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PREFACE

During the past sixteen years as a practitioner in college level English classes, I have undergone a gradual, but radical transformation. I began teaching as I had been taught, standing behind a podium, clutching coffee-stained yellow pages of lecture notes, determined to engage my rows of pen-poised students to copy down my information as accurately as possible. All I had to do was remember to bring my notes to class, enthusiastically deliver the material, offer positive and negative criticism on their papers, and give fair tests: my student ratings confirmed I was a good teacher. Then I became a student again.

The most stimulating, demanding classes were seminar classes, small groups of maybe five students, led by instructors who posed problems for our groups to discuss. At first intimidated by both the professor and the other members of my group, I was slow to participate, sure my responses were not of the caliber the teacher was looking for. When I realized my responses were not necessarily directed to the teacher, but to the comments of the other participants--I felt free to respond, no longer waiting for the "right answer" to meet with a teacher's approval. I had become comfortable enough with my group to risk a response. The process had become the education.
Gradually, I introduced the practice of "group work" to my own classes, literature and composition. My practitioner's instincts convinced me this method of teaching was the pedagogy which affirmed my basic philosophy of education and life; besides I now looked forward to walking into my classes. I sought to use collaborative techniques wherever and whenever, not limiting group work to the exchange of ideas but expanding it to include the production of group projects. My own research and writing was conducted with partners. Even though I felt this technique was "working," my researcher's sensibilities forced me to probe further. Conversations with other teachers brought mixed reviews of their experience with collaborative work--the same mixed reviews as found in the literature.

Even though I agree with the social constructionists that all writing is collaborative, that we have no real individual authors, I have narrowed my working definition of collaborative writing to establish research parameters. Even though most of the past research in composition has treated peer response groups as collaborative writing groups, I do not think this definition nor the research it has engendered has reflected adequately either the theory of collaborative learning or "real world" collaborative writing. Limiting the focus of this research project to
collaborative writing in a composition class, I have operationally defined "collaborative writing" to be the work produced by a group of individuals who have shared responsibility for the production of a document through oral and written discourse. The purpose of my study is to determine the efficacy of using collaborative writing groups in a college composition class. In a way, this project is a justification, allowing me to continue to trust the "lore," giving credence to the belief in and practice of collaboration as pedagogy.

Chapter 1, "Theoretical foundations/literature review," establishes a broad theoretical base for a collaborative pedagogy, affirming the philosophy of Dewey, Freire and others such as Vygotsky. Then I place collaborative work within the historical framework of composition studies, showing how writing groups have been most frequently used in academia (peer revision of an individually-produced draft), compared to their function in business and technical writing (group-produced "shared-document"). In reviewing the research, I include studies from the group dynamics literature of social psychology, cooperative learning in education, as well as the collaborative writing of composition and business writing, all which deal with the issues my study raises. The main issues of my own research focus upon two questions: (1)
What is the efficacy of using collaborative writing in college composition classes? Given the constraints of a one-semester class, how long should a group remain together?

Chapter 2, "Methods of gathering & analyzing information," details the methodology of the research, as well as justifies the integrated approach and triangulation of method necessary for this study. My project is an integration of two social scientific paradigms used to study "instructional" groups (Peterson and Wilkinson, 1984): the sociolinguistic, an type of ethnographic approach, describing the social, interactional processes at work in group activity, particularly the use of language; and the process-product, a quasi-experimental approach, seeking to measure effects of the processes and products in some tangible way. Peterson and Wilkinson as well as DiPardo and Freedman (1988) recommend such an integration of these two approaches for research specifically focusing on writing groups.

Chapter 3, "What the researcher saw," reports the results of both sociolinguistic and process-product approaches via analyses of observations and tape-recorded conversations of groups in process, scores on both group and individually produced essays, retention and absentee
rates as well as observations and interviews with the teacher-participants.

Chapter 4, "What the students saw," summarizes the student observations and evaluations of the collaborative writing process from student journals, evaluative essays and rating forms, final exams, and personal interviews.

Chapter 5, "What the teachers saw," reports what the teacher-participants in the study observed about their role in the classroom and the issues raised in Chapter 1. The information comes from their journals and from personal interviews with me.

Chapter 6, "The efficacy of using collaborative writing groups," discusses the results and examines the implications of the study for teachers and researchers.
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study of collaborative writing groups, those who share full responsibility for the production of a document, is (1) to measure the efficacy of using collaborative writing groups in a college level composition class (from the multi-perspectives of researcher, students, and teachers), and (2) to determine if students should remain in the same collaborative writing groups for an entire semester or for the duration of a writing project. My method of gathering and analyzing data integrated two social scientific research paradigms--a process-product, quantitative design, one which focused on measures of student writing performance, writing improvement, attitude, and retention and absentee rates; and a sociolinguistic, qualitative, one which described the social and interactional processes involved in collaborative writing groups. Participants were approximately 150 college freshmen at a mid-sized, public, open-admissions southern university, enrolled in 6 sections of a second semester freshman composition course; 2 instructors, and I. For an entire semester, two sections wrote the majority of their assignments in permanent groups; two sections wrote in groups that changed with each writing task, about every 2-4 weeks; two sections wrote all work independently. Groups
consisted of 4-5 students, heterogeneously mixed. Results include what the researcher saw, an integration of measurement of writing improvement, withdrawal and absentee rates, and class and group observations; what the students saw, reflected in journals, evaluative essays, final exams and personal interviews; and what the teachers saw, reported in personal interviews. Results show that collaborative writing groups are efficacious: all students significantly improve their writing; retention rates for group classes are significantly higher than individual classes; students enjoy writing more in group classes. Permanent groups show more dialogic collaboration, while changing groups use more hierarchical collaboration. Although there are benefits to all groups, students in permanent groups achieve a more process-oriented education.
CHAPTER 1: THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS/LITERATURE REVIEW

The Debate over Collaborative Writing

According to Freedman's 1987 national survey of 560 "successful" writing teachers, DiPardo and Freedman (1988) conclude that these practitioners are "deeply divided as to the efficacy of the small-group approach" (p. 120). The debate in composition continues as to whether collaborative learning is a valid, viable approach for a college composition class (DiPardo & Freedman, 1988). One of the basic fears is that students would not write as much, i.e., learn as much about writing, as they would writing independently. They would spend more time socializing in their groups (not learning about writing) than they would working directly on their task, writing a paper. Thus, using collaborative writing in freshmen classes would produce students who do not write as well as those who worked independently. In learning to write, according to one of the main voices in latter 20th century composition theory, "the most critical adjustment one makes is to relinquish collaborative discourse, with its reciprocal prompting and cognitive cooperation and go it alone" (Moffett, 1968, p. 87).

Other teachers, who have tried some form of collaboration in the composition classroom, usually peer
response groups, attest to how much talking about writing these groups generate. They believe these groups "work," i.e., produce better writers, but are not so sure that taking the next step--requiring these groups to produce a piece of writing together, sharing in all the responsibility for the document--would produce comparable results. For the traditional composition classroom, the act of writing remains the domain of individuals working alone to express their originality and equivalent to the words these individuals have produced, not the process in which they have been involved. For, according to Western philosophical tradition tracing back to Descartes, the individual self is the source of meaning and knowledge.

Others disagree. Composition theorists like Bruffee (1983) argue against the traditional concept of writing and the traditionally silent composition classroom. For Bruffee, the collaborative classroom provides the appropriate source for knowledge and meaning.

This necessity to talk-through the task of writing means that collaborative learning... is not merely a helpful pedagogical technique incidental to writing. It is essential to writing... Like any other learning or problem-solving activity, writing becomes essentially and inextricably social or collaborative in nature. (p. 571)

Collaborative writing groups offer students an opportunity to participate in the act of writing, to externalize the conversation individual writers
internalize, central to the social nature of writing and learning.

This study questions the pedagogy that assumes composition classes need to focus on teaching the individual student how to write. It supports an alternative pedagogy which assumes students in a language-centered classroom learn to write by engaging in the process together. Thus, it seeks to discover the efficacy of using collaborative writing groups in a college composition class.

Traditional vs. Collaborative Learning

Dewey. Treating this "small-group approach" or "collaborative learning" as a relatively new (i.e., untrustworthy) teaching technique is another way some teachers question its credibility when, in fact, it has long been recommended and practiced by educational theorists. Though the phrase "collaborative learning" does not originate with Dewey, in the late 1800's this idea is central to his revision of "traditional" educational theory; it becomes the antidote crucial to his revival of education.¹ In his pedagogic creed Dewey

¹The phrase "collaborative learning" was coined by Mason and colleagues in London in the 1960's (Lunsford & Ede, 1990); arising in part from the political unrest of the time, collaborative learning represented then, too, a way to rid traditional education of its authoritarian, non-democratic, non-social forms.
(1897) states that children are social individuals: the only real education they receive is activated through their interaction with others and is conditioned by their social context. According to Dewey (1897), education fails because it does not consider the school as a type of community life, because it does not recognize the centrality of interaction and social activity in the learning process: the social activities, not geography, nor science, nor history, provide the core, the center of a child's education to which all subjects correlate.

Dewey's (1938) critique of traditional education focuses on two observations: First, traditional education is hierarchical, with learning occurring in one direction only--from the top down--from teachers to students; their role is to transmit information. Since the knowledge the children receive is outside the realm of their experience, they cannot participate in its discovery; hence, education is imposed upon them from above. Second, traditional education is atomized; students enter into a one-to-one relationship with the teacher, with no attempt at interaction among the students. Dewey seeks to overturn this hierarchy and to replace the non-social aspects of education with social interaction. He sees the school as "a group or community
held together by participation in common activities" (p. 60).

Traditional education assumes that the domain of power and responsibility for learning in the classroom belongs to the teacher, not the learners. Students are considered mere empty containers which teachers fill with information, the content of education. But students are not empty when they enter a classroom; they come with life histories, with knowledge and experience. Teachers need to learn to mobilize what students already know. Dewey shifts the focus (not necessarily the authority) away from teachers to the students—a de-centering of the teacher. Students must learn to invest authority in each other to learn. How they learn and what they learn are, in essence, the same (Dewey, 1897).

Traditional schooling gives students an orientation to space which separates their social and intellectual life. Socializing is for after-school, inappropriate for learning behavior. Collaborative learning attempts to direct social interaction energy toward more positive channels, recognizing peer group influence as a powerful tool for learning. Dewey (1897, 1938, 1952) wants the school to reorganize itself around a spirit of free communication of ideas, where sharing knowledge is not
considered a threat to an individual’s learning, but rather the basis of education.

In addition, traditional education values consuming over producing, reading over writing. After all, the goal of "getting" an education is to finish it. Students learn they are their record, their rank, their average. They desire the esteem of the omnipotent authority in the system--the teacher. With collaborative learning, no longer would students distrust and devalue their peers, competing for knowledge rather than cooperating, hoarding their knowledge rather than giving an advantage to another student. For Dewey, cooperation replaces competition as the standard of value with the goal to create a spirit of community life. Collaborative learning offers a way to break their silence.

Social constructionists. Supporting Dewey’s cooperatively and socially-based theory of education is the philosophy of social constructionism. Sometimes referred to as "new pragmatism" or "dialogism," social constructionism professes that all knowledge is socially constructed. The overwhelming significance of social interaction, of collaboration and dialogue in the development of the self is evident in the work of one of its leading exponents, Vygotsky, a Russian social psychologist. Vygotsky (1978) believed that early in our
lives we use language the same way we use writing. He concludes:

the most significant moment in the course of intellectual development, which gives birth to the purely human forms of practical and abstract intelligence, occurs when speech and practical activity, two previously completely independent lines of development, converge. (p. 24)

Thus, the "inner voice" we hear as individuals is simply external conversation reflected back to us; therefore, the self is always in process, constructed through our relations with others. There is no framework, no objective truth somewhere out there for us to discover, no truth within for us to find: meaning, knowledge and language are generated through social interactions. The full implication of his philosophy is eloquently spoken by Buber (1970): "Man becomes an I through a You" (p. 80). As for Dewey, the process, not the product, becomes the goal; the process offers the chance for continual creation.

This philosophy is clearly reflected in the work of Freire (1971) who uses it for nothing less than transforming the world through a rehabilitation of education. Freire, echoing Dewey's lament, refers to traditional education as "suffering from a narrative sickness" (p. 57), where teachers (subjects) fill their students (objects) with the contents of their narrative (information). His "banking" concept of education views
the teacher's task to fill the empty vessels, "make deposits" of knowledge which the students will store in their accounts. Education proceeds hierarchically, from the teacher-authority down to the students who passively, silently, respectfully await the words to remember. But this type of education reinforces an oppressive society--keep the oppressed (uneducated students) at the mercy and whim of the paternalistic oppressor (teacher)--the situation remains the same. Freire's solution was an education founded upon communication, upon dialogue, the only way we can achieve any real meaning to our lives. Echoing Plato's theory of the dialectic, he states: "Only dialogue, which requires critical thinking, is also capable of generating critical thinking. Without dialogue there is no communication, and without communication there can be no true education" (p. 81). Freire replaces the bankrupt, dehumanizing banking concept of education with the idea that humans are conscious, intentional beings, aware of their consciousness, and demands education respond by posing the problems we face as we relate to our world. Dialogue offers us a chance to "name the world, to change it" (p. 76). Dialogue, the heart of his "problem-posing" alternative, is the "existential necessity," the
humanizer, the liberator, the one chance we have to live meaningfully in our world.

Traditional education assumes that the most homogeneous group is the most teachable. Thus, public schools have spent much time and money ordering, ranking students according to their ability (e.g., tracking, students grouped in separate classes by ability; and ability grouping, students grouped by ability within the same classroom). But the research on tracking (Good & Marshall, 1984) indicates the disservice to lower ability students: inferior teaching and low level student performance; no significant benefits have been realized by placing students according to their ability, their homogeneity. This technique underscores that the function of education is to rank students, with its results depressingly familiar. Collaborative learning, on the other hand, views our social and cultural differences as absolutely essential to classroom life. Thriving on the multiplicity of voices, it demands that teachers make productive use of student differences.

Collaborative learning forces us to confront the key issues necessary for freedom, for survival: can we learn to live and work and learn together with our differences? It challenges education to create an atmosphere, a context for critical thinking to flourish. Through
dialogue and communication students gain an understanding of their own experience and their world and the world of others. In a language-centered classroom, they learn to write together.

**Research on Collaborative Learning**

Looking to the research on collaborative learning, we can verify both the theory recommended above and North's (1987) "practitioner’s lore": collaborative learning groups do work. Much research has been conducted in psychology on group dynamics and in education on cooperative learning (learning in groups); the results support the positive value of working/learning collaboratively (cooperatively) as opposed to working independently (competitively).

Two of the first experiments conducted in social psychology (Triplett, 1898; Ringelmann, 1913) debated the issues of group versus individual performance on a task. In the 1940's psychologist Deutsch (1949a) conducted experimental research which showed how cooperative learning was superior to individual/competitive learning. Twenty-five years later he reviewed the literature to find overwhelming support for his research (Deutsch, 1973). At the University of Texas Helmreich (1986, 1982, 1980, 1978), conducted research at several different times with undergraduates, professionals, and children;
all groups showed a negative correlation between competition (individualized learning) and achievement. Johnson, Maruyama, Johnson, Nelson and Skon (1981) reviewed 122 studies which compared cooperative with competitive learning structures; sixty-five showed significant gains occurring with cooperative learning while only eight were significant with competitive. Slavin (1983) not only corroborated their findings but found the competitive learning situation counterproductive. Later, Johnson and Johnson (1991) conducted a meta-analysis of research completed over the past ninety years, including over 500 experimental and 100 correlational studies. Their conclusion revealed cooperative learning to be vastly superior to individual learning: they see greater critical thinking and problem-solving ability as well as better understanding of the “other voices,” perspectives other than their own.

Collaborative Learning in Composition Theory

Though collaborative learning theorists (Dewey 1897, 1938, 1952; Freire, 1971) and cooperative learning researchers (Johnson & Johnson, 1981, 1991; Slavin, 1983) focus particularly on the child’s general education, collaborative learning was also a feature of composition theory for the last hundred years or so. Scott (1922), one of the major theorists in late nineteenth century
composition instruction (though the exception among his peers), sounds remarkably like Dewey. Scott strongly believed that the school is a social community, and composition instruction should reflect the social and cultural aspects of knowledge. Composition instruction should not center on the teachers’ ability to search out errors in an essay; rather, it should foster an environment where students could generate knowledge about writing through discourse with each other; to Scott, like Dewey, Freire, and others, language was not just a conduit for ideas (Gere, 1987). One of his disciples, Leonard (1917) carried on his ideas, writing a text on the teaching of English composition as a social endeavor. This text suggests freewriting, treating writing as a process not a product, and valuing collaborative writing groups. He states:

> We must not make the mistake of assuming that training in composition is purely an individual matter. Most self expression is for the purpose of social communication. . . . Our whole use of language has a social setting. . . . If we are to make our training real, we must naturalize it, which is to say we must socialize our teaching of composition. (Leonard, pp. viii-ix)

Writing groups, one of the most common examples of collaborative learning, appear throughout our documented educational history. In the United States, writing groups flourished as early as the eighteenth century, both associated with academic institutions and apart from
them. At Harvard, the exchange and critiquing of writing played an integral part in one of its early social clubs, "The Spy Club." In the early nineteenth as well as twentieth centuries, The Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Hopkins University considered peer criticism and evaluation an important part of composition instruction, so much so that fifty percent of the students' grades were based on their ability to critique their peers' work. Moreover, two of our most famous writing workshops, the Iowa Writer's Workshop and Middlebury's Bread Loaf School of Writers, were based on collaborative writing groups found in the college composition classes (Gere, 1987).

Supporting Dewey and Freire's plea to create a context for dialogue in the classroom, many composition theorists reaffirm the social constructionist view that all knowledge is socially generated, including learning how to write. LeFevre (1987) removes writing ("invention") from the domain of the isolated individual and places its growth in a social context. Bruffee (1984) exhorts English teachers to encourage dialogue in their classes. Borrowing the code word "conversation" from another social constructionist, Rorty (1979), he tells us to keep the conversation going at all costs, for it is through conversation that knowledge is constructed.
In a solid endorsement of collaborative learning/writing, Bruffee maintains:

The first steps to learning to think better, therefore, are learning to converse better and learning to establish and maintain the sorts of social context, the sorts of community life, that foster the sorts of conversation members of the community value. (p. 640)

According to Bruffee, given the context of community that writing groups and collaborative learning groups provide, members need to put differences aside, especially those differences arising from economic and social conditions. They learn to engage in what Rorty calls "normal discourse," or discourse that arises from a group of "knowledgeable peers" striving to reach consensus. Consensus, then, is the product of normal discourse, "the sort of statement that can be agreed to be true by all participants whom the other participants count as rational’" (p. 320). However, Bruffee's collaborative writing group functions as a peer response group whose discourse offers critical commentary on an individually written draft. How critical is the goal of group consensus in a peer response group when the ultimate power resides within the individual writer who controls what is chosen and what is excluded, contrasted with a collaborative writing group working together to produce a single, shared document? A peer response group is never obligated to reach consensus; in order to complete its
task, a collaborative writing group must, even if it is to agree to disagree.


Cultural differences--marginal voices. Some composition theorists do not view collaborative writing groups as the panacea to our educational troubles, just a continuation of them. Myers (1986), for one, argues that conversations within these groups tend to be exclusionary--that marginal voices are not heard; that silent voices are forgotten. He suggests that the social constructionists hear only the voices within their own discourse community, ignoring the cultural differences that exist and shutting out the larger cultural context of which they are a part. The discourse communities we
create, the collaborative writing groups, are another example of a social reality that controls through subordination and silence those not powerful enough to be heard--those who do not speak the same language.

Criticizing Bruffee's notion of consensus, Myers states, "Having discovered the role of consensus in the production of knowledge, he takes this consensus as something that just is, rather than as something that might be good or bad" (p. 166). Myers wants those who use collaborative learning to gain a broader perspective on the reality, the social context they are constructing in their classroom: who collaborates with whom, and where the power and authority resides. In a sense, Myers' argument returns us to the "teacher-as examiner" audience that Britton (1975) found, the superficial, error-focused revisions that Sommers (1980) faced with her students--both groups rewrite and revise and orient their work to those in power.

Answering Myers' skepticism of collaborative learning groups, Fox (1990) illustrates how collaborative learning makes use of cultural differences in class composition. Adapting Freire's (1971) problem-posing teaching techniques from third-world illiteracy situations to middle-class college classrooms, he helps students "name" their world by having them consider how
their background and experience affect the way they use language, empowering them, challenging them to take responsibility and accept membership in a community. Problem-posing teaching begins with the students' presentation of their own experience. The teacher's task is to present the students' situation back to them as a problem. Students then need to understand the situation again, this time actively and in a dialogue with another person.


Consensus does not so much reconcile differences through rational negotiation. Instead, such a redefinition represents consensus as a strategy that structures differences by organizing them in relation to each other. In this sense, consensus cannot be known without its opposite--without the other voices at the periphery of the conversation. (p. 608)

"Dissensus" refers to those "marginalized voices," the "abnormal discourse," any voices outside the reigning power structure in the community. The consensus that Trimbur seeks from his students is based "not on collective agreement but on collective explanations of how people differ" (p. 615). Thus, Trimbur uses differences within discourse communities, collaborative
learning/writing groups, to allow the "unassimilated other" to speak through the gaps in conversation.

In collaborative learning groups, consensus then becomes the desired, unattainable goal, what Habermas (1979) identifies as "the ideal speech situation." Collaborative learning presents a perfect opportunity for dissensus, the process of trying to find meaning and knowledge together--a way to exist together with differences. So rather than limit consensus to imply closure, Trimbur expands consensus to offer continual negotiation of differences to arrive at understanding. His redefinition of consensus through the rhetoric of dissensus leads to a "dream of difference without domination. . . . a heterogeneity without hierarchy" (p. 615).

By accepting Trimbur's (1989) suggestion we do not have to deny how groups function--that they exert pressure toward conformity and consensus. Besides, collaborative writing groups would never complete a task if they never arrived at some sort of consensus. What Trimbur reminds us as teachers is to observe and to use those differences we find in our students. In creating context we must structure groups and tasks which lead students through a "rhetoric of dissensus" to understanding and meaning.
Defining Collaborative Writing

In the previous discussions of the theoretical justifications and hesitations for using collaborative learning/groups in the classroom, there seems to be an implied assumption that there is an accepted definition of collaborative writing. But the term "collaborative writing" itself is full of ambiguity (Ede & Lunsford, 1990; Forman, 1992). For them, as well as other composition theorists (Bruffee, 1984, 1986; LeFevre, 1987) all writing is collaborative, for all knowledge is a social construct (and language and knowledge are inseparable). One composition theorist (Reither, 1987) even sees a danger in attempting to operationally define collaborative writing as co-authorship or group work, saying we then relinquish the way all writing is inherently collaborative.

I maintain we can still acknowledge the collaborative nature of all writing, but at the same time, we must operationally define collaborative writing in order to study it. This study defines collaborative writing groups as those that share through written and oral discourse all the responsibility for the production of a document; thus, it takes the next logical step in the research of collaborative writing.
Collaborative writing as peer response. In most composition and pedagogical research, collaborative writing usually refers to peer interaction in all stages of the writing process except the actual drafting of the essay (Lemon, 1988). The early experimental studies of "collaborative writing" of Thompson (1919) and Johnson (1933) as well as later work by Clifford (1981) all demonstrate that collaborative groups produce better writing than do groups working independently. But the "collaborative writing" groups studied did not share in the drafting of the essay. Other research using peer response groups shows positive effects of the group: the positive influence of talk (Gere and Abbott, 1985; Gere and Stevens, 1985; Heath, 1983); improved critical thinking (Lagana, 1973); improved prewriting techniques (Meyers, 1980; Hillocks, 1979); the positive effect on audience awareness and revision (Kantor, 1984; Glassner, 1983). A recent review of the literature (Gillam, 1990) illustrates the positive effects that peer response groups provide their members. In composition research, "collaborative writing" means participating in a peer response group: collaborating to invent and to revise, but not to share in the actual creation of a draft. In fact, one of the only reported studies which investigates the actual collaborative drafting of a document, showing
direct positive effects and transfer of group writing is a small-scale laboratory study conducted with psychology students outside the classroom (O’Donnell, Danserau, Rocklin, Lambiotte, Hytherker, & Larson, 1985).

But are peer response groups what the collaborative learning theorists (Dewey, 1897, 1938, 1952; Johnson & Johnson, 1991) had in mind? In reality, a peer response group does not necessarily represent a context which promotes cooperative learning, a situation with positive goal interdependence. Group dynamicist Deutsch (1949b) clarifies the distinctions between a cooperative and competitive learning situation: cooperation, "promotive interdependence," refers to a situation in which the success of one group member enhances or improves the chances for the success of the rest of the group; competition, "contrient interdependence," refers to a situation in which the success of any one group member decreases the chances for success of another group member. Rather than fit completely into one category or another, peer response groups operate in a "mixed-motive situation," competing and cooperating simultaneously. (Forsyth, p. 356). The basic focus of the group is critiquing the work of an individual; the group offers assistance but knows that ultimately each member is
competing with one another for the best rank from the teacher-examiner.

Nor do peer response groups best reflect the concerns of the composition theorists. Though notions of difference without domination receive prominent attention in the collaborative literature, they remain unexamined in the research. Issues of consensus and dissensus do not appear particularly relevant to a collaborative group whose only responsibility is to respond to an individual’s writing. Are individual writers or their peer respondents concerned for negotiating consensus through conflict? Revising to please their peers? Myers’ (1986) argument that collaborative groups simply substitute peer for teacher in role of teacher-as-examiner seems more apropos to peer response groups than groups that actually share in the production of a document.

Collaborative writing as shared-document. In her study of ninth-graders, Freedman concluded that the groups who worked collaboratively were the ones who worked together to create a "group-owned product," not those who worked together on an individual’s product (DiPardo & Freedman, 1988). In this situation, "the process and the goal of education are one and the same thing" (Dewey, 1897, p. 27). If peer response groups have
been used successfully in composition, then adding the responsibility and vested interest in the actual creation of a document would seem to be the next logical step. Thus, writing groups would not be just responding to each other's work; by creating writing together they would learn and write collaboratively. Negotiating through differences, "storming through performing" become crucial theoretical issues when a group must produce together, must share the total responsibility for what they create. But as stated above, writing collaboratively to produce a "shared-document" (Morgan, Allen, Moore, Atkinson, and Snow, 1987) occurs seldom in composition classes. It does appear in business and technical writing classes, but still on a limited basis (Morgan, Allen & Atkinson, 1989).

While little collaborative writing occurs in the classroom, collaborative writing dominates "real world" professional--business and technical writing. Faigley and Miller (1982) report:

[A] major difference between the writing on the job and school writing is multiple authorship. The majority of people we surveyed (73.5%) sometimes collaborate with at least one other person in writing. The nature of the collaboration varies considerably. Sometimes a half dozen or more experts in various fields will contribute a section to a technical report, with the project leader integrating the sections into a coherent whole. In other cases a superior will simply review the work of a subordinate, making changes if necessary. And on still other occasions people will work closely
throughout all phases of a writing project, coming up with ideas and putting them on paper as a team. (p. 567)

Ede and Lunsford (1990) corroborate this report in a more recent study, finding that 87% of the professional writers they surveyed wrote as part of a team or group; they conclude that professional writing is not a solitary, isolated, individualized experience, but a collaborative effort.

If collaborative writing is what students can expect when they leave the classroom, we need to prepare them for the essentially collaborative contexts they will encounter in nonacademic settings (Louth, 1989). From the research in nonacademic settings not only do we learn how much of the writing is collaborative, but also, how integrally connected collaborative writing situations are tied to organizational context (Paradis, Dobris and Miller, 1985; Doheny-Farina, 1986). As teachers implement collaborative writing groups in the classroom, we must be aware of the context of our own organization, the communities we create--the classroom and the collaborative writing groups.

Despite the accolades for using peer response groups in writing classes, and despite the overwhelming abundance of collaborative writing in the workplace, we still do not have strong evidence for taking that next
step, having students interact to produce a shared-document. In one semester, can we produce better writers through engaging students in a context of collaborative "shared-document" work rather than by having them write independently? Can they learn to write collaboratively?

The Dramatism: Group Dynamics

In order to create a context which "works," we must first try to understand the complexities at work in a group. Forman (1991) suggests a Burkean framework which considers "language and thought as modes of action," (Burke, 1945, p. xxii). Thus, collaborative writing is considered an act, performed by agents (students), in particular scenes (the group's activity), engaging in conflict and building cohesion for the purpose of creating a document (performance) for the agency (group, class, teacher). These dramatic features interact with and influence one another continually during the process of collaborative writing. Lewin (1948), a social psychologist, labelled these complexities "group dynamics," describing how complex social processes impact on group members. One of the key assumptions of his theory of group dynamics is interactionism. He believed that behavior is a function of the personal characteristics of the individual interacting with the characteristics of the environment (which includes
features of the group, the group members, and the situation). Social relationships are, therefore, crucial for the successful functioning of the group and must be nurtured and maintained. Spear (1988), Forman and Katsky (1986), and Goldstein and Malone (1985) all stress the significant relationship between group dynamics and successful writing groups.

Thus, unlike workplace conditions, the teacher can exert a strong, ongoing influence on group dynamics as she usually helps create and maintain the characteristics of the environment. George (1984), in a two-year ethnographic study of collaborative response groups, noted the difficulties faced by teachers dealing with problems in group dynamics. Confronted by "leaderless" and "dysfunctional" groups, she counters these problems by providing techniques to avoid them—in a sense, ways a teacher can exercise some control over group dynamics.

Permanent vs. changing groups. In addition to contributing to the literature on the efficacy of using collaborative writing groups, this study examines an issue that remains ambiguously answered in the group dynamics literature as well as the literature on cooperative (active) learning and collaborative writing: Given the time-frame of one semester, how much time does a composition teacher allow for a group to develop the
characteristics to enable its members to work effectively together? How long does it take to create a context which lead students through a "rhetoric of dissensus" to understanding and meaning?

Group dynamics studies groups that have already been formed within a particular framework and within a particular context; it does not attempt to recommend, just report what it finds. Johnson and Johnson (1991) recognize the difficulty in prescribing a single time-frame to the myriad of cooperative learning contexts, so they simply advise teachers to

...allow groups to remain stable long enough for them to be successful. Breaking up groups that are having trouble functioning effectively is often counterproductive because the students do not learn the skills they need to resolve problems in collaborating with each other. (p. 65)

They go on to recommend having students work with the entire class over the course of the semester or year, so in a roundabout way they advocate that students do change groups after reaching some point of success. Spear (1988) also suggests keeping groups together as long as they are productive, either having the teacher or students themselves responsible for the "shuffling" (p. 153).

Teachers hesitate to put students in groups that will work together for an entire semester; one of the main fears is students' complaining they have been placed
in a "bad" (non-working, dysfunctional) group, thus jeopardizing their grade for the semester. On the other hand, group dynamics literature stresses that the effectiveness of a group depends in part upon the trust and cohesion it has developed, the ability to work through differences to arrive at some sort of consensus (Forsyth, 1983). Spear (1988) characterizes a successful group as one that develops enough trust, enthusiasm and openness through time spent working together to lose inhibitions about sharing ideas. But how much time this takes is not included in her characterization.

**Stages of group development.** Though there is an abundance of diverse literature on group development, most group dynamics theorists do agree that groups go through certain phases or stages of development as they work toward their goals. Tuckman has labelled these stages as follows (Tuckman, 1965; Tuckman & Jensen, 1977):

(1) Orientation (forming) Exchange of information; increased interdependency; task exploration; identification of commonalities; Polite discourse . . . self disclosure;
(2) Conflict (storming) Disagreements over procedures; . . . Criticism of ideas; poor attendance; hostility; polarization and coalition formation
(3) Cohesion (norming) Growth of cohesiveness and unity; establishment of roles, standards, and relationships; Agreement on procedures . . . increased "we-feeling"
Recursive models. Group dynamics literature acknowledges that though Tuckman's "successive stage" model characterizes the development of many groups, it is not universally applicable. Some groups proceed in their own order; some skip some phases altogether (Seeger, 1983). Tuckman's characterization of group development does resemble Trimbur's (1989) theory of dissensus; both acknowledge that successful groups must engage in conflict before achieving consensus. But Trimbur extends Tuckman's (1965; 1977) model by stressing continual negotiation of conflict and consensus, a recursive rather than a stage model.

Is a recursive model such as Trimbur's (1989) more appropriate than Tuckman's successive stage model for the collaborative writing groups we encounter in a college composition classroom? Do they pass through Tuckman's stages of development, or should we create a context to foster Trimbur's hopes for continual negotiation? Certainly the answer to this question is greatly influenced by the amount of time a group is together. If the group stays together just long enough to complete one
writing project, two to four weeks of class time, will the newly formed groups expend unnecessary time and effort forming, storming and norming in order to perform? Will the group who stayed together for an entire semester grow stale, relax into relationships and roles while remaining in the norming stage, and experience "burn out"? Or will this longer time be optimum for the collaborative writing experience?

**Cyclical model: recursive activity.** Cyclical model theory seems to provide the clearest characterization of the development of a collaborative writing group. Similar to Trimbur (1989), rather than focus on the sequence of stages in group development, cyclical models describe the actions characteristic of these stages as occurring recursively. Bales' (1965) "equilibrium model" views group interactions in terms of balancing goals: groups try to maintain cohesiveness while accomplishing their task. Referring to "mature" groups, he noted that they seem to shift between the norming and performing stages, balancing interpersonal relations with their orientation to task.

In order to answer the question how long should writing groups stay together within the constraints of a semester-long class, (permanent groups, stay the entire semester; changing groups, change with every new writing
project, two to four weeks), we have to examine what goes on in those groups to determine the length of time it takes a group to mature, to be successful: to develop the capabilities to work together to produce a "group-owned" document without sacrificing benefits to the individual member.

**Hierarchical vs. dialogic collaboration.** To answer the question, "what happens in collaborative writing groups," Ede and Lunsford (1990) conducted a mammoth survey of over 1400 members of professional organizations, such as the Modern Language Association, the American Psychological Association, etc. From the initial response to their survey about how much and how often these individuals write collaboratively, they sent a second, more in-depth questionnaire to a representative group from those who responded, a much smaller population. From those respondents, they chose just a representative from each organization to interview in person, in-depth, about their collaborative writing experience. From their surveys and interviews came a very fuzzy definition of collaborative writing, no neat categories, just ambiguities to try to "unassimilatingly" bring together. What they discovered were two kinds of collaborating going on--hierarchical and dialogic.
The hierarchical they described as product-oriented, goal-oriented, efficiently motivated towards achieving the goal as quickly and expediently as possible--they viewed this type of interaction as masculine, more problem-solving oriented, more task-oriented than the other, the dialogic. Those engaging in dialogic collaboration (including themselves as collaborators) were more concerned with interpersonal relations, process; they were less bound by roles within the group, often switching positions of leadership, never quite sure who actually wrote what part of the document, nor caring; they referred to this type of interaction as feminine.

In a sense Ede and Lunsford (1990) are renaming Bales' (1950) distinctions (i.e., task-orientation vs. socio-emotional responses). For a writing group in a composition classroom to be successful, what kind of balance is necessary between these two types of behavior? As creators of context within the classroom, rather than encourage either a task-oriented or person-oriented situation, do teachers need to be concerned with balancing the tension between these two types of interactions? In her theory on the influence of gender roles on group behavior, Lay (1992) suggests that in order for groups to be successful, there needs to be
almost an androgynous type of behavior, a balance between the "masculine"
hierearchical and the "feminine" dialogic collaboration. We need first to understand if the writing groups exhibit
this disparity in communication, or if, in collaborative
classrooms, the tension oscillates on its own.

Roles in the group. As students go about balancing
their task-orientedness with the necessary social
interaction, roles emerge within the group. Cazden
(1986) argues that students play different roles
dependent upon their expertise, sometimes teacher,
sometimes learner; working among peers, students do not
hesitate either to give and/or take advice, answer and/or
ask questions. When students view themselves as teachers
teaching other students, their verbalizing is considered
more effective than if they view themselves as students
verbalizing to a teacher (Durling & Schick, 1976), the
typical "teacher-as-examiner" role described by Britton
(1975).

In order to understand what kinds of interactions
are occurring in the group, observations must come from
several perspectives: the researcher, the teacher, and
of course, the students themselves. Students need to be
trained to be both the observer as well as the observed;
they need guidelines for their observations. They need
to understand the kinds of roles that are being played and how effectively these roles allow the task to be completed. Rubin and Budd (1975) offer a description of common roles individuals play in groups, organizing them in terms of "task-oriented roles," "relation-oriented roles," and "self-oriented roles." The first two categories clearly reflect Bales equilibrium theory, with the third category reflecting negative behavior, someone who "tries to meet felt individual needs often at the expense of group" (Rubin & Budd, p. 154). These categories reflect changing "modes of behavior," not static personalities of group members; they offer students guidelines for observing and a vocabulary for describing the "process of communication" they are involved in. They provide a format for evaluating others' behavior, allowing them to exercise some power and control over their group experience. (See Chapter 2 for a description of how these guidelines were used in this study).

Framework for Methodology

Though not referring directly to peer response or collaborative writing groups, Peterson and Wilkinson (1984) have identified three social scientific research paradigms used to study group processes in the classroom: the sociological, focusing not on classroom processes,
but on more large-scale, grouping patterns within school systems; the sociolinguistic, analyzing classroom processes to offer a "description of social, interactional processes," such as the verbal and nonverbal language group members use interacting; and the process-product, again looking to classroom processes, focusing "on those cognitive aspects of classroom processes that facilitate student achievement," such as "teacher behavior, student behavior, and student outcomes" (pp. 4-5). In order to study writing groups in the classroom, we need to integrate the sociolinguistic and process-product paradigms, combining the methodology (DiPardo & Freedman, 1988). This study does integrate methodology. It implements the observational methods of the sociolinguistic paradigm and the measuring techniques of the process-product paradigm. Thus, the research framework for this study reflects the same characteristics it assumes will be present in the participating groups--an integration of task-oriented (writing) and social-emotional interaction processes. In effect, it places the study of collaborative writing within a Burkean framework, studying language in terms of modes of action: the dramatism inherent in the interrelationships of collaborative writing (act), the student group members and teachers (actors), and the
classroom context, the group activity (scene). What this study reveals about the study of writing comes from the inherent unity of process and product in the very definition of writing. The richness of knowledge gained about writing can only be glimpsed through the framework of methodology introduced here. What the integration of the two paradigms provides is a way to explore the knowledge gained about writing through the process of social interaction, the necessity of exploring social process to understand the act of writing, the essential part of the process to the product, and the futility of trying to tease out process from product or vice versa.

Theorists have indicated the ways they believe collaborative writing/learning groups function or should behave. But they have not studied collaborative writing groups whose members are bound by the responsibility of creating together, learning to write as they learn to write together. The purpose of this study of collaborative writing groups, those groups who share full responsibility for the production of a document, is (1) to measure the efficacy of using collaborative writing groups in a college level composition class (from the multiple perspectives of researcher, students, and teachers) and (2) to determine if students should remain in the same collaborative writing groups for an entire
semester or for the duration of a writing project. In studying the behavior of collaborative writing groups, we hope to discover a language-centered context that allows for and supports its writers through a rhetoric of dissensus to understanding and meaning.
METHODS OF GATHERING & ANALYZING INFORMATION

Overview

The method of gathering and analyzing data in this study integrated two social scientific research paradigms used to describe group processes in the classroom--the sociolinguistic and the process-product (as recommended by Peterson and Wilkinson, 1984). (1) The sociolinguistic focused on the processes involved in the act of collaborative writing--the dramatism (Burke, 1945)--the interrelationship of the collaborative writing process (act), the writers (actors), and the group's context of activities (scene). This qualitative approach described the social and interactional processes involved in collaborative writing groups, such as the language, verbal and nonverbal. Data was gathered and analyzed from the perspectives of the researcher, the students and the teachers. (2) The process-product focused on measures of student writing performance, writing improvement, and retention and absentee rates. Since I wanted the setting for this study to remain as naturalistic as possible, I could not control for all the variables necessary for a strictly experimental study. Yet I did want to measure performance as well as observe it. Further, I wanted the teachers and me to maintain the flexibility to change tactics mid-semester if
necessary. Neither the sociolinguistic nor the process-product paradigm alone would answer my research questions; therefore, to understand the act of collaborative writing, I chose a methodology that combined a quantitative and a qualitative approach.

Gathering Information

Participants

The participants in this study were approximately 150 college freshmen at a mid-sized, public, open-admissions southern university, enrolled in 6 sections of a second-semester freshman composition course (expository, argument-oriented essay writing) during the 1992 spring semester (2 instructors, 3 sections each), the two instructors, and I. Each teacher had one section randomly designated as either using permanent groups, changing groups, or independent writers; students were informed that their class was to be either a permanent or changing group section at the beginning of the semester.

Procedure

Prior to the beginning of the semester two instructors (Annabel and David, both experienced instructors) and I met for several sessions (totalling about five hours) to determine the course information sheet, general syllabus, and types of group and independent activities for their classes. The two
instructors were chosen for several reasons: they had about the same teaching experience, were close in age, and more importantly, seemed to share the same philosophy of education and goals for their students—to instill the ability to think critically through writing. They both seemed to share the same classroom styles—informal, casual, but demanding in expectations. Both instructors displayed good interpersonal skills: they were good listeners, good connectors, good responders, easily able to offer supportive as well as challenging feedback to both the students and me. Neither had used collaborative writing groups in the classroom before.

The overall theme to the classes, "'Making Sense of the Sixties to Understand the Nineties," was derived in part from David’s apprehension over his students’ lack of cultural literacy and in part from the focus of the text. David had spent much of his semester break working on a thematic plan for his course; Annabel and I acquiesced to his agenda, even though she had used a different approach previously. I wanted to give the teachers the authority to choose their focus for their classes. The major units of reading, discussion, criticism, and writing originated from the students’ text, Writing and Reading Across the Curriculum (1991).
All of the students wrote a 50-minute diagnostic essay independently on the topic, "What happened in Vietnam in the sixties, and how did it affect both Vietnam and the United States" before the study began at the end of the first week of the semester. Since both the teachers and the experimenter had agreed that one of the goals of this class was cultural literacy, we chose a topic that would inform us of the students' understanding of the decade most salient to the class.

For an entire semester, two sections of second-semester freshman composition students wrote the majority of their assignments in a group that remained permanent; two sections wrote the majority of their assignments in groups that changed with each writing task, about every 2-4 weeks, dependent on the assignment; two sections wrote all work independently.

Before being placed in groups, students had been given an overall rank from one to four on the basis of their writing ability (determined from scores on ACT, English 101, and the preliminary holistic score on their diagnostic essay). Then the groups were randomly selected (though taking into account the need for groups to be heterogeneous), heterogeneously (according to gender,
Each group contained at least one good, two average and one poor writer. Throughout the semester, all students,

\[2\] One of the main issues in studying collaborative writing is group composition. Group dynamics literature reports that the size of the group depends on the nature of the task involved (Brown, 1988; Steiner, 1972). According to Latane, Williams and Harkins' (1979) theory of "social loafing," the larger the group, the more likely there will be a decrease in individual performance.

While reiterating that the optimal size of the group remains dependent on task, Hare (1962) mentions five as having "some advantages for problems which can be solved by group discussion" (p. 225). He also reviewed research (Carter, Haythorn, Meirwitz, & Lanzetta, 1951) which showed how a group of four allowed for good interaction among all the participants, while in a group of eight, only the most forceful of the group participated, "since the amount of freedom in the situation was not sufficient to accommodate all the group members" (p. 231). In prescribing optimum group size for cooperative learning groups, Johnson and Johnson (1991) suggest from two to six, dependent on the level of collaborative expertise of teachers and students as well as the nature of the task. Most of the composition literature focusing specifically collaborative writing tasks, i.e., peer response groups, suggests groups of anywhere from two to six (Spear, 1988), with five the ideal (Hawkins, 1976).

Spear (1988) recommends a heterogeneously mixed group ("sexes, capabilities, and backgrounds"), but acknowledges "there are no failsafe formulas" (p. 153). According to Johnson and Johnson (1991), heterogeneous groups offer "more elaborative thinking, more frequent giving and receiving of explanations, and greater perspective taking in discussing material . . . all of which increase the depth of understanding, the quality of reasoning, and the accuracy of long-term retention" (p. 65). Plus, research has shown that grouping students homogeneously according to ability does a distinct disservice to the students of lower ability (Good & Marshall, 1984). Hoffman (1965) believes that heterogeneous groups can be more effective than homogeneous groups because the differences among the members can lead to more diversified information and more questioning of the assumptions and opinions of one another.
both in group and independent conditions, wrote assigned essays and completed exercises on the same predetermined topics.

Prior to the start of classes and during the first few weeks of school, the instructors and I collaborated for many hours to develop a workable strategy for implementing this study. During the remainder of the semester we met from one to two hours a week to review strategies, to organize activities, and to discuss any problems that arose. At mid-semester we met for a lengthy session (9 hours) to review the students’ portfolios (folders containing journals, homework assignments, and group/independent writer exercises and essays, to determine the revised criteria for establishing the students’ grades, and to grade holistically the group/independent writer essays.

To introduce students in group conditions to cooperation and collaboration as well as to each other, we used exercises designed to foster interpersonal skills and relax personal barriers. During the first few weeks of school, subjects in the group conditions participated in ice-breaking exercises such as the "interview chain" (suggested by Spear, 1988). Students took turns interviewing each other and presented this information to the class. We had planned to continue using the
exercises as needed throughout the semester as well as implementing exercises that would enhance listening skills. However, both the instructors and I determined that students were communicating, were listening to each other, and did not feel the need to introduce more exercises whose sole focus would be increasing interpersonal skills. Also, limited class time for group work demanded the students’ attention focus on the writing task. Many groups did not have sufficient time in class to complete their assignments as it was and held meetings outside of class.

Guides for students. We did, however, give students a guide to different feedback strategies (see Appendix A), supportive and challenging (George, 1984; Johnson and Johnson, 1987; Ruben & Budd, 1975; Spear, 1988). Importantly, subjects in the group learning conditions were reminded to see the whole classroom as community—just a larger group—25 voices instead of their smaller group of four. The focus of their classroom experience was collaborative writing—learning in a community of discourse—learning to write with as well as to listen and to respond to different voices.

Students were informed as to the various roles needed within the group and what these roles meant, such as recorder/participant, responder/participant,
coordinator/participant and observer/participant. We did not assign roles within the group, nor did the students specifically assign roles. People just assumed those roles with which they were most comfortable.

The course information sheets (see Appendixes B and C) that were distributed to students in the group conditions listed a few brief characteristics of cooperative learning groups to foster discussion of group learning with the class. The information sheet also showed how subjects working in groups would be evaluated. The model for evaluation was derived and adapted from Beard et al. (1989): students' grades were based on both their contribution to the writing process (determined from peer, teacher, and self evaluations)--50%; and the overall grade on each product (e.g., essays, research paper)--50%.

Students were also given a copy (actually copies were distributed and redistributed throughout the semester) of "Descriptions of Common Roles in Interpersonal and Group Communication" (see Appendix D) and "Role Behavior Recording Form" (see Appendix E) as a guide for both peer and self-evaluation of interpersonal and group communication skills. The description of roles gave the students a working vocabulary of terms to use when describing and evaluating their observations of
group behavior. Terms included task-oriented roles such as coordinator and information-giver; relation-oriented roles such as encourager and follower; and self-oriented roles, such as blocker and avoider (Ruben and Budd, 1975).

Writing Assignments

Since this was a study of the efficacy of collaborative writing, all of the major writing assignments (including the research paper) were condition-generated, i.e., written in permanent or changing collaborative writing groups or by the independent writers. However, students in the group conditions also wrote several evaluative essays independently (evaluating their group experience; added mid-semester) and did some homework exercises independently. For example, outside of class the students practiced summarizing or synthesizing articles independently in their journals, then met back in their groups to discuss each other's summaries.

Synthesis. For the first group assignment, students needed to produce a synthesis of their individual summaries of the articles on the chapter "Obedience to Authority." Students in the independent writer classes produced the synthesis individually (see Appendix F for extended outline of "Obedience to Authority" project).
Research scavenger hunt. The second group assignment included a scavenger hunt. Students worked in their group or independent writer conditions to research bibliographic material in the library. The scavenger hunt provided a way of teaching bibliographic methods and the use of the library as well as promoting group unity and interpersonal communication (see Appendix G for list of articles to hunt for research methods). Not only were the students supposed to locate these articles, but after finding them, reading them, and summarizing them, they were to arrive at a theme to tie them together. These articles then became the basis for their research paper.

Journals. Students were also required to keep a journal, writing two to three times a week, documenting their response to group work and assignments. Five to ten minutes were allocated at the end of classes for students to begin jotting down their response to collaborative writing. Before they began writing in their journals, students were always reminded to refer to the description of common roles and to use the vocabulary provided in their analysis. These guides were to help them assess what was going on in their groups--productively and interpersonally [See Goldstein and Malone (1985) for the significance of journal-keeping as a method of strengthening collaborative writing]. Not
only were journals supposed to encourage students to think about and respond to their collaborative writing and group interaction, they were to provide the teachers help in diagnosing problems in their collaborative writing, in group dynamics, and in evaluating individual contributions to the group. Journals were multi-purposed, however, and contained summaries of readings and research, class notes, homework, etc. (see Appendix H for list of journal assignments).

The groups changed after they had completed their scavenger hunt task. Thus, the changing group students were in their second group by about the fifth week in the semester.

Fairy tale/myth or cartoon paper. The next writing assignment was a paper based on a critical study of the fairy tale and myth. Students were shown the video of the first of Bill Moyers’ interviews with Joseph Campbell on the power of myth; this session explored the idea of hero. They were also given hand-outs explaining the importance of myth (see Appendix I) as well as guidelines for writing their essays (see Appendixes J, K, and L). The students worked on this writing project for three weeks (Mardi gras holiday interrupted); the papers were due at mid-semester.
Research paper. The major writing assignment for the course was the research paper, a group-generated topic springing from the research they had collected during the scavenger hunt early in the semester (see Appendix F for focus of research articles; see Appendix M for instructions to students). The changing groups changed for a third time for this project, working on these papers from mid-semester until two weeks before the close of the semester (during this period they had a week off from class for spring break). Most student groups worked together both inside and outside of class on this project; some even met over spring break at one another's homes or at the library.

Bartleby: the individual who would not conform. The fourth project of the semester was an analysis of the short story, "Bartleby the Scrivener," by Herman Melville, plus accompanying critical readings in the text. Students were required to write in their journals their group's collaborative effort to summarize and critique both the story and the critical interpretations, spending one week on this project (the second to last week of the semester). Changing groups changed for the fourth and final time for this assignment and the one that followed.
"Main idea of the course" essay. During the last week of the semester all six sections (group and independent writers) wrote an essay collaboratively on the following assignment: "Define the main idea and important sub-ideas of the course. Compare and/or contrast how your different readings contributed." The independent writers were assigned to heterogeneous groups based on the same criteria used for the others' group formation (writing ability). Two hours was allotted for the project.

Final exam. During final exam week (all English composition exams are given at the same time), students were given two hours to write independently on the same final exam topic:

How have your values and beliefs been challenged or reinforced since you have been in this class? Refer to journals, hand-outs, texts as you need them. Write an organized essay. Consider: work ethic, gender identity, obedience to authority, human sexuality, conformity, personal history, and stories.

Many students evaluated what they had learned from and about collaborative writing in their final exams; their comments were used along with the following forms of
evaluation to gain a perspective on what the students saw.

**Forms of Evaluation**

**Peer assessment form.** When students completed a writing project, such as the essay generated from the chapter on "Fairy tales and myths," teachers also distributed a peer assessment form (see Appendix N). This evaluative tool asked the students in permanent and changing group classes to rate their own as well as their peers' performance (Meg Morgan et al., 1989; Ruben and Budd, 1975; Johnson and Johnson, 1991).

**Problems with evaluation.** But these evaluation methods were not working. We were not getting the information we sought from the students. After the mid-semester review of the students' portfolios, the instructors and I realized the students were not using the journal to discuss the collaborative writing activity, either to describe how they performed the task and the interpersonal activity or to evaluate group members' performance. They were giving generalized reports that said basically "everything's fine; we're working well together." Nor were they responding honestly on the peer assessment forms, with many students giving all the group members high scores. The methodology had to change.
Evaluative essay. To compensate for their lack of response and our lack of information as to peer and self-evaluation, we required an independently written essay (graded) which critiqued the collaborative writing and evaluated their groups' performance. It was decided that after every major writing project, students would write an essay, evaluating their experience, directed to and read by only the teacher (and me) rather than confide in a multi-purpose journal which other students often read.

Attitude survey. Also at the end of the semester, all students (permanent and changing groups and independent writers) completed an attitude survey. Modeled on Rymer and Beard (1989), this measure evaluated students' attitude toward writing as well as group work (see Appendix 0).

Teacher and Researcher Observations

Teacher. Not only were the students responsible for the observations. Following observation guidelines offered by Ruben and Budd (1975) as well as Johnson and Johnson (1988) and Spear (1988), both instructors observed group work. They kept a journal of their observations of collaborative writing, observing group behavior during class time, as well as following up on any problems out of class. They were aware from the
beginning of the study that what they observed would be a significant part of the data.

Researcher. At the beginning of the semester the instructors introduced me to their classes, stating that I would be a regular visitor, who I was and why I was there. Throughout my visitations I reminded the students that the data I was gathering would in no way affect their grade; I was not there to spy on them for the instructors. During the beginning of the semester, I observed each of the sections participating in the study three times each, watching all of the groups from a distance as unobtrusively as possible, taking notes in my journal. Then near mid-semester I spent three sessions, as a non-participating member of one specific group (randomly chosen) in each of the six sections; in addition to note-taking, I began tape recording the sessions. After mid-semester when the changing-group condition changed groups, I followed one student (per section, randomly chosen) whose group I had joined previously to her or his new group. I stayed with the same permanent group as before. I observed how groups were working on their collaborative research papers and felt quite comfortable sitting among them. One of the permanent groups even offered to tape-record a session for me that they were holding outside of class during
spring semester break. I returned twice during the last three weeks of the semester to observe and record group behavior.

**Personal Interviews**

**Students.** Also, at the end of the semester I randomly selected four students from each collaborative section for an in-depth, hour-long personal interview. The students knew these interviews were voluntary; I had simply picked their names out of a basket and they could refuse the interview with no penalty. These interviews were confidential and held in my office either during the last week of classes or finals week (see Appendix P for interview question format). I typed student responses as they spoke.

**Teachers.** I also interviewed the teacher-participants, following the same procedure as I did with the students (see Appendix Q).

**Retention/Absence Records**

After the semester ended, I collected copies of the grade reports from all sections participating in the study. These reports furnished me with not only the students' grades (including withdrawals) for the semester, but the number of absences per student.
Analyzing Data

Analyzing the Product

Research by McAllister (1985) demonstrated that graders' awareness of conditions (reading handwritten vs. typed drafts) could alter their perceptions of essays; therefore, the diagnostic essays, the group-produced essays (last week of the semester) and the independently written final exams were typed, removing the students' names and replacing them with coded numbers to maintain student anonymity and to keep graders blind to experimental conditions.

Eight English faculty members (excluding the instructors and me) blind to experimental conditions were trained as holistic raters before scoring the diagnostic, group, and independently written essays. Each essay was rated by at least 2 graders (a 3rd grader was used when scores varied by more than one point per essay on a 6-point scale). A holistic scoring method based on Cooper (1977), Myers (1984), and White (1986) was employed (see Appendix R for scoring guide).

Analyzing the sociolinguistic process

Student journals. I charted each collaborative writing student's journal by class section according to the following categories: name, total number of entries, journal entries worth quoting, positive/negative,
general/specific, length, socio-emotional, and task-oriented comments about the writing process (see Appendix S for sample of a student's journal chart).

**Evaluative essays.** I followed the same procedure as above for charting the student's evaluative essays. I also included notations about how they used the peer assessment form.

**Organizing the Analyses**

The results chapters which follow offer multi-perspective answers to the questions: (1) what is the efficacy of using collaborative writing groups in the college composition class? (2) should we keep students in the same groups the entire semester or change them every few weeks with each new writing project? Chapter 3 shows what the researcher saw, Chapter 4, what the students saw, and Chapter 5, what the teachers saw.
WHAT THE RESEARCHER SAW

Integrating qualitative and quantitative research methodology, this chapter presents perceptions and conclusions drawn from the researcher's perspective. The quantitative data represents the results based upon the following: the frequency of types of comments coded according to Bales' Interaction Process Analysis (see Appendix T) from taped-recorded conversations of groups at mid-point and at the end of the semester; evaluations of student writing scores on the diagnostic and the final essays; percentage of students successfully completing course (withdrawal from course comparisons); and the number of student absences. The qualitative data is derived from my observations partly as participant-observer (sitting with a particular group) and partly from transcripts of taped conversations, some of which I recorded, some of which were recorded without my being present. Observations of both permanent and changing groups at work are reported at four different times within the semester: early, first 1/3, middle, end (see Appendix U for composition of groups observed).

Summary of Qualitative and Quantitative Results

Observations and analysis from the researcher's perspective provide some answers to the questions raised earlier: What is the efficacy of using collaborative
writing groups in a college composition class? Should students remain in the same collaborative writing group for an entire semester or for the duration of a writing project?

To answer the first question, I looked first to the quantitative results. Here I saw that in both the permanent and changing group conditions, the absences and withdrawals were significantly lower than in the individual classes. Groups exerted a kind of power over their members, gave their members sufficient motivation to keep coming to class. Even though all the conditions were successful, all resulting in students’ significantly improving their writing, still the largest gains appeared in the permanent group classes. Further, the group classes maximized teacher productivity: here were larger classes (due to higher retention rate) who performed better than smaller classes (those individual classes with higher withdrawal rate).

In deciding whether to leave students in the same group for an entire semester or not, I found answers in both the quantitative and qualitative results. Quantitatively, the permanent groups made significantly more improvement in their writing than did the changing groups or the individual classes. But significant benefits extended to both groups: both the permanent and
changing groups kept students in the class. However, the differences between the two groups emerged in the qualitative data. Looking at the frequency of response, both positive socio-emotional and task-oriented, the permanent groups clearly surpassed the changing groups in both areas. Even though there was only minimal negative socio-emotional response in both groups, there was still more evidence of an ability to deal with conflict in the permanent groups. Permanent writing groups provided an environment conducive to building trust and solidarity: students engaged in more cohesive behavior when they were with the same groups for a whole semester than for just the duration of one writing project.

Quantitative Analysis

Initial Equivalency of the Groups

Since this is not a true experiment involving random assignment of subjects to conditions, it is important to establish that there were no major differences between the various classes before the classes began. For every student participating in this research, I obtained the grade in English 101 (the prerequisite course for the English 102 course used in this research) as well as the ACT score in English. Each of these measures was analyzed in a 2 (teacher: Annabel or David) X 3 (class condition: permanent, changing, or independent) Analysis
There were no significant effects on either measure (see Table 1 for mean scores). Thus, from this analysis it appears that at the beginning of the semester there were no differences in the basic writing abilities of the classes of students.

**Group Cohesiveness as Measured by Withdrawals and Absences**

Group cohesiveness is concerned with the degree to which individuals are attracted/drawn to the group as well as the ability of a group to keep its members. One indication of such cohesiveness would be the number of

---

3As with most psychological measures, some might argue that most of the dependent variables in this research (i.e., grades, ACT scores, holistic ratings, and attitude measures) are ordinal scales rather than interval scales. As far back as the 1940’s, theorists have debated whether ordinal measures should be analyzed using nonparametric statistics rather than parametric statistics (e.g., the Analysis of Variance (see Mitchell, 1986, for a review of this controversy). As Mitchell (1986) points out, this controversy has still not been resolved to every theorist’s satisfaction. However, in practice, Anderson's (1961) observation that parametric statistics are "the standard tools of psychological statistics although nonparametric procedures are useful minor techniques" (p. 315) still holds true; analyses in the psychological and educational journals predominately involve parametric statistics. Theorist such as Gaito (1980) argue that even if psychological/educational measures are, in fact, only ordinal in nature, parametric techniques are totally appropriate and would not distort the conclusions. In keeping with the current research in psychology and education, the current research will use parametric statistics wherever the data is designed to be interval, recognizing that even if the data does not achieve the desired equal intervals, the parametric statistics will still be appropriate.
Table 1

Mean ACT and English 101 Grades as a Function of Class Condition and Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>English 101</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annabel</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>19.46</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annabel</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>19.88</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annabel</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>21.81</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: English 101 grades are on a 4-point scale with a 4 indicating an A and a 1 indicating a D.
students who remained in the class as opposed to those who withdrew. Class withdrawals and completions were obtained for students in each of the three class conditions. The three groups were then compared in a 2(completion status: completed or withdrew) X 3(class condition: permanent, changing, or individual) Contingency Table (see Table 2). There was a significant difference among the class conditions with respect to completing or withdrawing from a class, $\chi^2 (2) = 9.129$, $p < .05$. As can be seen from Figure 1 the withdrawal rate in the individual condition is three times that of the condition is three times that of the permanent group and changing group conditions. Thus, there is support for the power of groups to maintain their membership. Further, given that greater cohesiveness would be expected in the permanent group than the changing group, it was not surprising that this group had the lowest level of withdrawals; however, it was not significantly different from the changing group withdrawals.

Another indication of a group's ability to hold its members could be seen from class attendance. It would be expected that attendance would be higher in classes using groups than in individual classes. Number of days absent and present were collected for each student in each of the three conditions. The three class conditions were
Table 2

Frequency of Observed and Expected Class Withdrawals and Completions as a Function of Class Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Outcome</th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>Changing</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completions</td>
<td>47  (42.9)</td>
<td>40  (37.9)</td>
<td>35  (41.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawals</td>
<td>4   (8.1)</td>
<td>5   (7.1)</td>
<td>14  (7.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For each cell the number on top is the observed frequency and the number below and in parentheses is the expected frequency.
Figure 1: Percentage of Students Withdrawing from the Class for Each Class Condition
then compared in a $2 \times 3$ Contingency Table (see Table 3). There was a significant difference among the class conditions with respect to attendance, $X^2 (2) = 97.092, p < .001$. As can be seen in Figure 2, the absences in the individual conditions are two to three times those in the permanent group and changing group conditions with the permanent group and changing group conditions being virtually identical.

In summary, both indices of the power of the groups to maintain their membership show the same pattern. The individual condition showed significantly higher withdrawals and absences than the two group conditions with both the permanent group and the changing group conditions at the same levels.

**Holistically Graded Essays**

**Final Group Product.** A final group paper was written by students in all classes (including those in the individual condition). It had been expected that the best papers would be produced by the permanent groups who had been working together on group papers throughout the semester. Lower quality papers were expected for students in the individual condition who were working on their first group project of the semester. Each group project
Table 3

**Frequency of Presences and Absences as a Function of Class Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Attendance</th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>Changing</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1899.0)</td>
<td>(1077.4)</td>
<td>(1023.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(216.0)</td>
<td>(122.6)</td>
<td>(116.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** For each cell the number on top is the observed frequency and the number below and in parenthesis is the expected frequency.
Figure 2: Percentage of Classes Missed During the Semester for Each Class Condition
had been holistically graded on a six-point scale by raters blind to class condition. This measure was analyzed in a 2 (teacher: David or Annabel) X 3 (class condition: permanent, changing, or individual) ANOVA. There were no significant effects. Thus, even though the conditions differed in their group experience, there were no differences in the quality of the writing of the group product (see Appendix W for samples of group-written essays).

Independent Student Essays. Each student in each condition independently produced two essays that were each graded holistically on a six-point scale by raters blind to class condition. The first essay was a diagnostic essay that served as a pretest while the second essay was the final exam essay that served as a posttest (see Appendix X for samples of individually-written essays). Essay grades were analyzed in a 2 (essay: pretest or posttest) X 2 (teacher: David or Annabel) X 2 (student sex: male or female) X 3 (class condition: permanent, changing, or individual) Mixed Model ANOVA. There were two significant effects. First, there was a significant difference between scores on the pretest and the posttest, $F(1,94) = 52.89, p < .001$. As can be seen in Figure 3, the grades on the posttest (final) are higher than the
Figure 3: Individual Grades on Diagnostic (Pretest) and Final (Posttest) Essays
grades on the pretest (diagnostic). This effect shows the improvement in writing that occurred during the semester for all three conditions. However, this effect was qualified by a significant essay X class condition interaction, $F (2, 94) = 3.93, p < .023$. This interaction means that the gains that occurred were not happening equally in all the conditions. As can be seen in Figure 3, although all groups show a gain of the posttest over the pretest, the largest gains occurred in the permanent group condition. In other words individuals in all individuals in all conditions showed improvement in their writing over the course of the semester with the permanent group showing the significant, dramatic improvement.

**Interaction Process Analysis**

Tape recordings were made of one group discussion in each class of the permanent group condition and the changing group at mid-semester and at the end of the semester. Each comment in a session was scored according Bale’s Interaction Process Analysis, a coding scheme devised for observing and analyzing group behavior. Each comment was placed in one of the eight categories (see Appendix T for a detailed description of these categories).

**Mid-Semester Results.** The results of the analysis of the mid-semester comments can be seen in Figure 4. From
Interaction Process Analysis
Mid-Semester

Figure 4: Interaction Process Analysis at Mid-Semester
this figure it is quite clear that there is much greater participation in the permanent groups than there is in the changing groups. This greater amount of participation occurs in both the socio-emotional as well as the task area. It is interesting to note that although the participation in both socio-emotional and task areas is greater in the permanent group, the ratio of socio-emotional to task comments appears about the same for both groups. In both cases there seemed to be activity in both the socio-emotional and task areas, but with greater numbers of comments in the task (talking about writing) area. This interaction profile reveals that at this point in the semester, the changing groups were not as communicative as the permanent groups. The changing groups' behavior remained characteristic of orientation--guarded, tentative, more polite discourse than lively flow of conversation. The permanent groups show much more communication, both in the ratio of socio-emotional positive response and task response (give). Even though neither group produced many comments in the negative socio-emotional area, here again the ratio of permanent to changing groups remains the same--the permanent groups made more comments in this area than did the changing groups. They were beginning to feel comfortable enough, secure enough within their groups to
disagree. In summary, this quantitative analysis suggested that there was greater group involvement in the permanent groups.

**End of semester results.** The results of the analysis of the end-of-semester comments can be seen in Figure 5. These results are very similar to those of the mid-semester. Again, the permanent groups show much greater activity in all categories. And again, the ratio of socio-emotional to task comments is approximately the same in both conditions.

One of the questions that the current research hoped to answer was whether writing groups would remain effective if they stayed together for an entire semester; would they experience "burn out," grow stale and be non-productive, or would they continue to develop trust and cohesion? Thus, it is significant that the Bales Interaction Process Analyses of the permanent group’s discussions at the end of the semester were very similar to the ones at mid-semester. The permanent groups kept the same high level of activity, the same flow of conversation. Although there was no significant increase in the number of negative socio-emotional comments, there was no decrease either, indicating the groups had not become bored, passive, and disinterested in either the collaborative writing or one another.
Figure 5: Interaction Process Analysis for the End of the Semester
Qualitative Results

To categorize what I observed in student groups, I have used Tuckman's (1965) terminology: orientation (forming), conflict (storming), cohesion (norming), performance (performing), and dissolution (adjourning) (see above for detailed description of categories). Here, these categories do not reflect sequential stages of group development (as designated by Tuckman, 1965; Tuckman & Jensen, 1977), but rather a system for classifying group behavior. I have compared the differences in behavior between the permanent groups and the changing groups. Further, I have referred to Ruben and Budd's (1975) "Descriptions of Common Roles in Interpersonal and Group Communication" in describing the behavior of individuals within the groups (see Appendix C).

Early Observations

During the third week of the semester, I visited each instructor's changing group and permanent group conditions once, staying for the whole class period. I observed the groups as non participant this first time since I wanted to get a feeling for what was occurring across the whole class. I did not join any particular group but instead observed the overall proceedings from the front of the classroom, as well as from other vantage points.
The groups themselves formed an ellipsis around the rectangular classroom, with most of the groups circling the left, back and right walls.

The students were working on completing an outline (almost as lengthy as rough draft to an essay) on their assigned critical readings on the chapter "Obedience to Authority" (see Appendix F for description of assignment).

Overview

Initially, I sensed the tension associated with being thrust into an unfamiliar classroom situation, an unfamiliar writing task, with an unfamiliar group of people. I saw the guardedness, heard the polite conversation, and felt the discomfort of many students, especially a few marginal voices. Yet I also noted how some students seemed eager to begin this new type of learning experience; their body language revealed their focus on their group, their conversation, their interest in exploring their task. I left these initial observations thinking that most students had adjusted somewhat, felt more at ease than at first, and overall, had enjoyed participating in their groups.

Orientation: Exploring the Task, Exchanging Information

Both permanent and changing group classes had only been in their groups for one or two prior class periods, so both conditions were in similar situations for this
observation. During this initial phase of group work, their language was characterized by at first, polite conversation, an exploration of their task (how are we going to write this?), with little self-disclosure, but self-discourse ("I can do this part"; "I know that"), and increasing exchange of information. Overall, the climate was informal, fairly relaxed and friendly in all classes.

In the beginning most students seemed cautious about taking command of the group, hesitant to assert authority or trespass on others' feelings, again indicative of a group's "forming" stage (Tuckman, 1965). They were also cautious of their own language, guarded, for here they were, thrown together with a group of people, and expected to trust them with their grade. At this point students were unsure of what their own roles in the group would be and if and how the group would accomplish its writing task. For example, I noticed in several of the groups that the women would punctuate their conversation with "okay?" Several women would nod their head in approval; they would second others' opinions with "right" or "yeah." They exhibited, according to Bales' IPA (Interaction Process Scale; see Appendix T), positive socio-emotional responses by agreeing, being careful not to impose on the group, often checking with others when they made a suggestion.
True to the initial stages of group formation, there was little open conflict or hostility, at most an underlying tension arising from the members’ lack of familiarity with one another. Signs of this initial tension ranged from a restrained, inhibited, polite language to a total lack of response—a withdrawal from the group to passivity. This primary tension lessened as the group became acquainted (Bormann, 1975). I observed similar behavior in both the permanent and changing group conditions.

Several times I noticed that if a group included a minority, a marginal voice (based on gender, race, or nationality), this minority would be more guarded than the others, sometimes even withdrawing active participation. In two separate instances, a single woman seemed overwhelmed, outnumbered by the three men in her group. She contributed little to the group's conversation, not trying too hard to participate. She played a passive role, not really focusing on the other members, just reading and re-reading her own material, keeping her chair pushed back a little from the rest of the group. Another time, a single man participated the least. He was in a group with three women who were cautious "okayers?" These women did not qualify as dominators, but in task-oriented roles sought information, in relation-oriented roles, encouraged and
harmonized. Once, however, the single man noticed my watching his group, he immediately joined in the conversation. Yet in several changing groups with only a single man present, this man was clearly dominant in two of the groups and co-leader in another.

Sometimes the teacher unintentionally drew non-participating students back to the group, simply by responding personally to that student. In Annabel’s changing groups class, I noticed one woman particularly withdrawn, her chair angled away from her group. She sat quietly, staring into space, not in any way attempting to participate in her group’s discussion, trying to remain insulated from any interaction with her group. The other group members ignored her and went on with their task, no one even trying to draw her in. After sitting passively for a half hour, she finally raised her hand and called to the teacher. When Annabel joined her, she revealed her problem: the day before she had tried for several hours, but was unable to complete her part of the research assignment. It appeared as though she had been deliberately misguided by a librarian. Her report was soon corroborated by other students who complained of difficulties with the librarians. Once this student had revealed her problem and found sympathy among the teacher and her classmates, as well as learned she had not been
singled out to receive this rude treatment, she voluntarily turned her chair toward her group and joined the writing activity and was soon after smiling and conversing with the others. She appeared a welcome member of the group even though she had not completed her part of the assignment. She had voluntarily left the group and voluntarily returned, orienting herself to the group task.

One of the most blatant examples of initial separateness, an overt reluctance to work with others, appeared in one of the changing groups. All the other group conditions had formed distinct groups immediately upon entering the classroom. Conversation occurred within the group, group members talking to one another, trying to release some barriers. What I noticed here was a lack of clear differentiation among the groups. The groups were open, more like scattered semi-circles than clustered, tightly knit circles of students. It was difficult to distinguish where one group ended and another began. Also, group members were chatting with members of other groups, not just with their own group members. After lecturing a few moments, the teacher had to instruct this class to turn into their groups, to close off the groups from one another.
Also, I noticed in several groups there seemed to be more polarized dialogue than group conversation, revealing the expected lack of cohesiveness for a group in its formative stage. For instance, in one group two women spoke mainly to each other, with brief dialogue occurring, usually the women asking for the men's contributions. In other groups, two students would dominate the conversation, with the other two students usually remaining relatively focused but silent, offering more nods of approval than comments.

**Conflict: Disagreements, Resistance, Incompatibilities**

There was relatively no conflict in this early forming stage of group work. The groups showed the strain of new relationships, but they had not worked long enough to allow for some members to act incompatibly with others; there were not yet any signs of "false conflicts," one member misinterpreting another, or "contingent conflicts," such as chronically arriving late for meetings (Deutsch, 1973). Further, these groups were not yet comfortable enough with one another to disagree. According to Trimbur (1989), conflict is not viewed necessarily as destructive to group work, but rather a sign of its stability. Generally, states Coser, conflict is healthy to the life of the group. "Insofar as conflict is the resolution of tension between antagonists, it has a stabilizing function
and becomes an integrating component of the relationship. . . " (1956, p. 80). Neither kind of conflict was apparent during this observation.

Cohesion: Establishing Roles, Relationships, Solidarity

Using Ruben and Budd's (1975) "Description of Common Roles in Interpersonal and Group Communication" (see Appendix T) as a guideline, I searched for roles emerging early on in the process. Just a few were obvious from the beginning.

In one of David's changing groups, a single man in a group with three women took immediate control by announcing: "I want to write the final thing that's gonna be typed." Two of the three women immediately volunteered to type it; no one questioned his authority.

In Annabel's permanent group class, Group A (see Appendix U for composition of observed groups) was clearly dominated by a non-traditional student named Debbie. She volunteered to act as coordinator, organizer "unless someone objects." No one did. Debbie led the conversation while Jennifer, an African-American, remained quiet, although seemingly involved according to her nods of approval and focused appearance. The men, including Jeff, an Australian, and Scott did participate in the conversation (I mention these group members by name because I became a participant-observer of this group,
sitting with them for the remainder of my class observations. From what I observed, no other group leader emerged so quickly, so compellingly as had Debbie. There was no polarization or splintering into dialogues in the above group. Debbie addressed her comments to all the group members as did Jeff and Scott when they spoke. From this early observation, it looked like Jeff would be the tension-breaker, ready to lighten procedures with an "off-the-wall" comment or funny remark. He was a strong personality, not as desirous for leadership as Debbie, but not about to be relegated to a passive, lack-of-recognition role.

By the end of the first sessions, I had observed no condition-generated differences in cohesion. Most students pulled chairs in close to other group members; most bodies leaned forward, focused in toward the group. Most groups seemed involved, self-absorbed, either reading from their articles, talking about their readings, or referring to their journals (where they had summarized these readings). The students remained absorbed and focused on their collaborative writing throughout the class session. They did not seem in a hurry to pack their belongings five minutes before class was over or to rush out the door exactly when class finished; rather, several groups in each class stayed overtime, planning their
strategies. By the end of this session, there was an increased feeling of interdependence and cohesion, of group solidarity stronger than at the beginning of the hour. For example, several students, notably women, extended themselves to members who could not stay after class due to prior commitments, saying, "That's all right; we'll catch you up later; don't worry."

**Performance: Problem-solving, Goal-achieving**

I observed little difference between the permanent groups and changing groups in performance. Most groups were focused on their writing task, but mainly exploring how to get the writing done rather than composing together. At this point I did not observe them engaged in solving any writing problems other than the problem of how to approach the topic, i.e., who should write which parts.

**First 1/3 Semester Observations**

By this time the permanent groups had worked together for about 4 weeks, and the changing groups had just changed to their second group. Both Annabel and David were absent for one of these observations, so I floated, answering questions as needed, but mainly just observing since the groups understood their task well (to find illustrations of different cultural values in the fairy tales they read as individuals; see Appendixes J, K, and L for description of fairy tale/myth assignment).
remained a non-participant observer, not yet joining any one group.

Overview

I had begun to notice a few differences arising between the two conditions in the way the groups interacted and worked together. The permanent groups seemed to be moving toward cohesion, engaged in writing together, while the changing groups gave more evidence of behavior vacillating between orientation and conflict. They approached their task as "divide and conquer."

Orientation: Exploring the Task, Exchanging Information

Permanent groups. Among the permanent groups, I observed only one group not moving solidly toward cohesion. This group (later referred to as Group B) still demonstrated signs of a lack of group maturity. They had polarized along gender lines, with two of three men talking together (the third looking on) while the two women spoke together. The women would try to focus the attention of the men on the task, but one, especially, seemed disinterested and kept the attention of the other men. He (Kelly) joked about this being his fourth time to take English 102; rather than laugh, the women just shook their heads, not really amused. Here were signs of tension, potential conflict, which if allowed to remain
unresolved, could threaten the group's ability to write collaboratively (Forsyth, 1990).

**Changing groups.** On the other hand, most changing groups (this being the first meeting of their newly-formed second group) were in the orientation stages—getting acquainted with one another, or resisting getting acquainted with one another. In some groups I saw signs of polarization and guardedness, probably due to the initial tension of once again being with new people.

For example, one changing group's interactions seemed relatively quiet and polite. This group spent much of their group work time reading material rather than conversing. The single man remained quiet throughout the class, while the two women spoke tentatively to each other about the task, exploring how they would go about dividing up the writing of the project.

Another changing group was hesitant to begin tackling their writing at all. The members were slow getting started, more interested in what Annabel was telling another group than in their own task. Finally, one man initiated the conversation about how they could each take a section to write and quickly another man responded, with the two women questioning, then responding with "Ooooh, okay's." For a good bit of the time, the third man sat with his head in his arms, clicking his pen, seemingly
uninterested in the proceedings and making no attempt to join them. But before the end of the hour he had sat up, focused on his group, and even offered some suggestions. Soon the five members were all engaged in exploring their writing activity—how they could divide and conquer their task. By the end of class, the whole group had digressed off-task and were chatting among themselves, (not in separate dialogues but in group conversation). However, these students were not sure they were supposed to be talking about anything else other than the task, unaccustomed to having the process of "getting acquainted" permitted during class time. When Annabel casually glanced toward this group, one man, smiling, though somewhat defensively said to Annabel, "We’re just getting to know each other a little better." They had begun orienting themselves to collaborative writing.

Other changing groups reflected a resistance to getting acquainted, with some members interacting while others remained uninvolved. In Annabel’s classes, I observed an African American marginal voice, Tyika (interviewed later) at first physically withdrawn from her new group. She sat with her chair turned somewhat away from the other two women. Yet as soon as Annabel responded to the other members’ pleas for suggestions, Tyika turned her chair inward and joined the her group.
Annabel had not asked Tyika to join the group, but rather Annabel’s presence and help drew her in (from what I could see). Once Tyika herself acknowledged her membership in the group and physically joined the others, they accepted her as well.

Many of David’s changing groups exemplified some polarization even after he visited the groups (unsolicited). In one group the single man was the only member to respond to David’s questions; the two women listened but did not comment. After David left, the two women began conversing with each other, but the man was silent. By the end of the class, the two women were chatting about social activities, chairs completely pulled away from the man. He, meantime, sat reading the mini-manual from the American Pool Players’ Association, not at all interested in becoming involved with the other two.

Another group exhibited similar characteristics of a polarized group as well. Here both women (one an African-American) responded to David’s questions immediately, while the men remained silent. The women were both focused on the discussion, with one liberally sprinkling "mm hmm’s" throughout David’s comments. Then the other woman addressed her group: "Where do we want to go next, y’all?" The men remained silent, but the other woman responded and a dialogue ensued between them. It seemed
as if these two women were trying to help each other reach understanding. At first one woman dominated the conversation, with the other giving only supportive comments. Later, while sitting in with another group, I heard the other speaking more and more. Little was heard from the men. The two women continued to explore their writing task with no obvious attempts to exchange personal information, but the men never really participated in the activity.

The lack of cohesion in another changing group was clearly reflected in their seating arrangements. They were organized in a flattened out semi-circle more than in a circle, with the lone man sitting on the far end of the group. In this instance, the teacher unconsciously contributed to the polarization, simply by his body language toward the students. He addressed them standing before them, his body angled away from the single man and toward the group of three women. Even though the man was the only member to respond to David's questions, David still focused on the women, barely acknowledging the fellow’s reply. David responded to him minimally, tossing his comments over his shoulder, then turned back to face the women and probe further. Undaunted, the man responded. Again, little acknowledgement from the teacher. But this time the man took control away from
David by telling him, "I think we've got the hang of it now." So David left. Afterward, the group split into two dialogues, with the man talking to the woman sitting next to him (she doing more nodding than talking), and the two women who were sitting next to each other talking. Both dialogues were focused on looking for cultural values in the cartoons they had watched. They continued this pattern of interaction throughout the remainder of the class, two dialogues within one group, not reflecting any real "we-feeling."

**Conflict: Disagreements, Resistance, Incomaptibilities**

**Permanent groups.** Again, I saw little evidence of any conflict or disagreement in their collaborative writing; more characteristic was the tension described above, common to orientation stages. There were, of course, a few exceptions. In the permanent groups, there was only one group I observed splintering into coalitions, with one working and one not working (Group B described above; see Appendix U for group composition and grades group members received).

**Changing groups.** In the changing groups, similar to the permanent groups, I observed very few signs of hostility, conflict, or disagreement about writing problems, mainly the irritations and tension associated with orientation. There was one exception, however.
I sensed a hostility growing within a group that was dominated by Cliff (I mention him by name since I observed him in different groups in succeeding observations). Group polarization appeared to be the result of his domination. He all but silenced the other three members, allowing for occasional questions or comments or quiet agreements. He spoke mostly at the two non-traditional students while the other man sat quietly, looking down at his work a good bit of the time. Throughout the class session, Cliff continued to act as initiator/coordinator (dominator), with the "conversation" occurring between the two women and him, all comments directed to and through him. He seemed to be engaging in a hierarchical mode of collaboration (Lunsford and Ede, 1991), strictly concerned with exploring the group task as expediently as possible--he would dictate how they would write the paper. He shut down dialogic communication among his group.

Cohesion: Establishing Roles, Relationships, Solidarity

Permanent groups. In the permanent conditions I saw a good deal of evidence that suggested the students were moving toward cohesion (characterized by establishment of roles, standards and relationships, agreement; "we-feeling"; good attendance). In the majority of the permanent groups, most members were present and participation seemed fairly well-balanced. The groups
appeared to be focused on their writing task, with bodies leaning in toward the other members. There were many smiles and much laughter in an overall informal, casual, friendly atmosphere.

One characteristic of cohesion is a group's ability to work through conflict. In the "Early Observations" discussed above, I had reported that a single woman had withdrawn somewhat from her group, allowing the three men to function without her. This time, her chair was now even pushed slightly away from the others, and she remained passive, not participating. As I approached her group, she called to me, saying loudly, "I don't like my group; they don't listen to me." Startled, one of her fellow group members replied good-humoredly, "That's the first good thing you've said all day." Laughing, he added, "These guys are in their own world." When I moved on, all the men were over-attentively focused on her, listening to her as she finally, assertively expressed her ideas. At the end of the class, she remained a part of the group, focused, participating. This group showed a solid move toward cohesion by successfully bringing in a member who felt excluded; they used humor in dealing with a problem to release tension, not minimize the problem. A marginal voice spoke out, identified her problem, and
demanded to be heard. The group listened; in doing so, they moved through conflict and hostility toward cohesion.

Changing groups. Two of the changing groups I observed had moved from orientation toward cohesion, not simply exploring how to accomplish their task, but actually doing it, working on the outline to their essay. Both of these groups consisted of only two women (the other group members were absent). One woman spoke engagingly to the other the whole time; their dialogue was balanced with orientation to task, i.e., listing the cultural values found in the fairy tales they had read, and socio-emotional response, i.e., a discussion of weekend plans, many supportive nods, "rights," and "yeahs." The other group was involved in much the same type of socio-emotional talk--encouraging and supportive one woman to the other: "That's good!" "Yeah!" "We should try this. . . ," plus plenty of nods of approval.

As the class continued, a good interchange of information about their paper was interspersed with supportive comments. There was little conflict or disagreement between the two, just a good dialogue going. Both of these "groups" seemed to be engaged in a dialogic mode of collaboration (Lunsford and Ede, 1991). But a dyad is not a group.
Performance: Problem-solving, Goal-achieving

Permanent groups. Most of the permanent groups I observed were engaged in performing their writing task—to identify certain ideas and values from their readings. There was little personal conversation, simply task-related discussion occurring among most group members.

Changing groups. The conversation did not proceed as evenly among members in the changing groups. Several of these groups were more polarized, with dialogue occurring between two members instead of intra-group. The changing groups, however, seemed to accomplish their task; some were just less successful than others in accomplishing the task as a group.

Mid-semester Observations

By this time in the semester, the permanent groups had worked together for 7-8 weeks, and the changing groups were still working in their second group, both finishing their fairy tale/myth/cartoon paper (David’s options for his classes included cartoons on television). I randomly chose one group in each condition to observe first-hand; after getting their permission, I sat with them as they worked together in several concurrent class periods. In the permanent groups’ classes I observed two groups: Group A included Jennifer (an African-American), Debbie (a non-traditional student), Jeff (an Australian), and Scott;
Group B was composed of Bridget, Michelle, John, Tommy and Kelly (4th time class-taker discussed above). In the changing groups’ classes, I observed two groups: Group C was comprised of Gwynne, Tracy, Margaret (a non-traditional student), and Ron; Group D consisted of Sharon and Angelle (both non-traditional students), Brant, and Cliff (the dominating male who shut down the group cited above).

Overview

I continued to find a few more differences between the changing group and the permanent group classes. Whereas there was small evidence of behavior characteristic of orientation in the permanent groups, orientation was the characteristic behavior of the changing groups. Thus, the changing groups’ behavior did not seem to have changed much from earlier observations; they still reflected less cohesion than did the permanent groups. Both permanent and changing groups responded similarly to individuals who had not done their part; they attempted to exclude them, "write them off." But they did deal with conflict differently. The permanent groups were more vocal, less restrained in expressing their displeasure with the individual causing the problem; also, they were able first to express their feelings with humor added; their points were made, but at first with a smile.
However, in the changing groups, members kept their feelings guarded; there was more an underlying tension among members, an "unspoken" hostility than any expression of conflict. Despite obvious polarization, the changing groups still managed to write collaboratively and perform their task.

Orientation: Exploring the Task, Exchanging Information

Permanent groups. Even in the permanent groups, there was still some behavior reflective of orientation. It was particularly evident when watching the beginning of group sessions: exchanging information, deciding how to perform the task; even though they had written together before, they still occasionally returned to the "how are we going to do this" mode. Also, certain group members, especially some of the marginal voices, still showed a tentativeness in their response, with most of their participation either neutral questions or vocal and/or non-vocal nods of approval.

Evidence of behavior characteristic of orientation was Jennifer's (Group A) continued reluctance to speak. Jennifer, a marginal voice I had worried about, did have a difficult time making herself heard, especially by Debbie (and it was usually Debbie who was directing the conversation). Twice I noticed Jennifer try to contribute, attempting to answer Debbie, but Debbie didn't
look her way, just responded to Scott’s questions, "okayed" them, and went on her way to the next issue. In the first sessions, Jennifer spoke a few times, usually when Debbie directed a question directly to her, and then she did not hesitate to speak and once even pointed out Debbie was mistaken. Also, Jennifer asked few questions, one concerning the task, one concerning a student outside their group. When the group was reworking the draft Debbie had roughed out, though, Jennifer participated some in the discussion of organizational as well as lexical concerns. But usually Jennifer remained the quiet, marginal voice who seldom spoke. Though quiet, she never gave the impression she was disinterested or unfocused. She laughed, offered her "okays," "rights," and "goods"; she was just quiet. No one in the group made a concerted effort to draw her out. Along with everyone else, she was asked for her drafted contributions, which she always had, and questioned on them, but no one really encouraged her to speak more or pursued a lengthy conversation with her. When Debbie was present, Jennifer never seemed to feel comfortable enough to participate actively.

The other trace of behavior reflective of orientation appeared in permanent Group B (Michelle, Bridget, Kelly, John and Tommy), who spent a good deal of time exploring how they were going to tackle the task as well as a slight
friction among the members. On the first day of my mid-
semester observation, Group B was first supposed to
discuss the idea, then turn the idea into an essay. They
spent a good deal of time exchanging information,
brainstorming, discussing ideas, with Michelle recording
what they brainstormed. The group still had not decided
how they were going to approach physically writing this
paper. Bridget suggested they each write a paragraph
about what they had gathered information on and add
transitions on Friday. Kelly kept asking what the
paragraphs were to be about. Then he replied, "I've never
been able to say, 'Oh, I'll write the third paragraph.'"
As the class period drew to a close, Michelle said, "Okay,
everybody, write this down so you have copies of this"
(the outline she had been working on). John, who had
participated negligibly for most of the class, offered
sarcastically, "Yes, Mama." Michelle, having lost
patience, told the group, "We're gonna sit here a minute
until we get this straight. Everybody will write their
own paper and we'll put together separate drafts."
Besides showing how a group can still demonstrate behavior
representative of orientation, this conversation also
revealed the conflict within the group.

Changing groups. On the other hand, the changing
groups demonstrated more than a trace of behavior
characteristic of an orientation level of development or maturity. This was especially evident in Group C.

In Group C, both Gwynne and Margaret exhibited signs of self-discourse immediately, by each one informing the group of what she planned to do (without considering the others). They dominated the conversation, with Gwynne more the initiator. Both women directed their comments to all of the group members, and neither one hesitated to command attention. They had all done preliminary research for their essay on the cultural values portrayed in the cartoon, "Roadrunner." Margaret opened the group discussion by announcing, "I can do the introduction."

Gwynne immediately followed with, "I want to write the conclusion." She then began telling the other two group members (Tracy and Ron) to write the body of the paper; "... really just a paragraph each."

The group then began discussing the project: what values should appear in what part of the paper, who would write what. Throughout the group discussion concerning what information they were going to include in their paper, I heard many "right's," often offered as Tracy or Ron's attempt to participate in the group discussion, and their responses the only example of positive socio-emotional response; the conversation was almost totally oriented toward exploring their writing task. This lack
of socio-emotional involvement, their task-orientation focus is clearly seen in the group’s reaction to one of its members casually mentioning a personal problem. When they were trying to arrange a time to meet the next evening at the library, Gwynne unabashedly announced, "I have an AA meeting then." The only reply came from Ron who startlingly said, "You’re in AA?" "Yeah," she said matter-of-factly, and without any pause she returned the conversation to writing concerns. Nobody else said anything; no one encouraged her to reveal any more. Finally, in a tone more business-like than sympathetic, Margaret and Ron responded, "We’ll wait for you." Gwynne shrugged. They were all so guarded and protective and impersonal that Gwynne’s admission of attending an AA meeting--one personal gesture in the midst of a business meeting of strangers--surprised me. Yet they worked diligently on their writing project. Despite the lack of personal exchange, this group cohered enough to write collaboratively and accomplish their task.

Conflict: Disagreements, Resistance, Incompatibilities

Permanent groups. During my first session (this round) with permanent Group B, I sensed a growing polarization of members. Michelle and Bridget were determined to keep the group focused on their writing, an essay describing the cultural values represented in the
"Ninja Turtles" and seemed disappointed with their other members' endeavors. John and Tommy were quietly carrying on a conversation of their own and finally brought into the group's work by Kelly's eavesdropping. Several times Tommy did try to participate in the discussion, offering comparisons of the Ninja Turtles to the Wizard of Oz, but Bridget kept talking, making it difficult for him to be heard. He persisted though, without calling attention to the problem, and made his point.

While the group continued to work on the outline for their essay, Kelly did offer suggestions, did participate, but was doing so without having done the preparatory work to be a really knowledgeable participator. At times I thought he was participating more for my benefit than for the group's. Whenever Bridget or Michelle would suggest how he could contribute, what he should write, he had an excuse as to why he could not. He kept asking what the paragraphs were to be about; Bridget told him just to write up the information he had gathered (I don't think he had gathered any). Ignoring her, he replied, "Just tell me what you want me to do." Michelle interceded, explained the assignment and offered him some suggestions. Still at the end of class, Kelly appeared ignorant. Finally Michelle said, "Try to write something so we can get this thing done." Kelly unconvincingly agreed as he
headed out the door (before anyone else had risen to leave) saying, "Okay, y'all, I'll write and you can use what you can." Here was a "social loafer" (Williams, Harkins, & Latane, 1981), one who reduced his effort in hopes of being carried by the group; Kelly was beginning to irritate the workers in his group and potentially disrupt the cohesiveness.

When they reconvened, the other group members had taken their responsibility to the group seriously and each completed a draft—all but Kelly. Their task at this point was to see how they could use each other’s draft, selecting the best from each. After Tommy had read his introduction and thesis statement and received approval and "that’s good" from Michelle and John, Kelly jokingly announced: "I don’t know how to write a thesis statement." Michelle’s hostility was clear when she answered, "Maybe that’s why you’re doing this [taking English 102] for the fourth time."

The class period continued with Kelly questioning everything the rest of the group suggested. He kept asking them to explain to him "what we have created so far," despite the fact he had done no writing himself. Whether he sincerely did not understand or was simply seeking attention no longer mattered. Michelle, by this point, had eliminated him from the group; she said, "We’ll
tell you Monday when we’ve all finished." Kelly continued to criticize them, telling them he didn’t think they were on the right track and wanted to change direction. He was clearly overruled by the women who disagreed with him; they thought they were doing well, and besides, said Bridget, "It is too late"; "We just have to put it together," followed Michelle. Kelly was treated as someone not really interested, a social loafer not willing to expend any effort. When he was asked when he was returning to campus on Sunday, whether he could plan to join them, he said, laughing, "It depends on Saturday night." He was unwilling to make a commitment to work with his group. Still, before the group disbanded, they reminded Kelly about the time of the weekend meeting and jokingly gave him directions to the library. His last comment was "So what are we trying to figure out?"

Group A, the other permanent group, showed virtually no signs of hostility, and any conflict was more of a healthy disputation of ideas that demonstrated the group was alive and focused on their activity. Most members had overcome their inhibitedness, willing to risk participation. Debbie was the acknowledged leader, and always talking, as Jeff, with the slightest bit of edge to his voice said to me: "Say, let’s put it [the tape recorder] over here [directly in front of Debbie] because
Debbie is going to talk." Jeff was more playful, more distracting than the others, sometimes talking to his friend in another group, sometimes simply not "with" them because he had missed class due to baseball obligations (the season was just beginning and had not become a problem). Jeff’s behavior had not aroused any conflict—yet. But perhaps Debbie’s had.

**Changing groups.** Changing Group C began their next group meeting by revealing a definite lack of cohesiveness, the fact that not all group members felt the same responsibility to the group, and a polarization of individuals. Ron opened the session by reaching out to Tracy with an attempt at solidarity: "We did; we worked hard, didn’t we Tracy? We wrote a separate introduction. We were just sitting around last night and wrote it."

Just he and Tracy had showed up at the library, their pre-arranged meeting place. Even though Margaret had not gone to the library, she had herself written up a draft of her part of the paper. Gwynne had done nothing.

Gwynne then nonchalantly asked for her group’s phone numbers and apologized for not joining them the previous night. Ron then blushed and said, "When you call, ask for the ‘Love Machine’"; then he laughed. No one else was amused. No one in the group acknowledged or accepted her apology.
The group did not question Gwynne as to why she did not join them; rather, they acted disinterested. Also, there was no follow-up to Ron's attempt at a joke. Instead, after an awkward, brief silence Ron asked Gwynne what she thought of the introduction he and Tracy had composed.

Gwynne, trying to soften what seemed like strained relations, volunteered to write a rough draft, this time asking the group, "Does that sound good?" Margaret matter-of-factly said, "Whatever you said sounds good; I'm not typing." Then she talked about what she had come up with, saying to Gwynne, "I wrote this," and gave her the draft to read.

After reading over Margaret's draft, Gwynne offered to write up a particular point that obviously required less work than what Margaret had done, and Margaret responded rather pointedly, "Whatever's fair." After Margaret talked for a while about what she had constructed, receiving supportive "yeahs" from the group, Gwynne interrupted with another idea, something else that she would do; Margaret bristled: "That sounds more like what I did." Gwynne acquiesced, "Yeah, okay." Then she changed direction and began to focus on critiquing Margaret's section, offering minor editorial criticism,
making minor word changes and additions. No one attempted to smooth over any irritated feelings.

Tracy then tried to explain how she and Ron had constructed their part of the paper. Margaret told Gwynne to read both their drafts and see what she could incorporate of one into the other. After another moment of silence, Gwynne again took control, but this time with one of the few personal bits of conversation: "I need to hire somebody to keep me organized."

Rather than show solidarity with a "me, too," the group was silent; then Margaret replied quietly, straight-faced, "Yeah, a young male."

Smiling and encouraged, Gwynne continued, "With a G-string and shaved legs." Rather than lighten the group feeling with laughter, the remark brought more silence.

Ron disbelievingly said, "Yuck, you mean it? Takes some years to grow all that."

With a disgusted look on her face, Tracy brought the group back to task with, "Let's work on our paper and forget about shaved legs." So much for attempts at tension-releasing.

Showing her hostility to Tracy, who was mumbling something, Gwynne said, irritated, "Shhh, he's talking to me," when she could easily have heard what Ron said. She then took command, pen in hand, and waited for them to
tell her what to write. Shortly after, both Tracy and Ron reminded Gwynne that she had to write her own paragraph as they had, not just put the draft together. Relations still felt strained at this point in the session. Rather than openly confront Gwynne with her letting them down or accept her apology, it appeared that some, especially the other women, preferred to punish her.

Cohesion: Establishing roles, Relationships, Solidarity

Permanent groups. At this time in the semester, the clearest examples of groups acting cohesively were the permanent groups, especially Group A. Their cohesiveness was evident in the way they worked and related together, the roles they had established that enabled them to work efficiently together, and how they had learned to accomplish their writing. They had established the "norms" which controlled the groups' internal dynamics, enabling them to function effectively.

I visited their group three times in a row at this point, and each time Debbie opened the session, pulling the group together: "Okay, do y'all have this?" or "All right, guys, did y'all write?" There seemed to be a good feeling to this group; I felt immediately at ease joining them, listening in on their work, and they joked with me to make me feel comfortable. Debbie said to me, "Don't
mind me, I’m just the witch figure; I’m like the mouth of the south." She was aware of the role she played.

Debbie was the leader and had regulated the dynamics of the group from the beginning of the semester. From the moment the sessions started, Debbie held on to the control, and all conversation was directed through her. At times she acted more like a teacher-examiner than a peer, but did try to balance the controller role with the being just "one of the guys." Even though she would laugh at Jeff’s clowning antics, she would always be the one to re-focus the group to task. She helped keep the group from breaking into dyads, by directing her comments to all members, not just the one or two most vocal. Most often, though, the conversation was three-way among Debbie, Scott, and Jeff (Jennifer silent) with Debbie responding with a "that will work" to many of their suggestions. Throughout the sessions Debbie’s group members offered positive socio-emotional responses, such as "right," "yeah," and "okay." No real disagreement occurred among the group members.

Even though Debbie was the initiator/coordinator, and at times a dominator, she tried to show respect and to value her group’s comments and contributions. Her ideas did not have to dominate. As she read what group members had written, she would respond warmly, supportively; for
example, to Scott she said, "Oooh, I like what you wrote on transformations; I want us to use it in the paper. I like your temptations, too!" She didn't hesitate to acknowledge her own weaknesses, e.g., "my own transformations suck."

Throughout the sessions all Group A members' conversation seemed to balance the socio-emotional with the task concerns. There were frequent "okay’s?" (especially after each time Debbie offered a suggestion), "that’s good’s" "right’s" and the most frequently used pronoun was "we." Interspersed with the writing task concerns were personal concerns--talk about a member’s other classes, social activities, home responsibilities, job schedule, baseball schedule, etc. During this time the group also extended itself to Jeff, who had missed meetings due to baseball responsibilities. As soon as the first session began, Debbie would immediately give Jeff any handout he might have missed or any copy of group work they had completed. When she noticed Jeff was spending less time focusing on the issue at hand and more time trying to catch up on what he had missed, she rubbed his back and said, "Don’t worry; we’ll take care of you" (This was still only mid-semester).

Although initially Scott lacked Debbie’s self-confidence and leadership qualities, punctuating many of
his statements with question marks, he did actively participate, clarifying, offering suggestions, evaluating, and often acting as group recorder. There was a noticeable improvement, in fact, in the amount of his participation from the early observations until now. With Jeff’s increasing absences, Scott’s presence within the group was much more strongly felt.

In the permanent Group B, what could have turned into a dysfunctional group with two coalitions and a social loafer, did not. Four out of five of the members turned into active contributors. Tommy and John, who had seemed withdrawn in a prior meeting, both opened up, read their work aloud, and brought the two coalitions together. They and the women scheduled time outside of class to meet to collaborate on the final draft. Tommy and John would edit what Michelle and Bridget had put together. Kelly withdrew from the group and the class; he just stopped coming and failed the class.

Changing groups. The changing groups still had not built real cohesion within their groups. They were in the early stages of trusting each other, still not sure of the other members. Yet they were moving in the direction of cohesion. For example, in Group D, Sharon and Cliff had begun the conversation, Sharon having written a draft of her part of the paper for the group to look over. (In the
"Early Observations," in his previous group, Cliff had clearly dominated; he shared leadership in this group). When I first joined Group C, Angelle introduced Sharon with a "this is our group leader," which Sharon good-humoredly denied with a "Naaahhhhh." Cliff quickly changed the subject asking, "Who types?" Sharon immediately acknowledged she could, while Angelle said she could not, but would gladly pay someone. They did not settle the issue at that moment, but instead discussed the draft Sharon had written in terms of the guidelines for the paper (see Appendixes J, K, and L). They then recognized they needed to write an introduction. After spending a few minutes trying to put one together, they postponed this endeavor until all members had written their separate parts of the paper.

The group did not appear comfortable enough with each other or secure enough in the task to offer real criticism to each other. After Cliff had read Sharon’s draft, he passed it on to Angelle without making a comment. Sharon questioned him: "I’m on the right track?" "Yeah," he replied. No other criticism did he offer. Though Brant had sat focused, looked interested, read through Sharon’s draft and worked on composing an introduction, he had remained quiet for almost the whole class time; I wondered if he would speak at all when finally he broke his
silence, asking a neutral task-oriented question. All three members responded to him, with Sharon still qualifying her responses by ending them with an "I don't know." But Sharon had other concerns. She told her group,

I've never worked in a group before; I'll be afraid to tear someone's [work] apart. We're supposed to be openly critical. In 101 people told you, 'Oh, that's great!' I'm that way--especially when it's not going to affect my grade; but in a group it's going to.

Sharon set the tenor for the group. She balanced positive socio-emotional comments with her concerns for the task. Always qualifying her suggestions by questioning her own ability, she was careful not to impose on others in any way. When Annabel announced the time-out for journal writing, Cliff responded, "We need more time; it seems like we've only been in here 15 minutes." I left class with the feeling this group would achieve enough cohesiveness to perform their task.

Performance: Problem-solving, Goal-achieving

Permanent groups. In order to pass the class, all groups had to perform their tasks--ultimately, they had to write an essay together, share in the production of a document. But at this half-way point in the semester, the permanent groups had an easier time working together, knew
how to go about accomplishing their task, had learned what approaches worked for them and which did not. For example, in permanent Group A, Debbie suggested that they each put a few sentences together for a thesis statement. Jeff agreed, reminding them they had "tried to create a thesis statement together in the Milgram thing, and it didn’t really work." So they all agreed it was better to work on the thesis separately and then pull together. On the other hand, when they were writing the actual draft of the paper, they sat in a group, organizing their individual sections into one point-by-point comparison/contrast essay. There were debates among the members about what worked and what didn’t and why. The goal of this group was to maximize productivity; they strived to produce a high quality essay. And as research indicates, since they were a highly cohesive group and did have high performance goals, they were a highly productive group (Seashore, 1954).

**Changing groups.** Though Group C stormed and showed some hostility towards Gwynne, they did manage to work through their conflict, to cohere enough to perform their task together. With both drafts before her, Gwynne began to merge them, asking her group questions, such as "Can I use ‘we’?" Tracy said she didn’t think so, that this was more of an objective paper; Ron supported Tracy with a
"yeah." Margaret, impatiently said, "We told you that in the beginning. Did I use 'I'? No. Also, change from active 'we' to the passive, 'it is noticed.'" Then, after reading Tracy and Ron's part, she turned to Tracy and told her she "should cut these words out." Recognizing she might have sounded a bit harsh, Margaret added, "Of course, I'm the master of the longest sentence in the world." Tracy took her recommendations positively and made the changes. "How about this?" she asked, handing her paper to Margaret. Tracy and Margaret continued to work together, both of them taking turns offering suggestions and agreeing. At one point all three women searched for a word that best fit the exact meaning of what they were trying to express. Even a member of another group interrupted them with his suggestion. The class ended with Gwynne reading aloud as she worked a draft, Margaret and Tracy working together, and Ron focused on Gwynne. There was not a strong feeling of group solidarity or cohesiveness--no friendships were blossoming; however, they had achieved enough cohesion to complete this one task together. They would perform and then adjourn. That was all that was required of them; that was all they wanted.
End-of-Semester Observations

The last week in the semester the students had one final project to work on: to define the main idea and important sub-ideas of the course, comparing and contrasting how their readings contributed. The changing groups were now working in their fourth group.

Overview

As expected, major differences in group cohesion arose at this point. There seemed to be much more of an easy flow of communication occurring in the permanent groups, more conversation among group members, showing a balance between the task-oriented comments and socio-emotional responses. I observed them writing collaboratively, creating an essay, performing this task as a group. On the other hand, the changing groups spent much of their group class time working silently as individuals. In the permanent groups there was a much greater feeling group solidarity, of the task having become the responsibility of the group, rather than the weakly-connected product of individuals or the cohesive product of the dominant member. Conflict had been dealt with openly; whether it concerned someone not showing up at a designated time, group members arguing over the content, organization, or style of a piece of writing. Permanent group members, for the most part, had gained
enough trust in each other and respect for each other to disagree.

Orientation: Exploring the Task, Exchanging Information

Permanent groups. In the permanent groups, I observed no real evidence of behavior characteristic of this early stage of group development. The groups no longer even took time to decide how they would explore the task; they just started performing it. Even the marginal voices had lost their tentativeness, their questioning quality when they spoke. In Group A, Jennifer still remained quiet, but I did not sense the same guardedness I observed in the early sessions. When she spoke, she spoke assertively, not hesitating to disagree or to offer a differing opinion on how she would react.

Changing groups. The changing groups, however, displayed behavior more reflective of this early stage of group development. Group E began the session by all members working individually on outlines; they spent a good deal of group time looking through their individual journals to see what information they had collected. They then exchanged what they had written, except for Cliff who had not completed his work. Cliff's body language revealed he was not totally focused on his group. He kept leaning back, turning away, trying to hear what was going on in the other groups, especially those who were talking
with Annabel. The conversation seemed directed to and through one individual, Alisa, who acted as coordinator, rather than among all members.

**Conflict: Disagreements, Resistance, Incompatibilities**

At this point in the semester, I again observed marked differences between the permanent and changing groups: if and/or how they confronted and/or resolved conflict. Both permanent groups had worked through some conflict, especially arising from what they perceived to be "social loafing" behavior. Both permanent groups dealt openly with disagreements, differences of opinion, yet learned how to keep the conflict from escalating. Conflict, for the most part, turned out to have positive consequences, causing the group members to re-evaluate, come to a better understanding of the differences among them. The changing groups, on the other hand, showed very little conflict; they did not possess a strong enough commitment either to the group or the task to generate conflict.

**Permanent groups.** In permanent Group B, the main conflict, which had developed over Kelly's absences, his lack of involvement and responsibility to the group, was resolved when Kelly dropped the class right after mid-semester. Minor conflict arose when Michelle failed to give Bridget a draft to type on time, resulting in the
groups’ turning the paper in late. Rather than act apologetic, Michelle became defensive, saying she had done most of the work anyway, and stomped out of the class to get the paper. The conflict did not carry over from that day; the rest of the members were just surprised by her behavior.

In permanent Group A, conflict had developed, in part, from Jeff’s many absences (baseball obligations had begun around mid-semester) and his oftentimes distractive clowning when he was present. The group had tolerated his lapses to a point, but after mid-semester, somewhere near mid-April, the group was no longer amused. When the group was trying to arrange a meeting during spring break to work on their research paper, Debbie led the discussion, trying to schedule their meeting when she returned from her trip, mid-week. Jeff, casually mentioned he was playing baseball out-of-town that day and did not think he would make it back in time for their scheduled 6:00 p.m. meeting. (Debbie said she had to be home by 9:00 p.m.).

After realizing that it was impossible for him to be back (he was playing in Kentucky), Jeff asked what they were doing Thursday night?

Debbie coldly replied, "I’m watching television."

Jeff laughed, but persisted, trying to convince her to change the time, but she would not relent. Debbie
continued to talk about how much television she did not watch, while Scott and Jeff tried to figure out another convenient time. Debbie ignored them and continued to plan on Wednesday, telling Jeff he could join them when he got back, telling the rest of the group that they would have pizza and beer.

Jeff continued to act upset, though somewhat playfully, exclaiming a long "Naaah. I want to be there!"

Then Scott calmly suggested, "We can meet on Saturday night."

Debbie just said, "No!"

Jeff insisted emphatically, "We’re changing!"

Debbie had the final say: "No, we’re not. We’re leaving it that way."

Neither Scott nor Jennifer said anything. Jeff, giving up, said, "Okay, y’all decide."

Debbie, continuing with their task, noticed that Jeff had packed up and was getting ready to leave the room. Rather than try to assuage Jeff’s feelings, she just said, "He’s pouting."

He said, "They’re teasing me."

I, the "non-participating" observer, asked Jeff to stay with his group and he did. Debbie was irritated: "I could have gone to California, but because of this paper
I’m not." She was in no mood to be kind to Jeff but instead asked the others for their phone numbers, reminding them once again they would meet at Scott’s place at 6:00 p.m. Wednesday. She told Jeff she didn’t want his phone number because he didn’t want her to pick him up when he came in to town. Scott laughed but did not seem to attempt to bring Jeff back into the group with his next remark: "She doesn’t want you."

With that Jeff, in a mock-tragic voice cried, "My group doesn’t want me!"

Trying to be reassuring I said, "Sure they do."

He repeated, "No, they don’t. They know I can’t be here Wednesday night."

Scott finally eased the tension by telling Jeff to call him whenever he got home. The group digressed into a discussion of how far western Kentucky was—but no further overtures were made to Jeff. Since Debbie had been irritated with Jeff for a while, she sought to maintain group cohesiveness and resolve her conflict by forcing him out of the group--she almost succeeded.

By the last part of the semester, Scott rivalled Debbie in questions directed to the group. Also, the group spoke much more to each other, with not every comment going through Debbie. Scott was ready to press Jeff on Jeff’s comment that he did not really learn
anything; that he came to this class with certain values and they had not changed any. Scott, dissatisfied with Jeff's unwillingness to evaluate more closely, said, "Well, it made you take a good look at yourself and that's important." This time Debbie, not Jeff, interrupted the main task-oriented conversation with a digression on her dog's getting fleas from its stay at the kennels and how upset she was and what her husband was going to do, etc. Her group members placated her with a few comments about having fleas or not having pets.

But Scott persisted, having grown much stronger and assertive throughout the semester: "So, it [the Milgram experiment--how far people will go, i.e., inflict pain on others, to obey authority] caught your attention."

Jeff, refusing to acquiesce, said, "I didn't think about it at all. What did you think, Jennifer?"

Before she could respond, Scott interrupted: "You heard what I said. It made you evaluate yourself, take a good look at yourself." But Scott spoke kindly; there was little overt hostility toward Jeff at this point. Even when Scott and Jeff were arguing over who was supposed to be where and why Jeff was not where he was supposed to be, Scott made just a few comments, noting his displeasure, but not any real anger. The dispute ended in just a few
comments, and both he and Jeff returned to the task with no leftover tension.

**Changing groups.** In changing Group E, the only conflict I felt arose from Cliff's turning away from his group to carry on a private argument with Annabel; he was much more interested in impressing Annabel with his thoughts than helping his group complete the task. No one said anything openly to him; Alisa kept working and directing questions to the other three members, who had very little to say. There was no disagreement of ideas among the group members, just between Cliff and Annabel.

**Cohesion: Establishing roles, Relationships, Solidarity**

**Permanent groups.** In Permanent Group A, Debbie never did relinquish control of the group, steadfastly remaining the initiator and coordinator; but she was not the sole evaluator, nor information seeker or giver. Scott's participation increased steadily over the course of the semester; he provided and sought information as well as evaluated group procedures and products. Jennifer's participation increased as well, but not as dramatically as Scott's. She still remained the quiet participator, offering information, seeking information, but minimally. However, she always did her part of the group work, always remained focused on group activities. (Note: The one time Debbie was absent during a taped
session [between mid- and end-of-semester], Jennifer's participation improved dramatically; she became a fully contributing member).

I did not sense anyone playing the role of gatekeeper, one who encouraged and facilitated the participation of other members. When I was present, no one said, "Let's hear from . . . ." Yet there were plenty of supportive and encouraging comments, many "that's good's" or "right's," plus light-hearted shared laughter. At the beginning of the semester, I saw Jeff's role as harmonizer, tension-breaker, one who always found something amusing to say. I also felt he had good ideas to contribute, could act as coordinator or initiator, but in a sense was relegated to what he considered a "lesser" role due to Debbie's takeover. As time went on, I felt him withdrawing more and more from the group; he would still participate, but not as effectively as in the beginning. I would classify him as somewhat of a recognition-seeker, someone trying to call attention to himself in whatever way he could, usually by his off-handed comments. But the group functioned with or without him, filling him in on what was needed and expected. Again, Debbie remained the leader, opening the session with a question addressed to her whole group, "So what do you guys think?" But this session on their final group
project showed a shift in the active participants from the beginning of the semester. Scott replaced Jeff as the clarifier, the member to offer immediate task-oriented feedback on writing to Debbie. Jeff spoke less informatively, yet he did not hesitate to offer his opinion in this last group project (what is the central theme of the course--what have they learned). Jennifer spoke quietly, but participated more frequently than usual when Debbie was present, offering her opinion unsolicited, speculating what she would do in a certain situation (a subject in the Milgram experiment).

They worked cohesively, continually balancing a task-orientation with socio-emotional concerns. There was a feeling of comfortableness with the whole group that enabled irritations to be mentioned aloud, then passed over. Mainly, they talked and took notes about what they had learned from each writing assignment.

Changing groups. Group E, representative of the changing groups, exemplified a lack of cohesion. They never demonstrated a feeling of group unity; rather they operated as separate individuals who happened to be sitting together, trying (or not trying) to get the task finished.

There was initial joking and laughter at the beginning of the session as Group E read over what had
been written. Alisa was the initiator and coordinator, trying to put together what the others had done. As she read the members' drafts, she would ask for clarification; all group members contributed at various times. Cindy usually had to be asked specifically what she thought or to clarify a particular point, but she would contribute. Tending to be a follower, she needed to be drawn out. Ted was also more quiet, less tuned in to the group than the others. At times I thought he might even be working on something other than group work, but I was not sure. He seemed to be the avoider of the group, maintaining distance from the others, a passive resister.

This was the third group I had watched Cliff participate in. When I first observed him, I thought he would be an initiator, a leader; I thought he wanted to be an active contributor. But he had not tried to coordinate or initiate. He had just wanted the others to think that he was fully capable of leading, in fact, probably the most capable, but he had not shown the motivation or interest to do so. Here again the same scenario was repeated. When Alisa had trouble understanding Cliff's ideas, he interpreted her difficulty as a sign of her inability to unravel the complexity of his ideas, not his inability to express himself well. His individually written draft was only a few paragraphs long, much shorter
than the efforts of the others. He did participate in group discussion, but I sensed a restraint, a passive resistance to group work. At times he was at odds with his group members, disagreeing, seeming to reject ideas simply because they were not his ideas. Towards the end of class he digressed on the subject of final exams, spending time trying to determine the contents of the class’s exam rather than work on their project. Also, he was more interested in securing Annabel’s attention, arguing, debating with her, than he was in working with his group. Also, the balance between task orientation and socio-emotional response was not so smooth in Group E’s session. Two members were withdrawn, with Cindy usually directing her infrequent comments to Alisa, Ted conversing mainly with Cliff.

**Performance: Problem-solving, Goal-achieving**

**Permanent groups.** Group A, in its final sessions, all seemed honestly trying to wrestle with the task, spending the whole session brainstorming, reviewing what they covered, what they wrote, and trying to arrive at a thesis for this paper, the main theme of the course. Group A continued to stay on task, each contributing to the content of their draft, discussing what they had learned throughout the semester. Both Debbie and Scott asked an equal number of questions, with usually those two
or Jeff offering a response. The conversation was continually punctuated with affirmative, "yeah’s," "right’s," "okay’s." Their focus was how to work successfully on a group-shared product: they had learned to compromise, and they had learned responsibility to the group: "how to organize our time, our schedules; how to work outside of class together." They referred to the works they read, looking for the values each taught them as well as how the work connected to the overall theme of the course. Scott returned to Bartleby near the end of their discussion asking the group what they had finally decided about this work. I could sense the double meaning in Debbie quietly suggesting, "How to deal with problem people," and Jennifer agreeing "He [Bartleby] was a problem." Debbie continued, "How somebody of that nature can influence other people without your even knowing it" (I could sense a hinted connection to Jeff). During the last few minutes of class, the group digressed to a discussion of outside but common concerns. First, they compared their schedules for the next semester, asking what others thought of their anticipated instructors, etc., with all members, including Jennifer, participating. Jennifer then asked the group what they thought the final exam would be like, provoking a few comments, and then
they checked all their journals and folders for completeness.

**Changing groups.** In Group E, Alisa tried her best to accomplish the task with her group, but she seemed the only one really determined to perform, to achieve their goal. She read excerpts, writing down those parts of papers, paragraphs, sentences, that worked best. As she read aloud she asked the group for comments and criticisms, changes, additions, deletions, and word choice. They all did contribute to the task, but minimally; Alisa was the energy force pulling bits and pieces from them.

**Summary**

The major difference between what happened in the permanent groups and what did not happen in the changing groups can best be illustrated by one of the last conversations of Group A.

Revising the final group essay, Scott sought one last clarification from his group: "So what did we learn? Do we understand each other better?"

Debbie answered Scott: "We want to learn from each other; we learned to be more patient with each other."

Jeff: "Yeah, we can put that in there, too."

Debbie continued: "We learned to let others voice their opinion; we learned the responsibility of being
somewhere at a certain time and having the paper ready and how you worked under the stress of being with another person. . . . When you work with a group of people, you get mad at yourself and everybody else too," she said laughing.

The process had become the product; this permanent group had recognized that the value of this class was the process they had been involved in, not in any tangible product they had produced. From their comments above (and despite Debbie's, at times, heavy-handed leadership), they had become, in a sense, dialogic communicators: those who understood that the group process in which they had been involved was an essential part of the knowledge they had produced, not simply a technique to recover knowledge from outside themselves. What they had learned about writing they themselves did not vocalize, perhaps because they could not, nor do I believe we can, separate process from product. The extent of what they learned about "writing" may not even be measurable from the limited means of this experiment, but appear in their future performance.
WHAT THE STUDENTS SAW

This chapter presents quantitative and qualitative data obtained from the students throughout the semester and describes how what the students saw confirmed, altered, or denied what the researcher saw.

The quantitative data consists of an attitude survey given to all students at the end of the semester. The qualitative data consists of student responses collected from their journals, evaluative essays, final exams, and personal interviews at the end of the semester.

Quantitative Data: Attitude Survey

The items on the Attitude Survey (see Appendix 0) were used to construct four attitude scales: (a) attitudes towards own writing--items 1, 2, and 3; (b) attitudes towards what was learned about writing--items 5, 6, 7, and 8; (c) attitudes towards class in general--items 12, 13, and 14; and (d) attitudes towards group work (only scored for those in group conditions)--items 10, 11, 15, 16, and 17. The students' own attitudes toward writing, attitudes toward learning, and attitudes toward class scales were each analyzed in a 2 (teacher: David or Annabel) X 3 (condition: permanent, changing, or individual) ANOVA. The only significant effect occurred on the learning about writing scale where there was a significant effect for condition, $F (2, 104) = 3.06$, $p <$
.05. As can be seen in Figure 6, students reported greater learning about writing in the permanent group condition than in the other two conditions. Post-hoc tests using the Newman-Keuls procedure revealed that the permanent groups' score was significantly higher ($p < .05$) than both of the other conditions, and the changing group and individual conditions were not significantly different from each other.

The attitudes towards group work scale (only computed for those in the changing and permanent group conditions) was analyzed in a 2 (teacher: David or Annabel) x 2 (condition: permanent or changing) ANOVA. There was a significant effect for teacher, $F(1, 73) = 4.44, p < .039$. The means revealed that there was a more positive attitude towards the group work in Annabel’s classes ($M = 20.32$) than in David’s classes ($M = 18.56$).

Qualitative Data

The qualitative data includes students' responses from their journals, evaluative essays, personal interviews, and final exams. This information was collected from students in the permanent and changing groups.

Journals. Though students were supposed to write in their journals following every group session in class,
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and were allowed five minutes at the end of class to begin their entries, very few students wrote complete entries (a full page) as often as required. The average number of entries per student varied from a low of 2.5 in David's permanent groups to a high of 4.1 in Annabel's changing groups. Most entries were less than half a notebook page long. As stated earlier, the journals were multi-purpose: in addition to providing a place for evaluation of collaborative activities, these journals were used for keeping homework, summaries of articles, sections of essays, even class notes (see Appendix S). When the journals were collected at mid-semester, the teachers and I realized that we needed to find a "safer" place for students to feel free to evaluate group activities. The journals were a good source for providing a "paper trail" on students' contributions to the group project but did not provide us with much specific information as to how the groups were working. We decided to require evaluative essays following each group project. (Note: Even though we no longer required students to evaluate group activities in their journals after mid-semester, some continued to do so).

Evaluative essays. The first evaluative essay was written during one whole class period; the succeeding essays were completed for homework. Annabel's classes
completed four, beginning at mid-semester and concluding with the final group project. David's class turned in two, one at mid-term, one at the end of the semester (due to David's apparent misunderstanding). Students seemed to be much more honest in these essays. They vented problems they had had in their groups, personality clashes, participation lapses, absences, etc. Even though these essays were written for the "teacher-as-examiner" audience, students did not show much hesitation to complain if they were dissatisfied with their groups or with the group process in general. There seemed to be an openness, a sincere desire to communicate in these essays that was missing from the journals. Throughout the semester we had reminded the students that they had been chosen to take part in an experiment, that we were trying a new teaching method, and we needed and valued their critical evaluation.

**Personal interview.** Another source for gathering information from the students was the personal interview. I randomly chose sixteen students to interview, four from each permanent and changing group section. The students were interviewed in my office, during the last week of school and the first week of final exams. I followed the same interview format for each student, asking the same questions (see Appendix P) and typing their responses on
my computer as they spoke. I told them before we began that these interview notes would not be seen by their teachers, that they were to be used as part of my dissertation data only. I thanked them profusely for giving up an hour at this busy time in the semester, and they seemed happy to do it, eager to talk of their experiences, good and bad.

**Final exam.** The final exam also provided information as to how students responded to their course. They had been given the prompt, "How were your beliefs and values challenged or reinforced?" Many students took this opportunity to summarize what they had learned from participating in a collaborative writing process instead of concentrating on the factual information they had received.

I integrated the data from the four sources of student response in this section, distinguishing the original source of the response by the following: journals (j), evaluative essays (e), personal interviews (i), and final exam (f). I sought answers to the following questions: Did the students find writing groups efficacious? How did students' attitudes differ whether they were in permanent groups or changing groups with respect to how their groups functioned; I categorized their responses as follows: orientation--how
their behavior reflected characteristics of "forming," exchanging information through polite discourse, and exploring the task; conflict--how much and what kinds of problems students discussed, and how they dealt with their disagreements; cohesion--how students found unity, and how they established roles and relationships within their groups; performance--how students mutually cooperated to writing collaboratively. In the "End-of-Semester" responses, performance drew mainly from the students’ responses to their final exam prompt; here students revealed what they learned from the course.

Early Responses

Overview

The main source of student responses for the first half of the semester were student journals. The journal entries were characterized by an enthusiasm for the class, but a lack of real substance in what students observed happening in their groups. After reading the first few journal entries, I found negligible differences between the permanent and changing groups. All but a very few entries were a page or less (usually less); students did not appear to use those five minutes just to begin their entries, but to finish them as well. For the most part the entries were as general and uninformative as they were brief and impersonal.
These early entries do show most students are enthusiastic about group work and even those a bit skeptical are willing to give it a chance. There is little evidence of conflict; students mention "avoiders," but no more hostility than that. Most entries suggest groups beginning to attain a solidarity, a cohesiveness, with little differences occurring between the permanent and changing group reports. Students did report that despite problems, groups did accomplish their tasks.

Permanent Groups

Orientation. In this initial period, students were hesitant to evaluate other students. For instance, a typical entry would say,

The group is working pretty good. We can relate to each other. We are going to do good together.

Today we basically got to know each other and the differences between us. But as far as I can see we are going to do good.

Or the entry might reveal an initial skepticism for the process: "I came to group work with mixed feelings, but I think it will work out."

Conflict. Rarely was any group conflict revealed in these early entries; however, this lack of acknowledgement of conflict did not mean lack of conflict. For example, Bridgette (interviewed) was
having a great deal of trouble with Agatha, a non-
traditional student in her group, who picked on her
openly in class and complained to the teacher about her
lack of work. But Bridgette’s journal entry read: "I
thought our group communicated well. It is going to be
easy going. I think we will work good together.
Everyone had a different opinion about the story we read
and had some real good points." In no entry was there
any mention of a conflict with Agatha. (Note: After
Agatha complained to Annabel about Bridgette, Annabel
called Bridgette in to discuss the problem; Bridgette
then discussed the conflict with Annabel).

Cohesion. As depicted in the polite discourse of
orientation cited above, many students described their
groups as operating cohesively. "Even better today than
last week," said Scott (Group A). "We can really work
together and help each other pull ideas out of our
heads." Even this early in the process, group roles
did emerge, and the students were aware of them. As
Troy’s (interviewed later) one-page entry indicated: "As
a group most of us function well. Everyone attends class
regularly. We have done a few projects for research and
everyone appears to be doing his part. Our group varies
from initiators to followers and avoiders." He followed
with a categorization of his group members according to those roles.

**Performance.** Students wrote optimistically about the likelihood of performing well together. Scott's (Group A) entry revealed the group can perform without all its members: "Group work--missing a member of the group wasn't crippling. We could still function productively and get our work done. Although feedback from all group members is better than just from one or two, we did fine." Very few journal entries delineated how groups actually performed the task, or how they composed the assignment. Rather, they discussed how well the group did perform the task. Both Jennifer and Jeff (Group A) noted how well the group worked when Debbie was absent: Said Jeff: "Our group worked fantastically, we did more work today than we have all semester. I think we should kick Debbie out of our group. Just jokes." Jennifer noted on the same day's entry: "We pretty much worked together trying to finish what we thought needed to be turned in today. . . . We did not have much talking we were majorly [sic] rushing to finish. As a whole we did well, even though Debbie wasn't there." (Note: Debbie was the self-proclaimed leader of Group A).
Changing groups

There were few differences between these students' observations and the students in the permanent groups. There was only one student in all four sections who mentioned any kind of problem or conflict, and he happened to be in a changing group. From the beginning this student was hostile to the idea of group work, and his attitude did not change much throughout the semester. Cliff complained in his first entry:

Our group is bogging itself down. We all agree on the first idea that is stated to avoid complications. We can't get our ideas down in paragraph form. . . . The group is not achieving its goal. We have a big problem--delegating authority, nothing gets down. 'Somebody get this on paper.' We all look at each other in blank stares. They won't delegate, then I will." (he did; see Chapter 3)

Mid-semester responses

Overview

When we (the teachers and I) collected and examined the students' journals at mid-semester, we were disappointed in the length and depth of their entries concerning their reactions to group work. Most were less than one page in length and offered very little detail as
to what actually occurred in their groups. There was more restraint than we had expected.

Writing their candid responses to group work in a journal was risky for the students. These were multi-purpose journals, filled with homework assignments, summaries, contributions to group projects, etc. It was not only possible but probable that other group members would be reading their journals. How could we expect total honesty if we were hoping groups were working to build trust and cohesion? One of the permanent group members, Tiah, expressed this reluctance to evaluate peers in one of her last journal entries:

In closing, I would like to mention some difficulties I have faced personally. I have found it very distressing to evaluate the members of my group. As friends with the group members, it is hard for me to be honest with myself about the participation of each individual, especially in writing. Others ask to see my journal, and I don’t feel quite comfortable stating any negative comments about specific persons.

After reviewing the journals, the teachers and I decided to have the students write their observations and evaluations directly to the teacher as audience. We required students write an essay evaluating group
processes following the completion of each remaining group project.

Some evaluative essays were written in-class; some were written outside of class. As an evaluative tool for the students, the essays allowed them more freedom to describe what was occurring in their groups. In these essays, students gave more details, hesitated less to be critical of their group members, and were generally more analytical. Further, students took more time and care with these essays knowing they would be graded and returned to them with comments.

Along with their essays, students were encouraged to fill out a peer assessment sheet (see Appendix N), rating their group members, and a role behavior recording form (see Appendix E). There were no surprises on these ratings; students were, for the most part, rated highly, unless they did something to irritate the group, e.g., miss class, miss group meetings outside of class. Their ratings corresponded with their evaluative essays, the teacher’s observations, and my observations.

These essays did show some differences between the permanent and changing groups. The permanent group members gave in-depth analyses of what had occurred in their groups, noting how people had changed over the course of the semester, for better or for worse. There
was little hostility, just good critical evaluation of performance. On the other hand, the changing group essays depicted group experience in general, still comparing and contrasting with previous groups, but not going into as much depth, or showing as much analysis of performance as did the permanent group essays.

What both permanent and changing groups shared was the indication that students learned in both these class. Essays from both groups demonstrated that for many students, the process of education had become the product.

Permanent Groups

Orientation. Most of the permanent group members revealed more than polite discourse in their evaluative essays. They were ready to have a "safe" format for expressing how they felt about their experience. Only a few, like Jennifer (Group A), continued to write politely in general terms, not revealing much feeling about her group members, just how group work helped individuals.

Conflict. Students evaluated one another basically on their participation in the group--did they contribute? Some students labelled (j) their problem members "blockers" and/or "avoiders" according to their role description guide. In Group B Michelle unleashed her resentment of Kelly (j):
Well, Kelly has totally dropped out of our group which proves to be real interesting. He definitely is an avoider, for he maintains distance from the group. He wants what he can get out of us, but he is not willing to contribute to make a good grade. It is very upsetting to the rest of the group because we were counting on him to help out. . . . I feel like I cannot trust the others in the group to do everything they need to do (I'm usually right with my worries in this area.)

In Group A, Debbie, though she herself saw herself as an encourager, came across (e) as the most critical member of the group, the most willing to reveal any problems or incompatibilities the group had. Debbie identified two problems in their group, Jeff and Jennifer (e):

Jeff is an extremely outgoing person who says exactly what is on his mind. The first two or three weeks of class he was wonderful in the role of initiator. He was always presenting new ideas to our group. However, when he fell into the role of evaluator, we all wanted to strangle him. He thrived on the logic and procedure of each and every idea we would present to the group. We were spending entirely to [sic] much time on Jeff analyzing our
thoughts and were not accomplishing anything on our projects. Therefore, I became the dominator of the group and persuaded Jeff into spending more time on solving problems in lieu of evaluating them. This is when he became the harmonizer. When we would think there was no hope of finding a solution to a problem, Jeff would say or do something to make us all feel that there was always hope. However, Jeff would usually get out of hand and we would lose valuable time. Eventually, he became a blocker and presented negative thoughts to the group. However, I believe this was due to him [sic] frequently missing class. When he would come to class, we did not have the time to explain our past discussions. Therefore, he lost interest in the projects and only wanted to goof off. . . . The avoider in our group was Jennifer. She did not respond to any ideas nor did she offer any ideas. We would ask her opinion on each idea and still there would not be a response. Therefore I took on the role of gatekeeper and encouraged Jennifer to express her ideas. Surprisingly, she reversed her roles and became a coordinator as well as an encourager.

**Cohesion.** Roles have been fairly solidly established in most permanent groups. Also, students
seemed to adapt easily to absent peers; the remaining members solidified their relationships, and sometimes the quiet participators began to speak. Once Agatha dropped the class, Bridgette’s group began to cohere (j):

Sondra and I worked very well today. We got our assignment organized. We got a lot of stuff accomplished even though one guy was absent and a lady dropped the class.

Group A had established the roles group members played early in the semester. Scott reported how they had achieved the cohesion to perform (j):

Our group is basically following the same roles it usually does. Debbie really likes to talk and lead things will [sic] Jeff and Jennifer supply the needed information when it is time to use it. I like to mediate things, give input, and take over leadership if I necessarily have to. Work today followed that same pattern. I think we have finally figured out where we all do the best in our group.

Other Group A members characterized the group much the same way. Jeff wrote (e) that "each group member has developed certain roles and to a certain extent, has stuck" to those roles. He was positive in his assessment of Debbie as assuming the most important roles in the group with just a hint of her domineering behavior
in this remark: "... she makes sure everything is
being done and wants it done to her own very high
standard." He agreed with the rest of his group about
Jennifer being the follower: "Jennifer is the quiet one
of the group, and prefers to just go along with everyone
else. She is our encourager and ... follower." Jeff
saw himself as Scott and Jennifer did, as "information
giver" and "harmonizer" (but also as coordinator):

... I am the Information giver as I relate my own
experience to the project. I am also the
coordinator and Harmonizer as I keep the group as a
group and made everyone feel relaxed and
comfortable.

Basically, he viewed his group as functioning cohesively.

Performance. Permanent groups had established a
methodology for accomplishing their task. For example,
Scott (Group A) explained (j):

Everybody (that was here) was really active today.
We got right to work and developed our introductory
paragraph. The group pattern has set itself into a
groove and will probably not change.

Many members of permanent groups stated that they learned
from their group members and from the experience. They
learned by being able to problem solve together, to
cooperate with one another to achieve their goals. Jeff
(Group A) expressed the positive feeling of most permanent group members (e): "The group has learnt [sic] a lot from each other and seems to put forward a lot more quality work than it probably would if it weren't for each one of us." Scott (Group A) detailed what he had learned:

... I feel I have learned from this group. Each member has taught me new ways and methods for developing a paper. Debbie has taught me leadership, as well as responsibility. Jennifer has taught me compatibility as well as writing skills. Jeff has taught me to speak out with information, even if you feel you are wrong.

**Changing groups**

**Orientation.** Though the journal entries continued to be mediocre, giving little more than polite information, the evaluative essays showed more analysis. Similar to the permanent groups’, these essays showed little guardedness, rather an eagerness to inform the teacher what was going on. Rather than compare/contrast how people within their groups had changed/not changed, they compared/contrasted the previous group experience to the current one. Excerpts from one student’s essay typifies many students’ reactions--how she began skeptical, but later opened to the process:
When we first started talking about working in groups during class, I really did not like the idea. I did not feel that working with a group of people would help me because of the lack of communication that may occur.

Her closing paragraph, several pages later stated:

After working with both groups I have realized that I was wrong about group work. I now see that it can work out better if you all just try to communicate with each other. Ever since we started working together I realized that this could help me out on my papers. I realized that you could get more information and facts by having more than one person.

**Conflict.** Changing group students followed much the same pattern as the permanent groups, opening up in their essays and contrasting group experiences. Students did not show how they resolved any conflict, just that the conflict existed. Ben, for example, in contrasting his first group to his second said (e), "The difference ... is like night and day." He detailed the treatment he received from two of the three females in his group: "Without exception, my suggestions were met with subtle contempt and total disregard. ..." His essay was well-illustrated and proved his point. He even mentioned
how one of the members would not address him directly, but would ask someone else: "'Ben might be able to use this information. . . . What do you think?' This makes me feel alienated from the group. Humans are social animals, after all." So Ben's conflict was easily resolved with just the change of a group. The members themselves did not have to work through their conflict for very long, just long enough to get one paper written.

Other problems arose from some members resenting the "know it all types." Angelle (Group C) implied she was over-powered or at least over-shadowed in her second group as she demonstrated the roles members played (e):

"Sharon was definitely [sic] the coordinator. She was also the initiator contributor and main information giver. She basically ran the show. Cliff was one of these know it all types; he did not know it all!"

Cohesion. Students wrote (e) about how they learned to establish roles and standards while dealing with the differences they encountered working in two groups with new sets of members. They learned the importance of working with difference and working toward cohesion. Tracy (Group D) illustrated (e) how she learned to accept and to work with someone she initially did not like.

When Gwynne (Group D) first entered the group I dreaded the thought of having to work with her
because she seemed like a "know it all" [probably from Gwynne's outspokenness in the classroom]. After working with her a couple of days, I learned to block her out when she bothered me. I later learned she wasn't all that bad. . . . The paper, to me, turned out pretty good. The group also turned out to be enjoyable.

Performance. The changing groups continually had to re-establish a methodology for performing their tasks, acquaint themselves with new members and trust them enough to succeed. Sometimes groups had difficulties; Cliff described his groups' endeavors (e): "--these group discussions are like climbing a sand hill. Working as hard as you can, but discouraged by lack of progress. We are making progress, but not as much as I would like."

But the final result was positive; the group did learn how to write: "Sharon - Angelle--they had the paper ready for Brant and myself to revise and type. Brant - Cliff--. . . We made final punctuation and word usage adjustments."

Students in changing groups had learned to trust each other in a short time to achieve their goal. After detailing the roles her group members played, one student explained what she had learned (e):
This group work has taught me how to get along with others and be understanding. It has also taught me to trust people. I had to trust the people in my group to do their part. It was very difficult for me because in the past my groups have let me down. Being in these groups has restored my trust in others.

End-of-the-Semester Responses

Overview

"The longer the groups worked together, the better they worked," responded many students interviewed in both permanent and changing groups. Many of the students in permanent groups observed how much more they and other group members opened up over the course of the semester; many of the changing group members complained about having to change groups. Just when they were beginning to feel comfortable with their group members, the groups changed. The "marginal voices" I interviewed expressed that view, in particular. On the other hand, some members of changing groups liked switching groups. They felt that each succeeding group worked better than the previous one. Overall, though, more changing group members would rather to have stayed with their "best" group than to have switched.
Conflict was handled differently in the two groups. The permanent groups worked to resolve group conflict one way or the other--either the disinterested student (usually the source of the conflict) dropped the course or became a more active participant in group activities, often pulled in by the group. On the other hand, changing groups often ignored group conflict. Students did not deal openly with hostilities, assuming they would soon be with a new group of people, thus any problems would be resolved via group change. Another difference between the two groups appeared to be the cause of the conflict. In the permanent groups, lack of participation and/or excessive absences initiated most problems. In the changing groups, however, personality clashes were the more frequent complaint.

Trust and cohesion grew among the permanent group members, with stronger relationships formed among them than those formed in the changing groups. Many permanent group members mentioned they had formed solid friendships, both inside and outside of class. Some also revealed they had moved beyond initial prejudices against certain group members based on appearance and discovered they had erred in their judgment. Few, if any, of the changing group members discussed having formed strong friendships. In general, there seemed to
be less complaining from members of permanent groups. Despite some members' failure to perform in the beginning of the group work, these members either dropped out or worked to achieve the group goal. Students commented positively (i) on the balance of work-load, saying it was equitably distributed among members. They seemed more pleased with the outcome of the course, what they had learned, and the relationships they had formed than did the changing group members. (Note: In this section Performance reports what the students said they learned from their classes; it concentrates mainly on data collected from the final exam prompt, "How have your beliefs and values been challenged in this course?").

Permanent groups

Orientation. Most of the students agreed that the longer they worked together, the better they worked together (i). Said Scott [the Australian],

At first we were all a bit tense and all; we didn’t want to offend anyone; we didn’t want to appear to other group members to be loud-mouthed; so everyone was sort of polite to one another; we were polite at the end, but we could talk to one another more freely.

... After the first couple of papers everyone felt comfortable with one another and they participated.
They noted how some of their group members and themselves lost their inhibitedness, their restraint over the course of the semester and became active participants. Scott spoke (i) about Tequila: "... the two girls in the group were quiet at first, Tequila, in particular. Towards the end she came out of her shell." Tommy admitted (i), "I was shy at first, but after we got into debates and discussions, it was easy [to express my opinion]." David said (i), "I was hesitant to trust the group, but once everybody got familiar with everybody [we] had the feeling it was going to go good."

Students learned to trust group members whom they were initially prejudiced against, for one superficial reason or another. Troy, the inadvertent leader of a group, while commenting on influential group members, showed how his initial prejudice had been dispelled (i):

Jimmy was instrumental, not influential; he helped to make my role a lot easier. ... I knew that if I couldn’t rely on someone else I could rely on him. Long, blond hair down the middle of his back. I don’t think he was a liberal--I think he was probably just as conservative as me. I’m sure I had some prejudging there like ‘why doesn’t this guy get a haircut and look like the rest of us?’--me and Jimmy are good friends now.
Conflict. By the end of the semester, the permanent groups opened about problems they had encountered. Debbie (Group A), for instance, in a four-page evaluation (e) of her group, did not hesitate to assail Jeff:

Jeff . . . has been a total attitude problem the last couple of weeks. I am not sure if he feels left out or he just does not care if the paper is done or not. Perhaps he has been having problems elsewhere that has [sic] caused his personality change or since he never reported to class we sort of excluded him from our conversations. It is extremely difficult to accomplish anything in a class meeting when [you] constantly have to repeat what transpired the last class meeting to an absent student. Therefore, our group discontinued asking Jeff for his help. However, we tried repeatedly to get him to attend one of our out-of-class meetings. He always had other obligations and could not make the meetings even when we tried to rearrange our schedule to meet his [see Chapter 5 for my contrasting taped observations]. Basically, Jeff was the blocker in our group. He transformed from being a high-spirited young man with lots of energy, into an unreasonable, self-centered person. Jeff reported he had been shut out of his group (e):
Debbie did not give me a copy of our group project. Why is it that in our society when someone is in the wrong, it is automatically assumed that the suspect that is thought of as being the less responsible or less intelligent, is the one to blame? During the semester, I have found my group to be very good to work with and interact socially with. On occasion though, our dominant personality group members have clashed in some way and this is going to happen. What is needed though is group resolvement; not encouragement on one particular side, which only aids to fuel the fire.

Two dominant personalities clashed, resulting in one member being thrust out: the other’s resolution of differences which enabled the group to perform their task. While some of the permanent groups did have conflict, some wished they had had it. When I asked students who played the major roles in their groups, Beth replied (i), "We really didn’t need a harmonizer--we never had any conflict." She later said that the lack of conflict was a problem. "Things were accepted too much." Scott also had the same complaint from working with his group. When I asked about how the group resolved differences of opinion, he stated (i):
There were no major differences of opinion. I think lack of opinion was the main problem. It would have been better for the group if there had been differences because it would have brought about discussion; there was no discussion; obedience to authority, I guess.

When I asked if people discussed feelings openly with one another he said (i), "No, perhaps I should have said something about being tired of being the leader..."

Later, Scott wrote (f) that being the leader "is not always easy... and often I did not lead my group in the right direction."

**Cohesion.** Cohesive permanent groups showed little signs of polarization, but instead a communication network extending group-wide. Permanent groups gave their members a sense of belonging. Said one student (f): "...in my group I felt a sense of belonging. I felt like this is my group and this is my place that I always sat." Students in permanent groups saw what belonging to a group could inspire in its members. Troy found (i) that "it [group work] has the ability to encourage students to improve where they wouldn't on their own because there are other people relying on them." Many students echoed Troy’s feelings, writing
about how the group developed a trust in and a responsibility to one another.

Permanent group members stated that they learned to value, respect, and listen to group members' opinions, often very different from their own. Chandra said (f):

... There wasn't a she's white, she's black thing. It was she's Chandra and she's Becky. We were all accepting of one another and supportive of the very different ideas each person contributed. That also made the group flow real easy.

Performance. From (f) "learning others had the same fears," to acknowledging a "moral responsibility to stand up for what I believe," and finding the confidence when "I was never bold enough to express those feelings," students (especially those in Annabel's class) tied their critical readings to their own development. Jennifer (Group A) learned (f)

... values that I did not have before. ... , like treating everyone in the group with respect, treat them as you would want them to treat you, and listen to whoever has anything to say.

These students were not the exception; they typified the types of response to the course written in the final examinations. The exams reflected the same openness they had established in their classroom. (Note: David's
class focused more on the course content, the
information, than on the group process they had been
involved in even though both Annabel and David's classes
had received identical instructions).

Changing groups

Orientation. Changing group members showed more
evidence of restraint at the end of the semester than did
the permanent group members. After a semester of working
with different people, Tyika (e) still maintained, "I
enjoyed working on the research paper in this group, but
things didn't get personal. I don't know about the
others in the group, but I'm a little skeptical about
interacting with new people." Cindy also admitted (i)
that she was "holding back." "It takes a lot for me to
get into something and start telling how I feel. I have
to get really used to you. I want to know exactly what
I'm talking about before I say something." Later on in
the interview she acknowledged that sometimes she would
remain quiet "because I didn't want to argue with Cliff."

Many of the students agreed with Alisa (i) who stated

... participation was not good at first because
nobody wanted to be in groups. Afraid of people
loafing ... In the middle everybody was glad.
But at the end, the last paper, God, not another
group. Let's just get it over with. We had got to a group we really worked well with and it was aggravation to go to a new group.

**Conflict.** Whereas in the permanent groups conflicts arose due to absences and lack of participation, in the changing groups, conflicts appeared more often due to a clash of personalities, usually dominant personalities. Both Alisa (i) and Cindy (i) discussed their dislike of working with Cliff. Alisa saw him as an anti-group person who never accepted his role as a group member.

Cliff hates group work and thinks that he should be able to do individual work. He talks to Mrs. Servat and tries to distract her, to get her to talk about stupid stuff, far-fetched stupid ideas that have no connection to what we are doing.

But Alisa admitted the group never confronted the problem:

Hostilities were not brought out in the open. They were looked over because we knew we were going to change groups. I suppose if he [Cliff] was in my group again, I would have told him, but Cindy would never have told him anything [twice with Cliff].

Also, Cindy said the groups avoided certain topics (i): feelings for one another--especially when I was in groups with Cliff. We just overlooked that; didn’t
talk about it. Nothing really discussed in our group. We'd just turn our head and roll our eyes. Changing groups did not have to resolve their conflict; they could ignore their problems; they would disappear once the groups changed. All they had to do was finish one task; permanent groups did not have that alternative.

Cohesion. Students observed not only how differently each group cohered, but how their own roles altered with the change of groups. Rhonda noted (e): "I have never been the type of person to speak up, but in this group [the last] I found myself sometimes playing the coordinating role. And, it actually felt wonderful." They saw the value of certain roles in establishing group solidarity (e): "Students feel more comfortable talking to other students than the teacher. Students can even play the role of the teacher by helping them [other students] understand and learn more about the assignment." Some students, especially the non-traditional, did not expect the changing groups to develop enough cohesiveness to perform. Said Kim (e): "These people come from radically different backgrounds and just could not come together to produce a quality paper." After a semester of working with groups she admitted: "Throughout the course of my schooling, I have
never learned more or enjoyed a class more than Mrs. Servat's group class."

Many students in changing groups found their groups improve each time they changed, as Jake articulated: "I think that the more groups people work with, the better they become at group work." Cyndi echoed (e): "Since the beginning the groups have gotten better; everyone has learned what is expected of them in group work." Perhaps Sharon best targeted what motivated the changing groups toward cohesion: "The task pulled the group together."

Performance. In their final analyses of the class, students thematically tied their critical readings to what they practiced: how to maintain individuality while belonging to a society. Many recognized the importance of balance in collaboration. Alisa's insights (e) connect the product with the process of education:

Bartleby could not balance his individuality with society and eventually died. Milgram's learners were more concerned with how society viewed them instead of how they viewed themselves. Though we need to [be] individuals, we must take our individuality and link it with society in order to make a total person.

Collaborative work forced us to do our individual work and relate and put it together with
others. The purpose was not only to put it all together piece by piece by [sic] to make it relate and coincide with each other.

Working together and understanding, not necessarily accepting, others [sic] views helps us to become able to function as a person in society. Jake, an ex-Marine, reiterated her claims (f): "It is important to stand out from the crowd, and to keep your individualism, at the same time you play your role in society."

Students learned (f) "how to compromise," how to "be more flexible," that "all people are not the same. Everyone has their own ideas on many issues, and others have to be open and expect it." They learned to expect differences: changing groups reflected the changing society they would encounter. They also found benefits. Tyika noted the interpersonal rewards she received:

All it did was to teach me how to work better with people. This was the first time I worked with people of different racial backgrounds. In public school in New Orleans . . . the majority of kids were blacks, also college [was the] first time that I sensed being a minority. I was more on the quiet side there [New Orleans public schools], too.
However, Tyika qualified her position by stating that the rewards of working with the same group of people for the entire semester might have been more to her. When I asked her about her overall response to working in groups, she replied:

It taught me how to work better with other individuals. It would have been better to stay in the same group, though. I have to get the feel of new people, to see what they’re capable of doing, [need] more time to build trust in the same group.
WHAT THE TEACHERS SAW

Qualitative Data: Personal Interviews

These interviews were conducted individually during the last week of spring semester in my office. I typed their responses as they answered, with each interview lasting approximately one hour.

Overview

Overall, both teachers played the same role, used the same style in their collaborative classes that they had in their prior composition classes and in this semester's individual writer classes. Annabel continued to be a dialogic collaborator with her students, David a hierarchical collaborator; Annabel continued her open-ended discussion class, just with smaller groups; David continued to lecture, just to smaller groups; he asked directed questions, and tried to fill the students with facts to heighten their cultural literacy: one teacher was concerned with process, one with product.

They also differed somewhat on how they would construct their groups. Though both found four or five students the optimal number for composition, they disagreed on what should determine group composition. After a semester of grouping her students heterogeneously according to ability, Annabel wanted to try grouping them homogeneously according to their ability in order to
challenge the "A" students sufficiently. David would like to set up his groups hierarchically according to ability, but also ensure that one student per group demonstrated leadership capabilities and could fulfill that role.

The teachers also differed in their preference for changing groups or keeping them the same for the semester. Annabel would change the groups once or twice, at least once at mid-semester. She sensed a burn-out occurring with some of the permanent groups. David strongly believed the permanent groups functioned more effectively. He would change the groups once at the very beginning of the semester after they had worked together on one simple project, to look for any leadership qualities to emerge here.

Both teachers remarked how students were motivated by a strong sense of responsibility to their group. In the same sense, the groups, especially the permanent groups, seemed to take care of their own problem students, such as social loafers or those absent a great deal. Teachers did not have to concern themselves much with dysfunctioning groups.

Both teachers felt positive about the results of implementing collaborative writing groups in their
classes, and both said they would continue to use them for succeeding classes.

**Orientation**

*Re-structuring the teacher's role.* At first Annabel responded that her role did not change among the three classes—permanent groups, changing groups, or individual.

I goad students into discussion anyway. I simply played monitor in more than one group as opposed to one large group. Some of it was easier; it was more fun in that I got more reaction by having them in smaller groups and could instigate greater controversy which ends up giving everybody something to say. If I can get them to argue with me, they'll have something to write.

She went on to discuss the difference she saw between this style of teaching versus the traditional classroom:

Unlike the standard lecture and write method, this style of instruction requires the teacher to become a team member in the effort to generate and express complex ideas in clear language. This is a case of teacher as writing coach, not teacher as the source of all answers. It requires that the teacher relax control and relinquish power as the authority.
David, on the other hand, noticed a change in his behavior in dealing with the group classes and individual class.

I did less lecturing and spoonfeeding and more in a guidance leadership position than in a teaching position; more of a delegating position, less of an authority figure. An agent of authority less, more of a project coordinator, manager. Because I said it was a project that Carole McAllister was in charge of, I was able to play middle management, claiming it was not me, but a bigger machine, people I had to answer to [he "passed the buck" to me]. I like being less in charge and more being the agent of a big machine, more of a sergeant, less of a captain. The captain does not delegate authority directly. The sergeant is the liaison between ultimate authority and students. Might be fewer students who take things personally when the middle man is the authority. 'The teacher doesn't like me' reason for students not doing well is not as common in collaborative . . . . They can't make an appeal directly to me; I'm an enforcer of standards.

Neither teacher had any difficulty entering the students' groups as they were working. Annabel said she "simply acted as a monitor and instigator to make them focus or
generate more information, more commentary. I had no problem interacting with them." David, on the other hand, did not simply monitor from a standing position, but actually physically entered their groups, sitting among them:

I would just go sit down in their groups. If I asked leading questions, if there were four or five they could make better progress. Sometimes I would tell other groups to quiet down and listen to the leading questions, to demonstrate the direction discussion should go, but I did my best not to give them answers.

Annabel found no difference whether she left the room or not: "When I left the room they continued. I may as well not have been there most of the time. Once they got the idea how to do their task, the rest simply went, except for technical assistance" [She stayed in the room most of the time, acting like a monitor, answering questions as needed]. However, David found it somewhat advantageous to leave the classroom while the students were working, despite some students taking advantage of his leaving. "Generally the kids continued to work; some would leave, but that behavior was consistent. I was able to tell who the students were; the students who saw this as an opportunity not to work
Students had questions for me when I got back. If I stayed in the class, I wouldn’t get questions.

**Structuring tasks.** Both teachers structured tasks similarly for all three classes: permanent, changing and individual. All students did the same tasks, except as David noted, he didn’t "break down the tasks into categories for individuals; their work was less segmented; they had greater options for choosing topics."

Annabel commented on the format, the historical "agenda" for the class which she felt did not work as effectively for her as her own method:

I accommodated David’s interesting ideas ["making sense of the sixties"]. A lot of the formats I normally use would have worked for the scope of the project, but didn’t meet David’s agenda; therefore, many of them got changed. When I do this again, I will go back to my standard setup of task, which uses a method and sequence which builds better writing than I think we got this time. . . . I didn’t feel the theme was successful in my classes; I couldn’t give enough time to it and have them do the reading in the book--not enough time.
David, on the other hand, felt he had accomplished what he had planned to with these classes before he even knew the students would be working in groups. He said,

I don’t feel that I did anything too different than I had planned over the break [semester]. I thought long and hard about cultural literacy and the seeds of the sixties and living in post-World War II America--they don’t have to take Western Civilization here to get a four-year degree. They have very little idea of how we get through the middle ages to here--it’s like asking the kids to paint a mountain from memory; I want to give them the mountain to look at--fill their head with information, random facts, eventually they find less anxiety about writing because they have more to write about.

Structuring the groups. After the semester ended, Annabel had some comments on group size and reservations about how the groups were structured (heterogeneously, based on writing ability and gender).

I find a group of four is best, although three’s don’t do so badly. I had a few fives, but they had trouble dealing with interpersonal dynamics--with five, someone always kept quiet, with three you can’t, with four, it is difficult. I’m not certain
I'd set up the groups heterogeneously. I might set up the groups generally grouped more homogeneously, [according to ability] so more like working in a group of their own. The A's [A students] suffer more being with D's than vice versa. It doesn't mean I wouldn't put B and C students together.

Later, she went into more detail, showing how composing two permanent groups differently might have brought more success to two "marginal voice" students. Hoping the groups could draw upon the different perspectives they offered, she had separated the two Australian baseball players; now she believed she should have kept them together:

There were two others [besides Agatha, the non-traditional student who dropped the class early in the semester] in that class who could have fared better had the groups been composed differently. . . . The first, Scott MacDonald, was exceptionally bright and was put with a student that had come to me recommended by another teacher as bright and a good writer, Nicole. I had hoped these two would balance the weak writer I knew we had, Shad--whom I had had in my 101 the previous semester--and the shy but competent C-type student, Tequilla. She was also the only Black in the group. The mix was not
effective. Nicole did not have a strong enough personality or intellect to challenge Scott, and Shad only wanted to play and became a blocker. Tequilla and Scott had a clash of wills and intellect, although again she was not strong enough to challenge him. Their conflict became one of the few sparks of life in the group. Scott did not want to be in a leadership role, but was forced there by the fact that what ideas the others had were weak and by the nature of his own approach to the material of the course. To put it in the clearest, but blunt terms, they were simply not smart enough to keep up with much, much less balance him. Scott would have done better in a stronger group, possibly even the one in which I placed the other Aussie, Debbie Sala’s group (Group A).

... Dividing groups after more careful observation and a little more time for writing analysis would enable the teacher to put groups together with a bit more success. Another element that could have hampered these but could be eliminated in future is the need to mix heterogeneously.

Other suggestions on group composition came from David. He would group his students less on their diagnostic essay score, more according to their
individual ACT scores, and whatever else he could find. He would specifically ask students to list past leadership role experience on their personal information cards. He would then combine the students in groups randomly, "except for one hot dog in their group to help me." He viewed this "hot dog" student as managing the group's work. David would have individual conferences with these students and convince them this position was "a challenge, an incentive; give them the flattery of recognition from the instructor."

As far as size, David recommended, "no fewer than four, no more than five (mainly due to attrition rate and absence), so the group might end up being three students.

Initial problems. Teachers mentioned the initial problems they faced with group work seemed to be convincing students that ultimately this method would be fair to all; they would be rewarded for the work they had done. Students had to trust that they would be evaluated fairly by the teacher as well as learn to entrust their work to strangers. David mentioned that the most difficult obstacle to overcome when trying to orient . . . is the pervasive fear and collective dread some students had of having to depend upon other students to complete the assignments. In each class I had several students who were quite vocal
about their reluctance to assist classmates who might not be capable of working at the same pace as the critics of group work. For example, Troy Galatas [non-traditional student; interviewed], one of two students who made an A in my class, initially protested group assignments saying, 'I don't want to have to share my hard work with other students.' .. Basically Troy had asked, 'What's in it for me?' A fair question. And my answer that he should consider it 'his group' and that the other four students would simply be his assistants. Then I encouraged all students to consider this same attitude. And not surprisingly, Troy quickly assumed the role of group leader.

Conflict

Personality clashes. There were a few personality clashes among the students. Annabel noted several personality clashes, one in her permanent groups, two in her changing groups and the problems that ensued.

It was fairly common in certain groups where there was an oppressive dictatorial personality that everybody else shut down. [In the changing groups] Had trouble with Cliff and Bree. Cliff goofing off in disguise. . . . The first problem to arise was based on a personality/age conflict that resulted in
a promising students dropping the class. This was in the permanent class between Bridgett and Agatha. Bridgett was a first-time freshman right out of high school. Agatha was a Native Alaskan and in her late thirties or early forties. She tended to mother/smother the three group members—all of whom were in the standard freshman age group. Bridgett, however, felt put upon and belittled. Very shortly after she came to me to ask if she could be put in another group, Agatha dropped out of the class. Bridgett and the rest of the now three-member group continued together and worked well [see my interviews with two group members, Bridgett and Brent].

David did not mention any specific personality clashes among his students, perhaps because he did not notice any. He was aware of absence problems and lack of participation problems when the other students made him aware, e.g., by talking to him after class. Rather than how well his students were collaborating, he was concerned with how well students were grasping his historical insights; he was teaching cultural literacy, the cause/effect agenda of how the "sixties" came to be what they were.
Social loafing. Both teachers acknowledged some social loafing did exist in both the changing and permanent group classes, and both dealt with it differently. Annabel reported,

Mostly, I didn’t do a great deal about it except remind everybody that their contributions were being monitored by observations, journals, notebooks. Mostly the group took care of it. There would be a fairly strong censuring from group members and by the last month it pretty much stopped on its own. She also noted social loafing as "fairly common with groups where there was an oppressive dictatorial personality" [see above discussion on personality clashes].

David responded to social loafing in his groups, just more actively: "I would question them [social loafers] on their progress, intimidate them. ‘Why aren’t you doing this? Have you followed up on this? Where are you going?’"

Groupthink. Both teachers admitted they found some presence of a "groupthink" conformity occurring in some of their groups, not more evident in either permanent or changing groups. Annabel noted:

... in some groups they agreed simply not to have to put forth any effort. MacDonald’s [Scott, the
Australian baseball player] group didn’t challenge anything. In most of the other groups it didn’t happen often but it did happen. Scott was the only one who made this complaint. I saw proof too, not a lot. Mostly what happened is that they became more confident in their own thinking. If it was me [the teacher interfering], it was something I did naturally, not consciously.

David equated "groupthink" conformity with "team spirit": Groupthink conformity is always synonymous with team spirit and that would come from someone in the group in a leadership position who would intimidate, demand. Troy pressured others in his group to help demonstrate his leadership abilities to me. Tiah Bergeron who should be in honors classes--precocious, good writer, creative, she set standards. [See above, David’s response to how he would restructure groups to combat problems such as groupthink.]

**Cohesion**

**Responsibility to group.** Both teachers remarked how students were motivated by a responsibility to their group. Annabel noted the empowering effect of group work:
The students gain power to control their own words and often will give much more effort to the work as they become an absolutely necessary member of the team producing a group product. I have heard frequently from students that they would not have come to class, or they would not have done the assignment had they not felt they would be letting the others down. I have also seen groups stay in the classroom after I left (often as long as an hour... to continue working while they were on a roll. I have never seen this happen in a standard, individual-work-only composition class.

David echoed Annabel’s conclusions, indicating that "the driving force seems to be fear of condemnation for turning in inferior work."

**Changing the groups.** The teachers also differed on how frequently they would change groups in the future in order to foster group cohesiveness. Annabel would change groups just a few times throughout the semester, at least at mid-semester, as she thought the permanent groups were beginning to "burn out" and work less effectively at the end of the semester. (However, neither the students nor I noticed evidence of burn-out). David was adamant. He would only change groups once, in the beginning of the
semester, and only to make sure he had not put two strong leadership types in the same group.

Never change a group in the middle of a semester. Once a group established its various roles and hierarchy, a change-up creates confusion and anarchy. If two leaders end up in the same group, the tasks at hand become a less significant priority, seconded by the personality conflict. The key to cohesion is rewarding each group throughout the semester for their efforts in coming together as a unit.

Marginal voices. I asked the teachers if social and/or cultural differences played a role in group interaction. Annabel noted differences between her permanent and changing group classes.

. . . In the permanent groups most of the cultural and social elements were overcome at the end. None of the black girls were very assertive in the beginning, but towards the end became so. Jennifer [permanent Group A] stayed quiet, but she opened up more and laughed more toward the end. She would occasionally tell Jeff to shut up--major stride in her case--‘Oh, hush, Jeff.’ In the changing groups, they [the differences] remained constant. . . . I don’t think differences had major impact, but I
think there was some reaction... much more on the basis of personality--that made a difference. Annabel saw gender differences playing more of a part than social/cultural differences, particularly when groups were working on gender-related topics.

When they worked on child care in research, gender differences played a big role there; however, there were an equal number of forceful males and females and an equal number of sliders, male and female. The level of interaction and the tone of interaction of the all-women group on birth control never would have taken the tactic they had, had they males in their group. More females had influence over men than vice versa. There were more bossy women; we had women who were married or who had been married and knew how to do it [had influence over men].

David did not think social and cultural differences had much impact. "No, not really," he said. "SLU is not that heterogeneous, so many of the kids have much in common." He did not see gender difference having a significant impact.

Establishing roles. Both teachers saw the leaders in the changing groups bringing their leadership tendencies with them when they changed groups. In the permanent groups, the leaders of the group were
established early and did not relinquish their authority. Annabel discussed the roles established in Group A:

This group also contained a former 101 student whose work I knew, Debbie Sala. I put Jeff [the other Australian] here because I thought her [Debbie’s] age—in the range of 25 or so—would help balance the cultural difference and be able to make use of it. The other two members were fairly competent writers, from their samples and prior grades, but again, the shy member was a Black girl named Jennifer. Debbie brought her into the group some, but at times tended to ignore her. The final member was Scott (Turner) who was bright, but became almost a ‘yes-man’ to Debbie. At the beginning of the semester, the balance was pretty successful, but as time went on, Jeff began to tire of challenging Debbie for the leadership role, and took on the role of clown. His often excellent perceptions were taken in very lightly and Debbie would not relinquish the role of leader. She was indeed an excellent organizer and writer, but there were ideas that were never brought out fully because Jeff got tired of playing the game, and Jennifer was not assertive enough to force her ideas into focus.
Another aspect of the failure of their group to pull together as expected was Jeff’s increasing absence.

Performance

What writing collaboratively produced. Both teachers concluded that group work did have beneficial effects on their students. Annabel saw group discussion and even group composition can and does work to stimulate thinking, acts as a checking point for students who are unsure of their ideas or how to express them and contributes to a positive attitude in the classroom.

She did not distinguish between changing groups and permanent groups, but overall thought that groups jelled and coalesced about as expected. Their collaborations produced approximately C level work, which was quite probably about what they would have done anyway. Their discussions were active, and they worked relatively well in actual composition sessions. Some were stronger students than others, and their individual efforts result in B’s or D’s as skills dictated. In general, I believe that all these students . . . benefitted from working in the small group format more than they would have done in the standard class arrangement.
She noted that even the two groups that were not as successful as their potential had suggested; still they were not "wholly unsuccessful," but conducted "interesting and productive composition sessions."

David tied his students' performance to the motivation of the group:

The strongest argument that I can make for group work is that the level of performance achieved by the students who do what is asked of them noticeably improves under the threat of peer pressure and peer criticism. The group work gives each student a chance to measure the level of their own performance.
At the onset of the semester the teachers and I agreed upon the goal for this particular writing course: to instill the ability to think critically through writing. This study addressed two questions: (1) What is the efficacy of using collaborative writing groups in the classroom? (2) Given the course of a semester, how long should students remain in the same groups--for the duration of a writing project or for the entire semester? To answer these questions, I combined a sociolinguistic with a process-product approach, a methodology that brought both qualitative and quantitative results. To discuss these results and understand their implications for both research and pedagogy, I broadened my perspective by integrating what the researcher saw with what the students and the teachers saw, a vision larger than the sum of its parts.

Collaborative vs. Traditional Learning

Just looking at the quality of the products students wrote at the end of the semester would suggest that all students, those who had participated in permanent groups, in changing groups, or those who had written independently, improved their writing significantly. Looking closer at the results, however, demonstrated that collaborative learning was superior to the traditional,
teacher-centered classroom: students improved their writing more, they exchanged ideas more, they came to class more frequently, and they withdrew from class less when they worked in groups than when they worked individually. The results of this study supported social constructionist philosophy and the educational philosophy of Dewey, Freire and others. It contributed to research findings concerning the positive effects of peer response groups in composition, cooperative learning, and group dynamics. It demonstrated that knowledge is gained through social interaction, and the teacher can facilitate the social context for critical thinking to occur. Collaborative writing groups can be used successfully in the college composition classroom; despite differences between permanent and changing groups and between the two teachers' classroom styles, writing collaboratively in groups offers students more benefits than writing individually in a traditional composition class.

Performance

Writing ability. The quantitative results showed that students who worked in collaborative writing groups learned to write as well as those students who wrote individually all semester. Students in all three conditions began (statistically) equivalent in writing
ability, and all students (the individual writers, the permanent groups, and the changing groups) significantly improved their writing as individuals over the course of the semester. Thus, collaborative writing groups performed equal to the individual writers. Whether they were in changing groups or permanent groups, students learned how to perform their assigned tasks and achieved their goals together—they learned how to write collaboratively. Not only did students perform their tasks, they perceived they were learning about writing in the process. The collaborative students rated what they had learned about writing as highly as the individual writers.

Retention/Attendance

Additional support for the use of collaborative writing groups was found in the significantly high retention and attendance rates for the group classes compared to the individual writer classes. Students working in groups, both permanent and changing, attended classes with significantly more regularity. The individual writers were absent from class two to three times more than students working in groups. Equally impressive was the difference in withdrawals from class. Students working in groups, changing and permanent, withdrew significantly less, one-third less than those
students who worked individually. Collaborative writing groups encouraged and motivated students to come to class. Said one student: "This is the only class I come to, that I am awake for; I have to; I can’t let my group down." Over and over again, in the personal interviews, in the evaluative essays, from the teachers--the message was the same. Students developed a responsibility to the group; when they felt the group relied on them, that they were a necessary member, they would come to class for the group. Some teachers, accustomed to poor attendance, had expressed concern about what would happen to a group if students were absent and/or dropped the class. Few students did either.

Strengths of the Group

Dewey thought traditional education failed students because it did not recognize the community life of the classroom. Composition theorists also stress the importance for establishing an environment where not only writing but also discourse about writing can generate knowledge about writing. Writing should be not separated from its inherent social nature. In this study collaborative writing groups established a community life within a language-centered classroom. Students exchanged dialogue continually, specifically focused on their task--to create a piece of writing together. Thus,
meaning and knowledge were generated through the language of social interactions; group dialogue became central to the learning process. As the teachers reported, their traditionally taught, individual writer classes were silent. The usual pattern of dialogue was teacher to student, or student to teacher, responding to questions or seeking clarification. There was little interchange of conversation among students in class, no student-to-student questioning or responding. Students played a passive role: they sat and waited for knowledge to come from the teacher.

In the collaborative classes students did not/could not sit and wait for answers to be given to them. They used language to discover language. The sense of community that groups fostered enabled them to act as a testing ground for students who were unsure of their ideas or how to express them (noted one teacher and several students). Often students themselves played the role of teacher to help other students in a less threatening manner. Throughout their responses, in permanent and changing groups alike, students wrote of how much more relaxed they were in this type of classroom environment. Students felt more comfortable talking their ideas over with other students; groups eased students' tensions and fears, gave them confidence to
take responsibility for their education. The freer the students felt to respond in their classroom, the more they participated in their education. Groups did not exist, however, to provide comfort for their members. From the students’ responses, they knew their purpose and always kept focused on their goal: to produce a document together, a piece of writing that all would share responsibility for. Annabel recognized the command of language her students accomplished: "The students gained power to control their own words and often gave much more effort to the work as they become an absolutely necessary member of the team producing a group product."

Marginal Voices

In trying to answer the question as to the usefulness of collaborative writing groups, I could not overlook Myers’ (1986) warning, that collaborative groups tended to be exclusionary, shutting out those voices not powerful enough to be heard. Throughout this study, I listened for Myers’ "marginal voices": I observed them; I listened to their responses in journals, essays, and interviews; I listened to what their teachers said; I hoped that collaborative writing groups would not be exclusionary, thus lessening their efficacy. Throughout the course of the semester, marginal voices did gain enough trust and confidence to speak, and most
dominant members of the group, those "in power," learned to listen through a natural bonding that occurred. All students had the same goals imposed on them: to work together to create writing through dialogue.

In this study I considered "marginal voices" those students clearly in the minority culture in their classroom or group: Australian men, African-American women (we had no male African-American in any of the group classes); long-haired, "earringed" men, a single woman in a group of all men; a single man in a group with all women.

Both of the Australians, whose group experiences were documented in more detail earlier in this study, were strong personalities, and neither appeared to have any difficulty making himself heard in his group. Their particular problems did not seem to arise from their being Australian (a "foreigner"); rather, the problems each faced were brought on by personality traits.

In a cursory look at gender issues (represented by a minority gender within a group), in only one instance did there appear to be a problem with either a lone woman in a group with all men (or vice versa) remaining a weak participant in the group. From the teachers, researcher, and other group members' perspective, this woman did not want to cooperate. Was her problem related to
personality or gender? Here was someone who became a "marginal voice" in her group, and despite attempts from the teacher and her group members, refused to be drawn in.

Though Myers might not have considered two "hippie"-looking individuals as "marginal," Jimmy and Ephraim's classmates did. Jimmy was a member of a permanent group, Ephraim, a member of a changing group. At first, Jimmy was "prejudged" by the group’s leader, Troy; by the end of the semester, according to Troy, not only had Jimmy become "instrumental" to the group, but he and Troy had also become good friends. Ephraim had been prejudged harshly by members of several of his groups; he himself felt welcome in "maybe two" of his four groups. He told me he wished he could have been with one group all semester. Ephraim might have been as successful as Jimmy in his acceptance and group relationships had he been in the same group for the entire semester.

Two of the clearest examples of Myers’ "marginal voices" were two African-American women: Jennifer, whom I observed first-hand in Permanent Group A; and Tyika (whom I interviewed), in Annabel’s changing group class. Both women began the semester silent. However, different circumstances enabled each to be heard.
According to Annabel, Tyika was "one of the most spectacular successes in the experiment." At first she was reluctant to participate. In her first group, she was brought somewhat into the group by Sharon, a dialogic collaborator. But in her second group Tyika opened up; she attributed her "opening up" to the efforts of a woman her own age, Melissa. Not only did Melissa draw her into the group, but she and Tyika continued the relationship outside of class. In talking with me, Tyika said she wished she had been able to stay in one group for the entire semester; she thought she would have been able to open up even more in a permanent group.

Jennifer’s group had been dominated by Debbie, clearly a hierarchical collaborator. So in a sense, Jennifer was a marginal voice on two counts: she was the only African-American and the only woman in a gender role. Not too surprisingly, the only group session where Jennifer participated equally with her other two male members (this session was taped) was when Debbie was absent. Towards the end of the semester, however, Jennifer did speak more, did participate in group discussion more than she had all semester. Her contributions improved noticeably, noted by fellow group members, teacher, and researcher. Being in the same group the whole semester, even though perhaps not the
optimal group for inducing her participation, had given Jennifer enough confidence to speak.

*Permanent vs. Changing Groups*

**Overview**

I began this study believing that permanent groups would provide more benefits for students than changing groups. While changing groups offered students some benefits that permanent groups did not, permanent groups provided more measurable benefits in almost every category analyzed and from most perspectives—students, teachers, and the researcher. The permanent groups talked significantly more about writing, felt they learned more about writing, and improved their writing significantly more than the changing groups. Moreover, permanent groups kept their members—fewer withdrew from permanent groups than any other condition.

**Benefits of Changing Groups**

Though changing groups did not outscore permanent groups in any measured category, they did provide benefits that the permanent groups did not. Changing groups allowed students to move away from particularly dominating personalities that they could not work with (e.g., Ted and Ephraim from Bree; Alisa and Cindy from Cliff). Since teachers could observe how all the groups worked, they might sense which individuals would be
capable of working together. Students would not have to work in an undesirable situation for the entire semester. Of course, they would not learn how to cope by themselves with this situation but have their problems remedied for them.

Changing groups did provide one definite advantage to students--it taught them adaptability. They had no time to develop strong bonds of cohesion and no time to build trust; they had time only to complete a writing project. Five times during the semester they changed groups; five times students adapted to different working situations and different personalities. Not one group failed to complete a writing project.

Moreover, on individually-written essays at the end of the semester, students from changing groups performed as well as the other groups and improved in their writing as much as the others. The student retention rates for these classes were significantly high, along with the permanent groups. Students learned to work collaboratively in an ever-changing environment, adapting to meet the needs of the group and the task.

Benefits of Permanent Groups

Writing improvement. Even though students in all conditions significantly improved their writing over the course of the semester (comparing pretest to posttest),
there was a statistically significant difference in the amount of improvement among the groups. The permanent groups improved their individual writing performance significantly more than did the changing groups. This finding corroborated the idea that discourse generates knowledge. One reason why this group improved the most could be that they talked the most. They exchanged ideas, learned from each other continually.

Attitude toward writing. From the results of an attitude survey given to all students at the end of the semester, students' attitudes toward what they had learned about writing differed between the two groups. Students who had worked in permanent groups felt they had learned significantly more about writing than did students in changing groups. This finding reinforced permanent group students' responses in their final exams and personal interviews as well as their teachers' observations: they participated in continual dialogue, mainly focused on solving their task--writing collaboratively.

Amount of participation. When I tallied the tape-recorded responses of the two groups, the difference in participation between permanent and changing groups was statistically significant. Supporting what the teachers and the researcher had observed, students in permanent
groups simply talked significantly more than did students in changing groups. In task-oriented comments, which focused on their writing (the overwhelming majority of type of response), and socio-emotional responses, concerned with interpersonal relationships, the permanent groups were significantly more vocal than changing groups and remained so through the end of the semester. One of the teachers thought she had detected some "burn out" in permanent groups; "they just seem tired," she said. However, at least from the amount of conversation that occurred, there was little evidence of end-of-the-semester "burn out"; on the other hand, many of the changing group students openly complained in their final exams or in their interviews about having to change groups one more time. When permanent groups completed a writing project, they did not move into Tuckman's "adjourning" stage and exhibit signs of increased independence of members, group disintegration, and withdrawal from one another. Rather, the permanent groups continued to work well together throughout the semester. They did not spend group time working individually (as I observed occurring in some changing groups), but working together.

Retention/attendance. A strong measure of a group's cohesiveness is its ability to retain its
members. Both permanent and changing groups succeeded significantly in retaining their members. Three times as many students withdrew from individual classes as did from group classes. Since I expected greater cohesion from the permanent groups, it was not surprising that they had the lowest withdrawal rate of all. It was not, however, significantly different from the changing group level.

Conflict negotiation. The ability to negotiate conflict is an important indicator of a writing group's success from a number of perspectives. In the group dynamics literature, one of the most crucial factors in determining a group's success is how well it negotiates conflict. Since the goal of the group is to produce a shared-document, students must continually negotiate to arrive at consensus: how to approach the task, how to divide responsibilities, how to decide what is chosen, what is excluded, etc. It is not enough for a group to keep the conversation going, but the group needs to acknowledge differences that exist among its members and be able to perform despite and because of the differences. Dissensus, Trimbur's answer to continual negotiation of differences to arrive at consensus, was evident in the behavior of the permanent groups. It took a semester of working together for students to build
enough trust to allow for conflict, to trust in the process of negotiation of differences.

From my observations, teachers' observations, and student essays and interviews, changing groups remained guarded. Students were not together long enough to establish working relationships that would permit hostilities and conflicts to be brought to the group. Instead, students confided (sometimes) in evaluative essays and discussions with the teacher or with a supportive group member, leaving an underlying tension hovering about group meetings which served only to polarize the group. Again, participation, conversation in changing groups was significantly less than in permanent groups: less discourse meant less knowledge from social interactions and more individual work. In permanent groups, however, students revealed they confronted conflicts fairly openly, often with humor. Changing groups could avoid dealing with their conflicts because as one member said, "we knew we were going to change groups anyway."

Permanent groups seemed to resolve their conflict one way or the other. The most obvious conflict stemmed from the "social loafers," those students who, at first, participated little and contributed little. In permanent groups, either these students changed their behavior and
became participating, contributing members of their group, or else they withdrew from the class. In the beginning of the semester, students registered their concern about these non-participating members; the teachers needed to assure students that their contributions were being monitored through a paper trail. But as the semester progressed, the teacher did not have to worry about social loafers, nor did the students. The group took care of its own problems by censuring unacceptable behavior.

**Growth of cohesion.** What typified the behavior of permanent groups was a growth of cohesion. In their initial journal entries, many students in both types of groups began skeptical of group work, hesitant to trust other students to do the work, reluctant to trust them with their grade. As the semester continued, changing groups never seemed to move beyond the polite discourse of information exchanging and task exploring characteristic of a group newly-acquainted with one another. They spent much of their group time re-establishing a methodology for performing their task with this new set of people. On the other hand, permanent groups had established their methodology for performing their tasks and continued to refine it; they did not
grope as much in the planning stages as did the changing groups.

Students in the permanent groups grew to trust one another; as Troy said, "we were still polite, but could talk to each other more freely." Even the marginal voices like Jennifer felt comfortable enough to complain openly in her group. However, the changing groups worked more as individuals grouped together; they explored separately and used group time less as group time and more as simply work time. The taped sessions revealed more overlapping comments, less long periods of silence, more laughter and socio-emotional response happening in the permanent groups. The length of time they spent together taught them how to balance naturally the task-orientation and the socio-emotional response to form cohesive relationships and perform the task at the same time. The number of their comments did not decrease over the course of the semester, but remained consistently higher than the changing groups. From the number of comments recorded, the permanent groups did not burn out before the semester ended. In fact, many students spoke of the good friendships they had developed with their group members, some friendships which surprised even them.
Shifts in participation. Many permanent group members noticed both a shift in participation among their group members and a change in attitude toward their group members. Often students felt that group work encouraged students to improve because others were dependent on them, "counting on them." Working in permanent groups taught students that they could rely on their group; they could trust their members to do the work; they could and did trust others with their grade. In one of their final essays, not only did permanent group members point out how much they learned from one another, but some even detailed what specifically they had learned about writing and working together from each of their group members (e.g., in Group A Scott learned organization from Debbie, word choice from Jennifer, and harmonizing skills from Jeff). The changing group members did not/could not show the same depth of analysis; their evaluation of group work consisted of a comparison and contrast of their different group experiences, most of them remaining general.

Though students in both groups expressed, "groups got better the more we worked at it," their explanations differed. Many students in changing groups thought the more they did group work, the easier it [the task] became. Permanent group members responded, "the longer
we worked together, the better we worked together." One group stressed the dominance of task; the other emphasized the importance of relationship--process. Permanent group members learned that the process they had been involved in was essential part of the knowledge they gained, not just a way to produce an essay.

**Implications**

**Structuring Groups**

Both permanent and changing groups did succeed. Students in all groups became better writers. How teachers structure their groups depends upon their goals for the course and their own particular style of teaching. After using collaborative writing groups in their classes for this study (the first time either teacher had used collaborative writing), the two teachers continued to use groups in their classes, but they altered the group structure to meet their own particular teaching needs and styles. Annabel decided to try a "semi-permanent" group situation, changing the groups only once at mid-semester. David strongly preferred keeping his groups the same for the entire semester after an initial "trial run" at group work early on to see how students worked. Both teachers wanted to maximize their chances for putting together the best possible combinations of students. Annabel worried about losing
brighter students to groups where they were not challenged, especially after hearing the complaint of one student. (But this same student, in a personal interview with me, took responsibility for his not being challenged; he did not blame his situation on his teacher or his group members, but himself—he wished he had done more to involve the others; he knew he could have.) Teachers need to trust the process and their students, allowing students to take more responsibility for their education.

**Evaluation tools**

Teachers must give students an opportunity to evaluate their group members' contributions to the group process and product as well as guarantee that their ratings will be confidential. But finding the most appropriate method for evaluation sometimes involved trial and error. Several studies in collaborative writing suggested the journal as an ideal place for students to evaluate their experience (Goldstein & Malone, 1985; Morgan et al., 1989). In this study at the beginning of their group work, students were asked to write in their journals describing their group experience, including an evaluation of their members. Students were even given time to begin their entries at the end of class, so they could note what they wanted to
remember. But students were not confiding in a personal journal; they were writing in a multi-purpose journal which had a good chance of being read by a group member. So instead of detailing their experiences, students practiced vagueness. They avoided topics, such as how they tackled their writing, or how much various members contributed. Journal entries were generalized to the point of uselessness.

Another method of evaluation which was not overly successful was the peer assessment form. Students hesitated to use this means of evaluation, especially when it was first introduced (at mid-semester along with the evaluative essay). This tool asked them to rate their group members and themselves on a scale from 1 to 5. Most students rated their peers a "5" on most items, except for the real "problem members" who might receive a "3." As the semester continued, however, students became more honest on this form, their evaluating corresponding to their comments in the evaluative essay.

Students did write candidly and in-depth on assigned evaluative essays, which were written to the teacher, graded and returned. One might question the validity of these evaluative essays, directed to the teachers, perhaps written to please and to gain "bonus points" in their teachers' esteem--writing what teachers want to
hear. One problem with this interpretation is that students did not know what the teacher (or the researcher) wanted to hear. As it was, teachers began the semester somewhat biased toward changing groups, the researcher toward permanent groups, but both entered the project wide-open to other possibilities. However, to the teachers and to me, these essays contained a candor and an openness; students seemed to attempt to evaluate honestly their experience. They discussed the positive and negative features of their experiences, the problems they faced and the rewards they received. In addition, these essays confirmed what the students reported to me in personal, confidential interviews at the end of the semester. These interviews appeared to be the "safest" place for opening up; students knew what they revealed here could have no bearing on their course grade since no one had access to their remarks except me.

Though no one evaluative method was without its flaws, trying to capture the picture from several different angles at least minimized the threats to validity. Still, research needs to be conducted to determine the most valid means for evaluating collaborative writing.
Collaborative Classrooms as Panacea?

Given the positive results obtained in the research, one might be tempted to recommend that composition classrooms be changed to collaborative writing classrooms. There are certainly strong reasons to do so. Students improved their writing more in the permanent groups than in any other and also felt they learned more. Students did not drop--significantly, two to three times more students finished group classes. Retention alone is an extremely important point. As university resources become constrained, we cannot afford to fill the classrooms with students taking the same course over and over. Plus, there are the practical advantages to the teacher. They grade two-thirds fewer papers, but at no cost to how much the students improve their writing. Teachers win and students win. However, there are certain cautions. Collaborative writing may not work equally well for all students or all teachers.

For all students? Collaborative writing can prove disadvantageous for the students in a mis-matched group, or a group with an over-bearing personality who can sometimes shut down the whole group. If the other students are not strong enough, or have not been together long enough to have built confidence, they will remain silent. Usually, the problem personality cannot trust in
the process. Cliff, one of the changing group members I observed, never learned to trust his peers, never really gained faith in the collaborative process. He seemed more interested in either impressing them or his teacher with his philosophizing or pseudo-intellectualizing. When his group members were no longer impressed by his speculations, but deemed them distracting, a waste of time, Cliff stopped participating in his group and focused his attention on impressing the teacher. Several of his group members complained about him, both privately in their evaluations and openly to the teacher. Even though Cliff never changed, never really accommodated his group, they performed their task; they wrote collaboratively; they just never resolved their problem. For those students and teachers unable to free themselves from the traditional teacher-centered classroom, collaborative writing groups will not prove efficacious. Myers' (1986) concerns for marginal voices are valid, but problematic. When we classify individuals as "marginal," does that imply that is how they view themselves, other students see them, or the teachers see them? Is "perceived" marginality what we should be looking for? Is it important to know how students view themselves before grouping them with other students, or are we again, "second-guessing" what the outcome
would/should be? Research needs to begin to tackle these questions.

From the observations and analysis of the "marginal voices," in this study (determined at the beginning of the semester as those students of minority culture or race, or gender-isolated in their group), in future groupings I would place a marginal voice (maybe just a quiet voice) in a group with at least one dialogic collaborator (determined, for example, by watching group interactions or by surveying students in the very beginning of the semester); the "marginal voices" I observed most closely responded best to this type of collaborator.

Are we doing a disservice to marginal voices by using collaborative groups; would they, in fact, be heard sooner if they were grouped with dialogic collaborators? Is a heterogeneous mix (race, gender) appropriate for college student writers, or are there more significant considerations? More research is needed to determine what is mis-matching students, and how much emphasis should be given to structuring groups to achieve the "best of all possible worlds."

For all teachers? Just as students, teachers also need to trust in the process, to trust that students can learn from one another, to resist interfering too much in
the group's interactions. Teachers, too, need to enjoy and believe in the process. How they behave has an strong impact on the success of their students' collaborative work.

I chose two teachers whom I considered to be promising candidates to implement collaborative learning in the classroom. Neither had used collaborative writing groups before, yet both teachers were willing to experiment in their classes; both were willing to give up authority in their class to a collaborative team with a researcher-leader; both were excited and did not hesitate to agree to implement collaborative writing groups in their classroom for a semester. Yet implementing collaborative writing is not as easy a task as the cooperative learning theorists and the philosophers of education would have us believe. All teachers, even those willing and able, are not equally adept at teaching in the type of collaborative classroom suggested by the literature, as David and Annabel illustrate.

David continued to maintain a traditional hierarchical classroom, just putting himself in a different place in the hierarchy. He had an agenda he wanted to get across to his students; he would not relinquish his center of focus in the classroom but continued to direct group discussions toward the
direction he wanted them going. There was a right answer, and he viewed his role as helping students find it. On the other hand, Annabel was more willing to relinquish control in the classroom to the groups, less likely to interfere in their proceedings. She was much more at ease in a collaborative classroom, perhaps because she was much more confident in her students' ability to perform without her constant intrusion. Yet she also had an "agenda" and kept control of her students' performance via the very detailed handouts she developed to accompany each writing assignment (e.g., see Appendixes I, J, K, and L--all aids to writing the "fairy tale" paper). She accomplished her agenda in a manner different from David--she did not intrude physically upon the interactions of the groups, but did exert authority.

What is the teacher's role in a collaborative classroom? If the groups are in place, is her role to observe unobtrusively from the front of the class? Should she monitor the groups, and if so, what should she be looking for? In the classroom, a teacher could keep a watch on those voices who are silent, and as unobtrusively as possible, find some way to draw them into their groups. Sometimes just noticing that silence on the perimeter and acting on it can foster participation. I see her role as a facilitator, one who
is disinterestedly interested in what the groups are doing; who, as a member of a workshop, a community of writers, will offer suggestions and criticisms in the form of "challenging feedback." As Spear (1988) suggests, "... by asking for clarification, citing counter-examples, challenging generalizations, identifying hidden assumptions, and so on" (p. 147). Although the teacher remains a distinctly active member of this community, she must replace teaching the right answers with teaching the right questions. Otherwise, discourse is abbreviated; students would not look to one another to learn, but instead to the teacher. Here again research could investigate what the teacher’s role is in a collaborative writing classroom.

This study did reveal one teacher-generated difference in student responses. The way the teachers viewed their role and implemented collaborative writing groups was reflected in the difference in their students’ responses to one question on the attitude evaluation survey measuring how much students enjoyed working in groups. Not surprisingly, students in Annabel’s classes stated they enjoyed working in groups significantly more than students in David’s classes. They responded more positively to the non-traditional classroom where they were respected by teacher and peers alike, than in a
classroom situation whose hierarchical structure undermined their potential.

Thus, not everyone can or should implement collaborative writing groups in the classroom—yet. In order to be successful, teachers need to learn about the collaborative process; moreover, they need to trust in their students and be willing to give them the responsibility for their education. Research might investigate how to train teachers to teach collaboratively. Many teachers, taught in traditional classrooms, have never had a "formal," classroom-based, collaborative learning experience themselves. Developing techniques for teaching teachers how to implement collaborative learning would be a viable direction for the future.

Though limited in focus, this study justifies our use of collaborative writing groups in the composition classroom. Students do improve their writing skills after working for a semester in groups. They learn to write as well as those students who were writing individually all semester in silence; in addition, they have received all the benefits of working in a process-oriented, collaborative classroom. Discourse generated knowledge. This study emphasizes the essential bond between process and product in the discussion of writing,
one that cannot be dissected in an attempt to measure exactly what students learn about writing. Therefore what the students learned through collaborative writing cannot be evaluated simply by rating the quality of the products they created at the end of the semester. The carry-over effects of what they have learned by participating in a collaborative writing process are beyond the bounds of this study, but offer possibilities for future research. Future research needs to address what specific language skills these students have accrued by working in a language-centered environment on language-centered tasks. We need to find methods to study how groups produce, how the product develops, and perhaps track how each member contributed to process and product. Our commitment is to challenge our students to take responsibility for learning: to engage them in dialogue and help them realize how much the process they are involved in affects the writing they produce.
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Guidelines for Providing Useful Feedback *

Feedback is communication to a person (or a group) which tells how he affects others. It can serve as a basis for the individual to correct his communication strategies to enhance the likelihood that the outcomes of his communicating will match his intentions.

Some criteria for useful feedback:

1. It is descriptive rather than evaluative. By describing one's own reaction, it leaves the individual free to use it or not, to use it as he sees fit. By avoiding evaluative language, it reduces the need for the individual to respond defensively.

2. It is specific rather than general. To be told that one is "dominating" will probably not be as useful as to be told that "just now when we were deciding the issue, you did not appear to listen to what others said and I felt forced to accept your arguments or face attack from you."

3. It takes into account the needs of both the receiver and giver of feedback. Feedback can be destructive when it serves only our own needs and fails to consider the needs of the person on the receiving end.

4. It is directed toward behavior which the receiver can do something about. Frustration is only increased when a person is reminded of some shortcoming over which he has no control.

5. It is solicited, rather than imposed. Feedback is most useful when the receiver himself has formulated the kind of question which those observing him can answer.

6. It is well-timed. In general, feedback is most useful at the earliest opportunity after the given behavior (depending, of course, on the person's readiness to hear it, validation available from others, etc.)
7. It is checked to insure clarity. One way of doing this is to have the receiver try to rephrase the feedback he has received to see if it corresponds to what the sender had in mind.

8. When possible, check accuracy of the feedback with others in the group. Is this only one person's impression or an impression shared by others?

* Reprinted from Ruben and Budd, Human Communication Handbook
APPENDIX B COURSE INFORMATION SHEET

English 102 Course Information Sheet

COURSE STANDARDS AND GOALS: I assume grammatical accuracy. Your writing will be severely penalized if it does not meet the basic standards of correct form, diction, grammar, punctuation and spelling. This does not mean that I expect absolute perfection, but it does mean that I do NOT expect major errors very often. Since none of you will be working in total isolation, I expect that you will proofread carefully and then have someone else proofread after that.

However, having said that, be forewarned that THE PRIMARY FOCUS OF THIS COURSE IS CLEAR AND ACCURATE THINKING EXPRESSED CONVINCINGLY. For this, you must demonstrate the ability to analyze and organize your thoughts and the information you obtain from your reading and research into well-developed argumentative writing. All of your papers will be written in the argumentative mode, so if you are not sure of this, review the principles in your grammar handbook and writing guide.

Goals for this class are as follows:
1. Learn principles of critical thinking and analysis.
2. Learn to apply these to reading on a variety of subjects.
3. Learn methods of argument as used in writing.
4. Combine critical thinking and argumentative approach to write about material you have read in an effective and accurate manner.
5. Obviously, to accomplish the above, fundamental elements of grammar and composition must be mastered so that these more advanced techniques can be successfully used.

ABSENCES: Up to the limit of 4 for a two-day class/6 for a three-day class, no excuses are needed. If there is a medical reason for an extended length, an excuse MUST be given. However, note that a series of doctor’s excuses will NOT extend the limited number of absences (which, if you note is two weeks of the fifteen you have in a semester). The point here is that if you have missed this much class, you cannot accomplish the learning tasks of the course adequately.

LATE PAPERS: Papers turned in on time, as called for in class on the day due, will receive a 5 point bonus. Late
papers will be accepted with no penalty at any time DURING THE WEEK DUE. Papers turned in later than this will not be accepted unless you have obtained permission from me PRIOR to the due date.

CIRCUMSTANCES THAT WILL RESULT IN FAILURE OF THE COURSE or FAILURE OF INDIVIDUAL PAPERS.

1. Excessive absences. Only after the drop date will medical excuses be considered.
2. Failure of the research paper will result in automatic failure of the course.
3. Failure to turn in ANY major paper/assignment. This includes papers not accepted because for lateness.
4. More than 4 major errors or 8 significant minor ones will result in failure on that paper. The possibility for revision will be limited.
5. Failure to turn in rough drafts, notes and xeroxed copies of material used for research will also result in failure of that paper.

"NIT-PICKY" REQUIREMENTS: Journals will be kept in a bound notebook (the old funky black and white marbled kind) or a bound blank book. Papers must be typed. All research materials must be xeroxed and turned in with the paper.

COOPERATIVE LEARNING GROUPS

Positive interdependence
Individual accountability
Heterogeneous membership
Shared leadership
Responsible for each other
Task and maintenance emphasized
Social skills directly taught
Teacher observes and intervenes
Group processing occurs

This class will work collaboratively in groups throughout the semester; all major papers, including the research paper will be written collaboratively. Your grades will be based on both your contribution to the writing process (determined from peer, teacher, and self evaluations)--50%; and the overall grade on each product (e.g., essay, research paper).
Instructor:
Office #
Phone:
Office Hours:

**Texts:**
- REQUIRED -
  - St. Martin’s Handbook (rental)
  - St. Martin’s Guide to Writing (rental)
  - Writing and Reading Across the Curriculum (purchase)
  - Southeastern Style (purchase)

- OPTIONAL -
  - Bedford Guide to the Research Process

**Grading Scale:** Standard ten point scale will be used, i.e., 100-90 = A, 89-90 = B, etc. Because of the focus and nature of this class, (to teach more complex forms of writing in response to reading and research), papers will be graded primarily for content. **IT IS ASSUMED that papers will be grammatically accurate.** Therefore, grading will comment on strengths and weaknesses of the papers’ facts, manner of expression, organization, etc.

**Point Structure:** Although this plan is firm, it is subject to change if needed. If a problem develops, adjustments will be made at instructor discretion.

25 points each
1. Summary quiz
2. Synthesis of reviews
3. Scavenger hunt (items successfully found)
4. Report information found in research tasks
5. "New" fairy or folk tale
6. Fairy tale NOT from England or Germany
7. Gender identity synthesis
8. "Bartleby..." critique

100 points each
1. Obedience to authority paper
2. Cinderella or folktale paper
3. Research paper
4. Revision of ??
5. Research analysis
6. Analysis of criticism on "Bartleby the Scrivener"
7. FINAL EXAM

**1000 POINTS TOTAL** available for course
List of Readings for Semester: Writing and Reading Across the Curriculum

Part I: How to write Summaries, Critiques, and Synthesis
2. Critical Reading and Critique, pp. 30-58.

Part II: An Anthology of Readings
6. Obedience to Authority, pp. 159-222.
   Group Minds, Lessing.
   The Perils of Obedience, Milgram.
   Reviews of Stanley Milgram's Obedience to Authority: Herrnstein, Baumrind, Meyer
   My Buttoned-Down Students, Crockett
   The Education of a Torturer, Gibson and Haritos-Fatouros
   The Lottery, Jackson.

   Universality of the Folktale, Thompson.
   Seven Variants of "Cinderella"
   Cinderella, Perrault
   Ashputtle, Grimm Brothers
   The Cat Cinderella, Basile
   The Chinese Cinderella, Taun Ch'eng-shih
   Walt Disney's "Cinderella," Grant
   (adapter)
   Cinderella, Sexton
   Grudgekin The Thistle Girl, Gardner
   "Cinderella": A Story of Sibling Rivalry and Oedipal Conflicts, Bettleheim
   A Feminist's View of "Cinderella," Kolbenschlag
   America's "Cinderella," Yolen

   Bartleby, Melville
   Bartleby is a Schizophrenic, Beja
   Bartleby is Christ, Franklin
   Bartleby is Marx's Alienated Worker, Barnett
   Bartleby is Melville, Marx
   Bartleby is a Woman, Barber
APPENDIX D DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMON ROLES

Descriptions of Common Roles in Interpersonal and Group Communication*

The following are descriptions of common roles in groups to be used as a basis for observing behavior in your groups. Typically, no one individual serves only in a single role; rather, she or he may move in and out of several of these roles within a short period of time. These categories should therefore be looked upon as descriptions of types of behavior, rather than of people.

A. Task-Oriented Roles: Facilitation and coordination of group problem solving activities
   1. Initiator: offers new idea; suggest solutions
   2. Information seeker: seeks clarification through facts
   3. Information giver: offers facts; relates own experience pertinent to group problem
   4. Coordinator: clarifies and synthesizes relationships among ideas; tries to coordinate members' activities
   5. Evaluator: subjects accomplishment of group to "standards"; may evaluate facts, logic, procedure

B. Relation-Oriented Roles: Building group-centered attitudes and orientation
   6. Encourager: praises, accepts others' ideas; displays warmth and solidarity toward other members
   7. Harmonizer: mediates intra-group scraps; relieves tensions
   8. Gatekeeper: encourages and facilities participation of others; e.g. "let's hear..."
   9. Standard setter: expresses standards for group to attempt to achieve; raises notion of group goals and purpose
  10. Follower: goes along somewhat passively; provides friendly audience
  11. Group-observer: functions by giving feedback as to what goes on during meetings

C. Self-Oriented Roles: Tries to meet felt individual needs often at expense of group
  12. Blocker: negativistic; unreasonably resistant;
  13. Recognition-seeker: calls attention to self; struggles to prevent being placed in "inferior" position
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14. Dominator: tries to assert authority in manipulating group or some individuals in group
15. Avoider: maintains distance from others; passive resister; tries to remain insulated from interaction

Reprinted from Ruben and Budd, Human Communication Handbook.
APPENDIX E  ROLE RECORDING BEHAVIOR FORM

Role Behavior Recording Form*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Group Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Initiator contributor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Information seeker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Information giver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Encourager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Harmonizer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gatekeeper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Standard Setter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Follower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Group Observer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Blocker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Recognition seeker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Dominator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Avoider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reprinted from Ruben and Budd, Human Communication Handbook
APPENDIX F  OBEDIENCE TO AUTHORITY OUTLINE

EXTENDED OUTLINE:  Preliminary Research Project
Instructions: Use the following basic outline to flesh out a fuller rough draft. If you were to do a paper on the topic of Obedience to Authority, this could serve as the full outline, or perhaps, even the final rough draft. You do not really have to write the paper, but you do have to extend the skeletal outline by using sentences and notes (even fragmentary) that you would want to include in a paper. REMEMBER that this is to function as the first step in developing your thoughts and organizing them for a real paper. Also, you MUST include sources of any quotes or paraphrased material you would use to support your opinion and thesis. In the right margin, note the page number. Where you draw upon information from a specific source or article, note it in the same way. This time, however, give the paragraph numbers that contain the information you are using.

OUTLINE ON PROBLEMS CONCERNING OBEDIENCE TO AUTHORITY
I. Introduction
   A. Define authority in your own terms, including what types of situations lend themselves to having to obey authority figures.
   B. Define obedience to authority as judged by Stanley Milgram.
   C. Summarize the experiment by Milgram and the findings he documented based on his outcome.
II. Review the commentaries on the experiment.
   A. Synthesis of the reviews.
   B. Critique (from YOUR point of view) on the value and validity of the experiment. Also, comment on which of the reviews you felt had the most balanced and accurate things to say about the experiment in your view.
III. Variant and opposing views ABOUT obedience, not necessarily having to do with the experiment or Milgram's views. Be sure to include some reference to Lessing's article and the Gibson, Haritos-Fatouros piece.
IV. How do the findings from Milgram's experiment and the other writing color and shape your own attitude toward obedience in realistic settings. Be sure to include references from the articles to the problems with both obedience and disobedience.
   A. Affects of obedience and disobedience on general society (Be sure to use the reviews and Gobson's article, Jackson's story).
B. How does the concept of obedience affect college students? (Use Crockett, Lessing and yourself).

V. CONCLUSION Include what you learned about the topic, what relevance you feel this information has and the attitudes you think are most appropriate to both obedience and disobedience in various settings.
APPENDIX G  SCAVENGER HUNT ARTICLES

Research Methods Tasks
English 102A
Spring, 1992

Group One:
"Letters form Hamburger Hill" Harper's, 1969
"White Council on Rock and Roll" Newsweek, 1956
Jackie Robinson-(objective profile)
Roosevelt-Time's Man of the Year--1942-(subjective profile)
"Resistance in Arkansas" Nation, 1958
"Great Speech: Inaugural Address" Time, 1961

Group Two:
Cuban Missile Crisis-(objective profile)
King Arthur-(literature, objective profile)
"Ready to Fight if Need Be" U.S. News, 1962
"Puppet Sovereign" Time, 1962
Peace Corp: Message to Congress--Vital Speeches, 1962
"Great Speech--Inaugural Address" Time, 1961

Group Three:
Spock, Benjamin-(objective profile)
Byronic-(literature, objective profile)
Book Reviews: The Common Sense Book of Baby and Child Care, Spock, Benjamin
Movie Reviews: Catcher in the Rye, Salinger, J.D.
Rebel Without a Cause, Roeg, Nicholas
The Graduate, Nichols, Mike
"Hippies Are Coming" Newsweek, 1967
"Hippies" Time, 1967

Group Four:
"Detroit Hunts Help" Business Week, 1942
"Output-Ladies Welcome" Newsweek, 1942
"Sex in the Factory" Time, 1942
"With Women and Work, the Factory Changes" Time, 1942
Book Reviews: The Hite Report, Hite, Sheer
Hugh Hefner-(subjective profile)
"Birth Control? A New Attitude by Catholics" U.S. News, 1963
"Birth Control-the Pill and the Church" Newsweek, 1964
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Group Five:
White Council vs. Rock n Roll* Newsweek, 1956
"Ready to Fight if Need Be" US News, 1962
Cuban Missile Crisis--(objective profile)
Joe McCarthy- (objective profile and subjective profile)
Kruschev, Nikita- (objective profile)
"If an H-Bomb Hits" US News, 1956
"Still No Place to Hide" Nation, 1955
"Letters From Hamburger Hill" Harper's, 1969
English 102A
Journal Checklist to Midterm

(* denotes something that has been or should be turned in preferably typed, especially for larger assignments, e.g., fairy tale paper.)

I. Obedience to Authority Chapter 6
1. summary & critique of Milgram’s experiment
2. answer #8 on p. 183; summary of "Group Minds"
3. notes on reviews of Milgram’s experiment
4. synthesis of reviews
5. summaries of rest of chapter
   * Extended Outline on Milgram & Obedience to Authority

II. Research Tasks (leading to the research paper)
6. topic chosen and articles found
7. documentation of articles
8. in class summary of "Baby Boomers" (newspaper)
   * Thesis Paragraph on research tasks (how the articles are connected)

III. "Cinderella" and the Importance of Fairy Tales
9. chart on the variant versions of "Cinderella"
10. notes on introduction to chapter and first article, "University of the Folktale"
11. critique of your favorite version of "Cinderella"
12. find and summarize three fairy tales you have never read before
13. document your sources for fairy tales just as you would in paper
14. notes on Luthi and Bettleheim articles (handout; Note difference in the two Bettleheim articles)
15. find the five points of isolation in Luthi’s article and test your fairy/folk tale to see if your hero is isolated
16. notes on the rest of the chapter
17. critical commentary of assertions made in articles by Thompson, Bettleheim (both articles), and Yolen
18. watch cartoons, movies or whatever source you see as contributing to the spread of values in modern times
20. notes and prewriting, brainstorming, looping or whatever it is that you do to get the initial ideas for a paper in order
   * Fairy Tale or Myth Paper: How are Values Being Changed and Transmitted?
A DEFINITION OF MYTH: Note that there is a difference between myth and mythology. Although there is a modern connotation of "myth" as something that is not true, that is a twist added when Christianity was trying to discredit all other religions, during the first three centuries A.D. The true definition of myth includes Christianity. It also includes all basic forms of religious and spiritual elements of mankind.

Rollo May, an American psychologist, has offered these definitions of "myth," upon which we will draw for our working idea and for the distinction between myth and folklore. The twentieth century use of the word myth is often to identify an idea as false or a phenomenon as nonexistent. Examples of this are notions such as A.I.D.S. being transmitted by talking to a victim or the notion that ghosts refers to other people's religion. An example of this is to say the Greek myths were the religion of the 5th century B.C. This is also called a system of mythology. The last definition of myth refers to stories using or illustrating basic or primary ideas about the nature of the spirit of mankind. This is the definition being used by Campbell in his discussion with Bill Moyers. This form of myth also relates elements of cultural value in the stories that are told as parts of the myths or pattern of beliefs expressed with symbols for ideas that represent their own culture and often many other cultures. The symbols that reappear over and over in all parts of the world and in many different times are important links that suggest that there are psychic unities or psychological truths that apply to all mankind. These universal symbols are also called archetypes or archetypal images, a term developed by the psychologist Carl Jung.

NOTES ON JOSEPH CAMPBELL’S POWER OF MYTH, "Myth and the Modern World"

[These comments are based on Campbell’s ideas, which are not accepted by everyone.]

Campbell is using a definition of myth that suggests it denotes or explains ideas that are so basically true to mankind in all places and times that it goes beyond the confines of a specific culture or region. It also explains and exemplifies the most fundamental nature of
man's spirit and his quest for purpose and definition to his life and his soul--his spiritual quest.

Second, notice that the mythic hero has a different set of requirements to meet than does the fairy/folk tale hero. While the folk hero usually does not return to the place of his origin, the mythic hero must return home, either bring with him the thing he went to find on his quest or the knowledge that he gained or to tell the story of his trials along the way or all three. The fairy/folk tale journey is linear or goes from the point of origin to another world and a different condition in the world; while the hero of myth goes on a circular journey, returning to the point of his origin in a changed condition or with an enlightened spirit. The heroic myth involves a journey into the soul or spirit, as well as a physical journey, which actually often represents or symbolizes the spiritual quest.

Modern knowledge is changing the factual nature of our view of the world. It has also changed our ideas about man's spiritual nature and the importance of myth and/or religion. Since these concepts are linked, they must be looked at as one focus. There are symbols and stories that appear in the world's major religions with remarkably similar elements and details. However, because of the influence of science, new myths must be developed to inform our spiritual consciousness in the twentieth century.
ENGLISH 102-A
Chapter 8: Fairy Tale Paper

REQUIREMENTS: Must be at least 500 words, with 750 being a more realistic length. Must be clearly written or typed, double-spaced and on only one side of the paper.

You MUST either use two or more traditional tales OR two or more variants of the tale you discuss.

You MUST use more than one critical or secondary article ABOUT the tale(s) you choose.

You MUST use in-text citations to document the sources of your material, both primary (the tale) and secondary (the articles about the tale).

SUGGESTIONS OF TOPICS AND STRATEGIES:
1. Using just the variants of "Cinderella" and the articles in the chapter, discuss whether you agree or disagree with a) the feminist concerns about traditional tales, b) the psychological concerns of those that suggest fairy tale literature is of major significance in the psychological development of children, c) their concern with the "proper" level of violence and what that level is.

2. You may also discuss "Cinderella" and another tale in terms of universality, as expressed in the Thompson article and any other you find in the library. If you choose this, be ready to deal with the idea that humans have had and continue to have many of the same concerns about their world and their children in all times and all places. People have similar basic desires and goals. You can touch on what has remained valid and what has diminished on been eliminated in the sense of cultural or ethical values and morals/mores.

3. Using the Max Luthi article, you may trace the isolation of a character in the tales you have chosen and explain. To do this properly, use each of the main points of Luthi's criterion and give examples from the tales you are using that show that tale does or does not match or vary the elements upon which Luthi is basing his article.
4. You may examine psychological truths exemplified in tales and explain why these elements are essential to development of personality (i.e. Note that many folk and fairy tale central characters are adolescents who undergo changes that transform them into adults by the end of the story.

5. You may combine Luthi, Thompson and perhaps some of the psychological to fully examine one tale in depth.

6. You may use one of the approaches suggested in Topic for paper: Changes in values and how they are reflected in stories/fairy tales/folk/mythic elements of a culture.

Thesis question for paper: What are the popular folk stories today and what do they say about our culture?

Method of development: Use the following suggestions to synthesize the information from all the sources from which you will draw ideas about the thesis. Use old fairy tales you researched and cartoons you have watched, as well as songs and/or movies to develop an idea of the current values as expressed in these sources. (Note: In using the old tales, notice what values are still stressed in modern telling and in the way you may remember these stories from your childhood.)

Use the articles in the chapter to point out how fairy/folk tales reflect cultures (Thompson) and how they have been changed by modern telling, especially Walt Disney (Ylen). Also look at the idea of feminist values supported or not supported by both old and new versions of tales and cartoons (Kolbenschlag).

Use Luthi’s...Isolated Hero" to compare fairy tale heroes and cartoon heroes. If you can do it, also show how the ideas of isolation fit current society, i.e. the deep forest and sense of being lost in a strange world dan relate to the feeling of a strange city, with its canyons of concrete and steel. For this you must have an understanding of the five major points upon which isolation is based by Luthi.

To use the film by Joseph Campbell, you must examine the idea of first what our current myths are and how they are told to the youth of our times. Be sure to include how you see movies like the Star Wars Trilogy and the Indiana Jones stories fitting into this scenario, as well as the cartoons you chose. You may also want to include
songs and other movies or television programs. If you wish, you may include negative values, like the increased violence and the deterioration of kindness in modern society. "Synthesis Activities" on p. 364 ff.
NOTES ON FAIRY/FOLK TALES

DEFINITION: Be sure to separate animal tales, fables and "true" fairy tales.

Note components of definition from book. Note that there has to be some magic and usually some diminutive creature—either a dwarf, fairy, elf or often an old person who is "stopped" or appears out of nowhere. Sometimes there is an enchanted animal who is really a prince of princess, etc. in disguise. Then there are two tasks being accomplished at the same time. Often the hero or heroine must do something to prove "worthy" or to prove that he/she has become an adult, while the "animal" must do something to break the spell. Note this is never so easy as simply telling the person "Kiss me so I can turn back into myself!" It almost always includes some sort of gear that requires the willingness, untainted, of the person who is to break the spell.

Note also that animals perform certain tasks to save the hero/heroine. E.G. The duck in "Hansel and Gretel," the polar bear in "East of the Sun, West of the Moon" and others.

NOTE THE MAJOR MOTIFS THAT APPEAR IN MOST FOLK AND FAIRY TALES: TRANSFORMATION INTO ADULTHOOD AND A CHANGE IN STATUS IN LIFE & SHATTERING OF ILLUSIONS THAT HIDE THE TRUTH OR A PERSON'S TRUE NATURE.

Use the quote from Crow and Weasel about people needing stories.
ENGLISH 102A
Chapter 8 - "Fairy Tales: A Closer Look at 'Cinderella'"

Week 1
M/T BEFORE CLASS: Read introduction to chapter. Think about why folk and fairy tales are significant in the development of personality, personal values and cultural unity.

IN CLASS: Discuss variations on widely known fairy tales. Also consider WHAT fairy and folk tales are known in general, WHICH are known only because of Walt Disney or television.

READING ASSIGNMENT: Read all the variants of "Cinderella"--307-340.

WRITING ASSIGNMENT: Make a chart of the elements of the story that remain the same in all versions, then list the things (elements or details of the important elements) that change. Select your favorite version and comment critically why it is so. (A tiny critique!)

W/T IN CLASS: Discuss variations in "Cinderella" and other fairy tales. REMEMBER one that you loved as a child and we'll see how many variations are represented by members of the class.

QUESTION: How many fairy and folk tales do YOU know without the help of Walt Disney and television; that is, how many did you read or were read or told to you as a child?

WHAT DOES THIS HAVE TO DO WITH UNIFICATION OF CULTURE? OF ALL MANKIND?

READING ASSIGNMENT: Find three other fairy or folk tales and write brief but clear narrative summaries of each. DO NOT USE WALT DISNEY VERSIONS!

Read Thompson’s "Universality of the Folktale" and the handout, which includes "Bettleheim’s "Uses of Enchantment" and Luthi’s "The Isolated Hero."

WRITING ASSIGNMENT: Using the Thompson article and perhaps the Bettleheim, comment on the universalities in the three OTHER tales you read, paying particular attention to the fact that elements of human nature transcend time and place.

Also, it would be a VERY GOOD IDEA to summarize each of the articles, or at least take notes on the most important ideas/theories.
Be ready to discuss at least the Thompson article and its relevance to an over-view of folk and fairy tales in general.

OVER THE WEEK-END: Read the rest of the chapter. Again, take notes on each article. Also, write a brief critical commentary dealing with what you agree and disagree with in the author’s assertions.

BE SURE TO BRING THE BOOK(S) FROM WHICH YOU GOT YOUR OTHER TALES TO CLASS ON MONDAY.
English 102-A
Research Notes

**TOPIC & BIBLIOGRAPHY:** After you have the general topic, begin looking for lists of information on that topic. There are frequently annotated bibliographies that include other sources of information in textbooks. There are also a number of general and specialized indexes that list sources of information. The library also has "Infotrak" which will help you find things. However, do not eliminate the card catalog, as sometimes you will literally stumble across a really good reference on the way through the cards to something else. Be sure to KEY your bibliography cards and include the call number of the book. Even if you are using a computer disk to store your information, back it up with written data.

You will need to begin your research before you can narrow your topic, as the amount of available information may make some of your choices for you. After you have some of your sources, be sure to use the index at the back of the book to further narrow the part of your topic upon which you will concentrate. Review pp. 521-527 in your HANDBOOK for comments on focusing your topic so that it is a manageable size.

**Remember:** Library research orientation-Davis Room, 4th floor 12:00 Friday 25th/2:00 Tuesday 29th.

**SEARCH LOG or I-SEARCH:** As you are looking for material and beginning to read to see what you can use and what won't help, write down both your findings and feeling. This will help you see where you have been and what you have left to do/read. It is a good place to note questions and problems. Also, write down your personal response to the information you are gaining from your reading. For instance, if you think that every one of the authors you have read so far needs serious psychiatric help, note that. If you think their ideas make no sense to any one with less that three PhD’s, write that. If you come across the perfect explanation of the structure of DNA that any one can understand, comment on it. (And tell me what it is!) Consider this talking to yourself in writing so you don’t forget what you have said to yourself. There may be a more interesting story in the unfolding pattern of your discoveries on your topic than you can write for the research paper. Remember also that this is the raw material for a paper you will write after
the research paper is turned in and probably also on your final exam.

A further rational for this kind of log comes from Ken Macrorie’s *I-Search*. He suggests that the research process--forming and discarding of hypotheses, the integration of research with personal ideas, the element of discovery and frustration, etc. are worthy of consideration and may be more important that the researched data you use for your paper. Your analysis of the journal or search log that you keep will be of value and will help you improve you skills in both writing and the process of researching information. You will note that the analysis paper you write on your research is worth 100 points, the same as the final revision of the research paper! Your journal will be the basis for your evaluation to your own reactions and journey through this process.

ROUGH-ROUGH ARGUMENT PAPER: To enable you to work out the form of your basic argument or position you will write a rough draft of that portion of your paper before you incorporate the research. This will be like you wrote for 101 and will be a basic statement of your ideas on the subject BEFORE you add the information you have researched. To do this well, you should read/skim the "How to Write" parts of Chapters 6 through 9 in GUIDE. These have check-lists that will help you focus. Also review Chapter 19 on ARGUING and pay particular attention to the LOGICAL FALLACIES on p. 515.

You need to have the rough draft of this portion of your paper ready for me to read when you come in for your conference. You do not have to have all of the research done be the time you write this. So, do it soon and you may have a better idea of the areas of your paper that need the most support and the areas where your own opinion is well expresses and well thought-out.
APPENDIX N PEER ASSESSMENT FORMS

Peer Assessment Sheet

(Confidential)

Your name: ____________________________
Assignment: ___________________________
Group number: _________________________
Total # of Team Members: ___________

Directions: On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being the lowest, 5 the highest), provide a confidential assessment of each member in your group, including yourself.
Note: Your score should differentiate among your group members and among the contributions of each person.

Members Names: __________________________

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended group meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintained group process/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributed positive group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated actively in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group discussion--con-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tributed ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listened and responded to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others’ remarks, asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions, provided sup-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portive feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped keep group focused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided effective coordina-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tion (leadership)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped draft assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped revise assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performed other tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to work with person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PEER ASSESSMENT SHEET
[confidential]
Your name____________________ Group number________
Assignment____________________ Date_______________
DIRECTIONS: With 1 being the lowest, rate each member including yourself from 1 through 5 according to the categories below.

MEMBERS NAMES
Attended group meetings
Maintained process; contributed to group feeling.
Listened and responded to remarks, asked ques's, supportive feedback
Helped keep on goals
Provided effective coordination; listening
Helped draft assignment
Helped revise assignment
Performed other tasks
Want to work with again

COMMENTS: (Be brutally honest)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Survey</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (SD)</th>
<th>Disagree (D)</th>
<th>Neutral (N)</th>
<th>Agree (A)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (SA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I enjoy writing more than I did before this course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel more confident about my writing than I did before this course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel this writing course has improved my writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Due to class, I've changed the way I write.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I've learned a lot about the whole writing process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I've learned a lot about generating ideas for a paper.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I've learned a lot about how to revise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have a better sense of writing for an audience than I did before this course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What I've learned about writing in this course will help me with my future occupation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Having others evaluate my writing helps me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Discussing my writing with others is useful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The way this class was taught was helpful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I'd like my next writing course to be taught the way this one was.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I recommend the particular class to my friends who have to take English 101.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Learning to write in groups was a positive experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Writing in groups helped me learn to write for other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I liked group writing the more I used it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX P  STUDENT INTERVIEW

Name of Student: 
Teacher: 
Class: 
Condition: 
Group members:

Communication Patterns 
1. How easy was it for you to express your opinions in your group(s)?

2. If you were in changing groups was there a difference among the groups?

3. What was the difference?

4. Did certain people look to other group members for support?

5. Did you find that communication among your group members was a one-to-one, one-to-group, or through a group leader kind of pattern?

6. Influence--who talks to whom, who looks at whom for support?

Major roles: 
________Initiator  __________Gatekeeper
________Information seeker __________Standard setter
________Information giver __________Follower
________Coordinator __________Observer
________Evaluator __________Blocker
________Encourager __________Recognition seeker
________Harmonizer __________Dominator

Leadership style 
1. Was the main leadership pattern democratic?

2. Was the main leadership pattern dictatorial?

3. Did a "do your own thing" leadership pattern prevail?

Participation 
1. Was participation generally good?

2. Was there a lack of enthusiasm by participants?
3. Did commitment seem low?
4. Were some participants holding back?
5. Who were the most active participators?
6. Which participants were not active?
7. Were there major shifts in levels of participation during the activity?
8. How were low participators treated?
9. How was their silence interpreted?

**Influence**
1. Who were the most influential members of the group?
2. Who were the least influential members of the group?
3. Were there major shifts of influence during the activity?
4. How many suggestions were rejected?
5. Was there one member’s suggestions rejected more than others?
6. How were decisions made--by voting? consensus? ramrodding?
7. How focused was the group on its main topic of concern?
8. Were there particular clusters of group participants who would usually support one another in arriving at decisions?
9. Were there groups or individuals who were frequently in conflict with one another?
10. How involved were all group members in arriving at decisions?
11. How did the group resolve major differences of opinion?

**Norms**
1. Were there certain topics which were generally avoided by the group (for example, race, religion,
feelings for one another, sex, points of disagreement, etc?)

2. Did members of the group conduct themselves in particularly polite or formal ways? Were members conducting themselves in a manner that seemed especially informal?

3. Were individual’s feelings dealt with openly?

4. Were individual’s motives dealt with openly?

Goals
1. Were groups goals discussed?

2. Were the goals agreed upon?

3. Did the group accommodate diverse member goals?

4. How did you go about writing collaboratively?

Cohesion
1. Did group members tend to perceive situations similarly?

2. Did membership in the group provide interpersonal rewards?

Group climate
1. How would you characterize the general climate of the group?

2. Did members of the group seem to have sincere regard for one another’s thoughts and feelings?

Situational Factors
1. What were the effects of the group size?

2. Was time a factor in the group’s process?

3. Were physical facilities an important factor in determining the nature of interaction (e.g., seating arrangements, tables, etc)

4. Were all members present for entire interaction?

5. What was your overall response to working in a group?

6. Would you choose this type of course again?
7. What were the frustrations you encountered?

8. What were the benefits?

9. How would you evaluate this class as a learning experience?

10. How would you evaluate what you learned about writing?

11. How do you feel about what you learned about yourself in relation with others?

12. Did you see yourself changing over the course of the semester? In what way?
APPENDIX Q  TEACHER INTERVIEW

Teachers’ Interview

Teacher:
Class:

1. What differences did you observe among the three sections?
2. How did your role change as a teacher?
3. How did you structure the tasks differently?
4. Do you feel students made productive use of class time?
5. How did you feel about entering their groups?
6. Did students complain to you about their groups?
7. What solutions did you offer them?
8. Did you have to tell students to go to groups or did they sit in their groups automatically?
9. What happened when you left the room?
10. What suggestions can you offer for improvement?
11. Did new leaders emerge when groups changed?
12. Did you find "social loafing"?
13. Did you find evidence of a "group think" conformity?
14. Did social or cultural differences play a role in group interaction?
15. Did gender differences play a part?
16. How imperative was it for you to follow the methodology of the experiment?
17. Please comment on the collaboration process at work among the teachers and the researcher?
18. Would you be willing to participate in another experiment?
19. Do you plan to use collaborative writing in future classes?

20. What did students learn about writing?
APPENDIX R  SCORING GUIDE

UPPER HALF SCORES

5
The 5 paper is well-focused on the question, developed, and generally free from distracting errors. Its thesis is clear and does not just restate the topic. Although the paper may need a little more development, it is clearly able to develop some points with logic and consistency and has a sure sense of introduction and conclusion. Paragraphs clearly relate to the central idea, have transitions between them, and flow without rambling. There is clear breakdown of the topic into subordinate ideas and evidence of strong paragraph development--each paragraph containing a central idea and strong support. Sentences are clear and direct, show some variety and sophistication in structure, and contain no major errors. There is little use of cliche, and word usage is proper, appropriate, and without dialect problems. It is not error free, but errors are negligible in the context of the paper.

6
The 6 paper adds sophistication in its content and form. It goes beyond simple clarity in its interpretation of the topic, the substance of its argument, and development of ideas. It has a good mix of general and specific statements and has strong organization, transition, progression of thought. While the paper is not perfect, it demonstrates significant, memorable thought matched by clear mastery of sentence structure and language.

4
The 4 paper is clearly focused, logical, and coherent, but it doesn’t have a lot to say. It sounds "pat" and lacks some of the characteristics of a 5. It needs more development. It prepares reader for the body of the paper in the introduction, but the body paragraphs may lack detail or make poor choices in their examples. Sentence structure and vocabulary are adequate, but there is no sense of sophistication, and there may be a few noticeable errors.
LOWER HALF SCORES

2
The 2 paper makes a stab at answering the question but is unfocused, incomplete, and superficial, or it has a distracting pattern of grammatical errors.
The argument is not fully developed and even repetitious or contradictory. The body does not support the initial assertion, and there is a focus on generalities rather than specifics. Restatement, summary, and emotion generally replace logical analysis of the topic. There is little sense of paragraph development or breakdown of thought into units. Important problems with diction, sentence structure, punctuation and the like distract the reader. Misuse of words and problems with idiom, diction, and dialect are severely distracting.

3
The 3 paper remains in the lower half because it has serious difficulties in some areas.
While it may have some sense of focus and arrangement, it has weak development of ideas, organization, or mechanics. Its paragraphs are weak and seem to lack internal logic and support despite some specific details. Its vocabulary is adequate, and it has fewer problems with language than a 2. Grammar and mechanics can hamper the reader.

1
The 1 paper shows incompetence in writing. It is hopeless and its writer slipped through the system.
It is incoherent, not focused on a single topic, and has no sense of paragraph development or supporting detail. It contains a distracting number of major and minor errors and shows no strength in using language or constructing sentences.
## APPENDIX S  SAMPLE STUDENT JOURNAL CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>WorthQuot</th>
<th>PosNeg</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Spec</th>
<th>Leng</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>#entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bergeron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probl w/eval of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: All numbers refer to the number of the student’s journal entry except for length where 1 = 1 page or less, 2 = between 1 and 2 pages and 3 = more than 2 pages.*
APPENDIX T  BALE'S INTERACTION PROCESS ANALYSIS

Bales' Interaction Process Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-emotional area: positive</th>
<th>1. <strong>Shows solidarity</strong>, raises other's status, gives help, reward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2. <strong>Shows tension release</strong>, jokes, laughs, shows satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. <strong>Agrees</strong>, shows passive acceptance, understands, concurs, complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. <strong>Gives suggestion</strong>, direction, implying autonomy for other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-area: neutral</td>
<td>5. <strong>Gives opinion</strong>, evaluation, analysis, expresses feeling, wish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. <strong>Gives orientation</strong>, information, repeats, clarifies, confirms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-emotional area: negative</td>
<td>7. <strong>Asks for orientation</strong>, information, repetition, confirmation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8. <strong>Asks for opinion</strong>, evaluation, analysis, expression of feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. <strong>Asks for suggestion</strong>, direction, possible ways of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. <strong>Disagrees</strong>, shows passive rejection, formality, withholds help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. <strong>Shows tension</strong>, asks for help, withdraws out of field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. <strong>Shows antagonism</strong>, deflates other's status, defends or asserts self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The coding categories in interaction process analysis and their major relations:

A. positive reactions
B. attempted answers
C. questions
D. negative reactions
## APPENDIX U COMPOSITION OF GROUPS OBSERVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent Groups &amp; Grades</th>
<th>Changing Groups &amp; Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A - Annabel</strong></td>
<td><strong>Group C - David</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Carlson - C</td>
<td>Ron Galbo - B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Sala - A</td>
<td>Margaret Lord - B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Turner - B</td>
<td>Tracy Scioneaux - B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Williams - A</td>
<td>Gwynne Williams - B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group B - David</strong></td>
<td><strong>Group D - Annabel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Dupont - F</td>
<td>Sharon Clark - A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget Rood - B</td>
<td>Brant Conti - B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Serpas - C</td>
<td>Cliff Dixon - C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Weeks - B</td>
<td>Angelle Robichaux - C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Werline - B</td>
<td><strong>Group E - Annabel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cliff Dixon - C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alisa Milioto - A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cyndi Ory - A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ted Pries - C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
English 102 Synthesis/Evaluative In-Class Essay

Major elements of essay must include the following:

1. Relate general feelings on collaborative/group work experience

2. List roles group members played for each project (include how member’s roles changed from class to class)

3. Compare and contrast projects and HOW specifically each one worked (names, roles, etc.)

4. Draw conclusion

Set up this essay with an introductory paragraph containing a thesis that needs to be proved, the body of the essay consisting of informatory paragraphs proving your thesis, and a concluding paragraph.
Note: These essays were written the last week of the semester.

Group A: Permanent Group (Annabel’s class)

Working as a group teaches an individual values, obedience, responsibility, as well as social interaction.

As we worked on each project we learned to delegate work evenly among the group. There were few problems with anyone in the group disobeying their responsibility. In fact, each person was receptive in receiving their command to locate certain items for our papers. Perhaps this was a result of each group person acting out the role of initiator. We learned being the leader all the time has its disadvantages, yet it also has some advantages.

The disadvantages of being the initiator constantly limits your ability to grow with the group. Also, when in the initiator role you tend to not listen to others ideas. Therefore, resulting in the others in the group resisting all ideas. However, we learned to express our ideas as an individual by each one of us being the initiator. Thereafter, we evaluated these ideas and decided on which ones would best suit our paper. This helped us not only appreciate each others ideas, but respect them as well.

When we began to work together as a group we knew little about each other; therefore, being somewhat shy from expressing our true feelings. However, as our group grew, we realized we were constantly influencing each other without our recognizing it. In fact, we discovered many traits about ourselves that we were unaware existed. One important fact is: communicating with people can accomplish more if only we provide considerate listening skills. Also, if there is a person in the group that becomes resistant to all ideas do not allow that person to detain the progress of the group.

Many responsibilities were delegated during our papers. In fact, each person spent hours locating items for our research paper. Everyone accepted their responsibility to the group as well as to themselves by located their items without resistance. Also, we each group member knew if there was a problem locating any material, we could call upon someone in our group for assistance. It was a comfort to have the people in our group interact favorably toward each other. However, it is not to say we never had problems.

There was some resistance in our group but it was quickly smoothed when the others in the group pulled together to complete the assignment. Also, knowing the
responsibility of developing a proper paper for class would result in others grades besides ones own, helped each other do a more thorough job. Therefore, we appreciated each others opinion in what should or should not be allowed in our paper.

Nevertheless, our time together was not always spent on assignments. There were days we spent socializing, yet unknowing to anyone in our group, we were learning even then. We learned how each person felt about certain issues. Therefore, discovering difference of opinion among our group and learning to deal with it in a tackful manner. Due to our group interacting in this manner, we were able to relay upon each other and make sure the assignment was completed.

We all agree that learning social responsibility is extremely important, especially prior to graduation. Therefore, a student should learn social responsibility and social interaction in class so he/she will be prepared for the workforce. An individual cannot be successful without having the knowledge and experience of interacting with others as well as the social responsibility required in today’s world.

Group B: Permanent Group (David’s class)

The values of society have moved toward different ideals from generation to generation. When a huge social crisis has occurred in the United States, the value system has been altered as a direct result. The United States has had many wars and times of poverty, World War II is by far the most influential in our lives today. Whether it was the 1940’s or the 1990’s, there have been many social changes in the United States since World War II.

The early 1900’s was a time of great hardships. There were two world wars and the stock market crashed causing the Great Depression. The Great Depression affected the lives of all Americans and it greatly altered the lives of future generations.

During this time of hardships, many people died from malnutrition and from lack of clothing, shelter, fuel, and medical care. Despair overcame millions more who survived but could not find work for months even years. Many children were forced to quit school. It was a time of hopelessness. However, one man believed he could conquer this depression. Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected in 1932. He needed the country’s participation to make his plan work. Americans had to desire to make life better for themselves. They did. Therefore, Roosevelt brought relief and reform to the nation.
Yet, Americans had another hardship to conquer, World War II. After being forced into the war by Japan’s attack on Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt faced more problems. However, he convinced Americans to work together to defeat the common enemy whether it be poverty or Hitler. During his thirteen years in office Roosevelt changed America’s outlook on life.

Right after World War II ended, the first wave of baby-boomers were born. The parents not wanting their children to grow up in the deprived depression as they did ended up spoiling their children. "Spare the rod and spoil the child" was a theory by a man named Dr. Spock. He wrote a book about child rearing which told parents instead of smacking your kid around spoil them. This era also sparked the T.V. age. Families, especially children would sit hours upon hours watching their favorite shows. Some family shows gave people the wrong idea of the "average family." People would see how their family didn’t measure up to Ward Cleaver’s family and consider their family a failure. Duck and Cover I was telling the children to go to school and become model citizens but also by the way you could be blown up at any given time. This brought about rebellion and rock ‘n roll. This type of music was anti-authority and was just for their generation. The kids figured if they were going to die anyway, why conform and be like their parents.

At the same time as this rebellion was taking place, authority was enforcing the values of obeying and controlled emotions. They told you to conform and don’t even think about sex until you are married. Even though the parents of this generation tried to over-indulge their children they feel as if they had failed.

This group of baby-boomers soon went off to college. This was a very unique time in America. It was a time of great social and political change. It was the start of the Vietnam conflict and the civil rights movement. Eisenhower once had to send the National Guard to Central High School to protect them in the de-segregation of schools. Duck and Cover II was the Cuban Missile Crisis. Russia had missiles in Cuba just 90 miles off of Florida. Camelot symbolized the ending of this "perfect government." It ended with the assassination of president John F. Kennedy. The ending of this era marked a tremendous time in U.S. History. I can not think of any other time of such social change in last one hundred years.

Many difficulties were faced in the 1970’s in that the Vietnam Veterans were returning home and Watergate. The use of drugs in the United States was also growing all
of these struggles led the second wave Baby Boomers who were going to college to learn that the country just cannot be trusted. So they learned to conform to society, and they had all the fun without the ideals.

Furthermore, in the 1980’s the "yuppies" came on the scene. They were supposedly rich and concerned with only theirselves and their well-being. The "yuppies" were very self-indulgent which they learned from their parents. This attitude originally came from Dr. Spock whose philosphy was to indulge your children. This indulgence resulted in spoiled and selfish "yuppies."

The 1990’s are a time of change and transformation. Things that most of us have known as tradition or just always known to be are beginning to change. For instance, the fall of the Berlin Wall in Germany. The wall had been up since World War II in 1945 and fell in 1990. The wall was up for 45 years and separated a country in two separate countries. Families were separated and until recently they have been united for the 1st time in 45 years. The Gulf War was another change that took place in the 1990’s. The Soviet Union fell in the oppressing values and tradition of many years. The Gulf War was another change that took place in the 1990’s. The gulf war was fought over money, and oil control in the far East. The U.S. was being threatened over and economic situation.

The youth of America in the 1990’s have a more rebellious attitude than the ones of the sixties. More violence and racial conflicts have flamed up due to poor education, financial problem and peer pressure.

Values are changing daily in the U.S. for the first time in a long time, the U.S. became united and almost everybody supported the troops in the gulf war. I feel the strong support by the adults is due because of the treatment that the vietnam veterans received after the vietnam conflict.

The 1990’s are altering the history of the world, as far as foreign governments are concerned they are drastically changing. The values of today compared to the 60’s are more individually related to selfishness and self indulgence.

Group E: Changing Group (Annabel’s class)

Individuals make up a society. As individuals we must all intermingle and relate with others. It is true that each person is an individual physically, but as part of society you are never individually isolated. We are
responsible for our individuality, thus we are responsible for how society functions.

Our values and morals are created, shaped, and passed on through stories and fairytales. We are taught through fairytales that good overcomes evil and that if we are patient and honest good things will come to us. Fairytales use the best values and ethics to create heroes that have these valuable qualities to be examples for society. By passing fairytales and stories from generation to generation culture is formed. Through the formation of culture our morals and values are instilled in us.

Bartleby was a true individual, completely isolating himself from society and those around him. We all possess a part of Bartleby’s personality, though we do not take extreme isolationism. Bartleby teaches us that we must be content and happy with ourselves in order to be an individual. We are taught by Bartleby that adaptation to our surroundings is a must in order for us to be content and happy.

Milgram shows us the true dependent person. The teachers in Milgram’s experiments have to be told what to do in order to do it. Just as Bartleby was content with not being told what to do, Milgram’s teachers were content with being told what to do. We all possess a dependent quality. Milgram’s teachers were more concerned with how society viewed them rather than what they were doing to society.

In order to be a truly stable individual in society we must learn to balance our dependency with our individuality. We must take our individuality and link it with society in order for us to be a complete person.

Collaborative work forced us to do our individual work and relate and put it together with others. The purpose was for us to coincide our ideas with the ideas of others.

During group work we were not only expected to work together but we needed to understand and have an open mind toward other people’s views. Working together and understanding not necessarily accepting, others views helps us to function in society.
APPENDIX X  SAMPLES OF INDIVIDUALLY-WRITTEN ESSAYS

Note: These essays were written as final exams during a two-hour period of time.

Permanent Group A: Annabel’s Class (Course Grade A)

I have never worked on a paper with a group before; therefore it was a new experience for me. When we began our first project no one in my group wanted to take charge and delegate responsibility. Since I had been in the work force previously and had experienced the job of delegating, it was easy for me to lead my group in writing a successful paper.

On our first paper there was little debate or challenge from anyone in the group. However, this attitude changed quickly as we began to know each other a little better. Jennifer, had been shy and did not want to offend anyone with her suggestions or ideas, but gradually this changed. In fact, she had very good ideas once she got past expressing them to our group. I was extremely proud of Jennifer for opening up to the group because she does have so much to offer. Also, she taught me to be patient and listen to what others have to say. As I listened to the others in my group I realized we were all changing our beliefs on different subjects. For example, when reading the article on Milgram, I was a firm believer that I would never execute such pain upon another human being. However, when Jeff challenged me on the idea that if it were my job to do this, then perhaps I would. I thought about that idea for a long time and came to the conclusion that Jeff was right. If it were my job, there is a possibility that I would do as my supervisor had instructed and execute electric shock to an individual. However, I still believe if I heard the screams of that individual I would cease the shock treatment immediately. Nevertheless, Jeff did make me look at things on a different viewpoint and I learned that perhaps I do not know myself as well as I thought.

Another important factor I learned is how fairy tales are related to our lives each day. For example, fairy tales give you the hope and dreams of tomorrow. This idea was reinforced as Scott and I discussed the different fairy tales. Neither one of us realized how important the tales were to us as children and what they taught us. In fact, I have always credited my parents for instilling the values of love and respect in my life, when in essence they had been fairy tales. Even though they were the ones that read the stories to me, it was the the stories that
taught me how to relate to different situations. Nevertheless, Scott and I found this fascinating. I have always thought working together would accomplish more in a shorter period of time and this idea was reinforced in this course. In fact, it not only taught me to respect others ideas and opinions but how to organize my time with others. Perhaps if more courses were taught in this manner there would be a much better relationship among employees in the work force. Moreover, this is what colleges around the country should be teaching students --- social interaction, which helps develop individuals to learn and understand others needs and values.

Permanent Group B: David’s class (Course Grade C)

Values

What are values? Where do they come from? The value system of today has changed drastically over the years. Values are ideals taught to us by our parents or through experience. Whether one learns obedience to authority, or conformity, or to work harder to get what he wants (work ethic), values are a part of our life. In this English class I have learned about many values, but my beliefs about obedience to authority have been challenged greatly. I have also learned a great amount about conforming to society.

We have spent a lot of time studying the 1960’s. To study that time era, we had to trace their value system all the way back to World War II. World War II had a great effect on the changing beliefs of the generations and still effects us today.

In the 1960’s the young people were going through a great rebellion to authority. They had a good reason to rebel. They were tired of being lied to by the government and society. They had grown up with lies and deceitfulness. On television there was the perfect family who never fought; or when they did, it was solved in a half hour. Also, the fathers were always there and could spend a great amount of quality time with their children. This just was not the case in the 1960’s. The fathers were working hard to make sure their children did not have to do without like their generation had. Another lie that the young people had lived with was the government. They were tired of hearing one thing and seeing an all together different view. So they rebelled against the rules of authority.

Further, that generation’s view of conformity was startling. They believed in standing up and fighting for
their beliefs and values, not just going along with the crowd. They wanted the United States to recognize them as different, so they did things to make them different. They wanted to be heard, for they were weary of people just letting things happen without protest.

I have learned from the 1960’s. Before this class, I did not know how to feel about that generation. I have always been told that they were wrong and there was no reason for what they did. In contrast, there were a number of reasons for their rebellion to authority. They were distressed over the attitude of the nation. As for being right or wrong - Well, I guess that is for each person to decide!

Changing Group C, E: Annabel’s Class (Course Grade C)

This course has intrigued me. I have come to class everyday with a ho-hum attitude ad gone with a hundred questions and ideas in my head. The readings in this class were very interesting, they have asked questions about society and individuals that I have never imagined before.

Starting with Milgram's experiment, I was hooked. I have always believed that if I was faced with an authority figure directing me to do something morally wring to another person, especially direct physical harm, I would not follow direction. After studying Milgram’s experiment I have to question my actions in the same situation as the "teachers" in the experiment. I would like to know that I would not harm someone else solely on the basis of an order, but I have not been in the pressure seat. The data shows that more people than not will follow orders to the extreme. From a very young age we are taught to "do as your told or else" and we take that with us into adulthood, but at what expense and whose expense. I have always thought that the members of Hitler’s army were evil creatures, but now I believe they were mind lessly following the orders of a handful of sick leaders And why? What would I do? I hope I’m never in those shoes.

From Milgram we moved to fairytales I never realized how much these stories shape our society. It is amazing that fairytales form generation to generation and all parts of the world are very similar in the values they teach. The stories in television and movies for current generation lack the family values and ethics that are present in traditional fairytales. Our society is being degraded form the lack of ethics and integrity in our modern fairytales.

As Milgram, (Hitler for that matter) has shown how extreme obedience to authority can destroy, Bartleby has
shown how total lack of obedience can destroy. Melville's "Bartleby, The Scrivers" has proven that to have a functional society we must obey to national demands. Individual must be capable of making correct decisions in order to have a healthy society.

This course has taught me how traditional fairytale values used with healthy educated minds can create a friendly society. Individualism and conformity must be balanced.

I have learned a great deal this semester, but what frightens me is how little I know.
VITA

Carole Hecht McAllister was born in Elizabeth, New Jersey, on September 2, 1946. Upon graduation from Union High School in June 1964, she attended Springfield College, Springfield, Massachusetts, where she received a B.A. degree in English in June 1968. She then went to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill where she received an M.A. in English in August 1969.


Moving to Louisiana in 1974, she began teaching part-time for the English department at Southeastern Louisiana University. Her second child Sara was born in 1975. In 1980 she was promoted to full-time instructor as well as received an M.F.A. in Drama from the University of New Orleans, active in community and children’s theatre.

After publishing a few articles and receiving grants, including one to fund a microcomputer laboratory for English students, she was promoted to assistant professor in 1986. In 1988 she began work on her doctorate in English while she continued to teach full-time and coordinate the English microcomputer laboratory. Her major research interests include computers and composition as well as collaborative writing.
DOCTORAL EXAMINATION AND DISSERTATION REPORT

Candidate: Carole H. McAllister

Major Field: English

Title of Dissertation: Collaboration and Composition: Effects of Group Structure on Writing and Classroom Dynamics

Approved:

[Signatures]

Major Professor and Chairman
Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

[Signatures]

Date of Examination:

December 11, 1992