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CHAPTER I
THE STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

It is the purpose of this study to construct a scale to evaluate the quality of creative writing. The scale will judge the following qualities held to be important by contemporary authors: originality, vocabulary, organization and elaborative thinking. The scale is designed to serve teachers and research workers alike. Teachers will find it useful for evaluating individuals' progress in composition, evaluating their own approaches and motivating techniques, and diagnosing a child's weaknesses and strengths. The researcher will find it a practical tool for comparing control and experimental groups in creative writing research or judging the results of various educational approaches.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

One of the haunting problems of teaching composition is that evaluation of the finished products is so difficult. Teachers and researchers alike feel a need for some effective means of measuring ability and growth in creative writing. Jordan says, "The need of more precision in evaluating English compositions has been felt for a long time."

Many teachers in the upper elementary grades and junior high must give marks in composition. All too frequently the student's performance is judged for matters of form and properly placed punctuation marks. Gerber states:

"(Communication) involves the matters of unity of purpose, of content, of organization, of language, and of oral or written delivery. But what happens? Is the student performance graded for all these matters? Not in the least. When he writes, he is reminded only that he misspelled four words, had one comma fault, and split two infinitives . . . . In short, communication in practice is reduced in meaning to the mechanics of writing . . . ."

The conscientious teacher tries to evaluate compositions


by considering more than misspelled words and misplaced commas. She is best with difficulties when she approaches this task. Experts such as Dierderich tell her this, "It is probably true that the average mark in composition might as well be assigned by drawing numbers out of a hat."

She receives more gloomy predictions such as the following from Lambert:

"There are, indeed, weaknesses to be found in the grading and marking of many teachers. Some of the most common ones are as follows:
1. Students are given a false standard of progress which often inhibits progress.
2. An artificial motivation is set up outside the course area.
3. Some of the most common ones are as follows:
4. The grading is not done objectively.
5. There is little consistency in grading, and there may even be variations from day to day.
6. Sometimes congeniality or prejudice may enter into the grade."

Knowing that her grades do much to encourage or discourage her pupils, that her professional honesty demands that she try to be consistent and fair in grading, Lambert gives her more discouraging words: "Tests have proven that grades are an arbitrary matter and that they definitely vary from teacher to teacher. Nowhere is this more likely to


3/ Ibid., p. 4.
happen than in the grading of compositions." And she is now ready to state with Lambert, \(^1\) "The problem of grading papers objectively is perhaps the greatest difficulty that the teacher of composition must overcome."

Some progressive school systems do not require their elementary school teachers to give formal marks, so the grading problem does not sharply confront them. However, any teacher who teaches her children to write creatively wants to be able to see results. She needs to compare the compositions she gets from trying different instructional methods. She wants to be able to see and recognize progress. And she wants very much to help a child see where his strengths and weaknesses lie.

The researcher faces similar problems. If he wants to study the effective methods of motivating creative writing, compare classes, or otherwise use creative writing, he must have a tool for evaluation. Lyman believes \(^2\) "... if comparisons in composition achievement are to be made between pupils, class groups, schools, or school systems, some common standard of measurement is indispensable."

A scale for use in judging creative writing looms then as a necessity. The needs for such a scale are succinctly

\(^1\) Mary Alice Lambert, op. cit., p. 6.

stated by Lyman:

"These needs are the elimination of the injustice of widely varying estimates of pupils' written compositions with the development of something better than unaided subjective judgment for determining ability groups; for comparing the composition attainments of pupils, schools, and school systems; and for appraising different instructional materials and methods."

Attempts at devising a scale for measuring creative writing dot the history of educational measurement. Pooley offers the following historical data:

"In point of time one of the earlier forms of research in English instruction was the effort to make somewhat objective the evaluation of composition. The decade from 1911 to 1921 witnessed considerable interest in the creation and validation of scales to measure objectively the art of composition."

Hudelson was an early pioneer. He devised a scale to serve the following ends:

"This scale is but a means toward ends. The most important of those ends are (1) to test impartially the various methods of teaching composition by measuring their results; (2) to measure those results in accurate, objective, stable and understandable terms; (3) to furnish a common basis for comparing the writing proficiency of different pupils within the same class or school or that of pupils in different classes or schools; (4) to classify pupils fairly in composition; (5) to grade them justly within their group; (6) to enable teachers to

1/ R. I. Lyman, op. cit., p. 158.


discover their reliability in judging the general merit of English composition; and (7) to furnish pupils an incentive to self-competition."

Hillegas was another scale-builder. His scale was composed of samples of compositions varying by known units from very poor to very good. To use the scale one slid a child's composition along until its general merit equaled that of a sample on the scale.

Other scales were devised by Trabue, Lewis, Thorndike, Van Wagenen, Willing, Breed and Frostic and Ballou. These scales embraced some glaring fallacies, but they did establish these principles stated by Pooley.

"1. That composition, while subjective in character, can be evaluated by group judgement into ranks or levels reasonably objective, to serve in the training of teachers and in the checking of the work of pupils at particular school levels. . . .

2. That unguided individual judgement in theme evaluation is liable to wide variation, calling, therefore, for frequent instruction and practice.

3. That the evaluation of compositions is much more than the correction of errors. In fact, to me the principal value of the research in composition scales was to direct attention to the content values of writing."

Lyman defends the scales by the following statements:

"The instruments are certainly far from

perfect. However, the fact is that every conscientious and capable reader of themes uses an informal scale. Compelled to grade themes, he employs, perhaps unconsciously, a standard for a C theme embodying certain degrees of excellence in substance, organization, and mechanics of expression and in freshness, vitality, and attractiveness of presentation. A theme somewhat better in these respects is to him worthy of a mark of B; a theme somewhat inferior in these elements is a D theme. In short, a theme-reader is compelled to appraise products in rough quantitative terms. Scales endeavor to make such informal quantitative standards somewhat more specific, to enable teachers to compare their criteria of excellence. Gross differences in merit which everyone can recognize are broken up into constituent elements, with the expectation that a more uniform and reliable set of standards may be available for use in appraising compositions. At any rate, . . . scales, scientifically questionable perhaps, actually assist teachers in making more reliable appraisals of the work of their pupils."

Hwang found that the composition scale can serve a useful function. He states that: "The use of an objective scale in rating English compositions helps to reduce the errors of rating as shown by the use of the Hudelson scale in this study."

For research work the scales have a definite need to fill. Van Wagenen asserts:

"In education, as in the physical sciences, we are no longer content with the statement that


a method or a means works successfully or better than some other method or means. We require to know just how well it does work, and that requirement can be met in the field of English composition only by definite and objective measurements."

Therefore, although the scales have flaws, they do serve teachers and research workers. Lyman defends them thus: "Imperfect as the scales for measuring compositions are, they have undoubtedly rendered great service in calling the attention of teachers and of schools to the necessity of appraising accomplishments in written composition by something better than guesswork."

The composition scales failed seriously in the following qualities: they failed to test originality; they used the nebulous term 'general merit' instead of being analytical about the qualities that make creative writing good; almost all of them tested form; none could be useful diagnostic tools.

Some of the scale-makers decided that they would have each child to be tested write on the same thing. Several read stories to the pupils who were then instructed to write the story. Hwang found that: "Other things being equal, the themes written on similar topics are easier to rate than the themes written on different topics." This meant that one of the most important qualities of creative writing,

2/ Fu Hwang, op. cit., p. 25.
that of originality, was ignored. What was evaluated was a child's ability to reproduce what he had heard, not his ability to write creatively. Lyman proposes: "They (composition scales) omit from consideration the most vital and essential qualities of expression." Lyman states further, "In general, measurements in the field of composition, quite in line with the customary practices in teaching, have exalted mechanical and rhetorical elements and have neglected originality, freshness, and inventiveness."

Authors criticize the scales also for failing to be analytical in judgment. Lyman reports:

"Composition scales attempt to measure very complex products; vigorous critics have questioned the measurability of 'general quality,' and several studies, notably those made by Dolch and Leonard, have indicated that little or no correlation of excellence exists between the content, the organization, and the mechanics of a composition. These characteristics should be measured separately."

As Lyman says, Dolch and colleagues tested the validity of the scale-makers' assumption that 'general merit' exists:

"They tested by translating the items on the Hillegas scale into statements of progressive excellence in systematic thinking, in maturity of sentence structure, and in freedom from errors."

2/ Ibid., p. 197.
4/ Ibid., p. 154 f.
Then they arranged ninety-five themes in order or rank on the Thorndike extension of the Hillegas scale and found the extent of each of the above categories. They tested, in other words, the reliability of the assumption that a theme good in one respect is good in the other two:

"The results . . . indicated that few themes had the same score on any two qualities and that the variation in many cases was large, the scores for individual qualities being sometimes higher, sometimes lower, than the ranking of the theme as a whole on the scale itself. Emphasis on different qualities by different users of the scale would have resulted in marked disagreement in the scores assigned. Moreover, excellence in one quality of composition was by no means indicative of excellence in other qualities." 1/

Lambert found that variations in marking " . . . are greatly reduced when the graders use an analytic method which considers the mechanical, literary, and logical aspects separately and allots marks for these elements separately." 2/

Lyman points to another glaring defect in the make-up of composition scales:

"Especially are the inventive elements of expression neglected or, at best, inadequately considered in all scales and investigations. Even if the importance of teaching pupils to be correct in the formal elements of expression is granted, it is at least questionable whether instruction and investigation in this phase of language training have not been seriously overstressed and the inventive,

1/ R. I. Lyman, loc. cit.
2/ Mary Alice Lambert, op. cit., p. 4f.
constructive aspects of expression correspondingly neglected. Twenty-five years ago Colvin pioneered in attempting to discover whether the inventive abilities of pupils can be improved through composition. With the possible exception of the studies made by Hudelson concerning composition topics, this significant line of inquiry has been neglected."

Too many teachers let good form and correct mechanics represent goodness in creative writing, and judge the compositions without these qualities to be poor.

Several authors feel that the gravest flaw in the existing composition scales is its uselessness for diagnostic purposes. Smith feels that, "The teacher, faced with the problem of getting at specific difficulties, complains frequently that the composition scale is too general to ferret out the detailed problems demanding remedial treatment."

Gilbride reports the same complaint, "The chief criticism of composition scales is their failure as a diagnostic measure. To provide remedial work specific qualities must be measured and analyzed."

Even the pupils suffer from this failing when they do not know what weaknesses they should strive to overcome, or what strengths to develop.


Cook purports the following:

"Perhaps their (composition scales) most serious limitation is the over-all character of the rating. Pupils may find that their compositions rate high or low without knowing why they rate high or low. It is difficult to understand how such ratings can clarify goals, direct learning or influence instruction in desirable ways."

Obviously the existing scales do not meet the needs of today's teaching of creative writing. Modern research states clearly that the biggest tasks lie ahead. Ferris found that:

"One of the common threads present in most of the published and unpublished studies and reports dealing with creative writing in the elementary schools is the need for evaluation of the writing. Most writers stress that subjective evaluation of the writings of children does not adequately evaluate the compositions."

Hildreth presents the problem as one that needs research and solution. "The validation of the newer trends in teaching written expression awaits more extensive research in a number of areas." Some of the problems to be studied are the


following:

"Methods for the appraisal of written English throughout the grades. The validity and reliability of existing techniques for appraising outcomes in written expression. The construction of new methods for evaluating outcomes in written work."\(^1\) Smith reiterates, "For qualities of effective style and of originality and imaginative concept there are no measures at the moment." She further declares:

"One cannot fail to be impressed, upon surveying the field of diagnosis of pupil difficulties in English with the many problems awaiting research.

Instruments for analyzing power in composition are yet to be devised. What, for example, do we mean by 'forceful style' by 'concrete diction' by 'wealth of ideas,' and how can they be measured? What are the components of 'ability to organize ideas,' and how can proficiency in it be tested?

... Scales or other instruments are awaited for the evaluation of results in certain functional centers of expression, such as the making of announcements, conversation, and creative writing."

Therefore, an attempt shall be made to meet the foregoing needs. A scale has been devised for this purpose. It shall attempt, as the others before it, to objectify evaluation of creative writing. It shall attempt, as those preceding it failed to do, to judge the following important

1/ Gertrude H. Hildreth, op. cit., p. 10.
2/ Dora V. Smith, op. cit., p. 248.
3/ Ibid., pp. 265-266.
qualities of creative writing: originality, vocabulary, organization and elaborative writing. The scale will ignore form, or mechanics, not because its creators do not consider these things important in their place, but because they are qualities which have received more than their share of teachers' and researchers' attention. The scale will measure the important qualities analytically so that the scale will have diagnostic value.

It is to be recognized and frankly stated that the scale is an experiment, and that it is not held up as a final answer. Improving evaluation of written language is a vast area with ample room for further experimentation. 

1/ Hatchett and Hughes feel that: "The breadth of the functional-creative approach to language learning requires extensive experimentation with evaluation techniques." The scale which is the outgrowth of this study is presented as a step which may be faltering, but one which is worth taking.

1. Definitions of Creativity

Authorities in the field of language arts do not, to the fullest extent, all agree as to what is the imperial requisite of creative writing. In defining creative writing the various authors emphasize different facets of

creativity but they all agree that creative writing is essential in the school curriculum:

"Language as an expression of individual feelings or aspirations has great significance in these times. The schools, therefore, give ample opportunity for creative writing, which becomes for many an outlet for feelings, an organization of personal experience, an instrument of self-discovery and self-development."

In referring to writing activities, Dawson states:

"Anyone who knows children and schools and life realizes that both creative and practical writing are necessary parts of the balanced curriculum..." and she reaffirms this point when she says: "In a well-rounded program of written activities, creative writing has a place of prime importance."

In defining creative writing the authors differ as to what is the element of importance. The definitions all have certain qualities in common, but variance between them is produced by the amount of stress on one or more factors in one explanation as opposed to their minimization in another explanation. This difference in emphasis is ably brought


3/ Ibid., p. 81.
forth by the statements of Dawson:

"To some extent, authorities disagree as to what constitutes creative language. Some insist that the ideas expressed must be unique, that the phrasing of them must be completely original, and that presumably there is nothing utilitarian in the purpose of the person expressing these ideas. Creativity, in their opinion, resides in the ability to think up viewpoints or conceptions that have not been expressed before, or to phrase an old idea in an entirely fresh manner.

Other authorities are less insistent on uniqueness; they maintain that whatever a person says in his own individual way, even for utilitarian purposes, is creative."

It might clarify the foregoing and the subsequent statements if the following is kept in mind:

"Most effective creation takes place not in a vacuum but through life's most significant experiences. . . . Horace, follower of Aristotle, 'If you wish me to weep, you yourself must first feel grief.' (Ars Poetica). . . . The best writing is that which roots in the soil of earth, though the foliage may brush the clouds."

A similar sentiment is expressed by Anderson in the following:

"Purpose of poet is to communicate the feeling-tones, the quality, of an experience. . . . To move us he must permit us to see; what we cannot visualize we cannot feel. Beauty, evil, love as abstractions have no power over our emotions; give them local


habitation and a name, and they do... we feel in particular; we think in abstractions. We live in the specific; we reason in the general.

Mearns begins his evaluation of good writing by establishing the basic criterion that the feeling of the writer did become the feeling of the reader: "What we really look for is instinctive insight, something never imitative and never wholly from without." Later on the same author says "... inner spirit speaks its true and individual note, ..."

The expression of personal feelings after contact with experiences is stressed by McKee when he says creative writing:

"... always includes ideas which represent the writer's reaction to the situation or experience about which he writes. When the child writes creatively he expresses, in one way or another, his feelings about or his intellectual reactions to some experience he has had, to something he has seen, heard, or otherwise come in contact with."

Hatfield also bases his definition of creative writing on personal experience:


2/ Ibid., p. 29.


"Creative expression is the translation of experience into words. It occurs when a person recognizes the dignity of his own experience, and when he imposes upon his experience the discipline of expression in an effort to share it with others. Creative expression is differentiated from other forms of composition by the absence of an external or utilitarian motive, by the fact that it is done primarily for its own sake, and proceeds from experience which is recognized as possessing intrinsic rather than 'practical' value."

Continuing along the same requisite of creative writing he proposes:

"We may exclude from the field of creative expression any writing or speaking in which no detail of the individual's first-hand experience is present. Expression becomes increasingly creative as the emphasis is placed upon the interpretation of the writer's own experience."

In Sister M. Evarista's consideration, creative writing "... is nothing more nor less than the writer's effort to communicate his spiritual, intellectual, and emotional experiences efficiently and effectively."

In their discourse on children's writing Hatchett and Hughes remind the reader that the purpose of story writing is to develop those powers in the children that are original and individualistic. One of the needs of children is that they set forth in written form their sense impressions and their ideas."

1/ W. Wilbur Hatfield, op. cit., p. 110.


and her associates ably bring out that when children write about their reactions to their experiences "... there is always at least a touch of the unique and the unusual."

The idea that creative writing is the children's translation of their experiences and feelings into words is the thought of Lee and Lee: "The essential element is that the child is saying something he feels the need and urge to say, something that is the result of his own experience, his own thinking and feeling."

Redford expresses quite strongly his sentiments as to this same aspect of creativeness:

"Everything, even our concepts and ideas, appear first in a world apprehended by our senses. Therefore if we are to tell someone else something it must be reduced to the sensory basis out of which it came. Good writing, regardless of what else characterizes it, is a selected record of what has been seen, heard, touched, tasted, smelled."

The foregoing definitions emphasize the translation of reality through the experience of each writer. Another approach to the meaning of creative writing is from the standpoint of expressing ideas. The first qualification of


creativeness in writing, according to Smith, "... deals with ideas and words for their expression."

In considering creative writing Baker reiterates this belief when she proposes "... the primary factor in creative expression is the possession of an idea or a point of view worth recording."

Burrows sets forth that the more children write creatively, "... the more they must bestir their minds for new ideas." This quality of invention is of primary importance in creativity.

A similar thought is expressed by Dawson who relates "... it seems possible to be creative when reproducing ideas to express a personal point of view or an individual interpretation of these ideas."

Further on in the same discussion Dawson presents the opinion that creativity in written language does not mean necessarily that the product of the writer needs to be "... fanciful or unusual; but it must reflect the


3/ Alvina T. Burrows and others, op. cit., p. 115.


5/ Ibid., p. 261.
inner self and express the storyteller's own ideas."

Applegate defines creative ideas as:

"... those we believe in so strongly that they pound on the inner door to be released. It does not matter whether a teacher assigned the writing or we assign it to ourselves; if we feel it, we can be taught to write it. ... Creative writing, then, is writing that pushes itself out of a bed of ideas."

In the words of Tidyman and Butterfield: "The essence of creative writing is to express worthy ideas beautifully in verse or prose."

Although the personal reaction of a writer to experience and his subsequent expression of ideas from his experiencing are certainly involved in creative writing, there is an important element that many definitions emphasize as the core of creativity. This factor is the quality of originality in writing. Strickland states "... creative writing is free writing, with the emphasis on originality of content and style. A creative product is the child's own and is satisfactory when he is satisfied with it."


Tidyman and Butterfield support their main point that creative writing is the expression of ideas with the inclusion of originality as "... as important factor; that is, the child must express his own mental or emotional reactions, not simply report the thoughts and feelings of others."

Relative to the place of importance that originality has in creativeness in writing, Dawson explains: "Originality characterizes expression. Sometimes ideas may be truly unique; they may be phrased in a completely original way." This authority feels that creativity is the essence of stories that have "intriguing original qualities."

Among the authorities there is much agreement that originality will be present if the child is writing creatively. Such an opinion is ably brought forth by the statement of Lee and Lee: "Creative writing is essentially original, the child's own. He must not consciously imitate either in thought or style."

It is the feeling of McKee that there is creativity when the child produces "... original ideas, or feelings

1/ Willard F. Tidyman and Marguerite Butterfield, op. cit., p. 189.


4/ J. Murray Lee and Doris May Lee, op. cit., p. 626.

5/ Paul McKee, op. cit., p. 292.
cloaked in individual and original expression."

Hatchett and Hughes express this sentiment concerning the relationship between creativity and originality: "In all creative activities there is something that is original, unique and significant to the child."

2. Originality

Research reveals many differences in the definitions of creative writing but authorities agree that originality is an important factor. The writer is free to express his inner thoughts and personal feelings and they are expressed in his own way. Thus creative writing is essentially original. It is the opinion of Strickland that: "Originality of expression is a desired quality of nearly all language work and some authors and teachers regard originality as the quality that identifies creativeness." Anderson states definitely that:

"Creativeness and originality are often taken to be synonymous, and there is probably some justification for the identification. Certainly a creative artist is not one who apes others' works and words. The stamp of his own personality must be on his productions. He must be original in that his writing must proceed from the fertile ground of his own experiences. Since his expressions are not like those of anyone else on earth he cannot help being original."

1/ Ethel Hatchett and Donald H. Hughes, op. cit., p. 276.

2/ Ruth G. Strickland, op. cit., p. 278.

According to Tidyman and Butterfield, originality of expression is a desired quality of nearly all language work and some authors and teachers regard originality as the quality that identifies creativeness.\(^1\)

Strickland believes that:

"No clear distinction can be made between what is creative and what is purely practical. . . . A personal letter to a friend or the report of an experience can be creative writing, in one sense. The distinction that is needed lies between the writing in which emphasis is placed on learning how to do things and practicing to gain skill and the writing in which the emphasis is on expression of one's own imaginative and original thinking for the pleasure that can be derived from such an experience."

That originality is the distinctive quality which identifies all creative writing is emphasized again by McKee in the following statement:

"The distinctive quality of creative writing as defined in this volume is originality. This means original expression of the child's thoughts or feelings regarding something about which he wishes to write. One must not ask for the conventional or traditional expressions, but rather for creativeness in the sense that the child states his ideas in his own way. Only through such writing can self-expression be real and sincere, and it is chiefly the quality of "original inventiveness" that makes the writing superior."

\(^1\) Willard F. Tidyman and Marguerite Butterfield, op. cit., p. 189.

\(^2\) Ruth G. Strickland, op. cit., p. 286.

\(^3\) Paul McKee, op. cit., pp. 296-297.
Lee says that: "In one sense, all writing that is not dictated or copied is creative. It is original, a new combination of words for the child." Originality is the basic standard by which creative writing may be judged.

McKee claims that:

"The program in creative writing cannot get very far without the construction and use of standards which are understood and used by the teacher and children. As indicated frequently in this discussion the basic standard is original inventiveness. . . . Further, it (the writing) should include at least one original idea concerning the topic discussed or a solution of the problem raised."

That there can be originality in various types of writing is assumed by Schofield in the following definition of creative writing:

"By creative writing for children the writer means any written work in which the child says what he wants to say in his own particular way of saying it. A book review, a report in social studies, a poem, an imaginary story or an experience story is creative if the writer's own particular way of expressing himself pervades it."

This originality of expression is also referred to by Dawson who calls attention to the fact that: "The

1/ J. Murray Lee and Doris May Lee, op. cit., p. 624.
2/ Paul McKee, op. cit., pp. 296-297.
4/ Mildred Dawson, op. cit., p. 246.
expression must come from within; the words come as a result of the writer's own personal thinking and feelings . . . What he is saying is honestly and genuinely his own and possibly unforseen reaction."

The importance of originality is also stressed by 1/ Van Allen who says:

"The expression of personal reactions constitutes the quality of originality, because no one other than the writer can produce it. It is his own contribution. It cannot be forced from without by topic assignments or adherence to form, but must come from within. The writer must have more than words. He must have the idea, the formation of the image."

This quality of originality is described by Baker 2/ who explains that:

"Some people have a refreshing individual quality in their speaking and writing which characterizes it as their own. These people have developed the ability to think for themselves, to analyze their thoughts and to express their ideas, attitudes and experiences in a manner that gives satisfaction to them and stimulates a reaction in others. We say they express themselves creatively. The very young child expresses himself creatively; his thoughts are his own and he expresses them uniquely."

Authorities are not in complete agreement concerning the concept of originality, which they agree is an important factor in all creative writing. Is this quality found in originality of ideas, originality of expression, or must


both be included? It is the belief of Conrad\(^1\) that:

"Creative writing is productive, rather than reproductive. The student writer ought not to reproduce knowledge, or ideas, or atmosphere from anything he has recently read. When he draws upon his reading at all, it will be upon impressions from forgotten sources that have so built themselves into his experiences that he can accept them as his own. Creative writing is original, not imitative."

Hatfield feels strongly that in creative writing, emphasis should be placed upon actual first-hand experience. According to him:

"The temptation to live vicariously is a strong impulse, often overpowering in its appeal to youth. It is easier for the imagination to accept the ready-made reactions of others, described in books, than it is for the senses and the imagination to respond to original stimuli. Too often pupils deceive themselves and their teachers by merely echoing or imitating pieces . . . which they have heard praised, without having any genuine content in their own mind."

Since a completely new idea is rare indeed, in the writing of children, some authorities believe that originality may be found in the form of expression which is \(^3\) the writer's own. Tidyman and Butterfield\(^2\) are in complete agreement, saying that:

"Very few thoughts are original in that they are expressed for the first time; originality consists to some extent in the selection, appropriation, and adaptation of the thoughts and


\(^2\) W. Wilbur Hatfield, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

\(^3\) Willard F. Tidyman and Marguerite Butterfield, *op. cit.*, p. 189.
feelings of others. Sincerity, conviction, and personal acceptance are thus involved."

In describing this type of originality which may be found in expression, Anderson explains that:

"The originality which we may expect from a writer is newness which is derived from the rearrangement of old or familiar materials. Probably no one can think of something really novel. As one philosopher once put it, even if a person did deliberately attempt to create in his mind an animal, for example, which was really new, made of materials which no one had ever seen or imagined before, he would find it impossible. He would necessarily resort to rearrangement of old materials: that is, he would imagine the head of a horse on the body of a man with the tail of a dog. The resulting chimera would certainly be new from one point of view, but so far as materials go, it is merely a new ordering of familiar materials. Rearrangements of materials then, may acceptably constitute originality."

3. Vocabulary

Vocabulary is an important factor in creative writing. Strickland states that:

"Words and meanings comprise much of the stuff of which life is made. The higher the level of civilization the more important they become. If children are to live richly and to lay hold on their intellectual inheritance they need vast resources in words and meanings to draw upon."

Many authorities make a distinction between the role which vocabulary plays in creative writing and that which

2/ Ruth G. Strickland, op. cit., p. 199.
it plays in informative writing. According to Thornley\(^1\) word choice is particularly important for creative expression. He says:

"A creative writer is a specialist in words, but with a difference. He studies vocabulary with the peculiar devotion of the violinist practicing scales and thirds and fifths. Yet, when he writes, his attention focuses, not on the words as such, but on the object of his report. This attitude toward vocabulary is on a fundamentally different level from that involved in the skillful teaching of the dictionary, thesaurus, word lists, derivations and so on. For a creative writer, the 'right' word takes on multiple shades of meaning involved in connotations, associations, sound, symbolisms, appropriateness to context and so on; and it does this more sensitively than it does for any other writer."

Tidyman and Butterfield\(^2\) feel that command of vocabulary is more important for the creative writer than for the informative writer. They claim that:

"Important as vocabulary is in the information-giving activities, it plays an even greater role in the creative activities, where value lies in the beauty of expression as well as in the exact statement of ideas and feelings."

Referring to the important ability of being able to create with language, Hatchett and Hughes\(^3\) point out that:

"Important as vocabulary development is, it is almost useless apart from the creative use of words."


\(^3\) Ethel L. Hatchett and Donald H. Hughes, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
In his discussion of the judgment of prose composition, Milligan affirms: "In my judgment interested writing and speaking result more from word choice and arrangement than from any type or length of sentence used."

Authorities agree upon the tremendous importance of rich vocabulary in creative writing. Opinions of individual writers differ as to the areas of vocabulary upon which emphasis should be laid.

Preciseness of word choice.-- A creative writer must be able to choose the right or the exact word.

According to Burrows: "A word is good only if it tells exactly what the author had in mind."

As the creative writing program develops, children will begin to recognize the need for the exact word.

Witty, in evaluating a specific program in creative writing, notes: "As work proceeded, there developed a marked concern on the part of the boys and girls that the right word be employed."


Sister Mary Vera and Sister Mary Marguerite claim that preliminary planning in the organization of ideas will increase ability to choose definite words. They say: "... organization likewise develops the power of discrimination in the choice and use of specific words for specific occasions." In the same vein, Treanor tells the teacher of composition "... drill upon specific words."

In stressing the need for precise and exact wording, Hatchett and Hughes agree that children need assistance in writing. It is their opinion that: "Children should be helped to find words that describe exactly what they mean as they create in prose and verse." Whittaker affirms that: "... the multitude (children) must be taught how to use facts, specific detail, illustrations ... to make writing come alive." Applegate says: "Develop the habit of using specific words," while Burrows states that use of "direct

5/ Mauree Applegate, op. cit., p. 135.
conversation, action and well chosen detail (will) give vividness and immediacy to a story."  

Tidyman and Butterfield also want to: "Eliminate vague and indefinite descriptions." To do this they see a need for substituting definite words for nebulous impressions. Mirrielees warns: "Remember, it is the concrete picture that makes the abstract picture of interest."

The importance of specific wording over generalized statements is recognized by Macrorie who concludes:

"A student can be taught at least to write and speak so that words do not get in the way of his thoughts. He can be taught to be not vague and general, but specific, making himself clear, as good speakers and writers do, by giving examples and telling stories. He can be taught to listen closely to the speech of everyday life until he hears its fluency and clearness and appropriateness. He can be helped to write at least as straight-forwardly as he talks to his best friend."

McKee feels that after children have recognized the need for exact word choice that preciseness of wording will

"... emphasis upon clearness and exactness of meaning in speaking and writing about familiar experiences will awaken the pupil's concern about presenting his meaning adequately in whatever speaking or writing he may undertake."

---

1/ Willard F. Tidyman and Marguerite Butterfield, op. cit., p. 283.


4/ Paul McKee, op. cit., pp. 43-44.
Synonyms.-- Use of synonyms is important in creative writing because synonyms give shades of meaning.  

McKee explains how over-worked words dull speaking and writing:

"Many people go through life with a rather meager stock of words to be used in speaking and writing. The result is that their talking and writing are usually colorless, occasionally boresome, and frequently not clear. The persistent repetition of a few words, the loose use of over-done connectives and transitional words, and in general a lack of enough words in which to cloak meanings brings this about."

Repetition prevents the fresh quality which is characteristic of good writing. DeMay concludes:

"The reason we who write lack style is because we do not use variety in our modes of expression. We employ the same words over and over until the effect is monotonous."

Rich experience is a requisite for a wealthy vocabulary. According to Strickland: "People who overuse a few dull words are probably people whose first-hand experience and vicarious book experience is sadly limited."

Tidyman and Butterfield recognize that lack of synonyms weakens expression. They state that:

"Language development is characterized by

1/ Paul McKee, op. cit., p. 302.
growth in range, variety, and selectivity in the use of words. Common faults are vagueness and the overuse of certain words - tired words."

In their discussion of creative writing, many authorities see the need for eliminating commonplace vocabulary. Mearns deplores the use of "... expected, imitative, ordinary vocabulary." The Commission on the English Curriculum affirms: Stereotyped expressions and also rigid classification can be avoided. Hatchett and Hughes say that "... stock or formal expressions" should not be employed.

There is a definite need for extensive use of synonyms in creative writing. Teachers of creative expression will agree with Sister Mary Vera and Sister Marguerite that:

"If the same word has been repeated several times in a story, the desirability of a knowledge of synonyms will be recognized not only by the pupil himself but also by his classmates."

Creative writing will improve as a result of teaching in this area of vocabulary. Mirrielees feels that: "Work on synonyms not only fixes meanings and shades of meaning,

1/ Hughes Mearns, op. cit., p. 31.
3/ Sister Mary Vera and Sister Mary Marguerite, op. cit., p. 227.
but is an excellent device for increasing a pupil's usable vocabulary."

Tidyman and Butterfield feel that the study and use of both synonyms and antonyms is valuable for purposeful expression.

Descriptive words and phrases.-- All writers agree that descriptive words are a requisite for creative writing. However terminology in this area of creative expression differs.

Dawson and several other authorities believe that creative writing must contain vocabulary which paints "word pictures". Ferebee in teaching creative writing, also recognizes the beauty of picture words: "Or I may ask that a vividly described action be read again while we close our eyes to see better the moving picture it presents."

Some authors use the term vividness. Strickland does this when she affirms: "Also, an ear tuned to catch interesting words and sensitivity to shades of meaning result in vivid and interesting use of words." Tidyman


and Butterfield go on to state: "Special commendation for the child who achieves an unusually vivid vocabulary effect is a spur to the group e.g. sound words, good descriptive words."

Writers agreeing with Strickland claim that creative writing has "colorful words." As children turn to creative expression, Gordon looks for "unusual description", while Dyer praises "highly imaginative description". Edwards seeks "picturesque speech" in children's written language. Again pertaining to descriptive language, Burrows emphasizes "... fascinating words and bewitching phrases."

Hatchett and Hughes characterize creative writing vocabulary as "refreshing and sparkling." Strickland urges children

---

1/ Willard F. Tidyman and Marguerite Butterfield, op. cit., p. 276.
6/ Alvina T. Burrows and others, op. cit., p. 113.
7/ Ethel L. Hatchett and Donald H. Hughes, op. cit., p. 132
to use "... words which are sound-filled or which carry feeling and emotion."  

Tidyman and Butterfield cite an example of aiding children in vivid expression. They state:

"Opportunities may arise for helping children to express ideas vividly. For example a pupil may say, 'The boy went down the street.' A clear picture is developed if one states how the boy went down the street. Did he run, walk, stroll, skip, stumble, shuffle? What kind of a boy was he - noisy, redheaded, big, frightened, happy, freckle-faced? By combining the proper words, we get a clear picture: The ragged, freckle-faced boy scampered down the street."

Whittaker views the importance of vivid action words too. He affirms: "The listing of words such as 'swoop,' 'swishes,' 'zooms,' 'descends,' 'darts,' makes the pupil see how vivid verbs create the desired effect in writing."

Authorities agree with Mirrielees:

"If you reward fresh wordings, and if you and the class discourage the cliche and the colorless, you might be able to bring to your classroom originality, vigor and picturesqueness."

Words that appeal to the senses. -- Many authors discuss the use of the five senses as a basis for disciplined observation which will produce effective writing.

1/ Willard F. Tidyman and Marguerite Butterfield, op. cit., p. 282.


Thornley says:

"In a creative situation, a writer has to learn to analyze dispassionately what produced for him a given experience: what sounds were made; what words were used; what odors were in the air; what details could be seen; how objects felt to the most intimate sense of touch; what taste of foods, what movements, what colors, temperatures, textures, and vibrations produced this emotional experience."

He even goes so far as to say:

"The attention is concentrated on sensitizing the five channels through which human experience can be received: taste, touch, sight, smell, and hearing. And no matter how intense a side issue of form, structure, mechanics, vocabulary etc., this realizing of life remains the chief occupation of the class."

Forrest claims that children do enjoy writing about things they like to hear, touch, see, taste or smell. He warns however: "Sense impressions are so important to children, but unless we get them to express themselves along these lines we never really get to know them."

Robbins is of the opinion that:

"The writer like any workman who wants to turn out an accurate product, must possess a

2/ Ibid., p. 530.
knowledge of materials and tools. For writing of any kind, pupils are equipped with one set of tools, the senses, which gather the material from the outside world of books and daily life and present these data to the other tool, the mind."

In urging that pupils pay attention to the testimony of their senses before they write, Treanor states:

"The wonders of this great and teeming world about us are continually clamoring for attention, knocking at the door of our senses, so to speak, until in some degree or other we consciously heed their importunities. We see, we hear, we taste, we smell and we feel. 'Sense', wrote Santayana, 'is like a lively child always saying, "Look, look, what is that?"' It is through the channels of our five senses that sensations are poured into the consciousness of the mind, there to be stored, combined, re-assembled, reproduced - filtered as it were, through the personality of the individual."

Hatchett and Hughes agree upon the importance of the use of the senses when they urge that: "Children should be led to feel the beauty and meaning of things seen, heard, touched and smelled. . . ."

In conclusion Mirrielees states:

"When you insist upon clear, vivid, words that appeal to the five senses and discuss these words, discarding those that are least successful, you are again working on vocabulary; you are sensitizing your pupils to word meanings and to word power."


2/ Ethel L. Hatchett and Donald H. Hughes, op. cit., p. 311.

Figurative language. -- Figurative language plays an important part in creative writing. Hatchett and Hughes feel that children need guidance in "... growing in imagination and the power to think in figures of speech." Applegate encourages the teacher to use figurative language so that her pupils will begin to recognize effective language: "A teacher who uses comparisons in her daily conversation will soon have pupils whose speech is more picturesque."

Most authors when mentioning figures of speech, urge the use of the metaphor and simile. Mirrielees points out:

"After you have awakened interest, after you and your pupils have wondered, guessed, investigated, found amusement, philosophized, and developed a genuine curiosity about words, you will doubtless stress even more than in your casual beginnings the use of metaphor and simile in language development."

She goes on to affirm that: "With interest in fresh metaphor and simile - you can combine, you and the class - disapproval of cliches, those stale word combinations. . . ."

Metaphors and similes make creative writing come to life. Tidyman and Butterfield convincingly claim:

1/ Ethel L. Hatchett and Donald H. Hughes, op. cit., p. 306.
2/ Mauree Applegate, op. cit., p. 58.
3/ Lucia B. Mirrielees, op. cit., p. 162.
4/ Ibid., p. 163.
"Comparisons and figures of speech add vividness."

Because words are the media of expression, authors must discuss vocabulary under creative writing. That vocabulary is important goes without saying. As to areas where the stress should be placed, opinions differ. It is safe to assume however, that the major factors involved are use of: precise words, synonyms, descriptive words, words that appeal to the senses, and figurative language.

4. Organization

The category of organization has been included in the scale as being an important consideration in the evaluation of creative writing. The importance of organization as a skill in written material has often been expressed.

To define the term "organize" Gilbride says it "may be defined as the ability to evaluate ideas and arrange them in sequence suited to the major idea expressed in the topic sentence."

In a study of the importance of orderly arrangement of ideas to accurate interpretation of thoughts, Neville states:

"Regardless of whatever high standards of usage correctness are acquired, meanings will be difficult to achieve in either oral or written


expression unless ideas are properly organized." \\
Neville also adds:

"Confusion is rampant in many paragraphs written by children and adults as well. Poor paragraphing is the result of lack of organization in the mind of the writer. The writer must be conscious of the divisions of his subject which call for new paragraphs. These divisions occur when the development of a new idea begins. Consequently sequence of ideas must be clear cut and orderly. The paragraph itself must be unified around one idea and one only, and the separate sentences must build up that idea in an orderly manner."

Hinton studied style and rhetoric of compositions and maintains: "that better compositions are better organized than inferior compositions."

Dolch describes organization as "... an aid to clear, forceful thinking."

The Commission on English Curriculum stresses that:

"Clarity is first of all a matter of clear mental concepts and well-formed ideas... Clarity in writing is dependent also upon the child's choice of words, the way he fits them together in sentences, his handwriting, his spelling, and his knowledge of how to place his thoughts on the paper so that others can read them."

1/ Mark A. Neville and others, op. cit., p. 45.


Lyman believes that organization is second to ideas and expresses his views and those of others when he says:

"Next in importance to inventiveness of mind in all expression is the ability to arrange ideas systematically, to organize thinking for effective presentation. Some scale-makers notably Van Wagemen and Willing, have attempted to account for this factor, but facts as to the development of this ability and as to the most suitable methods of developing it are as yet undiscovered. Greene and a few others have made a small beginning, and Leonard's recent experiments, in construction scales that will test children's ability to organize ideas quite apart from all consideration of punctuation, grammar, and form of manuscript are very suggestive. National English Committees insist that in composition content is one of the first importance; organization of ideas, second; and form (matter of careful scrutiny), third. Yet research has been confined almost exclusively to form."

Treanor asks this question: "What is the order and system of composition?"

In answering it he states:

"It is simply a reduction of the art of expression into its components; the various mental abstractions summed up in the word 'idea,' and the expression of ideas by means of words, phrases, sentences, paragraphs, and whole compositions. In actual composition, the exact mental processes are not always palpable. Sometimes ideas and their expression seem to be simultaneous (as they are not) and sometimes both are carefully and laboriously evolved. A person may or may not stop to ponder the relation of words, the niceties of vocabulary, or the possibility of sentence structure. Yet in varying degrees of intellectual acumen, he more or less

1/ R. I. Lyman, op. cit., p. 197.

deliberately follows a natural order in composition -- from the idea to the expressed word."

The idea that a composition must have unity and organization is expressed in this statement by Tidyman and Butterfield:

"Primarily important is sticking to the point, achieving and limiting the scope of the topic to a single phrase making sticking to the point easier; there is one point to stick to. A second feature of good organization is the presenting of material in an effective sequence."

Tidyman and Butterfield also express the opinion that schools should follow the natural stages of language development which includes the increasing ability of children to organize ideas well. He suggests:

"The ability to handle sentences well results from the gradual maturing of ability to think, to organize ideas, and to express ideas. . . . The attack of the school strategically follows the natural stages of language development: (1) the clear thinking and expressing of relationships between several ideas and (2) the giving of emphasis to expression and adding interest through the use of a variety of sentences."

Schofield expresses her ideas on paragraph building in saying:

"Building paragraph sense in children introduces, develops and strengthens other skills as well. Particularly important is sensitivity

1/ Willard F. Tidyman and Marguerite Butterfield, op. cit., p. 268.


to keeping to the point, correct sentence form, the use of bridging words and sentence sequence."

Evaluation of paragraphs should stress their most important characteristic that they concern one topic."

Schofield presents children's criteria for paragraph building:

"1. A paragraph is one or more sentences about one topic.

2. Each sentence in a paragraph should tell or ask something about the topic

3. The order of sentences within the paragraph is important.

4. Usually, but not always, the first sentence contains the topic."

Schofield concludes:

"Paragraphing, then reduces itself to these steps: studying good paragraphs, developing a set of criteria for judging paragraphs, formulating paragraphs from already prepared sentences and finally after help in the thinking that must precede the writing of paragraphs, the actual writing of the them."

Blanchard declares that clearness and forcefulness in thought-giving depend on organization.

Orderly thinking and expression is necessary to the effective transfer of ideas among people. Interest was shown in the importance of organization as a necessary skill


2/ Loc. cit.

in 1925 by Paul Klapper who observes:

"Lack of sequence of ideas causes lack of clearness and force. The problem is not to teach the principles of organization but to bring home consciousness of its needs and its importance by 'reductio ad absurdum.' . . .

Whenever, the topic is one of exposition, narrative or argumentation, then the logical sequence is exceedingly important in securing clearness and force.

The Fifth Annual Bulletin, The National Conference on Research in English recognizes the importance of the ability to organize verbally.

"Thus far the ability of the student to organize his thoughts expressed in verbal form has been measured most artificially and inadequately, yet every teacher realizes the importance of the development of this ability."

According to Burrows teachers should expect clarity in written composition:

"The teacher watches, naturally, for positive illustrations of clarity; good choice of language, or some additional use of a superior technique -- Emphasis of comments should be upon how clearly the ideas were developed, how one thought naturally led to the next, how interesting a certain picture was made."

Fluency can be attained in children's writings only


3/ Alvina Burrows and others, op. cit., p. 72.
if they have sufficient ideas and can organize them. This thought is expressed by Dawson in this statement:

"In other words fluency and accuracy are closely related. Corollary principals are (1) the pupil should write on topics concerning which they have an abundance of ideas: and (2) they should organize their ideas, think through a production, before writing under such conditions, a pupil can be fluent and, therefore, more accurate."

Pupils must be able to organize paragraphs in their writings to achieve clarity. According to Dawson:

"The qualities of content are more gradually developed and should be attained step by step. For instance, 4th graders should learn to write a well organized paragraph which centers about a single phase of a subject. Pupils in grade 5 and 6 should in addition, become able to write a unified composition of 2, 3, 4 paragraphs each of which clearly contributes to a single phase of the central subject."

Tidyman and Butterfield express the feeling that organization in writing is a process of maturity. They stipulate:

"In general, pupils in the elementary school give evidence of growth in power to think as they become increasingly able (1) to stick to the subject under discussion, (2) to relate events in the simple sequence of time, (3) to order ideas in relationship to a problem or a purpose and (4) to interpret experiences, at all levels of development, but the problems will vary in complexity with the age and experience of the children."


2/ Ibid., p. 55.

Treanor compares order in the composition to mathematics in this statement:

"For while it may not be formulated into such exact laws and gradations as mathematics, it (English Composition) has an order and a system of its own. And such being the case, teachers of composition ought to make use of it."

Treanor continues by saying that order in composition can and should be taught:

"Difficulties not withstanding, composition can be taught from a definite beginning with small, clear, manageable units of progression and with certain standards and goals of achievement."

Organization and understanding go hand in hand according to Burrows who states:

"Not only is clear construction an outgrowth of thoroughly assimilated ideas, effectiveness of organization that much lauded characteristic of intellectuality, it is also closely related to thorough understanding."

A test to measure the ability of seventh, eighth, and ninth grade pupils to organize has been constructed and evaluated by Prescott, further evidencing the importance of skill."


2/ Loc. cit.

Oral and written expression are closely related. Heffernan believes that it is an easy step from the oral to written form of expression. In either it is necessary to organize one's thoughts. Heffernan presents this idea:

"Composition is a process of thinking. When children are able to think through their ideas for effective oral presentation, it is a short, and almost wholly mechanical step to put these ideas into form. The factors which make for good oral expression are identical with those which produce effective written expression. To an extensive vocabulary, good sentence structure, interesting ideas effectively organized the child must add only sufficient motivation to communicate with someone at a distance or to record experience for written expression."

Children's writings often lack organization. McKee expresses this opinion when he says:

"Any teacher at any educational level who has made even a casual observation of pupils expression is well acquainted with the lack of ability to organize ideas."

Further evidence of this important skill of organization was observed by McDowell and Anderson in January, 1938:

"Not only is the organization of ideas one


2/ Paul McKee, op. cit., p. 313.

of the most important abilities involved in silent reading comprehension but such an ability is a prerequisite to effective oral and written expression."

Betts also observes:

"Information is organized for the purpose of applying facts to the solution of a personal problem or for communication to others interested in the same problem. In addition, well developed organization abilities permit the learner to perceive relationships between facts and therefore, contribute to intelligent interpretation. Hence, organization ability ranks high on a scale of values."

The need for organization in children's writings has been brought out by the foregoing authors. This skill cannot be overlooked in a scale for the evaluation of creative writing. The need for organization can be summed up in the words of Lee and Lee who believe:

"The real importance of writing is in the organization and putting in words the ideas and thoughts of the child."

5. Elaborative Writing

Elaborative writing is the term selected for the purposes of this study to mean an abundance of ideas in a composition. A wealth of ideas is a concomitant of good creative expression, for the more ideas presented by the creative writer, the more vivid, meaningful and satisfying is his creation. The intention of the creative writer


2/J. Murray Lee and Doris May Lee, op. cit., p. 626.
according to Atlick is:

"... to offer his readers a vivid experience, the essence of which is the transmutation of life, of actuality, into an imaginative adventure. He may wish to present before our inward eye a person or a scene that he himself has either witnessed or imagined, and to present it with as much color and credibility and meaningfulness as he can; or he may wish to play upon our emotions, so as to make us feel as he has felt concerning love or death or courage or religious devotion; or he may wish to communicate an intellectual idea to us in such terms that we cannot help apprehending its force and truth."

In order to accomplish these aims he needs a vast store of thoughts from which to draw, so that he can enrich and embellish his work. The quality of his production is increased with the addition of pertinent, appropriate ideas.

"A great part of the pleasure of reading poetry is due to the manner in which the poet is able to crowd the reader's mind with a rapid pageant of impressions..." The success of the prose writer also lies in his ability to express many ideas.

The creative writer must be an elaborative thinker, for he needs not only a wealth of experiences, but also the talent for organizing the associations he conceives as a result of his experiences. Durrell refers to the field of


2/ Loc. cit.

reading in the following examples of the associational abilities of a good thinker:

"... (He) finds examples and applications of the point being considered; suggests plans or activities allied to the topic, suggests additional pertinent topics for study or consideration; shows relationships to other fields; creates or invents new combinations of ideas."

The creative writer must also be able to embellish, relate, suggest and create. Hatfield, for instance, notes that in creative writing it is desirable to see relationships and to make new combinations and relationships. The creative writer does more than gather sense impressions; he thinks about, reflects upon, weighs, and juggles the associations he makes with each experience. The result of these mental meanderings is rich expression. Judd explains that: "In carrying on the processes of comparison, inference, and the like, the active mind uses language to achieve what has been referred to as the association, or integration, of elements of experience." Although the finished work may flow with ideas, the processes that go on beforehand are not simple. Hall verifies that: "Writing is a skill which has the appearance of simplicity, but which actually involves

1/ W. Wilbur Hatfield, op. cit., p. 123.


a complicated interplay of one's powers of observation, interpretation, and facility of language sufficient to express oneself accurately."

Experiences provide the initial stimulus for the creation of ideas. According to Walcott, the child gathers "... images in his mind for future reference," from his many experiences, and "... organizes these records of experience into his expanding universe of knowledge. Whether they be true or false, pleasant or unpleasant, they will color his attitudes and condition his responses to the world about him." The accumulation of sense-impressions is only the beginning of the process of elaborative thinking, however, for as Judd expounds:

"There is an uninterrupted series of steps leading up from the experiences which are externally conditioned, simple, and immature to the experiences which are higher because they emphasize systematically relations, abstractions, and broad generalizations." and concludes:

"The psychology of the higher mental processes teaches that the end and goal of all education is the development of ideas which can be carried over from the situations in which they were acquired to other situations. Systems of general ideas illuminate and clarify human experiences by raising them to the level of abstract, generalized,


3/ Ibid., p. 201.
conceptual understanding."

This scheme is vital to good creative writing for
as Jones says: ". . . before a student can transmit concepts
to another with sufficient clarity to make these experiences
communicable he must observe data, recreate it through his
imagination and interpret it." The Commission on the
English Curriculum makes the same observation:

"No child is ready to write until he has
had adequate experience; developed whatever
knowledge is necessary, and thought and talked
the subject through until it has become a part
of him. He cannot write clearly out of
meagerness of knowledge of experience, nor out
of hazy, half-formed ideas. Clear thinking is
essential to clear writing at all times." 2/

Dawson adds similar thoughts:

"It appears then that experiences must
provide the food for thought; mental processes
that center on initial experiences tend to
feature pictorial images rather than words;
children acquire the ability to think verbally
as they are led to compare, judge, or evaluate
such sensory impressions and then to express the
results orally (or in writing) in systematic terms."

Creativity arises as a person thinks penetratingly
about the events that take place within his personal orb.

1/ M. M. Jones, *Evaluation of a Method for Improving Personal
Description and Characterization in Written Composition*,
Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, Boston University, 1947,
p. 18.

2/ The Commission on the English Curriculum of the National

The ability to express his impressions increases moreover with the number of ideas he has. Hatchett and Hughes attest to this:

"It is as the result of his thinking and purposeful effort that a child creates a story, a poem, a play, a report, or a letter. When the result has been evaluated by him and pronounced an adequate expression of what he feels and thinks the experience has been a creative one. As the child creates, his imagery, emotions, and physical expression may blend into a complete and meaningful experience. As he finds outlets for his emotions and ideas, satisfaction results. This has the effect of developing self-confidence, enthusiasm for expressing oneself more creatively and the elements which characterize a wholesome personality. As integration of personality takes place, growth in ability to express occurs."

Lee and Lee hold the same view:

"Creative expression cannot take place without ideas and thoughts to express. Since one cannot create something out of nothing ... the wider and richer the background, the greater the creative possibilities. The re-organization of experience requires experiences to reorganize. Thus, the wider the experiences, and the greater the wealth of facts and concepts, the greater may be the creative activity."

"The degree to which a child expresses himself spontaneously and interestingly will largely depend on the amount of facts and ideas he has to express," states Dawson. On the other hand, "Much of the poor writing (whether mechanical errors, shallow and barren ideas, or poor organization) that pupils

1/ Ethel L. Hatchett and Donald H. Hughes, op. cit., p. 276.
2/ J. Murray Lee and Doris May Lee, op. cit., p. 589.
do is the result of inadequate knowledge and understanding," is offered by the same authority.

Creative writing, then, begins with ideas and requires many ideas to be a full statement of the writer's feelings. Applegate concurs, in the following remarks:

"Writing starts from ideas -- and children are full of ideas. Creative ideas are those we believe in so strongly that they pound on the inner door to be released . . . creative writing, then is writing that pushes itself out of a bed of ideas . . . We may have sent our roots far to gather the material that went into our letters or report or story or poem; but it has gone through the magic plant of ourselves and this synthesis we have achieved is ours."

Since ideas are the basis for and stimulus to creative writing, ideas need to be considered in a composition. Tidyman and Butterfield offer that, "Real communication is weighed in terms of ideas, and the school to be realistic must give similar emphasis to the meat of the composition." Swenson also feels that, "... the idea behind the words, the thought expressed through the words, the sayer's reason for presenting the idea or expressing the thought need to be constantly emphasized."

---


Dawson submits that: "Language is communication and communication presupposes ideas and interests as well as associates with whom to communicate;" and Swenson elaborates by saying: "Language may also be used by an individual person to formulate or state an idea for himself."

In either case language "... must say something." McKee advises in this respect that:

"In general the program in language should center attention upon meaning rather than form. The teacher should always ask first for ideas rather than the mere vehicle that carries them. In some way the pupil must take on the attitude that the first test of good speaking or writing is to have something to speak or write about."

Some factors that contribute to good content are mentioned by Tidyman and Butterfield: they include: "a suitable topic, interesting details, complete treatment, originality in expressing thoughts and feelings, and ability in distinguishing between the real and the make-believe." In the reverse, McKee cites that deficiencies in meaning are brought about

3/ Ibid., p. 433.
4/ Paul McKee, op. cit., p. 90.
6/ Paul McKee, op. cit., p. 41.
by:

"1) probable failure to clarify in the mind the meaning to be expressed, 2) failure to present enough detail to help the listener or reader to make the meaning intended, 3) poor selection of a word with which to present a meaning or a part of a meaning, and 4) poor organization of meanings within a sentence, within a paragraph, and within a longer selection."

Elaborative thinking is at the core of elaborative writing. Creative writing frees and "fosters an outpouring of ideas."1/ The more ideas one has, the more fluent is the expression of them. Embellished details that show feeling and thought contribute to the overall quality of the composition. It is this fact that leads Diederich to say: "The good papers have a copious flow of ideas about the topic, and the ideas are shrewd, penetrating, and logical, within the limits of the maturity of the students. . . ."2/

1/ June D. Ferebee, op. cit., p. 282.
2/ Paul B. Diederich, op. cit., p. 588.
CHAPTER III
CONSTRUCTION OF THE INSTRUMENT

The steps of procedure. -- A scale to evaluate creative writing was developed by the following steps: (1) interest in creative writing evidenced by seven members of a thesis seminar, (2) the determination of the need for a scale in order to evaluate motivated creative writing, (3) review of the literature on creative writing and constructed scales, (4) the realization that the construction of a scale would be more valuable for a thesis study than the building of motivation devices, (5) the determination of the categories of the scale, (6) the construction of the scale, (7) preliminary use of the scale to evaluate 30 compositions, (8) revision of the scale, and (9) use of the final scale.

Interest in creative writing evidenced by seven members of a thesis seminar. -- The co-authors indicated a strong interest toward the consideration of a problem related to creative writing. Five of them were teaching: three in Grade Four, one in Grade Five, and one in Grade Eight. Among the various ideas presented for a thesis study was one to formulate plans for the stimulation of creative writing. This precipitated a discussion as to what the group meant by creative writing: Does it include practical as well as imaginative writing? Does it include mechanics of form and style? Is all
personal, experiential writing creative? What are its component parts?

The determination of the need for a scale in order to evaluate motivated creative writing. -- Having decided to build and use motivating lessons to stimulate creative writing, the group assumed that growth and improvement in composition writing would result. The question of measuring this growth and improvement then arose. It became apparent that some objective measure was needed to evaluate children's composition writing in order to determine effectively this growth. At this point the group attempted to define creative writing. This was found to be difficult as each member of the group differed as to the elements of creative writing.

Review of the literature on creative writing and constructed scales. -- Each member of the group did consider- able reading in order to find out what research writers selected as the main elements of creative writing. It was noted that very few and crude attempts had been made to build objective scales for the evaluation of creative writing. As the information showed wide variations in points of emphases as to a definition of creative writing and the constructed scales were obviously very inadequate, it became evident that some attempt to build a scale would be necessary before proceeding with lesson plans to motivate an undefined result.

The realization that the construction of a scale would be more valuable for a thesis study than the building of
motivation devices. -- The construction of a scale became the major interest and stimulation of the group and it was decided unanimously to concentrate upon the construction of an objective measure. In order to do this as thoroughly as time would permit, it was decided to abandon the motivation idea and to attempt to build a scale which would serve a greater need in education. If a value judgment could be made as to what constituted creative writing then constructing lesson plans to motivate a determined result would not be difficult.

The determination of the categories of the scale. -- The four categories of the scale, originality, vocabulary, organization, and elaborative writing, were determined from the review of the literature on creative writing and the ideas of the group. Every descriptive phrase or word which was thought to pertain to creativity was examined, discussed, and after careful deliberation, either included or discarded. At first sentence structure was considered to be an element of creative writing but it was eliminated as the group decided that sentence structure was a quantitative, mechanical side of writing and not really indicative of creativity. In this manner the four categories began to appear; each with supporting, clarifying details. Preciseness of meaning for each detail was essential in order to make each category a distinct area of creative writing. Each category was defined and then, on a four point scale from three to zero, which
corresponds to the general terms excellent, good, fair, and poor, it was further redefined in order to facilitate the selection of compositions of different worth. Any composition to be judged would be comparable to one of the four arbitrary standards of each category.

The construction of the scale. -- The actual construction of the scale was the major consideration and effort of the group. The following detailed procedure was advanced by discussions based on independent research reading. The first problem to be solved was the determination of the categories of the scale. After study of the literature four categories were decided upon from the suggestions of the group. These first broad divisions of creative writing included: structure or organization of ideas and sentence organization, originality which included imagination as one of its prime constituents, vocabulary, and number of ideas. Further reading helped to delineate and to substantiate the four categories. Originality and vocabulary were retained, sensory perception was added, structure became sequence of ideas, and number of ideas was discarded and replaced by flow of ideas. The group decided that the evaluation of a composition in terms of the number of ideas was a quantitative measure which gave no indication of the quality or value of the ideas. Sensory perception or "the setting forth of sense impressions in written words" was eliminated as a category and included as a major part of vocabulary. There-
Therefore, the categories determined for the first scale were: originality, vocabulary, sequence of ideas, and flow of ideas.

The members of the group did more research reading on these four areas of creative writing in order to list as many descriptive terms as possible under each one. The efforts of the group were directed toward the construction of a quality scale. Quantitative differentiation was included in the terminology only when it appeared too difficult for the group to describe a category on the basis of quality. The decision was reached to give each category equal weight in the evaluation of a composition. No composition was considered to be more creative merely because it was original but lacked a sequence of ideas. Each category was divided into four subcategories, except for originality which had only two divisions. The group decided that a composition was either original in some way or not original at all. The scores for the subcategories were scaled from three to zero. A five point scale was discarded because of the tendency of scores to use the middle score for all questionable ratings. The divisions of the four point scale were made horizontally: 3 2 1 0. After a consultation with Dr. Baker on the most suitable format for the subcategories, it was decided to change the numerical arrangement to a vertical listing and to emphasize quantitative terminology in order to make clearer distinctions between each rating, especially 2 and 1.
After the determination of the categories the next problem to be considered was the analysis of the listed descriptive terms in order to formulate the definitions and the sub-categories. Two definitions were chosen as descriptive of originality: "a truly original composition contains unusual thoughts and/or a unique arrangement of ordinary words to express a common idea" and "that quality which makes a composition novel, fresh, individual, imaginative, and vivid." As the second definition was more specific, some of the terms were selected to be included in the highest sub-category. For example, "new" in place of novel, and "individual" were included in sub-category 3 and "vivid" was placed in the vocabulary list as descriptive of word elements. After determining the best qualities of an original composition the poorest sub-category was formulated. At first it was characterized as "no unique idea" but in order to avoid a negative phrase it was changed to "conventional ideas and/or commonplace word patterns." The middle sub-categories, numerical ratings of 2 and 1, were not attempted as the group could not come to an agreement as to whether originality could be judged quantitatively or not. As part of the difficulty lay in the two elements of originality, ideas and word arrangements, it was suggested that originality be divided into two categories: original ideas; and original word arrangements. The former category would be divided into a two point scale of 3 and 0; and the latter category would be a
quantitative four point scale utilizing the words: throughout, frequent, occasional, and commonplace word arrangements. Two scales for one area of creative writing reintroduced the problem of equal weight for each category. In order to resolve this difficulty the group decided to combine the two parts of originality. The categories having the highest and lowest numerical ratings, 3 and 0, would contain both ideas and word patterns; and the middle categories of 2 and 1 would include only word patterns. Thus, the first working scale for originality was created. (See Scale I, Originality, Appendix).

Before Scale I for originality was used to evaluate compositions the word "rate" was added before each sub-category to improve the format. (See Scale II, Originality, Appendix). Thirty compositions were rated with Scale II and certain inadequacies were evident. The descriptive terminology lacked precision and clarity and the quantitative measurement of word arrangement alone in 2 and 1 was unsatisfactory. Several compositions had been found which contained a few original ideas for which there was no provision in the scale. This correction was made by including the quantitative use of ideas in sub-categories 2 and 1 so that all sub-categories now contained original ideas and/or word arrangements. The terminology was improved: In sub-category 3 "different and unexpected" was changed to follow "unique", "ways of expressing" was changed to "interpretations
of" and "same" became "an". The major emphasis in each sub-category was underlined to improve the physical format for greater ease in using the scale and to focus the scorer's attention on the main characteristic or originality at that level. (See Scale III, Originality, Appendix).

In order to construct Scale I for vocabulary each member of the group listed all the appropriate, descriptive phrases which pertained to this category from her own reading and thinking. These phrases were discussed and the following ones selected to be used: shades of word meaning, general clearness of expression, effective telling words, words that create pictures, effective words that help you see more clearly, and understand more fully exactly what the author had in mind, multi-colored manner of expression, vividness conveyed by comparison and figures of speech, action words, words that are precise and lucid, and play on words. From these phrases the definition of vocabulary was formulated: "Use of words to express a particular thought or idea." In the process of selecting the best qualities of vocabulary for sub-category 3 a discussion arose as to which parts of speech to include. The term "parts of speech" was discarded because of its grammatical connotation and unclassified, specific terms were included. The selected terminology was arranged qualitatively throughout the scale. The quantitative aspect was also evident in order to make a better distinction between the sub-categories. The group felt that the better and more
extensive the word choices in a composition the better the quality of the composition. (See Scale I, Vocabulary, Appendix).

Scale I was revised by rearranging the order of the phrases to achieve a more logical progression of meaning; rewording the introductory words to each sub-category; changing certain words for clarity of meaning; eliminating the words: "powerful", "correct use of words", "some variety", "in word choices", "child uses", "but composition lacks", and "or lack variety"; and adding "some good metaphors and/or similes" in sub-category 2. (See Scale II, Vocabulary, Appendix). After rating thirty compositions with Scale II, certain further changes were necessary: "confused word meanings" eliminated in sub-category 0 as no confusions of word meanings were found in the compositions rated: "inaccurate or confusing impressions" was changed to "impressions" in sub-category 1; and the format was improved by underlining the main statement in each sub-category. (See Scale III, Vocabulary, Appendix).

Group work on the category, the sequence of ideas, began after considerable research reading. This reading revealed that the sequence of ideas is "clarity of structure and sound organization", "the telling of an experience in a logical sequence", and "the organization of interesting details which adds to the clarity of a composition."

Webster defines organization as "the arrangement of inter-
dependent parts, each having a special function or relation with respect to the whole. These definitions were discussed and the category was renamed organization. The first definition for the scale was that organization is the sequential organization of ideas. The sub-categories were then built with reference to the relation of major and minor ideas. (See Scale I, Organization, Appendix).

After this category was used to evaluate the organization of thirty compositions, it was found to need very little revision as the scoring was very consistent. The following changes were made: the definition was reworded to read - - organization is the sequential arrangement of ideas; the phrases "uses details for clarity", "few details used for clarity", and "composition creates", were eliminated; subcategory 2 was partially reworded to read - - "main idea clearly stated but relevant thoughts lack continuity and logical clear arrangement"; and "no sequence" changed to "illogical sequence" in subcategory 0 as all compositions have some sequence of ideas. (See Scale II, Organization, Appendix). The revisions of Scale II were made to facilitate the use of this scale by an improved format. The main statement in each sub-category was underlined and the supporting statements for each sub-category were listed in a vertical arrangement. The phrase, "but some ideas out of order" was discarded from sub-category 2. (See Scale III, Organization, Appendix).
The construction of the final category of elaborative writing was postponed as long as possible as the group could not arrive at any general agreement as to what constituted flow of ideas. According to Webster an idea is "any object of the mind existing in thought; a notion, or mental impression." The problem was how would it be possible to avoid counting mental impressions in order to measure the flow of ideas? If a composition has many mental impressions does that make it superior writing in regard to flow of ideas? Further research revealed that flow of ideas was also mentioned as associative writing or elaborative writing. The group decided that the term elaborative writing was a more suitable, descriptive name for this fourth category of the scale. The first attempt at a definition was: "elaborative writing is that form of fluent expression which summons a variety of appropriate, related thoughts." All the descriptive terminology that was discovered in the research reading was arranged in the four sub-categories. (See Scale 1, Elaborative Writing, Appendix).

As soon as Scale I for elaborative writing was completed certain changes seemed to be necessary. The definition was too similar to the definition for organization because of the inclusion of the phrase "appropriate and related thoughts." It was changed to read: "Elaborative writing is an abundance of ideas fluently expressed." The format of the sub-categories was rearranged to correspond to the format of the other
three categories. The contents of each sub-category were radically changed and such phrases as "full of life",
"experiential", "shows author's complete understanding and grasp", and "ideas are inappropriate" were eliminated. In sub-category 0 two additions were made: "ideas suggested but never fully carried out" and "jumbled and disassociated thoughts". (See Scale II, Elaborative Writing, Appendix).

Thirty compositions were rated using this revised scale for elaborative writing and sub-categories 2 and 1 were found to be very ambiguous. The definition was unsatisfactory as it was noticed from the rating of the compositions that ideas were related where good elaborative writing was evident. The definition was changed again to read: "Elaborative writing is an abundance of appropriately, related ideas fluently expressed." Sub-category 2 was improved by eliminating "ideas which lack color and imagination" and "inadequate details"; and adding"ideas which flow smoothly but lack development because..." Sub-category 1 was changed by the addition of "limited" and"smooth relationships and associations"; "dearth of details" became "inadequate details" and "clarity of meaning" was changed to "continuity". (See Scale III, Elaborative Writing, Appendix).

Preliminary use of the scale to evaluate 30 compositions. -- After the four categories were constructed the group tried out the scale to determine whether it would be possible for each scorer to achieve the same scores for one
composition using the same objective measure. Thirty compositions were rated by each of the seven members of the group and a considerable variance in scores was evident.

Revision of the scale. -- From the preliminary use of the scale many weaknesses were evident in the specific definitions of the categories. In order to profit from the discrepancies of the scores each member of the group was called upon to defend her scoring of the four categories for every composition. The variations in scoring were seen to be caused by vague definitions, omissions of specific factors within a category, and the subjective evaluation of a composition in which the scorers unintentionally deviated from the scale. The vague definitions were redefined more exactly and specific factors were added.

Use of the final scale. -- Fourteen more compositions were rated by the group and the variation of the sub-category scores was narrowed to within a range of two points and more often the variation was within a range of one point. The improvements appeared to have corrected the weaknesses of the scale and to have eliminated considerable individual subjectivity.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

It was the purpose of this study to develop a scale for judging creative writing. It was hoped that use of this scale would enable raters to judge a composition more objectively and would also foster scoring which would vary little from one rater to another.

The analysis in this chapter is concerned primarily with showing statistically the amount of variability which occurred among seven raters when each graded forty-four compositions using the scale.

The first thirty tables show the ratings of seven people on each of thirty compositions. The scale used in this instance would be Scale II in the Appendix.
TABLE I

COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 6

Originality, the first category, shows greater variability among the scorers than the other three. Organization has the least variability. In the case of both elaborative writing and vocabulary one rating varies by two points of score. All other ratings are very close.

The median total score for the seven raters is 6 with a semi-interquartile range of 1.
TABLE II

COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median on total</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ratings on originality vary from 0 to 2.
Vocabulary ratings range from 0 to 2. Six scorers placed the value at 2 or 1, with only one scorer assigning the value of 0.

Organization has the least variability with four scorers rating the composition at 2, and three scorers placing the value at 3.

Elaborative writing varies from 1 to 3 with only one scorer assigning the value of 1.

The median total score is 6 with a semi-interquartile range of 2 indicating some variability in scoring.
## TABLE III

**COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 11  
Q 1.5

The ratings range from 0 to 3 on originality. Six scorers assign the value of 2 or 3. Only one scorer places the value at 0.

The range of ratings on vocabulary varies from 2 to 3 with a modal score of 2.

The same variability is evident on organization but the modal score is 3.

Six of the raters assign a value of 3 on elaborative thinking and only one deviates with a score of 2.

The median of the total scores is 11. The semi-interquartile range of 1.5 shows slight variability among the raters.
### TABLE IV
COMPARISON OF RATINGS - COMPOSITION 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median on total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the scores under originality range from 0 to 2, the majority of raters place the value at 1 with one person assigning the value of 0 and the other placing the value at 2.

Vocabulary shows little variability with 6 raters assigning a score of 2 and one rater a value of 1.

The scores under organization show a variation of two points. The modal score is 3 with two raters scoring the composition at 1.

Elaborative thinking shows a variation of two points of score. The modal score is 2.

The median total score is 8 with a semi-interquartile range of 2.5 showing considerable variability in the total scoring.
TABLE V

COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 3
Q 2

Although the scores under originality range from 0 to 2, only one rater gave a score of 2.

The scores for vocabulary show the least variation with ratings of 1 and 2.

Organization shows a wide spread of scores from 0 to 3. With the exception of one rating of 3, all the scores under elaborative writing are very close, either 0 or 1.

The median total score is 3 with a semi-interquartile range of 2 showing some variability of scoring.
### TABLE VI
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median on total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the ratings under originality are very close with scores of 0 and 1 with the exception of one score of 3.

The scores for vocabulary show little variation as all ratings are 1 and 2.

Organization shows a spread of scores from 1 to 3.

The variation of scores for elaborative writing ranges from 1 to 3.

The median total score is 5 with a semi-interquartile range of 2 showing some variability of scoring.
### TABLE VII

**COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median on total</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ratings on originality range from 0 to 2 with five raters assigning a value of 0.

In vocabulary the ratings vary from 0 to 2 with a modal score of 1.

The raters ranged from 1 to 3 on organization. The modal rating is 2.

On elaborative writing the ratings range from 1 to 3 with five raters assigning a value of 2.

The median of the total scores is 5. The semi-interquartile range of 2 shows some variability in scoring.
### TABLE VIII

**COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total: $\overline{Q} = 3.5$

The raters vary widely in originality, with scores of 0 to 3. Three raters give scores of 3, two give scores of 1, and two give scores of 0.

A divergence occurs in the ratings of vocabulary, with a range from 1 to 3. Four scorers give scores of 1, two give 2 as a score, and one gives a score of 3.

Variability from 0 to 3 occurs in the organization category. Four raters agree on scores of 3, and the remaining three raters give independent scores of 0, 1, and 2 respectively.

In elaborative writing the scores range from 1 to 3. Three raters give scores of 3, three agree on 2 as a score,
and one gives 1 as a score.

The median total score is 7 and the semi-interquartile range is 3.5 showing considerable variation in both instances.

**TABLE IX**

**COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 4
Q 1.5

In originality there is agreement among the raters with one giving a score of 1.

Four raters give scores of 1, and three give scores of 0 in the category vocabulary.

A wide variance occurs in the organization category, where scores range from 1 to 3, with three raters giving scores of 2, two giving scores of 1, and two giving scores of 3.

Elaborative writing shows slight variance with five
raters giving 1 as a score, and two raters giving scores of 2.

The median total score is 4 showing some variation and the semi-interquartile range is 1.5 showing slight variation.

**TABLE X**

**COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total $Q_2 = 3$

In the category of originality the scores show a variance from 0 to 2. Five of the raters agree on a 0 rating, one rates 1 and one rates 2.

Vocabulary shows some variance with four raters giving scores of 0 and three raters giving scores of 1.

A wide variance occurs in the organization category with three raters giving scores of 2, two raters giving scores of 3 and two raters giving scores of 1.

In elaborative writing the scores vary from 2 to 1 with
three raters giving scores of 2 and four giving scores of 1.

The median total score is 3 and the semi-interquartile range is 2 showing some variability among the raters.

**TABLE XI**

**COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median on total</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Originality, the first category shows no variability. Vocabulary also shows no variation among the raters.

In organization the majority of the raters do not vary; however, two give scores of 1.

Elaborative writing shows a slight variance with three scores of 1 and four scores of 0.

The median total score is 1 with a semi-interquartile range of .5 showing little variability in over-all score.
# TABLE XII

**COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median on total** 3

Originality shows a variation from 3 to 0. The other scores range from 0 to 1.

Vocabulary shows variation of scores from 0 to 2. Only one rater uses the score of 2.

Organization, the third category, shows variability ranging from 3 to 0.

Elaborative writing scores indicate that raters vary from 0 to 2 in this category.

The median on total is 3 with the semi-interquartile range of 3 which shows a marked variability.
TABLE XIII

COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 7
Q 2.5

Originality shows a wide range of variation with three scores of 3, three scores of 1 and one score of 0.

An inspection of vocabulary shows a majority of the scores at 2 with one rater giving the composition 3, and 2 other raters giving a score of 1.

Variance of scores is very slight in organization with all except 1 rater giving a score of 2. One rater varies slightly by rating it 3.

The median on total is 7 with a semi-interquartile range of 2.5 showing some variability.
### TABLE XIV

**COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total  7
Q  2.5

Variation in the first category, originality, is wide with a range of scores from 3 to 0. The majority of raters give the score of 3, but two raters give a score of 1.

Vocabulary ratings show a majority of scores at 2, with two scores of 0.

All scores on organization are either 2 or 1, with 6 raters agreeing with the score of 2.

On elaborative writing the majority of the scores fall at 2 or 3 with one rater giving the composition a score of 1.

The median on the total score is 7. The semi-interquartile range is 2.5 showing considerable variance.
### TABLE XV

**COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 11

Median on total 11

- Originality shows only one varying score of 2 with all other raters giving the score of 3.
- Scores on vocabulary are all 2 or 3, with four scores of 3.
- Organization evidences negligible variance with six scores at 3 and one score at 2.
- Every rater gives a score of 3 in elaborative writing.
- With a median on total of 11, and a semi-interquartile range of .5, there is very slight variance in overall scoring.
TABLE XVI
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS — COMPOSITION 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 7
Q  1

Four raters give 0 for score in originality. Other raters range from scores of 3 to 1.

Vocabulary scores include five ratings of 2 with two scores of 1.

On inspection, organization presents: four scores of 3 with two scores of 1 and one score of 2.

Elaborative writing shows scores ranging from 3 to 1 with a majority of scores at 2.

Seven is the median on total. The semi-4thterquartile of 1 shows slight variability of ratings.
TABLE XVII
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 5  
Q 1.5

The greatest consistency in scoring is found in the category of originality where each rater gives a score of 0 with the exception of one who gives 3.

Elaborative writing shows a high consistency with six raters giving a score of 2 and the seventh scoring 3.

High consistency is shown in vocabulary scores, also, where five rate 1 and two rate 2.

The greatest variability is to be found in organization with three scores of 2, two scores of 3 and two scores of 1.

The median total score for the seven raters is 5 with a semi-interquartile range of 1.5 showing slight variability.
TABLE XVIII

COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 7
Q 2

A high consistency in the category of vocabulary is indicated by six ratings of 0 and one of 3.

The range in vocabulary is from 0 to 2 showing some variation. Four raters give 2, two raters give 1, and one rater gives 0.

A range of 3 to 1 occurs in the ratings of organization where four give 3, two give 2, and one gives 1.

Some variation is shown in the category of elaborative writing with scores ranging from 3 to 1. Four scorers rate 2, two scorers rate 3 and one scorer rates 1.

The median total score is 7 with a semi-interquartile range of 2 showing some variation.
TABLE XIX
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 6
Q 2

The scores in originality range from 0 to 2 showing some variation. Four scores rate 0, two scorers rate 2, and one rates 0.

Vocabulary shows a slight variation in scores with a range from 1 to 2. Four scorers give a rating of 2 and three scorers give a rating 1.

Slight variation is seen in organization where there is a range of 2 to 3. There are four scores of 3 and three scores of 2.

Elaborative writing shows a variance in scores from 2 to 3. Five scorers rate 3 and two scorers rate 2.

The median total score is 6 with a semi-interquartile range of 2 showing some variation.
### TABLE XX
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median on total</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A consistency among five raters giving a score of 0 in originality shows slight variation. One scorer rates 1 and one rates 2.

Scores in vocabulary range from 0 to 2 showing some variation. Three scorers rate 0, two scorers rate 2 and two scorers rate 0.

Three scores of 2, three scores of 1, and one score of 3 shows great variation in organization.

Scores in elaborative writing show a slight range from 1 to 2. Four scorers rate 2 and three scorers rate 1.

The total median is 5. The semi-interquartile score is 2.5 which shows some variation.
TABLE XXI
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 5
Q 2

Six raters assign a value of 0 to originality. The one rater who deviates assigned a value of 2.

The ratings on vocabulary range from 0 to 3 with a modal score of 1.

The ratings on organization vary from 0 to 3 with a modal rating of 2.

On elaborative writing the score ranges from 0 to 2 with a modal score of 2.

The median on the total score is 5 with a semi-inter-quartile range of 2.
TABLE XXII
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 3

Originality has the least variability in rating. Six people score the composition at 0, and one scores it at 1.

Vocabulary ratings range from 0 to 2. Five scorers rate the composition at 0 while one scorer rates it at 2 and the other rates it at 1.

In organization the ratings range from 0 to 2, with the majority of ratings at 2 or 1. Only one rater uses the score of 0.

In elaborative writing the ratings are all 2 or 1.

The median total score is 3 with a semi-interquartile range of 1 showing slight variability in over-all score.
TABLE XXIII
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 9
Q 1.5

An inspection of the ratings under originality shows that the scores vary from 0 to 3, although three scorers rate the composition 2.

Vocabulary ratings range from 1 to 3, with all but one rater placing the score at 2 or 1.

Each rater gives organization the score of 3.

In elaborative writing, four people score the composition at 3 and three score it at 2.

The median total score is 9 with a semi-interquartile range of 1.5 showing slight variability in over-all score.
TABLE XXIV

COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 10

Q 2.5

The first category, originality, shows the greatest variability, although the majority of raters give the composition a value of 3.

In vocabulary, the ratings are 2 or 1 with five scorers placing the value at 2.

In organization, four scorers rate 3 and three scorers rate 2.

The fourth category, elaborative writing, again shows a variability of one with four scorers placing the value at 3 and three scorers placing the value at 2.

The median total score is 10 with a semi-interquartile range of 2.5 showing some variability in over-all score.
TABLE XXV

COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 2

The first category, originality, shows no variation of scores.

In the categories of vocabulary, organization and elaborative writing, only two values are assigned, with a variation of one point in each category.

The median total score is 2 with a semi-interquartile range of .5 indicating that there is slight variation among the raters.
### TABLE XXVI
**COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 26**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median on total** 6

**Q 2.5**

In the rating on originality, the scores vary from 0 to 3, with a majority rating a value of 2.

Vocabulary shows the least variation of scores, ranging from 1 to 2.

Organization and elaborative writing are rated values of from 1 to 3.

The median for the total score is 6 with a semi-interquartile range of 2.5 which indicates that the total scores do not vary widely.
TABLE XXVII
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total \( \bar{Q} 7 \)

Only the two values of 0 and 3 are assigned in the category of originality. Five raters use the 3 value, two use 0.

Vocabulary has a variation of from 0 to 3. Five raters assign a value of 1, one uses 3 and the other 0.

The variation of scores in organization ranges from 1 to 3. The scores are fairly evenly distributed.

Elaborative writing has a variation of 3 points with a modal score of 3.

The median total score is 7. The semi-interquartile range of 3 indicates considerable variability in scoring.
TABLE XXVIII
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 10
Q 2

The category organization shows the greatest consistency with six rating a score of 3 and one rating a score of 2.

Elaborative writing shows only a slight variability with four rating it 3 and three rating it 2.

Vocabulary ratings vary from 2 to 3, with four giving a score of 3 and three giving a score of 2.

On originality the ratings vary from 0 to 3, with the majority rating 1 and 2, and only one rating it 0.

The median total score is 10 with a semi-interquartile range of 2 showing some variability in the over-all score.
### TABLE XXIX
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total Q .5

An inspection of the ratings of originality shows a variation of 0 to 2. Only one rater assigns a score of 2 while six give a score of 0.

Vocabulary ratings show a variation of 0 to 2 with the majority scoring 0 and 1 and only one rating a score of 2.

Organization shows a variation of 0 to 3, with the majority rating 1.

Elaborative writing shows a variation of 0 to 2, with five rating a score of 1; one giving a score of 0, and one giving a score of 2.

The median total score is 3 and the semi-interquartile range is .5 showing a slight variability on the over-all scores.
### TABLE XXX
COMPARISONS OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 6
Q 1.5

An inspection of the scores under originality shows a variation from 0 to 3.

Vocabulary scores range from 1 to 2 with a modal score of 1.

Organization scores range from 1 to 3 with a modal score of 2. This is true also of elaborative writing.

The median on the total score is 6 with a semi-interquartile range of 1.5 showing some variability in scoring.
After analyzing the scores on the thirty compositions, the writers revised the scale. (See Scale III - Final Scale in the Appendix). Fourteen more compositions were each rated by seven people using the new scale.

**TABLE XXXI**

**COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 31**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 7

An inspection of the ratings under originality shows that the scores vary from 0 to 3 although the majority of the ratings are 1 and 2.

Vocabulary ratings range from 0 to 2 with all but one rater placing the score at 1 or 2.

In organization the ratings are all 2 or 3 with the exception of one score which is 0.

Elaborative thinking has the least variability in rating.
Six people score the composition at 2, and one scores it at 3.

The median total score is 7 with a semi-interquartile range of .5 showing little variability in over-all score.

**TABLE XXXII**

**COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 32**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median on total** 3 1

All raters give a value of 0 on originality.

Vocabulary shows a variance of only 1 point with a modal score of 0.

In organization six people give a rating of 2 but one person assigns a score of 0.

Elaborative writing shows little variability with six raters assigning a value of 1 and one rater using 0.

The median on the total score is 3 with a semi-interquartile range of 1 showing little variability in rating.
## TABLE XXXIII

**COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 33**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median on total</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the rating on originality only two values are assigned, 0 and 1. The same variability is apparent in the ratings of vocabulary and organization with only one point of difference between the two scores assigned.

The scores on elaborative writing vary from 0 to 2. Five people assign a value of 1. One rater uses 0, the other 2.

The median for the total score is 5 with a semi-interquartile range of 1.5 indicating the total scores do not vary widely.
### TABLE XXXIV
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 7

Originality shows a variability of two points ranging from 0 to 2 with a modal score of 2.

On vocabulary the ratings are very close with a range of only one point between ratings. Five ratings fall at 2.

Organization again shows 2 points of difference between scores, three raters assigning a value of 3, three a value of 2 and one a value of 1.

Elaborative thinking shows only two scores; four raters assigning a value of 1 and three raters using 2.

The median total score is 7 with a semi-interquartile range of 1, indicating slight variability in over-all scoring.
### TABLE XXXV
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median on total</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The categories of originality and vocabulary are rated 0 by all seven raters.

Organization shows a difference of two points of score ranging from 0 to 2.

In elaborative writing the variation is from 0 to 1 with five raters using the value of 1.

The median total score is 2 with a semi-interquartile range of 1 indicating only slight variability in the over-all score.
### TABLE XXXVI

**COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 36**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 9

The first category, originality, shows the greatest variability in ratings ranging from 1 to 3. Two raters give a score of 1; two give a score of 3, and three give a score of 2.

Vocabulary ratings appear to show a variability of 1 to 3, but five scorers give a rating of 2.

There appears to be a spread of ratings from 1 to 3 in organization, but five scorers give a score of 3 in this category.

Elaborative writing shows the greatest variability from 1 to 2 with four giving a rate of 2, two giving a rate of 1 and only one giving a rate of 3.
The median total score is 9 with a semi-interquartile range of 2 showing some variability in the total scores.

TABLE XXXVII
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 8  
Q 2.5

The ratings on originality range from 0 to 3 with a modal score of 1.

Vocabulary ratings spread from 0 to 2 with a modal rating of 1.

All ratings on organization are placed at 3.

In elaborative writing the ratings range from 1 to 3 with a modal score of 3.

The median on the total scores is 8. The semi-interquartile range of 2.5 shows some variability among the raters.
### TABLE XXXVIII
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total: 3

The raters are most consistent on the category of vocabulary with six people assigning a value of 0 and only one using 0.

The ratings on originality vary from 0 to 2. The modal score is 1.

The ratings on organization vary from 0 to 2 and are rather evenly distributed.

The ratings on elaborative writing also vary from 0 to 2. The modal score is 1.

The median total score is 3 with a semi-interquartile range of 1 indicating only slight variability among the raters.
TABLE XXXIX
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 4
Q 1.5

The ratings on originality range from 0 to 1 with a modal score of 1.

The ratings on vocabulary spread from 0 to 2 but five of the raters place the score at 0.

The raters are equally consistent on organization. Five rate the category with a score of 3.

The ratings on elaborative writing vary from 0 to 2 with a modal score of 1.

The median on the total score is 4 with a semi-interquartile range of 1.5 showing only slight variation among the ratings.
### TABLE XL
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median on total** 5

**Q** 2

In originality the scores are all 0 or 1.

In vocabulary the ratings are all 2 or 1, with five raters placing the score at 1.

In organization the raters vary from 0 to 3 and the grades were fairly even in distribution.

The grades on elaborative writing varied from 0 to 2 with a modal score of 1.

The median on the total scores is 5. The semi-interquartile range of 2 shows some variability in scoring.
TABLE XLI

COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total: 1

The scores on originality and elaborative writing show that five raters assigned a value of 0 to each category with the same rater showing a slight variation by assigning a score of 1.

Vocabulary has a score of 0 by six raters; only one of the raters assigning 2.

In organization only two scores are assigned, 0 and 1. The modal score is 0.

The median on the total score is 1, with a semi-interquartile range of .5. The variability in scoring is very slight.
### TABLE XLII
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 3
Q 0.5

Inspection of the table indicates the ratings are very close throughout.

Originality ratings vary from 0 to 1. The modal score is 0.

Vocabulary ratings range from 0 to 1. The modal score is 1.

Organization scores range from 0 to 2. The modal score is 1.

Elaborative writing scores range from 0 to 3. The modal score is 1.

The median total score is 3 with a semi-interquartile range of 0.5 indicating only slight variability among raters.
TABLE XLIII
COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median on total 7
Q 1

Originality shows little variation among raters with a modal score of 1.

Vocabulary also shows only one point of variation with a modal score of 1.

There is no variation at all in the rating of organization.

Elaborative writing shows a variation of one point of score with a modal rating of 2.

The median total score is 7 with a semi-interquartile range of 1 indicating slight variability in overall score.
### TABLE XLIV

**COMPARISON OF SEVEN RATINGS - COMPOSITION 44**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median on total** | 7  
**Q** | 1.5

On originality the ratings vary from 0 to 2 with a modal score of 1.

The variation of vocabulary ratings is only one point. The modal score is 2.

In rating organization the raters vary from 0 to 3.

The scores on elaborative writing vary from 0 to 2 with a modal score of 1.

The median total score is 7 with a semi-interquartile range of 1.5 showing slight variability in the total ratings.
It was felt that the scale should be used by people who had not concentrated on its construction. Thirty-seven people enrolled in a class in the University were given the same composition and a copy of the scale. Each used the scale to rate the composition. The following table shows the variability among the thirty-seven different raters.

**TABLE XLV**

**COMPARISON OF 37 RATINGS ON ONE COMPOSITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Originality</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Elaborative</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Md. 1  Md. 3  Md. 3  Md. 3  Md. 11  
Q .5  Q .5  Q .5  Q 0  Q 1
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It was the purpose of this study to construct an objective scale to evaluate creative writing.

The writers feel that the following information is pertinent.

Research indicated these conclusions:
1. That a creative writing scale could fill a useful purpose.
2. That these four categories, Originality, Vocabulary, Organization and Elaborative Writing were important qualities in creative writing.

In building the scale it was found that:
1. A great deal of time and deliberation were necessary to find terms that were clear and suitable for defining the categories.
2. No matter how carefully the categories were worded, the terms still allowed for some subjective judgments. For example, What is an original idea? or, Is this or is it not a relevant idea?

Use of the scale indicated the following conclusions:
1. After the first use of the scale the semi-interquartile range for thirty compositions was from .5 to 3.5. Use of the revised scale on fourteen compositions
showed an interquartile range from .5 to 2.5. This indicated less variability in semi-interquartile range when the revised scale was used.

2. After the first use of the scale on thirty compositions, the following percentages of scores fell between .5 and 3.5 semi-interquartile range:

- 40.0% fell between .5 and 1.5
- 30.0% fell at 2
- 20.0% fell at 2.5
- 6.7% fell at 3
- 3.3% fell at 3.5

After use of the revised scale on fourteen compositions the following percentages of scores fell between .5 and 2.5 semi-interquartile range:

- 78.5% fell between .5 and 1.5
- 14.3% fell at 2
- 7.2% fell at 2.5

It should be noted that a higher percentage of scores fell between .5 and 1.5 semi-interquartile range with use of the revised scale. This indicated that the ratings with the revised scale were more nearly alike.

3. Variances even at the last use of the scale were great enough so that pure objectivity of the instrument is without proof.

4. The raters, as teachers, were definitely more analytical in creative writing evaluation because the scale forced them to evaluate particular qualities and not general merit.

5. Even though the statistical evidence shows the scale
lacks complete objectivity for research purposes, the
teachers who became familiar with the scale through constant
personal use found that it helped in the evaluation of
creative writing by focusing attention on definite qualities
and thereby was a useful diagnostic tool.

6. Organization seemed to be the quality of creative
writing which had the highest scores on the largest number
of compositions.

7. Originality was the quality which was the most
difficult to score with the scale.

8. Organization and vocabulary were the qualities
which were the easiest to score with the scale.

9. The scale was not too time-consuming to be of
practical value. Rather, once a teacher was able to use the
scale she could make quicker and more reliable judgments.
CHAPTER VI

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The following suggestions are offered by the writers for further research:

1. Wider use of the scale by a larger number of teachers.

2. Use of the scale by people thoroughly familiar with it for measuring results from experimental and control groups in research.

3. Further revision and refinement of the scale to try to increase its objectivity.

4. Comparison of this scale with other existing creative writing measures.

5. Use of the scale by teachers and pupils together to clarify markings.

6. Trial of the scale with junior high or high school pupils in self-evaluation, to determine if pupils' compositions would improve because of a better understanding of the goals of creative writing.
SCALE I

Originality

Definition: An original composition contains unusual thoughts and/or unique arrangements of ordinary words to give freshness to a common idea.

3 Unique idea or words so arranged throughout to produce an unusual effect; different, unexpected idea; individual way of expressing ordinary thoughts; new way of telling something; unusual placement of words; fresh interpretation of same old idea by unusual play on words or word order.

2 Frequent use of words arranged so as to produce an unusual effect.

1 Occasional use of words arranged so as to produce an unusual effect.

0 Conventional ideas and/or commonplace word patterns.
SCALE I

Vocabulary

Definition: Use of words to express a particular thought or idea.

3 Consistently uses a variety of clear, precise, vivid words; uses synonyms and antonyms to enhance word pictures; each action is clearly shown by use of word pictures; has colorful, picturesque, effective similes and metaphors; correct use of words; unusually descriptive words; words that appeal to the senses; has choice selective words to develop shades of meaning.

2 Child uses words that are adequately descriptive, but composition lacks an overall excellence in word choices; sporadic use of vivid words or phrases; some variety.

1 Child uses some appropriate words, but composition lacks variety of word choices; very few descriptive or picture words; common overworked similes and/or metaphors; words that produce vague, inaccurate or confusing impressions.

0 Uses commonplace words without variety; trite, ineffective, dull words which are monotonous or lack variety; confused word meanings.
SCALE I

Organization

Definition: Organization is the sequential organization of ideas.

3 Composition has continuity and logical, clear arrangement of relevant thoughts; no irrelevant details; uses details for clarity; build-up of ideas exactly suitable to express mood of story; main ideas fully expressed; all minor ideas support major idea.

2 Composition states main idea but lacks continuity and logical clear arrangement of relevant thoughts; no irrelevant ideas but some ideas out of order; not consistent in building up of ideas that express mood created; main ideas fully expressed; some minor ideas poorly arranged.

1 Main idea is suggested but contains irrelevant ideas; relevant ideas poorly developed and illogically arranged; few details used for clarity; jumbled arrangement of thoughts detracts from mood; important elements of composition placed where they are least effective.

0 Composition creates overall impression of disorder; illogical sequence; disorganized, needless digression; irrelevant material more prominent than topic; minor ideas dwarfing major ideas.
SCALE I

Elaborative Writing

Definition: Elaborative writing is that form of fluent expression which summons a variety of appropriate, related thoughts.

3 Ideas follow one after the other easily, naturally and appropriately; clearness of expression or clarity in supporting details; detail ideas are colorful, full of life, unrestrained; imaginative or experiential material shows author's complete understanding and grasp, and is rich in feeling and wide in scope.

2 Ideas are clear and appropriate, but details are sparse; ideas are appropriate.

1 Ideas are stilted or restrained; ideas are jumbled and unclear; appropriate details combined with inappropriate ones.

0 Dearth of detail; forced, inappropriate ideas; barrenness of expression; no detail at all.
SCALE II

Originality

Definition: An original composition contains unusual thoughts and/or unique arrangements of ordinary words to give freshness to a common idea.

Rate 3 if the composition contains the following:
unique ideas or words so arranged throughout to produce an unusual effect; different, unexpected ideas or individual ways of expressing ordinary thoughts; new ways of telling something; unusual placement of words; fresh interpretation of an old idea by unusual playon words or word order.

Rate 2 if the composition contains the following:
frequent use of words arranged so as to produce an unusual effect.

Rate 1 if the composition contains the following:
occasional use of words arranged so as to produce an unusual effect.

Rate 0 if the composition contains the following:
conventional ideas; commonplace word patterns.
SCALE II
Vocabulary

Definition: Use of words to express a particular thought or idea.

Rate 3 if the composition contains the following:
- a variety of clear, precise words; unusually descriptive and vivid words; words that appeal to the senses; choice selective words which develop shades of meaning; actions clearly shown by use of specific words; synonyms and antonyms which enhance word pictures; colorful, picturesque, effective similes and/or metaphors.

Rate 2 if the composition contains the following:
- words that are adequately descriptive but lack over-all excellence; sporadic use of vivid words or phrases; some good similes and/or metaphors.

Rate 1 if the composition contains the following:
- some appropriate words; little variety of word choice; very few descriptive or picture words; common over-worked similes and/or metaphors; words that produce vague, inaccurate or confusing impressions.

Rate 0 if the composition contains the following:
- only commonplace words without variety; trite ineffective, dull words which are monotonous; confused word meanings.
SCALE II
Organization

Definition: Organization is the sequential arrangement of ideas.

Rate 3 if the composition contains the following:
continuity and logical clear arrangement of relevant thoughts; no irrelevant details; build-up of ideas exactly suitable to express mood of story; main idea fully expressed; all minor ideas supporting major idea.

Rate 2 if the composition contains the following:
main idea clearly stated, but relevant thoughts lack continuity and logical, clear arrangement; no irrelevant ideas, but some ideas out of order; no consistency in build-up of ideas that express mood created; main idea fully expressed; some minor ideas poorly arranged.

Rate 1 if the composition contains the following:
a main idea with some irrelevant ideas; relevant ideas poorly developed and illogically arranged; jumbled arrangement of thoughts which detracts from mood; important elements of composition placed where they are least effective.

Rate 0 if the composition contains the following:
overall impression of disorder; illogical sequence of ideas; disorganized, needlss digression; irrelevant material more prominent than topic; minor ideas dwarfing major ideas.
Elaborative Writing

Definition: Elaborative writing is an abundance of ideas fluently expressed.

Rate 3 if the composition contains the following:
- a wealth of ideas which have depth, scope and feeling;
- full treatment of the subject through ample, unrestrained details which give clarity and color;
- associated ideas follow each other easily and naturally.

Rate 2 if the composition contains the following:
- ideas which are clear but lack color and imagination;
- incomplete treatment of subject due to inadequate details.

Rate 1 if the composition contains the following:
- ideas which are stilted and restrained; jumbled and disassociated thoughts; dearth of details which prevents clarity of meaning.

Rate 0 if the composition contains the following:
- ideas suggested but never fully carried out; no details;
- bareness of expression; confused impressions.
SCALE FOR EVALUATION OF CREATIVE WRITING

Manual of Directions for Final Scale

For ease and facility in using this scale the teacher should be thoroughly familiar with the definitions of each of the four categories - Originality, Vocabulary, Organization and Elaborative Writing, and the descriptive phrases for each of the sub-categories.

Each one of the four categories is divided into four sub-categories. Each sub-category represents a numerical value; the values range from 3 to 0. The underlined words in a sub-category state the qualities that must be present for a composition to merit the corresponding value. The descriptive phrases which follow help to define the underlined words.

Procedure for scoring:
1. Be thoroughly familiar with the scale.
2. Read the composition.
3. Refer to the first category - Originality.
   a. Read the definition.
   b. Read the underlined words in each sub-category.
   c. Refer to descriptive phrases for clarification.
   d. Select the sub-category that best describes the composition.
   e. Score the composition with the corresponding numerical value.
4. Use the above procedure for each of the other categories.

5. Tally the four scores to obtain your total. Twelve represents the maximum score; zero represents the minimum score.
SCALE III - FINAL SCALE

Originality

Definition: An original composition contains unusual thoughts and/or unique arrangements of ordinary words to give freshness to a common idea.

Rate 3 if the composition contains the following:

- unique different or unexpected ideas or words arranged throughout to produce an unusual effect.
- individual interpretations of ordinary thoughts
- new ways of telling something
- unusual placement of words
- fresh interpretation of an old idea by unusual play on words or word order

Rate 2 if the composition contains the following:

- frequent use of original ideas or frequent use of words arranged so as to produce an unusual effect.

Rate 1 if the composition contains the following:

- occasional use of original ideas; or occasional use of words arranged so as to produce an unusual effect.

Rate 0 if the composition contains the following:

- conventional ideas; commonplace word patterns.
SCALE III - FINAL SCALE

Vocabulary

Definition: Use of words to express a particular thought or idea.

Rate 3 if the composition contains the following:

- a variety of clear, precise words and unusually descriptive and vivid words.
- words that appeal to the senses
- choice selective words which develop shades of meaning
- actions clearly shown by use of specific words
- synonyms and antonyms which enhance word pictures
- colorful, picturesque, effective similes and/or metaphors

Rate 2 if the composition contains the following:

- words that are adequately descriptive but lack overall excellence.
- sporadic use of vivid words or phrases
- some good similes and/or metaphors

Rate 1 if the composition contains the following:

- some appropriate words with little variety of word choice
- very few descriptive or picture words
- common overworked similes and/or metaphors
- words that produce vague impressions

Rate 0 if the composition contains the following:

- only commonplace words without variety.
- trite, ineffective, dull words which are monotonous
SCALE III - FINAL SCALE

Organization

Definition: Organization is the sequential arrangement of ideas.

Rate 3 if the composition contains the following:

- continuity and logical clear arrangement of relevant thoughts.
  - no irrelevant details
  - build-up of ideas exactly suitable to express mood of story
  - main idea fully expressed
  - all minor ideas supporting major idea

Rate 2 if the composition contains the following:

- main idea clearly stated, but relevant thoughts lack continuity and logical clear arrangement.
  - no irrelevant ideas
  - no consistency in build-up of ideas that express mood created
  - main idea fully expressed
  - some minor ideas poorly arranged

Rate 1 if the composition contains the following:

- a main idea with some irrelevant ideas.
  - relevant ideas poorly developed and illogically arranged
  - jumbled arrangement of thoughts which detract from mood
  - important elements of composition placed where they are least effective
Rate 0 if the composition contains the following:

overall impression of disorder because of illogical sequence of ideas.

- disorganized, needless digression
- irrelevant material more prominent than topic
- minor ideas dwarfing major ideas
SCALE III - FINAL SCALE

Elaborative Writing

Definition: Elaborative writing is an abundance of appropriately related ideas fluently expressed.

Rate 3 if the composition contains the following:
- a wealth of ideas which have depth, scope, and feeling.
  - full treatment of the subject through ample, unrestrained details which give clarity and color
  - associated ideas which are fully developed and follow each other easily and naturally

Rate 2 if the composition contains the following:
- ideas which are clear and flow smoothly but lack full development because of incomplete treatment of the subject.

Rate 1 if the composition contains the following:
- limited ideas or stilted and restrained ideas which prevent continuity, smooth relationships and associations.
  - inadequate details

Rate 0 if the composition contains the following:
- ideas suggested but never carried out.
  - no details
  - barrenness of expression
  - confused impressions
  - jumbled and disassociated thoughts
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