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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to locate measurable criteria of responsiveness to language which have not been utilized to any significant extent in standardized tests. The project involved creating a testing instrument, reviewing of the instrument by a panel of experts, and applying the resultant test to a small population of college students and to a criterion group of acknowledged sensitive users of English. Comparison was made between the performances of students and members of the criterion group by means of a pre-and-post test. Reliability and validity studies were made of the results. Though the test was necessarily crude, it was found that certain areas of linguistic response warranted serious consideration in the development of future language competency tests: sociolinguistic and semantic context, deep structure of word-groups and sentences, primary factors of extended discourse, and, possibly, organization of extended discourse.
INTRODUCTION

Under a contract awarded by Region X of the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare members of the English Department of Portland State University, Portland, Oregon, conducted a pilot research project to isolate measurable criteria of responsiveness to language irrespective of dialect. Research was confined to written English in a variety of forms. The project was conceived because the researchers felt that most standardized language competency tests used in schools and colleges were superficial, that they measured the ability of the student to know and use certain expected forms of standard English, but seldom reached other linguistic abilities. Responsiveness—the capacity to recognize, if not intellectualize, nuances of word meaning, of structural form, and of rhetorical organization—was the term we used to represent those linguistic and sociolinguistic capacities left largely unmeasured by existing tests. Though the term was not entirely satisfactory, it did indicate the complexity and multiplicity of individual responses to various dialects in a speech community, e.g., the person who does not respond fully to the dialects of the university or business world but may react with great sensitivity to the dialect of his own group. To what extent this multiplicity of response was due to environmental factors we could not know, for while studies in the language of the disadvantaged child emphasize his inability to handle complex linguistic forms (Bernstein 1961, Deutsch 1963), few have probed deeply enough to determine whether this inability is merely symptomatic of a particular sociocultural environment (Labov 1969a, Wolfram 1969). Regardless of the ultimate causes of inadequacies with some particular linguistic forms, specialists generally recognize that the formal requirements of “good English” do not really reflect native capacity to understand and use another dialect of English (Shuy 1964, Labov 1969b, Baratz and Shuy 1969, Burling 1970). At the same time, no one has adequately determined, much less measured, the constituents of this native capacity.

Measurement of language competence is difficult; it is even more difficult when it attempts to quantify the elements of an intuitive ability which amounts to sensitivity to a number of complex linguistic factors. There has been some research on developing instruments to register linguistic aptitude (Carroll 1954, 1961, Hunt 1968, Tikofsky 1968), but evaluations of objective tests which attempt to measure
"aptitude," "competency," "communicational skill," etc. show that the tests are all but inadequate. In a survey of evaluations of sixteen standard tests of linguistic ability in junior high and high school the researcher concludes, "the evidence of this study points overwhelmingly to the fact that there is no perfect objective test of English, nor does any currently published test come close to the goal of measuring success in English" (Wood 1968). Not only are tests inadequate, criteria by which evaluations are made are evidently highly variable (Smith 1969). Such data not only point to the difficulty of objective testing with language, they suggest that existing tests may not be registering significant features of language response. From our own survey of testing materials we felt that they tended to emphasize superficial competencies at the expense of linguistic ability. This tendency, along with the difficulty of language measurement in general, may account for the but partial success of standardized tests in English.

What standardized tests lacked, we observed, were items which registered a "deep" response to language in the same sense that the linguist distinguishes between "deep" and "surface" structure. This "deep" response might include sensitivity to underlying grammatical structures, influence of speaker and situation on choice of words and structures, nuances of meaning, and subtle relationships operating beneath the surface of extended discourse. Though subjective in nature, responses to such factors needed to be isolated and examined to see whether or not they were measurable. This project was a beginning step in that process, with the specific aim of subjecting a number of likely responses--chiefly the ability to respond to underlying grammatical relationships--to a testing procedure which would indicate the probability of their being measured, given further work and more developed instruments than we would be able to use.
The project's principal investigator was Robert I. Williams, a teacher of writing and literature specializing in Renaissance comedy and stylistic analysis; its co-investigator was James R. Nattinger, a linguist specializing in bilingualism and sociolinguistics; its consultant was Morris Weitman, a psychologist specializing in tests and testing procedures. The project took from June of 1971 to June of 1972 not counting time needed for writing of this report. It consisted of selection of criteria to be tested, creation of a testing instrument, application of the instrument to a criterion group and to a subject population of junior and senior college students enrolled in 6 sections of Writing 323 (Junior Composition) in the academic year 1971-1972, and, finally, compilation and interpretation of results. While the results of the project were more indicative than final—we could not develop a fully reliable test, nor could we apply what we did develop to a large population—we succeeded in isolating 6 significant criteria of responsiveness which have some probability of yielding measurable results in future, more extensive projects. Further, the techniques we used may be of value to anyone continuing this line of research.

The first step in the project was selection of potential criteria for analysis and testing. We decided that we would have to be guided by two general principles: that responsiveness, whatever it may be, would involve a somewhat heightened sensitivity to the deep factors operating in semantic meaning, structure of word groups and sentences, and in extended discourse; and second, that our choice of components would be limited, necessarily, by testing. Whether or not the final resultant group of measurable criteria were the most significant as indicators of responsiveness would need to await a considerable advance of general knowledge of linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and of what specific capacities are likely to make one person a good poet, another no poet at all, or one person facile with words, another not. We composed rough test questions, then, on a number of specific aspects of the three general areas, semantic meaning, structure of word group and sentence, and extended discourse, emphasizing choices that would reveal a response to less than obvious factors operating in a particular case. James Nattinger devised the items on
structure of word groups and sentences, Robert Williams devised those on semantic meaning and extended discourse; each read and criticised each other’s items, rejecting those that were unclear or trivial.

Beginning with a stock of rough items totalling 135, we turned to the three problems they presented: were they significant, were they measurable, and were they susceptible to analysis? Whether or not an item was significant, both in itself as a meaningful choice and in respect to the linguistic feature it was meant to test, was determined by a group of five experts in the fields of English writing and linguistics. We chose people with experience in more than one phase of language study and teaching, who were acquainted with the concept of deep structure, and who were, otherwise, of varied backgrounds and interests:

Gregory F. Goekjian, Asst. Prof. English, Ph.D. Pittsburgh, 1970; specialist in literary criticism, poetry.


Shelley C. Reece, Asst. Prof. English, Ph.D. Nebraska, 1966; head of Composition Program, PSU, specialist in composition, teaching of writing, rhetoric.

Robert I. Williams, Assoc. Prof. English, Ph.D. California (Berkeley), 1967; specialist in Renaissance comedy, stylistic analysis.

Baxter D. Wilson, Assoc. Prof. English, Ph.D. Virginia, 1952; linguist, specializing in phonetics, Old English.

Note: Nattinger and Williams read each other’s test items and factored them independently, jointly making up the fifth member of the group.
Agreement of 4 out of 5 of the group was required to establish that a potential test item was intelligible and significant. Along with agreement on significance, we required the group of experts to have a similar community of opinion on each item's linguistic components, that is, we wanted to assure that each item could be analyzed, either as a choice that would measure a specific component (e.g., semantic meaning) or that would measure two or more components interacting together (e.g., semantic meaning, word form, structural feature). This procedure was necessary, we felt, because a given language choice often has more than one linguistic factor operating in it, and if it were possible to correlate responses we might find that a subject tended to be strong in choices involving, say, structure of word groups and sentences, and weak in those involving semantic meaning.

Agreement among the experts on the linguistic components of each test item was achieved by use of sheets which had a number of "factors" which could enter into the choice a test item called for. Though these factors were somewhat crude, they were sufficiently detailed to indicate whether or not a given test item's response could be analyzed and what linguistic components, specifically, the choice involved. (For a sample factoring sheet, see Appendix A). After discussing these components with the group, and providing them with a glossary so that everyone was clear as to what was meant by the headings and sub-headings on the sheet, Robert Williams and James Nittinger joined the group as experts analyzing each other's test items. Each potential item, then, of the original collection of 135 was subjected to independent analysis by the group. Each of the five experts was asked to distribute 10 points for each item among the various components he felt were operant in the choice the item called for. Thus the test item (1-C), which asked the subject to fill in a blank by choosing between "a real persuasive" and "a really persuasive," had the following distribution of factors according to one expert:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social-linguistic Context</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Content</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position, Positional Emphasis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlying Grammatical Relationships</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The numbers--parts of 10 distributed--indicate this expert's opinion of the linguistic factors operating in this particular language choice and their relative weights. Such a wide distribution of factors was, however, unusual; typically, the experts saw 2 or 3 factors operating in choices, e.g., an expert saw in a choice having to do with word-compounding (16-A) linguistic factors of the relative weights of 4 for Semantic Context, 6 for Underlying Grammatical Relationships. Where there was not substantial agreement among the experts on the components involved the item was excluded from the test. 80% or more agreement was required. By this process we arrived at a collection of 28 test items, many with two or more parts, totaling 74 single-choice decisions. These made up our test (see Appendix B).

As might have been anticipated, the testing instrument did not have items evenly distributed among choices involving semantic meaning, structure of word groups and sentences, and extended discourse; the largest part of the test was devoted to items on structure, with the remainder devoted to semantic meaning and extended discourse. Further, test items would be shown to be invalid because of vague wording and the like. However we proceeded with the testing, which called for giving the test first to a criterion group of 21 people who are acknowledged experienced users of language in their vocations or in their daily work lives. The group ranged from students to professional writers, from secretaries to writing teachers. We specifically avoided a predominance of college teachers of English because we felt their responses might reflect only one dialect of our language, written standard English, and, further, because many had had training which would allow them to see deep structure as an intellectual concept, thus clouding the intuitive response the test was designed to elicit. The responses of the criterion group became the basis for judging "right" and "wrong" answers in the main group of subects, 158 students enrolled in our junior-level writing classes. Because of lack of agreement by members of the criterion group our stock of items was to be further reduced at the time of analysis. The standard applied was that 16 responses out of the 21 of the group should be in agreement on any specific item. Disagreement appeared to come from ambiguities in the instrument, some confusion over deep structure (a concept unfamiliar to most of the group), and variability of responses with items that attempted to reach overly fine discriminations. Requiring, then, the agreement of 16 out of 21 for each item, the test was finally reduced from 73 to 52 items for purposes of analysis. Meanwhile, the 73 item test was given to the
 experimental group, composed of junior-senior students in Writing 323.

The six writing classes were taught, three each, by Williams and Nattinger, with parallel texts, parallel readings, parallel paper assignments and exercises, and, in so far as was possible, the same styles of classroom instruction. The chief purpose of instruction, in this case, was clarification of the idea of deep structure and establishment of some common store of knowledge about language in general. The last was most important because we had no way of knowing what the background of students would be. As it turned out, we had little difficulty in explaining the notion of deep structure, apparently, and we proceeded in each class to administer a pre- and a post-test. The pre-test was given the middle of the second week of instruction, the post-test was given at final examination time. In both testings, students were advised that no grade was attached to results, and, except for the fact of there being two testings, were informed what the project was about. Actual beginning enrollment in the courses totalled 246, but dropping of a class, failure to take both the pre- and post-test, and other causes resulted in a decreased subject population, 158. While this reduction was more than we had hoped would occur, the limited scope of the project made its impact less serious than it would be in a fully developed study.
RESULTS

The overall results of analysis of testing point toward six areas of measurable responsiveness: response to (1) sociolinguistic context, (2) semantic context, (3) deep structure of phrases, (4) deep structure of sentences, (5) primary semantic factors of extended discourse, and (6) organization of discourse.

Sociolinguistic context refers to the social setting in which language occurs, and involves the nature of a speaker and similar factors; it is not to be equated with "propriety," since many text items ranged over different levels and styles of expression and involved formal as well as informal social situations. Semantic context means, more narrowly, the connections with and influences on a given word or expression by surrounding words and meanings. It differs from "semantic meaning" (in the sense of "dictionary definition") by emphasis on the modifications of a word or expression brought about by the linguistic surrounding in which it occurs.

The two areas of deep structure are merely different ranges of the same phenomenon, and their meanings as we use them refer to the fundamental concept of deep structure as distinct from surface structure. Items were designed to test a subject's response to complex connections underlying phrase and sentence formulation, connections which go deeper than "agreement between subject and verb" or other superficial arrangements we observe as users of the language. The distinction, then, between the two areas is mainly one of the size of the linguistic unit, i.e., phrase or word-group, and sentence.

Primary semantic factors of extended discourse (listed on our factoring sheets as "primary factors of extended discussion," the last word being a misreading for "discourse"); refers to the basic semantic component of discourse, discourse being any unit of verbal communication larger than the sentence. As with semantic context primary semantic factors involves more than the "dictionary definition" of a word; it includes the basic meaning of a word and the modifications of that meaning through the influence of surrounding linguistic elements. This individual and contextual meaning becomes, in extended discourse, further modified by structure of sentences and of paragraphs, but we treat it as a distinguishable element.
for purposes of analysis. The same may be said of organization of discourse, which is, absolutely speaking, tied to the meanings of words, word groups, sentence form, and devices such as repetition, but which we treat as a separate factor. Organization of discourse includes such things as comparison-contrast, spacial arrangement, temporal arrangement, analogy, induction, deduction, cause and effect, and syllogistic form (See Appendix A).

These six areas are those which, out of a number we built into the test, survived analysis by experts and testing with a criterion and experimental group, and which emerged from analysis of results. Of the 73 items of the testing instrument (reduced by some disagreement among the criterion group) 52 items qualified for analysis and yielded the following distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of item</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociolinguistic Context</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Context</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Structure, word-group</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Structure, sentence</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Semantic Factors of Extended Discourse</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of Extended Discourse</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of items</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because three test items involved substantially more than one linguistic factor, the total number of items fed into computer analysis was 55. These six areas of apparently valid linguistic choice became, in effect, criteria of responsiveness the project was designed to search out.

However, the question of their reliability and validity remained, and further analysis was conducted to see to what extent items on the test registered differences of response and what these differences might reveal. In order to study reliability and validity, six scales were constructed, one each for the factors mentioned above. Since the attributes in question are dependent variables which presumably are amenable to change over time, test-retest reliability is inappropriate. Consequently pre-test and post-test data were analyzed separately, providing a form of replication. Odd-even split-half correlations were computed for each scale and corrected for reduction in length by the Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula. As a further check on attenuation produced
by insufficient number of items, Scales A and B were combined (odd items from A plus even items from B versus even items from A plus odd items from B), Scales C and D were combined (same as A and B), and Scales E and F were combined (same as A and B).

Factor A, Sociolinguistic Context, consists of eleven items which have score weights ranging from 16 to 35 with a median of 28. Reliability estimates are a little low (.55 and .52) but could well be raised by further development.

Factor B, Semantic Context, consists of seven items having score weights ranging from 12 to 32 with a median of 28. Reliability estimates appear to be quite low (.14 and .21); this scale does not look very promising. Combining A and B yielded somewhat higher reliability coefficients (.67 and .61) but the increase is not as great as would be obtained by adding seven items to Scale A.

Factor C, Deep Structure (word-group), consists of nine items having score weights ranging from 29 to 42 with a median of 37. Reliability coefficients are about the same as for Factor A (.56 and .53).

Factor D, Deep Structure (sentence), consists of twelve items having score weights ranging from 27 to 43 with a median of 38. Reliability estimates are at the same level as for Factors A and C (.56 and .55). Combining Scales C and D has relatively little effect on reliability (.63 and .63).

Factor E, Primary Semantic Factors of Extended Discourse, consists of eight items having scoring weights ranging from 21 to 46 with a median of 30. Reliability is slightly lower than for Factors A, C and D (.50 and .47).

Factor F, Organization of Extended Discourse, consists of eight items having score weights ranging from 12 to 45; the item weights are 12, 40, 42, 45, 45, 45, 45, 45. Reliability coefficients are quite low (.05 and .31). Combining E and F produces reliability coefficients of .32 and .54.

Reviewing the reliability findings (Table 1) it appears that there is no advantage to combining scales (A and B, C and D, E and F). It also appears that Scales A, C, D, E and F are promising whereas Scales B and F seem less worthwhile.
Performance on each of the six factor scales was analyzed separately by means of classes nested in Instructors ANOVA with two repeated measures (pre-post).

Since this study represents rather crude attempts to develop measures of some constructs derived from a particular theoretical approach to language, refined validation studies are rather premature. But it was considered useful to carry out some studies of this sort as a way of getting some hints as to the probable worth of the measures which had been developed. As displayed in Tables 3 through 8, it was found that there were student-gains in performance on Factors A, B, C and D by the end of the writing course and no pre-post change in performance on Scales E and F. Though these changes are as predicted, they are quite small in magnitude (Table 2). It is quite possible that this is partly a reflection of the insensitivity of the instrument indicated by the less than satisfactory reliabilities found for the six factor scales.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C &amp; D</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E &amp; F</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Odd-even product-moment correlation corrected with Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula; all 158 S's participated on both testing occasions.
### Table 2

#### Mean Factor Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructor 1</strong></td>
<td>214</td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td>250*</td>
<td>340*</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructor 2</strong></td>
<td>224</td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td>271*</td>
<td>366*</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class 1</strong></td>
<td>204</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class 2</strong></td>
<td>205</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class 3</strong></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class 4</strong></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class 5</strong></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class 6</strong></td>
<td>225</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class 7</strong></td>
<td>234</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class 8</strong></td>
<td>212</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Test</strong></td>
<td>215*</td>
<td>129*</td>
<td>254*</td>
<td>344*</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Test</strong></td>
<td>222*</td>
<td>135*</td>
<td>265*</td>
<td>359*</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor A Pre</strong></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong></td>
<td>214</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor B Pre</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor C Pre</strong></td>
<td>254</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor D Pre</strong></td>
<td>342</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong></td>
<td>369</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

13.

15.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>6880</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6880</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class (Instructor)</td>
<td>23928</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3418</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Between)</td>
<td>535678</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Between)</td>
<td>566486</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post</td>
<td>4221</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4221</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor x Pre-Post</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Within)</td>
<td>147590</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Within)</td>
<td>172659</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Variation</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F ratio</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class (Instructor)</td>
<td>4237</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Between)</td>
<td>172439</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Between)</td>
<td>176956</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post</td>
<td>2898</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2898</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor x Pre-Post</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class (Instructor) x Pre-Post</td>
<td>10877</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Within)</td>
<td>57570</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Within)</td>
<td>72302</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

FACTOR C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>35056</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35056</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class (Instructor)</td>
<td>11608</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Between)</td>
<td>838224</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Between)</td>
<td>884888</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post</td>
<td>9934</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9934</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor x Pre-Post</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class (Instructor) x Pre-Post</td>
<td>57998</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8285</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Within)</td>
<td>225300</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Within)</td>
<td>294478</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>51160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51160</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class (Instructor)</td>
<td>28692</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4099</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Between)</td>
<td>913146</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>6128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Between)</td>
<td>992998</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post</td>
<td>17972</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17972</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor x Pre-Post</td>
<td>6684</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6684</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class (Instructor) x Pre-Post</td>
<td>61540</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8791</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Within)</td>
<td>232652</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Within)</td>
<td>318848</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7

**FACTOR E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>5842</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5842</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class (Instructor)</td>
<td>16890</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2413</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Between)*</td>
<td>400016</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>2685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Between)</td>
<td>422748</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor x Pre-Post</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class (Instructor) x Pre-Post</td>
<td>10245</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Within)*</td>
<td>157268</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Within)</td>
<td>170367</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Winer (1962) recommends pooling nested factor sums of squares with appropriate error terms when none of the nested factors reaches significance at the .10 level. This is of course a matter of controversy and in this particular analysis would make no difference in outcome.

---

18.

20.
### Table A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class (Instructor)</td>
<td>19336</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2762</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Between)*</td>
<td>585660</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Between)</strong></td>
<td>605120</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F ratio</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor x Pre-Post</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class (Instructor) x Pre-Post</td>
<td>9964</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Within)*</td>
<td>347554</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>2333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Within)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Winer (1962) recommends pooling nested factor sums of squares with appropriate error terms when none of the nested factors reaches significance at the .10 level. This is of course a matter of controversy and in this particular analysis would make no difference in the outcome.
CONCLUSION

Taken together, the results of the reliability and validity studies indicate that scales A, B, C, D, and E merit further development. Discarding scale F may be premature since it may have been inappropriately employed and may prove worthwhile if tested on freshmen and sophomores rather than on juniors. These scales, and the criteria they represent, relate to individual items in the testing instrument given in Appendix B in the following manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale and Criterion of Responsiveness</th>
<th>Test Items Used in Final Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Factor A, Sociolinguistic Context</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3a, 3b, 5a, 5b, 5c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Factor B, Semantic Context</td>
<td>3a, 3c, 5b, 6a, 7a, 13c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Factor C, Deep Structure (word-group)</td>
<td>16a, 16b, 16c, 17a, 17b, 17c, 18a, 18b, 18c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Factor D, Deep Structure (sentence)</td>
<td>10a, 10b, 11b, 12a, 12b, 12c, 13a, 13b, 14a, 14b, 15a, 15b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Factor E, Primary Semantic Factors of Extended Discourse</td>
<td>19a, 19b, 20a, 20b, 23a, 24a, 24b, 24c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Factor F, Organization of Extended Discourse</td>
<td>22a, 24c, 25a, 27a, 27b, 27c, 28a, 28c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those interested in pursuing these criteria of responsiveness to English, actual test items should be consulted.

All in all, the researchers felt that a crude but indicative beginning has been made to define and measure aspects of language response not ordinarily considered and perhaps not even measured by standard instruments. It is hoped the criteria of responsiveness we have located will be further refined in the development of more sophisticated language tests than those now available.
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APPENDIX B

LANGUAGE PREFERENCE TEST

The following test is designed to find out how your responses to the English language compare with those of people who have acknowledged sensitivity to its nuances. The test goes on no official record, nor does its ultimate result influence your course grade.

The majority of items you are asked to respond to pertain to written English. Every item or parts of it asks you to choose between two alternatives; every item must be marked, and an item not marked will be counted as "wrong." The test is timed. Items not completed will have to be counted as "wrong," so the most advisable procedure is to mark down what you instinctively feel is "right" of a particular case, rather than marking down a choice after long deliberation.

For purposes of linguistic study you are asked to fill in the information requested below. This information, along with your name and score, will be kept with the test for a month; after that time your test will be assigned a number and your name and information about you destroyed. Test results can be found out by consultation with the instructor during that month.

Name __________________________
Writing 323, Sec. __________
Sex ________
Home address (family) __________________________
Other languages spoken at home __________________________
To what extent? __________________________
Previous formal instruction in English language structure __________________________
Current year in college __________
Special notes, if any, on the above: __________________________

23.
1. CONTEST AND WORD MEANING;
The sentence below has a blank space to be filled by a suitable expression.

For each of the following pairs of possibilities, select the one which would be most suitable in filling in the blank.

A. _______________ C. _______________
B. _______________ D. _______________

1. a real persuasive
2. a really persuasive

According to the standards of his as well as our time, Abraham Lincoln was a leader of men.

He was suitable in filling in the blank. Each of the following pairs of possibilities, select the one which would be most suitable by a suitable expression. For the sentence below has a blank space to be filled by _______________.

CONTEST AND WORD MEANING:
Choose from each of the following pairs of possibilities the most likely user of the expression, "that's a no-no."

1. A minister talking to a parishioner about sin.
2. An attorney talking to his son about using tools.
3. A beauty parlor operator talking to a customer about hair dye.
4. A clerk talking to a customer about payment of a charge account.
5. An insurance adjuster speaking to his client about what not to say about a recent accident.
6. A mechanic talking to his boss about how not to use an impact tool.
7. A clerk talking to a customer about payment of a charge account.
8. A minister talking to a parishioner about sin.
9. An attorney talking to his son about using tools.
10. An insurance adjuster speaking to his client about what not to say about a recent accident.

Which option(s) would you choose for each of the following scenarios?
Choose from each pair of alternatives given below the one which is most suitable in filling the blank:

A. Our Savior Jesus was deeply loved by

1. those who were his followers.
2. those who followed him.

B. Every individual

1. got mixed up in
2. became involved in

C. relationship was with someone outside the group.

1. entered into
2. went into

suitable in filling the blanks:

Choose from each pair of alternatives given below the one which is most suitable in filling the blank:
A novelist wants to capture the feeling, the look and tense of autumn leaves in his description of a street. It is important that his story make the reader feel, in as many ways as possible, the "autumnness" of the scene. For each of the following pairs of possibilities, select the one which best conveys the effect he wants.

A.
1. The wind blew autumn leaves across the empty street.
2. The wind blew parched autumn leaves across the empty street.

The wind blew autumn leaves across the empty street.
In a general discussion among neighbors on a warm afternoon over soft drinks in the backyard, the following are spoken.

For each of the two possibilities given choose the one most likely and suitable to the situation.

1. "You'd never think, as such, that there would be any problem.

A. It isn't a good field on which to play touch football.

B. It isn't a good field to play touch football or.

C. "Thus, you can't be certain of your average man."

2. "You'd never think that there would be any problem, as such.

A. "It isn't a good field to play touch football or.

B. "Thus, you can't be certain of your average man."

C.  

Given choose the one most likely and suitable to the situation. For each of the two possibilities the following are spoken. For each of the two possibilities in the background, the following are spoken. For each of the two possibilities in the foreground, the following are spoken. For each of the two possibilities in the background, the following are spoken. For each of the two possibilities in the foreground, the following are spoken.
Select the sentence most appropriate to the author's intent in each pair.

1. It pained him that he did not know what politics meant and where the universe ended.
2. It pained him that he did not know what politics meant and where the universe ended.
3. It pained him that he did not thoroughly know what politics meant and where the universe ended.

The author wants to focus on the boy's awareness of his own ignorance, but also on his immature pride in what he does know.

Young Stephen is caught up in the excitement of learning.
Select the sentence most appropriate to the author's intent in each pair.

The author wants a statement to reflect his moral indignation against war.

1. It is men torturing and killing their enemies, but it is also the enemy being tortured and killed.
2. It is men torturing and killing their own enemy, and it is also the enemy being tortured and killed.

The author wants a statement to reflect his moral indignation against war.

Select the sentence most appropriate to the author's intent in each pair.
Select the sentence most appropriate to the author's intent in each pair.

Maxwell Smith realizes he will have to borrow some money.

The author wants the emphasis here to be from Smith's point of view, of his being in a situation where borrowing might be necessary.

A. He had never thought what it would be for him.
B. He had never thought what borrowing would be for him.

I. Borrowing was something he had never thought of doing before.
J. He had never thought what it would be to borrow.

Select the sentence most appropriate to the author's intent in each pair.
Many times unusual combinations of words force us to modify our preconceived ideas about the meanings of one or the other of those words, e.g. "steel butterfly." If you came across the combination steel butterfly you would more likely change your ideas about butterflies than about steel. And it is not really a matter of which word comes first. Note the combination eloquent rain: it is most likely "eloquent" which would change meaning; 'rain" remains unchanged.

For each pair below choose which word is most likely to change meaning when underlined expression.

A. transparent chimpanzee
   1. transparent
   2. chimpanzee

B. brave coward
   1. brave
   2. coward

C. paralytic river
   1. paralytic
   2. river

WORD COLLOCATIONS
UNDEPLOYING GRAMMATICAL RELATIONSHIPS

Nany times we feel that certain sentences are closely related even though they look very different:

1. Class was dismissed by John
2. John dismissed class.

We have this feeling because we respond to the same underlying relationships: someone (John) did something (dismissed) to something (class).

Likewise, we understand that the sentences:

1. John is eager to please
2. John is anxious to please

share the same underlying relationships (John wants to do something: i.e., John is the agent of the action), while another, which superficially looks exactly the same:

1. John is easy to please
2. John is easy to please

is quite different in the essential relationship it expresses. Here, John is the object of the action, the thing acted upon.

From each of the pairs of alternatives below choose the one which comes closer to the underlined sentence in its underlying relations.

A.
1. The window was broken by the hail.
2. The window was broken by the garden.

B.
1. The window was broken by 12 o’clock.
2. The window was broken by the falling branch.

Untertying Grammatical Relationships
A. The baby was too young to punt.
B. The baby was too young to hold.
C. The baby was too young to understand.

1. The baby was too young to talk.
2. The baby was too young to read to.
3. The baby was too young to tickle.
4. The baby was too young to understand.
5. The baby was too young to punish.

See UNDERLYING CONTRIBUTIONAL INFLUENCES
A. She cooked him a roast turkey.

B. 1. They made him a nervous wreck.
   2. They built him a new home.

C. 1. She made him a good wife.
   2. She knitted him a blue sweater.

See UNDERLYING GRAMMATICAL RELATIONSHIPS
A.
B.
C.

This is a riddle to puzzle everybody.

1. This is a riddle to amuse everybody.

2. This is a riddle to interest everybody.

3. This is a riddle to please everybody.

4. This is a riddle to read to everybody.

5. This is a riddle to entertain everybody.

6. This is a riddle to ask everybody.

See UNDERLYING GRANULATION RELATIONSHIPS
A. She had a copy to read.
B. She had a book to read.
C. She had an article to read.

They had an hour to read.

1. She had a good reason to read.
2. She had a bad report to read.

1. They had an hour to read.
2. They had a good place to read.

1. She had an article to read.
2. She had a reason to read.

See underlying grammatical relationships.
See UNDERLYING GRAMMATICAL RELATIONSHIPS

A. The car drove smoothly.
B. The shirt ironed fairly well.
C. A woodsmen saved the tree.

A. A rock broke the stick.
B. The branch fell suddenly.
C. The shirt ironed neatly.
any compounded phrases are built from the same kinds of underlying relationships. For example, in the following compounds:

(1) notary stamp
(2) book cover
(3) record player
(4) finger ring

Numbers (2) and (4) share the same underlying relationships. This can be shown (and tested for) most readily by rephrasing each of the compounds. In (2), it’s a cover on a book, and in (4), a ring on a finger, while (1) is perhaps the stamp of a notary, and (3), a player of/for records. Compounds that can undergo the same kinds of rephrasings usually share the same underlying relationships.

Which of the following noun compounds are formed from the same kinds of internal grammatical relations as the underlined compound?

A. brick-mason
B. car-theft
C. brick-mason

For example, in the following compounds:

A. water pistol
B. blood-donor
C. brick-mason

1. limestone
2. locksmith
A. See C01720LINDING

1. body-fluids
2. gravel-pit

B. Space-Charge
1. Bug-spray
2. Brick-mason

C. Around-water
1. brick-mason
2. kidney-stone

See Ground-Water
A. coffee box
B. coffee cream
C. pocketbook

A.-tray

B. pet pen
A.-tray

See COMPOUNDING
EXTENDED DISCOURSE

The whole idea of the project was community involvement. That's why people objected: no one listened to what they wanted.

The individual wants to decide where and how he's going to live.

The high rise apartment will never take the place of a home where people live and raise their families.

That's why people objected: no one listened to what they wanted.

The individual wants to decide where and how he's going to live.
From the alternatives below choose the one which fills the blank so as to provide continuity of idea in the following passage:

A. The subject of the meeting was police relations with the community.

B. It was becoming dangerous, they said, to be on the streets at night. Of course part of the problem was poor street lighting.

C. All agreed that the area should be policed more frequently. Many people from the community objected to arrest procedures.

D. All agreed that the area should be policed more frequently. All agreed that the area should be policed more frequently. All agreed that the area should be policed more frequently. All agreed that the area should be policed more frequently.

2. All agreed that the area should be policed more frequently. Many people from the community objected to arrest procedures.

3. All agreed that the area should be policed more frequently. Many people from the community objected to arrest procedures. It was becoming dangerous, they said, to be on the streets at night. Of course part of the problem was poor street lighting.

4. All agreed that the area should be policed more frequently. Many people from the community objected to arrest procedures. It was becoming dangerous, they said, to be on the streets at night. Of course part of the problem was poor street lighting.

5. All agreed that the area should be policed more frequently. Many people from the community objected to arrest procedures. It was becoming dangerous, they said, to be on the streets at night. Of course part of the problem was poor street lighting.
The writer of the following passage wants to add to it a comparison which will make his subject matter clearer to his reader. Of the two alternatives given, choose the one which is most in keeping with the passage and the thought it expresses.

A. Not only do maples adapt to climatic conditions by shedding leaves, they respond to heat and cold by thickness and flow of their sap: hence the saying—"the sap is up" or "the sap is down."

B. The maple's life is like a human being's in many respects: it has "blood," "arteries," "circulation," and different metabolisms or rates of body function.

C. The maple's life is like an insect's in many respects; it responds to heat and snow by searching for food and by propagating, and to heat and cold by slowing down its use of energy.

Not only do maples adapt to climatic conditions by shedding leaves, the passage and the thought it expresses. Choose the one which is most in keeping with the passage and the reader's interest. The writer of the following passage wants to add to it a comparison which will make his subject matter clearer to his reader. Of the two alternatives given, choose the one which is most in keeping with the passage and the thought it expresses.
The writer of the following passage wants to split it into two paragraphs. Where would this split most naturally occur? Choose from the pairs of alternatives given below that which most nearly serves as a paragraph break.

The real art of taxation is in relieving people of their wealth in as agreeable a way as possible. This skill requires an approach which is at once courteous and threatening, with emphasis on courtesy. For though taxes will not be fully paid without threat, citizen compliance is the cheapest method of gaining revenue, were taxation to rely upon threat alone, a good share of revenue gained would have to be spent on law enforcement. Much public relations effort is required of the Internal Revenue Service to assure citizen compliance, much taxpayer education is carried on by it to assure that laws are known. For the Internal Revenue Service the aim of public relations is not so different from that of an advertising agency. In fact, one could say that the IRS is selling one of the most difficult "products" in our economy, the willful giving up of one's money. And it is selling successfully, to judge from the large share of taxes paid without regret.

A. in as agreeable a way as possible.
B. with emphasis on courtesy.
C. In fact, one could say that the IRS is selling one of the most difficult "products" in our economy, the willful giving up of one's money.
D. For though taxes will not be fully paid without threat, citizen compliance is the cheapest method of gaining revenue.

The writer of the following passage wants to split it into two paragraphs. Where would this split most naturally occur? Choose from the pairs of alternatives given below that which most nearly serves as a paragraph break.

The real art of taxation is in relieving people of their wealth in as agreeable a way as possible. This skill requires an approach which is at once courteous and threatening, with emphasis on courtesy. For though taxes will not be fully paid without threat, citizen compliance is the cheapest method of gaining revenue, were taxation to rely upon threat alone, a good share of revenue gained would have to be spent on law enforcement. Much public relations effort is required of the Internal Revenue Service to assure citizen compliance, much taxpayer education is carried on by it to assure that laws are known. For the Internal Revenue Service the aim of public relations is not so different from that of an advertising agency. In fact, one could say that the IRS is selling one of the most difficult "products" in our economy, the willful giving up of one's money. And it is selling successfully, to judge from the large share of taxes paid without regret.

A. in as agreeable a way as possible.
B. with emphasis on courtesy.
C. In fact, one could say that the IRS is selling one of the most difficult "products" in our economy, the willful giving up of one's money.
D. For though taxes will not be fully paid without threat, citizen compliance is the cheapest method of gaining revenue.
The writer wants to delete some repetitive words (or terms) in the passage below. Of those underlined which are most repetitive and most likely to come in for change? Choose among alternatives given.

A. 1. inertia
2. coexistence
B. 1. matter of safety
2. one instance
C. 2. conservatism
1. matter of safety

Building codes tend to stifle creativity. They are inherently conservative, a codified accumulation of builders' experience which leaves little room for innovation. For instance, if it were a matter of safety, the rigid provisions rather than by structural impossibility or occupant safety. Certainly if it were a matter of safety, the rigid provisions cannot have it because it would violate code. This is but one instance of thwarted imagination blocked by sheer inertia. The area of a ceiling less than seven feet in height, where it is an architect's wont to exceed seventy percent of the area of a ceiling less than seven feet in height, where it is an architect's wont to exceed seventy percent of the area of a ceiling less than seven feet in height, where it is an architect's wont to exceed seventy percent of the area of a ceiling less than seven feet in height, where it is an architect's wont to exceed seventy percent of

In order to change, choose some alternatives given.
From each of the pairs of alternatives given choose the one which least belongs to the passage below, in terms of general suitability and appropriateness.

1. normally our warranty does not cover parts which wear out quickly.
2. with large orders, however, our organization stretches a point.

A. C-1
B. B-1
C. C-2

I. fan belts, cutter blades, clutches, all can be replaced without cost to you.
2. I think you can see the reasoning behind that.

A. B-1
B. B-2
C. C-1

I. We pride ourselves on being a vital part of America's food processing industry, one of the underpinnings of our economy.
2. You will find our prices competitive and our equipment reliable, we mean it when we say, "AMSCO wants to join you."

A. B-1
B. A-2
C. A-1

I. normally our warranty does not cover parts which wear out quickly.
2. our organization stretches a point.

A. C-1
B. C-2
C. B-1
Read the passage below and then choose among the pairs of alternatives the ones which best describe what the passage emphasizes.

In front lay the valley. And across it, the mountains stood defiantly, locking the land in stifling heat. To the left, from what appeared to be a volcanic fissure, a dried creek bed began to cut the valley floor, winding through the center of the land then back towards the mountains, finally, slowly, disappearing in the distance.

1. Physical details described to give us a sense of the geography of the valley.
2. Accumulation of descriptive details.

1. Presentation of a character's impressions of the valley.
2. Suspense (as in a detective story).

In the distance then back towards the mountains, finally, slowly, disappearing. Which best describe what the passage emphasizes?

Read the passage below and then choose among the pairs of alternatives the ones which best describe what the passage emphasizes.

Accumulation of descriptive details.
Suspense (as in a detective story).
Presentation of a character's impressions of the valley.

26. From the alternatives given below choose one of each pair which best describes how the given passage is organized.

A. Narrative account.
B. Time sequence.
C. Cause and effect altered to fit time sequence.

The attempt to block the parking structure was well-supported but too late. Even if the city council had wanted to stop building of it, applications had been submitted and approved in accordance with zoning regulations for that area. The proper time for complaint, citizens found, would have been at earlier hearings on zoning changes. Now the only thing that could be done was restriction of building height, and even that restriction could be circumvented.

The attempt to block the parking structure was well-supported.
From the pairs of alternatives given, choose the one which best describes the way the passage below is put together.

A. Association of ideas with ideas.
B. Comparison and contrast.
C. Cause and effect.

Yellow, of course, is the color of wealth, as with gold. In fact, a certain shade of yellow was reserved for royalty in imperial China, but in this case the basic idea was sun worship. Just as the Western church took over sun worship, in the same way our representations of the sun and sunshine, which are, of course, put together. From the pairs of alternatives given, choose the one which best describes the way the passage below is put together.
From each of the alternatives below choose the one of each pair which is most logical as a statement.

(Ultimate truth is not the question.)

A. This dude black at heart, man. Everybody either black or white when it come to a feeling 'bout race.

B. This dude black at heart. Man, I mean, he ain't white. And every-

C. 2. I'm really turning out work on this job, and if you work hard your pay will be better than last time, which is why I expect a better paycheck than I got then.

1. I'm really turning out work on this job, and if you work hard your pay will be better than last time, which is why I expect a better paycheck than I got then.

2. All Republicans believe in free enterprise versus government control of the economy. Some Democrats, too, prefer that government be kept out of the country's economic affairs. That is why some Democrats are really Republicans.

I. All Republicans believe in free enterprise versus government control of the economy. Some Democrats, too, prefer that government be kept out of the country's economic affairs. That is why some Democrats are really Republicans.

Are close to being Republicans.

A. All Republicans believe in free enterprise versus government control of the economy. Some Democrats, too, prefer that government be kept out of the country's economic affairs. That is why some Democrats are close to being Republicans.

B. All Republicans believe in free enterprise versus government control of the economy. Some Democrats, too, prefer that government be kept out of the country's economic affairs. That is why some Democrats are close to being Republicans.

C. I'm really turning out work on this job, and if you work hard your pay will be better than last time, which is why I expect a better paycheck than I got then.

1. I'm really turning out work on this job, and if you work hard your pay will be better than last time, which is why I expect a better paycheck than I got then.

2. I'm really turning out work on this job, and if you work hard your pay will be better than last time, which is why I expect a better paycheck than I got then.