The CATESOL Journal

JANET LANE, ELLEN LANGE,
and MARY LOWRY
University of California, Davis

ESL Students at Risk: Identification and Intervention

■ **The lowest level ESL students in a college or university writing program usually represent a small, seldom-studied population. However, administrators and instructors concerned with retention and counseling need data on this group of high-risk students to improve their chances of succeeding academically. A significant percentage experience academic difficulty in English composition and other classes. A study of entrance exam essays and test scores of 70 low-level ESL university students was done to determine if students' later success or failure in ESL and mainstream composition courses could be predicted. Twelve of 20 variables analyzed proved statistically significant in predicting success or failure. Language factors, sentence clarity, and identifiability of errors were significant. Factors related to essay organization and development and scores from campus-developed reading, grammar, and cloze tests also proved significant. The information from this study gives instructors and program administrators concrete, measurable warning signals for identifying potentially high-risk ESL writers.**

At the University of California, Davis, as on many university campuses, recent trends in immigration and resettlement of refugees (in combination with the usual influx of international undergraduate students wishing to obtain a degree from an American university) have caused steady growth in the number of second language students in all levels of the writing program. Once admitted to UC Davis, all nonnative English-speaking undergraduate students must meet the same writing proficiency standards as other undergraduates. Many are held for ESL courses.

Most of these second language students progress steadily in their writing skills, but program statistics have shown that within the group of students who begin in the lowest level ESL writing class,[1] a substantial subgroup fails one or more courses and is often at risk of failing at the university because of poor reading and writing skills. When trying to help such students, many instructors feel frustrated and concerned, particularly since the administration often pressures to retain these students who contribute to the diversity of the university population.

Such concerns led to a study, completed in 1990, of the lowest level students in the ESL composition program at UC Davis. This study was designed to determine whether the highest risk students within this group could be identified from information available when they entered the university so that they could be counseled and referred for extra help. In the study, a comparison was made of the characteristics of two subgroups of students within the lowest level: (a) those who successfully completed four writing courses—three ESL composition courses and English A (the writing course preparatory to the required freshman composition courses) and (b) those who failed one or more classes in this sequence. It was hypothesized that the essay which the students wrote for placement in the composition program and their various test scores might differentiate the two subgroups.

The Population

The entrance materials of 70 students who placed into the lowest level in the three academic years between fall 1986 and winter 1989 were examined for the study. Examination of the students' grades in the sequence of four writing classes revealed that by the end of fall 1989, 35 (subsequently referred to as *passing students*) had progressed in the sequence without failing any course. The other 35 students (subsequently referred to as *failing students*) had failed one or more of the writing courses, 14 of these failing only once (*one-time failing students*), and 21 failing two or more courses (*multiple failing students*).[2]

The 70 students studied, 35 males and 35 females, represented 12 language groups (in descending order of frequency): Vietnamese, Chinese, Korean, Lao, Spanish, Amharic, Indonesian, Japanese, Arabic, Burmese, Farsi, and Hungarian. Fifty-six of the 70 had attended high school in the U.S., and 14 had attended high school in a foreign country. Their mean length of time in the U.S. was 5.15 years at the time of admission to the university, ranging from a few days in the U.S. to 18 years.

Available Data

The ESL program receives several kinds of test information about these students when they enter UC Davis. Second language students from U.S. high schools have taken the SAT Exam and thus have SAT verbal scores; in addition, they usually have English Achievement (College Entrance Examination Board or CEEB) scores.[3] ESL students are also required to take a campus-developed language test which consists of a cloze passage, a multiple choice grammar test, and a reading test. All of these test scores were analyzed.

The largest factor in a student's placement in a writing class, however, is the Subject A Examination which entering University of California freshmen, both native and nonnative speakers, must take unless exempted.[4] This examination, developed by a committee of writing faculty representing all UC campuses and administered by the Educational Testing Service, consists of an essay which students write in response to a 700 - 1000 word college-level reading passage. The passage is drawn from the works of authors university freshmen typically read, such as Margaret Mead, Clyde Kluckhohn, or Robert Bellah. In the passage, the author presents an argument on a general topic. The essay question is designed to allow students to show that they can understand and discuss the author's position and integrate their own experience or knowledge into their discussion (Gadda, 1991) (see Appendix B for sample essays).

All 70 students in the UCD study failed the Subject A Examination. A subsequent evaluation of their essays was done for placement purposes. All 70 students were placed in the lowest level of the ESL writing sequence. Because these 70 students took the Subject A Examination at different times over the course of almost three years, the study involved examining essays written in response to 10 different passages. The objective of this study was to determine whether the essays of students who later passed or failed university writing classes would reveal characteristics in their writing which could serve as predictors of future risk of failure for students.

Method

A preliminary reading of 25 of the 70 papers by three readers revealed that all of the writers had had considerable difficulty responding to the question and that all of the papers contained serious and frequent sentence-level errors. This initial reading also suggested differences between essays of passing versus failing students. Based on these preliminary findings, a checklist was developed that readers could use to analyze each essay formally. The checklist (see Appendix A) consisted of 13 different indicators,

each with at least one positive and one negative value so that each essay could be scored either positively or negatively on each indicator. For example, an essay might show *an attempt to answer the question* (positive) or, conversely, it might reveal *little or no attempt to answer the question* (negative). Two of the 13 factors have three rather than two possible values because an essay might, for instance, be of *reasonable length* (positive) or be *extremely brief* or *brief* (both negative). In a few cases, both the positive and negative value of an indicator could be marked. In some papers, for example, *evidence of accurate understanding of the author's ideas* could be found along with *evidence of misreading* of some aspect of the reading passage. The factors on the essay checklist are common to grading standards in composition and are commonly used in evaluating student writing in our program.

It was hypothesized that more negative indicators would be found in papers of students who later failed one or more courses while more positive indicators would be found in papers of those students who did not fail a subsequent writing course. The checklist, thus, is not a grading rubric but rather an instrument for analyzing the essays to determine if certain trends and patterns could be identified in the initial writing sample of passing versus failing writers.

The checklist is divided into six main categories, with one or more indicators listed within each category. The categories *reading comprehension, development, organization, length,* and *use of the author's words* are self-explanatory. The category *language,* however, requires some explanation. Since all of the papers contained frequent disruptive language errors (in sentence structure, verb tense, and verb form, for example), it was decided that counting or classifying language errors would not be an effective way of distinguishing the writing of students who had failed versus those who had not. Instead, the following questions about the writer's language control were considered:

1. Are the writer's errors identifiable and/or classifiable, or are they difficult to identify?

2. Does the paper have a predominance of sentences which, though flawed, are readable, or does it have many or even a predominance of unclear sentences?

From these questions, the language indicators on the checklist were developed. If the writer's errors were frequently difficult to identify or classify (Examples 1 and 2), the negative indicator was marked.

Example 1

> Fear was a feeling that to be escaped from a frighten to be alone but we live in together. (Paper #204)

Example 2

> The title refers to us one vote which similarity of fear and anxiety over the age. (Paper #111)

If, on the other hand, the errors were generally identifiable or classifiable (Example 3), the positive indicator was marked.

Example 3

> The modern technology has provided us with convenience transportations, useful utilities to make our daily life much easier but in exchange the chance of being robbed, murder, die on plane cratch and car accidents are happened. (Paper #202)

The second language indicator (*readable* versus *unclear sentences*) has three levels of distinction listed on the checklist. An essay could have a predominance of readable sentences (positive). On the negative side, it could have either many unclear sentences which make parts of the essay incoherent or a predominance of unclear sentences making the essay incoherent overall.[5]

The following procedure was used for analyzing each of the 70 essays:

1. The readings were blind, each paper being identified by number only;

2. The three readers independently read and marked a checklist for each essay;

3. The readers met and discussed each paper and checklist;

4. When the checklists differed, the readers reread and discussed the paper and reached agreement;

5. The result for each essay was a final checklist of positive and negative values for each indicator.

The 13 indicators on the essay checklist constituted the major portion of the 20 variables analyzed in the study. Six other variables were scores from the following tests: (a) SAT total, (b) SAT verbal, (c) CEEB (English Achievement), (d) UCD cloze test, (e) UCD reading test, and (f) UCD grammar test. The final variable considered was the number of years in the U.S. at the time of entering the composition program.

The values of each of the 20 variables for passing versus failing students were compared, using both a *t* test and Mann-Whitney Test. Pearson and Spearman correlations were also calculated in order to determine the relative strength of the relationship between each variable and frequency of failure.

Results

Table 1 shows that passing and failing students differed significantly ($p<.05$) with respect to 11 of the 20 variables studied. Of these, seven were indicators from the essay checklist, and four were test scores.

Table 1
Comparison Between Passing and Failing Students on 20 Variables

Variable	Pass Mean n=35	Fail Mean n=35	DF	*t* value	*p* value *t*	*p* value Mann-Whitney
(Essay Indicators)						
Reading comprehension	2.83	2.60	34	-0.758	*ns*	*ns*
Development						
Flow of ideas	1.85	1.66	33	-1.643	0.054	*ns*
Attempt to answer question	1.62	1.43	33	-1.436	*ns*	*ns*
Use of author's ideas	1.54	1.20	34	-2.797	0.004	0.0033
Use of examples from text	1.60	1.34	34	-2.172	0.018	0.0329
Use of own examples	1.77	1.80	34	0.255	*ns*	*ns*
Organization	1.94	1.77	33	-1.713	0.048	0.0479
Language						
Identifiability of errors	1.91	1.63	33	-2.721	0.005	0.0058
Clarity of sentences	2.68	2.17	33	-3.064	0.002	0.0071
Length	2.43	2.34	34	-0.502	*ns*	*ns*
Copying	1.74	1.54	34	-1.871	0.035	*ns*
Quotes	1.97	2.00	34	1.000	*ns*	*ns*
Accuracy of quotes	1.89	1.86	34	-0.442	*ns*	*ns*
(Test Scores)						
Cloze test (% correct)	42.46	32.91	34	-1.687	0.05	0.0277
Reading test (% correct)	55.80	43.91	34	-3.195	0.001	0.002
Grammar test (% correct)	63.57	53.66	34	-2.686	0.005	0.0098
SAT verbal score	257.33	247.69	22	-0.206	*ns*	*ns*
SAT total score	760.69	730.39	21	0.423	*ns*	*ns*
CEEB (English Achievement)	333.46	285.22	16	-2.445	0.013	0.0015
Years in U.S.	5.84	4.85	30	-0.684	*ns*	*ns*

Table 2 shows the descending order of product-moment correlations between the number of fails and the variable scores. Of the 20 variables studied, 12 were significantly correlated to frequency of failing. Of these 12, eight were indicators from the checklist while four were test scores.

Table 2
Significant Correlations Between Number of Fails (Pass, One-Time Fail, Multiple Fail) and Scores on Variables

Variable	Pearson	Spearman
Language: clarity of sentences	0.43	0.41
Development: use of author's ideas	0.39	0.39
English Achievement Test (CEEB)	0.39	0.45
Reading test	0.38	0.36
Language: identifiability of errors	0.37	0.37
Organization	0.32	0.31
Grammar test	0.32	0.31
Copying	0.31	0.30
Development: flow of ideas	0.30	0.29
Cloze test	0.24	0.26
Development: attempt to answer question	0.23	0.22
Development: use of examples from text	0.23	0.23

Correlations ≥ .23 are significant at $p<.05$

For both of these analyzes, the parametric (*t* test, Pearson correlations) and nonparametric (Mann-Whitney, Spearman correlations) results were qualitatively similar.

Discussion

The results of this study have confirmed many of our expectations about what factors would be important in identifying the highest risk ESL writers.[6]

Factors Related to the Subject A Essay

As we had hypothesized, the study indicates that the Subject A essay, even though all the lowest level students perform poorly on it, can be used to differentiate between potentially passing and failing ESL students. The variables related to the essay that proved significant were not limited to language indicators but included indicators linked to the students' ability to organize and develop an essay.

It was not surprising that the two language indicators from the checklist, clarity of sentences and identifiability of errors, proved statistically significant in identifying high-risk students. (Note that, as explained in the Method section, these indicators did not measure numbers of types of

errors since all the lowest level students in the study made frequent, serious errors.) In other words, students who write unclear sentences and produce errors which are difficult for the teacher to isolate and identify will most likely have trouble learning to avoid or correct such errors. Thus, they may not improve quickly enough to move through the various levels of the course sequence without failing.

However, factors from the essay checklist other than language showed statistical significance, suggesting that sentence-level problems should not be the only criteria used to predict whether an ESL writer is potentially at high risk of failing. As we had expected, an ability to organize—that is, to shape at least one point in the essay—was important. Also important were factors related to essay development: Successful students tended to demonstrate an attempt to answer the question and some ability to incorporate the author's ideas into the body of their essay, to use examples drawn from the reading passage, and to produce a coherent flow of ideas. Moreover, the fact that copying was statistically significant suggests that many of the very weakest students, unable to organize and develop their own ideas, resort to copying portions of the reading passage. Thus, in identifying possible high-risk students, it appears that instructors can look for students' inability to organize and develop as well as weaknesses in language.

Some factors did not prove as important as anticipated. While we hypothesized that comprehension of the reading passage would be a significant predictor, the data seem to suggest otherwise. However, our problems in analyzing for reading comprehension in the essays may explain why the checklist's reading comprehension indicator was not significant. Many students, both passing and failing, incorporated so little of the reading passage into their essays that we simply were unable to judge reading comprehension. Other students, both passing and failing, showed evidence of accurate understanding of parts of the passage but misreading of other parts. Thus, what a student had written did not always enable us to determine reading comprehension clearly. However, we felt accurate reading played a role in two of the significant development variables: ability to use the author's ideas and to use examples from the reading passage in the essay. Given this finding and the fact that a student's overall reading ability proved statistically significant in the campus reading test score, reading ability appears to be an important factor in identifying potential high-risk students.

Secondly, it was originally hypothesized that essay length would be an important predictor of success or failure, but many students, both passing and failing, wrote very brief essays. Conversely, some high-risk students produced long essays which were evaluated negatively on almost all checklist indicators. Thus, a short essay alone does not necessarily identify the writer as a high-risk student.

Objective Test Scores

The results of this study also suggest that in order to assess a student's chances of success or failure, it is useful for teachers or administrators to have available not only a writing sample but also various objective test scores. All three campus-administered tests (reading, grammar, and cloze) were significant. Such scores are particularly useful as predictors because a campus has scores for all students. Although we had expected the campus cloze test to be a clear predictor of success or failure, its weak significance in this study may be explained by the constraints of the testing situation. The cloze test, which contains only 15 items, is the first test in a one-hour battery of three objective tests. Students are advised to limit the time they spend on this first test since they need considerable time to do the grammar and reading tests. A number of students, presumably finding the cloze passage too difficult to do in a short period of time, either do not attempt it at all or fill in only one or two answers. Thus, our data for this cloze test may not accurately reflect students' actual language proficiency.

The CEEB test was also statistically significant. However, this test may not be as useful a predictor as campus-administered exams since not all college students take the CEEB exam. In our study, only 49 of the 70 students had CEEB scores.

The SAT verbal score did not prove significant. This test may have proved statistically insignificant because almost all of the students scored extremely low on the exam; 86% of the scores were clustered between 200 (the lowest possible score) and 290.

Future Studies and Application

It is important to underscore that this study was done post hoc; that is, we knew which of the high-risk ESL students had failed and which had successfully progressed through the three levels of composition classes. Nevertheless, our study of these two groups enabled us to establish that instructors can use writing samples and standardized tests to pinpoint students who are at the highest risk of failing.

A follow-up study needs to be done in which the factors used in this study are applied to entering high-risk ESL students. A preliminary study done in fall 1992 indicates that the factors identified as significant are reliable predictors. In a class of 17 high-risk ESL students, the instructor identified four students as being likely to fail, using their Subject A essay exams, standardized test scores, and first-day writing samples. These students were given extra support from the beginning of the quarter as outlined in the Suggestions for Instructors section at the end of this article. Three of the four students completed the course successfully.

Conclusions

Although a formal follow-up study has not yet been done, with the information this study provides, instructors and program administrators can move from relying on intuition to having more concrete, measurable warning signals for identifying potentially high-risk students. In other words, when a student's placement essay shows a pattern of significant negative indicators and, where applicable, when the student also has low test scores, educators are better able to identify this student as being at high risk of failing in a writing class. Using the indicators identified in this study, writing instructors can identify possible high-risk students early and intervene quickly to help them improve their chances of succeeding academically and staying in the university.

Retention of High-Risk ESL Students— Suggestions for Instructors

Once certain ESL students have been identified as being high-risk, the instructor can do the following to help them:

1. The instructor can make the student aware of being high risk in composition.

Some ESL students do not realize that they are high risk in composition. Some may never have been told, while others may not have had the need or opportunity to do the type or level of analytical writing generally required in university courses. Instructors can advise high-risk students of their weak writing skills so that they will understand they need to spend as much time and energy as possible developing and strengthening their English skills rather than devoting most of their time to their other coursework (which weak students often do in their fear of failing content classes).

2. The instructor can work with the student on strategies for improvement.

Some high-risk students are very discouraged and do not have any idea where and how to begin working to improve their writing skills. As early as possible, the instructor should discuss strategies for improvement with a student. The instructor might, for instance, suggest that the student treat the composition class as a foreign language class, devoting some time to working on English skills daily. Giving constant attention to their writing is extremely important for high-risk ESL writers since they are often expected to bring their writing up to a certain standard by the end of a short 10- to 15-week term. If a student has had very little exposure to English, the instructor might suggest that the student read and listen to the radio or public television for a set amount of time every day. Another student may benefit from a systematic grammar review, perhaps with a tutor.

3. The instructor can be aware of other language factors which may be affecting the student's writing.

Factors such as poor listening comprehension may affect the student's ability to process important information in class. As a result, the student may be missing out on valuable input concerning academic writing. Likewise, poor reading skills may affect the student's writing in numerous ways. Weak readers may have difficulty understanding essay questions, reading their own or other students' writing critically, and writing essays based on reading passages. Instructors may wish to suggest to students with weak listening or reading skills that they need to focus some attention on improving in these important skill areas as well.

4. The instructor can direct the student to available campus resources.

The instructor will want to inform high-risk ESL writers about available campus resources and encourage these students to use them. Individual tutoring by a writing specialist or student tutor may be available. In addition, supervised reading help may be available. Academic counseling, perhaps for a reduced workload, or personal counseling may also be helpful for some students. ■

Footnotes

1. Twenty to 25 students per year are placed in this lowest level. This figure, which has remained constant over a period of four academic years, represents about 12-15% of those students placed in ESL courses.

2. Not all of the 70 students had had enough time at UCD to complete the entire sequence at the time of the study, but all passing students have since successfully completed the fourth course. Eight of the failing students left school before completing the sequence, sometimes by their own choice, sometimes on the decision of their college. Passing students who left school before completing the sequence were not included in the study since it could not be predicted whether or not they would have failed a course if they had stayed.

3. A few (6 out of 70) other students submit a TOEFL score, and still others are admitted without scores (some political refugees and community college transfers.) Since SATV and CEEB scores were available for the majority, these were the standardized scores analyzed for the study.

4. Entering students who scored over 600 on the College Board's English Composition Achievement Test or received a 3 or higher on the Advanced Placement Exam for English are exempt.

5. Two language indicators (identifiable/nonidentifiable errors and readable/unclear sentences) seem necessary because some papers were found to have identifiable errors yet numerous unclear sentences. Also, it was hypothesized that certain kinds of errors (word choice, for example), would be identifiable even though they would lead to unclear sentences and ideas. Student Essay 2 in Appendix B illustrates this latter point.

6. We recognize, of course, that other, less easily measured factors such as the lack of a strong survival network, emotional or physical problems, poor study skills, motivation/attitude problems or even an undetected learning disability can also contribute to a student's failure.

Janet Lane is a lecturer in linguistics and coordinator of ESL courses for graduate students at the University of California, Davis, where she teaches ESL and composition classes. She is also coauthor of Writing Clearly: An Editing Guide *and* Writing Clearly: Responding to ESL Compositions.

Ellen Lange is a lecturer in English at the University of California, Davis, where she teaches mainstream, EOP, ESL, and computer-assisted writing classes and intensive English. She is coauthor of Writing Clearly: An Editing Guide *and* Writing Clearly: Responding to ESL Compositions *and an associate editor of* Writing on the Edge.

Mary Lowry is a lecturer in linguistics and coordinator of undergraduate ESL at the University of California, Davis. She teaches ESL, computer-assisted and mainstream composition classes.

References

Gadda, George. (1991). *The universitywide subject A examination book: A report to high schools.* Berkeley: University of California.

Appendix A
Essay Checklist

Negative Indicators **Essay #** _____

Reading Comprehension
❑ readily identifiable evidence of misreading of the reading passage **(reading comprehension)**

Development
❑ little discernible flow of ideas; lack of coherence **(flow of ideas)**
❑ little or no attempt to answer the question **(attempt to answer question)**
❑ little evidence of ability to use the author's ideas **(use of author's ideas)**
❑ no attempt to use examples from the text **(use of examples from text)**
❑ no attempt to use examples from writer's experience **(use of own examples)**

Organization
❑ no sense of shaping the whole essay or even on point **(organization)**

Language
❑ errors frequently difficult to identify and/or classify **(identifiability of errors)**
❑ a predominance of unclear sentences making the essay incoherent **(clarity of sentences)**
❑ many unclear sentences which make parts of the essay incoherent **(clarity of sentences)**

Length ❑ brief ❑ extremely brief **(length)**

Use of author's words
❑ noticeable copying from the reading passage **(copying)**
❑ overuse of quotes **(quotes)**
❑ noticeable inaccuracy in copied or quoted material **(accuracy)**

Positive Indicators

Reading comprehension
❑ evidence of accurate understanding of the author's ideas **(reading comprehension)**

Development
❑ recognizable flow of ideas; coherence **(flow of ideas)**
❑ an attempt to answer the question **(attempt to answer question)**
❑ evidence of ability to use the author's ideas **(use of author's ideas)**
❑ an attempt to use examples from the text **(use of examples from the text)**
❑ an attempt to use examples from writer's experience **(use of own experience)**

Organization
❑ a sense of shaping the whole essay or at least one point **(organization)**

Language
❑ errors generally identifiable/classifiable **(identifiability of errors)**
❑ a predominance of sentences which, though flawed, are readable **(clarity of sentences)**

Length ❑ reasonable **(length)**

Use of author's words
❑ no noticeable copying from the reading passage **(copying)**
❑ quotes not overused **(quotes)**
❑ accuracy in copied or quoted material **(accuracy)**

Appendix B
Sample Essays

The two essays below were written in response to a passage from Sissela Bok's 1978 book, Lying: Moral Choice in Public and Private Life. *In the essay Bok argues that lying by public officials is never justified because it undermines the public trust. The essay topic was as follows:*

> For centuries, some political writers have argued that leaders must be willing to deceive, even lie, to govern effectively. Sissela Bok argues otherwise. What do you think of the position she takes here? Draw on your reading, personal experience, or observation of others to develop your essay.

Student Essay 1 (written by a multiple-failing student):

Sissela Bok argues to consider the variation being played in campaigns all over the United State, Because she want to share all the comforsation with all the people what kind the person, she wanted all the people in the world fell more strong before elected.

My thought was good think to run campaigns because you can tell who have more power who had not have more power, althought you can not tell who should not take place and control, because the government was the best. If the people fell weak the governor fell weak, also some people not believed the campaigns because it damage to trust has been immense many refuse to vote under such circumstances and they look for personality factors. I think candidate campaigns very important if you fell so weak during when you talking with other the people in the world you need show all the power you had to all the the people if you so weak during the campaigns they might aproved you not strongly enough to take over the goverment even though you was very good person. I think you take several year running campaigns you need travel around states and to more people fell comfortable about you.

Significant positive indicators (from essay checklist)	**Significant negative indicators**
none	(-) Clarity of sentences (predominance of unclear)
	(-) Identifiability of errors
	(-) Use of author's ideas
	(-) Copying
	(-) Organization
	(-) Flow of ideas
	(-) Use of examples from the text

Note: The student completely fails to address the author's main point about political lies. Note also that copying occurs in lines 1-2 and again in lines 9-10. This student failed a total of three times at two different levels but has now successfully completed the fourth course in the sequence. This student made extensive use of tutoring services and one-on-one work with specialists at the UC Davis Learning Skills Center.

Student Essay 2 (written by a passing student):

Sissela Bok argues that as a government leader, he should be more morally keep his promise. And as a government as whole, it should not take the public's benefits as its lie saciftior.

Personally, I feel that the political stage is the darkest stage of human stages. Everything happens inside is dark and cold-blood. From political murder to affect other countries political business, are all cold-blood behair. The political people do not concern the people's death and suffers. For example, in current event, a lot of people die in Nocarago's war. Those people are not criminal, but they are the saciftiors of dark policial stage. Probably, they are also the people die for the political lie between two countries.

The lie of government might caused the suffer for its people. For example, the government lie to us that they do not have money to develop some country's necessaries. But on the other hand, they secretly spend lot of money to help other country to develop their mility. And what are the mility equipments for? They are use for to kill human beings - the saciftor of political stage.

For a better example, from Sissela Bok's paragraph, a big-city mayor tells a lie for his rent control issue because he wants to be reelected again. Think the consequence if he keeps his lie after he has been elected, there are probably many people will become benefit for the rent. And as a result, many social problems will immediately solve. For example, because of rental money, many employment will be occured, crimes will decrease. But for the long tearm, after his lie be successed, he will still keep his previous thinking. And as a result, he will remove rent control and many citizens will still suffer of his temporary lie. The social problems will follow; such as, stirk, people move out, industries move out, and unemployment etc. The mayor's political life will not been longer because of his lie. He can lie once but not twice.

Mr. Oliver probably is another sacifitor in political lie stage. The government lie to him that helping Norcaga is an honor to the country. Therefore, Oliver use all his abilities to help to finish his "honor." But as a result, he lose his job and become news people in the country. But he don't

think about there are many people have been died because of his honor and the government's lie to him.

Living in political stage is not a good way to gain power or to win the election for government position. We should tell the truth to the public and make the public believe the sincerity to run the government. The truth will help country become strong and make the world peace. There are many Nobel Prize winner of peace are telling their truth. They have gained many people respect and the true hornor. For a successful politician, he should not lie to the public. In this way telling the truth might help him to stay in the political stage more long and probably will him win next election.

Significant positive indicators
(+) Identifiability of errors
(+) Copying (none noticeable)
(+) Organization
(+) Flow of ideas
(+) Use of examples from text

Significant negative indicators
(-) Clarity of sentences (many unclear)
(-) Use of author's ideas

Note: This essay was given more positive than negative indicators. The essay is particularly interesting because it demonstrates how the two language indicators, clarity and identifiability of errors, can be independent of each other. The essay was given the middle score for clarity on the checklist, largely because of puzzling vocabulary items (see, for instance, lines 2-3) and isolated unclear sections. On the whole, though, the student's errors can be easily identified; thus, the essay received a positive score on this second language factor (see fourth paragraph for examples). This student passed all courses in the sequence without repeating.