

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: A LEARNING COMMUNITY PROJECT: COMPARATIVE
INTERVENTIONS ON WRITING APPREHENSION AND
LOCUS OF CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS
AT A TWO-YEAR COLLEGE

Terri Massie-Burrell, Doctor of Philosophy, 2010

Dissertation directed by: Professor Susan R. Komives,
Department of Counseling and Personnel Services

The education of under-prepared college students is a topic that interested and motivated this researcher to conduct a study on learning communities and measuring change in writing apprehension and locus of control of developmental students at a community college. Higher education is generally viewed as a place for the intellectually elite. However, more institutions are finding that students are enrolling at post-secondary institutions lacking proficiency in basic skills such as mathematics, reading, and writing. This study focused on the developmental studies area of writing.

A limited, but growing, number of institutions are pursuing differing ways of addressing the educational needs of students at risk of possible failure. Astin's (1984, 1999) foundational research states that locus of control is a factor of consideration to facilitate academic success for college students who are coming to some resolve about whether they have influence over, or if their effort in college is directly correlated with, successful outcomes; that is, students' beliefs about control being external or by chance opposed to internal based on effort or involvement. Pajares' (2003) research which is grounded in Bandura's work (1986) found that students' beliefs about their writing have an influence on academic outcomes.

The purpose of this study was to contribute to the sparse body of knowledge in developmental education and the success of developmental writing students. The goal was to increase the knowledge base about developmental writing students at a two-year college and their engagement in a learning community. This study examined the effect of a learning community intervention for students attending a community college. Specifically, the study included an experimental component to examine through pre- and post-test measures the pedagogical implications and strategies to determine if there was an improvement in locus of control and writing apprehension. The study was to determine if three groups of community college students enrolled in a variation of two courses would achieve positive academic outcomes after a semester of participation in the learning community as measured by the Writing Apprehension Measure (WAM) and the Adult Nowicki Strickland Internal External Control Scale (ANS-IE). One group was involved in a loosely linked learning community, i.e., co-enrolled in a college success course (CSS 110) and developmental English writing (ENGL 81). A second group was enrolled only in ENGL 81 and a third group was enrolled only in CSS 110.

The analysis of covariance concludes that there was no statistical significance in the posttest results among the three groups after controlling for the pretest score. The instruments used were measures of writing apprehension and locus of control. The level of writing apprehension and the higher levels of extrinsic locus of control were noted.

A LEARNING COMMUNITY PROJECT: COMPARATIVE INTERVENTIONS ON
WRITING APPREHENSION AND LOCUS OF CONTROL
OF DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS
AT A TWO-YEAR COLLEGE

by

Terri Massie-Burrell

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2010

Advisory Committee:

Professor Susan R. Komives, Chair
Associate Professor Sharon L. Fries-Britt
Professor Francine H. Hultgren
Affiliate Assistant Professor Jo Ann Hutchinson
Affiliate Assistant Professor Marcia V. Marinelli

DEDICATION

This is dedicated from the bottom of my heart to my loving family for their steadfast patience and encouragement to pursue my personal goal of earning a terminal degree. My husband, Robinson Burrell, Jr. and son, Robinson Burrell, III, "Trey," along with my parents and extended family, have been my backbone.

I am very grateful to my colleagues, both administrators and staff, whose support and thoughtfulness has made my very long days pleasant ones. Moreover, my genuine friendships have helped to sustain me. Most importantly, my faith in God and the kindness extended by members of my parish community have helped make this journey a rewarding experience.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I have to express the sincerest gratitude to my dissertation advisor, Dr. Susan Komives, and my committee members Dr. Sharon Fries-Britt, Dr. Francine Hultgren, Dr. Jo Ann Hutchinson and Dr. Marcia Marinelli for their guidance through this process. I must thank current and future college students, who make my work so rewarding. It is the collegial collaboration with developmental education faculty and academic support personnel, who care enough to make a difference in the lives of all students, that sustains our profession as we strive to increase research which will bring greater credibility overall to developmental studies. The ideal mark is to provide access for all students, with the understanding that so many have a desire to succeed, but enter higher education lacking the fundamental skills. The developmental educators proudly offer the guidance to help college students move beyond their academic challenges, by facilitating independent learning and providing strategies and life skills, which transcend the classroom.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Significance of the Study.....	1
	History of Colleges	2
	Developmental Education Through Learning Communities	6
	Developmental Learning.....	9
	Locus of Control	9
	Writing Apprehension.....	10
	Purpose of the Study.....	12
	Statement of the Problem.....	13
	Research Questions and Hypotheses	14
	Summary.....	15
CHAPTER II	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	16
	Developmental Education.....	16
	History.....	18
	Components of Developmental Education	19
	Research on Developmental Education	20
	Summary of Developmental Education.....	23
	Theoretical Foundations	24
	Tinto's (1987) Theory of Retention.....	25
	Adults as Learners (Knowles, 1988).....	26
	Bandura's (1997) Social Learning Theory	27
	Astin's (1985) Involvement Theory	28
	Learning Communities and Linked Courses	28
	Locus of Control and Motivation	32
	Writing Apprehension	38
	Academic Achievement.....	41
	Summary.....	43
CHAPTER III	METHODOLOGY	44
	Purpose of the Study.....	44
	Conceptual Framework.....	45
	Study Design.....	47
	Research Questions and Hypotheses	48
	Institutional Context	49
	Sample	50
	Measures	51
	Locus of Control	51
	Writing Apprehension.....	53
	Validity.....	56
	Reliability.....	57
	Procedures.....	58
	Developmental English 81-Composition Skill 1	58
	The College Success Seminar-Orientation Course	59

	Learning Community	60
	Data Analysis	61
	Summary	61
CHAPTER IV	FINDINGS	62
	Participants	63
	Demographics	65
	Results of the Study	67
	Assumptions	68
	Results of the Analysis of Covariance for the WAM	69
	Post Hoc Analysis for the WAM	69
	Assumptions	71
	Results of the Analysis of Covariance for the ANS-IE.....	72
	Post Hoc Analysis for the ANS-IE.....	72
	Summary.....	74
CHAPTER V	DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	75
	Introduction.....	75
	Research Questions and Hypotheses	76
	Statement of the Problem.....	77
	Study Design.....	78
	Summary of the Findings.....	79
	Interpretations in Light of Previous Research and Theory	82
	Theory and Practical Implications	83
	Limitations	84
	Recommendations for Further Research	87
	Conclusions.....	92
Appendix A	Adult Nowicki Strickland Internal External Control Scale...	95
Appendix B	Writing Apprehension Measure	97
Appendix C	Composition Skills 1- ENGL 81 Course Syllabus.....	99
Appendix D	College Success Seminar - CSS 110 Course Syllabus.....	114
References	121

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Respondents and Non-Respondents in WAM and ANS-IE for the Three Groups	64
Table 2	Age of Participants and Non-Participants.....	65
Table 3	Gender of Participants and Non-Participants	66
Table 4	Students Enrolled Full-Time or Part-Time	66
Table 5	Credits Earned	66
Table 6	Grade Point Average.....	67
Table 7	Means and Standard Deviations of the Three Groups on the WAM	68
Table 8	Analysis of Covariance for the WAM.....	69
Table 9	Independent t-tests Between the Learning Community and Study Skills	70
Table 10	Independent t-tests Between the Learning Community and English Only	70
Table 11	Independent t-tests Between Study Skills and English Only.....	70
Table 12	Means and Standard Deviations of the Three Groups on the ANS-IE	71
Table 13	Analysis of Covariance for the ANS-IE	72
Table 14	Independent t-tests Between the Learning Community and Study Skills	73
Table 15	Independent t-tests Between the Learning Community and English Only	73
Table 16	Independent t-tests Between Study Skills and English Only.....	73

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Over time, all types of colleges have seen increases in students who are under-prepared or have academic proficiency issues. "It is likely that at least 78% of higher education institutions enroll underprepared students and that in all probability, more than 30% of the students require remediation" (Merisotis & Phipps, 2000, p. 71). There have been an alarming number of students in need of developmental supports for decades. Ninety percent of colleges and universities, including many elite institutions, now offer some type of remedial coursework (Tinto, 1998). With this increase, policy analysts and governmental decision makers are asking new questions about the success of "at-risk" students. The number of students that are admitted to college and required to take what are now termed "developmental courses" has consistently been increasing. It is estimated that these students, who have historically been referred to as "remedial," make up over 40% of students entering college (Kane & Rouse, 1999; Tinto, 1998).

Significance of the Study

With the exception of the few elite institutions, most colleges do not have the luxury of limiting their student body exclusively to fully prepared applicants. To do so would too often result in a negative impact on projected enrollments (Hodgekinson, 1985; Strassen, 2003). Most public institutions have to admit students with academic deficiencies, because they are committed to training and contributing to a literate workforce within their state. Inadequate preparation is said to be attributed to lack of communication between K-12 and higher education (Kirst & Venezia, 2004). Colleges knowingly admit students who will need academic supports to be successful. The notion is that everyone is entitled to continue their education (Carnevale & Rose, 2004). Thus, developmental education is needed in all types of institutions.

History of Community Colleges

Colleges of the late 1700s, during the Aristocratic period, served only white upper class males. These families could afford the high cost of tuition. Their only goal was to prepare these young men to be leaders in society. Moreover, there were very few career options. These young men had a choice of medicine, law or religion. In spite of the prestige and academic rigor currently associated with these discipline areas, the young men of this period were not necessarily motivated or academically prepared. However, their family names afforded them admission (Barna, Haws, & Knefelkamp, 1978).

Meritocracy replaced Aristocracy and lasted until the 1950s. In short, the economically advantaged were being replaced by the academically talented. Intellectual ability is what earned most students a space in higher education's classrooms. The more talented students insisted on further diversity in the curriculum to meet their diverse needs, interests and the changes in employment opportunities. (Astin and Sax, 1998 & Cross, 1976).

William Rainey Harper, back in the late 19th century, was University of Chicago's founding president, who transformed higher education by introducing the concept of a six-year high school, which provided the lower-level university coursework that exposed students to the prerequisite courses in preparation for junior and senior-level college material. The purpose was to provide access to more students without imposing more demands on the university (Kane and Rouse, 1999). Moreover, community colleges were designed to provide an education to a broader population in society. Therefore, they were established with open admissions policies. Remediation is often a necessity, because absent selective admissions policies some students are admitted without the requisite skills. "If remedial education in higher education is to exist at all, it is argued, it should be located in the 'lower levels' of the higher education system" (Tinto, 1998, p.1). In fact, two-year colleges are believed to be better at serving this population of students. The value of this study is that learning communities in higher education aim to retrench

student isolation, while improving the academic outcomes. The study seeks to demonstrate the role of learning communities in student retention and academic success.

"With relatively little fanfare, community colleges have emerged in the last 40 years as an increasingly dynamic and important part of the postsecondary education system in the United States. They enroll some 6.2 million full- and part-time students – more than four out of every 10 American undergraduates. Another 5 million students of all ages attend community college for noncredit courses" (Shaffer, 2008, p.1). Their flexible admissions policies generally require only a GED or a high school diploma, bringing large groups of underprepared or high-risk students to college. These two-year institutions help to provide post-secondary education to students whose resources and college options are scarce. Community colleges do not require high standards for admission; although they do have standards and requisite skills and competencies required to enroll in credit bearing or college level courses (Kirst & Venezia, 2004). According to the Special 20th Anniversary Edition of the Community College Week, "Public two-year institutions have struggled for decades to remediate students. They have succeeded at times, but mostly those institutions have failed" (Pulley, 2008). As part of their mission, community colleges seek ways to best educate these students in order to prepare an economically sound workforce (McCabe, 2003).

In City Community College (BCCC), remedial needs are extensive. Sixty-five percent of first-time college students need remediation in each of the fundamental areas (mathematics, English and reading (Kirst & Venezia, 2004). According to a report published by the Community College Research Center (1999), nearly 60% of students enrolled in a community college must take at least one remedial course. For more than a decade, developmental education programs have been under scrutiny. Less than 50% of high school graduates take college preparation courses (Gaither, 1999). The Maryland Higher Education Commission in 1996 started conducting a study of remediation in Maryland public institutions. Low test scores in elementary and secondary education and

low graduation rates at the post-secondary level had public officials questioning the funding spent on remedial instruction. In addition, the general public had the misconception that remediation at any college was a repeat of skills that should have been learned in high school. In fact, "Over 50 percent of students entering all postsecondary education institutions will take remedial courses, many in several subject areas" (Kirst & Venezia, 2004, p.1).

Towson University, for example, began offering free tuition to students who graduated in the top 10 percent of their high school class. After discovering that finishing in the top decile doesn't guarantee academic preparedness, the university began paying for scholarship winners to acquire basic skills at BCCC prior to enrolling at Towson (Pulley, 2008, p. 10).

In recent years, community colleges have become an alternative choice for many students seeking post-secondary education, who have not planned to attend college while in high school. Shaffer (2008) stated:

With relatively little fanfare, community colleges have emerged in the last 40 years as an increasingly dynamic and important part of the postsecondary education system in the United States. They enroll some 6.2 million full- and part-time students—more than four out of every 10 American undergraduates. Another 5 million students of all ages attend community college for noncredit courses. (p. 1)

Their flexible admissions policies generally require only a GED or a high school diploma, bringing large groups of underprepared or high-risk students to college. These two-year institutions help to provide post-secondary education to students whose resources and college options are scarce. According to the Special 20th Anniversary Edition of the *Community College Week*, "Public two-year institutions have struggled for decades to remediate students. They have succeeded at times, but mostly those institutions have failed" (Pulley, 2008, p. 6). As part of their mission, community colleges

seek ways to best educate these students in order to prepare an economically sound workforce (McCabe, 2003).

As K-12 schools, community colleges and 4-year institutions continue to operate in silos, students attending community colleges may continue to confront roadblocks to success in higher education Tinto (1993, 2008). However, community colleges are leading in our nation's quest for training our workforce (Kane & Rouse, 1999). High school students need access to information to include academic preparation and the college application process to be successful in college. Therefore, the open access policy is not enough for entering community college students; successful transitioning with strategies that facilitate successful outcomes is imperative for all students entering college (Kirst & Venezia, 2004). Policies of admissions and enrollment at community colleges are simultaneously both positive and negative. Students entering can have immediate access with little to no preparation when entering. They can complete an application and enroll all in the same day, sometimes a day or so before the semester begins. This is the reality of open admissions, but it provides many challenges for the student in need of remediation and the faculty and staff who have to serve this population of community college students, as described in Kirst and Venezia (2004). For diverse groups of students aspiring to earn bachelor's degrees, community college is their entry into higher education through a transfer program. However, many have less confidence and academic skills, which can impact their success (Conway, 2010; Kane & Rouse, 1999).

Kane and Rouse (1999) acknowledged that, initially, two years at community college or freshman and sophomore year was a mirror image of college courses taken at 4-year colleges and universities. As the years have passed there is more vocational training, and students opt to enroll in terminal programs or settle for an Associate's degree when discouraged or lacking the motivation to persist and earn the bachelor's degree (Astin, 1984, 1999; Kirst & Venezia, 2004). Additionally, remediation is a

primary role at the community college level, as policy makers move to discontinue remedial education at the 4-year college level. They are viewed as the experts in developmental education and remediation. However, critics of community colleges often view them negatively, because less than one-half of students who enter a two-year college ever earn any degree (Kane & Rouse, 1999). According to Tinto (1993, 2008), community college students have a higher dropout rate than 4-year colleges and universities, which can be attributed to the make-up of the colleges being primarily commuter institutions, which makes it more difficult for students to be involved and immersed in the academic and social life of the campus. Overall, the result is often poorer academic outcomes for students enrolled in community colleges.

Developmental Education Through Learning Communities

"Successful programs begin with a well-defined mission statement and a set of program goals addressing specific areas" (Casazza & Silverman, 1996, p. 72). The mission of the developmental education program should be consistent with the overall mission of the institution. There are a variety of organizational structures for developmental programs. They are typically decentralized, being housed in various academic departments; for example, developmental writing is in the English Department, and developmental mathematics in Mathematics. There are, however, some centralized programs that are housed inside a college, such as a College of Undergraduate Education or the former General College at the University of Minnesota. Two-year colleges more often have decentralized programs, with a report by Boylan, Bonham, and Bliss (1994) stating mandatory placement in remedial courses contributes to greater attrition rates. Implementing learning communities has been found to improve the performance of students in need of remediation. Tinto (1998, 2008) found that learning communities contributed positively towards retention of developmental participants. The preliminary results of a study conducted by Tinto and colleague Cathy Engstrom at Syracuse

University on developmental coursework (termed basic skills courses by that study's researchers) and learning communities found positive academic outcomes. A four-year study included 19 campuses, 13 of which were 2-year colleges. The end result was that students performed better and felt better about their ability to be successful.

Approximately 2,209,079 developmental students are served annually by American colleges and universities" (Boylan, 1995, p. 1). Moreover, good developmental programs are aligned with the regular education curriculum and regularly assessed (Boylan, 1999). A limited, but growing, number of institutions are pursuing different ways of addressing the educational needs of students potentially at risk of failure. Initiatives to retain students have reported greater returns than in the past (A Project of the National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy, 2001).

Oversized lecture halls, inconsistent feedback, and objective tests do not reflect the best practices in pedagogy. A meaningful link is needed between teaching and learning—a paradigm shift from familiar ways of instructing students to a method where students are less isolated and more involved in their learning process (Smith, 1983). Learning communities are one of a few initiatives which boast positive outcomes. (Tinto, 1998) research found that developmental students' academic success and attitudes about learning improved as a result of their participation in learning communities. According to Tinto, Goodsell-Love, and Russo (1993), students' deep learning, achievement, and persistence were enhanced by their involvement in collaborative learning environments, also referred to as learning communities. These positive results were found to be the case in environments where students deliberately registered as participants, or added the courses, because they registered late and it was their only choice. In addition, learning communities represent the majority of collaboration that occurs between students, their peers, and faculty members on two-year college campuses (Bloom & Sommo, 2005; Gabelnick, Macgregor, Matthews & Smith, 1990).

Since their inception in the late 1920s, learning communities have had numerous names and instructional designs. Although learning community is the preferred term, other terms throughout the literature include learning clusters, triads, federated learning communities, and coordinated or integrated studies (O'Banion, 1997). The underlying body of research on learning communities by Gabelnick et al. (1990) states that the concept is the reason for the majority of collaboration occurring between students, their peers, and faculty members.

This shared knowledge seeks to create a level of cohesiveness among diverse peers within a campus environment that is established in the learning community concept. Peers are more likely to get to know one another as a result of shared experience (Tinto, 1998). According to Chickering and Reisser (1993), "Perhaps the closest facsimile to residence hall communities for commuter students is involvement in a learning community" (p. 414). Learning communities in the simplest form couple two courses around a thematic area and register a cohort of students, with an average of twenty-five in a small learning group (Gabelnick et al., 1990).

There are several variations of learning communities (Gabelnick et al., 1990; Strassen, 2003). One is a loosely linked program where courses from various disciplines connect around a central theme. A foundational study by McCarthy, Meier, and Rinderer (1985) determined college students' perception of their own behaviors necessary for academic success, such as writing apprehension and locus of control, can influence outcomes. The purpose of their research was to provide a more comprehensive understanding of psychological variables associated with college students' writing outcomes. Two of these psychological variables are writing apprehension and locus of control, which are two dependent variables in this study. Both Bandura (1997) and English composition researchers, such as Flower and Hayes (1981), have studied the variables related to this study. The former studied anxiety, which is general intense uneasiness, while this study focuses on writing apprehension, which is specific

uneasiness or distress in anticipation of writing. Bandura (1997) further described academic or scholastic anxiety as egregious worry about unmet goals, uncontrollable worries about tomorrow or the future. He suggested that this type of performance arousal, often seen with mathematics, can be conquered by self-regulatory skills which he called self-efficacy and this trait is positively related to locus of control.

Developmental Learning

The construct of developmental learning views learning as an evolving process; therefore using an eclectic approach taking into consideration a variety of disciplines. The idea is that individuals mature, grow, and develop from exposure. The belief is that learning is the result of human, natural, and behavioral sciences (Hashway, 1998). All academic programs must be deeply rooted in fundamental skills. Often, developmental students display a lack of interest in their studies and appear insecure about their own academic abilities. Curriculum is developed to either remediate or enrich and must hold true to the process of human growth and development, which emphasizes the need to strive for independent learning.

Locus of Control

Locus of control when measured assesses an individual's beliefs about certain behaviors that they have some control over and effects desired outcomes (Bandura, 1997). Similar to Astin's (1984) landmark developmental theory, it focuses on students' choices and overall effort, including both quantity and quality. Actually, it is a student's involvement or their engagement in the collegiate environment. This is a theory that developmental faculty can use to create Freshmen Year Experience (FYE) courses, which help to facilitate student learning. A foundational study by Lefcourt (1982) described students' behavior as learned helplessness. More recent trends associated with developmental students focus more on the locus of control construct. As well, the above

referenced research can be used as teachers and administrators develop learning communities for selected community college cohorts. Fazey and Fazey (2001) conducted a study that required faculty to address through their teaching methods any deficiencies college students may have which could have a negative influence on their academic outcomes. Surprisingly, in this study, there were no statistically significant differences in writing apprehension based on age and gender. In terms of this study, the desired behavior is viewed in terms of a shift from external to internal locus of control. Other researchers have found similar results in writing apprehension. Therefore, gender and age are provided as only descriptive analyses in this study.

Writing Apprehension

Many foundational studies conducted on the undergraduate population have reported a relationship between students' beliefs about their writing and actual achievement in writing (Pajares, 2003). According to Hacket and Betz (1989), students' thoughts and beliefs about their ability—in this case, writing—was a better predictor of success. Therefore, faculty's influence is very important to help establish students' confidence and improved competence. It is faculty members' support of students and their ability to be a positive influence for the student that facilitates successful outcomes. These links between locus of control, writing apprehension, and the impact of learning communities will form part of the foundation for this research.

Flower and Hayes (1981), in a classic study, stated that college students who believe in their knowledge base and skill set have begun to develop a sense of self-efficacy, and are more likely to use adaptive strategies to overcome anxiety and low motivation, while achieving their academic pursuits and ultimately their professional goals. Psychologists suggest that writers take active control of their lives, learn to manage their time and prioritize (Bandura, 1997). Similarly, Flower and Hayes (1981) stated that advising students to accept responsibility for the quality of their writing assignments

parallels psychologists' suggestions that their clients present internal control over themselves to enhance quality of life, which will later in this study be defined as internal locus of control. These are both academic and life-long skills. However, Flower and Hayes (1981) reported a relationship between students' locus of control and writing.

Bandura (1997) also described individuals experiencing anxiety as obsessed with the need to fulfill their academic demands; they are hard on themselves and take full responsibility for their success or failure, which is essentially internal locus of control. In 1985, McCarthy et al. reported on a landmark study conducted at Southern Illinois University (SIU). The university has two campuses, Carbondale and Edwardsville. They conducted two studies. Their initial research assessed 137 freshmen students enrolled in English in the fall; the second study was a population of 60 students in the spring. Many of the students in the sample were basic writing students. Basic writing at SIU is a remedial or developmental course, designed for students who need extra support with writing skills that can lead to success in subsequent English courses or other courses that require writing. The English curriculum at SIU is designed so students are registered for the developmental course and the required general education English course in consecutive semesters with the same instructor, referred to by educators as "looping." Courses are paced and sequenced to provide more assistance for those enrolled. Since a large number of the students were taking basic writing, this means during class they had opportunities to draft, edit and revise, and discuss their writing with instructors and peers. All participants were administered a measure created by the researchers called The Self-Assessment of Writing (1985) that required them to express feelings about writing. Also, Rotter's (1966) Generalized Expectancies of Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement measure was used. The researchers reported that of these two measures, anxiety was significantly related to writing performance, but no significant relationship with locus of control was found.

Meir, McCarthy and Schmeck (1984) conducted a study at Southern Illinois University with freshmen who were taking remedial writing, required freshman writing, or honors writing courses. More than half of the participants (54%) were in a remedial course. High efficacy expectations were positively related to good writing performance. Participants with an internal locus of control were better at estimating their writing skills than participants who scored more external, although participants in all groups were more likely than not to overestimate their overall outcomes. In a similar study, the lower students' scores were on anxiety or writing apprehension measure, the greater their writing outcomes. The researchers recommended that further study should be conducted to examine the effects of students' overestimating ability on outcomes (Meir et al., 1984). While the McCarthy et al. (1985) study is similar to this research, little is known about the details of the actual research design and the interventions are vaguely mentioned.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to contribute to the sparse body of knowledge in developmental education and the success of developmental writing students. The goal was to increase the knowledge base about developmental writing students at a two-year college and their engagement in a learning community. This study examined the effect of a learning community intervention for students attending a community college. Specifically, the study included an experimental component to examine through pre- and post-test measures the pedagogical implications and strategies to determine if there was an improvement in locus of control and writing apprehension. The study was to determine if three groups of community college students enrolled in a variation of two courses would achieve positive academic outcomes after a semester of participation in the learning community. One group was involved in a loosely linked learning community, i.e., co-enrolled in a college success course (CSS 110) and developmental English writing

(ENGL 81). A second group was enrolled only in ENGL 81 and a third group was enrolled only in CSS 110. Details of these class assignments are included in Chapter III.

Astin's (1993) inputs, environment, and outcomes assessment model is a framework designed to study the overall development of college students. First, inputs can be described as the demographics of the individual student when entering college. Second, the environment refers to the entire campus setting that each student is exposed to daily, which includes peers, faculty, staff, and program policies. Lastly, outcomes are determined by the growth and/or development in the student after interactions and experiences (Astin, 1993).

For this quasi-experimental study, the inputs are the pre-test measures of the dependent variables for students identified as developmental writers. In the context of a community college, the environment is a learning community project consisting of three treatment groups as defined by two linked courses, a developmental English course, and a first-year college success course. The outputs are the students' positive change in beliefs on the post-test surveys of the Adult Nowicki Strickland Internal External Control Scale and the Writing Apprehension Measure.

Statement of the Problem

This research considered the experience of developmental students enrolled in one of three treatment groups: a loosely-linked learning community consisting of two courses (CSS 110, College Success Seminar/ Freshman Year Experience course, and ENGL 81, Developmental English, the second in a sequence of three developmental courses), CSS 110 alone, or ENGL 81 alone. CSS 110 provides students tools to empower themselves to become active learners. The goal of this course is to help students rid themselves of "learned helplessness" and become internally motivated to succeed and to develop a sense of self-efficacy. Instructors teach students to set goals and transfer specific strategies to content-based curriculum. Students enrolled must develop a belief system

that supports hard work and the belief that patience can pay off. The course seeks to develop a positive attitude as a key to success.

In the study, underprepared college students were enrolled in a Composition Skills 1 course-ENGL 81, which is the second course in a sequence of three developmental writing courses. Students are placed in this course based on their ACCUPLACER Test (college computerized placement exam) scores. The other course is called the College Success Seminar. "CSS 110 provides an opportunity for students to learn and apply strategies shown to promote success in college and in life" (Baltimore City Community College Catalog, 1996-1998, p.117).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Because of the exploratory nature of this study, the hypotheses are stated in null form. Using ANCOVA to analyze the data, the following questions were answered.

Research Question 1. Is there a statistically significant difference between the scores on a measure of writing apprehension of two treatment groups of developmental students compared to developmental students in a loosely-linked learning community at a two-year college?

Hypothesis 1: After controlling for initial level of writing apprehension, there is no statistically significant difference in level of writing apprehension by treatment group at the end of the treatment.

Research Question 2. Is there a statistically significant difference between the scores on a measure of locus of control of two treatment groups of developmental students compared to developmental students in a loosely-linked learning community at a two-year college?

Hypothesis 2: After controlling for initial level of locus of control, there is no statistically significant difference in the level of locus of control by treatment group at the end of the treatment.

Summary

This chapter established the purpose of this quasi-experimental study. A brief overview of the literature on this topic helps to create the position that it is a fundamental issue in need of more complex solutions. A statement of the problem with research questions introduces the contextual framework and the theory, which Chapter II covers more thoroughly, discusses underprepared students in developmental education, specifically those in community colleges. The current and subsequent chapters each build, separately and collectively, on the need for more research in these areas. The methodology for this study is presented in Chapter III. Chapter IV presents the results of the data analysis. Chapter V includes the conclusions and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter provides a review of the literature relevant to this study. In particular, literature, concepts about developmental education, research theories, and learning communities, and their effect on writing apprehension and locus of control, are reviewed and summarized.

Developmental Education

Developmental education is a field of practice and research within higher education with theoretical underpinnings in developmental psychology and learning theory. Education estimates from the National Center for Education Statistics (2004) indicate that over 29% of college students attending 2-year colleges and 19% of students at 4-year colleges lack fundamental skills to be successful in college. Developmental Mathematics has the highest enrollment in developmental education, ranging from 15% to 22% at any given college. "The most basic concept in developmental education is that students are complete human beings. Their attitudes towards learning, their motivation, their self-concepts, and their confidence have as much or more to do with their success in college as do their academic skills" (Boylan, 2002, p. 25).

Developmental education and remediation are often used interchangeably and more recently referred to by some practitioners as transition courses, but the former is a far more complex notion involving a combination of theoretical approaches drawn from cognitive and developmental psychology (Boylan, 1995). Thus, it is important to note that developmental education is not the same as remediation. Developmental education is a more comprehensive approach to serving students borrowing from the foundational tenets of cognitive and developmental psychology (Chickering, 1969; Erickson, 1968; Kohlberg, 1975; Perry, 1970). Remedial coursework, on the other hand, is skills-based assistance in one or more areas. Developmental education provides a range of services to

educate the whole student both personally and academically. According to Boylan (1995), "these services may include counseling, advising, tutoring, topical workshops, individualized instruction, and courses to enhance study skills and strategies, promote critical thinking, or introduce students to the rewards and expectations of college" (p. 2). Developmental education programming includes tutorial services, foundation courses in mathematics, reading and writing, and other learning supports. Boylan's decades of research in developmental education are based on the assumption that this field is very complex, includes a range of services, and borrows from a variety of disciplines.

Although the field of developmental education grew from the fields of developmental psychology and learning theory, Clowes (1992) contended that it has sparse underpinnings of theoretical framing. Most practitioners come from multiple backgrounds and use their diverse academic and professional experiences to provide an eclectic approach to the practice. It is often stated that theory is adapted to justify, but not provide, prior planned and informed practice (Smith, 2001, 2006). This study can help to improve practice by contributing to the research base. Theory application in the field of developmental education in the broadest sense is a paradigm shift. "The reality is that most education programs are frequently defined by local contexts such as legislation, politics, test scores and other external factors of placement" (Lundell & Collins, 1999, p. 11).

Theory related to developmental education is relatively nonexistent in the professional practice. In instances where this relationship does appear, it is more likely accidental than deliberate. Boylan's (1999) research further added that courses in developmental education have received little attention from researchers, mostly due to stigma. As a result, effective tools to work with the population are relatively bleak. Theories to support the complexities of the profession are tremendously underdeveloped.

History

The term remedial remains widely used in the literature in spite of the negative connotation, because it needs no explanation when discussed within the higher education profession or among constituent groups, such as legislators and the media. There has been an evolution of terms used to describe students entering college underprepared. Prior to the 1960s, remediation was the term used for students in need of academic supports, while throughout this same decade the same language was used for the funded programs associated with equal rights legislation. Gradually, the term compensatory was introduced, which by definition means to compensate or make up for lacking skills (Rouche & Rouche, 1999). Remedial implies academic limitations in need of fixing, an approach borrowing from the tenets of the medical model. Educators in academic services who subscribe to this model of service delivery focus on fixing the student rather than adjusting or creating academic policies and practices that meet the needs of students where they are. Intentional and intense quality of academic service should be the standard. Remedial and compensatory are labels that cast a stigma on anyone associated with or using the services. These terms place separation between students enrolled in courses termed developmental opposed to their peers enrolled in regular credit courses (Clowes, 1980).

Developmental education is the contemporary term used to describe specialized courses and academic services for a special population of students that can be described as functioning at lower levels in reading, writing, and mathematics. This term came of use in the field in the late 1970s through the influence of college student personnel administration. With this new term came a transformation of the field's outlook, becoming more comprehensive. The term developmental encompasses the whole student including the in-class and out-of-class experiences that impact the academic experiences of the student. A developmental approach focuses on meeting students where they are by focusing on learning as well as personal issues. Moreover, this approach looks at

students' strengths and finds ways to use them to improve upon their needs (Clowes, 1980).

There is not a standard of widely accepted theory to govern the design of said programs. "Theory is used after the fact to justify practice as often as it is used to plan practice; there is no way to distinguish the two possibilities" (Clowes, 1992, p. 475). Theory has been a challenge for practitioners, being a field mostly governed by professional experiences. Clowes (1992) furthered enlightened practitioners in the field of developmental education by offering an overview that held up the notion that the framework for the field is still lacking. It is rare to find support from the top down or chief academic and student affairs officers in higher education that would include a conceptual framework that aligns with the mission of the institution. If that ideal were to occur it is believed that successful learning outcomes would be promoted. The practice in developmental education has been to take an eclectic approach.

Components of Developmental Education

Keimig (1983) in this classic research identified critical components of an effective developmental program and found that a comprehensive program was one that served a diverse student population. She proposed a four-level hierarchy for learning improvement programs. Level one included a stand-alone basic skills course; level two added individualized assistance, such as tutoring; level three was more comprehensive to include services for the complex needs of a heterogeneous learning environment. Finally, level four programs were established from the top down and had buy-in and adequate resources, which made them a fully acceptable part of the institutional mission. Each level increased with complexity in methods to impact students' learning and program design and evaluation. The needs and mission of the institution are what influences the scope of the currently proposed project.

The current study is an example of a level three program, integrating components of levels one and two, and including course-related support services, such as the College Success Seminar. The intent of the current study was to determine how the behaviors were changed or what were the outcomes resulting from the intervention. Level three programs encourage application of content skills, which is a practice of learning community-linked courses. This aspect of Keimig's (1983) research emphasized the complexity of the course and necessity for reinforcement to obtain mastery, while working towards full institutional support which would have full inclusion of comprehensive academic supports throughout the curriculum.

Research on Developmental Education

Literature addresses numerous characteristics about college students, but very few empirical studies are conducted to understand the profile of remedial community college students. According to Saxon and Boylan (1999) limitations with regard to timeliness and methodology were found with research on community colleges and developmental education. Strehlow (1996) reported a study at Wilmar Community College in Minnesota which was conducted to evaluate the success of the developmental writing program. The study examined entering freshman in 1992-93 who completed the Academic Skills Assessment Program (ASAP) testing. These students were tracked through Spring Quarter, 1994. Grades in the for-credit freshman composition course for students who completed a developmental writing course were compared to those of students who had not completed developmental writing, hereafter referred to as completers and non-completers respectively. Completers were students earning a "C" or above. There were 231 participants in the study. Using a Mann-Whitney U test, Strehlow found that completers had a significantly higher GPA. Eighty-two percent of the participants passed developmental English. It was found that completers' academic performance was better than non-completers subsequent to taking developmental writing. Completers earned a

2.0, in comparison to non-completers earning a 1.0. In addition, completers had a significantly higher number of credits earned compared to credits attempted, compared to non-completers. Although this study does take into effect students' success in the writing course, it does not provide data about students' overall feelings about writing or locus of control beliefs.

A large university in Minnesota with two campuses, one in St. Paul and the other in Minneapolis, up until 2007 had a developmental education program on the Minneapolis campus that was a feeder for both campuses' degree programs. During the time of the college's existence many studies were conducted with the intention of periodically updating the research. In fall 1992, the campus began offering students the option of registering for college courses in learning communities, which they called packaged courses. They were registered for three or four linked courses, which included a science or economics course; a composition course; a college success or first-year seminar course; and some, not all, were registered for developmental math. The study began in 1992 and concluded in 1994. There were three groups totaling 304 participants, the first being the control group and consisting of 117 participants, all co-registered for courses in two of the three learning communities available on campus. The experimental group consisted of 80 participants registered for the same courses with the same faculty, but not co-registered for other packaged courses. There was an additional randomly selected baseline group consisting of 107 participants who were not enrolled in any particular program. The experimental group, which was the students enrolled in the learning community, earned significantly higher mean grade point averages (2.73) compared to students in the control group (2.36). The participants in the learning community were predicted to demonstrate higher academic achievement, because faculty help the students apply the strategies learned in the success seminar to the content area. Pre- and post-surveys were administered to participants in the study to assess their perceived change. The results demonstrated that students in the experimental group

valued the study strategies they acquired, were aware of the campus resources, and were more connected to their peers, faculty, and academic support personnel (Wilcox, delMas, Stewart, Johnson & Ghery, 1997). That study is very similar to this present study, but this study was conducted at a community college where the need for additional research on developmental education at two-year colleges is made evident in the literature.

Slark (1989) found that 45% of remedial writing students who participated in the learning assessment retention consortium (LARC) at community colleges in California in Fall 1986 and Fall 1987 had completed the required freshman writing course by Spring 1988. In addition, nearly half or up to 47% of these students held a grade point average between 2.0 and 2.9. This rate would likely have been even higher if there had been a mechanism to track students who transferred to other colleges. The response rate for this research was excellent at 95%, which included 2,012 respondents who participated in a follow-up study at one of the 17 participating campuses. Although this study was conducted more than 20 years ago, it had a large sample, which many studies in this remedial and developmental education area do not; as well, it provided useful information on the academic performance for this population.

Higbee and Dwinell (1997) looked at the cohort of admitted freshmen in Developmental Studies at the University of Georgia in the Fall of 1986 and Fall of 1987, when the university was experiencing drastic programmatic changes. The cohort participated in a follow-up survey conducted in 1997 to determine the graduation rates, satisfaction, and benefits of participation in developmental education as provided using self-report data on questionnaires that were mailed to respondents. The students whose placement scores required them to take developmental reading and developmental math were split in their responses (ranging from 15-19%) on their perceived benefits and level of satisfaction. Students who were placed in developmental English responded favorably about the benefits of that course. The majority (63%) of the students who took Developmental English considered learning how to write essays the most valuable aspect

of the class. Moreover, they believed the course provided basic skills that facilitated their success in related general education courses. The major limitation of this study was the low 6% response rate. Although the sample size was small, these findings inform the current research. This research idea was extrapolated from the pedagogical implications for further study as identified by developmental students at University of Georgia. Although this follow-up study assessed respondents' feelings about the course, there is no data on their feeling about writing prior to taking the course.

"Even the most gifted students have relative weaknesses and may seek assistance through services like supplemental instruction. Developmental education programs can enhance educational opportunities for all students" (Higbee & Dwinell, 1997, p. 6). Academic support services help colleges provide opportunities and interventions to promote success by increasing access. However, there has always been a stigma attached to remediation and developmental education in higher education comparable to the shame evoked in K-12 special education. Regardless of the need and potential benefits acquired after using academic support services, most students try to avoid being associated with any such programs.

Summary of Developmental Education

Deficiencies in fundamental skills are just one of many reasons that students fail to do well in college. Research and practice in the field include assessment and placement, critical thinking, developmental math, developmental reading, and developmental English/writing. Sometimes reading and writing courses are combined. There may be learning assistance in advising or tutorial programs, and student retention services offered. Developmental education is both academic and programmatic, which means it is both separately and collectively the in- and out-of-class experiences. It also has the distinction of serving the most diverse population of students on any given

campus, due to the assumption that these programs provide access to the under-prepared students, who are often minorities.

Community colleges must work to improve the success of developmental education students by modeling appropriate academic strategies to increase involvement and by motivating their students to seek the gratification associated with acquiring goals due to hard work and accomplishing satisfaction of increased knowledge by facilitating high internal locus of control. Since the 1970s, there has been a steady increase in the number of students entering college in need of academic supports in reading, English, or mathematics and the trend leads most to believe it will be an issue of concern for a while. According to McCabe and Day (1998), nearly 50% of the students entering community colleges a decade ago were required to take some developmental education course in at least one discipline before being allowed to enroll in a credit bearing course. "Preparation for college is a growing and persistent issue, particularly for recent high school graduates" (McCabe & Day, 1998, p. 32). There are occasions where students need assistance in more than one of these courses. Stratton (1998) maintained that 19% of high school graduates enter college without taking college preparatory courses during high school. In addition, the fastest growing populations of college entrants are adult learners. A large number of this student population graduated many years ago, sometimes 20 years prior to matriculating, when college preparation programs were not an option in many secondary schools. Campuses have not done very well justifying the necessity for and benefits associated with remedial services. Evaluations to assess remedial activities and their impact on student retention and graduation rates are needed, yet scarce.

Theoretical Foundations

There are three main purposes supporting student development theory as a necessary component of this study. It helps to explain characteristics of the learners at the community college; it also helps the researcher to predict possible outcomes: and it will

eventually help student affairs professionals and academic support personnel to influence the academic environment. The practice of developmental education is on the cusp of given theories and interdisciplinary perspectives. It spans the terrains of student development, cognitive development, and cultural theories. The goal is to improve the fundamental skills that help foster success for community college students enrolled in developmental courses by facilitating positive outcomes that last a lifetime. This section provides an overview of developmental theories that can be interpreted as an eclectic approach that informs understanding of the experience of developmental students.

Tinto's (1987, 1993) Theory of Retention

Tinto's (1987, 1993) model of college student attrition suggests that students' successful transitions to college are influenced by social and academic integration into college life. Separation, transition, and incorporation are the three stages in his theory. This theory recognized that diverse groups of students may have more difficulty successfully transitioning in higher education. First-year students begin to sever their connections with former environments, including old friends and some family members, in order to adjust to a new role. They begin to adopt new belief systems as college students. The transition stage bridges the gap between values left behind and the new ones needed to successfully integrate and become a part of the campus community. The incorporation stage requires immersion in both the academic and social sides of campus life. Decisions to withdraw are more a function of what occurs after entry than of what precedes it (Tinto, 1987, 1993). The attributes of the person and environment are essential. "Student departure may then serve as a barometer of the social and intellectual health of institutional life as much as of the experiences of students in the institution" (Tinto, 1993, p. 5). Tinto's (1993) research on academic and social integration is similar to the academic course curriculum in the college success seminar and holistic learning community. Tinto's model supports the focus of this study, which includes making the

social and academic transition to college using an orientation course that teaches motivational skills, English remediation that is a course teaching writing skills, with combined efforts of a learning community to foster academic and social interaction in a new and often challenging environment. This study focuses on the practice of a loosely linked learning community that helps integrate relationships with faculty and peers, providing support and building community. The learning community pairs a developmental writing course with a college success seminar; both courses, as well as the learning community, emphasize essential skills for a lifetime. Each treatment group introduces lifetime learning strategies, such as fundamental writing, to increase confidence; the orientation seminar teaches students to manage skills like time, motivation, and feelings of self control. This study examines students' behavioral outcomes in writing apprehension, and locus of control to determine any effects.

Adults as Learners (Knowles, 1988)

College students should be aware that an integral part of their future success must include the establishment of relationships with peers and faculty. "Key features of cooperative learning are very consistent with the basic tenets of adult learning theory, which Knowles terms 'andragogy'" (Brookfield, 1986, p. 91). Andragogy is the term used to give meaning to the way adults learn in contrast to the term pedagogy, used primarily in referring to how children acquire knowledge. Knowles (1988) developed a classic theory that is focused on adult learners and deviates from the norms set and based on child development. His tenets include: adults are more independent learners; they enter the classroom with a wealth of experience to draw from; the instruction for adults should relate to their daily life experiences and be easily applicable; and adults are more internally motivated than children. Adults learn best through instructional methods that are active with experiential techniques involving discussion and problem solving which allow them to draw on their backlog of personal and professional experiences (Knowles,

1988). The college experience has to make personal meaning for adult learners both socially and academically. The policies that focus on developmental students should require academic support systems that clearly link these programs to positive academic outcomes (self-efficacy) for students (Bandura, 1996; Horn, 1997).

Bandura's (1997) Social Learning Theory

"The acquisition process can be accelerated by transmitting the rule structure of the skill through modeling and then refining and perfecting it experientially" (Bandura, 1997, p. 372). Learning by trial and error is rarely as efficient as modeling behavior. Social learning theory is described as the way humans pattern themselves by the observed actions of others. These actions often need to be direct and explicit to facilitate development and address the academic needs for students experiencing writing apprehension and the pitfalls associated with an external locus of control. "Those who feel powerless to alter detrimental life conditions accept things as they are. Those who have a resilient sense of collective efficacy find ways to improve their living conditions in the face of seemingly insurmountable obstacles" (Bandura, 1997, p. 145). Self-regulation of thoughts and behavior is essential for personal well-being and control of daily living situations, which include demands of college for those embarking upon that academic experience. Bandura (1997) stated that success is persistence over a period of time. Multiple challenges in college or any other environment are less a matter of concern than the student's belief in his/her ability to handle these challenges effectively. Developmental writing students are exposed to the fundamental English skills to prepare them for college level coursework. However, knowledge without the skills to apply desired behavior is self-defeating. According to Bandura (1997), college students who believe in their knowledge base and skill set are more likely to use adaptive strategies to overcome anxiety and low motivation, while achieving their academic pursuits and ultimately their professional goals. Locus of Control or self-regulating behavior also

contributes to choices that college students make outside of the classroom. "The more strongly people believe that they can meet challenging standards, the more they intensify their efforts" (Bandura, 1997, p. 129). The College Success Seminar (CSS 110), the Developmental Writing course (DVWR), and CSS 110 linked with DVWR provide students with the foundation knowledge coupled with the capacity to help facilitate students' involvement in their academics.

Astin's (1985) Involvement Theory

Astin's (1985) involvement theory which is "concerned more with behavior mechanisms or processes that facilitate student development" (p. 143) provides another conceptual framework for this study and is particularly useful in examining the experience of students at community colleges. Students attending community colleges are less likely to persist through graduation due to lack of campus housing, largely disproportionate numbers of part-time students and faculty, and students' general lack of college readiness. Astin stated, "The most consistent finding - reported in virtually every longitudinal study of student development - is that students' chances of dropping out are substantially greater at two year college than at four year college" (p. 146). The impact of commuting and underpreparedness are not the only contributors to these negative outcomes. The lack of involvement of the student and faculty because of competing priorities outside of the campus also affects students' ability to become engaged inside and outside of class. Encouraging more involvement with their peers through these loosely-linked courses may be a way to promote students' success.

Learning Communities and Linked Courses

Learning communities in the simplest form couple two courses around a thematic area and register a cohort of students, on average twenty-five, in a small learning group. Alexander Meiklejohn, the originator of learning communities, established the University

of Wisconsin's Experimental College in 1927. The foundation of the content was humanities based. The faculty facilitated discussion groups on both Greek and American literature that students were assigned to read and reflect on faculty mentoring. This initial attempt at learning communities continued for six years, and is the basis for contemporary learning communities (Gabelnick, MacGregor, Matthews, & Smith, 1990). Academic advising was a key element of learning communities shaping the college experience for many underprepared students (Shapiro & Levine, 1999). The overall objective is sharing opinions and values while discussing the content to academically develop and motivate students. The goals are shared knowledge and shared knowing. Student participants have been known to increase academic achievement, motivation, and self-concept. "Learning communities provide a coherent academic structure that enables the institution to align its various actions for student success" (Tinto, 2000, p. 7).

There are several versions of learning communities (Gabelnick et al., 1990). One of the methods is a loosely linked course where courses from various disciplines connect around a central theme. This shared knowledge seeks to create a level of cohesiveness among diverse peers within a campus community. Often the content area or skills course is linked to a freshman orientation course, with the same students jointly assigned. The courses are taught so that there is content overlap as well as reinforcement of new knowledge. In addition, peers are more likely to get to know one another due to the shared experience (Tinto, 1998).

A limited, but growing, number of institutions are pursuing differing ways of addressing the educational needs of students at risk of failure. In 1993, Tinto, Goodsell-Love, and Russo conducted a study of 20-30 students enrolled in the same course. The out-of-class contact fostering social and academic supports is the nature of learning communities. It was found these students demonstrated a 25% increase in knowledge, recall, and satisfaction above those who did not participate in the intervention. Learning

communities are one of a few initiatives that boast positive learning outcomes (Tinto, 2003).

A population of students who could benefit from participating in a learning community is those who enter college in need of academic support or developmental instruction (Hill, 1985; Gabelnick, MacGregor, Matthews & Smith, 1990, Tinto, 2003). Nonresidential colleges serving large numbers of commuter students and part-time students who typically work while in college are likely to begin their programs by linking two courses, one of which is developmental in character and the other, focused on content or a field of study (Tinto, 1998). Another alternative could link a developmental advising course for first-year or exploratory students, also referred to as undecided or open majors.

In the early 1990s, LaGuardia Community College, a large very diverse metropolitan institution, was the site of a comprehensive foundational study conducted by Tinto, Goodsell-Love and Russo (1993). This program was a partnership between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. Faculty worked with professional staff and both served as counselors or mentors for students. The focus of the program was collaborative. The learning community was called the "New Student House." There were six basic courses in the program including two basic reading and writing courses, a speech course, and a freshman year experience course. Students were assigned based on their developmental needs as measured by an assessment. The research measures were both quantitative and qualitative. The first was a case study and the second a survey, requiring respondents to answer two questions: (1) Does the program make a difference? (2) If so, how? The assessments were conducted separately to understand first year students' experiences and overall thoughts about learning. They were administered to students in the learning community and other freshmen in similar courses outside the learning community. These surveys were conducted at the beginning and end of the semester. The first survey asked demographic information, including academic goals, self-concept, learning styles, and educational beliefs. Measures of students' behaviors in and outside of

the classroom were derived from an adapted version of Pace's College Student Experience Questionnaire and customized to fit the target population. The original version was designed to work with undergraduates at four-year institutions, but can be modified to work with special populations. Students were asked questions about their academic behaviors in the current academic year that promoted or detracted from academic success (Pace, 1990, 1995).

The subsequent fall, researchers obtained unobtrusive data on total credits earned, grade point average, and persistence. The qualitative survey was conducted to understand students' feelings about the learning community and overall experience as freshmen. A purposeful sample of a diverse population of students (n=287) was selected. The results found that the learning communities built supportive peer groups to smooth the transition, foster group study, and increase involvement, learning, and persistence. The students in the learning community had greater persistence and a higher pass rate, with the exception of one class. Additionally, the students in the learning community earned more As and Bs than the control group and the general population on campus (Pace, 1990, 1995).

Another study examining learning communities was conducted at City University of New York (CUNY), Hunter College, a very large comprehensive teaching research institution (Pereira & Cobb, 1990; Smoke & Haas, 1995). Developmental students were selected to participate in the study after they expressed concern about being behind in the number of academic credits earned. These students were placed in a history content course that was paired with a Developmental Reading or Writing course. Students placed in Developmental Reading and Writing were co-enrolled in a history course. Data analysis demonstrated that 90% of the students in the learning community passed the CUNY Writing Assessment Test (WAT), while non-participants had a pass rate ranging from 40% to 75%.

Locus of Control and Motivation

The concepts of internal and external locus of control are a central theme in applied psychology (Rotter, 1966). Locus of control is a distinct part of personality that determines whether people possess either internal or external personal traits. These beliefs are based on individuals' personal actions towards success and whether it is controllable or based on the actions of others, and therefore out of one's control (Weiner, 1980). Students with more internal locus of control believe that their success is based on personal efforts and skill, so are viewed much more favorably than students who have an external locus of control and believe that destiny is based on fate or guided by luck. The purpose of academic support interventions is to foster the belief in students that their behavior or effort does have a direct impact on their success or failure. According to Bandura (1997), students with internal locus of control demonstrated a smoother transition to college life, academically and socially. They believed success is based on personal ability and effort, enjoyment of learning and effective study. These students believed in themselves and had high expectations and were therefore more motivated.

Students more externally driven were less apt to persist in higher education, as demonstrated by course failure, course withdrawals, and overall drop-out rates. Bloom (1985) found that careers and interests so vastly different as high achieving athletes, scholars, or artists have the common thread of persistence over time, self-discipline, and willingness to delay gratification to reach their goals. They share a desire to overwhelmingly succeed. Intrinsic motivation is the desire to perform a behavior for its own sake and to be effective. Extrinsic motivation is a desire to perform a behavior due to promised rewards or threats of punishment (Bandura, 1997). The more challenging circumstances encouraged the highly motivated to persevere (Findley & Cooper, 1983). Locus of control is essentially whether actions have an effect on outcomes. Locus of control is an outgrowth of Rotter's (1966, 1975, 1990) classic conceptual framework. The constructs of motivation and locus of control are closely connected. Students with high

internal motivation believe that their success is based on effort and skill. Conversely, students with an external locus of control believe that their success is destined or predetermined (Bandura, 1997). The basis for Rotter's (1974) instrument subsequent to his initial research was to confirm the notion that successful college students are highly motivated and possess an internal locus of control. As a result, the Adult Nowicki Strickland Internal External Control Scale was developed (Rotter, 1974). Students with external locus of control experience greater anxiety, because their belief is that external factors or luck control their destiny (Rotter, 1966). Essentially, locus of control is determined by an individual's belief in whether their destiny is within or outside of their control.

Similarly, motivation is often referred to as either intrinsic or extrinsic. Because academic strategies can be taught, both are crucial elements in the success of all students, and in particular the developmental education population addressed in this study (Dollinger, 2000; Elder & Paul, 2003; Ray, 2003). Intrinsic motivation is defined as personal action that is inward, opposed to extrinsic motivation that relies on rewards and punishment or the actions of others (Mayer, 1998). Motivation in an academic context is the longing to accomplish goals meeting a quality standard. Highly motivated developmental education students with an internal locus of control will make the wise choice to study and put forth the necessary effort to be successful in college (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). However, students with an external locus of control will not take the risk to study, believing that success is based on luck and not personal and purposeful involvement (Weiner, 1980). Rouché and Rouché (1999) observed, "It is possible that by deciding not to invest any of their 'selves' in what happens, these students will not identify with academics; furthermore, they will decide not to try" (p. 20). There are motivation skills and independent learning strategies that are essential qualities for developmental education students to possess. These students are impressionable and capable of learning the strategies to be successful in college, such as class attendance,

assignment completion, and time management (Moore & Jensen, 2003; Ray, 2003). The most successful developmental education students exhibit behaviors such as motivation, class attendance, hard work, and regular use of academic support services. These behaviors are predictors of desired outcomes (Moore, 2006, 2007; Moore, Jensen, Hatch, Duranczyk, Staats, & Koch, 2003). Learners must be independent—often referred to as autonomous learners. Bandura (1997) described motivation as a system of self-regulatory mechanisms or motivational sources of behavior.

Motivation is closely related to goal acquisition. Activating self-evaluation processes through cognitive comparison encompasses two factors: (1) a personal standard; and (2) knowledge of one's performance level. Simply adopting a goal and having no knowledge of one's progress towards achieving that goal or being without a goal to measure progress lacks all possibility of motivational impact. Goals motivate by enlisting self-evaluative involvement in the select activity and are measured by personal standards compared to perceived performances. Without the prospect of self-satisfaction from personal accomplishments, discontent would eventually take its toll on self-motivation (Bandura & Cervone, 1983; Bandura & Jourden, 1991). Understanding why a student is in college will explain his or her interest and/or desire to learn. Often, success in an area increases one's desire to learn and further motivates. Knowledge and academic strategies are important, but carrying out the task is essential. Motivation is the act of completing one's daily tasks (Knowles, 1988). Direction is given to actions by creating self-incentives to persist in those efforts until performance matches the desired goal. Under ideal circumstances, when there are unmet goals, efforts are intensified and grow even stronger to equal the intensity of the desire (Bandura, 1997). To paraphrase Mayer (1998), motivation is a purpose-driven power within an individual to act on a particular goal or task and the individual's decision to persist or retreat in difficult situations.

Astin (1985) suggested that educators become more student-centered by assessing how motivated or engaged the student is in the learning process. His involvement theory

encourages practitioners to focus on getting students more involved in their education, which is an observable behavior. Developmental education students who demonstrate motivational skills may continue to have some academic difficulties, because they lack the cultural capital to succeed in academe (Aragon & Kose, 2007; Wells & Frankenburg, 2007). These students' value of education is thwarted prior to entering college due to unsuccessful learning experiences, including little instruction on successful learning techniques combined with low expectations (Bandura, 1997). Faculty and learning assistance personnel can intervene to help motivate developmental education students whose perception of remedial coursework is discouraging, because of the inherent stigma. Promoting students' use of faculty office hours, tutorial services, and study groups can help facilitate success (Tinto, 1987). Moreover, the goal is to dissuade students from reliance on tangible rewards or extrinsic motivation (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

Goleman (1994) conducted a classic 40-year longitudinal study that followed the lives of 1,528 highly intelligent children in California, who experienced varying degrees of success. The study concluded that the most successful students had greater levels of ambition, energy, and persistence. Adolescence through adulthood, these individuals were more involved in hobbies, sports, and organizations (Goleman, 1994). Bandura (1977) stated motivation is the belief in one's ability to conquer any given problem or task, expressly in an educational environment. Students' successful academic experiences increase motivation. Developmental students may have limited successes to draw from in a collegiate sense. An integral part of motivation is students' conscious choices to persevere and be successful, inherent qualities to undertake academic challenges of varying degrees. The amount of effort expended is directly related to motivation and the performance is most related to time spent on tasks (Grant & Dweck, 2003; Walters, 1998; Weiner, 1990).

Motivation is found to be the single most important variable to academic success for developmental education students (Moore, 2004). Ray, Garavalia, and Murdock (2003) stated "Motivation is important because it affects students' willingness to approach academic tasks, invest the required time and effort and maintain enough effort to complete academic tasks on schedule" (p. 8). Moore (2007) has developed a model that suggests academic interventions which influence students' behaviors, such as learning communities, paired courses, or mentor programs, are most likely to influence success in college.

Motivation is a general construct that encompasses a system of self-regulatory mechanisms. Attempts to explain the motivational sources of behavior must specify the determinants and intervening mechanisms that govern the three main features of motivation: selection, activation, and sustained direction of behavior toward certain goals. (Bandura, 1997, p. 228)

After much research to understand, inform, and operationalize this variable, this researcher formed a definition that is a synthesis of Rotter's original interpretation (1966) and Hoad's etymological dictionary (1986). The foundation of this term refers to one's beliefs about where control exists and beliefs about on whom responsibility should rest for events that take place in individual's lives. Rotter's research views locus of control in two ways, either internally or externally. The former, internal locus of control, which is the preferred way, views people with this style as believing they control their own destiny. External locus of control is least preferred, particularly by educators, because students have difficulty learning from previous experience and blame the "other," believing that studying harder will not improve their academic success because faculty dislike them. Students with internal locus of control are adept at making decisions that are goal specific (Rotter, 1966). Similarly, motivation as used in this study refers to one's

ability to act or perform with valor and purpose on the most complex tasks in the most challenging situations and an expectation to persist and be successful at all things.

Dr. Skip Downing, noted educator, author, and international speaker on student success, was the opening keynote speaker at the 2007 College Reading and Learning Association's (CRLA) Annual Conference. Downing (2008) is the author of the textbook *On Course*, used in many freshman year experience courses. Downing's message to this audience of faculty and academic support services personnel included ways to engage and motivate their college students, particularly marginalized students or students in developmental education. He stated that motivation is something that has to come from the inside. In other words, it must be intrinsic and not extrinsic. It should be noted that while motivation is not a variable in this study, it is so influenced by locus of control that this area of research is included here to help understand the complexity of locus of control, which is so important in developmental education.

In the 1990s, a motivation study was conducted at North Carolina State University, a large comprehensive land grant institution (Pintrich & DeGroot, 1990). The survey was designed to establish the relationship between motivation and intervention of supplemental instruction (SI) for students in a university chemistry course. In a controlled study, a survey was administered to 142 students during the first week of the semester. Motivation was measured by using intrinsic and extrinsic motivational variables. This study found that although SI and both individual and group tutorial services had advantages, on their own these benefits were minimal. A combination of intentional and well coordinated academic services provided the greatest benefit for students at every motivational level (Gattis, 2002). Students identified with strengths in motivation still require academic interventions as part of the solution for academic success. Thus, Pintrich and DeGroot (1990) found students must have the willingness and ability to be successful in the classroom.

Grant and Dweck (2003) conducted longitudinal studies on motivation. Their study investigated types of goals. It was found that students with learner goals that were more internally motivated had more successful coping skills, which is a necessity in college. Students who believe that ability was greater than effort were not as successful. They found that helping students understand that academic success is internal and based on effort is something they can control.

Writing Apprehension

Between 1990 and 1996, the Exxon Education Foundation provided a grant to the National Center of Developmental Education to provide a greater understanding of underprepared students and successful academic interventions. Prior to this study there was little information available describing this population. To conduct this study, information was obtained from about 5,000 students, attending 116 colleges (Gerlaugh, Thompson, Boylan, & Davis, 2007). A finding of the study was that nearly 91% of students who passed developmental writing were successful in credit-bearing freshman English composition (Boylan & Bonham, 1992). In another more historical research study, *The Empirical Development of An Instrument to Measure Writing Apprehension*, Daly and Miller (1975) researched the initial anxiety towards communication, specifically writing. The quantitative study was administered to 164 undergraduate students enrolled in basic composition and speech communication courses at West Virginia University. Students were selected from the speech communication course because it was hypothesized that students seeking to avoid writing-intensive courses would select this option. Although this study supports the need for interventions to help alleviate writing apprehension, the majority of students (91.46%) scored moderate to high apprehensiveness. The researchers reported their results as exploratory and said the data was their attempt to begin understanding students' beliefs about their writing.

Since the 1970s, community colleges have recognized the writing limitations of many college freshmen. Some administrators and faculty have implemented programs for writing across the curriculum as an alternative to developmental education. Study results of these programs have found an increase in students' engagement in the learning environment and improvement in learning outcomes.

Hughes-Wiener and Martin's 1989 study of Minnesota Community Colleges found a pattern suggesting that WAC (writing across curriculum) instruction may improve students' mastery of course objectives and that students with more writing experiences have a more positive attitude toward writing and a better comprehension of subject material. (Williams, 1989, p. 1)

Students of low and high academic ability may experience apprehension about writing, and, moreover, experience task difficulty as perfectionists (Weiner, 1980). Teachers who provide positive, consistent feedback, introduce effective writing strategies, and foster a favorable learning environment can improve effort and success and may decrease fear of writing. This is true in the K-12 setting where some of these studies have been done, as well as higher education (Faigley, Witte, & Daily, 1981, 1984; Mueller & Dweck, 1998). According to Pajares and Johnson (1994), students' thoughts about their writing skills are the best predictor of academic success as measured by pre-tests on writing apprehension.

A foundational study conducted by Faigley and Lester (1981) administered the Writing Apprehension measure to college students to analyze competence in writing performance. The study observed 110 undergraduates at a large southwestern institution. Out of 161 in the cohort, half scored low and the other half scored high apprehension on this measure. The question was whether the two groups would perform differently on tests of writing-related skills and different types of writing tasks. The writing samples required subjects to demonstrate two skills: (1) writing about personal experiences and (2) writing a position paper eliminating any mention of personal experiences. The results

of the study found scores on writing-related skills were lower for college students with high apprehension. The subjects with high writing apprehension wrote much shorter and less sophisticated pieces. Also, college students with a score high in apprehension preferred writing in anonymity, excluding personal experiences. In fact, the results were better when subjects' writing tasks took an objective stance. Although Faigley and Lester's study suggests that more creative instructional methods should be used for high apprehension writers, there is a problem understanding how writing apprehension impacts writing performance. This study will look at writing apprehension to determine if the instructional interventions impact students' personal beliefs about writing.

Faigley, Daly, and Witte (1981) conducted a foundational study examining the academic performance and writing competency of college students. The study used two types of essays to determine if there was any difference in the way students achieved who were identified as either high or low writing apprehensive as assessed by their performance on the Writing Apprehension Measure (Daly & Miller, 1975). The researchers selected 55 high and 55 low apprehensive writers at a large Southwestern university. These were 110 undergraduates registered for beginning composition. The participants completed eight measures to determine what they knew about writing, which included four measures developed by Educational Testing Services, three developed by McGraw-Hill Writing and the last a paragraph comprehension sub-test of the McGraw-Hill Reading Test. There was a significant difference between the high and low writing-apprehensive college students. With the exception of just two measures, the high writing-apprehensive scores were lower on tests of writing-related skills, including usage and formal writing. Also, writing performance was hampered, with highly anxious writers writing shorter and less sophisticated, articulated, and developed pieces. There was no distinct difference between high-apprehensive and low-apprehensive writers when writing or arguing an objective point of view, opposed to the results of significant effects when required to write personal narratives. The results suggested that various types of

essays should be required when measuring performance (Faigley, 1981). Although this study is measuring students' beliefs about their writing, their thoughts about their writing can be positively or negatively influenced, resulting from their in-class experiences.

Academic Achievement

The decision to provide academic interventions can be either proactive and based on the characteristics of the incoming students, or reactive and result in providing support after students are unsuccessful their first semester. Petrie (1999) conducted a longitudinal study at a Canadian community college with 681 underprepared students. The students were on academic probation and required to take a semester-long study skills course. This study supported the benefits of study skills courses, because it was revealed that students completing the course earned higher first- and second-semester grades.

Southard and Clay (2004) conducted research at a community college in northwest Florida on the effectiveness of developmental writing. The study was based on previous research conducted at two community colleges and two universities (Glau & Ransdel, 1996; Ragland, 1997; Stein, 1982; Weissman et al., 1997). Developmental courses were required based on placement test scores. The researchers examined the transcripts of 929 students. There was no significant difference in the grades of the developmental students in comparison to non-developmental students. However, the developmental students passed the credit-bearing English composition with fewer attempts and at a higher rate than their counterparts. Although the study supported the need for quality academic supports for developmental students, there were also causes for concern. Students who passed the placement test may actually have needed some remediation because the passers failed English composition at a rate of 37%. This indicates that students who were required to remediate pass regular English at a higher rate than those who passed placement and were, therefore, exempt from remediation. The researchers reported that assessments to place students in developmental courses are not

completely accurate. Therefore, effective academic interventions may be necessary for all college students, not only those identified as developmental (Southard & Clay, 2004).

Albin, Benten, and Khramtsova (1996) conducted a writing study at a university in the Midwest. There were 224 students in the study, and 84% were females. They found that interest in the topic and knowledge was most important. In this study they defined knowledge in two ways. They looked at topic knowledge and discourse knowledge. The latter is defined specifically as what writers know about writing. They suggest that competence increases confidence in writing, and therefore increases the likelihood of success.

The homogeneity of student populations, particularly at community colleges, suggests that they may all enter with academic deficiencies in at least one basic skill. Clearly there may be students who should be placed in developmental education but slip between the cracks and are not identified. According to Rouche and Rouche (1999), students are identified for developmental education placement in a variety of ways including low scores on the SAT or ACT, low high school GPA, self-selection by some returning students or adult learners, and faculty referrals. Another widely used college admissions policy or very valuable tool for first semester course registration is scores on placement tests required of most entering students (Rouche & Rouche, 1999). In 1993, Boylan, Saxon, Bonham and Parks reported only a 7% use of psychological testing for placement. For example, instruments such as Sedlacek's noncognitive variables to augment the academic measures and predict academic success for nontraditional first-year students can supplement admissions and course placement decisions (Sedlacek & Adams-Gaston, 1992). In spite of the multiple measures and interventions, there are still students who fall through the cracks and are not identified until they encounter failure, as evidenced by attrition rates after the first year or even worse, the first semester (Rouche & Rouche, 1999).

This study is useful in helping to shed light on the fact that placement in developmental English is important for students underprepared in this basic skill, but it is not always sufficient in and of itself to remediate the academic skills of all students. The study presented here offered the variable of a learning community that co-enrolls students in developmental writing and a college success seminar/academic preparation course to determine if this intervention would influence students' outcomes, as it relates to writing apprehension and locus of control. The belief is that successful in-class experiences will translate into persistence which lead to successful academic outcomes. The ultimate goal was to improve the success of developmental students through increased retention initiatives. "If learning skills programs could be implemented more widely, there would be a significant reduction of attrition rates" (Johnson, 1989, p. 226).

Summary

This chapter offered a review of the literature as a basis for the study. The erratic usage of theory and the standard practice to take an eclectic approach to theory application was included. In addition, this notion was coupled with a profile of underprepared students and the developmental education programs that serve them. A description of learning communities and loosely linked courses, locus of control, writing apprehension and success in the academic learning environment at a 2-year college provided the conceptual framework to help establish the direction of data collection to obtain results that inform practice. In addition, pertinent research regarding the needs of remedial students, particularly those with writing deficiencies, and exploring locus of control was reviewed.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents a detailed description of the methodology used in this study. In particular, the purpose, research hypotheses, study design, institutional context, measures, sample, data collection, and analyses are reviewed.

"Nationally, 42% of first-year students at community colleges enroll in at least one developmental course" (Parsad & Lewis, 2000, p. 4). Without some type of intervention, only 10% of community college developmental students are likely to earn a degree (Boylan, 1999). Numerous interventions have been promoted in higher education to reduce feelings of isolation and promote environmental factors that positively influence academic success (Astin, 1993; Smith, 1989; Tinto, 1989, 1995). This study examined the treatment effect of a loosely linked pair of courses on two constructs shown to contribute to student success.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to contribute to the sparse body of knowledge in developmental education and the success of developmental writing students. The goal was to increase the knowledge base about developmental writing students at a two-year college and their engagement in a learning community. This study examined the effect of a learning community intervention for students attending a community college. Specifically, the study included an experimental component to determine through pre- and post-test measures the pedagogical implications and strategies to determine if there was an improvement in locus of control and writing apprehension. The study was to determine if three groups of community college students enrolled in a variation of two courses would achieve positive academic outcomes after a semester of participation in the learning community. Two conceptual frameworks were used in the study. The first,

Astin's (1993) Inputs, Environments, and Outcomes (I-E-O) model of assessment, is used as a philosophical guide. The second is Bandura's (1997) social cognitive theory.

Conceptual Framework

Developmental Education includes individual and institutional activities, and addresses students' academic backgrounds, educational needs, and demographics. Other terms to describe developmental are special, remedial, basic skills, and underpreparedness. "Much of the published literature in developmental education lacks a theoretical base through which the motives and goals of seemingly disparate practices might be understood as constituting a unified core of disciplines (Lundell & Collins, 1999, p. 4). Since developmental education pulls from tenets of multiple disciplines, it is difficult to pinpoint theory; therefore, practitioners adopt a pragmatic approach. Astin's (1993) Input-Environment-Outcome model was appropriate to address this quasi-experimental study.

This research must be interpreted with caution, understanding that the results on the larger population may or may not be relevant. The participants were volunteers; therefore, were not randomly assigned. The literature states there is not a comprehensive developmental theory that covers developmental education (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Higbee, Dwinell, & Thomas, 2002). The I-E-O model was selected to provide a philosophical framework for this study. It was used to help mitigate the problem of nonrandom assignments, such as participants' personal characteristic of being assessed and subsequently identified as developmental. The pretest results (inputs) in this quasi-experimental study's in-class treatments or interventions (environment) and the outputs were the results on the posttests (Astin & Sax, 1998). In this study there were three environments: (1) students in ENGL 81 only, (2) students in CSS 110 only, and (3) students in both, which in this study was the learning community. The conceptual framework for this study as it relates to the experience within the learning community

was based on the efficacy research of Bandura (1997), who stated that people are capable of managing their beliefs and actions. His theory explained how individuals acquire and maintain certain behavior patterns, while providing the basis for interventions. They must become skilled at handling and influencing obstacles, including academics with self-assuredness and competence. Perceived academic capability and inability to control negative thoughts, accompanied by increased academic anxiety, are within humans' control. Participation in the learning community may lessen any writing apprehension and move respondents to present an internal locus of control. Efficacy beliefs predict situational issues like academic performance and proneness to anxiety, such as writing apprehension. Achievement of self-regulated learning requires both will and skill (Blumenfeld & Marx, 1997; McCombs & Marzano, 1990). For this reason, education should help students to be aware of their own thinking, to be strategic, and to direct their motivation towards valuable rewards. The intent is for college students to become independent learners (Schunk & Zimmerman, 1994, 2001).

This study examined the outcomes of community college students in a learning community, which co-enrolled them in two courses. They included a developmental English course ((ENGL 81), a college success seminar (CSS 110) and students co-enrolled in ENGL 81 and CSS 110, termed a learning community. The participants' personal beliefs (self-efficacy) about locus of control and writing apprehension were assessed. Students pursuing additional education at two-year schools are sometimes doing it for more than the cost benefit or tuition savings. Many students at two-year colleges attend because their sense of self or belief in writing skills is diminished. Therefore, this study sought to measure the locus of control and writing apprehension of this population (Inman & Mayes, 1999). The framework used to organize the study and develop a logical arrangement for the instruments used in the experimental study was Astin's (1993) I-E-O assessment model. However, Bandura's (1997) social cognitive

theory is the best conceptual fit for the participants' experience in the learning community.

Study Design

The study was a quasi-experimental, causal comparative design (Borg & Gall, 1989). The causal comparative method considers cause-and-effect relationships between variables by comparing participants in the study with a comparison group of those with similar academic deficiencies. By eliminating extraneous variables or controlling for select student characteristics, change in the dependent variables can be correlated to the treatment applied.

This study included three treatment groups. The treatments involved students enrolled in either one or both of the following two courses: CSS 110 (College Success Seminar) and ENG 81 (Developmental Writing) courses. Group 1, referred to as the Learning Community Cohort, consisted of students who were co-enrolled in CSS 110 and ENGL 81. Group 2, referred to as the College Success Cohort, was comprised of students enrolled only in CSS 110. Group 3, referred to as the Developmental Writing Cohort, consisted of students enrolled only in ENGL 81.

CSS 110 is a one-semester 3-credit hour/15 week course that satisfied the college's 1-credit hour/15-week orientation course requirement. It meets 3 hours per week, with 2 hours of lecture and 1 hour of a small group seminar or discussion session. The course receives regular grades (A, B, C, D, and F). This orientation to college course teaches strategies for creating success in college and in life. Topics include life skills, including stress reduction, self-esteem, and academic study skills. Students in CSS 110 are provided direct instruction on the behavior, knowledge, and skills associated with outcomes of successful college students. In addition, the text for the course is designed to facilitate students' beliefs concerning their capabilities to learn and effectively employ the skills and knowledge necessary to attain the valued outcomes. The primary academic

goal is for students to learn to create coherent, grammatically correct essays that include paragraphs with solid structure, coherence, and readability.

English 81 is the second in a sequence of three noncredit/remedial writing courses of one semester each. The course requires 45 hours of lecture and 30 hours of laboratory for tutoring, editing assistance, and reinforcement of class topics. The course is graded Satisfactory (S) or Unsatisfactory (U). The ENGL 81 course teaches fundamentals in composition writing, including grammar and comprehension skills. Students are required to register for the course as a result of their score on the sentence skills battery of the placement test.

It is important to note that all participants volunteered rather than being randomly assigned to the treatment groups. Participants self-selected or chose to enroll in these courses rather than being placed into any of the groups.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Because of the exploratory nature of this study, the hypotheses are stated in null form. Using ANCOVA to analyze the data, the following questions were answered.

Research Question 1. Is there a statistically significant difference between the scores on a measure of writing apprehension of two treatment groups of developmental students compared to developmental students in a loosely-linked learning community at a two-year college?

Hypothesis 1: After controlling for initial level of writing apprehension, there is no statistically significant difference in level of writing apprehension by treatment group at the end of the treatment.

Research Question 2. Is there a statistically significant difference between the scores on a measure of locus of control of two treatment groups of developmental students compared to developmental students in a loosely-linked learning community at a two-year college?

Hypothesis 2: After controlling for initial level of locus of control, there is no statistically significant difference in the level of locus of control by treatment group at the end of the treatment.

A significance level of $<.05$ (p-value) was set to analyze the data.

Institutional Context

The setting was an urban community college in Maryland, with 5,926 full-time and part-time students enrolled Fall 1997, 75% females and 25% males (CCC Data Book, 1998). It should be noted that the actual name of the institution has been omitted and pseudonyms are being used. Twenty four percent of city residents seeking a post-secondary education during this time period chose to attend City Community College. This population is among the most financially disadvantaged in the state. According to the State Higher Education Commission (1998), in the distribution of total financial aid received by State Community Colleges in 1997 when the data were collected, CCC received 14% of the funding, only second to Midwest County College (MWCC), which received 18%. Moreover, CCC enrolled the largest number of Pell Grant recipients at 21% and MWCC ranked second at 16%. In the early 1990s, the success of first-time, full-time enrolled freshmen who graduated, transferred to a four-year institution, or were retained at least four years after entering college was an average of only 35%, which was consistently among the lowest in the state. The only other community colleges in the state of Maryland reporting comparable or lower success rates during that period were Far Northwest, Far Northeast, and Metro Capital counties (CCC Data Book, 1999, 1997). CCC received 29% of the market share of city residents who attended state institutions in 1997. Of the total unique head count of 5,155 City residents who enrolled in CCC for the Fall 1997 semester, 4,456 were identified as African American and 699 were identified in one of the other racial and ethnic groups. According to the State Higher Education Commission, "Among all *state* colleges, CCC enrolled 39% of the City's African

Americans, but only 12% of all others. Among *state* 2-year colleges, CCC enrolled 80% of the city's African Americans, but only 31% of all others" (CCC Data Book, 1999, p. 23).

During this same time, City Community College (CCC) had an increase of remedial needs at the institution. According to the Office of Institutional Research at CCC, between Fall 1990 and Fall 1998, remedial course enrollment on campus more than doubled, rising from 18% to 37% of all college enrollment (CCC Data Book, 1999). This study allowed those with an interest in higher education's successes and needs regarding remediation a snapshot in time to provide perspective on the community college developmental education program trajectory.

Sample

This study employed an existing data set. All three treatment groups were comprised of students enrolled in some combination of CSS 110 and ENGL 81 in Fall 1997. Students self-selected to enroll in CSS 110 in lieu of the one-credit required orientation course, known as Pre 100 "Preparation for Academic Achievement." One section each of CSS 110 and ENGL 81 were paired courses. Therefore, if a student registered for either course in the pilot section he/she was co-enrolled in the two courses, and was therefore a participant in the learning community project. Students in English 81 are required to take the course based on their placement test score. As noted earlier, English 81 is the second of a sequence of three remedial or developmental English courses. Students could have placed in English 80, which is the first in the sequence, and successfully completed that course prior to enrollment in English 81. All first-time full- or part-time students must register for an orientation course, so the population in the study is mostly first-semester students. However, some second-semester students who are either repeating the course or were unable to register for the course their first semester due to schedule conflicts or sections being full could be in this orientation course. The

study in Fall 1997 used students in ENGL 81, entitled Composition Skills, a developmental writing course, which had a total of 25 sections with 627 students enrolled. Fourteen sections were in the study initially with a potential for 221 students eligible to complete the study. However, only 13 sections actually completed the study. The 14th section had no students complete the post-test, because the faculty member forgot to administer the posttest to that entire section of English 81. In addition, there were 9 sections of a first-year experience or orientation course entitled College Success Seminar (CSS 110), a 3-credit orientation course. All nine sections participated in the study with the potential for 147 student participants. There were 3 sections of ENGL 81 and CSS 110 linked learning communities established to allow students to co-enroll in the paired courses. There could potentially be 45 students in this treatment group.

Measures

Students in all groups were administered a pre-test and post-test to measure two of the dependent variables, writing apprehension and locus of control. The Writing Apprehension Measure (WAM) (Miller & Daly, 1975) and the Adult Nowicki Strickland Internal External Control Scale (ANS-IE) (Nowicki & Duke, 1974) were used in this study. Other information such as demographics of gender and age are independent variables provided through institutional data.

Locus of Control

The Adult Nowicki Strickland Internal External Control Scale (ANS-IE) (Nowicki, Stephen, Duke, & Marshall, 1974) measures locus of control (see Appendix A). On this instrument, locus of control is defined as the extent to which individuals believe one of two extremes: that they control their destiny by their own behavior or that their destiny is controlled by fate, chance, or luck. Those who believe circumstances are within their control have an internal locus of control, and those who believe things are

outside of their control possess an external locus of control (Nowicki, 1972). This scale is an outgrowth of social learning theory measuring expectancies (Bandura, 1996).

Expectancy is the subjective probability that a given behavior will lead to a particular outcome or reinforcement (Rotter, 1989). The instrument replicates a very popular scale designed by Rotter and associates (Rotter, 1990). However, that instrument has been criticized for its lack of generalizability across age groups, particularly with children and non-college trained adults (Nowicki, 1972).

The ANS-IE is written at the fifth grade reading level to more readily conform to children, while still being appropriate for adults. Specifically, there are two forms, one for children and one for adults. The validity and reliability were addressed and the scores have the psychometric characteristics necessary for this research (Cronbach, Gleser, Rajaratnam, & Nanda, 1972). There is considerable evidence to support the instrument's reliability and construct validity (Nowicki, 1972). This scale can be administered in a one-to-one or group setting and the scale has moderate split-halves reliability from .74 to .86 and .63 to .76 test re-test reliability. On the basis of social learning theory and other empirical results, the scale is supported by construct and convergent validity (Nowicki, 1972; Wehmeyer, 1993). Sample ANS-IE items include:

- Do you believe that most problems will solve themselves if you just don't fool with them?
- Are some people just born lucky?
- Are most other people your age stronger than you are?
- Do you think that people can get their own way if they just keep trying?
- Do you feel that when good things happen they happen because you work hard?
- Are you the kind of person who believes that planning ahead makes things turn out better?

The adult form of the ANS-IE is a nominal data forced-choice (yes or no) 40-item instrument with scores ranging from 0 to 40. "The assessment yields a final score based on the number of items answered in the external direction: the higher the score, the more external the person's orientation" (Dixon, Marsh, & Craven, 2002, p. 5). The scoring procedures to be followed for the ANS-IE are as follows. There were 40 statements; the respondent was to choose a yes or a no response. The respondent's score is derived from adding the number of items that were scored correctly. Twenty-five of those 40 statements were correct if the respondent said yes; 15 of the statements were correct if the respondent answered no. The respondent's score is computed by adding together the number of correct Yes responses with the number of correct No responses. A higher score, therefore, indicates more external locus of control. The reliability for this sample appears in Chapter IV.

Writing Apprehension

Writing apprehension was assessed by the Writing Apprehension Measure (see Appendix B) (WAM) (Miller & Daly, 1975) that was developed to determine the constructs of anxiety, writing apprehension, or fear about writing that measurably affect behavior patterns, which includes the process of writing until completion. Specifically, the WAM measures respondents' beliefs about their ability to create well-developed thoughts that are grammatically correct (Miller & Daly, 1975). In comparison, the same researchers also developed the Writing Apprehension Scale (WAS) (Daly & Miller, 1975) that measures performance on standardized writing tests and is widely used for measuring apprehension when composing on the computer. The literature also refers to the Writing Apprehension Test (WAT) and the Writing Apprehension Questionnaire (WAQ), the latter not to be confused with Rose's (1984) Writing Attitude Questionnaire. All are essentially the same. There are minor distinctions between them: the WAT is a 6-Point Likert scale to respondents settling on a neutral position and has been used with

English as a Second Language (ESL) population; the WAQ looks at other subscales like time management (Bline, Lowe, Meixner, Nouri, & Pearce, 2001; Faris, Golen, & Lynch, 1999; Miller & Daly, 1975; Phinney, 1991); the Writing Apprehension Measure (Miller & Daly, 1975) predicts behavior and emotions of persons in various writing situations. Individuals may become anxious when asked to perform a writing task on the job or in the classroom. The WAM used in this study helps to identify the propensity for certain individuals to perform poorly in environments that require writing. These individuals will tend to avoid written communication for fear of failure.

Miller and Daly's (1975) WAM is a 26-item self-report survey. Respondents use a 5-point Likert-scale (1=Strongly agree; 5=Strongly disagree). Each item addresses writing avoidance, personal attitudes, and emotions that are felt during the actual writing process. The instrument attempts to capture the anxiety associated with the actual composition of a written message. It seeks to determine any anxiety or substandard performance in settings where writing is an integral part. Individuals whose background has included failure with writing tasks, such as poor grades, may be conditioned to such an anxiety. Subsequently, they could be found to have below average attendance or incomplete assignments in environments where writing is necessary. Moreover, the result appears to be a self-fulfilling prophecy. Those who experience writing anxiety generally perform poorly because of minimal writing practice or avoidance of opportunities that would offer the needed experience. The instrument measures the predisposition towards anxiety with writing. The items explore academic and professional settings where writing is required. Sample items include:

- I avoid writing.
- I have no fear of my writing being evaluated.
- I look forward to writing down my ideas.
- I like to write my ideas down.
- I'm nervous about writing.

- Writing is a lot of fun.

Scores range from 26, indicating a high level of writing apprehension, to 130, indicating the lowest level of writing apprehension (Miller & Daly, 1974). The WAM contains 26 statements to which the subject needs to respond. The scale used ranges from 1 to 5; strongly agree is a 1 and strongly disagree is a 5. The 26 statements are divided into two groups of 13. One set is positively stated; the other negatively. However, the same rating scale is used for both. The individual score is computed using an established mean of 78 plus the score on the positive section, minus the score on the negative section. The scores can range from 26 to 59, indicating a high level of anxiety; from 60 to 96, indicating a modest level; and 97 to 130, indicating a low level of anxiety.

The original version of the WAM was a 63-item Likert-scale instrument (strongly agree to strongly disagree), with the same response options as the measure uses in its final 26 items. One hundred sixty-four undergraduates completed the first format at West Virginia University in Spring 1974. Participation was voluntary. Respondents were from a variety of majors, but were all enrolled in basic communication and composition courses. The validity and reliability were addressed and the scores have the psychometric characteristics necessary for the research (Cronbach et al., 1972). An oblique factor analysis was conducted, and as a result of this further research the 26 items retained in the instrument formed the initial measure. It was found to have loadings above .60. The 26-item instrument has a split-halves reliability of .94. The instrument scores "1-5, polarity reflected so high scores indicate high apprehension and yielded a mean score of 79.28 with a standard deviation of 18.86" (Miller & Daly, 1975, p. 4). To establish odd-even reliability for the instrument, 141 students who were enrolled during Summer 1974 in a basic educational psychology course and the basic composition and communication courses named in the previously mentioned study were given the instrument. This instrument can be administered to individuals or in a group setting. The respondents

scored .93 for odd-even reliability with 71.87 for an obtained mean and 18.15 standard deviation. These scores demonstrated predictive validity (Miller & Daly, 1975).

The two measures used in the study, the Writing Apprehension Measure and the Adult Nowicki Strickland Internal External Control Scale, are widely used instruments with acceptable reliability and validity. However, inherent problems cannot be overlooked. The WAM is lacking in generalizability and relationships to other more specific variables and with other personality measures. In addition, the WAM measures success in general college level composition courses, but does not allow for behavioral predictions such as the success of remedial writing courses once students' apprehension is assessed. According to Miller and Daly (1975), "for example, we would suspect that there would be numerous stylistic and content differences between high and low anxious writers in their writing" (p. 9). A limitation of the ANS-IE is the instrument's potential bias against groups such as women, minorities, and those of lower socio-economic status. The aforementioned presents problems in obtaining the significant relationship between the results and academic achievement (Nowicki, 1972).

Validity

The two instruments used in this study, the WAM and the ANS-IE, were judged by a number of researchers named earlier to be valid for use with this student population. The review of the literature indicates that the instruments may be somewhat biased against women and minorities, who because of their cultural expectations, may rate themselves as more anxious and externally motivated based on cultural expectations. This may be important for this study since its population is made up of 75% female and 86% African American.

Reliability

Cronbach alphas were computed to determine the reliability of the Writing Apprehension Measure (WAM) and the Adult Nowicki Strickland Internal External Control Scale (ANS-IE) for this population. Cronbach alpha measures inter-item reliability and consistency of the survey instrument. It is used when no pretest-posttest reliability measures are available. Cronbach alphas were computed for the total on the WAM and the ANS-IE on both the pretests and the posttests. According to Gall, Gall and Borg (2003),

If a scale has a high alpha coefficient [typically, .60 or higher, with the highest possible coefficient being 1.00], it means that individuals who respond in a certain way to one item on the scale are likely to respond in the same way to the other items on that scale. (p. 196)

According to Daly and Miller (1975), they obtained a split-half reliability of .94 and a test-retest reliability of .92 on the WAM. This researcher computed a Cronbach alpha across all participants of .64 on the pretest and .70 on the posttest. Gall, Gall, and Borg (2003) would call those inter-item reliabilities modest. This researcher also computed a correlation between the total pretest score and the total posttest score, which was .66. This is an approximation of a test-retest reliability coefficient over the period of the course.

The authors of the ANS-IE indicated that split-half reliabilities ranged from .74 to .86; they felt that the test has satisfactory internal consistency. They also computed a test-retest reliability over a six-week period on the ANS-IE, which was .83. This researcher computed Cronbach alphas on the total pretest and posttest scores on the ANS-IE. The Cronbach alpha on the pretest was .58 and on the posttest, it was .63, indicating that it had low to modest reliability.

Procedures

Data for this study were collected in Fall 1997. Instructors for all 23 sections of ENGL 81 were invited to participate in the study and 14 participated. However, data from only 13 sections could be used, because the posttest was not administered in one of the sections. All nine sections of CSS 110 participated. The ANS-IE and WAM were administered as pre-tests during the first two weeks of the semester. The same form for each assessment was administered again during the last two weeks of the semester as the post-tests. This research was conducted under informed consent. Participants in the Learning Community Cohort and Developmental Writing Cohort received the assessments in the ENGL 81 course. Students in the College Skills Success received the assessments in the CSS course. The instructors administered the two measures by asking students to read the brief instructions and respond to each item by recording the appropriate response. Both instruments were administered using paper and pencil format. The participants were informed that their results would be part of a study, but that their identity would remain confidential. Since the measures were administered during class time there was no promise of incentives. The overall response rates for the 13 participating sections of ENGL 81, all 9 sections of CSS 110 and the learning community are reported in Chapter IV.

Developmental English 81-Composition Skill 1

The English (ENGL 81) Composition Skill 1 teaches students effective essay writing skills. It was the second in a sequence of three developmental courses. Students were placed in this required course based on the results of their Accuplacer placement test score. All faculty members use the same departmentally developed syllabus (see Appendix C). The course focuses on the basics of developing logical and grammatically correct paragraphs and over the semester creating coherent essays. The course meets 3 hours per week for lecture and 2 hours per week for required lab. During lecture the

faculty members teach the foundation of writing and allow time for students to apply written standard English skills taught in the classroom in a writers' workshop format where peers share and review one another's work, which is typical in most English writing courses. The instructor's role in this environment is to guide students through the peer evaluation process and to assure that students are paired heterogeneously. The lab sessions provide time for regularly scheduled review with tutors. The increased amount of contact hours in the lecture along with the required lab have to do with the pedagogical implications for developmental students and acceptable practice that beginning and low level writers need as much practice in writing as possible. Students are required to compose their work on a computer and are offered technology assistance by lab monitors if they need assistance in developing their computer literacy skills. Two required texts for the class are: We Are America by Anna Joy and Writing with Confidence by Alan Meyers. The various class activities to reinforce written language besides formal essays include free writing, journaling, quizzes and exams on course content.

The College Success Seminar-Orientation Course

The College Success Seminar (CSS 110) teaches techniques that help to facilitate students' successes and personal ideals of dreaming, excelling and managing stressful life situations. The course fulfilled an Orientation requirement. It is a course taught from an eclectic orientation combining best practices in personal effectiveness with the tenets of business, education, psychology and athletics' tenets. The instructors participated in required faculty training and used a departmental syllabus (see Appendix D) and textbook On Course by Skip Downing is used in all sections of the class. Students are required to complete weekly journals to improve writing, engage in class activities and group discussions, which help them focus and stay "On Course." The primary course is to maximize control over your life by the choices students make and to be open-minded and willing to try new things for better results. Another objective is to discover the best

methods that fit for their individual learning style. The pedagogical practices are designed to foster success in college and beyond. The curriculum encourages students to set goals, both academic and career related, and by being critical thinkers and using creative problem solving strategies that seek only positive outcomes, avoiding the victim persona and accepting direction and support from faculty. As a result of applying new strategies learned in the course, the desired outcome is that students will learn to utilize time management strategies and other academic strategies to succeed in college, in careers and in life overall.

Learning Community

The learning community in the simplest form consisted of students co-enrolled in the Developmental English (ENGL 81) and the College Success Seminar (CSS110) course. This is known as a loosely linked learning community.

It is important to note that Astin's (1993) model, which calls for pre-college experiences, was adapted and not true inputs according to the original intent and design of his model. Again, this research is used as a philosophical framework. The inputs for this study included the pre-test scores from the two measurements. The variables for the inputs were scores on the Writing Apprehension Measure (Miller & Daly, 1975) and the Adult Nowicki Strickland Internal External Control Scale (Nowicki & Duke, 1974). The environment variables were the treatment groups and the varying experiences they provided students. These include the involvement in the learning community, with enhanced peer and faculty interactions, use of campus resources like tutoring, since it was an integral part of the developmental writing course, and the additional time engaged in academic discussion with faculty and peers, a goal of the college success course. Lastly, the outputs for this study included the post-test scores from the two measurements. The outcome variables were scores on the Writing Apprehension Measure (Miller & Daly,

1975) and the Adult Nowicki Strickland Internal External Control Scale (Nowicki & Duke, 1974).

Data Analysis

Quasi-experimental designs have independent variables that are under the control of the experimenter. However, the design is less formal with fewer restrictions to be considered a true experimental design. Generally in quasi-experimental designs, one does not have enough control over the situation to randomly assign subjects. Correlation coefficients were computed for the three groups in the study on each of the instruments used, to determine the strength of a relationship between the pretest and the posttest. The final analysis involved using analysis of covariance to look for post-test score differences between the three groups on the two instruments, controlling for pre-test scores.

Summary

This chapter outlined the methods for the researcher's study. First, a conceptual framework was identified that was acceptable for explaining the participants' experiences within the learning community to influence writing apprehension and locus of control. A second conceptual framework was identified for the experimental study to control the inputs, which are the respondents' pre-test scores on the ANS-IE and the WAM, to determine if the experiences influenced the outcomes. The purpose, hypothesis, and study design were included. This chapter presents the institutional context, with facts and figures from the time period when the data were collected. Three treatment groups were identified. Next, the existing data set was presented, with proposed statistical methods, and analysis.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

As stated in Chapter I, the purpose of this study was to contribute to the sparse body of knowledge in developmental education and the success of developmental writing students. The goal was to increase the knowledge base about developmental writing students at a two-year college and their engagement in a learning community. This study examined the effect of a learning community intervention for students attending a community college. Specifically, the study included an experimental component to examine through pre- and post-test measures the pedagogical implications and strategies to determine if there was an improvement in locus of control and writing apprehension. The study was to determine if three groups of community college students enrolled in a variation of two courses would achieve positive academic outcomes after a semester of participation in the learning community. This researcher's desire was to gain a deeper understanding of developmental students at a community college. Two research questions were developed to determine the impact of developmental education intervention programming on the writing apprehension and locus of control of community college students in an urban community college. The results of this study should contribute to the sparse body of knowledge in developmental education and examine the pedagogical implications and strategies to improve the success of developmental writing students.

This chapter begins with a demographic overview of the participants. The results of the statistical analysis of ANCOVA are presented followed by a series of post hoc dependent t-tests. The data from question one were analyzed to determine the degree of writing apprehension by treatment group. Question two data were analyzed to determine if there is a difference in the level of locus of control by treatment group. The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings for this study.

On many community college campuses remedial coursework is required for over 40% of the campus population (Kane & Rouse, 1999; Tinto, 1998). With less than 50% of high school students taking college preparation courses, only the most highly selective institutions have the option of denying access to students with remedial needs (Gaither, 1999). A learning community is a developmental approach to enhance or foster success in educational environments. This method of academic intervention can promote positive outcomes for potentially at-risk college students. For students in this study, it is a method used to provide additional academic support. In the simplest form, learning communities are paired courses focused on a particular subject or theme; the students are registered for courses as a cohort in a small learning group (Gabelnick et al., 1990). The two linked courses in this study are the developmental English course (ENGL 81) and the College Success Seminar (CSS 110).

Participants

In order to be included in the study, 627 community college students met the following criteria: (a) students enrolled in a developmental English course (ENGL 81); (b) students enrolled in an orientation course, entitled the College Success Seminar (CSS 110); and (c) students enrolled in both the developmental English and college orientation course. The co-enrolled courses are called a learning community. The study was designed to determine if these three groups of community college students enrolled in either one or both of the two specified courses would achieve positive academic outcomes.

In Fall 1997, 25 sections of developmental English (ENGL 81) were offered; students from 13 of those sections were used in the study. Nine sections of the College Success Seminar (CSS 110) were offered that same semester and students from all 9 sections participated. The co-enrolled course had 3 sections and all sections participated.

There were 627 students eligible to participate in the study. The number of eligible participants was reduced when one instructor forgot to administer the posttest to

230 participants. Of the remaining 397 eligible students, 29 students' records were missing so many sections that they could not be used. This reduced the total number of records potentially available to 368. There was a very low response rate based on various reasons. The number of subjects was further reduced by such factors as students opting out of participating in the testing, withdrawing from the courses, failing to fully complete the survey or failing to write legibly, so that their surveys could not be coded. A large number of students did not complete both the pre- and posttest versions of either instrument and were not used in the analysis. A total of 131 student participants completed both the pretest and posttest surveys of the Writing Apprehension Measure (39.8%); 126 completed testing for the Locus of Control Inventory (38.3%) and constitute the sample for those analyses. A core group of 110 completed both measures (see Table 1).

Table 1

Respondents and Non-Respondents in WAM and ANS-IE for the Three Groups

Treatment	Learning Community**	Eng 81 only	CSS 110 only	Total
Population in participating sections	45	221	147	368
WAM Completed both pre-post	16	75	40	131
WAM non-respondent*	29	146	107	237
WAM Response rate	35.6%	33.9%	27.2%	35.6%
ANS-IE Completed both pre- & -post	15	72	39	126
ANS-IE non-respondent*	30	149	108	242
ANS-IE Response rate	33.3%	32.6%	26.5%	34.2%

* completed only one of the pre- or post test, unusable response, did not participate

**Learning community population is computed using average number of students in CSS 110 section n=15)

Demographics

Included here is information on the participants' age, gender, full-time or part-time enrollment, credits earned, and GPA for the group of respondents used for each instrument in the study. This information was obtained from the college student records of those enrolled in English 81, the college success seminar, CSS110, or those enrolled in the two linked courses. In all cases the WAM and ANS-IE samples were nearly identical and they are quite similar to those of the non-respondents.

Table 2

Age of Participants and Non-Participants

Age	WAM		ANS-IE		Non-Respondents	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
15-19	47	36.7	44	36.7	113	31.1
20-24	38	29.0	37	29.0	125	34.5
25-29	16	12.1	15	12.1	46	12.6
30-34	10	7.5	9	7.5	26	7.2
35-39	8	6.1	9	6.1	25	6.9
40-44	4	3.0	4	3.0	9	2.5
45-49	4	2.7	4	2.7	9	2.5
50-54	1	1.0	1	1.0	4	1.1
55-59	1	.6	1	.6	2	.6
60+	2	1.3	2	1.3	4	1.1
Total	131	100.0	126	100.0	363	100.0

The data in Table 2 indicate that about 66% of the three groups were between 15 and 24. About 20% more were between 25 and 34, that these students had delayed their entrance into post-secondary education. About 10% enrolled were between age 35 and 44. The mean age for each group is: WAM – 22.5; ANS-IE – 22.1; non-respondents – 23.6.

The gender of students in the study and non-respondents is displayed in Table 3. About two and one-half times more females than males were enrolled.

Table 3

Gender of Participants and Non-Participants

Gender	WAM		ANS-IE		Non-Respondents	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Male	38	28.4	36	28.4	108	29.8
Female	93	71.6	90	71.6	255	70.2
Total	131	100.0	126	100.0	363	100.0

In terms of student enrollment, twice as many students in the study were enrolled as full-time students than as part-time. This was also true of the non-respondents. These numbers are displayed in Table 4.

Table 4

Students Enrolled Full-Time or Part-Time

Status	WAM		ANS-IE		Non-Respondents	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Full-Time	90	68.9	87	68.9	248	68.3
Part-Time	41	31.1	39	31.1	115	31.7
Total	131	100.0	126	100.0	363	100.0

As shown in Table 5, 92% of the students had recently begun their college education and therefore had only earned about 10 credits.

Table 5

Credits Earned

Credits	WAM		ANS-IE		Non-Respondents	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
0-10	120	92.2	116	92.2	334	92.0
11-20	6	4.1	5	4.1	15	4.1
21-30	2	1.4	1	1.4	6	1.7
31-40	1	.8	1	.8	3	.8
41-50	1	.8	1	.8	2	.6
51-60	1	.7	2	.7	3	.8
Total	131	100.0	126	100.0	363	100.0

The data in Table 6 show that only 3% of the students had a GPA between 0.00 and 0.99. About 7% had a GPA between 1.00 and 1.99. Six percent had a GPA between 2.00 and 2.99; 10% were between 3.00 and 3.99. The vast majority of the students, 74%, did not have any GPAs yet since they had not been enrolled in enough courses to earn a GPA. The non-respondents had a somewhat higher GPA than the WAM or ANS-IE groups, particularly for GPAs between 3.50 and 3.99.

Table 6

Grade Point Average

GPA	WAM		ANS-IE		Non-Respondents	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
0 – 0.49	1	.6	1	.6	2	.6
0.50 – 0.99	3	2.4	3	2.4	2	1.2
1.00 – 1.49	5	3.7	5	3.7	10	4.8
1.50 – 1.99	4	3.2	5	3.2	18	4.6
2.00 – 2.49	5	3.8	5	3.8	10	3.1
2.50 – 2.99	3	2.2	3	2.2	15	4.1
3.00 – 3.49	7	5.3	5	5.3	9	2.5
3.50 – 3.99	6	4.6	6	4.6	40	11.0
Missing	97	74.2	93	74.2	253	69.7
Total	131	100.0	126	100.0	363	100.0

Results of the Study

The means and standard deviations for the three groups on which data were collected both before and during the research period on the Writing Apprehension Test are displayed in Table 7. The WAM mean score on the pre-test for the learning community was 59.63, and on the post-test it was 54.25. It should be noted that the number of participants was below the desired number of 30 for accurate statistical analysis. In the study skills group, the same pattern is evident; the mean on the pretest is 62.97 and on the posttest it is 60.38. The same is true for students who took

developmental English. Their pre-test mean score was 67.11 and the lower posttest score was 65.48. All treatment groups appeared to have modestly higher writing apprehension after the courses than when they started the courses. Lower scores on the WAM mean higher levels of writing apprehension. The direction of this effect is of interest and is discussed in Chapter V.

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations of the Three Groups on the WAM

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	S.D.
Learning Community					
Pretest	16	32	84	59.63	15.58
Posttest	16	29	76	54.25	12.69
Study Skills					
Pretest	40	30	103	62.97	15.88
Posttest	40	28	93	60.38	16.64
English Only					
Pretest	75	26	95	67.11	15.24
Posttest	75	26	97	65.48	14.95
Totals					
Pretest	131	26	103	64.93	15.60
Posttest	131	26	97	62.55	15.63

Hypothesis 1: After controlling for initial level of writing apprehension, there is no statistically significant difference in level of writing apprehension by treatment group at the end of the treatment.

Assumptions

The researcher checked to be sure that there were no discrepancies or violations prior to moving forward with the analysis using ANCOVA. The first set of assumptions

required in ANCOVA is that the covariate was measured before the dependent variable at a point when the covariate is a reliable measure.

Results of the Analysis of Covariance for the WAM

Table 8 displays the analysis of covariance for the three groups on the Writing Apprehension Test. The data show that there were no statistically significant differences across the three groups at the end of the courses after controlling for their pre-course level of writing apprehension. The conclusion is failure to reject null Hypothesis 1.

Table 8

Analysis of Covariance for the WAM

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Posttest	Covariates	Pretest	13541.13	1	13541.13	105.61	.000
	Main Effects	Group	544.30	2	272.15	2.12	.124
	Model		15476.47	3	5158.82	40.23	.000
	Residual		16283.96	127	128.22		
	Total		544292.00	131			

Post Hoc Analysis for the WAM

The researcher wanted to be sure that there were no statistically significant differences between the three groups on the Writing Apprehension Test. Therefore, following the analysis of co-variance, she did post hoc dependent t-tests on the changes in the mean scores from pretest to posttest. In Tables 9 through 11, the researcher documented the fact that in all cases, there were declines in mean scores between the pretest and posttest and none of the declines were statistically significant. Therefore, it can be stated with confidence that the students who took both the pretest and posttest on the Writing Apprehension Test had a modestly lower mean score on the posttest than on the pretest, indicating a higher level of writing apprehension.

Table 9

Dependent t-tests Between the Pretest and Posttest for Learning Community on the WAM

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t	df	2-tail sig.
Pretest	16	59.63	15.78	2.15	15	.058
Posttest	16	54.25	12.69			

Table 10

Dependent t-tests Between the Pretest and Posttest for Study Skills on the WAM

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t	df	2-tail sig.
Pretest	40	62.97	15.88	1.30	39	.202
Posttest	40	60.38	16.64			

Table 11

Dependent t-tests Between the Pretest and Posttest for English Only on the WAM

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t	df	2-tail sig.
Pretest	75	67.11	15.24	1.11	74	.272
Posttest	75	65.48	14.98			

Means and standard deviations for the locus of control are shown in Table 12 for the three groups on which data were collected both before and during the research period on the Adult Nowicki Strickland Internal External Control Scale. The number of participants with pretest and posttest scores is about equal to the number who took the WAM although they are a slightly different sample of participants. The learning community group was smaller than the number of 30, which is desired for statistical strength. Results involving the learning community group should be interpreted with caution. Lower scores reflect an internal locus of control and higher scores reflect an external locus of control. It should be noted that on English only the mean declined from pretest to posttest.

Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations of the Three Groups on the ANS-IE

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	S.D.
Learning Community					
Pretest	15	7	17	10.20	3.52
Posttest	15	6	18	10.90	4.12
Study Skills					
Pretest	39	8	19	11.00	4.00
Posttest	39	5	18	11.22	4.33
English Only					
Pretest	72	9	25	14.17	4.12
Posttest	72	10	27	14.07	4.14
Totals					
Pretest	126	8	21	12.87	4.36
Posttest	126	7	22	12.99	4.38

Hypothesis 2: After controlling for initial level of locus of control, there is no statistically significant difference in the level of locus of control by treatment group at the end of the treatment.

Assumptions

The researcher checked to be sure that there were no discrepancies or violations prior to moving forward with the analysis using ANCOVA. The first set of assumptions required in ANCOVA is that the covariate was measured before the dependent variable at a point when the covariate is a reliable measure.

Results of the Analysis of Covariance for the ANS-IE

Table 13 displays the analysis of covariance for the three groups on the locus of control. The data indicate that there were no statistically significant differences across the three groups at the end of the courses after controlling for their pre-course beliefs. The conclusion is failure to reject null Hypothesis 2.

Table 13

Analysis of Covariance for the ANS-IE

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Posttest	Covariates	Pretest	281.65	1	281.65	20.47	.000
	Main Effects	Group	22.91	2	11.46	.83	.439
	Model		434.62	3	144.87	10.53	.000
	Residual		963.16	122	13.76		
	Total		1397.78	125	19.15		

Post Hoc Analysis for the ANS-IE

Because of the results of the post hoc analysis done on the WAM, the researcher decided to repeat this process on the ANS-IE to be certain that there were no statistically significant differences between the three groups on the Locus of Control Inventory. She did post hoc dependent t-tests on the changes in the mean scores from pretest to posttest. In Tables 14 through 16, the researcher documented the fact that in two cases, there were gains in scores between the pretest and posttest and none of the gains were statistically significant. In one case, English only, there was a decline from pretest to posttest. The students in the study were more alike when they entered than different. They did not show significant change after the study. Therefore, the students in the learning community and study skills groups who took both the pretest and posttest on the Adult

Nowicki Strickland Internal External Control Scale had no meaningful change. For English only, the students had a minimal shift towards an internal locus of control. None of these show any significant change.

Table 14

Dependent t-tests Between the Pretest and Posttest for Learning Community on the ANS-IE

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Df	2-tail sig.
Pretest	15	10.20	3.52	-7.93	14	.448
Posttest	15	10.90	4.12			

Table 15

Dependent t-tests Between the Pretest and Posttest for Study Skills on the ANS-IE

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Df	2-tail sig.
Pretest	39	11.00	4.00	-.22	38	.827
Posttest	39	11.22	4.33			

Table 16

Dependent t-tests Between the Pretest and Posttest for English Only on the ANS-IE

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	t	df	2-tail sig.
Pretest	72	14.17	4.12	.17	71	.868
Posttest	72	14.06	4.14			

These analyses show no significant differences in either writing apprehension or locus of control by treatment group after controlling for pre-test levels of each. Changes during the semester were more similar than different in each group.

Descriptive observations from the population in this study suggest that developmental students enrolled in learning communities and first-year orientation courses have a slightly more external locus of control at the end of the courses than at the

beginning, although the gain was not statistically significantly different among the three groups. All treatment groups appeared to have slightly more writing apprehension after the courses than when they started. Again, with the understanding that the findings of this study are limited, it is important to point out that developmental students with writing apprehension, who are enrolled in developmental writing courses in this study, appear to show no significant change subsequent to the intervention.

The instruments used to assess the change were a writing apprehension measure and locus of control inventory. It should be noted that self-report data using post- then pre-test method has inherent bias, which is inevitable. However, quantifiable outcomes are still captured with more accuracy using pre-test then post-test, the method used in this study (Colosi & Dunifor, 2006).

Summary

Chapter IV described the research conducted and analyzed to answer the two research questions on developmental college students' writing apprehension and locus of control of developmental students at a two-year college. Interpreted in the chapter were the results of the at-risk college student scores on the pretest and posttest inventories. The analysis of covariance and results of dependent t-tests indicated that there was no statistical significance in the posttest results for the three groups after controlling for the pretest score. Chapter V includes conclusions based on the findings and suggestions of areas that may warrant further exploration.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of this quantitative research study on developmental students at a community college. The purpose of this study was to contribute to the sparse body of knowledge in developmental education and the success of developmental writing students. The goal was to increase the knowledge base about developmental writing students at a two-year college and their engagement in a learning community. This study examined the effect of a learning community intervention for students attending a community college. Specifically, the study included an experimental component to determine through pre- and post-test measures the pedagogical implications and strategies to determine if there was an improvement in locus of control and writing apprehension. The study was to determine if three groups of community college students enrolled in a variation of two courses would achieve positive academic outcomes after a semester of participation in the learning community. In the simplest form, learning communities are paired courses focused on a particular subject or theme. Two research questions were developed to determine the impact of developmental education intervention programming on the writing apprehension and locus of control of community college students in an urban community college. The data from question one were analyzed to determine the degree of writing apprehension by treatment group. Question two data were analyzed to determine if there is a difference in the level of locus of control by treatment group. The reader is cautioned that the sample may not be representative of the population of students who enroll in developmental courses and that the small sample size in the paired courses makes conclusions tentative. One group was involved in a loosely-linked learning community (i.e., co-enrolled in a college success course (CSS 110) and developmental English writing (ENGL 81). A second group was

enrolled only in ENGL 81 and a third group was enrolled in CSS 110 only. Specifically, this research used existing data with a total of 131 student participants who completed both the pretest and posttest surveys of the Writing Apprehension Measure as well as 126 students who completed testing for the Locus of Control Inventory. This study used a quasi-experimental research method employing analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) (a significance level of $<.05$ was set to analyze the data) using the existing data set. Post hoc analysis was done using independent t-tests. The analysis supported the findings of the ANCOVA of no statistically significant differences in the means between pretest and posttest.

This chapter presents an overview of the study to include: research questions, hypotheses, statement of the problem, and study design. The summary of the findings includes a discussion in relationship to the previous research and theory, theory and practical implications, limitations, and recommendations for further research. Finally, the chapter ends with the conclusions.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following research questions were used to frame this study:

Research Question 1. Is there a statistically significant difference between the scores on a measure of writing apprehension of two treatment groups of developmental students compared to developmental students in a loosely-linked learning community at a two-year college?

Hypothesis 1: After controlling for initial level of writing apprehension, there is no statistically significant difference in level of writing apprehension by treatment group at the end of the treatment.

Research Question 2. Is there a statistically significant difference between the scores on a measure of locus of control of two treatment groups of developmental

students compared to developmental students in a loosely-linked learning community at a two-year college?

Hypothesis 2: After controlling for initial level of locus of control, there is no statistically significant difference in the level of locus of control by treatment group at the end of the treatment.

Statement of the Problem

All community colleges offer some form of developmental education or remedial, which was the basis of their inception. Montgomery County has been widely known as having one of the best public school districts in not only the state, but also the nation. Administrators in the system agreed that the community college in Montgomery County has changed to meet the needs of a growing underprepared student population (Kirst & Venezia, 2004). Kirst and Venezia reported that for students attending Montgomery County Public Schools, entering college Fall 2001, 40% needed English remediation, 63% math remediation and 30% reading remediation. Similarly, students entering Baltimore County Public Schools have needed developmental coursework in English and math at 44% and reading at 40%. Likewise, such interventions at 4-year institutions in comparison are about 80% (Lewis, Farris, & Greene, 1996). Over 60% of students attending community colleges take remedial courses compared to 20% of students attending doctoral-granting 4-year institutions (Lewis, Farris, & Greene, 1996).

Hodgekinson (1985) pointed out over 25 years ago in a landmark study that with the exception of the few elite institutions, most colleges do not have the luxury of limiting their student body exclusively to fully prepared applicants. To do so would too often result in a negative impact on projected enrollments. Most public institutions have to admit students with academic deficiencies, because they are committed to training and contributing to a literate workforce within their state. Developmental education is needed in all types of institutions.

For over a decade, however, developmental education programs have been under attack. In 1996, the Maryland Higher Education Commission conducted a study of remediation in Maryland public institutions. Low test scores in elementary and secondary education and low graduation rates at the post-secondary level had public officials questioning the funding spent on remedial instruction. In addition, the general public had the misconception that remediation at any college was a repeat of skills that should have been learned in high school. In fact, less than 50% of high school graduates take college preparation courses (Gaither, 1999). Therefore, community college students taking developmental courses were less likely to be retained and outcomes were traditionally modest. This study provided a lens to examine the potential positive outcomes for community college students taking developmental English and a College Success Seminar.

Study Design

The study was a quasi-experimental, causal comparative design (Borg & Gall, 1989). The causal comparative method considers cause-and-effect relationships between variables by comparing participants in the study with a comparison group of those with similar academic deficiencies. By eliminating extraneous variables or controlling for select student characteristics, change in the dependent variables can be correlated to the treatment applied.

This study of writing apprehension and locus of control included three treatment groups. The treatments involved students enrolled in either one or both of the following two courses: CSS 110 (College Success Seminar) and ENG 81 (Developmental Writing) courses. Group 1, referred to as the Learning Community Cohort, consisted of students who were co-enrolled in CSS 110 and ENGL 81.

Summary of the Findings

This section summarizes and discusses the major findings in relation to the literature and elements of the conceptual framework by research question. The findings are reported by hypothesis. The reader is cautioned that the moderate reliability of measures for this population, small group of usable responders, and small sample size in one treatment group make these interpretations tentative.

Hypothesis 1: After controlling for initial level of writing apprehension, there is no statistically significant difference in level of writing apprehension by treatment group at the end of the treatment.

The analysis of covariance failed to reject null Hypothesis 1. The data indicate that there were no statistically significant differences across the three groups at the end of the semester after controlling for their pre-course level of writing apprehension. The changes in each group were more alike than they were different. Students in all three groups had a modestly higher level of writing apprehension at the end of the semester than they did at the beginning of the semester.

The findings of the analysis of covariance were confirmed when the researcher did independent t-tests across the three groups. The results indicated that in all cases there were no statistically significant differences. It must be noted that the scores on the posttest were lower, which can be attributed to response shift bias, which often affects outcomes when self-report measures are used. The intervention increases the knowledge of the participants and therefore impacts responses.

Colosi and Dunifon (2006) define response shift bias as a change in the respondent metric for answering questions from the pretest to the post-test. In terms of the respondents, research suggests that prior to exposure to a new academic program or service, participants may overestimate their competence or level of self-knowledge, but after the treatment their responses reflect a change (Moore & Tananis, 2009). It can occur either consciously or subconsciously (Paulhus, 1984).

Fox's (1980) historical study had two opposite findings. Fox found that writing apprehension was (1) reduced in both the treatment and experimental groups, and (2) at a faster rate in the experimental group. According to Fox (1980), structured and intense instructional methods and academic support provided a decrease in writing apprehension. The decrease was evident, but the means were not statistically significant. Fox's study recommended that a longer treatment in future studies would likely provide more striking results. Fox's findings are not consistent with the results of this study, but the belief is that it would be more closely aligned to the Fox (1980) study if the academic supports could continue or be prolonged into the subsequent semester.

In this study, the first major finding suggests that there is no statistical significance between the pretest and posttest means for the writing apprehensions measure. There were modest changes for the three groups of students in the study enrolled in developmental education classes at the community college. The mean scores on the posttest are lower than the mean scores on the pretest. This suggests an area for further research. Overall, the treatment had little or no effect on the students who participated in the study. The findings of this study reveal that the participants were made more aware of their writing apprehension. Although this study was limited by the number of participants, within the confines of this study it is possible that students may have improved in their writing skills, but their apprehension towards writing may have stayed the same or declined.

Hypothesis 2: After controlling for initial level of locus of control, there is no statistically significant difference in the level of locus of control by treatment group at the end of the treatment.

The analysis of covariance failed to reject null Hypothesis 2. There is no statistically significant difference in the means by treatment group in posttest levels of locus of control after controlling for pretest levels. The mean scores for two of the three groups indicate that the posttest scores were modestly higher than the pretest scores,

leading the researcher to conclude that the level of external locus of control was modestly higher than at the beginning of the treatment.

The findings of the analysis of covariance were confirmed when the researcher again performed independent t-tests across the three groups. The results indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in the means of the three groups. Results should be interpreted with caution. Lower scores reflect an internal locus of control and higher scores reflect an external locus of control. It may be cautiously inferred that developmental students with lower level writing skills have difficulty moving from externally driven motivators to internal, probably due to their lack of confidence in their ability. The more improved or better the content knowledge the greater sense of self and feelings of competency are internalized. That increased knowledge leaves less to chance and luck, and fosters greater self-control. In this study, the analyses were the result of self-report data, which should be interpreted with caution as to students' feelings about their writing ability having an effect on their beliefs in their control over situations and circumstances in the academic setting.

Hansemark (1998) found that achievement and internal locus of control increased for participants in their treatment groups as a result of involvement in an entrepreneurial program, which involved participants who were under-achieving students, identified as a mostly minority group population. The population in the study likewise describes the treatment group in this researcher's study. The entrepreneurship program has been found, similar to the learning community, to teach the characteristics of locus of control. Also, like this researcher's study, the Hansemark study (1998) was designed to influence student engagement to learn and succeed in and outside the classroom environment. The entrepreneurial program teaches transferable skills, such as relationship building, which are tenets of involvement in the learning community. There were higher gains on their posttests than their pretests. This study's findings are in direct contrast to Hansemark's results after a pretest and posttest study of developmental students. The quasi-

experimental study found modest changes in writing apprehension and locus of control. Essentially locus of control is determined by an individual's belief in whether their destiny is within or outside of their control. In the Hansemark study participants were not made aware of the purpose and desire for change in their personal characteristics as a result of participation. The objective was to influence or promote a positive change or an shift to a more internal locus of control, which is unlike the participants' knowledge of desired outcomes in this researcher's study.

Interpretations in Light of Previous Research and Theory

Developmental education and remediation are often used interchangeably, but the former is a far more complex notion involving a combination of theoretical approaches drawn from cognitive and developmental psychology (Boylan, 1995). Thus, it is important to note that developmental education is not the same as remediation. Developmental education is a more comprehensive approach to serving students, borrowing from the tenets of cognitive and developmental psychology (Chickering, 1969; Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Erickson, 1968; Kohlberg, 1975; Perry, 1970). Remedial coursework, on the other hand, is skills-based assistance in one or more areas. Developmental education provides a range of services to educate the whole student both personally and academically. According to Boylan (1995), "These services may include counseling, advising, tutoring, topical workshops, individualized instruction, and courses to enhance study skills and strategies, promote critical thinking, or introduce students to the rewards and expectations of college" (p. 2). Developmental education programming includes tutorial services, foundation courses in mathematics, reading and writing, and other learning supports. Boylan's decades of research in developmental education are based on the assumption that this field is very complex, includes a range of services, and borrows from a variety of disciplines. A large university in Minnesota used to register developmental students for learning communities, which they termed package courses

that included 3-4 linked courses. The Minnesota study had a larger sample size than this study, which was three groups totaling 304 participants. The results of the Minnesota study demonstrated that students in the experimental group valued the study strategies they acquired, were aware of the campus resources, and were more connected to their peers, faculty, and academic support personnel (Wilcox, delMas, Stewart, Johnson, & Ghere, 1997). The message for this study may be that loosely linked learning communities have little to no impact on students' beliefs about their writing and locus of control (i.e., the greater impact is personal effort on creating success). The findings could potentially be significant if a more tightly knit learning community was established to support developmental students at two-year colleges, where commuting and other personal factors that serve as competing priorities heavily impact the potential for these students to experience successful outcomes. Enhanced supports and consistent encouragement from peers and faculty could improve students' feelings about their ability to succeed and their anxiety about writing.

Theory and Practical Implications

The experience of this study supports the need for a comprehensive body of theory and more research regarding the experience of developmental students. "No common theoretical framework or groups of core assumptions have emerged to inform the work of developmental educators...Historically researchers and practitioners have taken an eclectic approach and borrowed theories across disciplines to inform and guide" (Chung, 2005, p. 4). Astin (1985) suggested that educators become more student-centered by assessing how motivated or engaged the student is in the learning process. His involvement theory encourages practitioners to focus on getting students more involved in their education, which is an observable behavior. Developmental education students who demonstrate motivational skills may continue to have some academic difficulties, because they lack the cultural capital to succeed in academe (Aragon & Kose, 2007;

Wells, 2008). These students' value of education is thwarted prior to entering college due to unsuccessful learning experiences, including little instruction on successful learning techniques combined with faculty's low expectations (Bandura, 1997). Faculty and learning assistance personnel can intervene to help motivate developmental education students whose perception of remedial coursework is discouraging, because of the inherent stigma. Promoting usage of faculty office hours for extra support, usage of tutorial services and study groups can help facilitate success (Tinto, 1987). Community colleges must work to improve the success of developmental education students by modeling appropriate academic strategies to increase student involvement and motivation. The idea is to avoid reliance on tangible rewards or extrinsic motivation, yet seek the gratification associated with acquiring goals and accomplishing satisfaction of increased knowledge, while clearly articulating the value in acquiring a high internal locus of control. In this study it was found that the additional faculty intervention and academic supports that are student-centered had no or minimal impact on the writing apprehension or locus of control on a sample of developmental college students. The analysis concludes that there was no statistical significance in the pretest or the posttest results for the three groups on either test. There is the possibility that it makes no difference whether students are enrolled in a learning community.

Limitations

The major limitations of the study were the small sample size in the learning community, the loss of responses from the number of potentially eligible participants and the duration of the study, which was one semester. The greatest losses in both writing apprehension shift to increased external locus of control was found in the learning community group. There are also important questions about the validity and reliability of the instruments. This was a quantitative study using instruments with forced-choice options; the personal stories and experiences of individuals were not available. In

addition, lack of knowledge about respondents' pre-college variables, such as success in high school, is a limitation.

One of the most widely used quasi-experimental designs in educational research is the nonequivalent control-group design. The distinctive qualities of this design are that the pretest and posttest are administered to nonrandom assigned groups. The experiment could be a cause, but not the sole cause of any change in behavior. The nonrandom assignment is mitigated because the researcher in the analysis can control for the initial differences between the groups at the beginning of the study (Borg & Gall, 1989). The ANCOVA on the posttest means is used to test the statistical significance between treatment group means in this nonequivalent control group design. The limitations are partially eliminated, because the independent variable, which is the instructional method used in both CSS 110 and ENGL 81, is the most experimentally manipulable, which further helps to mitigate any flaws in the design and helps validate the results. However, the majority of students at the community college have developmental placements in one or more disciplines. Moreover, the institution from which these data were obtained has the unfortunate distinction of being the college with the largest number of developmental students in the state. In 1997, nearly 80% of their students required remediation in English.

The fact that respondents were aware of being assessed at each point of the process makes the probability of errors in the responses a potential limitation (Borg & Gall, 1989). Additionally, students' reasons or aspirations for coming to college or taking these particular courses are unknown. Volunteer sample groups tend to be higher in need in terms of achievement, more often female, and more anxious than non-volunteers (Borg & Gall, 1989). Another limitation is the volunteer effect of using the sections for faculty who agreed to participate in the study. According to Borg and Gall (1989), considerable research has been conducted by Rosenthal and Rosnow (1991) on volunteer samples. Although the faculty participants were not randomly selected, the conclusion may

warrant maximum confidence in them over non-volunteers, because of likely participant characteristics, such as education, sociability, and commitment to the project.

The possible limitations to the ANS-IE that it is based on Rotter's instrument and both instruments were normed originally using all White respondents (Rotter, 1989). History dictates that minority groups often engage in submissive behavior, due to past treatments to which they were subjected and the influences of decisions passed down by powerful rulers, so decisions were outside of their control (Helms, 1990). The results lead to minority groups responding more externally. Also, gender bias suggests that females may tend to respond more externally, providing socially desirable responses to be consistent with cultural expectations (Roh, 1999), when in fact they may behave more internally (Strickland & Nowicki, 1973; Strickland, 1989).

The limitations for the WAM are that the instrument does not provide users with greater understanding of behaviors and does not establish a profile to predict ramifications with users' scores that would provide direction for useful treatments related to the test results. In short, it appears that the test is better at predicting overall apprehension but less useful in identifying specific variables when one may exhibit anxiety where there would be slightly different patterns in behavior between high and low apprehension scorers (Miller & Daly, 1975). The students in this study fit this analysis. The students were presumed to have higher levels of writing apprehension based on the known demographics of the overall population at the community college, and due to developmental writing (ENGL 81) participants. The college students in the study demonstrated a learned helplessness or presented externally driven traits as mean scores on both the pre and posttests for both measures concluded. In fact, after the treatment there were losses and very minimal gains in most cases.

Recommendations for Further Research

Developmental educators aim to facilitate a decrease the amount of time it takes for these students to successfully complete their required remediation and increase the percentage of successful students at two year colleges in developmental programs. Also, developmental educators want to be instrumental in having students successfully complete for credit coursework that the remedial courses were designed to prepare the students for. It is one step at a time—retention through graduation. It has been noted that the findings of this study were limited by the small sample size and the limited number of participants from the number potentially available to participate in the study, as initially anticipated. Therefore, it is recommended that this study be replicated with a larger population that is more representative of the community college. What is known about learning communities is that they create a safe and nurturing environment where students can build relationships with faculty and peers; as a result students are encouraged to study hard and use the resources of the college, which can impact student beliefs and outcomes. Developmental education students write more slowly than the general population of students. The reduced writing speed is further inhibited by their fear of error, which results in fewer lines written per hour. These students are more concerned about the mechanics than the content which in comparison to their peers decreases speed even more (Fox, 1986). Implications for research would include having developmental students with writing apprehension in three treatment groups with different output—the first, composing by hand; the second, composing on the computer; the third, dictating their compositions to a scribe—to determine which academic intervention has a greater impact on the group. Maslow's (1954) foundational research states that students who are motivated will rise to the occasion by demonstrating their best. The characteristic of learned helplessness permeates developmental writing classrooms (Fox, 1980). According to Miller and Daly (1975), students have to overcome their fear of mechanical errors, which is the fundamental or mechanical skill set, prior to overcoming their writing

apprehension. Comprehensive academic services that provide college students with the fundamental skills that they are lacking early on in their college experience can provide the fundamental skills to facilitate students' motivation to write due to bolstered confidence in their ability and their product, by that meaning writing assignments.

Each campus must determine interventions based on their demographics, one size fits all is not an option. Regular assessment and evaluation is necessary to capture any changes. That should be with the understanding that the population on most community college campuses will be largely based on the local education agency or district that surrounds them. Schools are not all equal, and they each have a profile, just as the local education agency LEA or school district, and as well the community colleges' profiles may be largely based on that. Therefore, the interventions should be determined based on the campus profile. As a result of this researcher's professional experiences the list of 15 recommendations follows, which exceeds the findings from this study. These are areas for further study on the topic of developmental college students attending community colleges:

1. A qualitative study should be conducted to explore the perceptions of college students taking developmental courses and their experiences with these courses and how they felt the courses improved select outcomes including their self esteem. This type of study would provide an intimate voice for the students to describe their feelings.
2. A mixed methods study using survey research design and interviews to examine if there is a difference between the race, gender, second language speakers/International students and socioeconomic status, age and full or part-time status of students taking multiple developmental courses at a community college.
3. A study to compare the self assessment of developmental education students' belief about their writing apprehension in comparison to the

general population. In this study students have self-reported on their beliefs of their writing apprehension. Once students become aware of their personal academic needs, it is possible that students' responses would be more realistic after reflection and learning more about themselves.

Consider comparing developmental education students to the general population of students to determine if the general population is better or worse about assessing their writing apprehension.

4. A study to compare the self assessment of developmental education students' belief about their locus of control in comparison to the general population. In this study students have self-reported on their beliefs about their ability to control their personal and academic experiences or outcomes. Once students become aware of their personal academic needs, it is possible that students' responses would be more realistic after reflection and learning more about themselves. Consider comparing developmental education students to the general population of students to determine if the general population to determine which group is more internally and externally driven, and what impact, if any the interventions have on each group.
5. Following a semester of involvement in any developmental course stressing knowledge about them, it appears that students were somewhat confident about their own ability, as demonstrated through the posttest. Once students become aware of their personal academic needs, it is possible that it translates to being more realistic. A study to compare the self assessment of developmental education students' beliefs about their locus of control in comparison to the general population should be done. In this study they have self-reported on their beliefs of their locus of control. Similar to the results of the Writing Apprehension Measure, the

data appear to suggest that while there were no significant differences in either group for pre-test and post-test scores. It must be noted that the scores on the pos-test were lower, which can be attributed to response shift bias, which often affects outcomes when self-report measures are used. The intervention increases the knowledge of the participants and therefore impacts responses. Consider comparing developmental education students to the general population of students to determine if the general population is better or worse at assessing their locus of control.

6. A study on faculty expectations of their developmental education students to determine if their beliefs have any influence on college students' feelings of empowerment and having more confidence in themselves after a semester of academic interventions, primarily provided by the faculty member being assessed.
7. A continuation of the study for a longer period of time (longitudinal) measuring writing apprehension and locus of control using a pre- and posttest analysis of developmental students. A study for one semester was likely too short of a timeframe to measure any change based on the intervention. However, after the pretest, provide students with the results of their surveys, so they can have a goal to work towards. Additionally, it is suggested that the college make available more intense academic support services to include more than two courses loosely linked. For example, create a learning community with block scheduling for up to four courses, more hours of tutoring, and study skills workshops with academic coaching. These services should be required and monitored for at least two semesters or until developmental placements are satisfied and to determine if there are gains in writing apprehension and locus of control in the post-test analysis.

8. On-line self-paced tutorial options and practice tests and assignments that allow students to work on deficient skills at any time, while providing immediate feedback and adaptive exercises that are individualized, based on each student's needs.
9. Require faculty of developmental students to have specialized training and experience working with this population, that is, MEd/MA, EdD/PhD in Developmental Studies or a related field and demonstrate commitment to serving this population.
10. Require individualized academic coaching by Learning Specialists (Masters' level professionals) and trained peer mentors to work on developing students' personal and academic skills, including internal locus of control and strengthening English writing skills.
11. In future studies, if using the Astin's IEO model as it was originally intended, it is important to have more demographic information (Inputs) at the onset, i.e., SAT and ACT codes, as well as students' intent for attending school (e.g., taking a course for professional development, matriculating to pursue an Associate's degree or commitment to pursuing a Bachelor's degree so therefore, enrolling in a transfer program).
12. Design and implement a more structured learning community that is centered around a thematic area, such as students' career goals and interests, which would give students a basis for establishing networks building friendships. In addition, students would be more vested in achieving successful outcomes.
13. Students in low performing K-12 schools need opportunities for more academic rigor. The more exposure and experiences students have to Advanced Placement, Honors and International Baccalaureate Programs, the more college-ready they become. Students must be advised and

encouraged to take courses beyond the required course load. If their community school is not offering higher level courses, then using vouchers to attend other schools, taking these course on-line, or parallel enrollment in the community colleges to take more academically demanding courses should be a priority and this positively impacts scores on college entrance exams.

14. Students entering open access institutions may have undiagnosed hidden disabilities, and could be inappropriately placed in developmental studies, when they may actually need to be referred to Disability Support Services.
15. Decentralized developmental education may need to be re-evaluated, in favor of an academic unit that houses Developmental Math, Writing and Reading opposed to three separate and disconnected units, as well as, decentralized academic support services of centralized academic support units that are student-centered, such as Academic Advising, Tutoring, Career Counseling, Counseling Center, etc.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to contribute to the sparse body of knowledge in developmental education and the success of developmental writing students. The goal was to increase the knowledge base about developmental writing students at a two-year college and their engagement in a learning community. This study examined the effect of a learning community intervention for students attending a community college. Specifically, the study included an experimental component to determine through pre- and post-test measures to examine the pedagogical implications and strategies to determine if there was an improvement in locus of control and writing apprehension. The study was to determine if three groups of community college students enrolled in a variation of two courses would achieve positive academic outcomes after a semester of

participation in the learning community. The variables measured were writing apprehension and locus of control, which are two dependent variables in this study. This study found no different effect of the three treatment groups on these dependent variables after controlling for pre-test levels. Flower and Hayes (1981) stated that advising students to accept responsibility for the quality of their writing assignments parallels psychologists' suggestions that their clients present internal control over themselves to enhance quality of life. These are both academic and life-long skills. However, Flower and Hayes (1981) reported a relationship between individuals' locus of control and writing. This study viewed both variables separately, so does not support the claims of Flower and Hayes' (1981) research.

The findings of the current study have informed this researcher on the magnitude of the issues surrounding developmental education at the community college level and have shed light on those that have benefitted from its curriculum. According to Boylan, Bonham, and Bliss (1992), students identified as having the greatest need in English remediation and associated academic support services benefit the most from the interventions and have the most successful individualized outcomes. Structured learning environments provide the most benefit to the students needing the most remediation. This study was limited to short-term results. Although there may not be evidence of statistical significance within this group, college students with developmental needs who are exposed to early interventions have a great chance of moving to college-level credit-bearing courses and acquiring successful life skills, transferring to four-year colleges and often realizing success through graduation (Boylan, Bonham, & Bliss, 1992; Moss & Yeaton, 2006; Pusser & Levin, 2007).

Finally, it is the hope of this researcher that community colleges will continue to be the hallmark and the leaders in the area of developmental curriculum design and the pinnacle of facilitating success for students needing that extra edge. This would be this researcher's vision for the future of developmental education at the community college.

Developmental education is highly demanded, but least researched, because practitioners are staff, often overworked with little time to do research. Demands to improve retention through graduation are increasingly putting developmental education in the forefront. My recommendation is that it be required at the administrative policy level down through the academic department level to the college support services in order to make a serious impact on the overall future direction of developmental education and specifically the two-year colleges. The ongoing change in pedagogy offers many possibilities for community colleges and those students that benefit most from enrolling in developmental courses, particularly English and specialized orientation or college success courses. We must be supportive and deliberate when working with our college students with developmental placements and explain the time and effort it takes to be successful. "Developmental education students should be warned that their success will depend largely on their motivation and willingness to work hard. If students are not motivated enough to work hard, they probably will not succeed" (Moore, 2004, p. 122).

APPENDIX A

Adult Nowicki Strickland Internal External Control Scale

Adult Nowicki Strickland Internal External Control Scale
(Nowicki, Stephen & Duke, Marshall, P., 1974)

PART 1: Directions: Answer the following questions by circling "Y" for "Yes" or "N" for "No." There are no right answers, only your opinion. Your name (Print clearly) _____

- Y N 1. Do you believe that most problems will solve themselves if you just don't fool with them?
- Y N 2. Do you believe that you can stop yourself from catching a cold?
- Y N 3. Are some people just born lucky?
- Y N 4. Most of the time do you feel that getting good grades meant a great deal to you?
- Y N 5. Are you often blamed for things that just aren't your fault?
- Y N 6. Do you believe that if somebody studies hard enough he or she can pass any subject?
- Y N 7. Do you feel that most of the time it doesn't pay to try hard because things never turn out right anyway?
- Y N 8. Do you feel that if things start out well in the morning that it's going to be a good day no matter what you do?
- Y N 9. Do you feel that most of the time parents listen to what their children have to say?
- Y N 10. Do you believe that wishing can make good things happen?
- Y N 11. When you get punished does it usually seem it's for no good reason at all?
- Y N 12. Most of the time do you find it hard to change a friend's (mind) opinion?
- Y N 13. Do you think that cheering more than luck helps a team to win?
- Y N 14. Did you feel that it was nearly impossible to change your parent's mind about anything?
- Y N 15. Do you believe that parents should allow children to make most of their own decisions?
- Y N 16. Do you feel that when you do something wrong there's very little you can do to make it right?
- Y N 17. Do you believe that most people are just born good at sports?
- Y N 18. Are most of the other people your age stronger than you are?
- Y N 19. Do you feel that one of the best ways to handle most problems is just not to think about them?
- Y N 20. Do you feel that you have a lot of choice in deciding who your friends are?
- Y N 21. If you find a four-leaf clover, do you believe that it might bring you good luck?
- Y N 22. Did you often feel that whether or not you did your homework had much to do with what kind of grades you got?
- Y N 23. Do you feel that when a person your age is angry at you, there is little you can do to stop him or her?
- Y N 24. Have you ever had a good luck charm?
- Y N 25. Do you believe that whether or not people like you depends on how you act?
- Y N 26. Did your parents usually help you if you asked them to?
- Y N 27. Have you felt that when people were angry with you it was usually for no reason at all?
- Y N 28. Most of the time, do you feel that you can change what might happen tomorrow by what you do today?
- Y N 29. Do you believe that when bad things are going to happen they just are going to happen no matter what you try to do to stop them?
- Y N 30. Do you think that people can get their own way if they just keep trying?
- Y N 31. Most of the time do you find it useless to try to get your own way at home?
- Y N 32. Do you feel that when good things happen they happen because you work hard?
- Y N 33. Do you feel that when somebody your age wants to be your enemy there's little you can do to change matters?
- Y N 34. Do you feel that it's easy to get friends to do what you want them to do?
- Y N 35. Do you usually feel that you have little to say about what you get to eat at home?
- Y N 36. Do you feel that when someone doesn't like you there's little you can do about it?
- Y N 37. Did you usually feel that it was almost useless to try in school because most other children were just plain smarter than you are?
- Y N 38. Are you the kind of person who believes that planning ahead makes things turn out better?
- Y N 39. Most of the time, do you feel that you have little to say about what your family decides to do?
- Y N 40. Do you think it's better to be smart than to be lucky?

APPENDIX B

Writing Apprehension Measure

Writing Apprehension Measure
(Miler, Michael & Daly, John, 1975)

PART 2: Directions: Below are a series of statements about writing. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by circling whether you **(1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) are Uncertain, (4) Disagree, or (5) Strongly Disagree** with the statement. While some of these statements may seem repetitious, take your time and try to be as honest as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.
Your name: _____
(Print clearly)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I avoid writing.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I have no fear of my writing being evaluated.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I look forward to writing down my ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Taking a composition course is a very frightening experience.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Handing in a composition makes me feel good.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on a composition.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I would enjoy submitting my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I like to write my ideas down.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I feel confident in my ability to clearly express my ideas in writing.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I like to have my friends read what I have written.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I'm nervous about writing.	1	2	3	4	5
14. People seem to enjoy what I write.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I enjoy writing.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I never seem to be able to clearly write down my ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Writing is a lot of fun.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I expect to do poorly in composition classes even before I enter them.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I like seeing my thoughts on paper.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I have a terrible time organizing my ideas in a composition course.	1	2	3	4	5
22. When I hand in a composition I know I'm going to do poorly.	1	2	3	4	5
23. It's easy for me to write good compositions.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I don't think I write as well as most other people	1	2	3	4	5
25. I don't like my compositions to be evaluated.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I'm no good at writing.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX C

Composition Skills 1

ENGL 81 Course Syllabus

Baltimore City Community College
Baltimore Maryland 21215

Course Syllabus

NOTE: This departmentally developed course syllabus is used by faculty and staff. Its contents are stored in the College Course Syllabus System (CSS).

English 81

Course Code

Composition Skills I

Course Title

English, Speech, Foreign Languages, Art, and Music

Department

Syllabus Output-Baltimore City Community College-1992

I. Course Information

A. Course Description:

English 81, Composition Skills I, is the second course in a three-tiered sequence of developmental writing courses. The course is required for students who have successfully completed English 80 and for others whose Accuplacer test scores fall between 50 and 71 in writing. The course focuses on composition of unified and coherent paragraphs, and it introduces students to the logical and well-developed expository essay. Grammar, spelling, punctuation, and sentence structure are stressed both as discrete skills and in relation to the skills of composing paragraphs and essays. Students attend scheduled Writing Lab sessions staffed by a tutorial staff to develop editing skills needed to improve the quality of the compositions being developed in the classroom.

The requirements of this course cannot be satisfied by CLEP, or by work experience.

B. Course Credit(s) Assigned

0.0 Credits

C. Course contact hour(s)/Semester

*Lecture.....	45	Contact hour/semester
*Other.....	30	Contact hour/semester

English 81 offers both lecture and lab. During lecture, the principles of the writing process are explained and practiced. Students frequently will break into small groups to practice writing techniques and to share written assignments. During lab, the principles of standard English are reviewed. Students will work, individually and in small groups, with tutors who will direct their practice and application of prescribed concepts.

Students will be required to use electronic word processors. IBM/CAI Lab assistants will provide help and/or instruction for those students who have not used computers in the past.

Both lecture and lab sessions (5 hours per week) are required.

D. Average number of pages per week for assigned reading

One Chapter -- about 15 pages. Chapters include both explanations of writing skills and sample (model) essays.

**E. Frequency of offering:
COURSE IS OFFERED)**

CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX(S) INDICATING WHEN THE

FALL SEMESTER

SUMMER SESSION

SPRING SEMESTER

F. PRE-REQUISITE(S): (LIST ALL PLACEMENT TEST SCORES OR COURSE REQUIREMENTS STUDENTS NEED BEFORE ENTERING THIS COURSE)

Eng 80
or
Accuplacer score between 55 and 76

G. CO-REQUISITES: (LIST ALL COURSES STUDENT MUST TAKE WHILE TAKING THIS COURSE)

None

H. TRANSFER POTENTIAL: (FOR TRANSFERABILITY INFORMATION, PLEASE CONSULT THE TRANSFER CENTER LOCATED ON ROOM 106, MAIN BUILDING, LIBERTY CAMPUS).

Non-transferrable

I. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE STUDENT:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REQUIRED CLASS ATTENDANCE	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT USED
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REQUIRED COMPLETION OF ASSIGNMENT	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT USED
<input type="checkbox"/> FOLLOWING REQUIRED SAFETY RULES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT USED
<input type="checkbox"/> REQUIRED SPECIAL EQUIPMENT/TOOL(S)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT USED
<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER REQUIREMENTS (PLEASE LIST)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT USED

II. INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL(S) USED FOR THIS COURSE

(CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX(ES) AS NEEDED AND LIST)

A. TEXTBOOK(S):

REQUIRED OPTIONAL NONE

Joy, Anna. We Are America. 2nd ed. Fort Worth: Harcourt
Brace, 1995.

Meyers, Alan. Writing With Confidence. 5th ed. New York:
Harper-Collins, 1996.

B. OTHER MATERIAL(S):

REQUIRED OPTIONAL NONE

Dictionary, thesaurus, notebook, paper (8 1/2 x 11, white,
lined), pens (blue or black ink), computer disk (3 1/2 " double
density, double sided), and/or other supplies as required by
individual instructor.

C. AUDIO VISUAL MATERIAL(S):

REQUIRED OPTIONAL NONE

III. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

A. CLASS ATTENDANCE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REQUIRED	<input type="checkbox"/> OPTIONAL	<input type="checkbox"/> NONE
B. CLASS DISCUSSION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REQUIRED	<input type="checkbox"/> OPTIONAL	<input type="checkbox"/> NONE
C. PAPERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REQUIRED	<input type="checkbox"/> OPTIONAL	<input type="checkbox"/> NONE
D. PORTFOLIO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REQUIRED	<input type="checkbox"/> OPTIONAL	<input type="checkbox"/> NONE
E. QUIZ	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REQUIRED	<input type="checkbox"/> OPTIONAL	<input type="checkbox"/> NONE
F. REPORT	<input type="checkbox"/> REQUIRED	<input type="checkbox"/> OPTIONAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NONE
G. PRESENTATION	<input type="checkbox"/> REQUIRED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OPTIONAL	<input type="checkbox"/> NONE
H. MID-TERM EXAMINATION	<input type="checkbox"/> REQUIRED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OPTIONAL	<input type="checkbox"/> NONE
I. FINAL EXAMINATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REQUIRED	<input type="checkbox"/> OPTIONAL	<input type="checkbox"/> NONE
J. COMPUTER ASSIGNMENT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REQUIRED	<input type="checkbox"/> OPTIONAL	<input type="checkbox"/> NONE
K. CLINICAL	<input type="checkbox"/> REQUIRED	<input type="checkbox"/> OPTIONAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NONE
L. PRACTICUM	<input type="checkbox"/> REQUIRED	<input type="checkbox"/> OPTIONAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NONE
M. *OTHER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REQUIRED	<input type="checkbox"/> OPTIONAL	<input type="checkbox"/> NONE

* Writing Portfolio Assessment

IV. GRADING SYSTEM

The grades of "S" (satisfactory) and "U" (unsatisfactory) are used in English 81. To pass English 81 a student must achieve proficiency in each of the following areas:

1. 10 Classroom Quizzes (60% averaged proficiency required)
2. 10 Sentence Generating Exercises
(70% averaged proficiency required)
3. 10 Writing Lab Quizzes
(70% averaged proficiency required)
4. Five pieces of polished writing: 2 paragraphs, 1 summary,
2 essays (70% averaged proficiency required)
5. Writing Lab Comprehensive Exam (70% proficiency required)
6. Portfolio of selected writing (passing score required)

GRADING: STANDARDS AND PRACTICE

1. Classroom Quizzes

The Quizzes component of English 81 is designed to accomplish a number of things. First and foremost, it is intended to motivate prompt and regular attendance. Students should be told on the first day of class that beginning in week 2 (schedule must be adjusted for 8-week summer sessions) and, except for week 7, continuing through week 12 a series of 10 quizzes will be administered to start the class. The instructor should determine whether a quiz will occur at the start of the first class of the week, or the second, or the third, and, to achieve the desired effect, the instructor should vary the administration schedule from week to week. Students should know that there will be a quiz each week but not the day of the week on which it will be administered. Students must also know that missed quizzes may not be made-up, regardless of the circumstances surrounding the absence/lateness, and that students who miss more than 4 quizzes will not pass the course, regardless of their performance in other components of the course.

Students should understand that, in addition to motivating attendance and promptness, the quizzes are intended to focus their attention on the work of the course. The quizzes are not intended primarily to test knowledge or skill; instructors should devise ways to show students that success in this portion of the course requirement is available to them practically just for showing up -- on time.

A set of sample quizzes is appended to this syllabus.

2. Sentence Generation Exercises

English 81 requires that students complete 10 Sentence Generation Exercises and achieve a 70% averaged proficiency. These weekly exercises (10 sentences, of at least 10 words each, required for each exercise) address the following topics:

1. identifying subjects and verbs
2. subject-verb agreement
3. verb tenses (simple)
4. verb tenses (perfect and progressive)
5. coordination
6. subordination
7. fragments and run-ons
8. pronoun case
9. punctuation
10. confused words

The Sentence Generation Exercises have several purposes:

- ▶ to reinforce and sharpen skills in standard written English, and

- ▶ to require of students initiative, organization, and perseverance, qualities essential to success in college.

The skills addressed by these exercises will be demonstrated and practiced through drill each week in the Writing Lab. The classroom instructor is expected to devote relatively little of the lecture time to these exercises: 20-30 minutes each week to introduce the next week's exercise and 30-40 minutes each week to return the previous week's graded exercises.

Students are to complete the exercises outside of class and submit them in a timely manner, with a penalty imposed for late submission, but they are to regard them as only one part of the course, and not the most important part. Students must be held responsible for correctness in all written work. The instructor's role is to require that students redo incorrect work until it is correct, thereby heightening the students' sense of responsibility for developing mechanically correct writing in all their courses and personal endeavors.

The grammar component of the course should be the primary emphasis in the Writing Lab, which will be providing instruction on the Sentence Generation topics each week. Instructors should not skip a week of exercises, nor should they delay introducing the next topic for any reason, because the Writing Lab will be moving on to the next topic with all sections of English 81.

The Sentence Generation Exercises are a great deal of work for both the students and for the instructor. They are designed to develop both discipline and perseverance. Developmental students who become frustrated by being made to redo something that was perhaps done carelessly in the first place will find it difficult to survive the rigors of a microbiology or accounting course.

When marking/grading the Sentence Generation Exercises, instructors should mark all errors in each sentence and not just those items being tested. Credit (10% for each sentence) should not be given until the sentence is completely correct and clear, but students should be allowed to re-write/revise (**these exercises should not be word processed**) correctly all sentences that contain errors. Students should be allowed two chances to improve their scores by revising the incorrect sentences within two weeks of receiving them back from the instructor.

An example of marking/grading is as follows. Given the prompt, "My ideal mate should be _____, _____, and _____," if the student mis-copies "ideal" as "idea," and has no other errors, the student must recopy the whole sentence correctly in order to receive credit (10%) -- no partial credit. Similarly, if the student writes an interrogative sentence and uses a period at the end, the error should be marked and the sentence redone. All errors, no matter how minor, are cause for re-doing the whole sentence.

A set of sample exercises is appended to this syllabus.

3. Writing Lab Quizzes :

Students must achieve a 70% averaged proficiency on a series of ten Writing Lab Quizzes. The quizzes will be directly related to each week's topic for the Sentence Generation Exercises, and they will be administered during the second hour of each week's Lab portion of the course. They will be graded by personnel in the Lab, and scores will be reported to the classroom instructors on a regular basis. The quizzes are not difficult, and students who attend the Lab regularly and participate in the activity should succeed. Students who do not attend the Lab regularly and/or do not engage themselves in the activity, and thereby do not achieve the required 70% average for this portion of the course, should receive a grade of "U" for the course, regardless of their performance in the lecture portion of the course.

4. Polished Writing

("Polished" essays refer to those essays that have been processed through invention/discovery, draft, review [peer and instructor], and revision. Polished essays have been edited and graded.

Students in English 81 must produce five pieces of polished writing. A clear sense of audience and purpose, adequate development, logical organization, and adherence to the standards of written American English are essential to all successful writing at the 81 level.

Students must produce a minimum of two polished paragraphs, one summary and two essays, each of which will be reviewed by the instructor in draft and which may be revised at least two times within a two week period for higher a score. Instructors may select from chapters 8 - 13 for kinds of paragraphs and from chapters 7, 14, 15 for essays. Instructors may use the "Topics for Writing" contained in the chapters. Topics for the summary may be developed by the instructors. These resources will provide opportunities for idea generation through class discussions, journaling, and collaborative groups. The students will submit their essays, which result from these activities, to their groups for peer response. Through the processes of revision and editing, students will refine their essays until they achieve an average (for the five pieces of writing) proficiency of 70%, based on the criteria printed in this syllabus.

A suggested distribution of writing assignments for English 81 is as follows:

Paragraph 1 -- 150 words

narrative of a personal experience or description of a person or scene

Paragraph 2 -- 200 words
cause/effect or
comparison/contrast or
classification or
process analysis

Summary -- 250 words
a text that discusses a controversial issue

Essay 1 -- 450 words
based on prompts from Ch. 7, 14, or 15

Essay 2 -- 450 words
based on prompts from Ch. 7, 14, or 15

Pedagogical Considerations

It is now generally accepted that students in beginning writing classes need to write as often as possible. To prepare students for the writing demands of a college-level writing course, they should be informed on the first day that they will be expected to write something during each class meeting. The writing might be a freewriting exercise, a writing skill exercise, a written reaction to another student's paper, a summary of a reading assignment, or a fast draft of a paragraph or an essay.

Some form of collaborative learning should be common to most writing classrooms. Even the most basic writing class can make use of small groups for discussion and peer review. In basic skills classes, peer groups are important for teaching students to work together, learn from each other, and begin talking about their writing. This process also helps students see how important it is to read their papers aloud and to revise what they have written -- something that they may not be in the habit of doing.

Most groups work best with three to four students; sometimes it is beneficial to have students work in pairs. Peer groups may be designed as more or less permanent, or students may be permitted to restructure their groups several times during the term. If groups are assigned by the instructor, it is advisable to make them representative of the range of ages and cultural backgrounds found in the class. The instructor's role in the peer evaluation process is important. The instructor must spend some time with each group to make sure that they are working on the assignment and to help them with the process.

Reading groups are effective when a formal activity such as the following is followed:

- ▶ Ask students to write a journal entry, freewriting exercise, or quiz in response to what they have read.
- ▶ Have students discuss their responses in their reading groups.

- ▶ Assign discussion questions and ask students to report on the most important ideas that came up in their group.
- ▶ Build on the discussion that follows these reports, adding any background information and commentary that might be important.
- ▶ List topics for writing that may emerge from the class discussion.

The instructor must play an active part in directing class discussions: restating students' ideas, affirming the significance of those ideas, directing questions to students, synthesizing ideas, and drawing conclusions. For successful reading or writing groups, the following principles should be observed:

- ▶ Have students work in groups of three or four. In larger groups of five or six, one or two students usually do all of the talking. On the other hand, groups of two or even three students may not have enough diversity of opinion to make the discussion fruitful.
- ▶ Make the students' task clear. If students are to discuss a particular reading assignment, they must know which freewriting exercise or discussion question they are responsible for. If they are evaluating each other's papers, they should have a list of questions or a checklist to follow.
- ▶ Have the groups choose a recorder who will list the major ideas that emerge from the group's discussion.
- ▶ Let the students know how much time they should spend on each task. This is particularly good advice for groups doing peer review because they are more likely to work quickly and efficiently when they know that they can spend only 20 - 30 minutes on each paper.
- ▶ The read-around is an effective activity for sharing students' writing. For this exercise, have students get into groups of four or five and pass their written assignment to the student on their right. Ask them to read the paper that was passed to them and keep reading and passing papers until all have been read. Students should then discuss what they liked about each paper, select the best one or two papers, and discuss what they would like to change in their own writing.

It is important to meet with students several times during the semester to discuss specific papers and the student's progress in the course. Such meetings put students at ease and give instructors a chance to clear up questions, discuss problems, and suggest supplemental work.

The use of journals is discussed at length in the text and is generally beneficial in developing critical thinking skills. Additionally, students can use journals to freewrite about topics they might later develop into formal essays. It is a good idea to

ask volunteers to read their journal entries to the class, particularly at the start of the semester when students might be confused about what they are supposed to write in their journals.

GRADING CRITERIA FOR POLISHED WRITING

In order to receive a grade, the writing should be typed (word processed) and submitted along with the invention/discovery work, the rough drafts, and peer reviews.

In their polished writings students should discuss subjects at a level appropriate to college writing. (A graphic description of "The First Time I Had Sex" might be an example of an inappropriate subject. One of the purposes of the peer/instructor reviews of rough drafts is to assure an appropriate subject.) Papers which are not appropriate for a mature, reasonably intelligent audience should be returned without a grade for total revision.

Instructors should respond to polished writing with the goal of guiding students to improve their writing. Instructors should offer comments and make reference to the handbook and other resources that can help students improve, revise, rewrite, or correct their work.

When grading the polished writing, instructors should consider the following as strengths and weaknesses in writing skills:

Purpose

Strengths:

A clear statement of the purpose presented early in the paper, a statement which gives direction to the whole piece of writing.

Reminders of the purpose at strategic points during the essay, especially in the conclusion.

A clear statement of purpose held until the end of the paper when its earlier presentation would be less effective (as in the persuasive essay which may benefit from the evidence being presented before the purpose is revealed).

Weaknesses:

A contradiction of the stated purpose of the paper.

A change or abandonment of the stated purpose of the paper.

No clear statement of purpose anywhere in the paper.

A one-sentence introductory paragraph.

Support

Strengths:

Sufficient explanation of all major abstract ideas.

Sufficient reasons offered for all major opinions.

Sufficient specific examples, anecdotes and/or facts to support the purpose.

Clear definitions of important, possibly confusing terms.

Appropriate organization of support.

Clear and appropriate transitions between major ideas.

Weaknesses:

Important abstract ideas left unexplained.

Important opinions left unsupported.

Lack of specific examples, anecdotes or facts necessary to support purpose.

Details irrelevant as support to the stated purpose.

Potentially sufficient but disorganized support.

Unclear relationship between support and purpose.

Unclear and/or inappropriate transitions between major ideas.

Audience

Strengths:

Anticipation of and response to likely audience questions about information being discussed.

Refutation of objections audience might have to the writer's purpose, especially in persuasive writing.

Appropriate use of "you" to refer to the actual audience of the writing.

Weaknesses:

Essential information left unexplained because the writer unreasonably assumes the reader already knows it.

Failure to identify and refute the audience's likely objections to the writer's purpose, especially in persuasive writing.

Inappropriate use of "you." That is the use of "you" to refer to someone or some group other than the audience of the writing.

Use of an inappropriate tone, or use of slang or jargon for a formal audience.

Failure of the writer to maintain a consistent point of view.

Style

Strengths:

Few errors in the use of standard grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Varied and sophisticated sentence structure.

Appropriate and mature word choice.

Few sentences with unnecessary words.

Weaknesses:

Dependence on simplistic sentence structure.

Confusing sentence structure.

Sentences weighted with unnecessary words.

Writing containing major deviations from standard grammar. For example:

- fragments
- tense errors
- double negatives
- subject/verb disagreement
- non-standard use of to be
- punctuation fault which confuses meaning
- run-on sentences
- unintelligible spelling
- pronoun/antecedent disagreement
- faulty pronoun reference
- misuse of pronoun case
- misuse of possessive case
- confused homonyms
- incorrect plurals or lack of plurals
- incorrect capitalization
- incorrect terminal punctuation

Although grading a paper is bound to be a somewhat individual matter depending on the emphasis given in the assignment, certain commonly held standards can be set forth:

100% - 90% ("A" -- "7"): The paper is substantial, well developed, and effectively organized and presented. It usually

demonstrates substantial or original ideas; thoughtful engagement with content; and sensitivity to diction, tone, and style. Sentences are well-structured, clear, and precise. The essay is well-formatted and virtually error-free.

80% - 89% ("B" -- "6"): The paper contains a number of the virtues of an "A" essay, but it often lacks the thoughtfulness, originality, sensitivity, and full development of the superior essay. In some instances, an 80% or 85% is given to a potential "A" paper marred by minor errors in mechanics.

70% - 79% ("C" -- "5"); The paper shows an understanding of the assignment and is reasonably well organized. The writer communicates ideas and is fairly successful in developing a thesis. There is no evidence of habitually-made, serious mechanical problems. The thought and expression, however, are usually undistinguished.

60% - 69% ("D" -- "3"); The paper usually contains such weaknesses as poor organization, lack of development, or failure to focus on a thesis. In some instances, a grade of 60% or 65% is given to a potential "C" essay marred by some serious errors in mechanics.

0% - 59% ("F" -- "2/1"); The paper shows some of the following weaknesses: failure to deal with the assignment, lack of a thesis, lack of organization, failure to develop ideas, or failure to conform to the assigned length. An "F" essay often contains numerous serious errors in mechanics.

5. Writing Lab Comprehensive Examination

To pass English 81, students must achieve a score of 70% on the Writing Lab Comprehensive Exam. This exam will be a comprehensive assessment of the skills covered in the Writing Lab. The examination will be administered and graded by Lab personnel during the final weeks of the semester.

6. Portfolio Assessment

The Portfolio Assessment measures students' competency in developing and completing a varied body of writing over an extended period of time. At the same time, by incorporating impromptu essay writing as only one kind of writing experience, the portfolio approach provides a means for overcoming the high level of anxiety associated with impromptu writing in an exit exam approach where passing the course depends totally upon writing a satisfactory impromptu paper.

The portfolio assessment format features:

use of multiple writing samples to assess students' writing competency

use of writing samples that demonstrate student proficiency in

varied formats

multiple opportunities for students to revise and improve samples in order to present their best work for evaluation

adequate time for each student to present thoughtful and mature writing samples

An essential benefit of portfolio assessment is that it is more appropriate to the instructional strategy we use. This approach, the process approach, which is the most widely used paradigm in English composition classes, seeks to teach students to attend not only to what they write, but also to how they write. Writing is taught as a series of thoughtful, recursive steps in which planning, drafting, revising, and editing are equally important.

The theory is that good writing is not a mysterious creative process that relies upon inspiration, but rather a process of good craftsmanship that results from the writer's mastery of definable, teachable/learnable steps. This approach is especially important for our students because it seeks to dispel the notion of many of our students that they are not good writers and cannot become good writers. Such an idea implies that writing is innate and that one either has or does not have the "gift."

The English 81 Portfolio

Before the end of the semester, each student will submit a portfolio of selected work consisting of the following:

A Reflective Letter (**typed**) addressed to the Portfolio Committee in which the student introduces him/herself as a student writer and comments on his/her experiences and progress throughout the course.

Two paragraphs (**revised/typed**) that exemplify any two of the seven types of paragraph development dealt with in chapters 8 - 13 of the text.

One essay (**revised/typed**) that exemplifies any one of the five types of essays dealt with in chapters 7, 14, 15 of the text.

An impromptu (**handwritten; inserted into portfolio by the instructor**) expository paragraph (150 - 250 words) to be written in class shortly before the Portfolio is due.

Grading

The student's Portfolio will be read and evaluated by an English 81 instructor other than the student's classroom instructor and one of the tutors from the Writing Lab. Should the two readers disagree on the portfolio's competency, the classroom instructor will resolve the split.

APPENDIX D

College Success Seminar

CSS 110 Course Syllabus

CSS 110: THE COLLEGE SUCCESS SEMINAR

Fall, 1997

Welcome to The College Success Seminar!

CSS 110 is designed to help you create greater success in college and in life. You may never again have an opportunity like this to improve the quality of your life. Please make the most of it!

WHO SHOULD TAKE THE COURSE: You will benefit from CSS 110 if...

- 1. **You are committed to being a success in college and in life.** This means you're absolutely sure that you want a better life. You're not only *willing* to change, you *want* to change.
- 2. **You are willing to do whatever is necessary.** For CSS110, this means attending every class, doing all the assignments to the best of your ability, participating actively in every class...and never, never, never giving up!
- 3. **You are coachable.** This means that you're willing to take guidance from your teachers. You're willing to experiment with new behaviors and beliefs.

If you have these three qualities, get ready for a great experience in CSS 110!!!

COURSE OBJECTIVES: In this course, you will learn how to...

1. **TAKE CHARGE OF YOUR LIFE.** You'll learn how to make wiser choices, thus gaining greater control over the results you create in college and in the rest of your life.
2. **INCREASE SELF-MOTIVATION.** You'll learn how to create the inner motivation necessary to keep going when you run into life's inevitable challenges.
3. **IMPROVE PERSONAL SELF-MANAGEMENT.** You'll learn proven strategies for creating greater results in your life, results that will move you effectively and efficiently toward the accomplishment of your goals and dreams.
4. **DEVELOP MUTUALLY SUPPORTIVE RELATIONSHIPS.** You'll learn how to develop meaningful relationships with people who will support you to achieve your goals and dreams while you assist them to achieve theirs.
5. **CREATE POWERFUL NEW BEHAVIORS AND BELIEFS.** You'll learn how to identify and change self-defeating habits that are keeping you from fulfilling your greatest potential.
6. **MAXIMIZE YOUR LEARNING.** You'll learn powerful strategies that will enable you to achieve better grades in college, to become an effective life-long learner, and to develop your natural wisdom.
7. **CREATE A MORE POSITIVE EXPERIENCE OF LIFE.** You'll learn effective techniques for managing your emotional life and increasing your sense of inner peace, joy and happiness.
8. **RAISE YOUR SELF-ESTEEM.** You'll learn how to develop greater self-acceptance, self-confidence, self-respect, self-love, and unconditional self-worth.
9. **WRITE MORE EFFECTIVELY.** You'll learn how to improve your writing skills through the extensive practice offered by your guided journal entries.
10. **IMPROVE CREATIVE AND CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS.** You'll learn how to enhance the thinking skills that are essential for analyzing and solving problems in your academic, professional, and personal lives.

REQUIRED COURSE SUPPLIES:

1. Text book: *On Course* by Skip Downing (Houghton Mifflin) Available in the BCCC Book Store
2. Composition notebook--string-bound, not glued (string-bound lasts longer)

WHAT TO EXPECT: By reading *On Course* (our text book), you'll learn empowering strategies that have helped others create great success. By keeping a guided journal, you'll discover how to apply these success strategies to achieve your own goals and dreams. By participating in class activities and focused conversations, and by completing a course project, you will further improve your ability to stay on course to your success. Once you make these new strategies your own through application, you'll have the ability to dramatically improve the outcome of your life—academically, professionally, personally.

COURSE ASSIGNMENTS: *Each assignment is explained later in this handout.*

	<u>Points</u>
1. 42 Guided Journal Entries (5 points each)	210
2. 1 Project	100

Total possible points	310

COURSE GRADES:		<u>Points Earned</u>
A	=	280-310
B	=	248-279
C	=	217-247
D	=	186-215
IP or F	=	185 or below

Note: This course is designed so that, by applying the success strategies you will learn, you can achieve the grade you want. Why not choose to get an "A"!!!

ATTENDANCE POLICY: We want you to learn the value of regular attendance. Therefore, you are expected to attend all three class hours each week (1-hour lecture + 2-hours class). However, because emergencies may occur in your life, you are given 5 hours of personal leave which you may use at any time during the semester with no penalty. **A STUDENT WHO MISSES MORE THAN THE 5 ALLOTTED CLASS HOURS--REGARDLESS OF THE REASON(S)--WILL NOT RECEIVE A PASSING GRADE FOR THE COURSE.**

MAKE-UP CLASSES: We want you to learn to manage your time and commitments responsibly. Therefore, you may make up any lecture or class hour you miss by attending any other lecture or class hour of CSS 110. See the schedule of lectures & classes posted outside of Room 244 (main building). After attending the make-up lecture or class of your choice, simply get a signed note from that teacher confirming your attendance and give that note to your small-class teacher (who records your attendance). Remember, you can make up any missed hour (lecture or class) by attending any other hour (lecture or class).

LATENESS: We want you to learn the empowering habit of being on time! Therefore, to be counted present, you must attend the ENTIRE class period. Students who arrive late or leave early will not be counted present. If you find yourself upset by this policy, consider the possibility that you have an important lesson to learn about effective self-management. We will help you learn this valuable lesson, and your life will never be the same again!!!

LARGE-GROUP ATTENDANCE: We want you to learn integrity. Therefore, attendance at the large-group lecture (Monday) will be taken on the honor system; you will sign your name as you enter the room. The lecture sign-in sheet will be collected at 12:20 PM. If your signature is not on the sign-in sheet, you will not be counted present, so be sure to sign in before 12:20 at each class. Occasionally at the end of class, the roll will be called from the sign-in sheet. Anyone whose signature is on the sign-in sheet but who is not present will be given 6 absences for that lecture. *Honoring your word fosters integrity!*

SUCCESS JOURNAL (210 Points)

PURPOSE: Your SUCCESS JOURNAL provides you an opportunity to explore the numerous success strategies presented in *On Course* (our text book). By doing so, you'll discover which success strategies will work best for you.

JOURNAL ENTRIES: For homework, you will write the 42 guided journal entries found in *On Course*. Directions for journal entries are found at the end of each reading assignment in your text book. Twenty years from now, you may find your journal in a drawer, so write your journal entries for that older, wiser you (not for your teacher). At various times during the semester, you will have an opportunity to share a journal entry with one or more classmates. **THEREFORE, BRING YOUR TEXTBOOK AND JOURNAL TO EVERY CLASS.**

JOURNAL EVALUATIONS: Journals will be collected five times during the semester. (See the schedule below.) Your teacher will look through your journal to verify the completion of each assignment and give you credit for a job well done. Teachers will read some or all of your journal entries to discover how to assist you achieve your goals. If you want your teacher's feedback on a specific journal entry, fold over the corner of the page and write a note on that page indicating the response you want.

JOURNAL POINTS: Each journal entry will be awarded up to 5 points. Thus, all 42 journal entries are worth a possible total of 210 points. A journal entry will be awarded the maximum of 5 points if it fulfills the following two criteria:

1. The entry is complete (all directions have been followed), and
2. The entry is written with high standards (an obvious attempt has been made to dive deep and gain maximum value from the journal activity).

Grammar, spelling, and punctuation will **NOT** be factors in awarding points.

Note: To earn a passing grade in CSS110, all 42 journal entries must be completed and they must be in a composition book (not in any other format unless your teacher gives you written permission).

ON-TIME JOURNALS: We want you to learn the empowering habit of doing your best work and handing it in on time. Therefore, two points will be added to your final grade each time you turn in your journals completed and on time. By completing all journals on time, you can earn up to 10 bonus points. Be smart: Do your journals early.

PRIVACY: Occasionally you may write a journal entry that you wish to keep private. If so, fold the appropriate pages in half vertically and staple them closed at the top and bottom. Your teacher will respect your privacy by not reading your locked journal entry. Teachers do, however, reserve the right to confirm that there is, in fact, writing on these pages. You may lock up to 5 journal entries; more than five will require your teacher's permission. Locked journals will be given scores equal to the average scores of all other journals.

SUCCESS PROJECTS (Do One) (100 Points)

Project 1: Creating Success (Letter)

Step 1: Write a letter to someone you love (your child, grandchild, brother, sister, etc.). Tell the person how he/she can create a successful life. Share three or more strategies you have learned in CSS 110. If the person you write to is very young (or not even born yet), you may want to give the letter as a gift when he/she is old enough to benefit from your wisdom.

An "A" project will...

1. Begin with an introductory paragraph explaining the purpose of your letter,
2. Continue with a paragraph explaining your personal definition of success (including your own goals and dreams),
3. Continue with three or more paragraphs that explain success strategies from CSS 110 that you recommend. Discuss only one success strategy per paragraph. In each paragraph offer your specific reasons (personal examples, experiences, evidence, and/or explanation) for recommending this strategy.
4. Conclude with a summary of your suggestions and a personal wish for the person to whom you're writing.
5. Show a commitment to excellence in preparation, including professional appearance and a command of standard English. You are encouraged to seek assistance from the writing center.

IMPORTANT NOTE: To earn any points, your letter must be prepared on a word processor and must contain 1000 or more words. Put the exact word count on the first page of your letter.

Project 2: A Successful Person (Interview)

Step 1: Interview a successful person of your choice. Perhaps this person has attained goals and dreams that you want (e.g., You want to be a lawyer and the person you interview is a practicing attorney). Consider interviewing someone whom you admire but don't know, perhaps someone well known. In your interview, discover this person's definition of success as well as the behaviors and beliefs that led to his/her success. (You would be wise to write out your questions before the interview: e.g. "How important have goals been in achieving your success?") Make an audio- or video-tape recording of the interview.

Step 2: Write up your interview, including what you learned from this person about creating success in college and in life.

An "A" project will...

1. Begin with a paragraph that introduces your reader to the successful person (Who is he/she? Why did you choose him/her? Why do you consider him/her successful? When/where did you do the interview?),
2. Present 10 or more of the question/answer pairs from the interview; these questions & answers should reveal three or more success strategies that the person used to create his/her extraordinary life, including personal examples or experiences from the person's life.
3. Conclude with a paragraph in which you summarize what you learned from this person about creating success in college and in life.
4. Show a commitment to excellence in preparation, including professional appearance and a command of standard English. You are encouraged to seek assistance from the writing center.
5. Include the audio or video tape recording of the interview.

IMPORTANT NOTE: To earn any points, you must include the audio- or video-taped interview. Also, your written interview must be prepared on a word processor and contain 500 or more words. Put the exact word count on the first page of your interview.

Project 3: Learning to Learn (Questions & Feedback)

Step 1: Create a 20-question test for a course you are now taking and write out your answers to each question. (You would be wise to choose your most difficult course.) Include 5 questions each of the following kinds: 1) true/false, 2) matching, 3) fill-in-the-blank, 4) essay questions. Design your questions so that a student who answers them well will be demonstrating the essential knowledge/skills covered in this course.

Step 2: Have a meeting with the teacher of the course. Go over your 20-question test with the teacher, asking him/her to comment on the quality of your questions and answers. Do your questions lead to the essential knowledge covered in this course? Are there ways to revise the questions you have asked to lead you to more profound discoveries? Are these the questions to which an expert in this subject area needs to know the answers? Make an audio- or video-tape recording of your conversation.

Step 3: Revise your test and answers based on what you discovered in the conversation with your teacher. If your teacher suggests another kind of question (other than the 4 kinds you prepared), substitute these new questions for ones in your first test.

Step 4: Write a summary paragraph explaining the most important discoveries you made while doing this project.

An "A" project will contain...

1. The original 20-question test that you created--containing 5 questions each of the following types: 1) true/false, 2) matching, 3) fill-in-the-blank, 4) essay questions—and your 20 answers.
2. The revised 20-question test and your revised answers,
3. A paragraph (250 or more words) explaining the most important discoveries you made while doing this project.
4. Show a commitment to excellence in preparation, including professional appearance and a command of standard English. You are encouraged to seek assistance from the writing center.
5. An audio- or video-tape recording of the conversation with your teacher.

IMPORTANT NOTE: To earn any points, you must include the audio- or video-recorded interview. Also your test and paragraph must be prepared on a word processor, and the paragraph must contain 250 or more words. Put the exact word count above your paragraph.

Project 4: Creating Your Own Project

If none of the projects above appeals to you, you may create your own project. You must submit a written project design to your small-group teacher, and you must have his/her written approval to proceed. The project must contain a part in which you explain what you learned from your project and how you intend to use that knowledge to advance your success in college and/or in life.

CSS 110: SCHEDULE OF ASSIGNMENTS

*****IMPORTANT: Bring your text book and up-to-date journal to every class.*****

- WEEK 1 (Sept 2): *On Course: Read/Write Journal #1*
WEEK 2 (Sept 8): *On Course: Read/Write Journals #2-4 (DUE MONDAY OF THIS WEEK)*
Turn in Journals 1-4
- WEEK 3 (Sept 15): *On Course: Read/Write Journals #5-7 (DUE MONDAY OF THIS WEEK)*
WEEK 4 (Sept 22): *On Course: Read/Write Journals #8-10 (DUE MONDAY OF THIS WEEK)*
WEEK 5 (Sept 29): *On Course: Read/Write Journals #11-13 (DUE MONDAY OF THIS WEEK)*
Turn in Journals 1-13
- WEEK 6 (Oct 6): *On Course: Read/Write Journals #14-16 (DUE MONDAY OF THIS WEEK)*
WEEK 7 (Oct 13): *On Course: Read/Write Journals #17-19 (DUE MONDAY OF THIS WEEK)*
WEEK 8 (Oct 20): *On Course: Read/Write Journals #20-23 (DUE MONDAY OF THIS WEEK)*
Turn in Journals 1-23
- WEEK 9 (Oct 27): *On Course: Read/Write Journals #24-26 (DUE MONDAY OF THIS WEEK)*
WEEK 10 (Nov 3): *On Course: Read/Write Journals #27-29 (DUE MONDAY OF THIS WEEK)*
WEEK 11 (Nov 10): *On Course: Read/Write Journals #30-32 (DUE MONDAY OF THIS WEEK)*
Turn in Journals 1-32
- WEEK 12 (Nov 17): *On Course: Read/Write Journals #33-35 (DUE MONDAY OF THIS WEEK)*
WEEK 13 (Nov 24): *On Course: Read/Write Journals #36-38 (DUE MONDAY OF THIS WEEK)*
WEEK 14 (Dec 1): *On Course: Read/Write Journals #39-41 (DUE MONDAY OF THIS WEEK)*
WEEK 15 (Dec 8): *On Course: Read/Write Journals #42 (DUE MONDAY OF THIS WEEK)*
Turn in Journals 1-42
Turn in your PROJECT

REFERENCES

- Albin, M. L., Benton, S. L., & Khramtsova, I. (1996). Individual differences in interest and narrative writing. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 21*, 305–324.
- Allinder, R. M. (1995). An examination of the relationship between teacher efficacy and curriculum-based measurement and student achievement. *Remedial and Special Education, 16*(4), 247-254.
- Aragon, S. R., & Kose, B. W. (2007). Conceptual framework of cultural capital development: A new perspective for the success of diverse college students. In J.L. Higbee, D. B. Lundell, & I. M. Duranczyk (Eds.), and R. Copeland (Ass't. Ed.), *Diversity and the Postsecondary Experience*, pp. 103-128. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research and Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, General College, University of Minnesota.
- Astin, A. (1984). *The American freshman national norms for fall 1984*. Cooperative Institutional Research Program. Los Angeles, CA: The Higher Education Research Institute Graduate School of Education, UCLA.
- Astin, A. W. (1985). *Achieving educational excellence*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters most in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W., & Astin, H. S. (1992). *Undergraduate science education: The impact of different college environments on the educational pipeline in the sciences*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, Graduate School of Education, UCLA.
- Astin, A. W., Dey, E., Korn, W., & Riggs, E. (1992). *American freshman national norms for Fall 1992*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 39*, 251-263.
- Baltimore City Community College. (Summer/Fall 1997). *Schedule of credit courses*. Planning and Advancement Division.
- Baltimore City Community College. (1996-1998). *Catalog*. Admissions Office.
- Baltimore City Community College. (1997). *Data book*. Office of Institutional Research, Division of Planning and Advancement.
- Baltimore City Community College. (1998). *Data book*. Office of Institutional Research, Division of Planning and Advancement.

- Baltimore City Community College. (1999). *Data book*. Office of Institutional Research, Division of Planning and Advancement.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1996). Failures in self-regulation: Energy depletion or selective-disengagement? *Psychological Inquiry*, 7, 20-24.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Bandura, A., & Cervone, D. (1983). Self-evaluative and self-efficacy mechanisms governing the motivational effects of goal systems. *Journal of Personal and Social Psychology*, 45, 1017-1028.
- Bandura, A., & Jourden, F. J. (1991). Self-regulatory mechanisms governing social comparison effects on complex decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 941-951.
- Barton, R. M., & Oja, S. N. (1999). Predicting beginning teachers' feelings of efficacy. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 22, 53-63.
- Berman, P. , McLaughlin, M., Bass, G., Pauly, E., & Zellman, G. (1977). *Federal programs supporting educational change: 7 Factors affecting implementation and continuation*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Bline, D., Lowe, D. R., Meixner, W. F., Nouri, H., & Pearce, K. (2001). A research note on the dimensionality of Daly and Miller's writing apprehension scale. *Written Communication*, 18, 61-79.
- Bloom, B. S. (1985). *Developing talent in young people*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.
- Bloom, D., & Sommo, C. (2005). *Building learning communities: Early results from the opening doors demonstration at Kingsborough Community College*. New York, NY: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.
- Blumenfeld, P. C., & Marx, R. W. (2007). Motivation and cognition. In H. J. Walberg & G. D. Haertel (Eds.), *Psychology and educational practice* (pp. 79-106). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational research: An introduction* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Longman.

- Boylan, H. (1995). The scope of developmental education. *Research in Developmental Education, 12*(4), 1-4.
- Boylan, H. R. (1999). Exploring alternatives to remediation. *Journal of Developmental Education, 22*(3), 2-10.
- Boylan, H. R. (2002). *What works: Research-based best practices in developmental education*. Boone, NC: National Center for Developmental Education.
- Boylan, H. R., Bliss, L. B., & Bonham, B. (1997). Program components and their relations to student performance. *Journal of Developmental Education, 20*(3), 2-9.
- Boylan, H., & Bonham, B. (1992). The impact of developmental education programs. *Research in Developmental Education, 9*(5), 1-4.
- Boylan, H., Bonham, B., & Bliss, L. (1994). Characteristic components of developmental programs. *Research in Developmental Education, 11*(1), 1-4.
- Boylan, H. R., Saxon, D. P. , Bonham, B. S., & Parks, H. E. (1993). A research agenda for developmental education: 50 ideas for future research. *Research in Developmental Education, 10*(3), 1-4.
- Brookfield, S. D. (1986). *Understanding and facilitating adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brookfield, S. D. (1987). *Developing critical thinkers: Challenging adults to explore alternative ways of thinking and acting*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2003). A test of the factorial validity of the Teacher Efficacy Scale. *Research in Education, 69*, 67-79.
- Bruffee, K. A. (1999). *Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge* (2nd ed.). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bruinsma, M. (2004). Motivation, cognitive processing and achievement in higher education. *Learning and Instruction, 14*, 549-568.
- Cabrera, A., Crissman, J. L., Bernal, E. M., Nora, A., Terenzini, P. T., & Pascarella, E. T. (2002). Collaborative learning: Its impact on college students' development and diversity. *Journal of College Student Development, 43*, 20-34.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P. , & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology, 44*, 473-490.

- Carnevale, A. P. , & Rose, S. J. (2004). Socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, and selective college admissions. In R. D. Kahlenberg (Hrsg.), *America's Untapped Resource: Low-Income Students in Higher Education*. New York. 101–156.
- Casazza, M. E. & Silverman, S. L. (1996). *Learning assistance and developmental education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chung, C. J. (2005, Spring) Theory, practice, and the future of developmental education. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 28(3), pp. 2-6, 8, 10, 32-33.
- Clowes, D. A. (1980). More than a definitional problem: Remedial, compensatory, and developmental education. *Journal of Developmental and Remedial Education*, 4, 8-10.
- Clowes, D. A. (1992). Remediation in American higher education. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, 8, (pp. 460-493). New York, NY: Agathon Press.
- Colosi, L., & Dunifon, R. (2006). *What's the difference? "Post then pre" & "Pre then post."* Cornell University Cooperative Extension, *Fam Med*. 2004;36: pp. 199-203.
- Conley, D. T. (2005). *College knowledge: What it really takes for students to succeed and what we can do to get them ready*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Conway, K. M (2010, January). Educational aspirations in an urban community college: Differences between immigrant and native student groups. *Community College Review*, 37(3), 209-242.
- Cronbach, L. J., Gleser, C. G., Rajaratnam, N., & Nanda, H. (1972). *The dependability of behavioral measurements*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Crone, I. (2007). Motivating today's college students. *Association of American Colleges & Universities*, 19-21.
- Cross, K. P. (1976). *Accent on learning: Improving instruction and reshaping the curriculum*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Daly, J. A. (1985). *Writing apprehension*. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When a writer can't write* (pp. 43–82). New York, NY: Guilford.

- Daly, J. A., & Miller, M. D. (1975). Apprehension of writing as a predictor of message intensity. *The Journal of Psychology*, 89, 173-177.
- Daly, J. A., & Miller, M. D. (1975a). The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 9, 242-249.
- Daly, J. A., & Miller, M. D. (1975b). Further studies on writing apprehension, SAT scores, success expectations, willingness to take advanced courses and sex differences. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 9, 250-256.
- Daly, J. A., & Wilson, D. A. (1983). Writing apprehension, self-esteem, and personality. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 17, 327-341.
- Day, P. R., Jr., & McCabe, R. H. (1997). Remedial education: A social and economic imperative. *Executive Issue Paper*. Washington, DC: AACC.
- Deemer, S. A., & Minke, K. M. (1999). An investigation of the factor structure of the Teacher Efficacy Scale. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 93(1), 3-10.
- Dixon, R. M., Marsh, H. W., & Craven, R. G. (2002). Moving out: The impact on the self and other related variables for people with mild intellectual disabilities. In H. W. Marsh, R. G. Craven, & K. Simpson (Eds.), *Self-concept research, driving international agendas*. Collected papers of the self-concept enhancement and learning facilitation (SELF) Research Centre Second International Conference, Sydney, Australia, August 6-8, 2002.
- Dollinger, S. J. (2000). Locus of control and incidental learning: An application to college student success. *College Student Journal*, 34, 537-541.
- Downing, S. (2008). *On course: Strategies for creating success in college and life* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Duke, M. P. , & Nowicki, S., Jr. (1974). Locus of control and achievement: Confirmation of a theoretical perspective. *Journal of Psychology*, 263-267.
- Elder, L. & Paul, R. (2003). Critical thinking: Teaching students how to study and learn. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 21, 36-37.
- Erickson, E. (1968). *Identity youth and crisis*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co., Inc.
- Faigley, L., Daly, J. A., & Witte, S. P. (1981, Sept.- Oct.). The role of writing apprehension in writing performance and competence. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 75(1), 16-21.
- Faris, K. A., Golen, S. P. , & Lynch, D. H. (1999). Writing apprehension in beginning accounting majors. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 62(2), 9-22.

- Fazey, D. M. A., & Fazey, D. A. (2001, October). The potential for autonomy in learning: Perceptions of competence, motivation and locus of control in first-year undergraduate students. *Studies in Higher Education, 26*(3), 345-361.
- Feenstra, J. S., Banyard, V. L., Rines, E. N., & Hopkins, K. R. (2001). First-year students' adaptation to college: The role of family variables and individual coping. *Journal of College Student Development, 42*, 106-113.
- Flower, L. S., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32*(4), 365-387.
- Fox, R. F. (Feb., 1980). Treatment of writing apprehension and its effects on composition. *Research in the Teaching of English, 14*(1), 39-49. Published by National Council of Teachers of English. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40171027>.
- Gabelnick, F., MacGregor, J., Matthews, R. S., & Smith, B. L. (1990). *Learning communities: Creating connections among students, faculty, and disciplines*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gaither, G. H. (Ed.). (1999). *Promising practices in recruitment, remediation and retention*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P. , & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th ed). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Gattis, K. W. (2002). Responding to self-selection bias in assessments of academic support programs: A motivational control study of supplemental instruction. *Learning Assistance Review, 7*, 26-36.
- Gerlaugh, K., Thompson, L., Boylan, H., & Davis, H. (2007). National Study of Developmental Education II: Baseline data for community colleges. *Research in Developmental Education, 20*(4), 1-3.
- Gifford, D. D, Briceno-Perriott, J., & Mianzo, F. (2006). Locus of control: Academic achievement and retention in a sample of university first-year students. *Journal of College Admission, 191*, 19-25.
- Goleman, D. (1994). *Emotional intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam.
- Goleman, R. W. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York, NY: Batman Books.
- Grant, H., & Dweck, C. S. (2003). Clarifying achievement goals and their impact. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*(3), 541-553.

- Grantz, M. (1999). *Do you have the power to succeed? Locus of control and its impact on education*. Retrieved from <http://miavx1.muohio.edu/~psybersite/control/education.htx>.
- Griffith, J. (2004). Relation of principal transformational leadership to school staff job satisfaction, staff turnover, and school performance. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42*(3), 333-356.
- Guskey, T. R., & Passaro, P. D. (1994). Teacher efficacy: A study of construct dimensions. *American Educational Research Journal, 31*, 627-643.
- Hackett, G., & Betz, N. E. (1989, May). An exploration of the mathematics self-efficacy/mathematics performance correspondence. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 20*(3), 261-273.
- Hansemark, O. C. (1998). The effects of an entrepreneurship programme on need for achievement and locus of control of reinforcement. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research, 4*(1), 28-50.
- Hashway, R. M. (1998). *Developmental cognitive styles: A primer to the literature including an introduction to the theory of developmentalism*. Westport, CT: Prager Publishers.
- Helms, J. E. (1990). An overview of Black racial identity theory. In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 9-32). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Higbee, J. L., & Dwinell, P. L. (1997). *Do developmental education programs enhance retention? A commentary*. Chicago, IL: National Association for Developmental Education.
- Higbee, J. L., & Dwinell, P. L. (1997, Fall). Educating students about the purpose of higher education. *Research and Teaching in Developmental Education, 14*(1), 75-79.
- Higbee, J. L., Dwinell, P. L., & Thomas, P. V. (2002). Beyond University 101: Elective courses to enhance retention. *Journal of College Student Retention, 3*(4), 311-318.
- Hill, P. (1985). *The rationale for learning communities*. Transcribed from a speech given by Patrick Hill, Academic Vice President at The Evergreen State College, on October 22, 1985 at the Inaugural Conference on Learning Communities of The Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education. retrieved from <http://www.evergreen.edu/washcenter/lcfaq.htm>.

- Hipp, K. A., & Bredeson, P. V. (1996, April). *Teacher efficacy: Influence of principal leadership behavior*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Hoad, T. F. (Ed.). (1986). *The concise Oxford dictionary of English etymology*. New York NY: Oxford University Press.
- H. L. Hodgekinson (1985). *All one system: demographics of education, kindergarten through graduate school*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership, EXXON Education Foundation, New York, NY. (pp 2-18).
- Horn, S. K. (1997). Ideas in practice: Extending collaboration beyond the developmental classroom. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 21(2), 26-32.
- Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 93(4), 355-372.
- Hughes-Wiener, G., & Martin, G. R. (1989, March). *Results of instructional research in a writing across the curriculum staff development program*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Inman, W. E., & Mayes, L. (1999). The importance of being first: Unique characteristics of first generation community college students. *Community College Review* 1999, 26(3). DOI: 10.1177/009155219902600402.
- Johnson, C. (1989). Mentoring programs. In M. L. Upcraft, J. N. Gardner, & Associates (Eds.), *The freshman year experience*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kane, T. J., & Rouse, C. E. (1999, Winter). The community college: Educating students at the margin between college and work. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* , 13(1), 63-84.
- Keimig, R. (1983). *Raising academic standards: A guide to learning improvement*. ASHE/ERIC Higher Education Research Report, No. 4. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education, ERIC Clearinghouse, George Washington University.
- King, P. (1990). Assessing development from a cognitive-developmental perspective. In D. G. Creamer (Ed.). *College student development: Theory and practice for the 1990s* (pp. 81-98). Alexandria, VA: ACPA-AACD.
- Kirst, M.W. & Venezia, A. (2004). *From high school to college: Improving opportunities for success in post education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

- Knowles, M. S. (1988). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Kohlberg, L. (1975, June). The cognitive-developmental approach to moral education. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 56(10), 670-677.
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J. & Associates (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J. & Associates (1991). *Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and development outside the classroom*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- H. M. Lefcourt (1982). *Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Levine, A. (1979). *Handbook on undergraduate curriculum: Prepared for the Carnegie Council on policy studies in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lewis, L., Farris, E., & Greene, B. (1996). *Remedial education at higher education institutions in Fall 1995*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. National Center for Education Statistics. (NCES 97-584).
- Lindquist, J. (Ed.). (1978). *Designing teaching improvement programs*. Berkeley, CA: Pacific Soundings Press.
- Lundell, D. B., Chung, C. J., & Higbee, J. L. (2005). Contributions of the general college to theory and research. In Higbee, J. L., Lundell, D. B., & Arendale, D. R. (Eds.), *The general college vision: Integrating intellectual growth, multicultural perspectives, and student development* (pp. 419-447). Minneapolis, MN: General College and the Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy.
- Lundell, D. B., & Collins, T. (1999). Toward a theory of developmental education: The centrality of "discourse." In J. L. Higbee & P. L. Dwinell (Eds.), *The expanding role of developmental education* (pp. 3-20). Morrow, GA: National Association for Developmental Education.
- Lundell, D. B., & Collins, T. (2002). The centrality of discourse. In J. L. Higbee & P. L. Dwinell (Eds.), *The expanding role of developmental education* (pp. 3-20). Morrow, GA: National Association for Developmental Education.
- Magolda, M. B., Terenzini, P. T., & Hutchings, P. (1999). Learning and teaching in the 21st century: Trends and implications for practice. In C. S. Johnson, & H. E. Cheatham (Eds.). *Higher education trends for the next century: A research*

- agenda for student success*. Washington DC: American College Personnel Association.
- Manning, K., Kinzie, J., & Schuh, J. (2006). *One size does not fit all: Traditional and innovative models of student affairs practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Maryland Higher Education Commission. (1996). *A study of remedial education at Maryland public campuses*. Annapolis: Author.
- Maryland Higher Education Commission. (1998). *College performance of new Maryland high school graduates*. Annapolis: Author.
- Marzano, R. J. (1990). Standardized tests: Do they measure general cognitive abilities? *NASSP Bulletin*, 74(526), 93-101.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Mayer, R. E. (1998). Cognitive, metacognitive, and motivational aspects of problem solving. *Instructional Science*, 26, 49-63.
- McCabe, R. H. (2001, Feb). Developmental education: A policy primer. *Leadership Abstracts*. Retrieved from <http://www.league.org/publication/abstracts/leadership/labs0102.htm>
- McCabe, R. H. (2003). *Yes, we can!: A community college guide for developing America's underprepared*. Washington, DC: The Community College Press.
- McCabe, R. H. & Day, P. R. (Eds.). (1998). *Developmental education: A twenty-first century social and economic imperative* (p. 119). Mission Viejo, CA: League for Innovation in the Community College.
- McCarthy, P., Meier, S., & Rinderer, R. (1985). Self-efficacy and writing: A different view of self-evaluation. *College Composition and Communication*, 36, 465-71.
- McCombs, B. L., & Marzano, R. J. (1990). Putting the self in self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 51-69.
- Meiklejohn, A. (1981). *The experimental college*. Cabin John, MD: Seven Locks Press.
- Merisotis, J. P. & Phipps, R. A. (2000). Remedial education in colleges and universities: What's really going on? *The Review of Higher Education*, 24 (1), 67-85.
- Meier, S., McCarthy, P.R., & Schmeck, R.R. (1984). Validity of self-efficacy as a predictor of writing performance. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 8 (2), 107-120.

- Meyer, R. E. (1998). Cognitive, metacognitive, and motivational aspects of problem solving. *Instructional Science*, 26, 49-63.
- Miller, C. A. (2003). Locus of control and at risk youth: A comparison of regular education high school students and students in alternative. *Education*, 123, 548-551.
- Models of Integrated Learning Communities*. Maricopa Center for Learning and Instruction. Retrieved from <http://www.mcli.dist.maricopa.edu/ilc/models.html>
- Moore, R. (2004). Who's helped by help-sessions in developmental education courses? *Research and Training in Developmental Education*, 21, 50-56.
- Moore, R. (2006). The importance of admission scores and attendance to first-year performance. *Journal of the First-Year Experience & Student in Transition*, 18, 105-125.
- Moore, R. (2007). Diverse behaviors, diverse results: A motivation-based model for students' academic outcomes. In J. L. Higbee, D. B. Lundell, & I. M. Duranczyk (Eds.). *Diversity and the postsecondary experience*, pp. 129–143. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, College of Education and Human Development, University of Minnesota.
- Moore, R., Jensen, M., Hatch, J., Duranczyk, I., Staats, S., & Koch, L. (2003). Showing up: The importance of class attendance for academic success in introductory science courses. *The American Biology Teacher*, 65(5), 325-329.
- Moore, D., & Tananis, C. A. (2009). Measuring change in a short-term educational program using a retrospective pretest design. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 30(2), 189-202.
- Moore, L. V., & Upcraft, M. L. (1990). Theory in student affairs: Evolving perspectives. In L.V. Moore (Ed.). *Evolving theoretical perspectives on students* (pp. 3-23). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Morrison, B. H. (1992). Ideas in practice: Bringing the curriculum into the developmental writing class. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 16(1), 26-33.
- Moss, B. G., & Yeaton, W. (2006). Shaping policies related to developmental education: An evaluation using the regression-discontinuity design. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 28(3), 215-229.
- Mueller, C. M., & Dweck, C. S. (1998). Praise for intelligence can undermine children's motivation and performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 33-52.

- Munday, L. A. (1970). Factors influencing the predictability of college grades. *American Educational Research Journal*, 7(1), 99-107.
- Nelson, D. D. (Ed.). (1991). *Programs and plans*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Neuman, M., & Pelchat, J. (2001). The challenge to leadership: Focusing on student achievement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82, 733-736.
- Nowicki, S., Jr. (1972). *Achievement correlates of locus of control as mediated by social desirability*. Southeastern Psychological Association meeting, Atlanta, GA.
- Nowicki, S., Jr., & Duke, M. P. (1974). A locus of control measure for noncollege as well as college educated adults. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 38, 136-137.
- Nowicki, S., & Strickland, B. R. (1973, Feb). A locus of control scale for children. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 40(1), 148-154.
- O'Banion, T. (1997). *A learning college for the 21st century*. Westport, CT: Oryx Series.
- Pace, C. R. (1990). *The undergraduates: A report of their activities and progress in the 1980s*. Los Angeles, CA: Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California Los Angeles.
- Pace, C. R. (1995). *College student experiences questionnaire: Norms for the third edition, 1990*. Bloomington, IN: Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning, Indiana University.
- Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(4), 543-578.
- Pajares, F., & Johnson, M. J. (1994, Oct.). Confidence and competence in writing: The role of self-efficacy, outcome expectance, and apprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 28(3), 313-331.
- Pajares, F. (2003, April). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 139-158.
- Parsad, B., & Lewis, L. *Remedial Education at Degree-Granting Postsecondary Institutions in Fall 2000*. NCES 2004-010. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2003).
- Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (2005). *How college affects students, Vol. 2: A third decade of research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Personality processes and individual differences: Two-component models of socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(3), 598-609.
- Pearson, P. D., & Iran-Nejad, A. (1998). *Review of research in education*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Pereira, J., & Cobb, E. (1990). *The first year college experience of entering SEEK freshmen: Findings from a longitudinal study of Special Programs students in the City University of New York*. New York, NY: CUNY Publication
- Perin, D. (2006). The location of developmental education in community colleges: A discussion of the merits of mainstreaming vs. centralization. *College Review Board*, 30, 27-44.
- Perry, W. G. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.
- Petrie, T. A. (1999). *Lisa Pinkenburg Landry and Kimberly Bobinski Edwards: Achieving personal and academic success*. Denton, TX: RonJon Publishing, Inc.
- Phinney, M. (1991). Computer-assisted writing and writing apprehension in ESL students. In P. Dunkel (Ed.), *Computer-assisted language learning and testing: Research issues and practice*, (pp. 189-204). New York, NY: Newbury House.
- Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), pp. 33-50.
- Pulley, J. L. (2008, April 7), Not down for the count: student plots comeback with return to classroom. *Community College Week*, p. 10.
- Pusser, B., Breneman, D. W., Gansneder, B. M., Kohl, K. J., Levin, J. S., Milan, J. H., et al. (2007). *Returning to learning: Adults' success in college is key to America's future*. Indianapolis, IN: Lumina Foundation for Education.
- Raab, L., & Adam, A. J. (2005). The university college model: A learning-centered approach to retention and remediation. *New Directional for Institutional Research*, 125, 87-106.
- Ragland, M. M. (1997). Leveling the playing field for developmental writers: A three year study. *Research & Teaching in Developmental Education*, 14(1), 5-11.
- Ransdell, D. R., & Glau, G. R. (1996, Jan.). Articulation and student voices: Eliminating the perception that "high school English doesn't teach you nothing." *English Journal*, 85(1), 17-21.

- Ray, M. (2003). Aptitude, motivation, and self regulation as predictors of achievement among developmental college students. *Research and Teaching in Developmental Education, 20*, 5-18.
- Ray, M., Garavalia, L., & Murdock, T. (2003). Aptitude, motivation, and self-regulation as predictors of achievement among developmental college students. *Researching and Teaching in Developmental Education, 20*, 5-18.
- Rever, P. R. (Ed.). (1971). *Open admissions and equal access*. The American College Testing Program.
- Rogers II the new thesaurus*. (1980). The American Heritage Dictionary. (Eds.), Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rohs, F. R. (1999). Response shift bias: A problem in evaluating leadership development with self-report pretest-posttest measures. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 40*(4), 28-37.
- Rohs, F. R., & Langone, C. A. (2003). *The challenges of measuring leadership development in college students*. Presentation for Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education and Communication, University of Georgia, Athens, GA.
- Rose, M. (1984). *Writer's block: The cognitive dimension*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L. (1991). *Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Rotter, J. B. (1954). *Social learning and clinical psychology*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs, 80*(1), Whole No. 609.
- Rotter, J. B. (1975, February). Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43*(1), 56-67.
- Rotter, J. B. (1989). Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A case history of a variable. *American Psychologist, 45*, 489-493.
- Rotter, J. B. (1992). Cognates of personal control: Locus of control, self-efficacy, and explanatory style: Comment. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 1*(2), 127-129.
- Roueche, K., & Barey, G. (1994). *Access & excellence: The open door college*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

- Roueche, J., & Roueche, S. (1999). *High stakes, high performance: Making remedial education work*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges, The Community College Press.
- Saxon, P. , & Boylan, H. (1999). *Characteristics of community college remedial students*. Research contracted by The League for Innovation in the Community College, Appalachian State University.
- Saxon, D. P. , & Boylan, H. R. (2001). Characteristics of community college remedial students. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 25, Retrieved from http://www.ncde.appstate.edu/reserve_reading/Student_Characteristics.htm
- Saxon, D. P. , & Boylan, H. R. (2001). The cost of remedial education in higher education. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 25(2), 2-4, 6, 8.
- Saxon, D. P. , Sullivan, M. P. , Boylan, H. R., & Forrest, D. (2005) Developmental education, facts, figures, and resources. *Research in Development Education*, 19, 1-5.
- Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (Eds.). (1994). *Self-regulation of learning and performance. Issues and educational applications*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (1997). Social origins of self-regulatory competence. *Educational Psychologist*, 32, 195-208.
- Schwartz, W., & Jenkins, D. (2007). *Promising practices for community college developmental education*. Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Sedlacek, W. E., & Adams-Gaston, J. (1992). Predicting the academic success of student-athletes using SAT and noncognitive variables. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 724-727.
- Shaffer, D. F. (2008, May 15). How states make use (or not) of community colleges. Inside Higher Ed News, Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/05/15/cc>
- Shapiro, N. S., & Levine, J. H. (1999). *Creating learning communities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Shults, C. (2000). Remedial education: Practices and policies in community college. *Research Brief: American Association Community College*, 3-14.
- Simpson, M. L., Hynd, C. R., Nist, S. L., & Burrell, K. (1997). College academic assistance programs and practices. *Educational Psychology Review*, 9, 39-87.

- Slark, J. (1989). Student outcomes study: Fall 1988 Follow-Up study of students enrolled in remedial writing courses in fall 1986 and remedial reading courses in fall 1987. Year 3. Sacramento, CA: Learning Assessment Retention Consortium.
- Smith, D. G. (1989). *The challenge of diversity: Involvement or alienation in the academy?* Report No. 5. Washington, DC: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.
- Smoke, T. & Haas, T. (1995, Winter). Ideas in practice: Linking classes to develop students' academic voices. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 19(2), 28-32.
- Southard, A. H., & Clay, J. K. (2004). Measuring the effectiveness of developmental writing courses. *Community College Review*, 32, 39-50.
- Stein, J. B. (1982). *Comparison of two methods of teaching fundamentals of written English and subsequent success in college composition courses at Minneapolis Community College*. Minneapolis, MI: Minneapolis Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED216720).
- Strage, A. A. (1999). Social and academic integration and college success: Similarities and differences as a function of ethnicity and family educational background. *College Student Journal*, 33. pp. 198-205.
- Strassen, M. L. A. (2003). Student outcomes: The impact of varying living-learning community models. *Research in Higher Education*. 44(5). pp. 581-613.
- Stratton, C. B. (1998). Transitions in developmental education: Interviews with Hunter Boylan and David Arendale. In J. L. Higbee & P. L. Dwinell (Eds.), *Developmental education: Preparing successful college students* (pp. 25-36). Columbia, SC: National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition, University of South Carolina.
- Strehlow, B.J. (1996). *Assessing the effectiveness of community college developmental English courses and examining variables related to course success*, Wilmar Community College, Wilmar, MN. 581-613.
- Strickland, B. R. (1989). Internal-external control expectancies. *American Psychologist*, 44(1), 1-12.
- Synder, P. L. (1996). Comparative levels of expressed academic motivation among Anglo and African American university student-athletes. *Journal of Black Studies*, 26, 651-667.
- Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

- Tinto, V. (1989, Sept. 6). Misconceptions mar campus discussions of student retention. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. B2.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd Ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Tinto, V. (1995, November). *Educational communities and student success in the first year of university*. Paper presented at the Monash University Conference on the transition from secondary school to university, Melbourne Australia.
- Tinto, V. (1998). *Learning communities and the reconstruction of remedial education in higher education*. Paper presented at the Conference on Replacing Remediation in Higher Education, Stanford, CA.
- Tinto, V. (1998). *Learning communities: Building gateways to student success*. Paper presented at American College Personnel Association Conference, St. Louis, MO. Retrieved from <http://www.ntlf.com/html/lib/suppmat/74tinto.htm>
- Tinto, V. (2000). Taking student retention seriously: Rethinking the first year of college. *NACADA Journal*, 19 (2). pp. 1-8.
- Tinto, V. (2003). Learning better together: The impact of learning communities on student success. *Higher Education Monograph Series*. 2003(1), 1-8. Syracuse, NY: Higher Education Program, School of Education, Syracuse University.
- Tinto, V. (2008). Access without support is not opportunity. Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/layout/set/print/views/2008/06/09/tinto>.
- Tinto, V., Goodsell-Love, A., & Russo, P. (1993). Building community among new college students. *Liberal Education*, 79, 16-21.
- Tinto, V., Russo, P. , & Kadel, S. (1994). Constructing educational communities: Increasing retention in challenging circumstances. *Community College Journal*, 64, 26-30.
- Tinto, V., Goodsell-Love, A., & Russo, P. (1993). Building community. *Liberal Education*, 79(4), 16-21.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(2), 202-248.
- Wehmeyer, M. L. (1993) Factor structure and construct validity of a locus of control scale with individuals with mental retardation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53, 1055–66.

- Weiner, B. (1980). *Human Motivation*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Weiner, B. (1990). History of motivational research in education. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 616–622.
- Wells, R. (2008, July). The effects of social and cultural capital on student persistence: Are community colleges more meritocratic? *Community College Review*, 36(1), 25-46.
- Wells, A., & Frankenburg, E. (2007, November). The public schools and the challenge of the supreme court's integration decision. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(3), 178-188.
- Weissman, J., Bulakowski, C., & Jumisko, M. K. (1997). Using research to evaluate developmental education programs and policies. In J. M. Ignash (Ed.), *Implementing effective policies for remedial and developmental education* (pp. 73-80). New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 100.
- Widick, C., Parker, C. A., & Knepfelkamp, L. (1978). Erik Erikson and psychosocial development. In L. Knepfelkamp, C. Widick, & C.A. Parker (Eds.), *Applying new developmental findings* (pp. 1-17). New Directions for Student Services, no. 4. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wilcox, K. J., del Mas, R. C., Stewart, B., Johnson, A. B., & Ghere, D. (1997). The "Package Course" experience and developmental education. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 20(3), 18-27.
- Williams, D. N. (1989). Writing across the curriculum programs at community colleges. *ERIC Digest*. Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. ED333952.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (Eds.). (2001). *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: theoretical perspectives* (pp. 153-189). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Zinn, A. (1998). Ideas in practice: Assessing writing in the developmental classroom. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 22(2), 28-39.