

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arrington, P. K. (1984). Tropes, invention, and the composing process (Doctoral dissertation, University of Louisville, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45:6, 1740A.

Barnet, S., Berman, M., Burto, W., & Cain, W. E. (1997). (Eds.) Literature: Thinking, Reading, and Writing Critically. New York: Longman

Bizzel, P. (1992). Academic discourse and critical consciousness. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Bizzell, P. & Herzberg, B. (Eds.). (1990). The rhetorical tradition: Reading from classical times to the present. Boston, MA: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press.

Blau, S. (1996, March). What's in a name? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Milwaukee, WI.

Black, J. (1993). The effects of auditory and visual stimuli on tenth graders' descriptive writing. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 346 887.

Braddlock, R., Lloyd-Jones, R., & Schoer, L. (1963). Research in written composition. Champaign, IL.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Bramer, G. R. (1985) Right rhetoric: Classical roots for contemporary aims in writing. In Rhetoric and Praxis (pp. 135-155). Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press.

Britton, J. (1978). The composing process and the functions of writing. In C. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), Research on composing: Points of departure (pp.13-28). Urbana, IL.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Burns, H. (1980). A writer's tool: computing as a mode of inventing. In J. N. Hays, J. R. Ramsey, R. D. Foulke (Eds.), The writer's mind. Writing as a mode of thinking (pp. 87) Urbana, IL.: National Council of Teachers.

Calkins, L. (1986). The art of teaching writing. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Carey, L. (1990). Differences among writers' initial task representations. Technical report No. 35. Center for the study of writing, Berkeley, CA; Center for the study of writing, Pittsburgh, PA. 33 pages

Cheshire, B. W. (1986) Freewriting: teacher perceptions and research data. In J. D. Moss (Ed.), Rhetoric and Praxis. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press. pp. 148-156

Corbett, P. J. (1971). Classical rhetoric for the modern student. (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Corbett, E. P. J. (1984). The theory and practice of imitation in classical rhetoric. In L. Graves (Ed.), Rhetoric and composition: A sourcebook for teachers and writers. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boyton/Cook Publishers, Inc.

Corbett, P. J. (1986). The *topoi* revisited. In J. D. Moss (Ed.), Rhetoric and Praxis (pp. 43-57). Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press.

Cooper, C. & Odell, L. (Eds.). (1978). Research on composing: Points of departure. Urbana, IL.: National Council of Teachers of English.

D'Angelo, F. J. (1984). The evolution of the analytic topoi: A speculative inquiry. In R. J. Connors, L. S. Ede, A. A. Lunsford (Eds.), Essays classical rhetoric and modern discourse (pp. 50-69). Carbondale, IL.: Southern Illinois University Press.

D'Angelo, F. J. (1985). Process and thought in composition (3rd edition) Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Delaney, M. C. (1980). A comparison of student-centered, free writing program with a teacher-centered rhetorical approach to teaching college composition. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 1985-A.

Dutch, W. L. (1980). A comparison of the use of student-generated heuristics with the use of Larson-generated heuristic in a college classroom. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40: 6177-A.

Ebbert, G. M. (1980). A comparison of three instructional approaches for teaching written composition: pentadic, tagmemic, and control treatment. (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 1985A.

Elbow, P. (1986). Toward a phenomenology of freewriting. In J. D. Moss (Ed.), Rhetoric and Praxis. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press. pp. 189-213.

Elliot, N., Plata, M., Zelhart, P. (1990). A program development handbook for the holistic assessment of writing. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Emig, J. (1971). The composing process of twelfth graders. (NCTE Research Rep. No. 13). Rutgers: The State University of New Jersey.

Enos, T. (1996) (Ed.). Encyclopedia of rhetoric and composition: communication from ancient times to the information age. New York: Garland Pub.

Ewing, J. B. (1968). A study of the influence of various stimuli on the written composition of selected third grade children. Dissertation Abstracts International, 28, 4525-A.

Enos, R. L. & Lauer, J. M. (1992). The meaning of *heuristic* in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and its implications for contemporary rhetorical theory. In S. P. Witte, N. N. Nakadate, & R. D. Cherry (Eds), A rhetoric of doing: Essays in honor of James L. Kinneavy (pp. 79-88). Carbondale, IL.: Southern Illinois University Press

Faigley, L., Cherry, R. D., Jolliffe, D. A., & Skinner, A. M. (1985). Assessing writers' knowledge and process of composing. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Fausett, S. & Sandberg, A. (1992). Evergreen with readings. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company

Flower, L. and Hayes, J. R. (1981). Plans that guide the composing process. In Fredericksen, C. H. & Dominic, J. R. (Eds.), Writing: Process, development, and communication: Vol. 2. Writing: The nature, development, and teaching of written communication (pp. 39-58). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Flower, L., Shriver, K., Haas, C., and Hayes, J (1992). Planning in writing: The cognition of a constructive process. In S. P. Witte, and Cherry, R. D. (Eds.), Rhetoric of doing: Essays in honor of James L. Kinneavy (pp. 181-243). Carbondale, IL.: Southern Illinois University Press.

Flynn, J. P. (1980). Neo-classical invention: Four principles for contemporary persuasive discourse (Doctoral Dissertation, Illinois university, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41(8), 3555A.

Fontaine, S. I. (1991). Recording and transforming: The mystery of the ten-minute freewrite. In P. Belanoff, P. Elbow, & S. I. Fontaine (Eds.), Nothing begins with N: New investigations of freewriting (pp. 3-15). Carbondale, IL.: Southern Illinois University Press.

Freedman, S. W. (1981). Influences on evaluators of expository essays: Beyond the text. Research in the Teaching of English, 15(3), 245-55.

Golden, J. L. (1984). Plato revisited: A theory of discourse for all seasons. In R. J. Connors, L. S. Ede, & A. A. Lunsford (Eds.), Essays on classical rhetoric and modern discourse (pp. 16-36). Carbondale, IL.: Southern Illinois University Press.

Hairston, M. C. (1985). Bringing Aristotle's Enthymeme into the composition classroom. In J. D. Moss (Ed.), Rhetoric and Praxis (pp. 59- 77). Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press.

Harrington, D. V., Keith, P. M., Tripp, J. A., Woods, W. F (1981). A critical survey of resources for teaching rhetorical invention: a review-essay. In G. Tate & P. J. Corbett (Eds.), The writing teacher's sourcebook. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hashway, R., Duke, I., Hammond, C., & Brooks, L. (1992). Test anxiety and reading performance. College Student Journal, 26 (2), 180-183.

Hennings, D. G. (1990). Communication in action: teaching the language arts (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Hillocks, G., Jr. (1986). Research on written composition. New directions for teaching. Urbana, IL.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills and the National Conference on Research in English.

Hood, M. D. (1984). The enthymeme: A brief bibliography of modern sources. Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 14, 159-162.

Irmscher, W. (1976). The Holt Guide to English (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kellogg, Ronald T. (1986) Knowledge and strategy in writing. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Psychometric Society (Seattle, WA, November 6-8, 1987)

Kennedy, X. J., Kennedy, D. M., & Holladay, S. A. (1993). The Bedford Guide for College Writers with Reader, Research Manual, and Handbook. Boston, MA: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press.

Kellogg, R. T. (1988). Attentional overload and writing performance: Effects of rough drafts and outline strategies. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition. 14 (2), 355-365

King, M. L. (1975). A sensory approach to creative writing: A study of the effect of increasing the number of types of sensory stimuli intended to motivate children to write creatively. Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 302-A.

Kirby, D. & Liner, T. (1988). Inside out. Developmental strategies for teaching writing. Portsmouth, NH: Boyton/Cook Publishers Inc.

Kneupper, C. W. & Anderson, F. D. (1980). Uniting wisdom and eloquence: the need for rhetorical invention. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 66, 313-326.

Knoblauch, C. H. (1984). Intentionality in the writing process: a case study. In R. L. Graves (Ed.), Rhetoric and composition: A sourcebook for teachers and writers (pp. 212-218). Portsmouth, NH.: Boyton/Cook Publishers.

Knoblauch, C. H., & Brannon, L. (1984). Rhetorical traditions and the teaching of writing. Upper Montclair NJ.:Boyton/Cook Publishers, Inc.

Kurosawa, K. & Harackiewicz, J. M. (1995). Test anxiety, self-awareness, and cognitive interference: a process analysis. Journal of Personality, 63(4), 931-951.

LaRoche, K. M. (1993). A focus on using prewriting and knowledge level strategies and skills to improve the attitudes and writing skills of middle school students. Unpublished M.S. Practicum, Nova University, 1993. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 366 974).

Larson, R. L. (November 1968). Discovery through questioning: A plan for teaching rhetorical invention. College English, 30, 126-134.

Larson, R. (1992) Re-energizing invention: Some suggested goals and emphases for helping students toward the discovery of ideas and toward the development of them. In Walzer, A. and Gardner, L. W. Rhetoric in the vortex of cultural studies. Proceedings of the fifth Biennial Conference. St. Paul, Minnesota: Rhetoric Society of America.

Linderman, E. (1982). A rhetoric for writing teachers. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lunsford, A. A. & Ede, L. S. (1984). On distinctions between classical and modern rhetoric. In R. J. Connors, L. S. Ede, & A. A. Lunsford (Eds.), Essays on classical rhetoric and modern discourse (pp. 37-49). Carbondale, IL.: Southern Illinois University Press.

Lauer, J. M. (1984). Issues in rhetorical invention. In R. J. Connors, L. S. Ede, & A. A. Lunsford (Eds.), Essays on classical rhetoric and modern discourse (pp. 127-139). Carbondale, IL.: Southern Illinois University Press.

Macrorie, K. (1986). The freewriting relationship. In J. D. Moss (Ed.), Rhetoric and Praxis (pp. 173-188). Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press.

Mahoney, M. A. (1982). Hemispheric dominance and imagistic writing. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 2999-A.

Matsushashi, A. (1981). Pausing and planning: The tempo of written discourse production. Research in Teaching of English, 15, 113-134.

Molberg, D. R. (1992). Ethical reasoning: A heuristic approach for business educators. Paper presented at the Annual Association for Business Communication western Region Conference, San Diego, CA.

Moran, M. R., Myles, B. S., & Shank, M. (1991). Variables in Eliciting Writing Samples. Educational Measurement, Issues and practices, 10 (3), 23-26.

Moss, D. J. (1986). Prolegomenon: The revival of practical reasoning. In J. D. Moss (Ed.), Rhetoric and Praxis (pp. 1-21). Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press.

Murray, D. M. (1978). Internal Revision: A process of discovery. In C. Cooper & L. Odell (Ed.), Research on composing: Points of departure (pp. 85-103). Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Musgrove, L. B. (1993). Classical "topoi" and the academic commonplace. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the Conference of College Composition and Communication, San Diego, CA.

Myers, M. (1983). A procedure for writing assessment and holistic scoring. Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills and the National Council of Teachers of English.

Najimy, N. C. (Ed.). (1981). Measure for measure: A guidebook for evaluating students' expository writing. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Nickerson, R. S., Perkins, D. N., & Smith, E. E. (1985). The teaching of thinking. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

North Carolina State department of Public Instruction. (1994). Focused holistic scoring guide: The persuasive/argumentative composition. Raleigh, NC: Author.

Odell, L. (Ed.). (1993). Theory and practice in the teaching of writing: Rethinking the discipline. Carbondale, IL.: Southern Illinois University Press.

Olson, G. A. (1985). Diagnosing problems with invention. Journal of Teaching Writing, 4(2), 194-202.

Palmer, B. C., Hafner, M. L., Sharp, M. F. (1994). Developing cultural literacy through the writing process. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Pearce, K. C. (1994). "Dissoi topoi" and rhetorical invention: Contradictory Arguments for contemporary pedagogy. Opinion paper. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 370 142).

Pedhazur , E. J. & Schmelkin, L. (1991). Measurement, design, and analysis: An integrated approach. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Perelman, C. & Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969). The new rhetoric: a treatise of on argumentation (J. Wilkinson & P. Weaver, trans.). Notre dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Piolat, A. & Roussey, J. (1996). Students' drafting strategies and text quality. Learning and Instruction, 6 (2), 111-129.

Pope, C. & Prater, d. L. (1990) Writing proficiency and student use of prewriting/invention strategies. Reading Research and Instruction, 29 (4), 64-70.

Reynolds, H. M. (1981). The design and testing of a focused and sequenced free writing to a first course in composition for two year college students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 989-A.

Rico, G. L. (1983). Writing the natural way: Using right-brain techniques to release your expression powers. Los Angeles, CA: J. P. Tarcher, Inc.

Rohman, D. G., & Wlecke, A. O. (1964). Pre-writing: The construction and application of models for concept formation in writing. (Cooperative Research project No. 2174). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Rose, M. (1994). Rigid rules, inflexible plans, and the stifling of language: a cognitivist analysis of writer's block. In S. Perl (Ed.), Landmark essays on writing process (pp. 85-97). Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press

Ross, C. T. (1996). The I, II, IIIs of outlining. The English Journal, 85 (1), 67.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1980). Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. In R. Spiro, B. Bruce, & B. Brewer (Eds.), Theoretical issues in reading comprehension (pp. 33-58). Hillsdale, NJ.: L. Erlbaum Associates

Secor, M. (1982). Modes of thinking, modes of argument. In J. N. Hayes, P. A. Roth, J. R. Ramsey, R. D. Foulke (Eds.), The writer's mind. Writing as a mode of thinking. National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, Ill.

Scardamalia, M. (1984). Higher order abilities: Written communication. American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC Paper presented for the American Educational Research Association Project: research contributions for educational improvement.

Schnelle, L. & Riley, J. D. (1991) Guided story invention. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 209 677.

SPSS [Computer software]. (1997). SPSS Inc.

Steele, J. L. & Steele, P. (1991). The thinking-writing connection: using clustering to help students write persuasively. Reading Horizons, 32 (1), 41-51.

Stein, N. D., & Glenn, C. G. (1979). An analysis of story comprehension in elementary school children. In R. O. Freede (Ed.), New Directions in discourse processing (Vol. 2) (pp. 53-120). Norwood, NJ.: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Sternglass, M. (1983). Integrating instruction in reading, writing, and reasoning. In J. N. Hays, J. N. Ramsey, R. D. (Eds.), The Writer's Mind (pp. ---). Foulke. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE

Stewart, D. W. & Shamdasani, P. N. (1990). Focus groups: Theory and practice (Vol. 20). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Tate, G. (1987). Teaching composition: Twelve bibliographical essays. Fort Worth: Christian University Press.

Theophilides, C. & Dionysiou, O. (1996). The major functions of the open-book examination at the university level: a factor analytic study. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 22 (2), 157-170.

Thorne, S. (1993). Prewriting: a basic skill for basic writers. Teaching English in Two-year College, 20 (1), 31-36.

Welch, K. E. (1990). The contemporary reception of classical rhetoric. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.

White, E. C. (1987). Kaironomania: On the will to invent. Ithaca, NY.: Cornell University Press.

White, E. M. (1985). Teaching and assessing writing: Recent advances in understanding, evaluating, and improving student performance. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Witte, S. P. & Faigley, L. L. (1981). A comparison of analytic and synthetic approaches to the teaching of college writing. Austin, TX: Department of English (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 209 677).

Williams, J. K. (1994). Invention techniques: avoiding the “sounds good, says nothing” essay. Exercise Exchange: A Journal for Teachers of English in High Schools and Colleges, 39 (2), 3-6.

Williamson, M. M. & Huot, B. A. (Eds.). (1993). Validating holistic scoring for writing assessment: Theoretical and empirical foundations. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.

Young, R. (1978). Paradigms and problems: Needed research in rhetorical invention. In C. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), Research on composing: Points of departure (pp. 29-47). Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Young, R. (1981). Invention: A topographical survey. In G. Tate (Ed.), Teaching composition: Ten bibliographical essays (pp. 1-43). Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.

Young, R. (1987). Recent developments in rhetorical invention. In G. Tate (Ed.), Teaching composition. Twelve bibliographical essays (pp.1-38). Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.

Young, P. E., Becker, A. L., & Pike, K. L. (1970). Rhetoric: Discovery and change. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World Inc.

APPENDIX 1

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPANTS OF RESEARCH

Title of Project **A Comparison of Effectiveness of Structured and Non-structured Strategies of Rhetorical Invention for Written Argumentation Produced by College Students.**

Principal Investigator Alona Smolova

Chairperson/ Faculty Advisor Dr. Judith L. Shrum

I The Purpose of this Research

This research study is aimed to investigate the writing processes of the student writers who compose argumentative essays. The focus of the study is the role of invention (pre-writing) in the writing processes.

II Procedures

We will meet during regular class sessions to study invention strategies over the period of three weeks of the current semester. You will be asked to: (1) give me permission to analyze results of the survey completed by you at the beginning of this semester; (2) write two out-of-class argumentative essays; (3) participate in one focus group discussion lasting approximately one hour.

Your essays will be scored by two independent raters who will not be able to identify your names, since the papers will be coded. Your participation in this research study is greatly appreciated.

III Risks

The research study in which you are invited to participate does not involve any risks. All instructional procedures will follow the general guidelines as stated in the Course Plan and Syllabus. Data collection and analysis will not create any danger for you.

Benefits of This Project

There is an academic incentive of your participation in this study. You will have an opportunity to write two argumentative essays, and only the better grade will contribute to your final grade for this course.

During the last week of the research study, we will meet for a focus group discussion. Snacks and refreshments will be provided. You will have an opportunity to exchange ideas about your writing process and share suggestions and comments about the strategies of rhetorical invention (pre-writing) that you will learn during the three weeks of the research study.

If you are interested in the outcome of the study, I will make sure that you obtain a summary of its results upon completion of the analysis.

Extent of Confidentiality

The researcher will be the only person who will enter the data obtained from your surveys. No other individual will have access to your responses. The two argumentative essays will be coded and scored by two independent raters. Under no conditions will the raters be able to identify the author of the paper or deduce the section of the English 112 course in which the author is enrolled. Your names will never be exposed. Under no conditions will your authorship be identified by anybody except for the researcher. The focus group discussions will be audio taped. The tapes will be stored in a locked filing cabinet and only the researcher will have access to them. Upon completion of the research study all tapes will be destroyed.

Freedom to Withdraw

Your participation in this research project is voluntary. Your decision to participate in it will not affect your final grade for the English 112 course. You are free to discontinue your participation in the study at any time. You will not be penalized for your decision in any way. If you decide to withdraw from the project, you will need to notify the researcher about your decision.

VII Approval of Research

This research project has been approved, as required, by the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and by the Department of Teaching and Learning.

VIII Subject's Responsibilities

I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I have the following responsibilities: regularly attend class meetings; complete all assigned homework; write two out-of-class argumentative essays; participate in one focus group discussion.

IX Subject's Permission

I have read and understand the Informed Consent and conditions of this project. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent for participation in this project.

If I participate, I may withdraw at any time without penalty. I agree to abide by the rules of this project.

Signature

Date

Should I have any questions about this research project, I may contact

Alona Smolova

Principal Investigator

(540) 674-3600

Phone

Dr. J. Shrum

Faculty Advisor

(540) 231-5361

Phone

T. Hurd

Chair, IRB
Research Division

(540) 231-9359

Phone

APPENDIX 2

Narrative Statement of Research Objectives

I am conducting a study on students' knowledge and use of strategies of rhetorical invention (pre-writing). Participation in the study is voluntary and will not affect your final grade. You will be asked to: (1) complete a survey about your knowledge of pre-writing strategies prior to the beginning of the current semester; (2) write two argumentative essays (out-of-class assignments); (2) take part in one focus group discussion of pre-writing lasting approximately one hour. Your participation in the study is greatly appreciated.

APPENDIX 3

Writing Skills Analysis Survey

Name _____

Class

GPA

Is this a required course for you?

How would you describe your experience as a writer? ___not experienced

____experienced

What part of the writing process is the most difficult for you? (check all that apply)

choosing the topic _____

discovering ideas to write about _____

supporting ideas _____

keeping focus _____

revising _____

grammar, spelling, punctuation _____

Have you used any of the following prewriting strategies? (check all that apply):

freewriting _____

brainstorming _____

clustering _____

webbing _____

Burke's Pentad _____

Pike's Tagmemic

Larson's heuristic _____

What is (are) your favorite prewriting strategy (strategies)?

DIRECTIONS: Below are a series of statements about writing. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Check the answer to the statement as it applies to your attitude towards writing and your experience in it.

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 1. I am confident with my writing skills. | ___Yes ___No |
| 2. I enjoy expressing my ideas through writing. | ___Yes ___No |
| 3. I am nervous about having my writing evaluated. | ___Yes ___No |
| 4. I like discussing my writing with others. | ___Yes ___No |
| 5. I would enjoy seeing my writing published. | ___Yes ___No |
| 6. I enjoy writing better when I work with others. | ___Yes ___No |
| 7. I enjoy writing outside of class. | ___Yes ___No |
| 8. I like criticism about my writing. | ___Yes ___No |
| 9. It takes me a long time to complete a writing assignment. | ___Yes ___No |
| 10. I put a lot of effort and time into a writing assignment. | ___Yes ___No |
| 11. I don't know where to begin when starting a writing assignment | ___Yes ___No |
| 12. I have a hard time getting my message across in writing. | ___Yes ___No |
| 13. I use or have used prewriting activities to help
organize my thoughts in writing. | ___Yes ___No |
| 14. When doing a writing assignment, I just start writing until done. | ___Yes ___No |
| 15. I wish I were a better writer. | ___Yes ___No |
| 16. Prewriting strategies help me in writing. | ___Yes ___No |
| 17. Organizing my ideas by using prewriting strategies makes me
feel less nervous about writing. | ___Yes ___No |
| 18. I feel confident using prewriting strategies. | ___Yes ___No |
| 19 I use a pre-writing strategy (strategies) only when I have to | ___Yes ___No |
| 20 I like using pre-writing strategies | ___Yes ___No |

Coding of the Survey Responses

Is this a required course for you?

<u>How would you describe your experience as a writer?</u>	1	not experienced
	2	experienced

What part of the writing process is the most difficult for you? (check all that apply)

choosing the topic 1

discovering ideas to write about 2

supporting ideas 3

keeping focus 4

revising 5

grammar, spelling, punctuation 6

Have you used any of the following prewriting strategies? (check all that apply):

freewriting 1

brainstorming 2

clustering	3
------------	---

webbing 4

Burke's Pentad 5

Pike's Tagmemic 6

Larson's heuristic 7

Questions 1 through 20 were consistently coded as follows:

Yes 1

No 2

APPENDIX 5

Student Directions Sheet 1

(Sample 1)

For the next class, you are to compose an argumentative essay based on the writing prompt listed below. You should strive to state your position clearly and provide reasons to support it. You may use a dictionary, thesaurus, reference, and/or spelling check. You may use a writing implement of your choice. The final drafts of your essays need to be typed and double spaced. You will be expected to return your final draft and all notes to the instructor on April 6, 1998.

Topic: _____

APPENDIX 6

Student Directions Sheet 2

(Sample 2)

For the next class, you are to compose an argumentative essay based on the writing prompt listed below. You should strive to state your position clearly and provide reasons to support it.

You are to employ one of the two strategies of rhetorical invention: (1) Larson's Heuristic, or (2) freewriting. Your essays will not be evaluated unless you attach scratch paper with the evidence of one of the above strategies of rhetorical invention. Upon completion of the assignment, indicate the particular strategy that you used to generate ideas for your writing in the upper right corner of your final draft.

You may use a dictionary, thesaurus, reference, and/or spelling check. You may use a writing implement of your choice. The final drafts of your essays need to be typed and double spaced. You will be expected to return your final draft and all notes to the instructor on April 29, 1998.

Topic: _____

APPENDIX 7

Writing Prompts

1. College (or high school) sports place too much emphasis on winning.
2. Husbands of wives who work outside the home should share equally in all housework.
3. Sterile needles should be provided to all addicts in order to stop the spread of AIDS.
4. English should be the official language of the United States.
5. People over sixty-five should be forced to retire to make room for the younger generation.
6. _____(public speaking, wilderness survival, swimming, or whatever) should be a required course at this college.
7. Popular music today is more (or less) exciting than it was ten years ago.
8. Occasional arguments are good for friendship.
9. Parents should pay for the damage caused by their delinquent children.
10. Money is the key to happiness.
11. _____is the most _____ (violent, educational, racist, ridiculous) program on TV.
12. Condom machines should be permitted on campus.
13. Single people should not be allowed to adopt children.
14. A woman's career can break up her marriage.
15. Colleges should require computer literacy courses.
16. People should laugh more because laughter heals.
17. Students should be allowed to attend any college course as frequently or infrequently as they like.
18. To respect all beliefs, including those of nonbelievers, prayers should not be allowed in public schools.
19. People convicted of drunk driving should lose their license for one year.
20. _____ company should provide _____ for its employees.
21. To excel in any skill talent alone is sufficient.

APPENDIX 8

Larson's Heuristic

I. "Topics" That Invite Comment

A. Writing about Single Items (in present existence)

What are its precise physical characteristics (shape, dimensions, composition, etc.)

How does it differ from things that resemble it?

What is its "range of variation" (how much can we change it and still identify it as the thing we started with?)

Does it call to mind other objects we observed earlier in our lives? Why?

In what respects?

From what points of view can it be examined ?

What sort of structure does it have?

How do the parts of it work together?

How are the parts put together?

How are the parts proportional in relation to each other?

To what structure (class or sequence of items) does it belong?

B. Writing about Single Completed Events, or Parts of an Ongoing Process.

(These questions can apply to scenes and pictures, as well as works of fiction and drama)

Exactly what happened? (Tell the precise sequence: who? what? when?

how? why? Who did what to whom? What did what to what? How?)

What were the circumstances in which the event occurred? What did they contribute to its happening?

How was the event like or unlike similar events?

What were its causes?

What were its consequences?

What does this occurrence imply? What action (if any) is called for?

What was affected (indirectly) by it?

What, if anything, does it reveal or emphasize about some general condition?

To what group or class might it be assigned?

Is it (in general) good or bad? by what standard? How do we arrive at the standard?

How do we know about it? What is the authority for our information?

How reliable is the authority? How do we know it to be reliable? (or unreliable?)

How might the event have been changed or avoided?

To what other events was it connected? how?

To what kinds of structure (if any) can it be assigned? On what basis?

C. Writing about Abstract Concept (e.g. “religion,” “socialism”)

To what specific items, groups of items, events or groups of events, does the word or words connect, in your experience or imagination?

What characteristics must an item or event have before the name of the concept can apply to it?

How do the referents of that concept differ from the things we name with similar concepts (e.g., “democracy” and “socialism”)

How has the term been used by writers whom you have read? How have they implicitly defined it?

Does the word have a “persuasive” value? Does the use of it in connection to another concept seem to praise or condemn the other concept?

Are you favorably disposed to all things included in the concept? Why or why not?

D. Writing about Collections of Items (in present existence). [These questions are in addition to the questions about single items, which can presumably be asked of each item in the group.]

What, exactly, do the items have in common?

If they have features in common, how do they differ?

How are the items related to each other, if not by common characteristics?

What is revealed about them by the possibility of grouping them in this way?

How may the group be divided? What bases for division can be found?

What correlations, if any, may be found among the various possible sub-groups? Is anything disclosed by the study of these correlations?

In to what class, if any, can the group as a whole be put?

- E. Writing about Groups of Completed Events, Including Processes [These questions are in addition to questions about single completed events; such questions are applicable to each event in the group. These questions also apply to literary works, principally fiction and drama.]

What have the events in common?

If they have features in common, how do they differ?

How are the events related to each other (if they are not part of a chronological sequence)? What is revealed by the possibility of grouping them in this way (these ways)?

What is revealed by the events when taken as a group?

How can a group be divided? On what bases?

What possible correlations can be found among the several sub-groups?

Into what class, if any, can the events taken as a group fit?

Does the group belong to any other structure that simply is a larger group of similar events? (Is it part of a more inclusive chronological sequence?

One more piece of evidence that may point toward a conclusion about history? and so on)

To what antecedents does the group of events look back? Where can they be found?

What implications, if any, does the group of events have? Does the group point to a need for some sort of action?

II “Topics” with “Comments” Already Attached

- A. Writing about Propositions (statements set forth to be proved or disproved)

What must be established for the reader before he will believe it?

Into what sub-propositions, if any, can it be broken down? (What smaller assertions does it contain?)

What are the meanings of key words in it?

To what line of reasoning is it apparently a conclusion?

How can we contrast it with other, similar, propositions? (How can we change it, if at all, and still have roughly the same proposition?)

To what class (or classes) of propositions does it belong?

How inclusive (or how limited) is it?

What is at issue, if one tries to prove the proposition?

How can it be illustrated?

How can it be proven (by what kinds of evidence)?

What will or can be said in opposition to it?

Is it true or false? How do we know? (direct observation, authority, deduction, statistics, other sources?)

Why might someone disbelieve it?

What does it assume? (What other propositions does it take for granted?)

What does it imply? (What follows from it? Does it follow from the proposition that action of some sort must be taken?)

What does it reveal (signify, if true)?

If it is a prediction, how probable is it? On what observations of past experience is it based?

If it is a call for action, what are the possibilities that action can be taken? (Is what is called for feasible? What are the probabilities that the action, if taken, will do what it is supposed to? (Will the action called for work?)

B. Writing about questions (interrogative sentences)

Does the question refer to the past, present, or future time?

What does the question assume (take for granted)?

In what data might answers be sought?

Why does the question arise?

What, fundamentally, is in doubt? How can it be tested? Evaluated?

What propositions might be advanced in answer to it?

Is each proposition true?

If it is true:

What will happen in the future? What follows from it?

Which of these predictions are possible? Probable?

What action should be taken (avoided) in consequence?

[Most of the other questions listed under “Propositions” also apply]

APPENDIX 9

Writing Prompts (Larson's Heuristic)

1. To excel in any skill, talent alone is not enough. Every kind of worthwhile activity has its special technique. What is needed is both talent and technique.
2. Sports help to develop character.
3. Working creates difficulties for the students.
4. Define the term "generation gap".
5. Compare and contrast an amateur and a professional.
6. Students should be allowed to attend any college course as frequently or infrequently as they like.
7. People convicted of drunk driving should lose their licenses for one year.

APPENDIX 10

Writing Prompts

(Freewriting)

1. College (high school) sports place too much emphasis on winning.
2. Husbands of wives who work outside of home should share equally in all housework.
3. Sterile needles should be provided to all addicts in order to stop the spread of AIDS.
4. English should be the official language in the United States.
5. People over sixty-five should be forced to retire to make room for the younger generation.
6. Occasional arguments are good for friendship.
7. A woman's career can break her marriage.

APPENDIX 11
FOCUS GROUP

1. What is the most difficult part of the writing process for you?
2. What was the most difficult essay to write? Why?
3. Do you use invention/pre-writing strategies every time you write?
4. What strategy do you find helpful?
5. How did you prepare yourself for the first argumentative essay? Did you do any prewriting? What did it help you to accomplish?
6. What strategy did you choose for your second argumentative writing? Why?
7. What strategy, Larson's heuristic or freewriting, did you find more difficult? Why?
8. Which one was more helpful? Why?

APPENDIX 12

WRITING SAMPLE EVALUATION SCALE

- Score Point 4 The response exhibits a strong command of persuasive writing. The writer has identified the subject matter, has taken a positive stand about the subject matter, and has appropriately and effectively presented persuasive information in support of the position that he/she has taken. The writer's organization provides a clear sense of logical progression and overall completeness. The composition is coherent.
- Score point 3 The response exhibits a reasonable command of persuasive writing. Most of these responses will have two or more adequately elaborated reasons. However, some responses may have one reason that is well-developed and well-articulated. The writer has a sense of audience and has attempted to establish rapport with that audience through the use of persuasive argument. The writer's organization provides a reasonable sense of logical progression. The response is generally coherent and complete overall, although minor weaknesses are present.
- Score Point 2 The response exhibits a weakness of persuasive writing. The writer has stated a position and has reasons to support that position. Some of these responses will contain two reasons with weak elaboration. Others may have only one reason, but that reason is moderately well-elaborated. Still others are merely lists of reasons without elaboration. These responses introduce ideas which are not explained or related to the argument, causing the reader to make inferences.

Curriculum Vita
Alona A. Smolova
607 Ingles St., Radford, VA, 24141
Phone: (540) 633-1014
E-mail: asmolova@juno.com

EDUCATION:

Doctoral **August 1996- April1999**
Education: Curriculum & Instruction
Cognate: ESL/EFL, Rhetoric and Composition,
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Virginia

M.S. in Education: Curriculum and Instruction (ESL/EFL) **December 1995**
Radford University, Virginia

M.A. in English and German **June 1993**
Kherson State Pedagogical University, Kherson, Ukraine

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Adjunct English Faculty, **January1997present**
New River Community College, Dublin, Virginia

- Teach Intermediate and Advanced English Composition classes;
- develop students' ability to write literary critiques, argumentative essays, and research reports;
- develop students' writing ability for academic study and work;
- use Daedalus Integrated Writing Environment software to teach writing process;
- test the implications of computer-assisted language instruction;
- hold individual conferences with student writers;
- serve as a referee for the Annual Senior Citizen Poetry Contest;
- participate in the professional development activities;
- conduct and coordinate faculty workshops

Graduate Assistant, **Aug. 1997-present**
Center for Teacher Training, Virginia Tech

- update the web page;
- assist in PRAXIS orientation
- request and confirm student teachers' placements;
- provide administrative and technical support

Graduate Teaching Assistant, **Aug. 1994-Aug 1995**
English Language Institute, Radford University, VA

- Participated in curriculum development;
- designed and implemented lesson plans for TOEFL preparation class;
- generated lesson plans for English Composition class (intermediate level);
- conducted research "Communicative Methodology in Foreign Language Instruction"
- supervised the language laboratory;
- assisted students in developing their skills in reading, writing and speaking;
- tested ESL software

**English Faculty,
Kherson State Pedagogical University, Kherson, Ukraine**

July 1993-July 1994

- Taught English Composition and Communication class;
- taught Literature in English course
- taught Theory and Practice of Translation course
- supervised a student's graduation thesis "Grammatical Competence in Foreign Language and Writing Performance"

RELATED EXPERIENCE

- Fellow for the Cultural Studies Seminar
Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia **Summer 1998**
- Fellow for the National Writing Project
University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia **Summer 1998**

PUBLICATIONS AND WORK IN PROGRESS

Intertextuality as rhetorical invention (1998-99). Manuscript submitted for publication in the Journal of Advanced Composition.

Literary criticism as rhetorical invention (July 1998). Paper presented at the Central Virginia Writing Project Conference, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

Responding to diversity in a composition classroom: Commonplace books. Paper presented at the Central New York Conference on Language and Literature, October 18-20, 1998, Cortland College of the State University of New York, NY.

Rhetoric of critical pedagogy (1998). Manuscript accepted for publication in Inquiry: The Journal of the Virginia Community Colleges.

Seven hours away from myself (Submitted). In M. Aleksuk and T. M. Nelson (Eds.), Nature, environment and me: Personal explorations in a deteriorating world. University of Alberta, Canada

A study of relative effectiveness of structured and non-structured strategies of rhetorical invention for the argumentative discourse produced by college students (1999). Doctoral Dissertation in progress, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Virginia.

Structural and semantic peculiarities of C. Sandburg's blank verse (January, 1994). Paper presented at the Conference on Literature in English, Kiev State University, Ukraine.

Upon definition of teaching: Teaching as writing (April 3-4, 1998). Paper presented at the 10th AEGIS Conference on Literature and Culture, University of Houston, TX

LANGUAGES Russian (native), Ukrainian (near native), English (near native), German (read, written).