welcome those accents into the room, then we need to re-define what we do therein" (p. 11). Following careful review of the literature, quasi-experimental research design was developed to answer the Research Questions. Chapter III, the Methodology, will provide a detailed description of the methodology used in this study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The methodology for this quantitative study was quasi-experimental research design, assessing the occurrence of code-switching in student composition writing and the effective teaching strategies which will assist students in switching to formal English without devaluing their "first" linguistic system. Quasi-experimentation enabled the Researcher to measure the occurrence of code-switching in the composition writing of freshman students, allowing the Researcher to implement effective teaching strategies, both written and oral, to help students recognize when and why they have code-switched, and to aid students in developing writing of a standard which is acceptable at the collegiate level. The teaching ultimately aided students in developing effective writing for all courses in which they needed to utilize written communication.

Stouffer (1950) and Campbell (1957) define quasi-experimentation as:

> Experiments that have treatments, outcome measures, and experiment units, but do not use random assignment to create the comparisons from which treatment-caused change is inferred. Instead, the comparisons depend on nonequivalent groups that differ from each other in many ways other than the presence of a treatment whose effects are being tested (p. 6).

Usually in quasi-experiments, only the effects of the treatment are of importance to the Researcher; thus, the challenge of this research was to make explicit "the irrelevant causal forces" seem "unimportant"" or at least "hidden," within the realm of random assignment. Quasi-experimentation yielded important results in student code-switching. The specific design for this study was the following: Interrupted Time Series with a Nonequivalent No-treatment Control Group quasi-experimental design (Cook and Campbell, 1979). This specific design yielded more accurate results, controlling for many threats to internal and

external validity while providing time to assess fully the occurrence of student code-switching over a series of class periods.

The aim of using quasi-experimentation was to show the occurrence of code-switching in the writing of students in freshman composition, that code-switching does occur, and that students may not be aware when or why it occurs. The Researcher taught students what code-switching is, when it occurs, and that using one's "first" language in order to initially grasp an idea, theme, or concept in order to write is acceptable and an important learning tool. For scholastic writing, however, students must "switch" to formal English. Quasi-experimentation methodology served to identify and teach the concept of code-switching while urging the retention of the first language and the improvement of formal English. After the treatments, students were able to recognize their own code-switching and transition to formal English without losing their language or their meaning.

Research Design

The purpose of this study was threefold: (1) to address and identify code-switching in the writing of freshman English composition students, (2) to help students identify their own code-switching in their written assignments, and (3) to apply effective teaching strategies to assist students in learning formal English without devaluing their first language, and without forcing the students to lose or change their meaning in the transitional process.

Independent Variables

This study used several independent variables to affect student writing. The first variable was the teaching of code-switching to freshman composition students. The Researcher manipulated this variable as needed for the study. The goal was to develop the most effective strategy to teach the conventions of formal English. The next two variables

are what the Researcher taught and how she taught. The Researcher used features of both written and oral language students have the most difficulty grasping, such as noun-verb agreement and usage, grammar, lexicon/word choice, pronoun usage, and syntax. The Researcher taught both phonology and morphology since the two features are important in composition instruction.

Dependent Variables

This study used several dependent variables, including the measure of student composition writing. The Researcher analyzed how the writing improved, if the writing improved, and if so, why the writing improved. The Researcher also analyzed what factors or elements in the writing improved.

Procedures and Instrumentation

Procedures

Quasi-experimental design was used for this descriptive research study. The Researcher did a study of the semantic component in writing, or rather, an analysis based on the students' "meaning" in the writing process. When instructors look at the meaning level of writing, they look at all identifying markers, e.g. grammar, word choice, word arrangement, essay organization, overall competence, etc. Recognizing these markers will help instructors identify when students switch. Instructors can then devise strategies to help students use their language to switch to formal English. The Researcher and two classroom instructors administered the procedures connected to the code-switching treatment; the classroom instructors administered both Pretest and Posttest. The Researcher served as an observer during the Pretest and Posttest and had no personal contact with the subjects. The instructor of each section was the contact person for the study.

The Researcher and instructors collaboratively developed specific essay topics which promoted and encouraged code-switching features. These topics were as follows:

1. Pretest: Goals for the future
2. Experiment #1: Where do you see yourself ten years from now?
3. Experiment #2: If you were informed that you only had one month to live, what would you do?
4. Experiment #3: How much money do you think you would need to earn in order to survive in society today?
5. Posttest: What are the three greatest pressures facing youth today?

At no time did the Researcher touch or have any personal, individual contact with the students before, during, or after the study. Only the students' writing was reviewed.

Because of the nature of the study, it was not necessary for the students to give consent. The purpose of using quasi-experimentation was to analyze code-switching in a natural scholastic environment. If the students (subjects, respondents) were aware that their writing was being analyzed for non-scholastic purposes, or rather, reasons separate from their regular classroom, the results could have been impaired, and the purpose of the study would have been jeopardized. The students were not made aware of the nature of the study; their grades were not affected by this study in any way, unless the individual instructor chose to use the essays for his or her own purposes. As a result, the students did not encounter potential stress.

All three instructors decided to use a few of the essays for their own classroom purposes. Both instructors of the Experiment Groups used at least two of the essays for classroom revision exercises. The Control Group instructor used the essays as journal entries in which students received credit for doing the assignment. In no way did the Researcher's experiment, participation, or data collection disrupt or influence the students' grades in the composition courses.

The Researcher maintained human subject confidentiality by using a matrix system, the Chart of student code-switching, which lists the students ethnicities as well as the occurrence of code-switching patterns, to identify the students involved in this study. The instructors administered the Pretest and Posttest; the Researcher had no personal contact with the subjects. The Researcher hid the names of the students by using the symbol-matrix, or Chart of code-switching features. The Researcher covered students' names with colored tabs in order to identify subjects and hide names. The tabs identified the initials of the students only, not the ethnicities of the students. Dr. Reed, Control Group instructor and Chairman of the Department of Humanities, gave the Researcher three complete class lists representing both Experiment Groups and the Control Group. He also identified the ethnicities of the students. The subjects' initials were included as a way to prevent human error in identification of the students. Using a black marker, the Researcher covered names after double-checking the attendance roster. A colored tab was placed over the concealed name and the initial of the student was marked. After completing this task, the Researcher placed rosters in a sealed envelope, further protecting the identity of the subjects.

After confidentiality was assured, the Researcher examined the occurrence of code-switching at all phases of the study (Pretest, Time-series treatment, Posttest). Since the Researcher did not use the college at which she instructs, the chance of any future contact with the subjects was lessened, further protecting the identity and confidentiality of human subjects. The Researcher will never know the true identities of the subjects, as she did not make the connection between the names (initials) and the actual students. The Researcher does not predict any discomforts to the subjects, including effects on the students' grade in the class. The Researcher's study will not negatively affect the students' overall grade, but may, instead, aid students in improving their writing performance.

Instrumentation

The instrument to be used in the study is a code-switching chart of features frequently observed in the writing of African American students (APPENDIX G). The five features observed are: Subject-verb agreement and usage, grammatical usage, lexicon/word choice, pronoun usage, and syntax. These features were selected by the Researcher due to the frequency of their misuse in freshman composition writing and from the information discussed in Chapter II, the Review of the Literature. In addition to the features, information is provided which includes samples of African American student writing, samples of formal English, and possible reasons for code-switching. The second part of the Chart is a symbol matrix for Pretests, experiments, and Posttests for Group A (Experimental #1) and Group B (Experimental #2), and Group C (Control). Charts L through Z (APPENDICES) records student information and observed code-switching features outlined in APPENDIX G (the Chart of code-switching).

Validity and Reliability

Validity

Threats to Internal Validity

According to Campbell and Stanley (1963), the following are potential threats to the internal validity in experiments or quasi-experiments. The Researcher attempted to controlled for each variable which might have affected the results of her experiment.

History

Campbell and Cook (1979) assert that "the ability to test for the threat of history is the major strength of the control group time-series design" (p. 215). Overall, the subjects involved in this study were not involved in an additional English writing course; therefore, other unique circumstances affecting student performance were not likely. However, the

Researcher has found that the more frequently students write, the more effective their writing becomes--they tend to improve their overall skills over time. Over the duration of the experiment, some students may have improved for reasons unrelated to the code-switching treatment. An important point, however, is that since the Groups were comparable (summer school classes at the same community college), the historical threat is lessened (Campbell and Cook, 1979).

Maturation

Maturation of students did not occur, a fact which reduced the threat to internal validity. Campbell and Stanley (1963) assert that over time, students may become more physically, socially, and intellectually capable, which could affect the study. Therefore, the Researcher narrowed the duration of the study to one month, as opposed to one full semester or one full academic year. Also included in this component are the negative affects of maturation: fatigue, stress, discouragement, and so forth. Therefore, maturation, as opposed to the code-switching treatment, could not account for better student writing skills. The Researcher controlled for this threat by not prolonging the experiment, meaning, one summer session, as opposed to two, yielded the required data needed to assess the occurrence of code-switching.

Testing

Borg, Gall and Gall (1993) assert that the time ratio between Pretest and Posttest is important to control. Also, "if the pretest and posttest are similar, students may show an improvement on the posttest simply as a result of their experience with the pretest; that is, they become 'test-wise'" (p. 301). The Researcher controlled for this threat by choosing different essay topics for both the Pretest and Posttest. Otherwise, students could have used the written comments from the Pretest and simply revised according to the instructor's suggestions. As a result, the Researcher may not have been able to

determine if the improvements in student writing were due to the experiments or the Pretest assignment. Regardless of whether the students remembered the Pretest essay topic, the Posttest topic was different, which controlled for this variable.

Instrumentation

There was no foreseeable reason why the instrumentation in this study should change. After the Pretest, the Researcher had a better idea of the specific code-switching features which occur in student writing. The selected features (APPENDIX G) have occurred consistently in the Researcher's composition classes. In addition, the analysis of the Literature Review confirms these selected features as representative of Africanized English usage. A threat to the validity of instrumentation can be affected if the instrument changes, but this did not occur. Since both the Experimental Groups #1 and #2 and Control Group were comparable, no change of instrumentation was needed. Detailed in Chapter IV, The Findings, is the instrument used for this study, the Scale for Evaluating Expository Writing, or the SEEW. As Campbell and Cook (1979) assert, "threats to internal validity are more problematic the less comparable the groups" (p. 216).

Statistical Regression

Campbell and Cook (1979) mention that "Given a no treatment control series, the possibility of differential regression can be simply explored by seeing if there is an immediate pretreatment shift in one series but not in the other" (p. 216). If there is not, the author asserts, then regression is not a threat. The Researcher tested for regression (e.g., pretreatment shift in Experiment Group #1 but not in Experiment Group #2), but did not experience any shift which could affect the study.

Differential Selection

The Researcher controlled for differential selection by not specifically selecting students for the experiment. Three random classrooms were selected; the only criteria needed for this study was that the subjects were Freshman composition students. Subjects did not need to meet any other specific criteria. Borg, Gall and Gall (1993) assert that "the researchers need to select experimental and control groups that do not differ except for exposure to the experiment treatment" (p. 302). Experiment Groups #1 and #2 and the Control Group were comparable in that all students are in Freshman English composition.

Selection-Maturation Interaction

Students were not specifically selected for this study; thus, the Control Group time-series controlled for this threat. There was no differential selection.

Experimental Mortality (Attrition)

Mortality was the most consequential threat to this study. Freshman students usually have a lower attrition rate than other students. Threats could have arisen if several students dropped the course. The Researcher had no control over student attrition. The Researcher controlled for this threat, in a sense, by selecting summer school courses for the study. Students who attend summer school usually persist because they are attempting to transfer to a four-year institution, and summer classes are generally shorter than those courses held during the regular school year. If Experiment Group #1 lost a significant number of African American students and Experiment Group #2 remained the same, the results of the study could have been jeopardized. Fortunately, this situation did not occur. All three classes remained fairly consistent; during the experimental process, some White and Asian students did drop the classes, but the number was not substantial enough to affect the results of the study. The Researcher carefully tallied the number of students

participating at the beginning of the experiment with the number of students at the end. No African American students dropped the courses, but some European American and Asian American students dropped the courses.

Threats to External Validity

Population Validity

Borg, Gall and Gall (1993) assert that "population validity is determined by examining evidence of the similarity among the *sample* used in the study, the *accessible population* from which the research was drawn, and the *target population* to which the research results are to be generalized" [sic] (p. 303). The Researcher controlled for this variable because all populations were the same.

Personological Variables

This threat relates to results of the study which "apply to subjects with certain characteristics but not to subjects with other characteristics" (Borg, Gall and Gall, 1993, p. 304). The code-switching method was more effective for some students, less effective for others. The purpose of this study was to identify the code-switching behaviors of African American students, so certain characteristics or features in the writing of African American students were evident to the Researcher, but not as evident to the students, which proved most helpful to the Researcher. The Researcher controlled for this variable by giving code-switching examples from other ethnicities, as well, writing which exhibited code-switching features similar to Africanized English, making the treatment more effective.

Ecological Validity

The Researcher controlled for this threat by being consistent with the students' environment. The assigned classrooms did not change; thus, the environment was not a threat. The only noticeable occurrence during the study which could have affected the

results of the study dealt with an uncontrollable mosquito infestation. The instructors and a maintenance worker tried to eradicate the problem to no avail. The students adjusted, but some might have rushed through their writing assignment due to the insect problem. The Researcher does not believe that this situation was significant enough to disrupt the study.

Reliability

To increase reliability and validity in the date gathering process, the Researcher's Chart of code-switching features, which she developed, will be used in conjunction with the Scale for Evaluating Expository Writing (SEEW). The SEEW scale has been validated and approved for use, and provides useful support of the Researcher's selected code-switching features which she selected after careful review of the Literature. The data collected will be observed and reviewed by the Researcher and the instructor or someone familiar with code-switching. A second reader could both increase reliability and validity of the study and serve as an objective observer.

Subjects

The students involved in the study were not selected specifically for this experiment. The Researcher and the Chairman of the Humanities Department, Dr. Keflyn Reed, chose three random composition classrooms at the same college campus, Bishop State Community College, taught by three composition instructors, including Dr. Reed, himself, as the Control Groups' instructor. Although the research was geared toward identifying code-switching in the writing of African American students, all students in both the Control and Experiment classrooms were included in the study and in the review of the experiment's results.

Data Collection

The data collection process included the following: choosing the institution to be used for the study; obtaining permission from the selected institution; selecting the classes to be used for the study; conducting a Pretest to identify the frequency of particular code-switching features; analyzing student composition writing before the experiment; conducting the time series experiment over several class sessions; conducting a Posttest; and analyzing the study's results.

The specific data gathering procedures are as follows:

1. Institution at which the Researcher will conduct the study was chosen and verified by the Researcher's committee. Appropriate signatures from the President of the college, Dr. Yvonne Kennedy, and from the Chairman of the Department of Humanities (APPENDICES A and B) were obtained. Approval from the instructors whose classes the Researcher used to conduct the study was obtained. The study was conducted in a summer school setting, which proved important to the study. Typically, community college summer school students are attempting to complete courses which will allow them to transfer to a four-year college or university. The Researcher focused on this particular group of students because these students are more likely to use scholastic, formal writing beyond college.

2. The Chairman of the Humanities department, Dr. Keflyn Reed, and the Researcher selected the classes used in the study. The aim was to selected three composition courses, identified as Group A (Experimental #1), Group B (Experimental #2), and Group C (Control) taught by the three different instructors. Although all three classes were taught by three different instructors, uniformity was established before the experiments began. The Researcher called a meeting which included all three instructors. The essay topics

were developed through a collaborative effort. Guidelines for the study were given to all three instructors (APPENDIX H). All three courses were titled English 101, English Composition 1. Interestingly, all three courses were taught on the same days of the week, Monday through Friday. The Control Group met at 8:00 a.m., Experiment Group #1 at 10:30 a.m., and Experiment Group #2 at 12:00 p.m., all on the Main Campus of Bishop State Community College, in Mobile, Alabama.

The Researcher used an outline during her discussion with the instructors which covered the specific format of the study. The outline is as follows:

I. Over view

-introduce self

-introduce code-switching, the study

II. Why I am conducting this study

-to help students learn a more formal system of language, writing

-will help produce better writing, comprehension, clarity, critical thinking

-write freely, no pressure, will not affect grade

III. What to do

A. Guidelines

-will give a writing assignment

-researcher will photocopy samples

-instructor and I will analyze

B. Experiments 1-3:

-give samples of switching

-introduce next essay topic

-collect essays

-analyze, alone with instructor; look for evidence of switching

C. Posttest (instructors):

-assign essay

-analyze for evidence of switching

IV. Thank students, ask for feedback

-administer a follow-up survey

3. The instructors conducted the Pretest on Experiment Groups #1 and #2, which involved the first writing assignment. The Control Group instructor conducted all segments of the essay assignments in that class. The Researcher discovered that the topics selected allowed students to become familiar with their own writing. The topics also produced evidence of code-switching because students are allowed to write more freely on a topic familiar to them.

4. The instructors collected completed essays; the Researcher hid the students' names using the tab system. As mentioned earlier, students' initials were included to avoid human error in identification. After confidentiality was assured, the Researcher reviewed essays at each stage in the experimental process, checking for evidence of code-switching in the composition. The Researcher used a code-switching Chart, created specifically for this study, to identify and analyze features frequently displayed in the writing, paying particular attention to the compositions of African American students. The Researcher identified code-switching behaviors with the instructors, who were familiar with code-switching dynamics in composition writing, serving as second, third, and fourth readers. The time-series treatment (teaching strategy) depended upon the kinds of code-switching found in the Pretest.

After the Pretest and each experiment, the Researcher identified certain sentences which contained code-switching features. These sentences and the stages which they occurred are listed in APPENDIX (I).

5. The Researcher and instructors discussed these features at each stage, identifying the features and deciding which sentences would be used for the teaching portion of the experiment. Once the sentences were chosen, the Researcher prepared sentences to be discussed in class (APPENDIX J). The Researcher presented these sentences on the chalk board, discussed the sentences, asked for feedback from the students, and asked students to correct the sentences using a more formal style without losing their meaning. The identity of the students whose writing was being examined remained confidential. Only the writer herself knew the sentences were her own. The Researcher used two to three sentences to demonstrate code-switching, allowing the students the remainder of the class period to write the next essay in the experimental process.

The Researcher taught code-switching to the experiment group for three class sessions, not including the sessions in which the Pretest and Posttests were administered. The Researcher began by defining code-switching. The Researcher then gave examples of code-switching (less effective writing) and asked students to write the examples more effectively. Each treatment consisted of various code-switching activities developed by the Researcher, according to the features evident in each stage of the experiment (to be discussed in Chapter IV, the Findings). Each Group, Experiment Groups #1 and #2, and the Control Group, were analyzed during the same time period.

6. Finally, the instructor administered a Posttest to Experiment Groups #1 and #2. The Control Group instructor administered the essay for his Group. The Researcher followed the same procedure as with the Pretest, analyzing the occurrence of code-switching in student writing and reviewing the results of the experiment. These code-switching procedures were done in the assigned classrooms only; the approximate time for each session was fifty (50) minutes.

An additional class session was required as follow-up in order to administer the Student Questionnaire. With the assistance of one of the instructors, the Researcher

developed a questionnaire in order to obtain critical feedback from the students (APPENDIX K). The responses to this questionnaire will be discussed in Chapter IV, The Findings.

Data Analysis

Data analysis reliability was increased by having the instructor and someone knowledgeable about code-switching behaviors assist the Researcher in reviewing the information collected from the composition writing of the students involved in the study. Review of the data analyses was conducted by the Researcher.

Criteria for Analysis and Interpretation

The effectiveness of the tools used in the study and the actual teaching procedures providing relevant information for the study was determined by the following questions and will be analyzed in Chapter V, the Summary:

1. Did the teaching strategies help students understand code-switching?
2. Did the instrument provide enough features to adequately identify code-switching of students in college composition?
3. Did the data gathering process provide the researcher with enough information to analyze fully the occurrence of code-switching?
4. Was there significant improvement by students in the experiment group identifying their own code-switching? Did these students improve their overall writing without losing their meaning in the transitional process?
5. What, if any, were the improvements or changes in the composition writing of the students in the control group? What situations could contribute to these changes, if any?

6. Did the series of teaching code-switching to the experiment group serve to help students understand code-switching better and how to transition their writing to formal English without losing their meaning?
7. Did follow-up data gathering after the time-series quasi-experimental teaching strategies indicate successful and substantial modification?

The above data will be assorted into a descriptive analysis of the results of this study in Chapter V, the Summary.

The Researcher

As an instructor at the community college level, the Researcher advocates for all students to pursue higher education. She helps them strive toward enlightenment in writing, reading and literature while encouraging them to maintain their ideas, thoughts, and linguistic systems. By encouraging exploration through critical thinking and rhetorical strategies, new discoveries and creative conviction can be achieved. The Researcher is committed to education in all respects. As an instructor, she is living her dream. The Researcher has made a firm commitment to encourage students, and all people in the community, to strive to their fullest potential; in this case, for a more effective understanding of English and all of the many advantages effective writing, reading, and communication skills render.

Summary

This section discussed the research design and methodology. The design, Interrupted Time Series with a Nonequivalent No-treatment Control Group Time Series quasi-experimentation, provided the Researcher with the information needed to analyze code-switching in freshman English composition. The methodology and design also aided the Researcher in establishing more effective teaching strategies to help students learn,

transition, and add formal English to improve overall writing. By using the Lewis Model of analysis, as mentioned in Chapter II, the Review of the Literature, instructors can possibly determine the specific needs of not only the entire class, but also the needs of each individual student early in the semester, as opposed to later when students are more likely to lose confidence in themselves and their writing abilities. More analysis on the Lewis Model and other teaching strategies is necessary to observe the many benefits early observation provides.

CHAPTER IV

THE FINDINGS

This chapter analyzes the types, frequency, features, and motivation for code-switching of African American students in freshman English composition. This chapter also explains the effects of recognizing the students' first linguistic system by using effective teaching strategies.

Answers to the Research Questions

Research Question No. 1:

How were the types of code-switching in freshman English composition detected, observed, and identified?

To answer this question, the Scale for Evaluating Expository Writing (SEEW) was used. The purpose of this instrument is as follows:

> SEEW provides separate six-point rating scales for general impression of the quality of an essay, general competence, coherence, paragraph organization, support for main ideas, and mechanics. The mechanics scale includes a brief guide for identifying certain errors in sentence construction, usage, spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. Designed as a criterion-references scale to describe levels of writing skill development for basic essay elements, SEEW defines score points 4-6 in terms of mastery or competence, score points 1-3 in terms of nonmastery (p. 1).

The specific components of the scale are listed in APPENDIX AA. The evaluation scale is designed so that the evaluator can chose what or which elements she wants to use for her diagnosis. The evaluator can use all six components or a combination of the elements to suit the needs of the particular evaluation. The Researcher of this study chose five of the six elements to use for her study. The Researcher chose the following:

1. Impressionistic Rating Procedures
2. General Competence
3. Essay Coherence

4. Organization-Paragraph

5. Mechanics

The mechanics element, Element 6 in the SEEW, was modified to show, from the Review of the Literature, what the Researcher has identified as characteristics of Africanized English. APPENDIX AA also shows the original SEEW chart of mechanical features. The Researchers' features show similarities with these features. The Researchers' areas of concentration are listed in APPENDIX G and include: Subject-verb agreement, grammar, word choice/lexicon, pronoun usage, and syntax, all of which contribute to the students' overall meaning in composition work. APPENDICES AA offers a detailed description of the elements used in this study. The occurrence of the missing features, those features needed in order to satisfy the requirements for an effective composition essay, were recorded in APPENDICES L through Z. Using these three charts enabled the Researcher to identify, observe, and detect the occurrence of code-switching at every level of the quasi-experiment.

The first essay question posed to the students was "Goals for the Future." Both Experimental Groups wrote thirty-minute essays on this topic. The Control Group's topic was "Guest Star on a Television Show." Since the Control Group's instructor had previously assigned this writing topic for the class at the same time the Researcher planned to assigned her Pretest topic, the Researcher accepted the Control Group's topic as reasonable for the Pretest.

The findings for Research Question No. 1 were reported in five stages, using the SEEW chart of features: Pretest, Experimental #1, Experimental #2, Experimental #3, and Posttest. The Control Group's results are recorded as the No-treatment group. The Tables show the progression of the experiment and the progression of the students' writing at all stages of the experiment. Each stage is followed by a comprehensive analysis of what was discovered at each stage.

The main feature of code-switching consistent throughout the Findings is what Lipski (1985) calls "intrasentential language shifting," as defined in Chapter II, the Review of the Literature, as shifting spontaneously, in the middle of sentences, without hesitation, pause, or other intense categorical shifting (p. 2). Intrasentential shifting reflects the challenges faced by students who are using Africanized English composition while 1) searching for fluency in formal English, and 2) attempting to maintain the register most familiar to them, which they know is not accepted in formal writing. Further in the Findings and in Chapter V, the Summary, samples sentences which show this code-switching form are observed and identified.

Table 1 shows the features and scores of Experimental Group #1. As Table 1 indicates, the Pretest establishes the writing ability of the students at this stage in the process.

TABLE 1

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #1 -- PRETEST

Student Identity	Ethnicity	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics	
AGJ	W	4	4	4	4	4	
BAR	B	3	3	3	3	2	
BPT	B	3	3	4	3	3	
CHS	B	3	3	4	3	3	
FKL	W	4	4	4	4	4	
FTJ	W	3	3	3	3	3	
GLL	W	3	3	3	3	3	
GMA	W	4	4	4	4	4	
HJA	B	4	4	4	3	3	
HKL	B	4	4	4	4	4	
JKT	B	4	3	3	3	3	
JBA	B	5	4	4	4	4	
J.A.N.	W	5	4	5	5	5	
MT	B	2	2	2	1	1	
MJRV	B	3	3	3	2	2	
MJN	W	3	3	3	2	2	
NVE	B	4	4	3	3	3	
PR	A	3	3	2	2	2	
PLM	B	3	3	3	2	2	
PNS	B	3	3	3	1	1	
RMA	B	3	3	3	2	2	
SWM	W	2	2	2	1	1	
SAD	B	3	3	3	2	2	
TRL	B	4	4	4	3	3	
TN	B	3	3	3	2	2	
WAJ	B	4	4	4	3	3	

N = 26 respondents

Also included in this Table, and in all Tables included in the Findings where applicable, are the ethnicities of the students. The letter B represents African American students, W

represents white students, A represents Asian ancestry students, H represents Hispanic students, and O is used to represent other ethnicities not clearly identifiable. Interestingly, there were no Hispanic or unidentifiable students in any of the classes. This observation could be the result of the community population, environment, or cultural dynamics. Another important note: Over the course of the experiment, some European American students either dropped the courses or were absent. This occurrence, however, does not affect the overall Findings of the study. No African American students dropped the courses. As mentioned in Chapter III, The Methodology, some variables are difficult to control for; student attendance is one of them.

As seen in Table 1, the lowest scores were in the mechanics category. According to the SEEW scale, 6 (six) is the highest possible score, 1 (one), the lowest. The Pretest scores are as follows: Of the twenty-six respondents, the following scores were reported:

Results from the Pretest
Essay Topic #1--"Goal for the Future"

TABLE 2

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #1
PRETEST SCORES

Points	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
6	0	0	0	0	0
5	2	0	1	1	1
4	9	10	10	7	5
3	13	14	12	13	9
2	2	2	3	5	8
1	0	0	0	0	3

N = 26 respondents

Of the twenty-six respondents, the most consistency in all five categories placed students below SEEWs Mastery level. The results show that students scored the lowest overall in the Mechanics section. The first three categories, overall Impression, Competence, and Coherence, showed low scores, indicating that students had difficulty conveying their meaning in the compositions. Low scores in the final two categories, Paragraph/Organization and Mechanics, shows that the respondents' overall competence in composition is not effective in the early stages of the experiment.

Table 3 shows the results of the Pretest for Experimental Group #2:

TABLE 3

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #2 -- PRETEST

Student Identity	Ethnicity	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
ALB	B	3	3	3	3	
BC	B	4	4	4	4	
DDY	B	3	3	3	3	
DLF	B	3	3	3	3	
FDB	B	3	4	3	3	
KMH	W	4	4	4	4	
LRA	W	4	3	3	3	
NAY	B	3	3	3	3	
NKA	B	4	4	4	4	
PK	A	3	3	3	3	
PPB	B	3	3	2	2	
PMA	B	4	4	4	4	
RRS	A	2	2	3	2	
SM	A					
SCD	B	4	4	3	3	
UF	A	4	4	4	3	

N = 16 respondents

The results of Experimental Group #2s Pretest are as follows:

TABLE 4

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #2
PRETEST SCORES

Points	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
6	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0
4	9	7	7	5	4
3	6	8	8	7	10
2	1	1	1	4	2
1	0	0	0	0	0

N = 16 respondents

Although Experimental Group #2 maintained some consistency for all five components, the distinctive lowest score remained consistent with Experimental Group #1, in the Mechanical component. The overall score, ten, was in Mechanics, where students scored below Mastery level. Of the sixteen respondents, no student scored a six or a five, showing that the respondents were not in the upper-Mastery category, but a significant number of students scores slightly above Mastery level in the first three categories: Impression, Competence, and Coherence. This observation shows that students are able to convey their meaning clearly enough for a reader to grasp the students' overall ideas, thoughts, and observations; however, the highest score of ten shows that students are challenged in "how" they convey their meaning. According to the SEEW criteria, an overall effective composition would score above Mastery level in all categories. This theory proves true for many, if not all, composition criteria at the college level. Therefore, although students may convey their meaning at an acceptable level, other features of

writing must also be consistent for students to perform at a level acceptable for college composition. The following are the results from the Control Groups' Pretest:

TABLE 5

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
CONTROL GROUP -- PRETEST

Student Identity	Ethnicity	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics	
AJRW	B	3	3	4	3	3	
BG	W	4	4	4	4	4	
BEN	B	3	3	2	2	2	
BGP	B	3	3	3	3	3	
ESA	B	3	3	4	3	3	
FSS	B	3	3	3	2	2	
FD	B	3	3	4	3	3	
GMA	W	4	4	4	4	4	
HMA	W	3	3	4	3	3	
HDK	W	3	3	4	3	3	
HTM	B	3	3	4	3	3	
JAM	W	2	2	2	2	2	
JLT	B	3	3	3	3	3	
KMS	B	3	3	4	3	3	
KSN	B	3	3	3	3	3	
LDK	B	3	3	3	3	3	
LSL	B	4	3	4	2	2	
MC	B	4	3	4	3	3	
PCN	B	4	3	3	3	3	
PSL	B	3	4	3	3	3	
PAL	B	3	2	3	3	3	
PAT	B	3	2	4	3	3	
RCE	B	3	3	2	2	2	
SVL	B	3	3	2	2	2	
TD	B	2	2	2	2	2	
YMD	B	3	3	3	2	2	

N = 26 respondents

The results of the Control Groups' Pretest are as follows:

TABLE 6

CONTROL GROUP
PRETEST SCORES

Points	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
6	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0
4	5	4	4	12	2
3	17	18	18	8	15
2	3	3	3	5	8
1	0	0	0	0	0

N = 26 respondents

Of the twenty-six respondents, the lowest scores, again, were in the Mechanics category. Although some students scored above average in the overall Impression, Competence, and Coherence categories, the majority of the students scored below average in all five categories, especially in the Mechanics category.

In all three Groups, the students fared the highest in what can be considered the "meaning' categories: Impression, Competence, and Coherence. The students scored the lowest in the what can be considered the "concrete", objective categories: Paragraph/Organization and Mechanics. These results show that although the overall compositions can be understood, mechanics play a significant role in determining overall competence in compositions, according to the SEEW scale. Students, thus, seem to "switch" at the mechanics level, which, in turn, affects their overall composition competency. Students seems to compose essays based on semantics, or meaning, rather than using mechanics as a basis for composition strategy, which seems reasonable. However, if the mechanical skills acceptable at the college level are not present in the

overall composition, according to the criteria acceptable for college writing, students are more likely to fare below average. The "meaning" is somewhat clear, but the mechanics (e.g. subject-verb agreement, pronoun usage, word usage, etc.) are not what would be considered "acceptable" in a collegiate environment.

After review of the Pretest results, Experiment #1 was conducted. The Researcher, with the assistance of the three instructors participating in the study, selected two sentences taken from the students' Pretest essays. The sentences used by the Researcher for instruction in effective writing and code-switching were:

1. "I've reach one step toward my goal that I'm here in college now for, that's I finished the LPN program."
2. "I want to set up financially were I don't have to live check by check. This what helps me in focus and not giving up."

The two sentences were presented anonymously, so that only the authors of the sentences were aware that the writing was their own. The Researcher mentioned that the sentences were from the "Goals for the Future" essay. The students were instructed to dissect the "meaning" of the sentences, revising them for clarity without losing the author's intended meaning. Most students responded effectively. After discussing various ways to improve the structure and coherence of the two sentences, Experiment #1 was administered.

Results from Experiment #1
Essay Topic #2--"Where do you see yourself ten years from now?"

TABLE 7

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #1
EXPERIMENT #1 SCORES

Points	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
6	0	0	0	0	0
5	2	2	2	2	2
4	6	6	6	3	3
3	13	13	13	14	14
2	3	3	3	5	5
1	0	0	0	0	0

N = 24 respondents

The twenty-four respondents continued to score below Mastery level in this phase. The students continued to show low scores in both the Paragraph/Organization and Mechanics areas, with a total of nineteen students scoring well below competency. Experimental Group #1, however, showed some overall improvement in all categories: two students scored at the upper Mastery level in all five categories, which indicates some overall improvement.

Following are the scores for Experimental Group #2:

TABLE 8

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #2
EXPERIMENT #1 SCORES

Points	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
6	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0
4	3	3	1	1	0
3	6	6	8	8	7
2	4	4	4	4	6
1	2	2	2	2	2

N = 15 respondents

Experimental Group #2 showed some decline in the overall scores after the Pretest. This occurrence could have transferred over from the Experiment #1 preparation. The Researcher noticed that many students had trouble with the sentences presented in the Researcher's presentation of the selected sentences. After extensive dissecting of the sentences, students began to comprehend the meaning. The fifteen respondents in the experiment remained consistent overall, scoring below Mastery level primarily.

TABLE 9

CONTROL GROUP
NO TREATMENT #1 SCORES

Points	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
6	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0
4	3	1	1	2	2
3	14	14	12	9	9
2	8	10	12	14	12
1	0	0	0	0	2

N = 25 respondents

The Control Group's twenty-five respondents remained fairly consistent in overall responses, yet two students scored 1 (one), the lowest possible score, in the Mechanics category. Overall, the students in this Group remained consistent, scoring primarily below Mastery level in all categories.

The respondents in all three Groups improved in some areas but continued to suffer in the Paragraph/Organization and Mechanics categories. The sentence work seemed to help guide students in the direction of reviewing their own writing more closely, but the Mechanical piece seemed to obstruct the otherwise competent composition writing of most students. Experimental #2 will show student improvement.

Results from Experiment #2
Essay Topic #3--"If you were informed that you only had one month to live, what would you do?"

After meeting with the experiments' instructors and analyzing the results of Experiment #1, the following sentences were selected for instruction in code-switching and effective writing:

1. "At any degree of my education, I want to find myself with self contentment."
2. "I have always dreamed of helping children. It has always been a special love for special kids or cripple kids."

The Researcher presented these two sample sentences from Experiment #1 and asked for student suggestions for more effective sentences without losing the author's meaning. The students were responsive in both Experimental classes, noting the meaning and transitioning the writing to formal English without neglecting the author's original meaning. The students wrote for nearly 40 (forty) minutes following instruction on Topic #3, "If you were informed that you only had one month to live, what would you do?"

Following are the results from Experiment # 2:

TABLE 10

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #1
EXPERIMENT #2 SCORES

Points	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
6	0	0	0	0	0
5	4	2	3	2	0
4	10	10	9	8	8
3	9	10	10	7	7
2	1	2	2	7	8
1	0	0	0	0	1

N = 24 respondents

As seen in the results from Experiment #2, the twenty-four respondents from Experimental Group #1 scored significantly higher. For the first time in the experimental process, students scored above the Mastery level commandingly. In the overall Impression and Competency categories, fourteen students scored above Mastery level, twelve students scored above Mastery in Competence and Coherence, ten students scored above Mastery level in Paragraph/Organization, and eight in the Mechanics category. Only one student scored far below Mastery in the Mechanics category, and only a total of sixteen students scored below Mastery level in Mechanics, an improvement of one to two points.

Following are the results from Experimental Group #2:

TABLE 11

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #2
EXPERIMENT #2 SCORES

Points	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
6	0	0	0	0	0
5	4	1	1	0	0
4	3	5	5	5	4
3	5	6	4	6	5
2	3	3	5	3	4
1	0	0	0	1	2

N = 15 respondents

Experimental Group #2 experienced important improvement in the first three categories: Impression, Competence, and Coherence. The respondents also showed improvement in the Paragraph/Organization and Mechanics categories as well, indicating improvement in their conceptualization of writing strategy. This Group exhibited a better understanding of

the sample sentences presented during the instruction, which could account for their improvement. Two respondents, however, received the lowest possible score in Mechanics, indicating that some students continue to struggle in this area. For this Group, the strongest overall scores were received in the overall Impression category, with a score of seven, followed by Competence and Coherence, with scores of six in each category.

TABLE 12

CONTROL GROUP
NO TREATMENT #2 SCORES

Points	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
6	0	0	0	0	0
5	1	1	1	1	0
4	7	8	6	5	7
3	16	11	16	8	8
2	4	7	5	14	10
1	0	0	0	0	3

N = 28 respondents

The twenty-eight respondents in the Control Group showed improvement in all categories, yet the majority of the respondents scored below Mastery level. This observation could be the result of No-treatment. The Control Group does not receive additional instruction in effective writing or code-switching from the Researcher. Sample sentences are not presented as examples whereas both Experimental Groups receive specific instruction on how to transition their meaning to a more formal register. Most impressive was that the Control Group maintained some consistency in the process. An important observation, however, is that 3 (three) students scored at the lowest possible level in Mechanics.

The results of Experiment #2 showed noteworthy improvements in the overall composition of students. The most troubling area for the respondents is in the Mechanics category consistently. The respondents are conveying their overall meaning, but most readers or composition instructors may ascribe negative impressions of the writing if the Mechanical piece is suffering.

Results from Experiment #3
Essay Topic #4--"How much money do you think you would need to earn in order to survive in society today?"

The Researcher decided to use a full paragraph example, as opposed to short sentences, for her effective writing and code-switching instruction. Since students appear to suffer at the paragraph and mechanical levels, the Researcher, as well as the Experiments' instructors, agreed that using a full paragraph would prove beneficial to students. APPENDIX I (Sample Paragraph) shows the students' writing used for the experiment. Only one paragraph, from a respondent in Experimental Group #2, was used with respect to the time allotted. Students were told that the paragraph originated from a fellow student. The students were then instructed to revise the paragraph so that it reads more clearly, more fluidly, more effectively. For consistency, students were again instructed to maintain the author's original meaning.

Quellmaltz (1982) suggests that "when paragraph-length writing samples are collected, the essay coherence subscale would not apply" (p. 18). The Researcher also believes that the Competence scale would not apply either. The Researcher chose Impression, Paragraph, and Mechanics subgroups to assess the paragraph competence of the students. Although this exercise is not one of the formal essays in the experimental process, results from Experimental Groups #1 and #2 may prove important in the overall Findings of the study. Since the Researcher used the paragraph exercise as the instructional tool for Experiment #3 code-switching instruction, the Control Group did not participate in this exercise since the Control Group is the No-treatment group.

TABLE 13

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #1
PARAGRAPH EXERCISE SCORES

Points	Impression	Paragraph	Mechanics
6	0	0	0
5	4	4	4
4	6	6	8
3	10	5	6
2	2	7	4
1	0	0	0

N = 22 respondents

Of the twenty-two Experimental Group #1 respondents, the students scored surprisingly well in all categories, especially Mechanics. Some students suffered in paragraph construction, but the Mechanical category improved greatly. Instructing the students to respond to the author's "meaning" seemed to help guide the students in their revisions. Reflecting on the actual writing of the respondents, many students composed a first draft before rewriting the final draft, indicating improved thought process. The original paragraph is listed in APPENDIX I. Following are example of student transitions to formal English:

1. "Life is too short to joke around with. If somebody told me that I only have a month to live, I would probably look at them strangely. There are a lot of thing you can do in a month, but why wait until you think that therer is only onr month left? If you do these things when you were alive and well, why should this change now? But if this were true, I would do three main things: get married, buy a house, and leave my troubles to the Lord."

2. "Life is too short to take for granted. If someone told me that I had only one month to live, I would probably look at them strangely. But what can a person do with only one month to live? There are many things you could do, but why wait until you have one month to live? If I can not get the things done while I am alive, then I shouldn't try to get them done a month before I die. If I were going to die in a month, I would do three main things: leave my life to the Lord, get married, and buy a house."

TABLE 14

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #2
PARAGRAPH EXERCISE SCORES

Points	Impression	Paragraph	Mechanics
6	0	0	0
5	3	1	1
4	2	4	4
3	2	1	1
2	3	4	4
1	0	0	0

N = 10 respondents

Experimental Group #2 fared relatively well on this exercise despite the very low class attendance. Students in this group struggled with the paragraph exercise more so than Experimental Group #1. The result of this could be uncontrollable factors, such as the infestation of insects in the classroom that day. Some students expressed concern, mentioning that the fumes from the insect spray distracted them. It is possible that some students entered the classroom, realized that the fumes were overwhelming, and departed, which would account for the low attendance that day. Of the ten students who attended for the entire class session, some expressed delight with the paragraph exercise. A sample paragraph follows:

1. "Life is simply too short to take for granted. If someone told me that I were to die, I would probably stare at them as if they were demented. In such a situation, what can a person do?"

2. "Life is too short to take for granted. If I cannot accomplish my goals in my lifetime then why try to force them into the one month I have left to live? If I had to choose, though, what actions I would do first, they would be: to get married, to buy a myself a house, and to trust in the Lord's guidance for my future."

After the paragraph exercise, Experiment #3 was administered to both Experimental Groups. Following are the results from Experiment #3:

TABLE 15

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #1
EXPERIMENT #3 SCORES

Points	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
6	3	2	3	2	3
5	7	8	7	9	7
4	6	6	6	6	7
3	4	4	4	3	1
2	1	1	1	1	3
1	0	0	0	0	0

N = 21 respondents

Experimental Group #1 demonstrated remarkable improvement in all categories. The most significant findings here are the number of scores in the upper Mastery level. Three students scored six in Impression, two students scores six in Competence, three students scored six in Coherence, two students scored six in Paragraph/Organization, and, surprisingly, three students scored six in Mechanics. The Researcher believes that

dissecting the paragraph aided the students in composing this essay. The instruction in effective and transitional writing without losing the writers' meaning also helped the respondents in developing more structured, clear, cohesive essays. In the Mechanics component, only four students scored below Master level, seventeen scored above. Sixteen students scored above Mastery level in the first three categories, seventeen scored above Mastery in Paragraph/Organization.

TABLE 16

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #2
EXPERIMENT #2 SCORES

Points	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
6	2	2	2	3	3
5	3	3	3	2	2
4	1	1	1	1	1
3	6	5	6	5	5
2	0	1	0	1	1
1	0	0	0	0	0

N = 12 respondents

Of the twelve respondents in Experimental Group #2 (two students arrived late to class; thus, the two additional respondents), phenomenal improvement occurred. For the first time during the experimental process, respondents in Experimental Group #2 performed overwhelmingly above the Mastery level. Two students scored 6 in Impression, Competence, and Coherence. Most surprisingly, three students scored six in Paragraph/Organization and Mechanics, a tremendous improvement. The scores were consistently split: six students scored above Mastery level, six below. The Researcher attributed the improvement to the paragraph exercise. Although the respondents

struggled with the preparation exercise, the example seemed to help students develop their own writing and competency skills.

TABLE 17

CONTROL GROUP
NO TREATMENT #3 SCORES

Points	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
6	0	0	0	0	0
5	3	2	2	5	4
4	9	10	10	8	10
3	8	8	8	7	6
2	1	1	1	1	1
1	0	0	0	0	0

N = 21 respondents

The Control Group maintained consistency at this stage. Most respondents scored slightly above Mastery level, which has remained consistent for this Group. Again, the Control Group did not have the additional instruction on enhancing writing as did both Experimental Groups; however, the Control Group remained above Mastery level; the majority of students scored at this level. In the first three categories, twelve students scored above Mastery level; thirteen students scored above Mastery in Paragraph/Organization and fourteen scored above Mastery in Mechanics. The observation here is that with additional instruction, the respondents' scores gradually improved, as displayed by Experimental Groups #1 and #2.

Results from the Posttest
Essay Topic #5--"What are the three greatest pressures facing youth today?"

Students in the Experimental Groups were not given any additional assistance before the Posttest was administered. As with the Pretest, the Posttest is designed to observe student writing without additional instruction from the instructor or Researcher. The Researcher gave the students the essay topic and simply instructed students to use the skills they had learned to guide them through this final essay. The results of the Posttest are as follows:

TABLE 18

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #1
POSTTEST SCORES

Points	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
6	7	6	6	9	7
5	9	8	8	7	5
4	7	9	9	7	9
3	0	0	0	0	2
2	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	0

N = 23 respondents

The twenty-three respondents in this Group fared better on this essay than on all previous essays. All respondents scored above Mastery level in the first four categories, including the troubling Paragraph/Organization component. Only two students scored below Mastery level in Mechanics, a phenomenal improvement. The Researcher believes that the sessions on effective strategy in transitioning to formal English without losing the original meaning helped students improve overall.

TABLE 19

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #2
POSTTEST SCORES

Points	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
6	2	1	1	0	1
5	6	5	5	7	6
4	3	4	4	3	2
3	1	2	2	2	3
2	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	0

N = 12 respondents

The twelve respondents in Experimental Group #2 fared much better on the Posttest than on previous essays. The majority of the respondents scored above Mastery level without any additional instruction in effective writing. Although this Group did not perform as successfully as Experimental Group #1, the respondents improved greatly from the Pretest, in which the majority of the respondents scored below Mastery level.

TABLE 20

CONTROL GROUP
POSTTEST SCORES

Points	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
6	0	0	0	0	0
5	6	3	3	3	4
4	15	16	16	11	13
3	4	6	6	9	6
2	0	0	0	2	2
1	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE Cont.

N = 25 respondents

The Control Group's results provide a significant finding in this final section. The Control Group seems to have fallen in their overall scores. Over the course of the experiment, the Control Group has remained fairly consistent, scoring above Mastery level. The Posttest shows that although the first three categories--Impression, Competency, and Coherence--remain the Groups' strongest characteristics, the respondents did not fare as well in the final two categories, Paragraph/Organization and Mechanics. Some students scored just above Mastery whereas eleven students scored below Mastery level in Paragraph/Organization; eight students scored below Mastery in Mechanics. At this stage, the additional instruction provided by the Researcher as was given to the Experimental Groups may have assisted the Control Group in improving overall scores, as opposed to remaining consistent or dropping in scores.

In summary, the results of the SEEW scale and the analysis of Experimental Group #1, Experimental Group #2, and the Control Group provided the following information:

The results of the data analysis supported the research assumption that if students are allowed to use their code-switching behaviors as a learning tool, students will learn to transition their writing to the formal register accepted in academe. If the thoughts, ideas, and language of students are neglected, or simply devalued and unsubstantiated, students could fail in their attempts to write effectively.

The results of the study also show that students from all ethnicities in the study showed greater improvement in their overall writing when the idea of semantics as the focus for learning and transitioning to formal English was encouraged; thus, showing that students possess the willingness to learn and use formal English if 1) their first linguistic system is used, identified, and appreciated in the classroom, and 2) if they are giving the opportunity to: examine a more formal register; attempt, on their own, to transition the

writing to a more formal, accepted register; and if their first linguistic system is validated and encouraged as a viable learning tool.

Research Question No. 2:

What were the features of code-switching in freshman English composition classes demonstrated by African American students?

To answer Research Question No. 2, APPENDICES L through Z were used to document the African American respondents at every stage in the experimental process. The Researcher also constructed a Chart of selected code-switching features which seems to reoccur in student writing (APPENDIX G). The selected features are consistent with the SEEW Expository Scale V, Element 6, used to examine Research Question No. 1. The features are also consistent with features of African American code-switching observed and documented in Chapter II, The Review of the Literature. The Chart consists of five domains representing five areas indicative of the code-switching behavior in African American student writing. As mentioned previously, although these features are seen in the writing of students from most ethnicities, the specific examples used in the Chart, and examined in Chapter II, The Review of the Literature, support the applicability of the features as representative of Africanized English.

To establish a framework in which to examine the Findings in Research Question No. 2, Table 21 shows a condensed version of the features and scores of the African American students and their responses on the Pretest.

TABLE 21

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #1--PRETEST
AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

Student Identity	Ethnicity	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
BAR	B	3	3	3	3	2
BPT	B	3	3	4	3	3
CHS	B	3	3	4	3	3
HJA	B	4	4	4	3	3
HKL	B	4	4	4	4	4
JKT	B	4	3	3	3	3
JBA	B	5	4	4	4	4
MT	B	2	2	2	1	1
MJRV	B	3	3	3	2	2
NVE	B	4	4	3	3	3
PLM	B	3	3	3	2	2
PNS	B	3	3	3	1	1
RMA	B	3	3	3	2	2
SAD	B	3	3	3	2	2
TRL	B	4	4	4	3	3
TN	B	3	3	3	2	2
WAJ	B	4	4	4	3	3

N = 22 respondents

The majority of the African American respondents (seventeen of twenty-two) scored below Mastery level in the Mechanics category.

The results are as follows:

TABLE 22

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #1
RESULTS IN MECHANICS CATEGORY

Points	Mechanics
6	0
5	0
4	2
3	7
2	6
1	2

Students appear to struggle with the Mechanical element of composition writing, according to the results of the Pretest. Examples of mechanical switching are a follows:

1. "Changing careers always seem like a step backward for me. I guess I been out of school too long."
2. "For the pass two years I've gain alot of weight."
3. "Having to study long hours to past test and meet objectives."
4. "Eager to reach this goal time will past."
5. "Until the meantime I plan to stick with going into the field of medical records because it's an open field and a home run. These are not all my goals but the top three that on my list of goals."
6. "I majoring in Business Administration. The reason I chose this major is because it dealing with computers."
7. "Working with computers is some I enjoy very much. This what helps me in focus and not giving up. MIS [Management Information Systems] grads are some of the most

demand there are with so many computer jobs and not enough people to work them also makes it very profitable."

At the Pretest level, African American respondents switched, using almost all features indicated in the Chart of code-switching (See APPENDIX L, TABLE 23): seventeen students switched at the subject-verb agreement level; twelve students switched the grammatical level; thirteen students switched at the lexicon/word choice level; fourteen students switched at the pronoun level; and fifteen students switched at the syntax level. These scores indicate a connection between switching patterns and the below Mastery scores in the Mechanics category of the Pretest.

Following is the students' chart for Experimental Group #2:

TABLE 24

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #2--PRETEST
AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

Student Identity	Ethnicity	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
ALB	B	3	3	3	3	3
BC	B	4	4	4	4	4
DDY	B	3	3	3	3	3
DLF	B	3	3	3	3	3
FDB	B	4	4	4	3	3
NAY	B	3	3	3	3	3
NKA	B	4	4	4	4	4
PPB	B	3	3	3	2	2
PMA	B	4	4	4	4	4
SCD	B	4	4	4	3	3

N = 10 respondents

As with Experimental Group #1, the majority of the respondents (seven of ten) in Experimental Group #2 scored below Mastery level in the Mechanics category:

TABLE 25

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #2
RESULTS IN MECHANICS CATEGORY

Points	Mechanics
6	0
5	0
4	3
3	6
2	1
1	0

Examples of switching are as follows:

1. "My plans for the future is to get my degree in nursing."
2. "I've reach one step toward my goal that I'm here in college now for, that's I finished the LPN program."
3. "When I reach fifty I plan to never do everything that look like work again."
4. "These personal goals one day will be a success story for my history to someday look back on."
5. "My most important goal is to make the society proud of me in my achievements, always do and be the best in everything I do."

Again, students seemed to struggled primarily with the Mechanics element, using the following code-switching features to compose the Pretest: (See APPENDIX M, TABLE 26). The African American respondents in this group also switched in almost every element of the code-switching chart: ten students switched at the subject-verb agreement level; nine students switching at the grammatical level; eight students switched at the lexicon/word choice level; ten students switched at the pronoun level; and ten students switched at the syntax level. The results remain consistent in that the respondents who

code-switch in composition writing seem to do so at the Mechanical level, which affects the overall synthesis of the students' meaning.

Table 27 shows the chart of the African American respondents in the Control Group for the Pretest:

TABLE 27

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
CONTROL GROUP--PRETEST
AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

Student Identity	Ethnicity	Impression	Competence	Coherence	Paragraph	Mechanics
AJRW	B	3	3	4	3	3
BEN	B	3	3	2	2	2
BGP	B	3	3	3	3	3
ESA	B	3	3	4	3	3
FSS	B	3	3	3	2	2
FD	B	3	3	4	3	3
HTM	B	3	3	4	3	3
JLT	B	3	3	3	3	3
KMS	B	3	3	4	3	3
KSN	B	3	3	3	3	3
LDK	B	3	3	3	3	3
LSL	B	4	3	4	2	2
MC	B	4	3	4	3	3
PCN	B	4	3	3	3	3
PSL	B	3	4	3	3	3
PAL	B	3	2	3	3	3
PAT	B	3	2	4	3	3
RCE	B	3	3	2	2	2
SVL	B	3	3	2	2	2
TD	B	2	2	2	2	2
YMD	B	3	3	3	2	2

N = 21 respondents

All of the African American students (twenty-one respondents) scored below Mastery level in Mechanics on the Pretest. Yet the chart shows that the Control Groups' African

American students scored even lower in Mechanics than both Experimental Groups. The reason is unclear. The results of the Mechanics category for this Groups are as follows:

TABLE 28

CONTROL GROUP
RESULTS IN MECHANICS CATEGORY

Points	Mechanics
6	0
5	0
4	0
3	13
2	8
1	0

Following are sample sentences from the Control Groups' Pretest:

1. "And some just tell what they soon and then ask was it right."
2. "They are treating their love one like dirt, but making themselves look like trash."
3. "She talk about things like education, and how important education is good to have in the real world."

Table 29 (APPENDIX N) shows the specific code-switching features demonstrated by the Control Groups' respondents. The African American students remained consistent with both Experimental Groups, switching in practically all five types of code-switching categories: twenty students switched at the subject-verb agreement level; eighteen students switched at the grammatical level; fourteen students switched at the lexicon/word choice level; eighteen students switched at the pronoun level; and sixteen students switched at the syntax level. The connection between the switching patterns and the level of Mastery remains consistent.

Experiment #1 scores shows minimal improvement in the Mechanics category. The following table shows the African American student results from Experimental Group #1, Experiment #1:

TABLE 30

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #1--EXPERIMENT #1
AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

Student Identity	Ethnicity	Mechanics
BAR	B	2
BPT	B	3
CHS	B	3
HJA	B	3
HKL	B	5
JKT	B	3
JBA	B	5
MT	B	2
MJRLV	B	2
NVE	B	3
PLM	B	2
PNS	B	2
RMA	B	2
SAD	B	2
TRL	B	3
TN	B	2
WAJ	B	3

N = 17 respondents

Again, the majority of the African American respondents (fifteen of seventeen) scored below Mastery level in the Mechanics category. The results are as follows:

TABLE 31

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #1
RESULTS IN MECHANICS CATEGORY

Points	Mechanics
6	0
5	2
4	0
3	7
2	8
1	0

Examples from Experiment #1 are as follows:

1. "In ten years, I hope to be established in the work force, be married, and be ready to begin a family."

2. "I've always been enthuse with teach, therefore I hope to get a teaching position in Alaska."

3. "Goals, for me my goals are not all put together, but whatever I decide to do I hope to succeed as far as possible."

4. "At any degree of my education, I want to find myself with self contentment."

5. "My last accomplishment I want have made in 10 years is to be happy."

Table 32 shows the specific features in which students switched: (See APPENDIX 0, Table 32). Results of the experiment show that students switched primarily at the subject-verb agreement level (sixteen students) and the grammatical level (sixteen students). The remaining elements also play a significant role in code-switching behaviors: lexicon/word choice, ten students; pronoun, fourteen students; and syntax, thirteen students.

Experimental Group #2 African American student results in Mechanics are as follows:

TABLE 33

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #2--EXPERIMENT #1
AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

Student Identity	Ethnicity	Mechanics
ALB	B	3
BC	B	4
DDY	B	3
DLF	B	3
FDB	B	2
NAY	B	2
NKA	B	4
PPB	B	2
PMA	B	3
SCD	B	3

N = 10 respondents

As with Experimental Group #1, the majority of the respondents in Experimental Group #2 scored below Mastery level in the Mechanics category:

TABLE 34

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #2
RESULTS IN MECHANICS CATEGORY

Points	Mechanics
6	0
5	0
4	2
3	5
2	3
1	0

Examples from Experiment #1 are as follows:

1. "I have always dreamed of helping children. It has always been a special love for special kids or cripple kids."
2. "I know what that no one in the world have everything they want, when and how they want it."
3. "If circumstance permits, I hope to be having another child."
4. "Being at my easy with my job, where I can spend more time with my family."

Table 35 shows the code-switching results: (See Table 35, APPENDIX P). Results of this experiment show that African American students switched primarily at the subject-verb agreement level (ten respondents) and the pronoun level (ten respondents). The remaining results are as follows: grammatical level, seven respondents; lexicon/word choice, six respondents; and syntax, six respondents. The results also show that there was a decline in Mechanical scores for Experimental Group #2, which affected the overall scores in the five remaining categories (e.g., Impression, Competence, Coherence, and Paragraph/Organization).

The Control Groups' African American student scores are as follows:

TABLE 36

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
CONTROL GROUP--NO-TREATMENT #1
AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

Student Ethnicity	Ethnicity	Mechanics
AJRW	B	3
BEN	B	2
BGP	B	3
ESA	B	3
FSS	B	2
FD	B	4
HTM	B	1
JLT	B	3
KMS	B	1
KSN	B	2
LDK	B	4
LSL	B	2
MC	B	3
PCN	B	2
PSL	B	3
PAL	B	3
PAT	B	3
RCE	B	2
SVL	B	2
TD	B	2
YMD	B	2

N = 21 respondents

The results of the Mechanics category for this Group are as follows:

TABLE 37

CONTROL GROUP
RESULTS IN MECHANICS CATEGORY

Points	Mechanics
6	0
5	0
4	2
3	8
2	9
1	2

Examples from No-treatment #1 are as follows:

1. "My daughter future is important to me."

2. "Ten years from now I look at myself being a power black leader of some national organization...I'm a twenty-two year old black male who has being through hell."

3. " In the year 2013, my children will be grown and all left home."

Table 38 shows the code-switching results for this group: (Table 38, APPENDIX Q). Results of the No-treatment #1 shows that African American students switched primarily at the subject-verb agreement level (nineteen students) and at the grammatical level (twenty students). The Control Group shows a slight decline in mechanics, with two students scoring the lowest possible score (one) in this category.

Experiment #2 scores for Experimental Group #1 showed significant improvement in overall composition features, including Mechanics. The following are the results of the Mechanics category:

TABLE 39

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #1--EXPERIMENT #2
AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

Student Identity	Ethnicity	Mechanics
BAR	B	2
BPT	B	3
CHS	B	4
HJA	B	4
HKL	B	4
JKT	B	3
JBA	B	4
MT	B	2
MJRLV	B	2
NVE	B	4
PLM	B	3
PNS	B	3
RMA	B	2
SAD	B	3
TRL	B	4
TN	B	2
WAJ	B	3

N = 17 respondents

The specific results are as follows:

TABLE 40

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #1
RESULTS IN MECHANICS CATEGORY

Points	Mechanics
6	0
5	0
4	6

TABLE Cont.

3	6
2	5
1	0

Examples from Experiment #2 are as follows:

1. "I would be praying, going around tell people about Jesus, and repenting for all the wrong I done."

2. "My relationship with my sister never been good...Now she a third grade teacher, and she tries to act like she's change, but I still thinks she's phony."

3. "I would try to make self peace within myself about the life I had lived."

Table 41 demonstrates the code-switching features of Experimental Group #1 (Table 41, APPENDIX R). Results of Experiment #2 show slight improvement in Mechanics. Students switched at the following levels: subject-verb agreement, twelve students; grammatical level, twelve students; lexicon, eleven students; pronoun level, fourteen students; and syntax, thirteen students. Results of this experiment show that students switched less in subject-verb agreement, as well as in grammar.

Experimental Group #2 scores improved slightly in the Mechanics component.

TABLE 42

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #2--EXPERIMENT #2
AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

Student Identity	Ethnicity	Mechanics
ALB	B	3
BC	B	4
DDY	B	4
DLF	B	3
FDB	B	2
NAY	B	3
NKA	B	4
PPB	B	2
PMA	B	3
SCD	B	3

N = 10 respondents

The results in the Mechanics category for this Group are as follows:

TABLE 43

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #2
RESULTS IN MECHANICS CATEGORY

Points	Mechanics
6	0
5	0
4	3
3	5
2	2
1	0

Examples from Experiment # 2 are as follows:

1. "When finishing with God's work I'll think of all the friends I ever had and done wrong to and ask of there forgiveness."

2. "I would try to adopt me a child. Since I have one month to live, I can not get pregnant. That want make any since whatsoever."

3. "My mother health not good I want to one day be able to buy her all the things she want and need."

Table 44 shows the code-switching results for Experimental Group #2 (Table 44, APPENDIX S). Students showed some improvement in subject-verb agreement (five students), but remained consistent in their use of the remaining four code-switching features identified in the code-switching chart: grammar, six students; lexicon/word choice, seven students; pronoun usage, six students; and syntax, seven students.

Results from the Control Group are as follows:

TABLE 45

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
CONTROL GROUP--NO-TREATMENT #2
AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

Student Identity	Ethnicity	Mechanics
AJRW	B	4
BEN	B	2
BGP	B	3
ESA	B	3
FSS	B	2
FD	B	4
HTM	B	1
JLT	B	4
KMS	B	1
KSN	B	2
LDK	B	4
LSL	B	2
MC	B	3
PCN	B	2
PSL	B	3
PAL	B	3
PAT	B	3
RCE	B	2
SVL	B	3
TD	B	3
YMD	B	2

N = 21 respondents

The results of the Mechanics category for this Group are as follows:

TABLE 46

CONTROL GROUP
RESULTS IN MECHANICS CATEGORY

Points	Mechanics
6	0
5	0
4	4
3	9
2	7
1	1

Examples from No-treatment #2 are as follows:

1. "I would like to take a trip to Africa Safari and see so many of species of animals that I have never seen before."
2. "I think they would enjoy spend the quality time with their mom."
3. "I would fine our the purpose, and live it to mu full potentiality."
4. "I would try to go placed where I never been."

Table 47 shows the code-switching features for the African American students (Table 47, APPENDIX T). The specific scores are: subject-verb agreement, eighteen students; grammatical usage, fifteen students; lexicon, fourteen students; pronoun usage, seventeen students; and syntax, seventeen students. The Control Group showed only slight improvement, remaining fairly consistent in all categories. This observation could be the result of No-treatment.

Experiment #3 scores show a tremendous improvement in the overall composition of students in Experimental Group #1, including Mechanics improvement. The results are as follows:

TABLE 48

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #1--EXPERIMENT #3
AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

Student Identity	Ethnicity	Mechanics
BAR	B	4
BPT	B	4
CHS	B	5
HJA	B	5
HKL	B	6
JKT	B	4
JBA	B	4
MT	B	4
MJRLV	B	2
NVE	B	6
PLM	B	3
PNS	B	5
RMA	B	2
SAD	B	4
TRL	B	5
TN	B	4
WAJ	B	5

N = 17 respondents

The specific results for this Group are as follows:

TABLE 49

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #1
RESULTS IN MECHANICS CATEGORY

Points	Mechanics
6	2
5	5
4	7
3	1

TABLE CONT.

2	2
1	0

Examples of effective improvement from Experiment #3 are as follows:

1. "The amount of money needed to survive would depend on the part of the country in which you live."
2. "There is a difference in the amount of money that I would need to survive and the amount of money that I would need to be happy."

An example of a less effective sentence from Experiment #3 is as follows:

1. "A sufficient income would be need to survive comfortable in society."

Table 50 includes the code-switching features results: Table 50, APPENDIX U). The specific scores are: subject-verb agreement, ten students; grammar, nine students; lexicon, eight students; pronoun usage, six students; and syntax, six students. According to the results, fewer students switched than in the previous experiments, including the Pretest. This occurrence could be attributed to the paragraph exercise conducted prior to Experiment #3 and/or their use of code-switching features as a learning tool to improve their mastery in composition writing.

Experimental Group #2 scores are as follows:

TABLE 51

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #2--EXPERIMENT #3
AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

Student Identity	Ethnicity	Mechanics
ALB	B	3
BC	B	5
DDY	B	6
DLF	B	3
FDB	B	2
NAY	B	6
NKA	B	4
PPB	B	5
PMA	B	3
SCD	B	3

N = 10 respondents

Following are the Mechanics scores for this Group:

TABLE 52

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #2
RESULTS IN MECHANICS CATEGORY

Points	Mechanics
6	2
5	2
4	1
3	4
2	1
1	0

Examples of improved sentence work are as follows:

1. "With all of the changes taking place in the economy, people need to earn more money."

2. "For the lump sum of ten-thousand dollars you could purchase a lot of land to live and farm on, build a sheltered living space, and cultivate the land for sustenance."

An example of a less effective sentence is as follows:

1. "Everyone needs are different and everyone has different opinions."

Table 53 shows the code-switching results: (Table 53, APPENDIX V). The specific scores are: subject-verb agreement, four students; grammar, four students; lexicon/word choice, five students; pronoun, five students; and syntax, five students. The results show that African American students in Experiment Group #2 experienced noteworthy improvement, especially in Mechanics. Again, the paragraph exercise could have contributed to the students' use of code-switching features as learning tools.

The Control Group results are as follows:

TABLE 54

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
CONTROL GROUP--NO-TREATMENT #3
AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

Student Identity	Ethnicity	Mechanics
AJRW	B	4
BEN	B	4
BGP	B	4
ESA	B	4
FSS	B	5
FD	B	4
HTM	B	3
JLT	B	4
KMS	B	3
KSN	B	5
LDK	B	5
LSL	B	5
MC	B	3
PCN	B	2
PSL	B	3
PAL	B	4
PAT	B	3
RCE	B	4
SVL	B	4
TD	B	3
YMD	B	4

N = 21 respondents

The results of the Mechanics category for this Group are as follows:

TABLE 55

CONTROL GROUP
RESULTS IN MECHANICS CATEGORY

Points	Mechanics
6	0
5	4
4	10
3	6
2	1
1	0

Examples from No-treatment #3 are as follows:

1. "If I see something I want, I buy it without think about the cost of it."
2. "Even though I can surviving off eight hundred dollars, I would like to make more money."

Table 56 shows the code-switching results: (Table 56, APPENDIX W). The specific scores as follows: subject-verb agreement, sixteen students; grammatical usage, sixteen students; lexicon/word choice, fifteen students; pronoun usage, fifteen students; and syntax, fourteen students. The Control Group, as mentioned earlier, did not participate in the paragraph exercise, which could contribute to the consistency, as opposed to improvement, in all categories, including Mechanics.

The Posttest results for the three groups show significant improvement in both Experiment Groups, consistency in the Control Group. Experiment Group #1 results on the Posttest are as follows:

TABLE 57

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #1--POSTTEST
AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

Student Identity	Ethnicity	Mechanics
BAR	B	4
BPT	B	5
CHS	B	6
HJA	B	6
HKL	B	6
JKT	B	4
JBA	B	4
MT	B	3
MJRLV	B	4
NVE	B	6
PLM	B	3
PNS	B	6
RMA	B	4
SAD	B	5
TRL	B	5
TN	B	4
WAJ	B	5

N = 17 respondents

The specific results are as follows:

TABLE 58

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #1
RESULTS IN MECHANICS CATEGORY

Points	Mechanics
6	5
5	4
4	6

TABLE CONT.

3	2
2	0
1	0

The code-switching features are listed in Table 59, APPENDIX X. The specific scores are: subject-verb agreement, six students; grammatical usage, five students; lexicon, five students; pronoun usage, four students; and syntax, three students. Experiment Group #1 scored impressively on the Posttest, with only two students scoring below Mastery in Mechanics. Students appear to have learned to use their code-switching behaviors to transition to formal English.

Examples of improved writing is as follows:

1. "To categorize parents can be difficult because people hold different values towards their children. But as a whole, in the past, parents had complete control over their children. The parents never had to worry about their children misbehaving or doing anything uncivilized; parents got the last word and were always respected. How a person ends up has alot to do with how they are brought up."

2. "The youth of America, especially the ages between 13 and 19, are currently experiencing a different, most often negative pressure around every corner. The time we live in now is vastly different than, let us say, 15 years ago. The rate at which the morals of young people have lowered from, even then, is astonishing."

Experiment Group #2 results are as follows:

TABLE 60

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #2--POSTTEST
AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

Student Identity	Ethnicity	Mechanics
ALB	B	3
BC	B	5
DDY	B	5
DLF	B	3
FDB	B	4
NAY	B	6
NKA	B	5
PPB	B	5
PMA	B	4
SCD	B	3

N = 10 respondents

Table 61 shows the Mechanical results:

TABLE 61

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP #2
RESULTS IN MECHANICS CATEGORY

Points	Mechanics
6	1
5	4
4	2
3	3
2	0
1	0

Table 62 shows the specific features (APPENDIX Y). Experiment Group #2 had the most difficulty transitioning their writing to formal English throughout the experimental process. Yet, the Posttest shows the following: subject-verb agreement, three students; grammatical usage, three students; lexicon/word choice, three students; pronoun usage, four students; and syntax, three students. The majority of the students scored above Mastery level, and the African American students improved importantly in Mechanics, indicating use of code-switching as a tool to help transition to a more formal register. An example of improved writing is as follows:

1. "Peer pressures have the most detrimental effects on America's youth. Peers often develop values and interests other than what their parents taught them. The peers often enforces other pressures such as drugs, violence, financial desires, and sexual desires. In most cases, the parents will ultimately regain control. In many cases, a talented adolescent will lower his standards to fit in with his peers. If the parents do not regain control soon enough, the child's personality and reputation may be damaged forever."

The Control Groups' Posttest is as follows:

TABLE 63

SEEW SELECTED FEATURES AND SCORES
CONTROL GROUP--POSTTEST
AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

Student Identity	Ethnicity	Mechanics
AJRW	B	4
BEN	B	4
BGP	B	4
ESA	B	4
FSS	B	5
FD	B	4
HTM	B	3
JLT	B	4
KMS	B	2
KSN	B	4
LDK	B	5
LSL	B	4
MC	B	3
PCN	B	2
PSL	B	3
PAL	B	5
PAT	B	3
RCE	B	4
SVL	B	4
TD	B	3
YMD	B	4

N = 21 respondents

The results of the Mechanics category for this Group are as follows:

TABLE 64

CONTROL GROUP
RESULTS IN MECHANICS CATEGORY

Points	Mechanics
6	0
5	3
4	11
3	5
2	2
1	0

Table 65 shows the code-switching features as follows (Table 65, APPENDIX Z): subject-verb agreement, fifteen students; grammatical usage, seventeen students; lexicon/word choice, fifteen students; pronoun usage, sixteen students; and syntax, sixteen students. Surprisingly, the Control Groups' overall scores fell somewhat on the Posttest. The results could be attributed to No-treatment and/or the fact that these students had no experience with the Researcher's teachings on how to use their language as transitioning tool.

An example of effective writing is as follows:

1. "I believe drugs play a big role that leads to sex and violence. Most people that are my age are alcoholics already. The people I know look at me as a "good girl" because I am not a smoker or don't wish to smoke marijuana. I am not going to lie, I may have a drink or two when I'm out with the social scene, but I do not let the alcohol control me. I control the alcohol."

In summary, the improvement in the Mechanical component of student writing displayed in this study can be attributed to students' learning that code-switching can be

used as a learning tool to aid students in switching to formal English, the register recognized in academic, scholastic writing. Once exposed to transitioning without losing their meaning, students were more comfortable with the writing process; thus, their scores improved. The Control Groups' results present a noteworthy observation. Since the Control Group had no experience with the benefits of using code-switching as a learning tool, the respondents only showed minimal improvement, if any, throughout the experimental process. In fact, some students in the Control Group regressed in their writing effectiveness. The findings show that first recognizing the features of African American student code-switching and then allowing students to use these features in the transitional process will aid students in mastering composition writing.

In comparison to the African American students, the European American students at all level in the experimental process remained consistent with their use of formal English. The errors made by White students were not consistent with errors made by African American students. According to the SEEW instrument, many White students consistently scored at or above Mastery level throughout the experimental process. Some examples of writing from the six White students participating in the experiment are as follows:

Pretest:

"At eighteen years old, I know these goals are long term, but every actino I take places me a step further towards my goals."

"In my near future, I plan to graduate from a university."

Experiment #1:

"My life in ten years will be very different from my life now."

"In ten years, I see myself with a good job, a stable household, and a big family."

Experiment #2:

"I have just found out that my life life will end in thirty days. I've got so many plans and so little time. I am determined to enjoy what is left of my life."

"I cherish life and everything in it. Having one month to live is something I would never want to happen."

"Life is very important to me. For this reason, I would have a hard time accepting the fact that I was dying."

Experiment #3:

"I belive it would take about 30,000 dollars a year for me to live as comfortably as I would like to live."

"In order to survive in society today someone must really try."

Posttest:

"My areas of selection are strictly based upon past occurences and circumstances."

"American's youth face many pressures and decisions. One pressure most teens are confronted with is drug use."

"Young adults in today's society need to pay a little more attention to reality and not friends."

"For youth that are in need of money but don't have a way to get it, they aften turn to violence to obtain it."

Although some of the sentences have errors, according to the SEEW scale, most White students would score at or above Mastery level. Improvements the White students made could be attributed to maturation or to the code-switching demonstrations.

Research Question No. 3:

What were the semantic transitions in code-switching identified in the English composition writing of African American students?

A. What do African American students accomplish by code-switching in compositions?

B. Does code-switching in English compositions lead to more effective communication, or does code-switching lead to miscommunication?

To answer this question, the Scale for Evaluating Expository Writing (SEEW) was used. In order to focus on the semantic transitions of African American students, only the Impressionistic Rating Procedure was used. Quallmalz (1982) defines the purpose of the Impressionistic Scale as the following:

> The purpose of Impressionistic Rating is to form a single impression of a piece of writing as to how well it communicates a whole message to the reader. Impressionistic scoring assumes that each characteristic that makes up an essay -- organization of ideas, content, mechanics and so on -- is related to all other characteristics. Impressionistic scoring further assumes that some qualities of an essay cannot easily be separated from each other. In short, the procedure views a piece of writing as a total work, the whole of which is greater than the sum of its parts" (p. 6).

Quallmalz (1982) continues by asserting that "[you] are being asked to form an overall opinion concerning the effectiveness of the essays as examples of expository writing" (p. 6). Some ideas offered as examples of effective composition are as follows:

- Exposition is the kind of discourse that explains or clarifies a subject.
- Exposition seeks to explain or inform through such methods as giving reasons or examples, comparing and contrasting, defining, enumerating or through a combination of methods.
- Exposition explains why or how.
- Exposition promotes reader understanding of a subject (p. 6).

Fromkin and Rodman (1998) assert that semantics is "the study of the linguistic meaning of morphemes, words, phrases, and sentences" (p. 158). Several subfields exist within the framework of semantics, which were not explored in this dissertation. The reason for this decision is that to cover every area of semantics would lead the Researcher off task and off track. The entire field of semantics of too broad to cover in a single dissertation, but the Researcher recommends future study which would cover additional areas of the semantic meaning in the code-switching behavior of Africanized English users in freshman English composition. Instead, the general interpretation of semantics, the overall meaning of the students' writing, will be analyzed and observed.

Of the six elements listed in the SEEW scale, Impressionistic Rating was the most applicable in analyzing students' semantic transitions. This scale utilizes the same numbering system as previously demonstrated in Research Questions No. 1 and No. 2.

According to the SEEW scale for Impressionistic Rating, the following were identified as the students' scores in this category:

TABLE 66

STUDENT PRETEST SCORES

Points	Impression	Impression	Impression
	Experimental Group #1	Experimental Group #2	Control Group
6	0	0	0
5	1	0	0
4	6	6	3
3	9	4	16
2	1	0	2
1	0	0	0
	N = 17	N = 10	N = 21

TABLE 67

STUDENT EXPERIMENT #1 AND NO-TREATMENT #1 SCORES

Points	Impression	Impression	Impression
	Experimental Group #1	Experimental Group #2	Control Group
6	0	0	0
5	0	0	0
4	6	3	2
3	7	4	12
2	4	3	7
1	0	0	0
	N = 17	N = 10	N = 21

TABLE 68

STUDENT EXPERIMENT #2 AND NO-TREATMENT #2 SCORES

Points	Impression	Impression	Impression
	Experimental Group #1	Experimental Group #2	Control Group
6	0	0	0
5	2	3	1
4	10	2	3
3	5	4	14
2	0	1	3
1	0	0	0
	N = 17	N = 10	N = 21

TABLE 69

STUDENT EXPERIMENT #3 AND NO-TREATMENT #3 SCORES

Points	Impression	Impression	Impression
	Experimental Group #1	Experimental Group #2	Control Group
6	2	2	0
5	7	2	3
4	5	2	7
3	3	4	9
2	0	0	2
1	0	0	0
	N = 17	N = 10	N = 21

TABLE 70

STUDENT POSTTEST SCORES

Points	Impression	Impression	Impression
	Experimental Group #1	Experimental Group #2	Control Group
6	6	2	0
5	6	4	5
4	5	4	12
3	0	0	4
2	0	0	0
1	0	0	0
	N = 17	N = 10	N = 21

Students gradually improved in the Impressionistic category over the duration of the experiment. Students' scored generally below Mastery level at the beginning of the experimental process, higher toward the end of the process. The improvement can be

attributed to maturation of the students; meaning, the more one writes, the more proficient one becomes with the writing process. Or the improvement can be attributed to the students using what they were taught regarding how to transition their writing without losing the meaning. An important analysis worth mentioning is that the reader of the material, the Researcher, is familiar with and uses Africanized English; meaning, the students' intended meaning was communicated relatively clearly. However, if a reader unfamiliar with Africanized English reads the essays in this study, she would rate the essays according to the above scores (SEEW system). More on this issue will be addressed in Chapter V, The Summary.

According to the description of the Impressionistic scale, the sum of the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. If this is the case, then the students fared relatively well, showing significant improvement in transitioning their overall meaning; thus, writing more effective essays. Using the Researcher's code-switching Chart (APPENDIX G), the students were consistent in using these five domains in their semantic transitions. These five "parts" will be used to explain how the "whole" meaning of a composition can be effected.

1. Subject-Verb Agreement and Usage:

The students were consistent with their use of the verb "to be" in their compositions. For example, one student wrote for essay #4 (How much money...), "I be making enough money to survive." The formal English version is "I make enough money to survive." Toward the conclusion of the experimental process, students who regularly used the verb "to be" habitually were able to transition their writing without losing their intended meaning.

2. Grammar:

Students gradually improved their grammatical usage, as well. An example, one student wrote, "My goals for the future *is* to be a medical transcriptionist." By the end of the experimental process, students who made such errors were able to correct them on their own while maintaining their intended meaning. The Researcher has found that when students attempt to elongate their sentences, which is encouraged at the composition level, they disregard the plurality or singularity of the noun. However, in Africanized English, such errors are common. The students in this study, after being taught to identify the noun before assigning a verb, transitioned to formal English effectively.

3. Word Choice/Lexicon:

One students wrote, "At any degree of my education, I want to find myself with self contentment." According to the Impressionistic Rating scale, the intended meaning is lost. If the student consistently made such errors throughout the essay, this essay would score below Mastery level. Due to the students' use of language, her intended meaning would be misunderstood, yet would remain perfectly clear to the student. When the Researcher used this sentence as an example of code-switching, many students were initially confused, even some Africanized English speakers. After careful review, most Africanized English speakers understood the intended meaning whereas students of different ethnicities remained confused with the writer's meaning.

The writer uses "degree" to mean expected level of her education, not an official academic degree (e.g., BA, MA, Ph.D., etc.). She also uses "self contentment" to refer to satisfaction or contentment with her accomplishments. Throughout the experimental process, several students used words a non-Africanized English speaker would find confusing, which would affect the writer's meaning, and thus, scores.

4. Pronoun Usage:

Throughout the experimental process, in each of the three Groups, the pronoun "it" was used in place of a more specific noun. Using the Impressionistic scale, an essay littered with the vague "it" would lower the overall Impression of the students' writing. Such a nebulous term does not communicate the intended meaning of the writer; thus, writing instructors encourage students to be more specific with their terminology. At the beginning of the experimental process, students wrote much like the following example: "I have always dreamed of helping children. *It* has always been a special love for special kids or cripple kids." The sentence has noticeable problems, yet the most obscure term to identify is the "it" in the second sentence. Here, the "it" refers to the students' goal of helping mentally or physically challenged children. When the Researcher presented this sentence to the Experiment classes, the Africanized English speakers immediately understood the reference to the "it." The non-Africanized English speakers ascribed "a special love" to the "it."

5. Syntax:

How sentences are formed, or the rules of sentence formation, defines syntax. Applying the Impressionist scale, the way sentences are formed throughout the essay can affect the overall interpretation of the piece. If the sentences are misunderstood, then the meaning of the essay will be misinterpreted, as well. For example, one students wrote, "I want to set up financially were I don't have to live check by check. This what helps me in focus and not giving up." There are obvious problems with syntax in these sentences, but with careful analysis, the meaning is conveyed. Transitioned to formal English by a student in Experiment Group #2, the sentence reads, "I want to establish myself financially so that I do not have to live paycheck by paycheck. Doing so will help me stay focused so that I will not give up on my goals." The student transitioned the sentence effectively, maintaining the writer's intended meaning while using a more formal, academic register.

A. What do African American students accomplish by code-switching in compositions?

From the findings in the follow-up questionnaire which will be discussed further in Chapter V, The Summary, one can conclude that code-switching allows students to establish their thoughts on paper using the linguistic system most familiar to them. This strategy provides students with the flexibility to rearrange ideas and thoughts, try different rhetorical strategies, and use their language to aid them in the transitioning process. As with other bilingual speakers, Africanized English speakers have the advantage of using a different linguistic system, other than formal English, to accomplish their writing tasks. A fundamental problem students in Freshman English composition have is drafting ideas; some students have been ashamed to or encouraged not to use their first linguistic system to compose their drafts. Yet second language speakers can benefit from using their native language in order to demonstrate their meaning, then transition to a more acceptable, academic register. As with other languages, African American students can use these same code-switching strategies in their composition work.

B. Does code-switching in English compositions lead to more effective communication, or does code-switching lead to miscommunication?

From the finding in Research Question No. #3 and the results of the questionnaire, which will be discussed in Chapter V, The Summary, one can conclude that code-switching can lead to more effective communication if the reader [instructor] of the composition work values, reveres, and acknowledges the writer's linguistic system. If the code-switching features of the student are devalued, denigrated, and denounced, the students' attempts at communicating her ideas will be misunderstood.

In summary, the analysis of the data shows that in order to read an essay holistically, the parts of which can be observed as affecting the entire meaning of the

essay. The overall Impression of the essays shows significant improvement in that the students used their language to transition to formal English without losing their intended meaning. As the experiment progressed and the students learned more about transitioning and code-switching, their writing improved, or rather, their writing became more communicative. Chapter V, The Summary, will analyze further the implications of what is and what is not communicative, and how educators committed to helping students in composition can redefine "standard," acceptable communication.

Research Question No. 4:

Which features reflected code-switching speech patterns?

To answer this question, the Researcher's Chart of code-switching features was used in order to identify the similarities between written and spoken code-switching usage. In addition, sample sentences from the Student Questionnaire were used to illustrate the similarities in spoken and written language.

There is much literature on the "spoken" language of African ancestry people, as was indicated in Chapter II of this study. Yet researchers have not sufficiently studied the connection between how the students' speak and what they write. As DeFrantz (1979) indicates, "oral language changes more rapidly than does written" (p. 384).

The Questionnaire was used as an informal query as to how the students' interpreted the code-switching procedures taught to them by the Researcher; thus, some students used code-switching features to communicate their intended meaning. Some students attempted to use a more formal register, trying to incorporate the switching skills they learned in the research process. Several students, however, code-switched on a few levels. Since only Experiment Group #1 and Experiment Group #2 were instructed in transitioning techniques, only these two Groups answered the Questionnaire.

Following is an examination of the five selected writing features which are consistent with spoken language.

1. Subject-Verb Agreement and Usage:

Students in this study regularly used the verb "to be" in their writing. Similar to spoken language, the use, deletion, and atypical use of the verb "to be" is identifiable. The literature reinforces the use of the verb "to be" in spoken Africanized English, but this study shows that the verb "to be" remains consistent in the written language as well (See APPENDICES L through Z). Remembering that Africanized English is rule-governed, the students' use of "to be" is consistent with the rules of the oral language, which seems justifiable because in both instances, oral and written language usage, the student is using the same linguistic system for both communicative forms.

2. Grammar:

Students in this study regularly followed the rules of spoken Africanized English grammar in their written compositions (See APPENDICES L through Z). For example, some students neglected the identifiable verb in the sentences, e.g., "She nice." This pattern of language also persists in the written language. Again, the speakers of the language are also the writers of the language; therefore, the same familiar rules apply.

3. Word Choice/Lexicon:

As with the spoken language, Africanized English writers will use word selection according to the rules of the language. According to the rules of other acknowledged languages, speakers and writers of a linguistic system will "switch" to their first language system in an effort to convey their meaning. Although the word selection may not sound or read logically to a person unfamiliar with the language, the speaker's (writer's) interpretation is clear. Thus, the written form is consistent with the spoken form, and vice versa. An example (Question #3, Questionnaire): "The process has helped me ask a friend to *overlook* my paper, for a fresh eye." According to the rules of formal, academic

word usage, the word *overlook* is used inappropriately. A correct term would be, "look over," or "edit," or "proofread." Although the lexical usage is incorrect in a more formal register, the students' meaning is clear.

4. Pronoun Usage:

The literature shows that other linguistic systems use language features similar to Africanized English. In Africanized English, the written and spoken use of the pronoun "it" is used deliberately, as Anderson (1985) asserts, to show presence or to introduce statements. An example of which is the following (Question #2, Questionnaire): "I never knew how many mistakes I really make until I proofread my work carefully. *It* would sometimes change the meaning of what I was trying to say." The pronoun here refers to her proofreading corrections, not the actual mistakes made in her work. This type of pronoun usage remains consistent in the respondents' work. Another example is the following (Question #3, Questionnaire): "*It* makes *it* easier to write." The student's first use of the pronoun refers to analyzing one's written work more thoroughly; the second "it" refers to the topic or assignment.

5. Syntax:

Syntactical relationships cover a broad range of domains, including the double negative, the use, misuse, and habitual use of the verb "to be," and the general construction of sentences. According to the results of this study, the written syntactical transitions were consistent with the literature's examination of Africanized English speech patterns. The manner in which the students speak appears to translate to the written communication. An example from the Questionnaire is as follows (Question #2): "Because sometimes I just go to writing with all of my thoughts jammed together, making mistakes at the same time. So proofreading is a good solution to *not* making *no*

mistakes." The use of the double negative here is syntactically incorrect, but the author's meaning is conveyed.

In summary, the spoken word and the written word are connected because the speaker of the language is also the writer of that language. The five domains identified in this study--subject-verb agreement, grammatical structure, word choice/lexicon, pronoun usage, and syntax--are represented consistently in both oral and written language patterns. The spoken word appears to translate to the written form, in that the same rules of the language apply. The respondents in this study swicthed consistently, using the rules of the spoken language. By the conclusion of the study, several students switched less often in their transitional process, yet some used the features of the language consistently. Some students could not omit their first linguistic system completely; some evidence of Africanized English remained. A suggestion for further study in this area will be made in Chapter V, The Summary.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter addresses the following: (1) the summary of the research conducted, (2) the conclusions drawn from the analysis of the findings, (3) the implications of the study, and (4) the recommendations for future research, which result from the conclusions and the implications.

Summary

The instrument used in this study--the Scale for Evaluating Expository Writing--was used to identify, detect, observe, and analyze the research questions. In addition to this instrument, a Chart of specific code-switching features of African American students, derived from the Review of the Literature, was incorporated. At the end of the experimental process, a questionnaire was also administered to the respondents in order to analyze further the experimental process. These groups of students were selected for the study, labeled as Experiment Group #1, Experiment Group #2, and Control Group. All three Groups were matched according to composition level, meaning, all three Groups were comprised of English Composition students; all three classes were Freshman English composition classes. The five stages in the experimental process were administered to the two Experimental groups, #1 and #2. The Control Group received No-treatment. The five stages in the experimental process were as follows: Pretest, Experiment #1, Experiment #2, Experiment #3, and Posttest. The SEEW instrument provided criteria to use in evaluating student performance in expository writing. Of the six domains provided in the SEEW scale, five were selected for this study: Impressionistic Rating, General Competence, Essay Coherence, Organization/Paragraph, and Mechanics. In addition to the Scale, the Researcher's Chart of code-switching was used in conjunction with the instrument to document when and at what levels code-switching occurred in

student writing. The SEEW scale offered six levels of rating criteria, listed from the highest possible score (6) to the lowest possible score (1).

At the beginning of the experimental process, the majority of the students in all three groups scored relatively and consistently below Mastery level (3, 2, or 1), especially in the Mechanics category. The scores seem to imply that students lack the mechanical skills required to write proficient compositions. The proceeding stages in the research process show that students used Mechanics to code-switch. In other words, the meaning was somewhat clear, but certain features of mechanical usage--noun-verb agreement, grammatical usage, word choice/lexicon, pronoun usage, and syntax--were consistently misused in order to convey meaning. The occurrence of such switching behaviors is consistent with the Literature in that code-switching typically occurs in these particular features of Africanized English language--in this case, in the writing, which proves concordant with the oral language.

The respondents continually scored slightly above average in the first three categories of the SEEW scale: overall Impression, Coherence, and Competence. Toward the conclusion of the experimental process, the respondents in all three Groups scored impressively higher in these three categories, the most improvement resulting in the two Experiment Groups. Throughout the process, an important observation was made. The Control Group, which received No-treatment, remained fairly consistent, improving slightly, but dropping somewhat in scores toward the end of the process. The slight drop in scores could be the result of No-treatment, as the Control Group was not exposed to additional teaching in code-switching and transitional skills.

Conclusions

Research Question No. 1:

How were the types of code-switching in freshman English composition detected, observed, and identified?

To answer this research question, the Scale of Expository Writing was used to detect, observe, and identify the types of code-switching features of students in the three Groups. The categories used in analyzing the features were, according to the SEEW scale, as follows: Impressionistic Rating, Competence, Coherence, Paragraph/Organization, and Mechanics. The scores assigned to the respondents were 6 (six), the highest possible score, and 1 (one), the lowest possible scores. According to the criteria listed in the SEEW scale, a score of 4 (four) and above was considered Mastery level whereas scores of 3 (three) and below were considered below Mastery level. The assumption here is that above Mastery scores equate to passing scores, below Mastery, not passing. It was thought that students would consistently score below Mastery level at the beginning of the experimental process and gradually increase their performance by the end of the experiment. It was also thought that students would show evidence of code-switching in the first three categories of the SEEW scale more so than in the final two selected categories of Paragraph/Organization and Mechanics.

As the results of Question No. 1 show, students scored higher in the first three categories, which are more subjective, and scored lowest in the objective categories. Although students' scores improved greatly over the experimental process, the Paragraph/Organization and Mechanics categories proved most challenging for the students. Students, in essence, used Mechanics to "switch" from one linguistic system to the other.

Research Question No. 2:

What were the features of code-switching in freshman English composition classes demonstrated by African American students?

To answer Research Question No. 2, APPENDICES L through Z were used to document the African American respondents at every stage in the experimental process. The Researcher constructed a Chart of selected code-switching features which seems to

recur in student writing (APPENDIX G). The selected features are consistent with the SEEW Expository Scale V, Element 6, used to examine the Research Questions. The features are also consistent with features of African American code-switching observed and documented in Chapter II, The Review of the Literature. The Chart consisted of five domains representing five areas indicative of the code-switching behavior in African American student writing: Subject-verb agreement, grammatical usage, pronoun usage, word choice/lexicon, and syntactical features. As mentioned previously, although these features are seen in the writing of students from most ethnicities, the specific examples used in the Chart, and examined in Chapter II, The Review of the Literature, reinforce the applicability of the features as representative of Africanized English.

The assumption was that these five domains listed above would be evident in the writing of Africanized English users. The study found that indeed these five specific features, the use and atypical use of the features, dominated the students' writing. At the beginning of the experimental process, the respondents used these features frequently to switch from their first linguistic system to formal English. By the conclusion of the experimental process, the respondents switched less frequently, but some characteristics of Africanized English remained in the students' writing, indicating that Africanized English usage is consistent with and embedded in the students' culture, and that regardless of the transitional skills of students, communicative devices learned throughout life remain constant.

Research Question No. 3:

What were the semantic transitions in code-switching identified in the English composition writing of African American students?

A. What do African American students accomplish by code-switching in compositions?

B. Does code-switching in English compositions lead to more effective communication, or does code-switching lead to miscommunication?

As mentioned earlier in Chapter IV, Research Question #4, the respondents gradually improved in the Impressionistic category over the duration of the experiment. Students scored generally below Mastery level at the beginning of the experimental process, higher toward the end of the process. The improvement can be attributed to maturation of the students, meaning the more one writes, the more proficient one becomes with the writing process. Or the improvement can be attributed to the students using what they were taught regarding how to transition their writing without losing the meaning. The Researcher, being familiar with and a user of Africanized English, understood the respondents' intended meaning, but the Researcher also believes that any instructor committed to the skills improvement and communicative proficiency of students can learn the features of various linguistic systems in order to fairly evaluate student writing without attributing preconceived ideas regarding different linguistic systems. Although the SEEW instrument proved helpful in this study, clearly an instrument which considers various linguistic features should be developed. The assumption here is that in American society, formal English is the accepted linguistic system, and any variation of or departure from formal English is considered nonstandard. To stress the importance of learning standard English does not mean that the students' first linguistic system must be ostracized or devalued. In order to value the students' culture while encouraging the application of formal English writing skills, educators should learn, for themselves, the language patterns of students from different cultures and reinforce the use of the language as a transitional tool.

A. What do African American students accomplish by code-switching in compositions?

The findings show that by maintaining the first linguistic system and using the system as a learning tool, African American students were able to switch effectively or transition their intended meaning to formal English. Once the students were assured that their language was accepted, the students gained confidence in their ability to learn another register.

B. Does code-switching in English compositions lead to more effective communication, or does code-switching lead to miscommunication?

The research shows that if the code-switching features and patterns of students are validated and used effectively in the classroom, code-switching can actually lead to more clear, coherent, effective communication in student writing. However, if the features of the language are slighted or considered "poor English," miscommunication can result.

Research Question No. 4:

Which features reflected code-switching speech patterns?

This study found that the spoken word and the written word are connected because the speaker of the language is also the writer of that language. The five domains identified in this study--subject-verb agreement, grammatical structure, word choice/lexicon, pronoun usage, and syntax--are consistently represented in both oral and written language patterns. The Researcher discovered that the spoken word translates to the written form, in that the same rules of the language apply. The respondents in this study switched consistently, using the rules of the spoken language to translate their meaning to the written word. The suggestions offered in the Review of the Literature regarding drafting and revising could aid students in their transitional process since the first draft students write is typically a direct translation of their spoken language. The Questionnaire given to both Experimental Groups confirms the notion that students are

not sure what to "say," and their writing will reflect this formidable task. The specific student responses to the Questionnaire are listed at the end of this study.

Implications

The findings of this study have the following implications for English compositions instructors and departments, for educators in teaching and developing programs and methods to aid students in transitioning to formal English while maintaining their first linguistic system, and for communities that would like to maintain their first linguistic system while developing formal English skills.

First, the findings of this study show that Africanized English is a legitimate language that Africanized English speakers can use as a tool to help them transition to formal English without losing their meaning. If students' linguistic system is disparaged, students lose motivation to learn the "accepted" language and thus, perform unsuccessfully. The results show that when students' are "taught" to use their linguistic system in the writing process, and if that system is esteemed, students learn to transition successfully.

Secondly, the findings show that if the students are given an opportunity to critique their own and their classmates' work fairly, in which students recognize their linguistic features, students will gain more confidence in their ability to write in a different linguistic system and maintain some consistency in the more formal system. The results of this study also show that the improvements made by African American students is a result the students recognizing their own code-switching, not just "good teaching." The features identified in this study were consistently used by the African American students participating in this study, which is how the Researcher detected that these features were representative consistently of Africanized English usage. Effective teaching strategies can help students improve their writing, but this research shows that also validating the

linguistic systems of students and allowing students to recognize their own writing and make the necessary transitions can lead to more effective writing.

Finally, English departments can stress the importance of identifying the code-switching behaviors of students in order to help instructors recognize different linguistic systems and thus, develop strategies to aid students in the transitional process without forcing students to lose, reject, or eliminate their first linguistic system. Doing so would strengthen the motivational level of students who use a language that has been labeled "unacademic."

In addition to the above mentioned implications, a notation should be made concerning instrumentation. Although the SEEW scale proved useful in this study, there is an imperative need for instrumentation geared toward observing, identifying, and analyzing linguistic systems other than formal English, more pointedly, an instrument which analyzes, observes, and identifies Africanized English. Implications of this study show that the African American respondents did indeed improve their comprehension and development of formal English writing skills. Yet the SEEW scale does not consider the language skills of those respondents whose first linguistic system is not formal English, or those who switch from one linguistic system to another. In order to obtain a fair and accurate assessment of students' writing skills, a more developed instrument is needed, one which will consider all students of various ethnicities. As this study shows, an instrument that analyses Africanized English is absolutely essential.

The effectiveness of the tools used in the study and the actual teaching procedures providing relevant information for the study were determined by the following questions:

1. Did the teaching strategies help students understand code-switching?

According to the respondents in this study, the code-switching teaching strategy helped importantly. Following are actual student responses from Question #1 from the Student Questionnaire administered after the experimental process:

1. Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to your reader? Why or why not?

The responses are listed in three sections according to theme: Thought process, Clarity, and Teaching demonstration. The ethnicity of the respondent is also included: AA represents African American students; EA represents White students.

Thought Process:

(AA) "Yes. It has helped me to read and understand so others can understand my writing."
(AA) "This process has helped my think before I write."
(AA) "This process has helped me. It has made me think a lot before I write. It has also helped me to shape what I'm trying to say so that the reader can understand."
(AA) "Now I ask myself questions about my paper before I turn it in."
(AA) "Yes. It helps me in considering and receiving meaning of essays."

Clarity:

(AA) "Yes. It has helped me to shape the way that I write so that the meaning is clearer and understandable."
(AA) "I think this process has helped me in both ways because [it has] given me steps to follow, to help me get started and read what I have written and to make sense of what I have written."
(AA) "Yes, it has helped. I find myself connecting vague statements as if I was a reader who had no background on my topic."
(EA) "It has helped me realize that I need to write more clearly so that *anyone* who read my paper would be able to understand it."
(EA) "Rereading for an objective perspective makes me realize if meaning is conveyed properly or not."
(AA) "Yes, because now when I write I try to make sure the reader will understand (clearly) what I'm saying."
(AA) "Yes, because it demonstrates how a writer's meaning can be difficult to understand to other readers."
(AA) "Yes, because I want my writing to be understood."
(AA) "Yes, other people need to understand what I write, not just me."

Teaching Demonstration:

(AA) "Yes, because reading the examples sentences, I could not understand them myself and I could see my writing within the examples."

(AA) "The process has enabled me to understand the reasons for the exercises that were given."
(AA) "Yes. Because you put a lot of paragraphs on the board. Yes. Because I now know my mistakes."

2. Did the instrument provide enough features to identify code-switching of students in college composition adequately?

The SEEW instrument provided the features necessary for evaluating composition writing; however, as mentioned earlier, the instrument (or the instruments' developers) do not consider how these features manifest themselves in the writing of African American students, or any other group of students who speak languages other than formal English. The instrument was useful, but clearly there is a need for more accurate and applicable instrumentation.

3. Did the data gathering process provide the researcher with enough information to analyze fully the occurrence of code-switching?

The data gathering process did provide the Researcher with enough information to assess fully the occurrence of code-switching in the English composition classes selected. The Researcher was surprised by the amount of applicable and important information this study provided. A future study could expand the experimental process to one full semester or one full academic year in order to further observe the code-switching patterns of students in composition courses.

4. Was there significant improvement by students in the experiment groups identifying their own code-switching? Did these students improve their overall writing without losing their meaning in the transitional process?

Question #4 of the Student Questionnaire shows that students were able to identify their transitional process in writing. The study shows that students did indeed improve in

the experimental process in both Experiment Groups and were able to detect when they switched, why they switched, and how to write their meaning more effectively. The following are actual student responses to Question #4. Three themes emerged from the responses: Revision techniques, Clarity, and No change in writing strategy. Again, the AA represents African American students; EA represents White students.

Revision:

(AA) "I detected confused sentences, and mostly misspelled words. A formal style helped me to complete my paper without starting over."
(EA) "Sometimes when I would read over some things I would have to totally change the meaning because it would be unclear or very hard to understand. I would even los[e] the meaning all together."
(AA) "On somethings my meaning was not clear but reading it over and over again, putting words and phrases to help better get my meaning clear helped me."
(AA) "I would not change my meaning, but I would try to gradual[ly] transition [my] style."
(AA) "I tried to not change my meaning but just clear up my writing. I knew what I wanted to say; I just had to change it several times to get it right."
(EA) "On several occasions, I was able to detect that my meaning was unclear. I was able to change the meaning without losing what I was trying to say."

Clarity:

(AA) "I would try to transition to a more formal style without losing my mean[ing] that I was try[ing] to bring across to the reader in my paper."
(AA) "I was able to detect when my meaning could have been viewed as unclear to the reader and I found clearer sentences, or tried to do so."
(AA) "Yes. I want to make sure the reader clearly understood what I was trying to say."
(AA) "Yes because after I read it [it] didn't make sense to me."
(AA) "Yes. If my work was unclear or didn't make any sense whatsoever I would rewrite it and make myself clear."

No Change:

(EA) "No because I haven't faced this problem."
(AA) "During some of the discussion I finally check[ed] where the meaning was not clear. I was not really compelled to change the style completely."

According to the students' responses, observing and detecting their use of language and using the language as a transitional tool helped students clarify their writing without losing their intended meaning.

5. What, if any, were the improvements or changes in the composition writing of the students in the control group? What situations could contribute to these changes, if any?

The Control Groups' respondents, as mentioned earlier, remained fairly consistent throughout the experimental process. The respondents improved slightly, then slipped somewhat in scores toward the conclusion of the process. The reason for the consistency and for the slight drop in scores could be the result of No-treatment. Both experiment groups were introduced to identifying language shifts and taught how to transition to a more formal register. The Control Group, however, was not exposed to this teaching strategy. Although the Control Group did not fare as well as the Experiment Groups, the performance in this Group was more than satisfactory holistically.

6. Did the series of teaching code-switching to the experiment groups serve to help students understand code-switching better and how to transition their writing to formal English without losing their meaning?

As seen in the participants' responses, the code-switching strategies worked successfully. Questions #2 and #3 from the Student Questions support this analysis. The majority of respondents asserted that the process increased their awareness of the need to convey meaning, but the students were most responsive to the idea that they did not need to change their meaning. The students were also responsive to the notion that they could maintain their language and use their language as a transitional tool. The majority of the students who responded to questions #2 and #3 affirm that the process encouraged them to do more extensive proofreading in order to catch switching patterns and to continuously focus on analyzing writing patterns and switching in their regular course work.

7. Did follow-up data gathering after the time-series quasi-experimental teaching strategies indicate successful and substantial modification?

The follow-up work, the Student Questionnaire, provided feedback the Researcher found particularly helpful in analyzing the study's effectiveness. Without the voices of the respondents, the honest observations of the respondents in the study would remain unknown.

Recommendation for Future Study

The results of this study show and confirm that African American students own and use a legitimate, rule-governed linguistic system that should be recognized in the English composition classroom. The results also show that students can use their linguistic system to transition to formal English without losing their intended meaning. Maintaining their first linguistic system can aid students in communicating in both linguistic systems, giving students a tool which can help them write and communicate more effectively. The results of this study rationalize the following recommendations:

1. An investigative study of additional code-switching features used by African American students in English composition classes should be conducted. The results of which should be included with the features studied by this Researcher and past researchers in the fields of linguistics and education, with an emphasis in African American college students.
2. A thorough study of the code-switching features and patterns of African American students at the primary levels, particularly kindergarten through sixth grades, but not excluding seventh through twelfth grades, should be conducted. In additional to the writing patterns of these students, an investigation of the code-switching speech patterns is also recommended.
3. An intrinsic study, possibly participatory or experiential, of students at various grade levels, identifying when, where, why, and how these subjects code-switch should be explored and analyzed.

4. Situational and motivational factors of why African American students from varying backgrounds code-switch should be explored.

5. A cross-relational study should be conducted to analyze whether English composition instructors of various backgrounds can also use code-switching patterns of all students as a tool in the classroom.

6. A thorough analysis of the diagnostic process of English composition classrooms should be conducted. Early detection of code-switching behaviors can benefit both the instructor and the students.

7. The development of an instrument that would be appropriate for the analysis of linguistic systems other than formal English. Such an instrument would consider and investigate features of language labeled unacademic or informal.

Recommendations for Action

English departments should begin rigorously to recognize all linguistic systems in order to teach students from diverse backgrounds better. English departments should also incorporate the use of code-switching as a learning tool for all students, including African ancestry and European ancestry students. The community college system is a good place to start, as class sizes are usually small, allowing the instructor more opportunity to identify specific features and plan instructional lessons accordingly. Encouraging English departments to administer cohesive diagnostics, such as the Lewis Model, will aid instructors at the beginning of the course to diagnose code-switching patterns of students. If English departments stressed code-switching as a learning tool, all students would benefit from learning the linguistic patterns of other ethnicities, lean to use their first language as a transitional tool, and proudly maintain their first linguistic system, knowing that the language, and their culture, have been validated and legitimized in the classroom.

REFERENCES

References

Alexander, C. F. (1985). Black English dialect and the classroom teacher. In Brooks, C. K. and others (Eds.), Tapping potential: English and language arts for the black leader (pp. 20-29). Illinois: NCTE.

American Psychological Association. (1994). Publication manual, 4th Ed. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Anderson, E. (1976). Black American English: a survey of its origins and development and its use in teaching composition.

Anderson, E. (1985). Using folk literature in teaching composition. In Brooks, C. K. and others (Eds.), Tapping potential: English and language arts for the black leader (pp. 219-225). Illinois: NCTE.

Auer, J. C. P. (1984). Bilingual conversation. Philidelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Axelrod, R. B. & Cooper, C. R. (1994). The St. Martin's Guide to Writing, 4th Education. St. Martin Press: New York.

Bailey, B. L. (1971). Toward a new perspective in Negro dialectology (revised version). In Wolfram, W. & Clark, N. A. (Eds.), Black-white speech relationships (pp. 40-50) Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Baron, D. E. (1975). Non-standard English, composition, and the academic establishment. College English, 37 (2), pp. 176-183.

Bibb, T. C. (1985). Teaching tip: giving students feedback. In Brooks, C. K. and others (Eds.), Tapping potential: English and language arts for the black leader (pp. 239-240). Illinois: NCTE.

Bickerton, D. (1975). Dynamics of a Creole system. New York: Canbridge University Press.

Bickerton, D. (1981). Roots of langauge. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers, Inc.

Bond, C. L. & Bowie, R. L. (1994). Influencing future teachers' attitudes toward black English: are we making a difference? Journal of Teacher Education, 45 (1), pp. 112-118.

Borg, W. R., Gall, J. P. & Gall, M. D. (1993). Applying educational research: a practical guide (3rd ed.). White Plains: Longman.

Bradford, E. & Taylor, E. (1985). Using the oral history approach to teach freshman writing. In Brooks, C. K. and others (Eds.), Tapping potential: English and language arts for the black leader (pp. 214-218). Illinois: NCTE .

Britton, J., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A., & Rosen, H. (1975). The development of writing abilities (11-18). London: Macmillan Educational.

Bruder, M. N. & Hayden, L. (1972). Teaching composition: a report on a bidialectal approach. Paper presented at the Sixth Annual TESOL Convention, Washington, DC.

Burkett, E. M. (1978). American English dialects in literature. Metuchen: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Burling, R. (1973). English in black and white. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Campbell, D. T. (1957). Factors relevant to the validity of experiments in social settings. Psychological Bulletin, 54, 297-312.

Campbell, E. D. (1994). Empowerment through bidialectalism: encouraging standard English in a black English environment. A practicum report.

Campbell, D. T. & Cook, T. D. (1979). Quasi-experimentation: design & analysis issues for field settings. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Campbell, D. T. & Stanley, J. C. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research on teaching. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Chapman, D. W. & Walker, P. L. (1994). The Power of Writing. Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing Company

Dandy, E. B. (1988). Dialect differences: do they interfere? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Minority Advising Program and Minority Recruitment Officers (4th, Savannah, GA, April 19).

Dandy, E.B. (1991). Black communications: breaking down the barriers. Chicago: African American Images.

DeFrantz, A. P. (1995). Coming to cultural and linguistic awakening: an African and African American educational vision. In J. Frederickson (Ed.), Reclaiming our Voices (pp. 53-78). Ontario: CABE.

DeFrantz, A. P. (1979). A critique of the literature on Ebonics. Journal of Black Studies, 9, 383-396.

Dietsch, B. M. (1998). Reasoning and writing well: a rhetoric, reader, and handbook. Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Dillard, J. L. (1972) Black English: its history and usage in the United States. New York: Vintage Books.

DiYanni, R. (1985). Connections: reading, writing, and thinking. Upper Montclair: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.

Dulay, H. (1982). Language two. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Epps, J. (1985). Killing them softly: Why Willie can't write. In Brooks, C. K. and others (Eds.), Tapping potential: English and language arts for the black leader (pp. 154-158). Illinois: NCTE.

Fanon, F. (1967). Black skin, white masks. New York: Grove Press, Inc.

Farr, M. (1986). Language, culture, and writing: sociolinguistic foundations of research on writing. In Rothkopf, E. Z. (Ed.), Review of Research in Education (pp. 195-233). Washington, DC: The American Educational Research Association.

Feigenbaum, I. (1975). The use of nonstandard English in teaching standard: contrast and comparison. In Stoller, P. (Ed.), Black American English: Its background and its usage in the school and in literature (pp. 89-131). New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc.

Fishman, J. A. (1971). Advances in the sociology of language, Volume 1. Basic concepts, theories, and problem: alternative approaches. Mouton & Co. N.V. Publishers, The Hague.

Fishman, J. A. (1991). Reversing language shift: theorhetical and empirical foundatins of assistence to threatened languages. England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Fowler, R. J. (1985). The composing process of black student writers. In Brooks, C. K. and others (Eds.), Tapping potential: English and language arts for the black leader (pp. 182-186). Illinois: NCTE.

Fromkin, V. & Rodman, R. (1998). An Introduction to Language. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace College Publishers

Gibbons, J. (1987). Code-mixing and code-choice: A Hong Kong case study. England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Hart, A. W., Reinking, J. A., & Von Der Osten, R. (1996). Strategies for Successful Writing: A Rhetoric, Reader, and Handbook, 4th Edition. Prentice-Hall Inc. New Jersey.

Hindman, J. E. (1993). Into action: reading black and write styles in the composition classroom. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English (83rd, Pittsburgh, PA, November 17-22).

Hindman, J. E. & Robinson, M. A. (1994). Un-rapping the invisible man: black and white styles in conflict. A panel presentation (including The conventions of distance: the effects of schooling on style by Robinson, M. A.). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the conference on College Composition and Communication (45th, Nashville, TN, March 16-19).

Hoffman, A. J. & Yardes, R. E. (1996). Writing for College: A Practical Approach, 3rd Edition. HarperCollins College Publishers: New York.

Holiday, D. A. (1991). Street Corner Writing. Viewpoints.

Hoover, M. R. (1985). Ethnography of Black communications. Journal of Black Reading/Language Education, 2, 2-4.

Hunt, B. (1985). Structuring the college composition class around the black basic writer. In Brooks, C. K. and others (Eds.), Tapping potential: English and language arts for the black leader (pp. 212-213). Illinois: NCTE.

Hymes, D. (1996). Ethnography, linguistics, narrative inequality: toward an understanding of voice. London: Taylor & Francis Ltd.

Hymes, D. (1980). Language in education. Washington, DC: The Center for Applied Linguistics.

Krapp. G. P. (1962). A comprehensive guide to good English: Volume I, A-H. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing, Co.

Labov, W. A. (1970). The logic of non-standard English. In Stoller, P. (Ed.), Black American English: Its background and its usage in the school and in literature (pp. 89-131). New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc.

Labov, W. A. (1970). The study of non-standard English. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and NCTE.

Lipski, J. M. (1985). Linguistic aspects of Spanish-English language switching. Arizona: Arizona State University.

Macrorie, K. (1984). Searching writing. Upper Montclair: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.

Mitchell-Kernan, C. (1986). Signifying and marking: two Afro-American speech acts. In Gumpertz, J. & Hymes, D. H. (Eds.), Direction in sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication (pp. 161-179). Oxford: T.J. Press Ltd.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). Duelling languages: grammatical struture in code-switching. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). Social motivations for code-switching: evidence from Africa. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Perry, J. (1985). Language tips: the black Ebonics speaker and the reading process. In Brooks, C. K. and others (Eds.), Tapping potential: English and language arts for the black leader (pp. 72-74). Illinois: NCTE.

Quallmalz, E. S. (1982). Scale for evaluating expository writing (SEEW). Los Angeles: University of California, Center for the Study of Evaluation.

Ramsey, P. A. (1985). Teaching the teachers to teach black-dialect writers. In Brooks, C. K. and others (Eds.), Tapping potential: English and language arts for the black leader (pp. 176-181). Illinois: NCTE.

Rickford, J. R. (1987). Dimension of a Creole continuum. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Rosu, A. (1988). Pragmatics and the teaching of writing. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (39th, St. Louis, MO, March 17-19).

Royster, J. (1985). A new lease on writing. In Brooks, C. K. and others (Eds.), Tapping potential: English and language arts for the black leader (pp. 159-167). Illinois: NCTE.

Smitherman, G. (1977). Talkin' and Testifyin'. Boston: Houghton Mufflin Company.

Stouffer, S.A. (1950). Some observations on study design. American Journal of Sociology, 55, 355-61.

Sutcliff, D. (1992). System in black language. Bristol: Longdunn Press.

Taylor, O. L. (1971). Some sociolinguistic concepts of black language. Today's Speech, 19, 19-26.

Tollefson, J. W. (1991) Planning Language, Planning Inequality. New York: Longman.

Turner, L. D. (1969). Africanisms in the Gullah dialect. Chicago: Arno Press, Inc.

Valdes-Fallis, G. (1978). Language in education theory & practice: Code switching and the classroom teacher. Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Valentine, L. P. (1994). Code switching and language leveling: Use of multiple codes in a Severn Ojibwe community. International Journal of American Linguistics, 60 (4), pp. 315-341.

Walker, G. P. (1977). Afro-American linguistic patterns: impact on academic success. Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board.

Wardhaugh, R. (1992). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Woodson, C. G. (1933). The Mis-education of the Negro. Washington: The Associated Publishers.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Dr. Keflyn Reed
Chairman of the Division of Humanities
Bishop State Community College
351 N. Broad
Mobile, AL 36603

Dear Dr. Reed,

Attached is a consent form requesting the use of Bishop State Community College for educational research purposes. Included in the consent form are the study aim, the research procedures, subject population, potential risks, and benefits to the study population.

If you have any questions or need clarification, please feel free to contact Melanie A. Lewis at 916/568-3100 ext. 7645 anytime.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Melanie A. Lewis

University of San Francisco

Consent for Education Research

Melanie A. Lewis, in the International and Multicultural Education Department, requests permission to conduct a study of African American student code-switching in freshman English composition.

A. STUDY AIM

The purpose of this study is to identify code-switching in the composition writing of African American students as having significance in the framework of college writing. The purpose is also to not only identify code-switching in composition as having linguistic significance, but to examine how African American students can effectively retain their linguistic system while transitioning into formal English.

B. STUDY POPULATION

The researcher will choose at least two composition classrooms at Bishop State Community College with the consent of Dr. Keflyn Reed. The students involved in the study will not be selected specifically for this experiment. Although the research is geared toward identifying code-switching in the writing of African American students, all students in both classrooms will be included in the study and in the review of the experiment results. Results of this study have implications that acknowledging code-switching as a common occurrence in composition will lead to a greater understanding of the difficulties students face in freshman English composition, and determine more effective ways to teach writing to students at the college level.

C. RESEARCH DESIGN

Quasi-experimental design will be used for this descriptive research study. The researcher will do a study of the semantic component in writing, or rather, an analysis based on the student's "meaning" in the writing process. The researcher will teach the procedures connected to the code-switching treatment; the classroom instructor will administer both the pretest and posttest. The researcher will serve as an observer during

the pretest and posttest, and will have no personal contact with the subjects. The instructor will be the contact person for the study. Once fully developed, the researcher will give the instructor specific essay topics geared toward revealing and understanding the nature of code-switching. Such teaching techniques may already exist in the researcher's repertoire, but much more research on additional techniques will be explored. At no time will the researcher touch or have any personal, individual contact with the students before, during, or after the study. Only the students' writing will be reviewed. The students will not give consent because of the nature of the study. The purpose of using quasi-experimentation is to analyze code-switching in a natural, scholastic environment. If the students (subjects) were aware that their writing was being analyzed for non-scholastic purposes, or rather, reasons separate from their regular classroom, the results would be impaired, the purpose of the study would be jeopardized. The students will not be aware of the nature of the study, their grades will not be affected by this study in any way. As a result, the students will not encounter potential stress.

The format for conducting the study is as follows:

1. Selection of school in which to conduct experiment
2. Selection of classes/approval process
3. Conduct pre-test on student writing
4. Conduct experiment (s)
5. Conduct post-test on student writing
6. Review findings

These code-switching procedures will be done in the assigned classrooms and should only include three (3) class sessions, approximately 150 minutes. An additional class session may be required as follow-up.

D. RISKS

The researcher hopes to maintain human subject confidentiality by using a matrix system to identify the students involved in this study. The instructor will administer all

phases of the study; thus, the researcher will have no personal contact with the subjects. The researcher will ask the selected instructor to hide the names of students by using a symbol-matrix. The researcher will give tabs to the instructor in order to identify the subjects and hide names. The tabs will identify the ethnicity of the students only; full names will never be revealed to the researcher. The subjects' initials may also be included as a way to prevent human error in identification of the students. After confidentiality is assured, the researcher will examine the occurrence of code-switching at all phases of the study (pre, treatment, post). The researcher will never know the true identities of the subjects, further protecting the identity and confidentiality of human subjects. The researcher does not predict any discomforts to the subjects, including effects on the students' grade in the class. The researcher's study will not negatively affect the student's overall grade, but may, instead, aid students in improving their writing performance.

E. COSTS

There are no costs involved in this study

F. QUESTIONS

If there are any questions, please contact Melanie A. Lewis, at 916/568-3100 ext. 7645. The researcher is willing to further explain the purposes, procedures, and benefits of this investigation if clarification if required.

G. CONSENT

A copy of the consent form has been received for record keeping purposes. I give consent to Melanie A. Lewis, International and Multicultural Education Department, to conduct a study of African American student code-switching in Freshman English Composition in my classrooms.

_____	_____
Date	Dr. Keflyn Reed, Chairman of the Division of Humanities
_____	_____
Date	Melanie A. Lewis, Researcher

APPENDIX B

Dr. Yvonne Kennedy
President
Bishop State Community College
351 N. Broad
Mobile, AL 36603

Dear Dr. Kennedy,

Attached is a consent form requesting the use of Bishop State Community College for educational research purposes. Included in the consent form are the study aim, the research procedures, subject population, potential risks, and benefits to the study population.

If you have any questions or need clarification, please feel free to contact Melanie A. Lewis at 916/568-3100 ext. 7645 anytime.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Melanie A. Lewis

University of San Francisco

Consent for Education Research

Melanie A. Lewis, in the International and Multicultural Education Department, requests permission to conduct a study of African American student code-switching in freshman English composition.

A. STUDY AIM

The purpose of this study is to identify code-switching in the composition writing of African American students as having significance in the framework of college writing. The purpose is also to not only identify code-switching in composition as having linguistic significance, but to examine how African American students can effectively retain their linguistic system while transitioning into formal English.

B. STUDY POPULATION

The researcher will choose two composition classrooms at Bishop State Community College with the consent of Dr. Keflyn Reed. The students involved in the study will not be selected specifically for this experiment. Although the research is geared toward identifying code-switching in the writing of African American students, all students in both classrooms will be included in the study and in the review of the experiment results. Results of this study have implications that acknowledging code-switching as a common occurrence in composition will lead to a greater understanding of the difficulties students face in freshman English composition, and determine more effective ways to teach writing to students at the college level.

C. RESEARCH DESIGN

Quasi-experimental design will be used for this descriptive research study. The researcher will do a study of the semantic component in writing, or rather, an analysis based on the student's "meaning" in the writing process. The researcher will administer/teach the procedures connected to the code-switching treatment; the classroom instructor will administer both the pretest and posttest. The researcher will serve as an

observer during the pretest and posttest, and will have no personal contact with the subjects. The instructor will be the contact person for the study. Once fully developed, the researcher will give the instructor specific essay topics geared toward revealing and understanding the nature of code-switching. Such teaching techniques may already exist in the researcher's repertoire, but much more research on additional techniques will be explored. At no time will the researcher touch or have any personal, individual contact with the students before, during, or after the study. Only the students' writing will be reviewed. The students will not give consent because of the nature of the study. The purpose of using quasi-experimentation is to analyze code-switching in a natural, scholastic environment. If the students (subjects) were aware that their writing was being analyzed for non-scholastic purposes, or rather, reasons separate from their regular classroom, the results would be impaired, the purpose of the study would be jeopardized. The students will not be aware of the nature of the study, their grades will not be affected by this study in any way. As a result, the students will not encounter potential stress.

The format for conducting the study is as follows:

1. Selection of school in which to conduct experiment
2. Selection of classes/approval process
3. Conduct pre-test on student writing
4. Conduct experiment (s)
5. Conduct post-test on student writing
6. Review findings

These code-switching procedures will be done in the assigned classrooms and should only include three (3) class sessions, approximately 150 minutes. An additional class session may be required as follow-up.

D. RISKS

The researcher hopes to maintain human subject confidentiality by using a matrix system to identify the students involved in this study. The instructor will administer all

phases of the study; thus, the researcher will have no personal contact with the subjects. The researcher will ask the selected instructor to hide the names of students by using a symbol-matrix. The researcher will give tabs to the instructor in order to identify the subjects and hide names. The tabs will identify the ethnicity of the students only; full names will never be revealed to the researcher. The subjects' initials may also be included as a way to prevent human error in identification of the students. After confidentiality is assured, the researcher will examine the occurrence of code-switching at all phases of the study (pre, treatment, post). The researcher will never know the true identities of the subjects, further protecting the identity and confidentiality of human subjects. The researcher does not predict any discomforts to the subjects, including effects on the students' grade in the class. The researcher's study will not negatively affect the student's overall grade, but may, instead, aid students in improving their writing performance.

E. COSTS

There are no costs involved in this study

F. QUESTIONS

If there are any questions, please contact Melanie A. Lewis, at 916/568-3100 ext. 7645. The researcher is willing to further explain the purposes, procedures, and benefits of this investigation if clarification if required.

G. CONSENT

A copy of the consent form has been received for record keeping purposes. I give consent to Melanie A. Lewis, International and Multicultural Education Department, to conduct a study of African American student code-switching in Freshman English Composition in my classrooms.

_____	_____
Date	Dr. Yvonne Kennedy, President
_____	_____
Date	Melanie A. Lewis, Researcher

APPENDIX C

English 1A - College Composition
Spring 1998

Units: 3
Acceptable for UC and CSU

Instructor: Melanie Lewis
Office Hours: By Appointment
(leave message on voice mail)
Voice Mail: 568-3100 ext. 7645
Dept. Phone: 688-7359

Prerequisite: Eligibility is determined by the assessment process or completion of English 57 with a "C" or better.

Required Texts: From Idea to Essay, 8th Edition (E), A Writer's Reference, 3rd Edition (R), Walden (W), three (3) Blue Exam books, large size--all located in the bookstore. Magazines and other articles may be requested. Other material will be supplied.

***You will receive a calendar each month listing assignments and due dates. It is **your** responsibility to obtain and maintain calendars.

COURSE DESCRIPTION: Instruction in critical thinking, reading and writing. The course is designed to help the student demonstrate in both argumentative and expository prose critical thinking, clear organization, precise diction, and appropriate style. Throughout the course, fluency and correctness are emphasized.

COURSE OBJECTIVE: The purpose of this course is to afford the student the opportunity to improve critical thinking skills through the evaluation of selected readings and to develop expository and argumentative writing techniques. Students are required to proofread for errors and omissions of both form and substance.

METHODS OF INSTRUCTION: The instructional methods used in this class are lecture, discussion, class and small group workshops, student presentations and conferences by appointment.

METHODS OF EVALUATION: Students are evaluated on the basis of their written work, completion of assignments, class participation, attendance and mutual respect.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:
Regular and punctual attendance are mandatory in this class. You are allowed six absences in this course. **Additional absences may be allowed only under the MOST UNUSUAL circumstances.** After six absences, I will not hesitate to lower your grade.

After eight absences, I will not hesitate to drop you from the course. Late arrivals and early departures count as absences and disruptive conduct.

Assignments: All assignments are due at the beginning of the next class period. You may be quizzed, without prior notice, on assignments. I may ask for the assignment at the beginning of class or after review. In other words, have all assignments ready to go when they are due! This three unit class requires at least six hours of homework per week. Homework includes reading, writing, and studying.

Essays are due at the beginning of class, no exceptions. **All essays are to be typed, double spaced, and must follow MLA format (guidelines will be explained), no exceptions!** I will not accept hand-written formal essays. Please make copies of your outlines and drafts (one for me, one for you and two additional for our small group workshops). Always submit one copy of your formal essay to me **IN CLASS on the due date**. If we do a special group workshop, I will notify you well in advance to make additional copies. After we edit the document, you are to hand it in upon request.

Reading assignments are made during the semester to generate ideas for writing, to serve as rhetorical models, and to teach critical thinking.

Late assignments will not be accepted! All work must be handed in ON TIME to receive credit. Revisions of essays, outlines, drafts and homework are due one week after I hand back the original. All work assigned must be turned in to receive credit for this course (see **GRADING**).

You are asked to keep a journal in this class due approximately every week. I will assign the topic you are to write on. We will also use our journals for in-class freewriting, so bring your journals to class every class meeting. Each journal entry should be at least **two hand-written pages long** and **ALWAYS in ink**! **Do not** skip a line when writing your entries. Journals will be graded on content, not structure. Even though you will have more flexibility in the journal writing, the same rules of writing apply. In other words, you should still apply the skills you have learned up to that point in your journals.

Students will complete one research paper this semester. The paper is **8-10 pages long** and fully documented (MLA). **Failure to complete either the major research paper or the Walden paper will result in an automatic failing grade (D/F) for the semester/NO EXCEPTIONS.**

You may be asked to revise an essay before I will give you a final grade for that assignment. This occurs when there are too many editing errors or other major weaknesses.

Class discussions are very important! This class is usually large for a writing course and I do not want to rush through the course work; it will not do you, or me, any good.

Therefore, SPEAK UP! Class participation is part of your grade. **I also expect all of us to respect one another; respect your classmates as you would want to be respected.**

****

GRADING:

5% Attendance

10% Homework (including sentence exercises, tests, quizzes, pop-quizzes, journals, and in-class work). You will receive points for homework assignments: 4=A, 3=B, 2=C, 1=D, 0=F. You may revise any homework you receive a "0", or F, on; the revision must be received within one week--a satisfactory revision will receive credit. I will be happy to conference with you on any questions or concerns you have with the homework assignments.

20% Essays

50% Term paper and Walden paper

15% Final

Grading percentages: A=90-100%, B=80-89%, C=70-79%, D=60-69%, F=59% and below.

****

PLAGIARISM will not be tolerated!!! If you are ever in doubt about whether or not you have plagiarized, please see me as soon as possible. If you plagiarize, or cheat on any other assignment, I will report your actions to both the Dean of Humanities and the Vice President of Instruction; you may be kicked out of the class, receive an F grade, or be expelled from CRC.

FINAL NOTES: Writing well is dependent upon reading well. Memorizing rules of grammar will not teach us how to write. Extensive reading is essential to developing fluency in writing. Many students find English 1A a fast-paced course. It is imperative to establish good study habits quickly. Students who have weak sentence skills will need to strengthen their command of sentence structure if they expect to do well in this course. Much help is available. I suggest visiting the Reading and Writing Center located in the library building for help with skills improvement.

PERSONAL NOTE: English 1A is a difficult and time-consuming course, but if we work together in a positive and cooperative fashion, it will be a rewarding experience. I want to see you succeed, and I will help you if I can. Please schedule an appointment with me whenever you need some help or friendly advice.
GOOD LUCK THIS SEMESTER!!!

SYLLABUS EXAM

Instructor: Ms. Lewis

Name:_____
Class: English 1A
Hour:_____
Date:_____

Write a short response for each of the following questions. When applicable, answer "yes" or "no" (followed by any additional responses for extra credit).

1. Summarize the Course Objective.

2. How many absences are allowed before the grade is lowered?

3. Students will be dropped from the course after how many absences?

4. What conditions also count as absences?

5. How many hours per week are students expected to study for this course?

6. Do I accept late work? (elaborate for extra credit).

7. Describe at least two guidelines for essays in this class (e.g., "no exceptions" rules).

8. Briefly describe journal writing for this class.

9. The two *major* papers in this class are:

1.
2.

10. Describe what will occur if these two major papers are not turned in **on time**.

11. Under what conditions are students asked to revise an essay?

12. How many pages should the term paper be?

13. Grading percentages:

Attendance: %

Final exam: %

Essays: %

Walden paper and Term paper: %

Homework: %

14. Explain the plagiarism policy (extra credit for a definition of plagiarism).

15. Writing well is dependent upon what?

16. A resource center on campus is suggested for students seeking help with skills improvement. What is the name of the center (located in the library)?

17. Trick question: What room are we in? (a freebie for those students who wish they had studied for this exam!).

Procrastination

Sharon Y. Friedner

Sharon Friedner (b. 1974) was born in New York and raised and educated through high school in Massachusetts. She is furthering her education at Oberlin College (Ohio) where she is majoring in English. About her essay, she says:

> ***"Procrastination" was originally a college application essay. I chose the topic because I feel that procrastination is a trait many people see as a flaw. I wanted to show how this "flaw" can, indeed, be a virtue. There is nothing that can spur the imagination more than trying to write an essay at midnight.***

IT IS TWO O'CLOCK in the morning and the wires that connect my brain to my mind are smoldering as they hover precariously near their melting point. Once again I am imprisoned by the shackles of procrastination. Once again I try in vain to capture time—the elusive monster. But, as always, my efforts are for naught, and I am left with nothing but a blank piece of notebook paper that must be magically transformed into a literary masterpiece before sunrise.

The force of gravity inevitably becomes too much for my weary eyelids, and they finally give in—momentarily shutting out the clock that progresses unceasingly toward my deadline. A familiar scene begins to creep into my mind. . . .

It is morning and the sun comes up but no one—absolutely no one—awakens. In a sense, the progression of time is ignored—completely denied by the happy slumberers. The following morning everything proceeds as usual, and not a soul is aware of the day that has been skipped. Oh, how easy it seems to outsmart this thing we call time. I smile inwardly as I recall the fact that if everyone in the world could agree that today is Friday, it would be. But no one has agreed to this; and in the morning everyone will wake up as usual; and the clock in its perpetual rush has not stopped to wait for me to think; and the paper in front of me is still as blank as it was the day the factory spit it out.

I count to three and heave my eyelids open. I glance at the clock and grin, knowing that I have been tempting time to catch up with me. Half an hour—shoot! It used to be at this point that panic would begin to

I must use every ounce of my academic prowess to create not only a mechanically perfect essay, but an essay on *paper* that does justice to the essay in my *mind*. I am tired and unsure, yet hopeful that my skill will come through for me this time. Fortunately I have long ago learned to overcome my "after midnight panic." Indeed, I am calm. I have been in this exact situation an uncountable number of times and, admittedly, I have come to enjoy it. For me procrastination is a challenge, a skill, an art—maybe even an addiction. It is the thrill of mental stamina and survival. It is the feeling of being alone, utterly alone in a race against time—and against myself; a race that I have initiated and a contest that I *must* win. Procrastination is the ability to look time in the eye and laugh. An ability that I have only begun to master.

I stand up, stretch, and walk over to the window. One at a time I lift the shade, the glass, the screen, and the storm window. Nature rushes in. I breathe the sweet, frigid morning air and look out at the obscure and soundless world that is my inspiration. The cold wind revives my body and I find that my mind is still surprisingly lucid. I sit down in my favorite spot by the bed where the carpet is worn from all the nights I've spent like this one. Confidently I grasp my pen, and take one final glance at the clock. I am surprised that an hour has passed in what seemed like only a moment. Time hits me with all the harsh exactness of its reality. It is now that the true race begins.

APPENDIX E

English 1A
M. Lewis, Instructor
Diagnostic--In-class, timed essay examination.

***This diagnostic will test your ability to analyze, critique, and summarize, as well as your ability to comprehend text and use significant examples.
Although this exam will not be graded, your performance will determine if this class is the class for you (thus the term "diagnostic").

Feel free to use this sheet to brainstorm, compose an outline, etc.

Topic:
How true is it that we are in a race against time?

APPENDIX F

GUIDELINES FOR ESSAY EXAMINATION

M. LEWIS

ENGLISH 1A--COLLEGE COMPOSITION

You will need a blue exam book (located in the bookstore), a blue or black ink pen, and, if you wish, a dictionary (electronic dictionaries are fine).

Leave all preparation notes at home. You will be given a clean copy of the essay with the topic when you arrive.

TO PREPARE, READ AND ANALYZE THE ESSAY:

1. Underline and highlight the author's main ideas.

2. Make notes in the margins. Ask questions and note your responses.

3. Use a dictionary to look up words you do not understand.

4. Summarize the essay; do not neglect rhetorical strategies.

5. Think about what procrastination means to you, your experiences.

6. Remember: you may not bring preparation

APPENDIX G

The researcher's chart of the specific features of code-switching to be examined in this study.

CODE-SWITCH TYPE	SAMPLES OF AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENT WRITING	SAMPLES OF FORMAL ENGLISH	REASONS FOR CODE-SWITCH TYPE
Subject-Verb Agreement and Usage	**Use of the Verb "To Be" (Dandy, 1988)** **"The coffee bees cold." "The coffee cold."** **We be playing.**	**The coffee is cold. Right now, the coffee is cold.** **We are playing.**	**Used "habitually, and it is omitted if the condition is not repeated or reoccurring" (Dandy, 1988, p. 4)** **"Habitual action, or something on going" (Anderson, 1985, p. 22)**
Grammar, including omission of Final Consonant "S"	**She dress nice. Three book. His name Jack.** **"Tes" "Des"**	**She dresses nice. Three books. His name is Jack.** **"Test" "Desk"**	**Final consonant endings of words is a familiar feature in Africanized English. (Dandy, 1988)** **"The absence of the 3rd person singular markers 's' and 'es'" (Anderson, 1985).**
Word Choice/Lexicon	**"Ax" (Dandy, 1988)**	**Ask**	**Ax has been found in the Gullah language and is currently being used in parts of England and Ireland (Dandy, p. 4)**
Pronoun Usage	**"It", "It is"**	**It is a good time to travel.**	**"To denote presence, or to introduce statements" (Alexander, 1985, p. 22). Used as the subject of the sentence**
Syntax	**"I don't know nobody like that" (Anderson, 1985).** **My mom, she cooks good.** **"Everybody look down at they feet" (Bailey,**	**I do not know anyone like that.** **My mom cooks good.** **Everybody looks down at their feet.**	**Double negatives or multiple negation (Anderson, 1985)** **Subject stress (Anderson, 1985).** **Noticeable similarities can be witnessed in**

APPENDIX H

African American Student Code-Switching in Freshman English Composition

Melanie Lewis--Doctoral Student

Quasi-experimentation essay questions (for students)

Instructions for Dr. Reed, Ms. Hall and Mrs. Davis

Each essay questions should take at least fifty minutes to complete. Although some freshman composition students are unfamiliar with the steps in the writing process early in the semester (quarter, summer session), students who are familiar with brainstorming, free writing, outlining, or prewriting should have the opportunity to do so.

Try to give students "general" instructions; too much detail could affect student performance, and thus, the results of the study. Soon, students will know that I am a visiting researcher attempting to help freshman composition students write more effectively. To give students a sense of importance (and they are very important to me!), I will explain that their participation is greatly appreciated.

Reminder: Students' grades will not be affected by this study unless the instructor wishes to use the essays. I hope the essays will serve a greater purpose in your classrooms.

Following are the essay topics for this study:

1. Pretest, Monday, June 22--Goals for the future
2. Wednesday, June 24--Where of you see yourself ten years from now?
3. Friday, June 26--If you were informed that you only had one month to live, what would you do?
4. Monday, June 29--How much money do you think you would need to earn in order to survive in society today?
5. Posttest, Wednesday, July 1--What are the three greatest pressures facing youth today? (e.g. violence, sex or sexual orientation, drugs, parents, peers, media, finances, health, gender, etc.).

Tentatively, we will meet Tuesdays and Thursdays at 2:30 p.m., Room S103, to examine the results of the sessions and to choose strategy for the next experiment.

P.S. Thank you all for agreeing to participate in this study.

APPENDIX I

Sample sentences-- Results of Pretest
Researcher's Copy
(Group A) Experiment--Mrs. Davis

T.M.
For the pass two years, I've gain a lot of weight.
I gone from a size twelve to a size eighteen.
I did some research on some different cities, and there salaries for teachers. Alaska was the highest paid city.

M.R.
Being happy is very important; it's not really all about money.

K.H.
ICD coding is a major career located in the medical field. It is basically dealing with numbers and codes.

N.T.
The reason I chose this major is because it dealing with computers, and my sister majored in it in college.

A.W.
I want to set up financially were I don't have to live check by check.
This what helps me in focus and not giving up.

A.B.
My goals for the future is to be a medical transcriptionist, because of the lite duties it consists of.

(Group B) Experiment--Ms. Hall

K.N.
I have really planned out my goals. It takes time but once you get them straight. Then you are set to go. Those goals should give everyone a boost on getting started. To me its all about mind control.

C.S.
I've reach one step toward my goal that I'm here in college now for, That's I finished the LPN program.

A.N.

Finishing school is just one of the many tasks in which I have get to accomplish the list still goes on.

C.B. *(Good)*
Acquire peace, in my mind, entails nothing more than a fair opportunity to succeed, a fair effort on my part, and a strong relationship with God.

(Group C)-- Control

D.L.
My reason for choosing Martin is because he is one of the funniest comedians around.

D.F.
It [NY Undercover] had a show about drug dealers and how they use young teens to distribute their products throughout the community.

A.P.
This way by it being on public television the whole world can know how much I care for this person.

L.J.
Here is some more reason why I would say Oprah show. She talk about things like education, and how important education is good to have in the real world.

Sample sentences--Results of Experiment #1
Researcher's Copy
(Group A)--Davis

A.J.
In ten years, I hope to be established in the work force, be married, and be ready to begin a family.

T.M.
I've always been enthuse with teach, therefore I hope to get a teaching position in Alaska.

A.S.
Goals, for me my goals are not all put together but what ever I decide to do I hope to succeed as far as possible.

At any degree of my education, I want to find myself with self contentment.

(Group B)--Hall
K.N.
I have always dreamed of helping children. It has always been a special love for special kids or cripple kids.

C.B.
Marriage is an institution, and I plan to approach getting married as becoming part of an institution.

Control unavailable--Reed

Sample Paragraph--Results of Experiment #2
Experiment #2--Essay excerpt from Group B--Hall
Researcher's Copy

Rewrite a more effective paragraph without losing writer's meaning.

Life is to short to joke around with. If somebody told me that I had only one month to live. I would probably look at them very strange. But what can a person do? There is a lot of things you can do, but why wait to do them if you are going to die. If I can not get the things done when I am alive and well. Then why wait til somebody tell me I have only a month to live. If I have not done it by now. It want get done. But if this was true then I would go out and do three main things. But the first thing is not a main thing.

Hint: Three things: 1) leave it to the Lord, 2) go out and get married, and 3) go out and buy me a house

APPENDIX J

Selected Sentences

Pretest

A.W.
I want to set up financially were I don't have to live check by check.
This what helps me in focus and not giving up.

C.S.
I've reach one step toward my goal that I'm here in college now for, That's I finished the LPN program.

Experiment #1

A.S.
At any degree of my education, I want to find myself with self contentment.

K.N.
I have always dreamed of helping children. It has always been a special love for special kids or cripple kids.

Experiment #2

Rewrite a more effective paragraph without losing writer's meaning.

Life is to short to joke around with. If somebody told me that I had only one month to live. I would probably look at them very strange. But what can a person do? There is a lot of things you can do, but why wait to do them if you are going to die. If I can not get the things done when I am alive and well. Then why wait til somebody tell me I have only a month to live. If I have not done it by now. It want get done. But if this was true then I would go out and do three main things. But the first thing is not a main thing.

Hint: Three things: 1) leave it to the Lord, 2) go out and get married, and 3) go out and buy me a house

APPENDIX K

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?

2. Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?

3. Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?

4. Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?

5. Additional comments?

APPENDIX L
TABLE 23

Symbol Matrix for recording occurrence of student code-switching
SYMBOL MATRIX PRETEST -- EXPERIMENT GROUP #1

Symbols representing ethnicity:

- African American Students..... B
- European American Students ..... W
- Asian Students..... A
- Hispanic Students..... H
- Other Students.....O

Chart of students and occurrence of code-switching.
X = Evidence of switching on this level.

STUDENT IDENTITY	ETHNICITY	VERB	GRAMMAR	LEXICON	PRONOUN	SYNTAX
BAR	B	X	X		X	X
BPT	B	X	X		X	X
CHS	B	X	X	X		X
HJA	B	X	X		X	X
HKL	B	X		X	X	X
JKT	B	X	X		X	X
JBA	B	X	X	X	X	X
MT	B	X	X	X		X
MJRLV	B	X		X	X	X
NVE	B	X		X	X	X
PLM	B	X	X	X	X	X
PNS	B	X		X	X	X
RMA	B	X		X	X	
SAD	B	X	X	X	X	X
TRL	B	X	X	X		X
TN	B	X	X	X	X	
WAJ	B	X	X	X	X	X

APPENDIX M
TABLE 26

Symbol Matrix for recording occurrence of student code-switching
SYMBOL MATRIX PRETEST -- EXPERIMENT GROUP #2

Symbols representing ethnicity:

- African American Students..... B
- European American Students ..... W
- Asian Students..... A
- Hispanic Students..... H
- Other Students.....O

Chart of students and occurrence of code-switching.
X = Evidence of switching on this level.

STUDENT IDENTITY	ETHNICITY	VERB	GRAMMAR	LEXICON	PRONOUN	SYNTAX
ALB	B	X	X	X	X	X
BC	B	X	X	X	X	X
DDY	B	X	X		X	X
DLF	B	X	X	X	X	X
FDB	B	X	X	X	X	X
NAY	B	X	X	X	X	X
NKA	B	X		X	X	X
PPB	B	X	X		X	X
PMA	B	X	X	X	X	X
SCD	B	X	X	X	X	X

APPENDIX N
TABLE 29

Symbol Matrix for recording occurrence of student code-switching
SYMBOL MATRIX PRETEST -- CONTROL GROUP

Symbols representing ethnicity:

- African American Students..... B
- European American Students ..... W
- Asian Students..... A
- Hispanic Students..... H
- Other Students.....O

Chart of students and occurrence of code-switching.
X = Evidence of switching on this level.

STUDENT IDENTITY	ETHNICITY	VERB	GRAMMAR	LEXICON	PRONOUN	SYNTAX
AJRW	B	X	X	X	X	X
BEN	B	X	X		X	X
BGP	B	X	X		X	X
ESA	B	X	X			X
FSS	B	X		X	X	X
FD	B	X	X	X	X	
HTM	B		X	X	X	
JLT	B	X	X	X	X	X
KMS	B	X	X			
LDK	B	X	X	X		X
LSL	B	X			X	
MC	B	X	X		X	X
PCN	B	X		X	X	
PSL	B	X	X		X	X
PAL	B	X	X	X	X	X
PAT	B	X	X	X	X	X
RCE	B	X	X	X	X	X
SVL	B	X	X	X	X	X
TD	B	X	X	X	X	X
YMD	B	X	X	X	X	X

APPENDIX O
TABLE 32

Symbol Matrix for recording occurrence of student code-switching
SYMBOL MATRIX TREATMENT #1 -- EXPERIMENT GROUP #1

Symbols representing ethnicity:

- African American Students..... B
- European American Students ..... W
- Asian Students..... A
- Hispanic Students..... H
- Other Students.....O

Chart of students and occurrence of code-switching.
X = Evidence of switching on this level.

STUDENT IDENTITY	ETHNICITY	VERB	GRAMMAR	LEXICON	PRONOUN	SYNTAX
BAR	B	X	X		X	X
BPT	B	X	X	X	X	X
CHS	B	X	X	X	X	X
HJA	B			X		X
HKL	B	X	X	X	X	
JKT	B	X	X	X	X	X
JBA	B	X	X		X	X
MT	B	X	X			X
MJRLV	B	X	X		X	X
NVE	B	X	X	X	X	
PLM	B	X	X	X	X	X
PNS	B	X	X		X	
RMA	B	X	X	X		X
SAD	B	X	X	X	X	X
TRL	B	X	X		X	X
TN	B	X	X	X	X	
WAJ	B	X	X		X	X

APPENDIX P
TABLE 35

Symbol Matrix for recording occurrence of student code-switching
SYMBOL MATRIX EXPERIMENT #1 -- EXPERIMENT GROUP #2

Symbols representing ethnicity:

- African American Students..... B
- European American Students ..... W
- Asian Students..... A
- Hispanic Students..... H
- Other Students.....O

Chart of students and occurrence of code-switching.
X = Evidence of switching on this level.

STUDENT IDENTITY	ETHNICITY	VERB	GRAMMAR	LEXICON	PRONOUN	SYNTAX
ALB	B	X	X		X	X
BC	B	X		X	X	X
DDY	B	X	X		X	X
DLF	B	X	X	X	X	
FDB	B	X	X	X	X	
NAY	B	X		X	X	
NKA	B	X			X	X
PPB	B	X	X		X	
PMA	B	X	X	X	X	X
SCD	B	X	X	X	X	X

APPENDIX Q
TABLE 38

Symbol Matrix for recording occurrence of student code-switching
SYMBOL MATRIX NO TREATMENT #1 -- CONTROL GROUP

Symbols representing ethnicity:

- African American Students..... B
- European American Students ..... W
- Asian Students..... A
- Hispanic Students..... H
- Other Students.....O

Chart of students and occurrence of code-switching.
X = Evidence of switching on this level.

STUDENT IDENTITY	ETHNICITY	VERB	GRAMMAR	LEXICON	PRONOUN	SYNTAX
AJRW	B	X	X	X		
BEN	B	X	X	X	X	X
BGP	B	X	X	X	X	X
ESA	B	X	X	X	X	X
FSS	B	X	X		X	
FD	B		X	X	X	X
HTM	B	X	X	X		X
JLT	B	X	X	X	X	
KMS	B	X	X		X	
LDK	B	X	X		X	X
LSL	B	X	X	X		X
MC	B			X	X	X
PCN	B	X	X		X	
PSL	B	X	X	X	X	
PAL	B	X	X	X		X
PAT	B	X	X	X	X	X
RCE	B	X	X	X	X	X
SVL	B	X	X			
TD	B	X	X	X	X	X
YMD	B	X	X	X	X	X

APPENDIX R
TABLE 41

Symbol Matrix for recording occurrence of student code-switching
SYMBOL MATRIX EXPERIMENT #2 -- EXPERIMENT GROUP #1

Symbols representing ethnicity:

- African American Students..... B
- European American Students ..... W
- Asian Students..... A
- Hispanic Students..... H
- Other Students.....O

Chart of students and occurrence of code-switching.
X = Evidence of switching on this level.

STUDENT IDENTITY	ETHNICITY	VERB	GRAMMAR	LEXICON	PRONOUN	SYNTAX
BAR	B	X	X	X	X	X
BPT	B	X	X	X	X	X
CHS	B	X	X	X	X	X
HJA	B					
HKL	B	X			X	X
JKT	B	X	X		X	X
JBA	B	X	X	X	X	X
MT	B		X	X	X	X
MJRLV	B	X	X	X		
NVE	B	X	X	X	X	X
PLM	B	X			X	X
PNS	B	X	X			X
RMA	B		X	X	X	
SAD	B				X	X
TRL	B			X	X	
TN	B	X	X	X	X	X
WAJ	B	X	X	X	X	X

APPENDIX S
TABLE 44

Symbol Matrix for recording occurrence of student code-switching
SYMBOL MATRIX EXPERIMENT #2 -- EXPERIMENT GROUP #2

Symbols representing ethnicity:

- African American Students..... B
- European American Students ..... W
- Asian Students..... A
- Hispanic Students..... H
- Other Students.....O

Chart of students and occurrence of code-switching.
X = Evidence of switching on this level.

STUDENT IDENTITY	ETHNICITY	VERB	GRAMMAR	LEXICON	PRONOUN	SYNTAX
ALB	B	X	X	X		X
BC	B	X	X	X	X	X
DDY	B			X	X	
DLF	B	X	X			
FDB	B	X		X	X	X
NAY	B			X		
NKA	B			X	X	X
PPB	B		X		X	X
PMA	B	X	X	X	X	X
SCD	B		X			X

APPENDIX T
TABLE 47

Symbol Matrix for recording occurrence of student code-switching
SYMBOL MATRIX NO TREATMENT #2 -- CONTROL GROUP

Symbols representing ethnicity:

- African American Students..... B
- European American Students ..... W
- Asian Students..... A
- Hispanic Students..... H
- Other Students.....O

Chart of students and occurrence of code-switching.
X = Evidence of switching on this level.

STUDENT IDENTITY	ETHNICITY	VERB	GRAMMAR	LEXICON	PRONOUN	SYNTAX
AJRW	B	X	X	X	X	X
BEN	B	X	X	X	X	X
BGP	B	X	X	X	X	X
ESA	B	X	X	X	X	
FSS	B				X	X
FD	B	X	X	X	X	X
HTM	B	X	X	X	X	X
JLT	B	X	X		X	
KMS	B			X		X
LDK	B	X		X		
LSL	B	X	X	X	X	X
MC	B	X	X	X	X	X
PCN	B	X	X		X	X
PSL	B	X	X	X		X
PAL	B	X		X	X	X
PAT	B	X	X	X	X	X
RCE	B	X	X		X	X
SVL	B	X	X		X	X
TD	B	X	X		X	X
YMD	B	X		X	X	X

APPENDIX U
TABLE 50

Symbol Matrix for recording occurrence of student code-switching
SYMBOL MATRIX EXPERIMENT #3 -- EXPERIMENT GROUP #1

Symbols representing ethnicity:

- African American Students..... B
- European American Students ..... W
- Asian Students..... A
- Hispanic Students..... H
- Other Students.....O

Chart of students and occurrence of code-switching.
X = Evidence of switching on this level.

STUDENT IDENTITY	ETHNICITY	VERB	GRAMMAR	LEXICON	PRONOUN	SYNTAX
BAR	B		X	X		X
BPT	B		X	X	X	
CHS	B		X			
HJA	B	X			X	
HKL	B	X	X	X		
JKT	B		X	X		X
JBA	B	X			X	
MT	B	X	X			
MJRLV	B		X	X		X
NVE	B				X	
PLM	B	X			X	
PNS	B	X	X	X		
RMA	B		X			X
SAD	B	X		X		
TRL	B	X			X	
TN	B	X		X		X
WAJ	B	X				X

APPENDIX V
TABLE 53

Symbol Matrix for recording occurrence of student code-switching
SYMBOL MATRIX EXPERIMENT #3 – EXPERIMENT GROUP #2

Symbols representing ethnicity:

- African American Students..... B
- European American Students ..... W
- Asian Students..... A
- Hispanic Students..... H
- Other Students.....O

Chart of students and occurrence of code-switching.
X = Evidence of switching on this level.

STUDENT IDENTITY	ETHNICITY	VERB	GRAMMAR	LEXICON	PRONOUN	SYNTAX
ALB	B	X	X	X		
BC	B			X	X	
DDY	B	X				X
DLF	B	X	X		X	
FDB	B			X		X
NAY	B				X	
NKA	B	X		X		X
PPB	B		X	X		
PMA	B		X		X	X
SCD	B				X	X

APPENDIX W
TABLE 56

Symbol Matrix for recording occurrence of student code-switching
SYMBOL MATRIX NO TREATMENT #3 -- CONTROL GROUP

Symbols representing ethnicity:

- African American Students..... B
- European American Students ..... W
- Asian Students..... A
- Hispanic Students..... H
- Other Students.....O

Chart of students and occurrence of code-switching.
X = Evidence of switching on this level.

STUDENT IDENTITY	ETHNICITY	VERB	GRAMMAR	LEXICON	PRONOUN	SYNTAX
AJRW	B	X	X	X	X	X
BEN	B	X	X	X	X	X
BGP	B	X	X		X	
ESA	B		X	X		X
FSS	B	X		X	X	X
FD	B	X	X		X	
HTM	B	X	X	X		X
JLT	B	X	X	X	X	X
KMS	B	X		X	X	
LDK	B	X	X			X
LSL	B	X	X	X		X
MC	B		X	X	X	
PCN	B	X		X	X	X
PSL	B	X	X		X	
PAL	B	X	X	X		X
PAT	B	X		X	X	X
RCE	B	X	X		X	X
SVL	B	X	X	X	X	
TD	B		X	X	X	X
YMD	B		X	X	X	X

APPENDIX X
TABLE 59

Symbol Matrix for recording occurrence of student code-switching
SYMBOL MATRIX POSTTEST -- EXPERIMENT GROUP #1

Symbols representing ethnicity:

- African American Students..... B
- European American Students ..... W
- Asian Students..... A
- Hispanic Students..... H
- Other Students.....O

Chart of students and occurrence of code-switching.
X = Evidence of switching on this level.

STUDENT IDENTITY	ETHNICITY	VERB	GRAMMAR	LEXICON	PRONOUN	SYNTAX
BAR	B				X	
BPT	B		X			X
CHS	B			X		
HJA	B	X			X	
HKL	B			X		
JKT	B			X		
JBA	B	X			X	
MT	B	X				X
MJRLV	B		X			
NVE	B		X			
PLM	B	X				
PNS	B			X	X	
RMA	B		X			
SAD	B		X			
TRL	B	X				
TN	B	X				X
WAJ	B			X		

APPENDIX Y
TABLE 62

Symbol Matrix for recording occurrence of student code-switching
SYMBOL MATRIX POSTTEST – EXPERIMENT GROUP #2

Symbols representing ethnicity:

- African American Students..... B
- European American Students ..... W
- Asian Students..... A
- Hispanic Students..... H
- Other Students.....O

Chart of students and occurrence of code-switching.
X = Evidence of switching on this level.

STUDENT IDENTITY	ETHNICITY	VERB	GRAMMAR	LEXICON	PRONOUN	SYNTAX
ALB	B			X	X	
BC	B	X			X	
DDY	B		X			
DLF	B					X
FDB	B		X		X	
NAY	B		X			
NKA	B			X		
PPB	B	X				X
PMA	B	X			X	
SCD	B			X		X

APPENDIX Z
TABLE 65

Symbol Matrix for recording occurrence of student code-switching
SYMBOL MATRIX POSTTEST -- CONTROL GROUP

Symbols representing ethnicity:

- African American Students..... B
- European American Students ..... W
- Asian Students..... A
- Hispanic Students..... H
- Other Students.....O

Chart of students and occurrence of code-switching.
X = Evidence of switching on this level.

STUDENT IDENTITY	ETHNICITY	VERB	GRAMMAR	LEXICON	PRONOUN	SYNTAX
AJRW	B	X	X	X	X	X
BEN	B		X	X	X	X
BGP	B	X	X	X	X	X
ESA	B	X	X	X		
FSS	B	X	X		X	X
FD	B	X		X	X	X
HTM	B		X			
JLT	B	X	X	X	X	X
KMS	B	X	X		X	X
LDK	B		X	X	X	X
LSL	B	X		X	X	X
MC	B	X	X		X	X
PCN	B		X	X	X	X
PSL	B	X	X			
PAL	B	X	X	X	X	X
PAT	B	X	X	X		X
RCE	B		X	X	X	X
SVL	B	X		X	X	X
TD	B	X	X	X	X	
YMD	B	X	X	X	X	X

Expository Scale V

Edys Quellmalz
Center for the Study of Evaluation
University of California, Los Angeles

ELEMENT 1

Impressionistic Rating Procedures

The purpose of Impressionistic Rating is to form a single impression of a piece of writing as to how well it communicates a whole message to the reader. Impressionistic scoring assumes that each characteristic that makes up an essay — organization of ideas, content, mechanics and so on — is related to all other characteristics. Impressionistic scoring further assumes that some qualities of an essay cannot easily be separated from each other. In short, the procedure views a piece of writing as a total work, the whole of which is greater than the sum of its parts.

Discerning readers naturally will attend to, or be influenced by, some essay characteristics more than others. In the Impressionistic scoring, however, readers should arrive at a judgment regarding the overall quality of the essay.

For this element, you are being asked to form an overall opinion concerning the effectiveness of the essays as examples of expository writing.

Some views on exposition are given below:

- Exposition is the kind of discourse that explains or clarifies a subject.
- Exposition seeks to explain or inform through such methods as giving reasons or examples, comparing and contrasting, defining, ennumerating or through a combination of methods.
- Exposition explaines why or how.
- Exposition promotes reader understanding of a subject.

General Impression

You are to read each essay through first, in order to form an overall impression of its quality. To assign the essay a score, consider the following question: To what extent does the essay achieve an expository purpose for the intended audience?

Assign each paper a mark of 1 - 6 using the scale below:

6 = An excellent example of exposition
5 = A good, adequate example of exposition
4 = An adequate example of exposition

---

3 = A marginal example
2 = A poor example
1 = A very poor example or barely readable
. Paper completely off topic or genre

MASTER

6 = • The subject is identified
• The main idea is stated or implied in opening and/or closing statements
• Opening and closing statements must match or logically relate to the text and to each other
• The topic is limited through reference to key points or lines or reasoning
• The essay plan is logical
• The essay plan is clearly signalled by transitions
• The essay plan is consistently maintained (no digression or extraneous material)

5 = • The subject is identified
• The main idea is stated or implied in opening and/or closing statements
• Opening and closing statements relate to or follow from the text and from each other
• The topic is partly limited by indicating number and type of key points
• Plan is logical
• Plan is signalled by appropriate transitions
• There may be digression or an elaboration

4 = • The subject is identified
• The main idea is identified or implied
• There may or may not be an attempt to limit the topic, give directions to subsequent reasoning
• There may be a few minor digressions from the plan, but no major digressions
• Subtopics can be reshuffled

NON-MASTER

3 = • Subject is clear
• Main point may not be very clear. There may be a major digression or several minor digressions
• A plan is attempted which may need to be inferred

2 = • Subject is clear
• Main idea is not very clear and/or there may be more than one
• The plan is attempted, but not consistently or not completely carried out
• There are many digressions

1 = • Subject is unclear
• Main idea is absent or very unclear
• No plan is attempted or followed

Validity, Reliability, and Normative Data:

SEEW is a composite of several current approaches to general impression and analytic scoring. Choices could be made among its six

Expository Scale ▼

ELEMENT 2

General Competence

Based on your first or second reading of the essay, decide how competently the writer formed the essay. Does the essay demonstrate mastery/command of just the basic essay elements listed below? If the student received no further writing instruction do you think he would produce other writing which communicates clearly and exhibits command of these elements?

1. Main idea
2. Essay organization
3. Paragraph organization
4. Support
5. Mechanics (usage, sentence construction, spelling, punctuation, capitalization)

Assign each paper a mark of 1 - 6 using the scale below:

	MASTER
6 = Very competent	The paper executes all the elements competently. There are no serious errors. The paper has a clear main idea, logical organization, relevant, detailed support and a command of basic mechanics. There are no major flaws.
5 = Definitely competent	The paper is competent in all of the basic elements, but there may be a few minor flaws.
4 = Adequately competent	The paper is adequately competent in all elements. There may be a few flaws. Some may be serious.*
	NON-MASTER
3 = Almost competent	The paper lacks competence in one or two elements, and there are several major flaws.
2 = Not very competent	The paper has two or more of the elements. There are many serious flaws.
1 = Not at all competent	Paper has none or only one of the elements competently executed.

*If the essay is only one paragraph, paragraph cohesion is not considered a missing element, if the one existing paragraph coheres. If it clearly should have been divided into several paragaphs, then paragraph cohesion is a missing element.

Expository Scale V

ELEMENT 3

Essay Coherence

This subscale focuses on the flow of ideas throughout the entire paper and between paragraphs. The emphasis is on vertical relationships of ideas throughout the essay.

Essay coherence: The paper has a main idea (stated or clearly implied) which makes a point about the subject and is at a greater level of generality than the other points within the paper. Subtopics are logically related to the main idea and to each other.

MASTER

6 =
- The subject is identified
- The main idea is stated or implied in opening and/or closing statement
- Opening and closing statements must match or logically relate to the text and to each other
- The topic is limited through reference to key points or lines of reasoning
- The essay plan is logical
- The essay plan is clearly signalled by transitions
- The essay plan is consistently maintained (no digression or extraneous material)

5 =
- The subject is identified
- The main idea is stated or implied in opening and/or closing statements
- Opening and closing statements relate to or follow from the text and from each other
- The topic is partly limited by indicating number and type of key points
- Plan is logical
- Plan is signalled by appropriate transitions
- There may be digression or an elaboration

4 =
- The subject is identified
- The main idea is identified or implied
- There may or may not be an attempt to limit the topic, give directions to subsequent reasoning
- There may be a few minor digressions from the plan, but no major digressions
- Subtopics can be reshuffled

NON-MASTER

3 =
- Subject is clear
- Main point may not be very clear. There may be a major digression or several minor digressions
- A plan is attempted which may need to be inferred

2 =
- Subject is clear
- Main idea is not very clear and/or there may be more than one
- The plan is attempted, but not consistently or not completely carried out There are many digressions

1 =
- Subject is unclear
- Main idea is absent or very unclear
- No plan is attempted or followed

Expository Scale V

ELEMENT 4

Organization - Paragraph*

This subscale focuses on the relationship of ideas within paragraphs, their logical interrelationship and subordination to the paragraph topic.

Paragraphs present subtopics which are developed by cohesive groups of supporting statements. Each subtopic represents a complete unit of thought. Major units of thought are delineated by physical separation of paragraphs. Statements within the paragraph relate logically to each other and to the paragraph subtopic.

MASTER

6 = • All major units of thought are set off by distinct paragraphs
• The paragraph has a clearly stated or implied topic
• All sentences within paragraphs are related to each other, to the paragraph topic and are subordinate to it. There are no digressions or irrelevancies
• There are no one sentence paragraphs unless they are especially effective

5 = • Most major subtopics are developed in paragraphs
• Most paragraphs contain logically related subordinate support
• There may be a minor digression

4 = • Many subtopics are developed in discrete paragraphs with related subordinate support
• There may be some minor digressions

NON-MASTER

3 = • In some paragraphs statements are logically related, but may not function as support subordinate to the paragraph topic. Paragraph separation is evident and consistent. Some relationships between sentences must be inferred

2 = • There are few paragraphs where statements are logically related or supported. There are many digressions. Paragraph separation is inconsistent. Many relationships among sentences must be inferred

1 = • There are no paragraphs where statements logically cohere. Paragraph separation is incorrect

9 = • There is only 1 paragraph

---

*For conventions for paragraph separation (e.g., physical separation or indenting) see Mechanics.

Expository Scale V

ELEMENT 5

Support

This subscale focuses on the quality (specificity and relationship) of the support provided vertically for the essay theme as well as horizontally within each paragraph.

Support statements are at a greater level of specificity than the generalizations they are intended to support. Support statements logically relate to each other and to the generalization. Support includes specific details such as examples, facts, anecdotes, reasons, concrete language.

MASTER

6 = • The essay main idea and all paragraph topics are supported by relevant, specific statements.

5 = • The essay main idea and almost all paragraph generalizations/assertions are supported by predominently specific statements. Enumerations are supported by descriptive detail, functions, or rationale

4 = • The essay main idea and most paragraph generalizations are supported. Most support is specific. Enumerations are supported by descriptive detail, functions or reasons

---

NON-MASTER

3 = • Some or all generalizations are supported by logically related detail, or, some support is not specific but it is distinct and clear. Support may be primarily an unelaborated, undetailed, unsupported list

2 = • An attempt is made to support generalizations/assertions. Some supporting sentences do not logically follow from each other or are redundant.
• Support lacks precision, clarity in details and/or language

1 = • No support is provided, or,
• Support, if present, is vague, and confusing, or,
• Not logically related to generalizations, or,
• At the same level of generality as the topic it attempts to support

Expository Scale V

ELEMENT 6

Mechanics (Usage, sentence construction, spelling, punctuation, capitalization)

MASTER

6 = • There are few or no errors. There are no serious errors.

5 = • There may be a few minor errors in the categories, but no more than one serious error.

4 = • There are some errors. A few may be serious.

NON-MASTER

3 = • There are numerous errors in the categories. There are some serious errors in several categories. Below mastery in sentence construction.

2 = • There are many serious errors, causing some confusion.

1 = • Errors are so numerous and serious that they interfere with communication.

Check those mechanical skills below master level.*

_____ Usage. Does not display command of standard vocabulary usage.

_____ Sentence construction. Does not display command of basic sentence structure.

_____ Spelling. Misspells many common words (includes homonyms).

_____ Capitalizations and punctuation. Does not use standard conventions appropriately, e.g., periods, commas, capitals, apostrophes.

_____ Conventions of paragraph separation are incorrect or inconsistent (indenting, spacing, titles, numbers).

1) Sentence Construction

Serious errors:
- Subject verb agreement
- Run on
- Fragments

2) Usage

Serious errors:
- Homonyms, e.g., it, it's, their, there; to, two, too
- Incorrect use of common words
- Incorrect pronoun reference

Minor errors:
- awkward or odd use of words, phrases, but meaning still clear
- vague, abstract language

3) Spelling

Serious errors:
- Common words misspelled; does not include homonyms. Any misspelled word only counts as one error, even if the misspelling repeats

Minor errors:
- Unusual, less frequent words

4) Punctuation/Capitalization
- Initial caps--common proper nouns
- Periods at end of sentence, common abbreviation
- Commas (in series, for opening phrases)
- Contractions

5) Paragraph Conventions

Serious errors:
- Title
- Number
- Inconsistency of separation convention
- Absence of only convention for separation

Minor errors:
- Use of spacing instead of indentation (as in business letters)

Competence	Focus/Organization	Support	Mechanics
Excellent	• subject clear • main idea clear • key points, reasoning at beginning or end • beginning and end relate • plan logical • plan signaled by transitions • paragraphs set off all major ideas • no one sentence paragraphs • no digressions	• main idea and all major topics elaborated by more specific details • enumerations supported by detail, functions, rationale	• one or two minor errors • no gross errors
Good	• subject clear • main idea clear • topic partly limited by reference to number or type of key reasons • logical plan • some transitions • most major ideas in paragraphs • minor digression	• almost all major points elaborated by more specific detail, elaboration • most elaboration is specific	• a few minor errors • may be one gross error • usage and mechanics still not a problem
Adequate	• subject clear • main idea clear • topic may be limited • plan logical, but sub topic can be reshuffled • many major thoughts in paragraphs • few minor digressions, no major	• many major points supported • much elaboration is specific	• a few common errors • one or two gross pl no more than one mi • total
Developing	• subject clear • main idea not very clear • plan attempted, must infer • some logically developed paragraphs • some major digressions or excessive elaboration	• some major points developed by elaborative detail and reasons • some elaboration is specific but is distinct and clear • may be a list	• some errors interfer • some gross and minor • sentence constructio below mastery
Rudimentary	• subject clear • main idea not very clear or more than one • plan attempted • few paragraphs logically developed • many digressions	• supportive detail attempted • may be redundant • may not be precise or clear	• many gross and minor • some confusion
Off topic Off genre	• subject may be unclear • main idea unclear • plan unclear • almost no logically developed paragraphs	• little or no support or • support is confusing or at the same level of generality as the main assertion	• difficult to read • many gross varied • very confusing

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?

I believe so, because it is clearer to myself.

2. Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?

The proof reading enabled be find flaw's in my writing and at times re word my statements.

3. Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?

I would because, it is important that whom ever is reading my work, can understand my statements

4. Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?

I find it sometime's difficult to write down exactly what I am trying to say.

5. Additional comments?

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?**

Yes. Yes, It has helped me to read and understand so others can understand my writing

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?**

Yes proofreading helps me to see what changes I need to make, words to omit and add.

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?**

Yes because it makes my writing ~~clearer~~ clearer to read and understand for me and the reader

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?**

Yes, Something might not be as clear to others as they are to me. changing words for others to understand.

5. **Additional comments?**

I have enjoyed this process of writing and will use it in the future.

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

Eng 101
6/30/98

1. Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not? This process has helped me think before I write, and to time my time ~~before~~ before I write. Yes.

2. Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?
Yes. The process has helped me explore different topics, instead of the norm. By proofreading I've been able to catch my mistakes, before turning in a fused paper.

3. Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not? Yes. the Process has helped me ask a friend to overlook my paper, for a fresh eye.

4. Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?
I detected fused sentences, and mostly misspelled words. A formal style helped me to completed my paper without starting over.

5. Additional comments?
This process was helping for me in many ways. Thank you.

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?**

Yes, it has helped me to shape the way that I write so that the meaning is clearer and understandable.

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?**

Yes, I never knew how many mistakes I really make until I proofread my work carefully. It would sometimes change the meaning of what I was trying to say.

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?**

I try to stress what I'm trying to get across to my reader but now I do it in a clearer more formal way of writing.

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?**

Sometime when I would ~~rea~~reread over some things I would have to totaly change the meaning because it would be unclear or very hard to understand. I would even losing the meaning all together.

5. **Additional comments?**

This program really helped me with the way I write now. I spend more time profreading and trying to make my writing clearer.

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not? yes, because reading the example sentences I could not understand them myself and I could see my writting with in the examples.

2. Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?
yes, because I found more mistakes after I proofread my paper that I really didn't know I had made while I was just writting

3. Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not? yes, because if I am writting something to someone I would like them to be able to determine what I am trying to say on the first time they read over my papers.

4. Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?

I would find myself trying to transition to a more formal style without losing my mean that I was try to bring across to the readers in my paper.

5. Additional comments?

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?**

it think this process has helped me in both ways because gives me steps to follow, to help me get started and read what I have written and to make sense of what I have written.

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?**

Yes, I think that it encouraged me. because as I went back I keep seeing mistakes that I made on my paper.

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?**

I would continuously focus on analyzing my writing because I see that it help in my learning and it help me to get a better grade.

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?**

On somethings my meaning was not clear but reading it over and over again, putting words and phrases to help better get my meaning clear helped me.

5. **Additional comments?** I really enjoyed this process, I learned something that will help me, when I get in a writing jam.

11-2-98

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?** yes it has. I try to write as clearly as possible to ease the reader's understanding. The reader's view is very importa

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?** When I proofread, I mainly concentrate on punctuation and other careless grammatical errors. I focus on content and clarity as I am writing.

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?** Yes, I would. I write better when I am focusing on the constant clarity of my paper.

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?** Yes, I was able to detect unclearness. I would not change my meaning, but I would try a gradual transition of style.

5. **Additional comments?**

AK

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?**

Yes, it has helped. I find myself correcting vague statements as if I was a reader who had no background in my topic.

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?**

Yes, I found myself finding little mistakes that I used to overlook (verb tense, subject agreement)

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?**

Yes, it makes my purpose in writing more clear to the reader. Writing is only effective if my readers fully understand my points.

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?**

At times, I found ways to make the paragraph flow more easily. This made the whole essay flow and hopefully made my points clear to my readers

5. **Additional comments?**

AJ

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?** It has helped me realize that I need to write more clearly so that anyone who read my paper would be able to understand it.

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?** [yes] [NO]
I kept the same meaning, but I made my paper more fluent and changed the ~~words~~ problems that needed to be changed.

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?** Yes. It makes my paper sound better to have the problems corrected. My writing because clearer and more concise.

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?** I tried to not change my meaning but just clean up my writing. I knew what I wanted to say; I just had to ~~take~~ change it several times to get it ~~right~~ right.

5. **Additional comments?**

7/2/1998
ENG 101-002

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?

The process has helped me to write essays.

2. Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?

I did not do much profreading, but I did rewrite a little.

3. Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?

Yes I would continually focus on analyzing my writing.

4. Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?

I was able to detect when my meaning could have been viewed as unclear to the reader and I formed clearer sentences, or tried to do so.

5. Additional comments?

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?**

Yes,
Yes, It was explained and examples were shown to help understand some of the problems when writing occurs

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?**

Proofreading helped me alot. After I reread the paper. I saw errors that I didn't see before.

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?**

Yes I would because it will help me in the future.

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?**

Depending on how bad the mistake was.

5. **Additional comments?**

Thanks for your time and effort.

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?**

This process has helped me. It has made me think a lot before I write. It has also helped me to shape what I'm trying to say so that the reader can understand.

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?**

This process did encourage me to do more extensive proofreading. I was able to pretty much clarify what I was writing. Also with proofreading, I had the chance to see what I was really trying to say.

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?**

I would continue to analyzing my papers so that I can allow my reader to enjoy my papers.

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?**

On several occasion, I was able to ~~dect~~ detect that my meaning was unclear. I was able to change the meaning without losing whost I was trying to say.

5. **Additional comments?**

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?**

I really don't know because I haven't seen a grade

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?**

yes no

because I new what I was talking about & just had to shape it up

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?**

If it is important yes

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?**

no because I haven't faced this problem

5. **Additional comments?** It would have been beettrif the papers were ~~grade~~ checked before we had to rewrite them, It would have help a great deal

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?

(A) yes
(B) yes
(C) rereading from an objective perspective makes me realize if meaning is conveyed properly or not.

2. Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?

(A) yes
(B) no
(C) it just made my sentences more defining

3. Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not? Yes, so it comes across clearer, and politically correct

4. Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?

(A) yes
(B) yes
(C) proofread.

5. Additional comments?

Thank you

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?

Yes, Now I ask myself questions About my paper Before I turn it in.

2. Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?

Yes, Because Sometimes I just go to writing with all of my thoughts jammed together, making mistakes at the same time. So proof reading is a good solution to not making mistakes

3. Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?

Yes, Because I found it to be very helpful.

4. Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?

Yes

5. Additional comments?

I think the young lady was a wonderful instructor, and hopes see continue doing the good work teaching see does.

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?** The process has enabled me to understand the reasons for the exercises that were given.

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?**

Having a purpose, other than just doing an asignment, really changed My perspective and improved my comprehension of passages.

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?**

Without a doubt, the system helps, and I will continue for my personal purposes.

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?**

I could dipict the writings that were incoherent after proofreading, and depending on the condition I did what was necessary.

5. **Additional comments?**

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?**

Yes,

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?**

Yes, I proofreading change the meaing.

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?**

Yes, I would.

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?**

Yes, I was able to detect my meaning and compelled to change my meaning.

5. **Additional comments?**

no comment.

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?** kind of. It probably will help in writing for a longer period of time. I am not good at writing in a small period of time.

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?**
yes. you learn that you can pick up on some simple mistakes if you proofread your work.

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?** yes. I could help me get a better grade and write better papers.

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?**
yes. I want to make sure the reader clearly understood what I was trying to say

5. **Additional comments?**

n/A

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?** Yes, because now when I write I try to make sure the reader will understand (clearly) what I'm saying.

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?**
Yes, because most of the time I would mean one thing and my reader would think I a meant another.

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?** Yes, because it just make more since when you do.

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?** Sometimes yes, because I would like for my reader to understand exactly what I'm saying

5. **Additional comments?** I really have enjoyed ~~kup~~ helping you with your essay.

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?**

yes, it has shown me how not to lose the reader in what I was trying to say

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?**

yes, It made my proofreading more extensive in the final copy. The proofreading changed my meaning just a little

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?**

I will focus a lot closer because of this procedure

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?**

yes trying to transition it to a more formal style without losing my meaning

5. **Additional comments?**

Engl 101 K. N.
2 July 98

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?** yes. Because you put a lot of my paragraphs on the board. yes. Because I now I know my mistakes.

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?** yes. Because when I had peer read ~~it~~ the paragraph. the paragraph did not make any sense. yes.

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?** yes. ~~#~~ So I can become better at it.

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?**
yes. Because after ~~they~~ cleared it up ~~it~~ the paragraph made better sense. yes

5. **Additional comments?** I have enjoyed your teaching skills And understanding of a good paper. See you soon
Mrs. Lewis

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?** This process help me consider the writers understanding of the material. Also the process help me by pointing out words or word that could be used for anything [illegible] It, they, and that

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning?, Why or why not?**
No! There was not enough time to proof reading after the essay was completed.

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?**
I would focus [illegible] analyzing my writing so I could get a better grade in the course

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?**
During some of the discussion I finally check where the meaning was not clear. I was not really compelled to change the ~~meaning~~ style completely.

5. **Additional comments?**

20

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?**

Yes, no. I always reread + proofread before submitting anything to be sure that it's clear + understandable.

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?**

No, No. I usually think about whether or not I make sense before writing down my sentence.

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?**

No, not really. I go over everything after I finish writing so I wouldn't really have to dissect anything after I edit my work.

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?**

Yes, yes. If my work was unclear or didn't make any sense whatsoever I would rewrite it and make myself clear.

5. **Additional comments?** Done.

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?** Yes, because it demonstrates how a ~~person's~~ writer's meaning can be difficult to understand to other readers

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?**
Yes No, but it made my meaning clearer

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?** Yes, because it is important for the reader to clearly understand my writing.

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?**
Sometimes. Yes, to make my writing clearer.

5. **Additional comments?** ~~[illegible]~~

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?**

Yes, It helps me in considering and receiving meaning of essay.

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?**

Not very much, but it ~~with~~ is good for us.

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?**

Yes, I am continuosly focus on analyzing my writing. Because, we are almost everyday wrote an essay that help ~~our~~ in improving our writing skills

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?**

Yes, sometimes it happened when I completed my essay. I have seen mistake and to cover that I am try to change that.

5. **Additional comments?**

She is nice lady, she give lectures in very well manner way.

LDM

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. **Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?**

Yes, because I've learned that it's more important for the reader to understand your writing than the writer. So, the write has to think for their self and reader.

2. **Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?**

Yes, it gives the reader a better understand after all corrections are made by the writer. And it also help me see my error before the reader does,

3. **Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?**

Yes, because it makes it easier to write.

4. **Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?**

Yes,

5. **Additional comments?**

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?

Yes it has

2. Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?

3. Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?

4. Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?

5. Additional comments?

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?

Yes because I want my writing to be understood

2. Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?

Yes, sometime proofreading change my meaning.

3. Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?

yes for better grades

4. Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?

Yes because after I read it didn't make sense to me

5. Additional comments?

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not?

Yes, other people need to understand what I write, not just me.

2. Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?

Yes, so me & other can understand my work.

3. Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not? yes,

4. Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?

Yes, I could.

5. Additional comments?

Follow-up questions for students
Answer as completely and honestly as possible.

1. Has this process helped you give thought or consideration to the receiver of your meaning (your reader)? Has this process helped you shape what you write so that the meaning is clear to the reader? Why or why not? Yes.

2. Did this process encourage you to do more extensive proofreading (for content, clarity) especially in the final copy? Did your proofreading change your meaning? Why or why not?

Yes, yes Because you find erro that
Uther writeing the papes you may thought
to have Written something but did not.

3. Would you continuously focus on analyzing your writing (dissecting meaning for clarity as performed by researcher) in your regular course work (not just for the researcher)? Why or why not?

Yes. to become a better writer And to
do well in my regular Course work.

4. Were you able to detect when your meaning could have been viewed as unclear to your reader? Were you compelled to change your meaning completely or try to transition to a more formal style without losing your meaning? Why or why not?

yes, yes.

5. Additional comments? N/A