Two papers given at a conference on compensatory/remedial education are provided. The first paper, "How to Plan a Developmental English Program with College-Wide Cooperation" by Edith A. Freiligh, discusses the hypothesis that certain kinds of personalities are attracted to certain kinds of disciplines, applying it to teachers, students, and administrators. Requirements for developing programs are given. In the second paper, "Critical Thinking in Communication" by Henry R. Pea, the need for adults to be able to distinguish critical thinking from other types of thought, to understand the process of thinking critically, and to be able to teach children to think critically is discussed. An appendix lists the conference participants. (DB)
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PREFACE

Here are the papers delivered by Dr. Edith Freligh and Dr. Henry Fea. We hope you enjoyed the Compensatory/Remedial Education Conference held at Travelodge-at-Sea-Tac May 16 and 17, and hope you gained from it professionally, too.

Many more people attended this year than last (61 as opposed to about 35), and we hope this trend continues in future years. Perhaps we will be able to expand our meetings to include more specific and detailed work in the areas of Adult Basic Education, remedial math programs, and so forth.

We will be using your evaluation forms in next year's planning and would appreciate further suggestions if you wish to correspond with us. In case you have forgotten, here is our address:

COMPENSATORY CONFERENCE COMMITTEE
Center for the Development of Community College Education
M201 Miller Hall  DQ-12
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

Again, thanks for your interest and participation.

Dr. Frederic T. Giles, Dean
College of Education
University of Washington
Piet Hein is a Danish scientist-turned-poet who is the inventor and author of GROOKS. A GROOK is a short, aphoristic poem, accompanied by an appropriate drawing, revealing in a minimum of words and with a minimum of lines some basic truth about the human condition. Hein invented grooks during the Nazi occupation of Denmark as a sort of underground language just out of reach of the understanding of the Germans. The first one here presented is designed to provide ammunition for those of you who have the temerity to disagree with everything I shall have to say:

THE UNTENABLE ARGUMENT

My adversary's argument is not alone malevolent but ignorant to boot. He hasn't even got the sense to state his so-called evidence in terms I can refute.

(Hein, Crooks 2, p. 10)

I have a hypothesis. Part of it is somewhat anthropological in approach and suggests that those of us who live and work in educational (or any other bureaucratic) institutions behave in ways which are almost ritualistic, which are certainly conditioned by the bureaucratic and academic cultures, and which involve both "password" or "shibboleth" behavior and taboos. Sanctioned behavior—in our setting—may include

*Associate Dean of Instruction, Golden West College
the notion among teachers, e.g., that if one would be accepted by colleagues, one must be--by definition--anti-whatever everyone else is currently anti--(administration, remedial students, Republicans, etc.)

A strong taboo in any academic community is to be politically conservative, e.g. Among teachers, behavior which actively supports improvement of working conditions (salary, hours, teaching load, class size) is strongly approved; behavior which appears to be that of an "informer" for administration is strongly taboo. Among administrators, behavior which suggests that administrators who deserve it should be fired for irresponsible management or poor judgment is taboo; behavior which exhibits ambition for "higher" administrative position or promotion--even though it may mean leaving the current institution at some loss to the institution--is heartily sanctioned; leaving administration for teaching is taboo, etc.

A second part of the hypothesis is that certain kinds of personalities are attracted to certain kinds of disciplines. An extrovert who is concerned chiefly with people, for example, who values human contacts above all things, who tends to be loyal to a respected person or cause, and has a strong sense of "shoulds" and "should nots" may well be attracted to the social sciences--political science, history, sociology. On the other hand, an introvert who chooses his final values without reference to the judgment of outsiders, who is very warm inside but hardly shows it until one gets past his reserve, who is tolerant, open-minded, understanding, and wants to contribute to something that matters (a purpose beyond his
paycheck) may be attracted to art, psychology, or literature. The student attracted to a major in the humanities, or, more specifically, in language or literature may be quick, ingenious, gifted along several lines, lively and stimulating company, ready to argue for fun on any side of a question. He may be creative, imaginative, certainly humane. He may exercise considerable insight; he probably enjoys reading and may be particularly good at either speaking or writing or both. He is an idealist. He may also be impractical, individualistic to the point of resisting any form of prescribed institutional behavior; he may find it difficult to accept criticism; he probably hates routine and finds it exceptionally hard to apply himself to humdrum detail.

A. TEACHERS

Now, if it is true—or even temporarily acceptable to this audience—that given personalities are more likely to be attracted to "matching" disciplines, or to those disciplines which provide the kinds of reinforcement of values and attitudes which are either comforting or inviting, then it may also be true that engaging in a career which requires the teaching of that discipline may well continue to reinforce those qualities of personality which attracted one to a given discipline in the first place. The humanist may become even more likely to espouse humane causes, the scientist to rely extensively on demonstrable facts for the shaping of his attitudes, the sociologist to build a better world, the artist to resist infringement on or interruption of his creative pursuits.
The Myers-Briggs Personality Type Inventory used in a management series, "Manager: Know Your Effectiveness," at Golden West College in Huntington Beach, California in January of this year, is derived from Jungian personality theory which postulates that people have certain basic differences which began as tendencies, turned into habits of mind, and, if strongly developed, produce specialized skill. Recognition, understanding, and acceptance of these differences on the part of the administrators of the organization should lead to a decrease in tensions within that organization, since much of what is incomprehensible and unacceptable to others stems from an unconscious assumption that others are basically like ourselves and therefore ought to perceive and react to the world as we do. Once, however, an administrator takes a position that others (including other administrators) are basically different, he can begin to understand and make allowances for those differences so as to make those differences contribute to the goals of the institution. The authors of the Inventory caution that if we do not stop to think about type differences, we will automatically present our ideas in terms of what matters to our own types, and, for all types except our own, that will be the wrong approach. (Keirsey and Bates, p. 1)

All of us fall into one of four types: sensing-perceptive (SP), sensing-judging (SJ), intuitive-thinking (NT), or intuitive-feeling (NF). None of us is a "pure," however, and usually contain a mix of each quality. All of the S's (sensing types) respond more readily to appearances, to verifiable information, to realities. The N's (intuitive types) take in the possibilities, tend to exercise vision, insight. The J (judging) person likes to have things settled, decided; he may be tactless and a poor listener; decisive, he may judge too hastily. The P (perceptive) type is more likely to look for a solution instead of imposing a judgment of his own; he may be open-minded, tolerant, a good listener; he seeks to understand people rather than to judge them.
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#### Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wait &amp; see</td>
<td>Decide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let it happen</td>
<td>Runs his life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarry</td>
<td>Get going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt as we go</td>
<td>Plan ahead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Humanities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NF</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Pleasure-loving, hedonistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Freedom, autonomy, pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-worth</td>
<td>(All gratification needs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>(Artists, theater types, actors here.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Arts & Crafts

| (Have language facility, fascination with words. Writers here.) |

#### Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NT</th>
<th>SJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>To belong, be related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>To have institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over</td>
<td>Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self</td>
<td>To be together</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Services, Business, Administration, Educ.

| (Notes from the Keirsey-Bates presentation) |

N=intuitive, S=sensing, F=feeling, T=thinking, P=perceiving, J=judging
N's are the "thinker-uppers"; S's are the "getter-doners."

An appreciation for the strengths of each style, can, hopefully, cut out unnecessary friction within an organization. For example, in a decision-making, problem-solving situation, an awareness on the part of all participants that a thinking type will want the solution to the problem which is systematic, that a sensation type will want the solution to work, that the feeling type will want the solution to take into account the feelings of those involved in a humanistic manner, that the intuitive type will want a door left open for growth and improvement in the future, and that a perceiving type wants problems to be solved automatically may cause those involved to remember that people are different and react to the inner and outer world in very different ways. (Keirsey & Bates, pp. 1-2)

And all of this does have something to do with (a) my hypothesis, and (b) my thesis: Chances are good that you are described accurately as one of the following personality types if you are indeed an English or literature major:

**CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TYPE IN HIGH SCHOOL**

**ENFP** (Extroverted intuitive type):
Quick, ingenious, gifted in many lines, lively and stimulating company, alert and outspoken, argues for fun on either side of the question. Resourceful in solving new and challenging problems, but tends to neglect routine assignments as a boring waste of time. Turns to one new interest after another. Can always find excellent reasons for whatever he wants.

**SUMMARY**

More enthusiastic, more concerned with people and skillful in handling them. Has remarkable insight into their possibilities and interest in their development. May be inspired and inspiring teacher, scientist, artist, advertising man, salesman, politician, or almost anything it interests him to be. (Keirsey & Bates)
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CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TYPE IN HIGH SCHOOL

INFP (Introverted feeling type): Particularly enthusiastic about books, reads or tells the parts he likes best to his friends. Interested and responsive in class, always warm, friendly personality but is not sociable just for the sake of sociability and seldom puts his mind on his possessions or physical surroundings.

SUMMARY

Takes in the possibilities. Mildly resembles an extroverted intuitive, particularly in liking to concentrate on a project and disliking all details not relevant to any deep interest. Marked by insight and long-range vision, curious about new ideas, interested in books and language. Likely to have a gift of expression, especially in writing, and to be ingenious and persuasive on the subject of his enthusiasms, which are quiet but deep-rooted. (Keirsey and Bates)

If it is true that one of the descriptions accurately describes your personality or behavior, then it may be that your attitudes toward, success or failure with, remedial and developmental programs is at least partially explained. Certainly your attitudes toward your students will be a reflection of your personal values and personality. If you impose your own type needs on your students, assuming that their needs equal yours, you may fail with those who differ!

I am, as you have noted, still describing teachers, not students or programs or administrators or institutions. Those will come in a moment.

The chances are also good that your education and experience are similar to those reported in the literature. Stock, an English teacher in an eastern community college, reported in "From Ivy League to Community
Colleges" (Change, Sept. 1973) that 10% of the English department at his college come from Ivy-league teaching, and another 25% from similar four-year institutions. Most, he says, view themselves as teachers (rather than publishing scholars) and fall into 2 categories: (1) impersonal, task-oriented, empirical, standards-approach instructors, and (2) romantic, personal, subjective, process-oriented "catalysts". But both kinds of teachers center their interests and focus on students rather than on textual analysis or academic discipline.

However, Eley, in "English Programs for Terminal Students" (Proceedings of the NCTE Tempe Conference, 1965) indicates that—in 1965—only 10% of remedial English teachers had had "any special training whatsoever, either in linguistics or in reading." (p. 101)

Now, if it is true that most of you were attracted to majors with a heavy emphasis on literature, and if it is true that your education (and perhaps some experience as well) has been in four-year colleges and university systems, and if it is true that you tend to be—by and large—an intuitive, impractical, imaginative group of idealists and dreamers out to save the world, then consider the implications all of those factors combined might have for the plodding, repetitive, systematic, detailed, exceedingly practical, diagnostic, and analytical teaching which must be brought to bear on work with students who exhibit language disabilities or inhibitions. These are people who differ fundamentally from you.
B. STUDENTS

Let's talk about students. Piet Hein offers some more advice:

A TIP
(to members of the literary profession)
Those who can write have a lot to learn from those bright enough not to.

(Hein, Grooks 2, p. 32)

Higher education has changed considerably. Its early history in America was aristocratic. The advent of land-grant colleges in the mid-19th century changed that concept somewhat, creating what Jencks and Riesman have called a meritocracy which reached its peak in the 1950's: the deserving student must be served regardless of his socio-economic background. From the 1950's through the '60's, the emphasis in admissions offices has been strongly egalitarian; higher education has become a right, and the provision of geographic and economic opportunity to all students has been legislated in some states. "Affirmative action" has now become pervasive—from recruitment of students from all minority groups to employment of all faculty and staff.

The rise of egalitarianism inevitably affected the kind of student we have, especially in the community junior college. In fact, the community college is itself egalitarian by definition. The California state legislature, for example, funded Extended Opportunities Programs and
Best copy available
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Services (EOPS) for students not otherwise able to continue school. Of the 14,000 students assisted in 1969-70, 75% were minority students. Community college students in general, in California, are 8.4% black (twice the proportion of 4-year schools), and 7.9% Mexican American. A survey of 2/3 of the community colleges nationwide, spring 1971, reported less than 1/4 of students enrolled in "remedial" classes as belonging to ethnic minorities. (p. 13, Cross, Beyond. . .) But clearly, when we talk about remedial anything, we are not talking solely about minority students or ghetto problems.

K. Patricia Cross has written what I believe to be one of the most interesting and most important books about the community college student that has appeared in some time: Beyond the Open Door, published by Jossey-Bass in 1971, describes student attitudes, interests, plans, and characteristics.

Pat Cross defines the "new students" of the 1970's as those scoring in the lowest 1/3 among national samples of young people on "traditional tests of academic ability." (p. 13) Her reasons are these: (1) Students "who have not considered college in the past but who are newly entering college in the 1970's are distinguished more by low test scores than by any other single measure available, including race, sex, and socio-economic status." (p. 14) And (2) new students have educational problems--i.e., do not perform traditional educational tasks with competence.
PROFILE OF NEW STUDENTS: Most are caucasians whose fathers are blue-collar workers. A substantial number are members of minority ethnic groups. Most have parents with no college, and college expectations are new to the family. They are not especially successful at high school studies. (Traditional students, in the upper 1/3, usually make A's and B's; the new students make mostly C's. The traditional students are attracted to 4-year colleges and universities; the new students enter public community colleges or vocational schools.) (p. 15)

The lowest 1/3 in K-12 years are learning different things from those intended for them to learn: e.g., "Most are becoming students of methods to avoid failure... Relative to other children in school, the below-average youngster in the fifth grade has a much better chance than the above-average child of shifting his position downward by the 12th grade. The very nature of the dropout statistics constantly threatens the relative position of the lower half of the class while leaving the upper half almost unaffected." (p. 18)

The sorry fact is that if you are next to last, you become last when the last leaves his place, while whoever is first remains unaffected. There is always room at the bottom, it seems. (p. 19)

Assuming again that it is the least successful students who drop out, students who were doing above-average work as sophomores in high school will--as a result of the dropout rate--graduate in the bottom third of their class. If senior high school teachers grade on the curve, a B student as a sophomore may quite suddenly find himself a D student as a senior--with no changes in his own study habits." (p. 20)

Pat Cross also cites the Atkinson-Feather theory "for the failure-threatened personality": If the major concern is to avoid failure, then any task of even intermediate difficulty is to be shunned as most dangerous.
The failure-threatened individual avoids tasks in which the outcome is uncertain. He is motivated to defend himself against the threat of failure either by selecting easy tasks, where success is virtually assured, or by attempting such difficult tasks that failure is expected and therefore not threatening." She also quotes Holt (How Children Fail) as saying: "'Children (who fear failure). . . may decide that if they can't have total success, their next best bet is to have total failure.'" (p. 85 in Holt, p. 23 in Cross)

This fear-of-failure reaction to learning may account for the highly unrealistic aspirations that many community college educators see in their low-ability students. Not to succeed at being a doctor or a lawyer is not very threatening, because neither the student nor his associates have any real expectation that such a goal will be realized. (p. 23)

Cross concludes, therefore, that successful remediation programs must "devote considerable attention to a total reorientation of the students' approach to learning situations." (p. 26) Most frustrating to college personnel, she writes, is the apparent passivity of students in learning situations. The failure-threatened student seems to feel, "if I don't try very hard, I can't fail very much." She quotes Hold: "... You can't fall out of bed when you sleep on the floor." (p. 24) The student who has become passive must be shown that a new kind of learning situation exists—a situation in which he can almost certainly succeed if he makes an effort to do so. The "guaranteed-success" programs now being tried in some remedial-education programs show considerable promise for helping students to reorient themselves to learning tasks. The problem, she seems
to be saying, is not with a program or its content, but with the student's own attitude toward learning. Perhaps all remedial-program teachers should be required to study the psychology of learning—it may be more helpful than a course in linguistics or Jacobean drama.

C. ADMINISTRATORS AND INSTITUTIONS

Administrators are people also, intuitive or sensing, thinking or feeling, perceptive or judging. Sometimes they convince themselves that what they do is of far greater importance than what teachers do—an attitude which may be either consciously or subconsciously reinforced by the adversary games which are played far too frequently between faculty and administration.

But planning developmental programs with total college cooperation involves administrators as well as teachers and students, and all such plans are clearly affected by institutional purpose.

Leslie Purdy, in "Helping Teachers Teach Better" (Change, Nov. 1973), reports the results of a study she made of a community college with a reputation for highly innovative teaching. Her purpose was to analyze, if she could, what really causes innovation to occur: what finally persuades teachers to explore new learning strategies and objectives. She reports four observations:

(1) That the "innovative" campus exhibited a high degree of "collegaueship"—i.e., innovation by contagion.
(2) That innovation was most likely to occur when the faculty found inexpensive media, clerical support, and other resources readily available—but not imposed.

(3) That teaching practices—whatever they are—reflect teachers' basic beliefs regarding teaching (so basic as to be, sometimes, unconscious or unadmitted)—e.g., a basic need for controlling the learning situation was true for both the traditional teacher who insisted on preserving his classroom with 30 students and a blackboard as well as for the teacher making extensive use of media.

(4) Attitudes toward administration were important. Those teachers who felt that "the administrators manipulated the instructors to achieve predetermined administrative goals expressed little sense of responsibility to the college. Any desire to experiment with instructional practices seemed fruitless. Their cynical attitude reflected their feelings of being pawns in administrators' hands and they concentrated their energies on opposing administrative policies and generating discontent with other instructors." (56) "On the other hand, teachers who perceived that the administration respected faculty autonomy felt the freedom and responsibility within the institution to concentrate on improving instruction. That both perceptions of administrators could exist at the same college was partly a result of the ambiguous messages sent by the college administration regarding faculty autonomy in areas of instruction and curriculum. Faculty whose ideas for change were not in the direction of innovations favored by the administration did not receive much support." (56)

Institutional purposes, of course, also affect what the teacher does.

The disparities among 2-year, 4-year, and university systems in terms of teaching load makes a difference. Farrell and Farrell, in "A Report on the Conditions of English Teaching, 1973-74" (Council-Grams, NCTE, Nov. 1973) cite a recent study by Alan Bayer for the American Council on Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13+ teaching hours per week</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-yr. colleges</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-yr. colleges</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2 or fewer courses per term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>4-yr. colleges</th>
<th>2-yr. colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-yr. colleges</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-yr. colleges</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 or more hours/week in research and writing unrelated to teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>4-yr. colleges</th>
<th>2-yr. colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-yr. colleges</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-yr. colleges</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

John Roueche, in his ERIC monograph Salvage, Redirection, or Custody? Remedial Education in the Community Junior College commented 5 or 6 years ago that the community college had not been very successful in developmental education; that new and innovative approaches were needed, especially in the description and identification of the kinds of student who need developmental assistance.

The Farrells report that trends in the teaching of English include

--emphasis on developmental and remedial reading
--preoccupation with career education
--increased concern with oral English
--wide implementation of ESL programs

Within the community college itself, there appears to be—at last—a growing willingness to re-examine institutional purpose. As dropping enrollments create anxieties in higher education, four-year colleges and universities begin to open their doors somewhat wider, restoring a competition for students which has not occurred for nearly 20 years. Moreover, the community colleges are discovering, somewhat to their dismay, that more and more students are enrolling in fewer and fewer courses (thus
effectively reducing state-allocated funds based on ADA). Part-time students are also arranging themselves in new distributions, with as many students over 30 as are under 21, with a larger proportion of women students than has ever been the case before, and with a decreasing interest among students in the traditional transfer-pattern courses or even in courses meeting graduation requirements; with special-interest courses (Living with Divorce, Science Fiction, The American West in Fiction and Film, Sights and Sounds of the 20th Century, The Life and Times of Jesus) attracting more students than do the traditional courses. Students are no longer militantly against the system; they're just quietly going their own ways—in and out of colleges, ignoring requirements which don't interest them, pursuing interests which do even though they may not be part of any long-range plan, worrying about careers and selecting courses which contribute to career planning, etc.

All of this causes us to ask ourselves whether the community college as it was traditionally conceived—with a comprehensive curriculum designed to accommodate both transfer and career students—is still appropriate to changing local community demands. Should we admit that we are really providing an educational smorgasboard, or that our primary purpose should be career-training?

D. THE DISCIPLINE

Piet Hein has something to say here, too:
IF YOU KNOW WHAT I MEAN

A poet should be of the
old-fashioned meaningless brand:
obscure, esoteric, symbolic,—
the critics demand it;
so if there's a poem of mine
that you do understand
I'll gladly explain what it means
till you don't understand it.
(Hein, Crooks, p. 42)

But let me go back to the English-teacher personality inventory
for a moment. It will be something of a stereotype, and a generalization,
but sometimes both of those are helpful and appropriate to a larger view.
And it might soften it a bit if I include me. We are first of all humanists: we believe ourselves to be infinitely concerned about the human
condition, and endlessly interested in education, including our students' welfare. We identify strongly with the academic culture—the intellectual liberal tradition. We hate the establishment—whatever that is. We can't really understand why anyone would ever have voted for Nixon—even though some of us may have in fact done so. We are strongly anti-bureaucratic and, therefore, anti-administrative policies and procedures as well. Whatever the current groundswell for social reform, we're for it—as long as our university counterparts are too. We believe ourselves highly tolerant of disabilities in our students, but in our secret hearts we really prefer the exceedingly bright ones. We are thoroughly intolerant of and impatient with all forms of intrusion into what we think of as our own territory—all supervision of teaching, all restrictions on when we report to or leave campus, all forms of accounting for our absences from
the classroom, all requirements for regulation of curriculum or text adoptions, all manipulations of teaching schedules which begin before 9:00 a.m. or end after 2:00 p.m. We strongly believe that the use of behavioral objectives for our discipline is impossible and should not be imposed on us. What we teach is so ineffably important that it cannot be measured; what we expect our students to learn is infinitely immeasurable and indefinable; we must be free to teach by impulse (only we call it spontaneity). Our classes are often much more lively if we plan at the red light on the way to the campus what we are going to talk about that day; careful planning tends to inhibit and stifle ingenuity and spontaneity, we tell ourselves. The teaching of literature and writing is not logical or systematic or quantifiable or predictable. It is intuitive. It is immediately responsive. It is more feeling than thinking.

If this is exaggerated, consider the following. If you examine the literature published by NCTE or the 4 C's, or the literary magazines, note well: nothing ever changes very much. Three topics continue to be presented in a variety of ways: (1) censorship, (2) how to present the discipline in such a way as to be "relevant," and (3) whether or not one should impose standardized English on students whose dialect differs from ours.

Censorship we need not pursue here. But on the subject of relevance, let me suggest this: whatever we consider currently relevant to our students, by the time we arrive at it, is probably irrelevant. We tend to
be guilty of "fadthink," and assume that students--especially community
college students--cannot be excited by or become involved with Donne,
or Dostoevsky. We produce scores of anthologies for use in freshman
English every year, with such titles as Pop Arts in America, Alienation,
The Whole Earth, Ecology Reader, The American Search for Identity,
Encounter, Here and Now I and Here and Now II. We may even convert our
freshman English composition course to something we think will reach
the students better than teaching them how to write: "Writing about TV,"
"Focus on Magic and the Occult," "Self-Awareness," "Getting to Know Me,"
"Modern Films," "How to Get the Most out of TV."

John D'Arms, in his "The Banality of Relevance" (Change, April 1974),
reminds us that "Something must always be 'relevant' or 'irrelevant' to
something." There must be a frame of reference "explicitly stated or
clearly understood." As a classicist, he expresses frustration with the
attempt on the part of some of his colleagues to make classical studies
more "relevant" by advertising courses like "Environmental Pollution in
Ancient Rome," or "Eroticism and Family Life in Greece and Rome," or
"Madness and Deviant Behavior in Greece and Rome."

And so a classicist gets used to being treated in the wider
context of modern American society as some kind of freak--
relatively harmless, perhaps, but definitely odd. Few classi-
cists ever appear outside academic circles to address large
audiences about their professional work. It is true that my
father did once--he was a classicist for 14 years before he
joined one of the opulent New York Foundations. Just before
Thanksgiving in 1941 he was invited to address the Junior
Chamber of Commerce and its special guests in Denver, Colorado.
He had something new and important to say about the way Mus-solini used Roman documents of the time of the emperor Augustus as fascist propaganda, and was expecting an audience of about 15. But to his astonishment the large room was filled to capacity. He was introduced; he spoke; there was polite, restrained applause. The master of ceremonies thanked him, turned to the audience, and said: "Now, ladies and gentlemen, American homemakers, the speaker we've all been waiting for: T.P. Twitchell of Twitchell's Cutlery, who will demonstrate how to carve your Thanksgiving turkey." (34-35)

D'Arms goes on to say:

... Classicism, far from being narrow, is really the first genuine area studies program (described that way to many a modern colleague, we sound much better): at least 1,200 years of Greek history, 1,200 years of Roman, two rich languages, epic and lyric and elegiac and pastoral poetry, tragedy, biography, historiography, religion, philosophy, art, architecture—we are the spokesmen for an incredibly varied and rich tradition. (35)

And what of the perennial argument regarding the teaching of standardized English? The debate continues. But a recent article by Sledd—one of the top professors of linguistics—illustrates the paradox. His thesis: Who are we to impose our way of talking and writing on those whose dialect is different from ours? But his article appears in a scholarly magazine, written in the kind of prose most of us envy for its lucidity and style—a standard which must be met before one can hope to reach the top of the profession, or to hold a position similar to Sledd's! We are, perhaps, a bundle of contradictions—not necessarily paradoxical (since paradox is truth standing on its head to attract attention, and our contradictions are not always truthful). We have been attracted to a discipline which is highly academic, highly abstract. It requires a considerable sensitivity
to symbol and the layers of meaning inherent in any art. Chances are we are intrigued or fascinated by words—either their etymology, their sequence, their symbolism, or all of those together. We probably deplore the Madison Avenue style; we don't like billboards. We never admit to watching television—unless it is a political, sociological, or literary special.

Yet we contract to teach students (whose ears are deaf to language, whose vocabularies are poverty stricken, whose preferences are whatever advertising suggests, whose skills are non-verbal) to write and—worse—to read! Furthermore, we disagree with each other about what should be done, how it should be done, who should do it, and to whom it should be done! Then compound the issue by distrusting each others' judgment, textbooks, and teaching techniques. We have an overwhelming conviction that no learning occurs without individual attention from us. Nevertheless, we believe we can save the world, take all comers, destroy Madison Avenue, restore order and improve communication.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT'S WHY

Why do bad writers win the fight?
Why do good writers die in need?
Because the writers who can't write are read by readers who can't read.
(Hein, Crooks 2, p. 40)
MAKING AN EFFORT

Our so-called limitations, I believe apply to faculties we don't apply. We don't discover what we can't achieve until we make an effort not to try. (Ibid., p. 29)

The case for terminal or behavioral objectives is exceedingly strong. If you don't know where you are going, you can't know how to get there. If you can't describe what it is your students should be able to do—or how they will feel—when they leave you, you can't expect them to change. Objectives are not the monstrous quantification of affective experiences which our anxieties may lead us to believe. Of course students learn things which are indefinable; of course some of their attitudes and values are affected, modified, or sharply changed; of course internal change is hard or impossible to identify, demonstrate, or define—especially when the change is subtle, long-range, and intensely personal; of course some clear objectives, clearly described, do not lend themselves to objective measurement. Given all these "of-courses," it is still necessary (and honest) to let the students in on your plans; to tell them each step of the way what it is you want them to be able to do. In any sequence of courses students are considerably reassured when they know what is expected of them at each level. The beginning assumptions about student skills or achievement for a given course should be almost identical with the concluding objectives of the course prerequisites to it. There is really nothing difficult about that. It merely requires
attention to detail! Furthermore, English teachers can agree on terminal objectives or goals, leaving themselves still free to pursue those objectives by any means which suits them. If, e.g., a terminal objective of freshman composition is that every student enrolling in any section of the course will, at the end of the term, be able to document a research paper appropriately, then how or when or by what means each teacher teaches that skill is his own business—as long as his students attain the objective. If it is assumed that every student who enters freshman composition will be able to write a coherent paragraph with an identifiable topic sentence, and adequate development and support of his point, then that skill should be one of the terminal objectives of any course which immediately precedes freshman composition. This is not to say that some students will not need a review of that skill; but even if they do, the restoration of the skill after some time has elapsed between courses should require much less time than it would take to teach paragraph writing from the beginning.

Arthur Cohen, who has conducted research at UCLA on the teaching of English—especially composition—indicates that evaluation of student writing can be exercised consistently:

For a study of this type to be successful—(use of scoring key which includes yes/no responses to specific questions regarding content, organization, and mechanics)—that is, to yield valid data that instructors will trust—the participants must design their own composition scoring device, arguing with each other about the meaning of terms until they are satisfied and can use it reliably. ("Assessing College Students' Ability to Write Compositions," pp. 370-371)
I attended a retreat for administrators recently, at which management by objectives was being discussed. Finally, someone explained that objectives were what God asked Moses to write. Then another commented, "But who put all those 'Thou shalt nots' in front of them?"

Once again: conclusions and recommendations:

1. We have not sufficiently identified or described the kinds of students who require extra help before they can succeed in the programs which they came to us to get. Pat Cross' findings are of considerable help, as would be analysis on your own campuses--of the characteristics of the students you get. Counseling departments, or administrative offices might do well to consult with faculty regarding the kinds of things it might be helpful to know about students, and then seek the information.

2. It is essential, before any planning can take place, that the aims and purposes--objectives--of all developmental programs be clearly described. The development of objectives cannot proceed, obviously, without accurate data regarding the students and the community. It is always better to begin with a few general goals for a developmental program than to get bogged down in detailed lists of objectives. Task or unit objectives, designed as a course proceeds, step-by-step, can be defined as you go. But whatever your style, your objectives--if they are alive--will be continuously revised.
English teachers are often frustrated by the fact that, in their view, the standardized tests which are available on the market--the English Coop, the Purdue, the California Test of English Usage, the ACT, the CLEP or CEEB exams--do not adequately test what the teachers teach. And that may be so. It often happens, too, that English teachers believe the only valid test is when an English teacher reads a sample of a student's writing. And that too may be so. However, we're still stuck with large numbers of entering students, many of whom have great difficulties with reading and writing, who must be somehow placed where they can be most effectively helped. Large numbers in most cases preclude reading of individual essays. CEEB and CLEP exams, which include writing samples, cost money. English teachers or readers are not available during the summer when the majority of students may be applying for admission.

Worse than all of those problems, the tests not only fail to test--in the view of many English teachers--what must be taught, but they fail to diagnose a student's difficulties. Now if you belong to the school of thought which believes we should leave the student's dialect alone, and that it is unnecessary to teach him "standard" English, and that misspelling doesn't matter any more than sentence fragments or subject-verb mismatches do, then you don't have a problem. You can
make all of your courses electives and emphasize the teaching of what you love most—perhaps literature. But if you do believe developmental programs are necessary, that some corrective measures must be taken, that the way a student reads and writes will not only affect his success in college but may affect his success as a voter or as a white-collar or professions' or blue-collar worker as well, the diagnosis of his disabilities is essential. I do not know of any diagnostic instrument on the market which would make it easy for us to direct students toward courses or units of modules which they need and allow them to avoid the ones they don’t need. It is an area which sorely needs exploration. But I do not believe the development of effective diagnostic instruments for the teaching of language skills is at all impossible. I think you are the ones who can do it, if you will.

(4) Assuming that diagnostic testing or diagnosis by conference or in classes has been developed, the next step in the planning of developmental programs might be to develop a wide variety of learning strategies designed to accommodate student differences. Some students are turned on by computers; some enjoy slides or filmstrips which present patterns graphically; some prefer to read; some cannot progress without frequent contact with an instructor—either in small groups or in conferences; some will watch anything with fascination as long as it's on
a screen; some will respond much more readily to student tutors, etc. Any system of teaching which assumes that all students respond to the same stimuli is obviously bound to be unsuccessful with some students. Students often select teachers on the basis of grapevine information—why not learning strategies as well?

(5) Evaluation of programs and teaching modes is the one ingredient too often missing in the kinds of programs—developmental or otherwise—which we create in the community college. Most of us have some form of evaluation which is focused on the teaching process if not on the teacher himself. But why not focus that attention on student learning instead. The mark of success for a teacher is the success of his students. And I don't mean grade distributions. I do mean whether or not a student has met the objectives of your course. Can he do what it was you told him you wanted him to be able to do at the end of the course? And there is some doing involved in every course. His feelings and attitudes are much more difficult to assess, and maybe they don't need to be described; but his behavior in terms of the skills or knowledge which you have expected him to master are measurable. If 90% of your students drop out or earn D's and C's perhaps you or he is not clear about the objectives. If 90% earn A's and B's, perhaps you have not defined the criteria which must be met for success.
The clearest objectives describe what the student should be able to do, how well he should do it, and the conditions under which it must be done. Evaluation of learning appears to me to be infinitely more appropriate than evaluation of teaching.

Administrators are a special breed. Sometimes they are difficult and obtuse. Sometimes they are keenly interested in and sensitive to the learning process. Sometimes they are highly autocratic, and sometimes they are democratic to the point of absurdity—abdicating responsibility both for results and for standards of excellence. But whatever your administrators are like, they are not likely to accept your recommendations and pleas for special programs and media and facilities and time at face value. Your opinion in the matter—expert or not—is not admissible alone. English teachers (or any teachers) who fail to consider the practical, humdrum detail of costs will fail if they attempt persuasions which neglect to take costs into account. For example, teachers who plead for smaller classes—10 or 15 students—on the grounds that the quality of instruction and learning is thereby assured must also consider that the smaller the student-teacher ratio, the more staff is required to accommodate students; the more staff, the lower all salaries must be; the lower the salaries, the more difficult to attract excellent staff; the lower the student-teacher ratio,
the lower the availability of adequate facilities, clerical support, and supplies. No administrator is opposed to quality control; all of us are frustrated by fiscal limitations. Some of us are continuously concerned about teaching load and the drain of energies, ideas, and creativity which occurs when teachers are overloaded. I am not suggesting a formula or a panacea; I do not suggest that teachers alone are impractical. I do suggest that if both teachers and administrators will examine their adversary roles when they occur, their distrust of each others' motives, and their assumption that everyone's needs are the same, we shall progress toward better solutions. English teachers are, by and large, a creative, imaginative, caring, impractical lot. I am the last one to want to inhibit or stifle that creativity. But I am torn by the fact that we cannot continue to teach as we have in the past, in the traditional ways, and be successful.

Student enrollments in English classes are steadily dropping. Why? Institutions--both 4-year and 2-year--are gradually dropping all requirements in English. Why? The University of California is complaining, currently, that the top 8-12% of the high school students which they admit cannot write. But the university English department itself is the source of many of the high school English teachers who are, apparently, failing to teach their students to write.
We live in a Peter-Paul bureaucracy. As long as budgets are fixed, we must set priorities within the limits of monies we have available.

Now, given those realities, it would seem logical that we must analyze the situation for what it is. We simply cannot afford English classes which are limited to 10 or 12 students—unless we pay for that limitation in some other way.

It would seem high time that we reexamine some of the myths—and I truly believe some of them are myths—surrounding the teaching of English, not only for fiscal reasons but also for professional reasons:

(1) Should every student—even the one-year or six-month student—be required to pass a writing course?

(2) Is there no body of information within the study of language and literature—historical or structural or analytical—which is just that: a body of information?

(3) Is it really true that information about language patterns cannot be studied apart from writing, as a separate course of study?

(4) Is it really true that if a student learns to recognize, let’s say, unclear constructions (inappropriate fragments, misspellings, mismatched subjects and verbs, ambiguous reference) that he cannot bring that recognition skill to an analysis of his own writing?
(5) Is it really true that no part of the teaching of English or literature can be accomplished in large groups, over TV, through video or audio-tapes, with computers, etc.?

(6) Is it really true that no student can learn anything except in your presence?

(7) Is it really true that the academic approach to expository reading and writing will equip a student to read the editorial pages with understanding and insight, to vote intelligently, to be discriminating in what he watches on TV? If not, why not? Or should that even be claimed as an objective (or by-product) of the teaching of English?

(8) Is it really true that a student who takes your remedial or composition course will write better essay exams and cease to mystify his anthropology and history teachers with his creative spelling?

(9) Should we abandon all attempts to teach literacy and style in the belief that our students have failed for 12 years anyway, and they're too old to learn now?

Requirements for Developing Programs:

(1) Honest analysis of English-teacher predilections.

(2) Honest recognition of different predilections.
among most of our students.

(3) Continuous renewal of aims and purposes of:

(a) institution.

(b) the discipline.

(4) The exercise of self-discipline in the systematic, detailed, practical work of creating a developmental program.

(5) Acceptance of the notion that teaching of elementary reading/writing is a service to other kinds of people and a service to other kinds of disciplines.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


BIBLIOGRAPHY

CRITICAL THINKING IN COMMUNICATION

Henry R. Fea*

Oral and graphic symbols usually require interpretation beyond literal. Even a simple remark such as, "It is hot today," requires the listener to supply background, to compare and conclude. The "It" must refer to the weather, "Hot" is not a standard measure and is the opinion of the speaker. When Portia in The Merchant of Venice stated that, "The quality of mercy is not strained;" the listener should not envision gobs of mercy dripping slowly through a colander. Mental activity beyond literal acceptance is categorized as Critical Thinking. It is truly the soul of communication.

Given that critical thinking is vital to communication, adults should be able to distinguish critical thinking from other types of thought, understand the process of thinking critically, and be able to teach children to think critically. Yet this is not the case. Gray (1), after a study of thirty years of research on the subject, concluded that elementary school age children are capable of critical thinking and critical reading, but are not taught to do so. Gray (1:457)

Critical reading and thinking instruction should be emphasized in college methods courses. Teachers may need in-service training in critical reading instruction and perhaps even in critical reading.

Many students of thinking would agree with her. Many teachers cannot teach it. Many teachers cannot think, listen and read critically, beyond the simple levels required for everyday activities.

*Professor, Educational Psychology, University of Washington
This statement is not intended as an indictment of schools and teachers. It is intended as a suggestion that, in this accountability-for-teaching era, there may be ways of teaching which have greater yield per pupil per hour.

There appears to be abounding faith among laymen and superintendents that teachers think critically, and can teach their students to do likewise. The faith is heartwarming but misplaced. Why should teachers be able to teach what they were never taught? Laymen do not expect it from professionals. Only those who prepare for the law are taught to think and read critically. And even here there are exceptions beyond belief. For example: Over the past decade the supreme court has had great difficulty in arriving at a working definition of "obscenity," because of its abstract and personal nature. Yet it has experienced no difficulty, apparently, defining "justice," which is even more abstract and personal.

Critical thinking becomes more difficult as the listener is expected to supply more background and make finer distinctions, and it is in these situations that the lack in the thinker becomes obvious. Some examples will illustrate this deficiency.

The following problem has been used for graduate students over the past three years:

From the novel, Deliverance (2:40), the speaker describes "sliding" but does not give an example. In ten lines take the speaker through a situation which might be classified by him as "sliding." (Remember - a reader lives a scene through his senses).

"I'm a get-through-the-day man. I don't think I was ever anything else. I am not a great art director. I am not a great archer. I am mainly interested in sliding. Do you know what sliding is?...Sliding is living antifriction. It is finding a modest thing you can do and greasing that thing. On both sides."
The following is one answer selected at random:

"The speaker is an art director. A situation in which he would consider himself sliding would be where he should say something to help someone or the entire situation but doesn't because it would cause conflict. He might see some mistakes or feel some mistakes but he doesn't voice them because it is easier not to say something and maybe have his ideas rejected. He would consider himself sliding in being an archer because he doesn't practice very much and because he doesn't have the desire to be very good at it."

Another example:

"For example a student will slide through a course by copying homework, by studying just enough to pass the tests, by always smiling and being nice to the teacher, by just making deadlines."

Note that the author says he is not a great artist...it cannot be assumed that he is an artist of any sort, yet the first student has assumed the author is an art director. For her, the author states, "It is finding a modest thing you can do..." The second writer has ignored this limitation in his interpretation of "sliding." Neither student has appealed to the senses of the future reader.

Why is it that many adults cannot think critically? Is it a skill which is difficult to acquire and therefore not to be expected from the average adult? Or is it that adults have never been taught the skill and therefore practice it only to the degree required by a society which neither understands nor demands critical standards of thought? In the opinion of one writer, Epstein (3:122):

"It has been the writer's experience in working with college students in reading improvement and study skills laboratory that they have never developed literal and critical comprehension skills or an efficient method
of using them. The fact that recall and application of the information acquired are essential ingredients of reading comprehension seems to be learned more by osmosis than formal instruction.”

Epstein’s work was with medical students.

In the opinion of the present writer, the problem lies primarily in ignorance of the nature of critical thinking and of its critical attributes.

Human beings solve most problems by means of associative thinking. It is an everyday, workhorse type of thinking which solves the bulk of human problems with the least effort. It consists of searching back in the memory for similar circumstances whenever a problem is encountered, such as, “Why won’t the car start?” And it consists of recalling what was done on that occasion to solve the problem. The thinker may go so far as to remember what a neighbor did when his car would not start. The result is a number of alternatives such as kick the tires, call a garage, etc. The alternative most likely to provide a solution is selected and acted upon.

Critical thinking above the simplest levels is indicated whenever no similar situation can be recalled for a solution to a problem situation. The thinker is stuck because associative thinking will not yield a solution. To use critical thinking the thinker must be familiar with the nature of assumptions, and the process of selecting a standard for evaluating opinions. The two form the necessary and sufficient attributes for critical thinking. The individual begins by examining assumptions relative to the problem then continues to infer possibilities within
the limits of the assumptions. Inference involves so little literal interpretation, from the language stimulus, and so much exploration of the mind of the thinker, that many students of thinking will not accept inference as part of listening, speaking, writing and reading. They equate it with intelligence. Carroll (4) is an example.

Perhaps, at this juncture, an example of critical thinking with the critical attributes indicated, would be enlightening. Suppose the following sentence is presented out of context:

"Hostile Indians shot flaming arrows into the covered wagons."

If the reader thinks about it critically he will proceed as follows:

The "Indians" must be the plains Indians of the American West...because in communication there is always an assumption that a word is used in its commonest sense, or most frequently used context unless otherwise indicated. Since there is nothing to indicate that Indians from India were in the mind of the writer, the reader must interpret "Indians" as "American Indians" of the plains. "Covered wagons" must be interpreted in the same way. The reader cannot assume that the wagons are covered with sheet iron and therefore impervious to fire because there is nothing to indicate that the wagons are not of the canvas-top variety. Likewise, "flaming arrows," must refer to the flaming arrows used by the plains Indians under such circumstances. So what is there to think about further? In this case merely the word "Hostile." Must the reader assume that the writer used this term correctly? And the answer is that there is a STANDARD to which the reader may refer to check this--the dictionary.
The dictionary defines "hostile" as "Intent to harm..." But who knows the intent of an individual besides that individual? The answer, obviously, is no one. Therefore, by use of this standard the reader should conclude that the historian, or the writer had no right to use this word. He could have used "Seemingly hostile" as the shooting of flaming arrows in the direction of the covered wagons could be interpreted as an unfriendly act...but he did not have the right to state that the Indians were "Hostile." So much for assumptions, for a standard, and for thinking and forming conclusions within their limits.

Critical thinking is identifying the assumptions underlying the verbal statement, examining them to reveal the limitations within which the thinking will take place, accepting those which are found to be mutually acceptable, reserving those assumptions which are questionable, and evaluating those assumptions against standards which are accepted as valid.

Critical thinking requires discipline. Few adults are willing to expend the time and effort. The skill is not taught. That which passes for critical thinking in schools is a number of lessons in propaganda, in which students are shown examples of classes of propaganda and then required to classify new examples. Correctly classifying examples of propaganda is not critical thinking but conceptual thinking students are fitting examples to known classes. Free exchange of opinion also is considered to be critical thinking. Opinion without examination of assumptions and evaluation of statements by means of standards is worthless. I can state that I believe music today would
be much improved by use of more half notes. Since I know nothing of music and have no idea what a half note is, my opinion is ridiculous. Voltaire did state: "I do not agree with what you say but I would defend to the death your right to say it." But he was referring to free speech - not to the veridicality of opinion. Where did we get the idea that opinion is of value? Examples set by radio and television reporters asking the first ten persons they meet on a street to express an opinion, and then tabulating pro and con and formulating conclusions about the larger number daily add to this fallacy of the value of uninformed opinion.

Thinking is a most complex subject. A complete examination of critical thinking would take volumes. But for practical application in school, college and daily life the attributes discussed and illustrated here will suffice. Examples of deeper exploration into communication and critical thinking are to be found in references such as Ennis (5), Spearritt (6), and Fraim (7).

For reasons difficult to explain it seems appropriate to close with a quotation from that ancient Irish philosopher, Finn Cool Murphy:

"If you explain something so clearly that no one can misunderstand it, someone will."
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