

THE EFFECT OF DIRECTED PROOFREADING PRACTICE
ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROOFREADING SKILL
IN A COLLEGE-LEVEL TYPEWRITING CLASS

By

JUDITH CANFIELD SIMON

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1961

Master of Business Administration
West Texas State University
Canyon, Texas
1969

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1976



THE EFFECT OF DIRECTED PROOFREADING PRACTICE
ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROOFREADING SKILL
IN A COLLEGE-LEVEL TYPEWRITING CLASS

Thesis Approved:

Robert J. Kelley

Thesis Adviser

Arnold C. Quonby

Pennis L. Mott

James Y. Wall

N. N. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

963987

PREFACE

This study is concerned with the effectiveness of using specific proofreading exercises in a college-level typewriting course. Twenty proofreading exercises were designed, based on literature concerning common types of proofreading errors by typists. These proofreading exercises were used in a typewriting class in an effort to assess the value of developing and including this type material in a typewriting course.

The author wishes to express her appreciation to Dr. Herbert Jelley for his guidance and assistance throughout this study. Appreciation is also expressed to the other members of the committee, Dr. Dennis Mott, Dr. Arnola Ownby, and Dr. James Yelvington, for their assistance in this study, and to Dr. Lloyd Garrison for his help in scheduling of teaching assignments to make this study possible.

Special appreciation is expressed to my mother, Mrs. Ira Canfield, to my husband, John, and to my son, Gregory, for their assistance and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Importance of the Study	2
Delimitations	3
Limitations	3
Assumptions	3
Definition of Terms	4
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	6
Literature on the Need for Proofreading Skill by Typists in Business	6
Literature on the Most Common Types of Proofreading Errors	7
Literature on Methods of Teaching Proofreading in Typewriting Classes	8
Literature on Developing Proofreading Skill in Other Subject Areas	11
Summary of the Literature	12
III. PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY	13
Selection of Participants	13
Development of Proofreading Materials	13
Treatment of the Experimental and Control Groups	15
Statistical Analysis	17
IV. FINDINGS	20
Background Information About the Students	20
Pre-Test	20
Proofreading Records During Course	26
Post-Test	38
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	41
Summary	41
Conclusions	43
Recommendations	44

Chapter	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY	46
APPENDIX A - PROOFREADING EXERCISES	49
APPENDIX B - BACKGROUND INFORMATION	80
APPENDIX C - PROOFREADING ERROR RECORDS	86
APPENDIX D - COMPARISONS OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION WITH PROOFREADING ERROR RECORD	99
APPENDIX E - PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST RESULTS	104
APPENDIX F - STATISTICAL DATA	107

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Grade Point Averages	20
II. ACT Scores	21
III. Business Versus Non-Business Students	22
IV. Grade Classifications	23
V. Male/Female Ratio	24
VI. Class Absences	25
VII. Proofreading Errors on Pre-Test	26
VIII. Student Proofreading Error Averages on Timed Writings	28
IX. Student Proofreading Error Averages on Production Measurements	29
X. Average Number of Proofreading Errors on Timed Writings	29
XI. Average Number of Proofreading Errors on Production Measurements	30
XII. Comparison of Grade Point Average and Proofreading Error Average	32
XIII. Comparison of Business and Non-Business Majors With Their Proofreading Error Averages	34
XIV. Comparison of Grade Classifications With Proofreading Error Averages	35
XV. Comparison of Class Absence Averages With Proofreading Error Averages	37
XVI. Proofreading Errors on Post-Test	39
XVII. Comparison of Pre-Test and Post-Test Results	39

Table	Page
XVIII. Individual Grade Point Averages	81
XIX. Individual ACT Scores	82
XX. Individual Business/Non-Business Majors	83
XXI. Individual Grade Classifications	84
XXII. Individual Class Absences	85
XXIII. Individual Proofreading Errors on Timed Writings by Control Group	87
XXIV. Individual Proofreading Errors on Timed Writings by Experimental Group	89
XXV. Proofreading Error Averages on Timed Writings	91
XXVI. Individual Proofreading Errors on Production Measurements by Control Group	92
XXVII. Individual Proofreading Errors on Production Measurements by Experimental Group	94
XXVIII. Proofreading Error Averages on Production Measurements	96
XXIX. Average Number of Proofreading Errors on Each Timed Writing	97
XXX. Average Number of Proofreading Errors on Each Production Measurement	98
XXXI. Comparison of Individual Grade Point Averages With Proofreading Error Averages	100
XXXII. Comparison of Individual Business and Non-Business Majors With Proofreading Error Averages	101
XXXIII. Comparison of Individual Grade Classification With Proofreading Error Averages	102
XXXIV. Comparison of Individual Class Absences With Proofreading Error Averages	103
XXXV. Individual Pre-Test Results	105
XXXVI. Individual Post-Test Results	107

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Proofreading has an illustrious background that has been traced to times preceding the invention of movable types.¹ The art of proofreading grew concurrently with the invention and development of printing. The need for the improvement of manuscripts and the printed page stimulated a desire for more technical knowledge about proofreading as early as the Second Century; the first known volume on the subject of proofreading is a treatise in Latin by Jerome Hornschuch, a doctor of medicine.²

Purpose of the Study

Complaints have been heard from teachers and businessmen that typists cannot proofread accurately, but there are few materials available for the teacher's use in developing this skill. The objectives of this study were (1) to develop proofreading materials for use in a college-level production typewriting course, and (2) to determine if the use of directed proofreading practice in a college-level production typewriting course is significantly more effective in improving proofreading skill than indirect proofreading practice in a college-

¹Joseph Lasky, Proofreading and Copy-Preparation (New York, 1954), p. 1.

²Ibid., p. 15.

level production typewriting course.

Importance of the Study

Many problems can be caused by a typist's inability to proofread accurately. The meaning of a sentence can be changed in many ways, such as by typing an incorrect word, by transposing a dollar amount, perhaps at considerable expense to the writer, or problems can arise by typing incorrect street addresses, possibly causing letters to be undeliverable. Any error that is undetected by the typist could cause an individual or a business a great deal of embarrassment as well as possible financial loss.

While business teachers, businessmen, and typists themselves would probably agree that accurate proofreading is extremely important, very little work appears to have been done that is specifically designed to improve this skill. The literature found involving the actual use of proofreading exercises was in subject areas other than business.

It is sometimes difficult for a teacher to have time to present all the material in a typewriting textbook that appears to be important, and it is even more difficult to have additional time for extra practice on areas such as proofreading. Although it is frequently recommended that students get additional practice to improve their proofreading skill, there is little evidence to indicate that this practice does provide a significant improvement in the skill.

This study involved the development of proofreading exercises and a study of their effectiveness, in an attempt to determine the value of taking the additional time required to prepare and use specific proofreading exercises. The proofreading materials developed for this

study have additional value in that they can be used as supplementary exercises for other courses or can be used on an individual basis with students who need proofreading practice.

Delimitations

The study was delimited to those students who enrolled in Office Management 2313, Production Typewriting, 12:30 p.m. section, during the Fall and Spring semesters of the 1974-1975 school year at Oklahoma State University.

Limitations

Data were collected and analyzed for only those students who participated in the two proofreading tests and who completed at least 75 percent of the timed writings and production measurements during the course.

Assumptions

The following assumptions are noted:

1. Students enrolled in Office Management 2313 (Production Typewriting) at Oklahoma State University in the 12:30 p.m. section during the 1974-1975 school year will have successfully completed one year of high school typewriting or one semester of college typewriting.
2. There is no significant difference in ability of students who enroll in Office Management 2313 in the Fall semester and students who enroll in Office Management 2313 in the Spring semester.

Definition of Terms

Production typewriting. Production typewriting is a course designed for college students who have some previous training in typewriting (at least one year of high school typewriting or one semester of college typewriting), with emphasis placed on producing a variety of typed materials (such as letters, reports, tables, and business forms) with all errors corrected.

Timed writing. A timed writing is a typewriting test for a specific length of time where speed and accuracy rates are determined and errors are not corrected, using materials that are straight paragraph copy, as opposed to such materials as business forms and tables.

Production measurement. A production measurement is a typewriting test for a specific length of time (usually 20 to 30 minutes) using such materials as business forms and tables, where all errors are corrected and a rate is determined based on the amount of work completed in the specific length of time involved.

Proofreading skill. Proofreading skill is the ability to recognize all types of errors in completed copy, such as misspelled words, omissions or additions of letters or words, and errors in numerical information.

Proofreading exercise. The proofreading exercises referred to in this study are materials designed specifically for use by students in practicing to improve proofreading skill.

Directed proofreading practice. Directed practice on proofreading is specific practice using proofreading exercises, with instructions by the teacher.

Indirect proofreading practice. Indirect proofreading practice is practice that students traditionally receive by checking their own work and having it evaluated by the teacher, with the teacher reporting to each student any proofreading errors that were made.

Control group. The control group in this study is the group of students in production typewriting who receive indirect proofreading practice but no directed proofreading practice.

Experimental group. The experimental group in this study is the group of students in production typewriting who receive indirect proofreading practice, and, in addition, receive directed proofreading practice.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

While there is little specific literature on the actual use of proofreading exercises, there is a great deal of literature indicating the importance of improving proofreading skill, on specific proofreading difficulties, on methods of teaching proofreading, and on proofreading in areas other than business subjects. The literature on proofreading will be discussed below.

Literature on the Need for Proofreading Skill by Typists in Business

Some of the literature reviewed indicated a need for good proofreading skill by typists in business. Odell and Stuart stated in their book on teaching typewriting that the typist is responsible for proofreading the letters he types in the business office.¹ According to Rowe, employers seldom complain if typists make errors but are very concerned when the errors are not located and corrected.² Winger stated that the teacher who permits inaccurate proofreading is being

¹William R. Odell and Esta Ross Stuart, Principles and Techniques for Directing the Learning of Typewriting (Boston, 1935), p. 174.

²John L. Rowe, "Typewriting in the Seventies--An Overview," Effective Secretarial Education, National Business Education Yearbook, No. 12 (Reston, Virginia, 1974), p. 63.

unfair to the student who does a good job, and that teacher is not going to turn out students who will be in great demand in the office.³

Wise observed some large companies and concluded that although speed and accuracy in typewriting were considered necessary, the ability to proofread and produce mailable copy was of primary concern to the businesses.⁴ Ryan made a survey of executives concerning qualifications wanted in secretaries and found that one of the five main "pet peeves" listed by executives was "lack of proofreading for meaning in letters."⁵

The literature discussed above seemed to indicate a need for improvement in typists' proofreading performance in business offices.

Literature on the Most Common Types on Proofreading Errors

In studying possible methods of improving proofreading skill, literature on the most common types of proofreading errors seemed helpful.

A study by Wong indicated the most common types of proofreading errors, in order, are: (1) transposition of words within sentences, (2) spacing errors--omission of extra space, (3) substitution of one small word for another, (4) omission of one of a pair of doubled

³Fred E. Winger, "Skill Building in Typewriting," Effective Secretarial Education, National Business Education Yearbook, No. 12 (Reston, Virginia, 1974), p. 67.

⁴Elva Lea Wise, "Training for Today's Office," The Balance Sheet, Vol. LV, No. 6 (March, 1974), pp. 257-260.

⁵LaVerne C. Ryan, "Wanted: Secretary," Business Education Forum, Vol. 28, No. 8 (May, 1974), pp. 35-36.

letters, (5) omission of a letter within a word, (6) doubling of small words or of syllables within a word, (7) transposition of letters within a word. She also found that errors on the left half and bottom half of a page are more difficult to detect.⁶

According to Peterson and Staples, the types of errors likely to be undetected are: (1) errors in headings or subheadings, (2) near beginnings or at ends of lines, (3) toward the bottom of the page, (4) in long words that occur rather frequently, (5) additions or omissions, (6) transpositions, (7) captions or footnotes, (8) proper nouns, (9) vertical enumerations, and (10) number combinations.⁷

The literature discussed above indicated some specific locations when proofreading errors commonly occur which could be useful in determining areas of concentration in proofreading practice.

Literature on Methods of Teaching Proofreading in Typewriting Classes

Some of the literature reviewed suggested methods of teaching proofreading in typewriting classes.

Sobolik listed a number of specific suggestions for classroom practice to improve proofreading, such as (1) assuming the possibility of the existence of errors, (2) taking whatever time and effort are needed to locate errors, (3) proofreading several times, and

⁶ Shirley Wong, "A Study to Compare the Effects of Three Different Methods of Reading Copy When Proofreading Straight Paragraph Copy by First-Year Typewriting Students" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, 1971).

⁷ John C. Peterson and John Staples, "Declare War on Undetected Typing Errors," Business Education World, Vol. 49, No. 7 (March, 1969), pp. 9-10.

(4) proofreading backwards letter by letter or word by word.⁸

According to Peterson and Staples, students should have the opportunity to practice proofreading skills frequently. They recommended that the teacher prepare a series of short proofreading exercises for the students to complete and that short proofreading projects be assigned throughout the course. They also mentioned that even though these exercises should be fairly short, the student should be allowed sufficient time for careful proofreading.⁹

Ashby stated that homework assignments could be made in the area of proofreading. She suggested that students be given mimeographed problems prepared by the teacher to be done outside the class and returned to the teacher. These homework assignments were suggested so students could develop more skill than is possible in the average class period.¹⁰

In discussing collegiate typewriting, Harris and Rainey also suggested the use of homework assignments to supplement class sessions. They stated that the teacher can design proofreading exercises which include all types of errors to be used throughout intermediate and advanced typewriting and that proofreading exercises completed outside of class can be quite effective. They stated that this out-of-class work should be reinforced with some teacher instruction in the classroom and by strict adherence to high standards of perfection in classroom typing assignments.¹¹

⁸Gayle A. Sobolik, "It Pays to be Sure--Proofread," The Journal of Business Education, Vol. 50, No. 5 (February, 1975), pp. 188-189.

⁹John C. Peterson and John Staples, pp. 22-24.

¹⁰Patricia Ashby, "Assign Typewriting Related Activities Outside the Classroom," The Balance Sheet, Vol. LII, No. 8 (May, 1971), pp. 346-7.

¹¹Clyta L. Harris and Bill G. Rainey, "Collegiate Typewriting--Fact or Fiction," The Balance Sheet, Vol. LII, No. 5 (February, 1971), pp. 214-215.

Robinson stated that proofreading is a much neglected basic skill competency that needs to be given more attention. He further stated that a student should proofread his own work and his proofreading skill should be evaluated and graded.¹²

Odell and Stuart also felt that evaluation of proofreading work was important. They stated that most poor proofreading results from carelessness or laziness and reported that they had not found a student who had not learned to proofread accurately when he knew he would fail the course if he did not.¹³

In discussing the teaching of typewriting in their textbook, Harms, Stehr, and Harris also indicated that evaluation of proofreading is important and that it can be used effectively. They stated that we often let proofreading go without careful checking, so students learn not to penalize themselves by proofreading their work too carefully. Their suggestion was that we use a different approach in evaluation and sometimes not consider the errors at all but have the student's grade depend on his proofreading ability.¹⁴

The literature discussed above suggested the use of such items as short proofreading exercises in class homework assignments, and an increased emphasis on proofreading in all phases of class activities.

¹²Jerry W. Robinson, Editor, Strategies of Instruction in Typewriting, (Cincinnati, 1972), p. 46.

¹³William R. Odell and Esta Ross Stuart, p. 172.

¹⁴Harm Harms, B. W. Stehr, and E. Edward Harris, Methods of Teaching Business and Distributive Education, Third Edition, (Cincinnati, 1972), pp. 101-102.

Literature on Developing Proofreading Skill
on Other Subject Areas

Several studies concerned the development of proofreading skill in subject areas other than business.

A study by Holmes of the effect of direct instruction in proofreading on the spelling accuracy of fifth grade children indicated that those children receiving the direct proofreading practice showed a marked gain in spelling accuracy over the other children. Both groups displayed improvement in discovering errors in their own compositions, but the experimental group (with the direct proofreading practice) made significant gains in spelling accuracy over the control group.¹⁵

Laubner found that the use of a proofreading card, constant proofreading and immediate reference to a corrected copy produced statistically significant gains in the use of capitals and punctuation for elementary children involved in the study.¹⁶

Oswalt found that proofreading instruction improved achievement of fifth grade pupils in recognizing misspelled words and reproducing them correctly. He recommended that systematic instruction in proofreading for spelling errors be incorporated into language arts programs.¹⁷

¹⁵Elizabeth Haworth Holmes, "An Analysis of the Effect of Direct Instruction in Proofreading Upon Spelling Accuracy of Fifth Grade Children as Reflected in Improvement in Basic Vocabulary Lists" (unpub. doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1962).

¹⁶George Francis Laubner, "The Effect of a Series of Lessons on Proofreading Abilities in Capitalization and Punctuation" (unpub. doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1964).

¹⁷William W. Oswalt, "The Effect of Proofreading for Spelling Errors on Spelling Achievement of Fifth Grade Pupils" (unpub. doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1962).

The studies discussed above indicated improvement in the schoolwork of elementary students through the use of specific proofreading instruction.

Summary of the Literature

It appears from reviewing the literature that there is general agreement that proofreading skill is important and needs more emphasis. Suggestions about the teaching of proofreading included giving frequent teacher-made proofreading exercises, assigning proofreading homework, and evaluating and grading proofreading work. Other literature mentioned specific types of common proofreading errors, information which could be used in designing proofreading exercises. Also mentioned in the literature were methods of teaching proofreading in the typewriting classroom, methods which could be used in coordination with teacher-made proofreading exercises.

While there were recommendations in the literature reviewed indicating that teacher-made proofreading exercises should be used in typewriting classes, there was nothing to indicate that the writers recommending this practice had actually tested their hypotheses. The only literature found that involved actual use of proofreading exercises was in other subject areas.

Because of the lack of information and the apparent need for better proofreading skill by typists, this study was conducted in an effort to determine the value of using certain teacher-prepared proofreading exercises in a college-level typewriting class.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

Selection of Participants

This study was conducted at Oklahoma State University during the Fall and Spring semesters of the 1974-1975 school year. Since one of the purposes was to study the effectiveness of using specific proofreading materials, the groups being compared needed to be as similar as possible in areas which might have an effect on their proofreading performance. Factors which could be controlled included the type of course, the instructor, the class meeting days, and the class meeting time. The course in which the above factors could be controlled was Office Management 2313 (Production Typewriting), and the study participants were those students who enrolled in the 12:30 p.m. section of the course in the Fall and Spring semesters. Both classes were taught by the researcher, and both classes met each week on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. The Fall section was the "control" group, and the Spring section was the "experimental" group.

Development of Proofreading Materials

The proofreading exercises used in this study were designed by the researcher and were based on the literature concerning common types of proofreading errors, so students would get practice using materials in which proofreading errors appear to occur most often. The materials

used were presented in four different forms to give students proof-reading practice under varying circumstances. Listed below are brief descriptions of the twenty proofreading exercises used in this study:

<u>Exercise No.</u>	<u>Type of Material</u>	<u>Form of Presentation</u>
1	Numerical figures	Original copy typewritten; final copy typewritten
2	Straight paragraph copy	Original copy typewritten; final copy typewritten
3	Dollar amounts	Original copy typewritten; final copy typewritten
4	Business letters	Original copy typewritten; final copy typewritten
5	Names and addresses	Original copy typewritten; final copy typewritten
6	Numerical figures	Original copy handwritten; final copy typewritten
7	Straight paragraph copy	Original copy handwritten; final copy typewritten
8	Dollar amounts	Original copy handwritten; final copy typewritten
9	Business letters	Original copy handwritten; final copy typewritten
10	Names and addresses	Original copy handwritten; final copy typewritten
11	Numerical figures	Original copy typewritten; final copy student typed
12	Straight paragraph copy	Original copy typewritten; final copy student typed
13	Dollar amounts	Original copy typewritten; final copy student typed
14	Business letters	Original copy typewritten; final copy student typed
15	Names and addresses	Original copy typewritten; final copy student typed
16	Numerical figures	Original copy handwritten; final copy student typed
17	Straight paragraph copy	Original copy handwritten; final copy student typed
18	Dollar amounts	Original copy handwritten; final copy student typed
19	Business letters	Original copy handwritten; final copy student typed
20	Names and addresses	Original copy handwritten; final copy student typed

In Exercises 1 through 5, both the original and final copies were prepared in advance by the researcher and were in typewritten form. The student was to compare the original copy with the final copy and circle on the final copy any differences found.

In Exercises 6 through 10, both the original and final copies were prepared in advance by the researcher, with the original copy handwritten and the final copy typewritten. The student was to compare the original copy with the final copy and circle on the final copy any differences found.

In Exercises 11 through 15, the original copy was prepared in advance by the researcher and was in typewritten form. The final copy was to be typed by the student, with any differences in the two copies circled on the final copy.

In Exercises 16 through 20, the original copy was prepared in advance by the researcher and was in handwritten form. The final copy was to be typed by the student, with any differences in the two copies circled on the final copy.

The first ten exercises were used during class to provide more instructor direction and to provide immediate feedback to the students. The final ten exercises, which were to be typed by the students and required more time to complete, were done as homework assignments and were evaluated by the instructor before the final proofreading test, given as a post-test near the end of the semester.

Treatment of the Experimental and Control Groups

The control group used no special proofreading materials. The students were told that 10 percent of their grade would be based on

their proofreading skill. Their five-minute timed writings and twenty-minute production measurements were evaluated and returned to them to give them feedback concerning the number of proofreading errors made, if any. Two proofreading tests were given during the semester, one near the beginning of the semester (pre-test) and one near the end of the semester (post-test). The pre-test was the production measurement from Lesson 87, and the post-test was the production measurement from Lesson 141 in the textbook used for the course.¹ These proofreading tests were similar in nature to the production measurements, but students were informed that this work would be evaluated and graded based on their proofreading skill.

The experimental group used basically the same procedure as the control group. They were told that 10 percent of their grade would be based on their proofreading skill. The same five-minute timed writings and twenty-minute production measurements were used as in the control group and were evaluated and returned to them to give them feedback concerning the number of proofreading errors made, if any. The same two proofreading tests were given to the experimental group and to the control group at the same learning stages in the semester.

The one difference in the treatment of the two groups was the addition of twenty proofreading exercises to the course work of the experimental group. These students were not told that they were in an experimental group. The proofreading exercises were designed by the

¹D. D. Lessenberry, S. J. Wanous, and C. H. Duncan, College Typewriting, 8th ed., (Cincinnati, 1969), pp. 153-154, 244-245.

researcher and were short, untimed, and scattered throughout the semester, beginning after the first proofreading test and ending before the final proofreading test. The proofreading exercises were short to avoid consuming much class time and were untimed to give students proofreading practice that would be somewhat similar to work in a business office and to give students with varying abilities sufficient time to complete the exercises as accurately as possible.

Students in both groups were encouraged throughout the course to work to improve their proofreading skill. This was emphasized frequently through the feedback given concerning proofreading errors on timed writings and on production measurements. It was further emphasized in the experimental group through the use of the proofreading exercises. With this continual emphasis on proofreading in the two groups, attendance became very important. Students with poor attendance records would not receive the proofreading training that was an essential part of the study, and their scores on the pre-test and post-test would not be good indicators of the value of the proofreading practice. Because of this, only those students who completed at least 75 percent of the five-minute timed writings given in class and at least 75 percent of the twenty-minute production measurements given in class were included in the study. In addition, only those students in the experimental group who completed at least 75 percent of the special proofreading exercises designed by the researcher were included in the study.

Statistical Analysis

Since one of the major purposes of the study was to determine the

value of using specific proofreading exercises, it was necessary to make several comparisons of the two groups involved to determine whether or not there were differences in the two groups that were statistically significant.

A proofreading pre-test was given near the beginning of the semester and a t-test was used to determine if there was any statistically significant difference in the two groups in their proofreading performance at that time.

Other data were collected concerning the backgrounds of the students, such as their grade point averages, ACT scores, majors, and grade classifications. A t-test was used to determine if there was any statistically significant difference in the two groups in their grade point averages and ACT scores. Differences in majors and grade classifications were studied by comparing percentages of students in each group.

During the semester, data were collected concerning students' proofreading records on five-minute timed writings and on twenty-minute production measurements. A t-test was used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the proofreading performance of the two groups on timed writings and production measurements during the semester.

A record of absences from class was also kept for each student, and a t-test was used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the number of absences from class in the two groups.

Near the end of the semester, a proofreading post-test was given to the two groups. A t-test was used to determine if there was a

statistically significant difference in the proofreading performance of the two groups on the post-test.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Background Information About the Students

In order to help determine how much similarity existed between the two groups of students being studied, data were gathered on the students in addition to their proofreading records during the semester. Additional data used included grade point averages, ACT scores, majors, grade classifications, and the number of absences from the typewriting class.

An analysis of the grade point averages of the two groups indicated that there was very little difference. As shown in Table I, the control group had a mean grade point average of 2.792, and the experimental group had a mean grade point average of 2.849, a difference in the two groups of 0.057.

TABLE I
GRADE POINT AVERAGES

Data	Control Group Mean N=42	Experimental Group Mean N=42	t-test	s/ns .01
Grade Point Average	2.792	2.849	.456	ns

Difference in means = 0.057; df = 82; critical value = 2.638

A t-test was used to assess the difference in the grade point averages of the two groups. The t-test value was .456. As shown in Table I, this value indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the grade point averages of the control and experimental groups at the .01 level of significance.

The individual grade point averages of each student in the two groups are shown in Table XVIII in Appendix B, page 81.

ACT scores were also obtained to help in making comparisons of the background information of the two groups. As Table II indicates, the mean ACT score of the control group was 18.868, and the mean ACT score of the experimental group was 18.371, a difference in the two means of 0.497.

TABLE II
ACT SCORES

Data	Control Group Mean N=38	Experimental Group Mean N=36	<u>t</u> -test	n/ns .01
ACT Score	18.868	18.371	.917	ns

Difference in means = 0.497; df = 72; critical value = 2.648

A t-test was used to assess the difference in the ACT scores of the two groups. As shown in Table II, the t-test value was .917. This value indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the ACT scores of the control and experimental groups at the .01 level of significance.

The individual ACT scores for the students in the two groups are shown in Table XIX in Appendix B, page 82.

Another area of background information studied was the majors of the students in the two groups. They were classified for purposes of this study as either business majors or nonbusiness majors. As shown in Table III, business majors made up 92.857 percent of the students in the control group and 80.952 percent of the students in the experimental group.

TABLE III
BUSINESS VERSUS NON-BUSINESS STUDENTS

Data	Control Group		Experimental Group	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Business Majors	39	92.857	34	80.952
Nonbusiness Majors	<u>3</u>	<u>7.143</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>19.048</u>
Totals	42	100.000	42	100.000

Percentages were used in this area for ease of comparison of the two groups. By inspection of these percentages, it appeared that the difference in the majors of the control and experimental groups was not great enough to have an appreciable effect on the results of the study.

Specific information as to the majors of the individual students in the two groups can be found in Table XX in Appendix B, page 83.

Another area of background information considered was the grade classifications of the students. As can be determined by studying the information in Table IV, 90.477 percent of the students in the control group were freshmen and sophomores, while 83.333 percent of the students in the experimental group were freshmen and sophomores. All other students in the two groups were classified as juniors, seniors, or special students. (Special students are regularly enrolled in the course but are not taking the course to satisfy a degree requirement.)

TABLE IV
GRADE CLASSIFICATIONS

Grade Classification	Control Group		Experimental Group	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Freshman	28	66.667	23	54.762
Sophomore	10	23.810	12	28.571
Junior	2	4.761	3	7.143
Senior	1	2.381	3	7.143
Special	<u>1</u>	<u>2.381</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.381</u>
Totals	42	100.000	42	100.000

Percentages were used in this area for ease of comparison of the two groups. By inspection of these percentages, it appeared that the difference in the grade classifications of the control and experimental groups was not great enough to have a significant effect on the results of the study.

Specific information concerning grade classifications of the students in the two groups can be found in Table XXI in Appendix B, page 84.

Another area of comparison was the number of males and females in each group. As shown in Table V, there were 41 females and 1 male student in each group. Since the groups were identical in this area, no statistical testing was done.

TABLE V
MALE/FEMALE RATIO

Data	Control Group N=42	Experimental Group N= 42
Number of Males	1	1
Number of Females	<u>41</u>	<u>41</u>
Totals	42	42

Another area studied was the number of absences from the type-writing class by each student. As shown in Table VI, the mean number of absences of the control group was 4.929 and the mean number of absences of the experimental group was 9.500, a difference in the means of the two groups of 4.571.

A t-test was used to assess the difference in the class absences of the two groups. As shown in Table VI, the t-test value was 3.800.

This value indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in the number of class absences of the control and experimental groups at the .01 level of significance. This significant difference occurred although the students who had not completed 75 percent of the classwork had been eliminated from the study and were not included in this comparison.

TABLE VI
CLASS ABSENCES

Data	Control Group Mean N=42	Experimental Group Mean N=42	t-test	s/ns
Class Absences	4.929	9.500	3.800	s

Difference in means = 4.571; df = 82; critical value = 2.638

Specific numbers of absences by each student in the two groups are given in Table XXII in Appendix B, page 85.

As previously indicated, there was no significant difference in the backgrounds of the students in the control and experimental groups in their grade point averages, ACT scores, majors, and grade classifications. However, there was a statistically significant difference indicated in the number of absences from class, as the experimental group had an average of class absences that was almost double the number of class absences of the control group. These absences from

class could have had a considerable effect on the results of this study.

Pre-Test

A pre-test was given to the two groups at the same stage of learning in the course to determine if there was a significant difference in their proofreading abilities before the beginning of the specific proofreading instruction. Students in both groups were instructed that the evaluation of the test would be based on their proofreading skill.

As shown in Table VII, the mean number of proofreading errors on the pre-test by the control group was 2.143, and the mean number of proofreading errors on the pre-test by the experimental group was 3.095. The difference in the means of the two groups was 0.952.

TABLE VII
PROOFREADING ERRORS ON PRE-TEST

Data	Control Group Mean N=42	Experimental Group Mean N=42	<u>t</u> -test	n/na .01
Proofreading Errors	2.143	3.095	1.440	ns
Difference in means = 0.952; df = 82; critical value = 2.638				

The number of proofreading errors made on the pre-test by each student in the two groups is shown in Table XXXV in Appendix E, page 105.

A t-test was used to determine if there was a significant difference in the means of the control and experimental groups on the

pre-test. As shown in Table VII, the t -test value was 1.440. This value indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the pre-test proofreading error means of the control and experimental groups at the .01 level of significance.

Proofreading Records During Course

During the semester (after the pre-test but before the post-test), numerous production measurements and straight-copy timed writings were given to the two groups. Identical material was used for the two groups, and this material included fourteen production measurements and nineteen timed writings. Records were kept of the number of proofreading errors made by each student, and this information is shown in Tables XXIII, XXIV, XXVI, and XXVII in Appendix C, pages 87, 89, 92, and 94, respectively.

From the proofreading record for each student, several comparisons were made. Proofreading error averages were determined for each student on the timed writings as well as on the production Measurements. Proofreading error averages were also determined for the two groups on each timed writing and on each production measurement. These data were compared to determine if there was a significant difference in the proofreading performance of the control and experimental groups on their regular classwork during the semester.

As shown in Table VIII, the mean number of proofreading errors on timed writings by students in the control group was 1.872, compared with a mean of 1.581 for the experimental group. This was a difference in means of 0.291.

TABLE VIII
STUDENT PROOFREADING ERROR AVERAGES
ON TIMED WRITINGS

Data	Control Group Mean N=42	Experimental Group Mean N=42	<u>t</u> -test	s/ns
Proofreading Error Average by Student	1.872	1.581	.793	ns
Difference in means = 0.291; df = 82; critical value = 2.638				

A t-test was used to assess the difference in the average number of proofreading errors by each student in the control and experimental groups. As shown in Table VIII, the t-test value was .793. This value indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the average number of proofreading errors on timed writings by students in the two groups at the .01 level of significance.

A comparison was also made of the proofreading error averages by students in the two groups on production measurements during the semester. As indicated in Table IX, the mean number of proofreading errors on production measurements by students in the control group was 1.918, compared with a mean of 2.608 for students in the experimental group. This was a difference in means of 0.690.

As shown in Table IX, the t-test value was 2.226. This value indicated that there was not a statistically significant difference in the average number of proofreading errors on production measurements by students in the two groups at the .01 level of significance.

TABLE IX
STUDENT PROOFREADING ERROR AVERAGES
ON PRODUCTION MEASUREMENTS

Data	Control Group Mean N=42	Experimental Group Mean N=42	t-test	s/ns .01
Proofreading Error Average by Student (42 students per group)	1.918	2.608	2.226	ns

Difference in means = 0.690; df = 82; critical value = 2.638

In addition to the comparisons made of proofreading error averages by each student, comparisons were also made of the average number of proofreading errors on each timed writing and production measurement. As shown in Table X, the mean number of proofreading errors made on timed writings by the control group was 1.927, compared with a mean of 1.553 for the experimental group. This was a difference in means of 0.374.

TABLE X
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PROOFREADING ERRORS
ON TIMED WRITINGS

Data	Control Group Mean N=42	Experimental Group Mean N=42	t-test	s/ns
Proofreading Error Average (19 timed writings)	1.927	1.553	2.125	ns

Difference in means = 0.374; df = 82; critical value = 2.638

As shown in Table X, the t -test value was 2.125. This value indicated that there was not a statistically significant difference in the two groups in the average number of proofreading errors on timed writings at the .01 level of significance.

The comparison that was made of the proofreading error averages on production measurements by the control and experimental groups is shown in Table XI. The mean number of proofreading errors on production measurements by the control group was 1.894, compared with a mean of 2.598 by the experimental group, a difference in means of 0.704.

TABLE XI
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PROOFREADING ERRORS
ON PRODUCTION MEASUREMENTS

Data	Control Group Mean N=42	Experimental Group Mean N=42	t -test	n/ns
Proofreading Error Average (14 production measurements)	1.894	2.598	2.029	ns
Difference in means = 0.704; df = 82; critical value = 2.638				

As shown in Table XI, the t -test value was 2.029. This value indicated that there was not a statistically significant difference in the two groups in the average number of proofreading errors on production measurements at the .01 level of significance.

Analysis of the data in Tables VIII, IX, X, and XI indicates that

the experimental group had a lower average number of proofreading errors on timed writings, and the control group had a lower average number of proofreading errors on production measurements during the course. While there were differences in the means of the two groups on their proofreading work during the course, these differences were not statistically significant.

The individual student information used for Tables VIII, IX, X, and XI can be found in Tables XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, and XXX in Appendix C, pages 87, 89, 91, 92, 94, 96, 97, and 98.

Since two types of data about students were being studied (background information and proofreading records), some comparisons were made between specific areas of background information and students' proofreading records. As some measure of proofreading performance was needed for this comparison, the proofreading records on production measurements during the semester were used. The production measurement data were used as an indicator of student proofreading performance during the semester because that type of material seemed more representative of realistic proofreading situations, because it represented proofreading performance over an entire semester, and because it was the same type material as that used for the pre-test and post-test.

The first comparison made was of students' grade point averages and their proofreading performance on production measurements. In making this comparison, the record of each student was compared with the mean in that category and determined to be either above the mean or below the mean.

As shown in Table XII, 38.095 percent of the students in the control group were above the grade point average mean and below the

proofreading error mean, compared with the same percentage for the experimental group. There were 19.048 percent of the students in the control group above the proofreading error mean and below the grade point average mean, compared with 30.952 percent for the students in the experimental group. All other students in both groups were either above both the grade point average mean and the proofreading error mean or below both means.

TABLE XII
COMPARISON OF GRADE POINT AVERAGE
AND PROOFREADING ERROR AVERAGE*

Data	Control Group		Experimental Group	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Above Grade Point Average Mean/ Below Proofreading Error Mean	16	38.095	16	38.095
Below Grade Point Average Mean/ Above Proofreading Error Mean	8	19.048	13	30.952
Above Grade Point Average Mean/ Above Proofreading Error Mean	6	14.286	4	9.524
Below Grade Point Average Mean/ Below Proofreading Error Mean	<u>12</u>	<u>28.571</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>21.429</u>
Totals	42	100.000	42	100.000

*Proofreading error average on production measurements

If the grade point average were a predictor of proofreading performance, it seems logical that those students who were above the grade point average mean would be below the proofreading error mean, and vice versa. As shown in Table XII, a majority of the students in each group

showed this to be the case; over half of the students who were above the grade point average mean were below the proofreading error mean and vice versa.

Specific information gathered for use in making the comparisons shown in Table XII can be found in Table XXXI in Appendix D, page 100.

A comparison was also made of the business and nonbusiness majors and their proofreading error averages on production measurements. As shown in Table XIII, 33.333 percent of the business majors in the control group were above the proofreading error mean and 66.667 percent were below, compared with 38.235 percent of the business majors in the experimental group who were above the proofreading error mean and 61.765 percent below. Nonbusiness majors in the control group had 33.333 percent who were above the proofreading error mean and 66.667 percent below. In the experimental group, 50.000 percent of the non-business majors were above the proofreading error mean and 50.000 percent were below the proofreading error mean.

It would seem that business majors might indicate a better proofreading performance than nonbusiness majors. This was the case with the experimental group, but there was no difference in the comparison in the control group.

Specific information showing the comparisons of individual business and nonbusiness majors with their proofreading error averages is shown in Table XXXII in Appendix D, page 102.

Another comparison made was of the grade classifications of the students and their proofreading error averages on production measurements. As indicated in Table XIV, 39.286 percent of the freshmen in the control group were above the proofreading error mean and 60.714

TABLE XIII

COMPARISON OF BUSINESS AND NONBUSINESS MAJORS
WITH THEIR PROOFREADING ERROR AVERAGES*

Data	Control Group		Experimental Group	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Business Majors				
Above Proofreading Error Mean	13	33.333	13	38.235
Below Proofreading Error Mean	<u>26</u>	<u>66.667</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>61.765</u>
Total Business Majors	39	100.000	34	100.000
Nonbusiness Majors				
Above Proofreading Error Mean	1	33.333	4	50.000
Below Proofreading Error Mean	<u>2</u>	<u>66.667</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>50.000</u>
Total Nonbusiness Majors	3	100.000	8	100.000

*Proofreading error average on production measurements

TABLE XIV
COMPARISON OF GRADE CLASSIFICATIONS
WITH PROOFREADING ERROR AVERAGES*

Data	Control Group		Experimental Group	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Freshmen				
Above Proofreading Error Mean	11	39.286	9	39.130
Below Proofreading Error Mean	<u>17</u>	<u>60.714</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>60.870</u>
Total Freshmen	28	100.000	23	100.000
Sophomores				
Above Proofreading Error Mean	3	30.000	6	50.000
Below Proofreading Error Mean	<u>7</u>	<u>70.000</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>50.000</u>
Total Sophomores	10	100.000	12	100.000
Juniors				
Above Proofreading Error Mean	0	0.000	1	33.333
Below Proofreading Error Mean	<u>2</u>	<u>100.000</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>66.667</u>
Total Juniors	2	100.000	3	100.000
Seniors				
Above Proofreading Error Mean	0	0.000	1	33.333
Below Proofreading Error Mean	<u>1</u>	<u>100.000</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>66.667</u>
Total Seniors	1	100.000	3	100.000
Special				
Above Proofreading Error Mean	0	0.000	0	0.000
Below Proofreading Error Mean	<u>1</u>	<u>100.000</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>100.000</u>
Total Special	1	100.000	1	100.000

*Proofreading error average on production measurements

percent were below, compared with 39.130 percent of the freshmen in the experimental group who were above the proofreading error mean and 60.870 percent below. On the sophomore level, 30.000 percent in the control group were above the proofreading error mean and 70.000 percent were below, while 50.000 percent in the experimental group were above the proofreading error mean and 50.000 percent were below. There were no juniors, seniors, or special students above the proofreading error mean in the control group, so in all three cases 100.000 percent were below the mean. At both the junior and senior levels in the experimental group, there were 33.333 percent of the students above the proofreading error mean and 66.667 percent below. In the special student category in the experimental group, 100.000 percent of the students were below the proofreading error mean.

Upperclassmen (juniors and seniors) might be expected to have a better proofreading performance than freshmen and sophomores. This was found to be true in this study. Table XIV indicates that in both groups the juniors and seniors had a higher percentage of students who were below the proofreading error mean than was the case with freshmen and sophomores.

Specific information concerning individual students' grade classifications and their proofreading error averages can be found in Table XXXIII in Appendix D, page 102.

Another comparison made was of the number of absences by each student with his proofreading error record on production measurements. If attendance had an effect on performance, it seems logical to expect that students with a high absence rate would also have a high proofreading error average, and those with a low absence rate would have a

low proofreading error average.

As Table XV indicates, 33.333 percent of the students in the control group were below the absence mean and below the proofreading error mean, compared with 40.476 students in the experimental group who were below both means. In the control group, 9.524 percent of the students were above both the absence mean and the proofreading error mean, and in the experimental group 21.428 percent of the students were above both means. All other students in the two groups were above the mean in one category and below the mean in the other category.

TABLE XV
COMPARISON OF CLASS ABSENCE AVERAGES
WITH PROOFREADING ERROR AVERAGES*

Data	Control Group		Experimental Group	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Above Class Absence Mean/ Below Proofreading Error Mean	14	33.333	8	19.048
Below Class Absence Mean/ Above Proofreading Error Mean	10	23.810	8	19.048
Above Class Absence Mean/ Above Proofreading Error Mean	4	9.524	9	21.428
Below Class Absence Mean/ Below Proofreading Error Mean	<u>14</u>	<u>33.333</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>40.476</u>
Totals	42	100.000	42	100.000

*Proofreading error average on production measurements

It would be expected that students with high absence rates might not perform as well as those with lower absence rates. In other words,

students who were above the mean of class absences would be expected to be above the mean of proofreading errors and vice versa. This was not true in the control group but was true in the experimental group, with approximately two-thirds of the students either above both means or below both means.

Specific information concerning individual students' class absence averages and their proofreading error averages can be found in Table XXXIV in Appendix D, page 103.

Post-Test

Near the end of the semester, a post-test was given to the two groups of students. It consisted of production-type material of a similar nature to the work completed during the semester. Both groups were informed that their work would be evaluated based on their proofreading performance.

As shown in Table XVI, the mean number of proofreading errors by the control group on the post-test was 2.786, and the mean number of proofreading errors by the experimental group on the post-test was 2.595. This was a difference in the two means of 0.191.

The number of proofreading errors made by each student in the two groups on the post-test is shown in Table XXXVI in Appendix E, page 107.

A t-test was used to assess the difference in the post-test scores of the two groups. As shown in Table XVI, the t-test value was .311. This value indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the proofreading performance of the two groups on the post-test at the .01 level of significance.

TABLE XVI
 PROOFREADING ERRORS ON POST-TEST

Data	Control Group Mean N=42	Experimental Group Mean N=42	t-test	s/ns .01
Proofreading Errors (Post-Test)	2.786	2.595	.311	ns
Difference in means = 0.191; df = 82; critical value = 2.638				

For ease of comparison, Table XVII was prepared to show the mean number of proofreading errors by the control and experimental groups on both the pre-test and post-test. As Table XVII indicates, the experimental group had a mean difference of 0.952 more proofreading errors on the pre-test than the control group. However, on the post-test, the experimental group had a mean difference of 0.191 fewer proofreading errors than the control group.

TABLE XVII
 COMPARISON OF PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST RESULTS

Data	Control Group	Experimental Group
Pre-Test Proofreading Error Mean	2.143 (Difference = 0.952)	3.095
Post-Test Proofreading Error Mean	2.786 (Difference = 0.191)	2.595

It appears from analysis of the information in Table XVII that the experimental group's proofreading performance improved in relation to that of the control group. This improvement occurred even though the experimental group had a poorer performance than the control group on proofreading of the same type of material (production measurements) during the semester. In addition, the experimental group's improved performance occurred even though they had a class absence average that was almost twice as high as that of the control group.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Since a definite need for improvement in proofreading skill of typewriting students seemed apparent, this study was conducted to develop some proofreading materials for classroom use and to evaluate the effectiveness of using these materials. This study was done at Oklahoma State University during the 1974-1975 school year and involved two intermediate typewriting classes. The approach used was to give a pre-test to both groups, to use some specific proofreading exercises in the experimental group, and to give a post-test to both groups near the end of the semester.

Background information was obtained about the students in the two groups to determine how much similarity seemed to exist between the groups. In the area of scholastic ability, the information obtained indicated that the experimental group had a slightly higher grade point average than did the control group, but the control group had a slightly higher mean ACT score than did the experimental group. In studying other background information, it was determined that there were more business majors in the control group than in the experimental group, and there were more upperclassmen in the experimental group than in the control group. There was no statistically significant difference in the two groups in their grade point averages and ACT scores at the .01

level of significance, indicating that there was no significant difference in these areas that would have an effect on the results of the study.

The other area of information studied that did not deal specifically with proofreading was the number of absences from the typewriting class. The experimental group, which met during the Spring semester, had almost twice as many average absences from class as did the control group, which met during the Fall semester. A t-test was used to determine if there was a significant difference in the class absences of the two groups, and it was found that the difference in class absences was statistically significant at the .01 level of significance.

In studying the proofreading records of the two groups, it was determined that the control group had a lower average number of proofreading errors on production measurements than did the experimental group. However, the experimental group had a lower average number of proofreading errors on timed writings than did the control group. A t-test was used to assess the difference in the two groups on timed writings and production measurements, and no statistically significant difference was found in the proofreading performance of the two groups at the .01 level of significance on either the timed writings or the production measurements.

After making comparisons of students' background information with their proofreading error records on production measurements, there did not appear to be large differences between the two groups in any area except attendance. There was a considerably larger percentage in the experimental group who had more absences than the mean and also had more proofreading errors than the mean. The control group had a higher

percentage of students who were above the mean in number of absences and below the mean in number of proofreading errors, but the mean number of absences being used for the control group was lower than that for the experimental group because of the difference in absence rates of the two groups.

The pre-test and post-test given to the two groups consisted of production-type work, with the students being instructed in advance that the evaluation of their work would be based on the accuracy of their proofreading. These two tests were used as the basis for determining any change in proofreading ability which might have occurred during the course. The results of the pre-test indicated that the mean number of proofreading errors by the experimental group was somewhat higher than that of the control group, but the difference in the means of the two groups was not statistically significant at the .01 level of significance. The post-test results indicated that by the end of the semester the experimental group had a mean number of proofreading errors that was lower than that of the control group, but the difference in the means of the two groups was not statistically significant at the .01 level of significance.

Conclusions

Based on the literature reviewed and on the number of proofreading errors made by students in the study, there is an apparent need for improvement in proofreading skill.

Background information about the students in the areas of grade point averages, ACT scores, majors and grade classifications did not appear to have a significant effect on the results of the study.

However, the number of absences from class could have had an effect on the results of this study since the average number of absences by the experimental group was almost twice as high as the average number of absences by the control group. It is conceivable that the experimental group's proofreading record could have been better if their attendance record had been better.

Although there was not a statistically significant difference in the means of the two groups on the post-test, there did appear to be a noticeable change indicated by the results. Some improvement in proofreading skill was indicated by the experimental group in relation to the control group. The control group had a lower mean number of proofreading errors on the pre-test than the experimental group, but the experimental group had a lower mean number of proofreading errors on the post-test than the control group. Since there was an indication that improvement was made by the experimental group in comparison with the control group, it is possible that the improvement could have been greater if the experimental group's attendance had been as good as that of the control group.

Recommendations

Emphasis should continue to be placed on efforts to improve proofreading skill of typists, as there is evidence of a need for more skill in this area. Further studies should be made at the beginning level of typewriting skill before proofreading habits have been formed so that proofreading materials can be used as a teaching device rather than as remedial training.

Any further studies of this nature should give consideration to

having both groups in the study meet during the same semester to avoid possible attendance variations between Fall and Spring semesters.

Further studies should be considered in which only those students are included who demonstrate a need for improvement in proofreading skill; when an entire class is used, there may be some students included who are already accurate proofreaders and who have little or no room for improvement.

As there appeared to be some improvement indicated by the group which had access to proofreading exercises when compared with the group which did not use the proofreading exercises, the use of the supplementary proofreading exercises should be considered for further development and implementation into typewriting courses at the collegiate level.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Archer, Fred C., Raymond F. Brecker, John C. Frakes and Jeffrey R. Steward, Jr. General Office Practice. 3rd Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968.
- Ashby, Patricia. "Assign Typewriting Related Activities Outside the Classroom." The Balance Sheet, Vol. LII, No. 8 (May, 1971), pp. 346-347.
- Bishop, Inez Euline. "The Comparison of a Conventional Method of Teaching Spelling With a Method Emphasizing Proofreading as an Integral Part of Spelling Program." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1965.)
- Bundel, Leroy A. "Pinpointing Critical Areas of Proofreading." Business Education World, Vol. 47, No. 4 (December, 1966), pp. 14, 20.
- Goss, James E. "Analysis of Accuracy of Spelling in Written Compositions of Elementary School Children and the Effects of Proofreading Emphasis Upon Accuracy." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1959.)
- Harms, Harm, B. W. Stehr and E. Edward Harris. Methods of Teaching Business and Distributive Education. 3rd Ed. Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Company, 1972.
- Harris, Clyta L. and Bill G. Rainey. "Collegiate Typewriting--Fact or Fiction." The Balance Sheet, Vol. LII, No. 5 (February, 1971), pp. 214-215.
- Holmes, Elizabeth Haworth. "An Analysis of the Effect of Direct Instruction in Proofreading Upon Spelling Accuracy of Fifth Grade Children as Reflected in Improvement in Basic Vocabulary Lists." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1965.)
- Laubner, George Francis. "The Effect of a Series of Lessons on Proofreading Abilities in Capitalization and Punctuation." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1964.)
- Lessenberry, D. D., S. J. Wanous and C. H. Duncan. College Typewriting. 8th Ed. Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Company, 1969.
- Meehan, James R., Mary Ellen Oliverio and William R. Pasewark. Secretarial Office Procedures. 8th Ed. Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Company, 1972.

- Odell, William R. and Esta Ross Stuart. Principles and Techniques for Directing the Learning of Typewriting. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1935.
- Oswalt, William W. "The Effect of Proofreading for Spelling Errors on Spelling Achievement of Fifth Grade Pupils." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Temple University, 1962.)
- Peterson, John C. and John Staples. "Declare War on Undetected Typing Errors." Business Education World, Vol. 49, No. 7 (March, 1969), pp. 9-10, 22-24.
- Robinson, Jerry W. (ed.). Strategies of Instruction in Typewriting. Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Company, 1972.
- Rowe, John L. "Typewriting in the Seventies--An Overview." National Business Education Association Yearbook. Vol. 12, Reston, Virginia: National Business Education Association, 1974, p. 63.
- Runyon, Richard P. and Audrey Haber. Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics. 2nd Ed. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1972.
- Russon, Allien R. and S. J. Wanous. Philosophy and Psychology of Teaching Typewriting. 2nd Ed. Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Company, 1973.
- Ryan, LaVerne C. "Wanted: Secretary." Business Education Forum, Vol. 28, No. 8 (May, 1974), pp. 35-36.
- Sobolik, Gayle A. "It Pays to be Sure--Proofread." The Journal of Business Education, Vol. 50, No. 5 (February, 1975), pp. 188-189.
- Staples, John. "An Experimental Study to Identify Basic Abilities Needed to Detect Typescript Errors With Implications for Improvement of Instruction in Typewriting." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, University of North Dakota, 1965.)
- Stuart, Eudene May. "The Relationship Between Selected Language Arts and Proofreading Performance." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, University of North Dakota, 1971.)
- Wanous, S. J. Personal and Professional Typing. 3rd Ed. Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Company, 1967.
- West, Leonard J. Acquisition of Typewriting Skills. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1969.
- Winger, Fred E. "Skill Building in Typewriting." National Business Education Association Yearbook. Vol. 12, Reston, Virginia: National Business Education Association, 1974, p. 67.

Wise, Elva Lea. "Training for Today's Office." The Balance Sheet,
Vol. LV, No. 6 (March, 1974), pp. 257-260.

Wong, Shirley. "A Study to Compare the Effects of Three Different
Methods of Reading Copy When Proofreading Straight Paragraph Copy
by First-Year Typewriting Students." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation,
Oregon State University, 1971.)

APPENDIX A

PROOFREADING EXERCISES

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 1

Instructions: Compare the original copy with the final copy. If there are any differences, circle them on the final copy.

Original Copy

42375
11211
41091
3655
5878

1020
35563
744111
772881
899093

711171
450947
328504
3535535
900733

4300419
821235
82330194
1551551
4017931

3241124
743233
6736773
2150550
3585853

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 1

Final Copy

42375
1211
41091
3566
5878

1020
35563
74411
778211
399093

711171
459047
328304
3535535
907333

4300019
821235
32230194
1551551
4017921

3241124
743223
6736773
2150550
3585855

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 2

Instructions: Compare the original copy with the final copy. If there are any differences, circle them on the final copy.

Original Copy

Dale Carnegie has written many books and articles on how to win friends and influence people. He also has established training courses to help people win friends. The recommendations that he gives in one of his books for making people like you are to become genuinely interested in other people, to smile, to remember that a man's name is to him the most important sound in any language, to be a good listener, to talk in terms of the other man's interest, and to make the other person feel important.

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 2

Final Copy

Dale Carnegie has written many books and articles on how to win friends and influence people. He also has established training courses to help people win freinds. The reccomendations that he gives in one of his books for making people like you are to become genuineley interested in other people, to smile, to rememember that a man's mane is to him the most important sound in any language, to be a good lisetener, to talk in terms of the other mans' interest, and to make the other person feel important,

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 3

Instructions: Compare the original copy with the final copy. If there are any differences, circle them on the final copy.

Original Copy

23.77
15.60
1,472.64
16.34
92.86

121.75
122.21
33.30
94.55
166.38

8,344.42
423.67
18.96
221.77
5,680.21

314.05
6,780.44
275.98
44,365.81
12,220.02

657,321.85
3,714.25
57,222.31
72.22
565.02

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 3

Final Copy

23.77
1.56
1,472.64
16.34
98.86

121.57
121.21
33.00
94.55
166.38

8,344.42
422.67
81.96
221.79
5,680.12

134.05
6,780.44
275.98
44,653.81
12,220.00

857,321.85
3,714.25
51,222.31
72.22
565.02

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 4

Instructions: Compare the original copy with the final copy. If there are any differences, circle them on the final copy.

Original Copy

292 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, GA 30308
May 5, 1975

Sheraton-Plaza Hotel
Copley Square
Boston, MA 02116

Attention Reservations Desk

Gentlemen:

Please reserve a single room for me in the \$25 a day range from Friday, May 16, until Monday, May 19. I expect to arrive at the Sheraton-Plaza sometime after 6 p.m. on May 16 and plan to leave about 3 p.m. on May 19.

Please send a confirmation of this reservation to my office at the above address.

Very truly yours,

Horace O. Ransom

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 4

Final Copy

299 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, GA 30038
May 5, 1974

Sheraton-Plaza Hotel
Copely Square
Boston, MA 02116

Attention Reservations Desk

Gentleman:

Please reserve a single room for me in the \$35 a day range from Friday, May 16, until Monday, May 19. I expect to arrive at the Sheraton-Plaza sometime after 6 p.m. on May 16 and plan to leave about 3 p.m. on May 19,

Please send a confirmation of this reservations to my office at the above address.

Very truly yours

Horace Q. Ransom

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 5

Instructions: Compare the original copy with the final copy. If there are any differences, circle them on the final copy.

Original Copy

Mr. Harold Hite
1816 Willow Road
Troy, New York 12180

Mrs. Allice Hanson
3655 Duncan Drive
Atlanta, Georgia 30318

Mr. Jerry Walters
935 Harris Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53216

Mr. Richard Peters
1336 Christine
Fremont, CA 94538

Mrs. Ramona Craben
73 Perry Place
New York, New York 10017

Mr. Ronald Meeker
522 Ellen Lane
Collegetown, Maine 04192

Mrs. Mary Lloyd
2775 Central Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut 06100

Mrs. John Simmons
401 Maple Avenue
St. Petersburg, Florida 33713

Mr. Milton Morris
1221 West Lincoln
Atlanta, GA 30312

Mrs. Gary Lambe
2101 Evanston
Newkirk, Alabama 35213

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 5

Final Copy

Mr. Harold Hite
1815 Willow Road
Troy, New York 12180

Mrs. Alice Hanson
3655 Duncan Drive
Atlanta, Georgia 30318

Mr. Jerry Walters
935 Harris Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 52316

Mr. Richard Peters
1336 Christine
Fremont, CA 94538

Mrs. Ramona Graben
73 Perry Place
New York, New York 10017

Mr. Ronald Meaker
522 Ellen Lane
Collegetown, Maine 04992

Mrs. Mary Lloyd
2775 Central Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut 06100

Mrs. John Simons
401 Maple Avenue
St. Petersburg, Florida 33113

Mr. Milton Morris
1212 West Lincoln
Atlanta, CA 30312

Mrs. Gary Lambe
2101 Evanston
Newkirk, Alabama 35123

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 6

Instructions: Compare the original copy with the final copy. If there are any differences, circle them on the final copy.

Original Copy

1482007147
5155155151
1290000650
341135111
4544544

142007147
6656566
445544434544
342111726552
21900073000

804777621939
5332353253
6006766777
314597826
8532144

5979973
665625933
441477114411
145973288
66338686

79343651
1941665543
864663295
923659148
2554977612

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 6

Final Copy

1482007147
515515151
129000650
34113511
4544544

142002147
6656566
44554434544
342111726552
21900073000

80477762939
5332353523
6006766777
314579826
5832144

5979973
665635933
4414177114411
145972288
66338686

79343651
7941665543
654663295
923659148
2554977612

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 7

Instructions: Compare the original copy with the final copy. If there are any differences, circle them on the final copy.

Original Copy

When you apply for a job, you will be asked to state what you can do. Most jobs require some special skill. For example, some firms may want to know if you can typewrite, and others if you can handle figures. Most firms will want to know something about you as a person—whether or not you are lazy, how well you can work with others, and how much pride you have in your work.

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 7

Final Copy

When you apply for a job you will be asked to state what you can do. Most jobs require some special skill. For example, some firms may want to know if you can typewrite, and others if you can handle figures. Most firms will want to know something about you as a person-- whether or not you are lazy, how well you can work with others, and how much pride you have in your work.

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 8

Instructions: Compare the original copy with the final copy. If there are any differences, circle them on the final copy.

Original Copy

777,888.21
665,321.14
371,737.37
8,827.40
651,372.00

1,355.04
752,365.99
66,424.00
37,514.92
83,833.38

66,341.11
1,411.77
327.49
992,000.47
64,271.01

32,584.61
41,761.07
23,509.76
1,446.83
141,835.92

65,221.84
71,340.00
29,856.63
44,221.15
711,356.29

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 8

Final Copy

777,888.12
65,321.14
371,237.37
8,827.40
657,312.00

1,533.04
152,365.99
99,424.00
37,514.92
83,883.38

66,341.00
1,411.77
327.49
992,000.47
64,277.01

32,584.61
47,161.07
32,509.76
1,446.83
141,835.92

56,221.84
71,340.00
29,856.63
44,221.15
771,356.29

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 9

Instructions: Compare the original copy with the final copy. If there are any differences, circle them on the final copy.

Original Copy

July 15, 1975

Miss Lynn Kosater
4907 Westmont Drive
Cripple Creek, CO 80813

Dear Miss Kosater

Thank you for your order of 3 copies of Walden by Henry David Thoreau. We have in stock 3 editions of this book:

1. Modern Library Edition, hardbound, \$ 2.69
2. Doubleday Edition, paperback \$.95
3. Peter Pauper Press Edition, hardbound, \$ 6.50

All editions are complete; differences in prices represent differences in quality of books. The Peter Pauper edition is the only one that has attractive sketches throughout the book and a special cloth binding. It is especially appropriate for gift-giving.

We have enclosed a stamped, self-addressed postcard that will simplify your task of informing us of your choice. We will send your order promptly upon receipt of this postcard.

Sincerely yours

Robert Mansford, Manager

jfd

Enclosure

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 9

Final Copy

July 15, 1975

Mrs. Lynn Kosetar
4707 Westmont Drive
Cripple Creek, CO 80813

Dear Mrs. Kosater

Thank you for your order of 3 copies of Walden by Henry David Thoreau. We have in stock 3 editions of this book:

1. Modern Library Edition, hardbound, \$2.69
2. Doubleday Edition, paperback, \$1.95
3. Peter Pouper Press Edition, hardbound, \$5.60

All editions are complete; differences in prices represent differences in quality of books. The Peter Pauper edition is the only one that has attractive sketches throughout the book and a special cloth binding. It is especially appropriate for gift-giving.

We have inclosed a stamped, self-addressed postcard that will simplify your task of informing us of your choice. We will send your order promptly upon receipt of this postcard.

Sincerely yours

Robert Manford, Manager

jc

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 10

Instructions: Compare the original copy with the final copy. If there are any differences, circle them on the final copy.

Original Copy

Mr. Walter Stribling
8645 Melrose Lane
Seattle, Washington 98122

Mr. Clifford Canfield
2101 Biggers Boulevard
Aberdeen, South Dakota 41990

Mrs. George Jackson
1449 Riverside Drive
Covington, Kentucky 41010

Mr. Frederick Jones
3149 Harrison Street
Aaronsburg, Pennsylvania 15926

Mrs. Marshall Smithke
5522 Beech Lane
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87104

Mr. Edward Benson
7820 East 22nd Drive
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74129

Mr. David Milburn
1919 Evergreen
Cincinnati, Ohio 45240

Mrs. William Carnes
100 Stanford
Tyler, Texas 75701

Mr. Howard Graham
128 East 26th
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49002

Mrs. Jerry Chamberlain
92751 Holly Avenue
San Jose, California 91520

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 10

Final Copy

Mr. Walter Stribling
8645 Melrose Lane
Seattle, Washington 99122

Mr. Clifford Canfield
2011 Biggers Boulevard
Aberdeen, South Dakota 41990

Mrs. George Jackson
1449 Riverside Drive
Covington, Kentucky 41019

Mr. Frederick Jones
3144 Harrison Street
Aaronsburg, Pennsylvania 15926

Mrs. Marshall Smithe
5522 Beech Lane
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87104

Mr. Edward Benson
7824 East 32nd Drive
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74129

Mr. David Milbern
1919 Evergreen
Cincinnati, Ohio 45240

Mrs. William Carnes
100 Stanford
Tyler, Texas 75701

Mr. Howard Graham
128 East 26th
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49002

Mrs. Terry Chamberland
92751 Holly Avenue
San Jose, California 91520

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 11

Instructions: Type the information below on another page. Then compare your typing with the original copy. If there are any differences, circle them on your typed copy.

Original Copy

34561
79985
431022
11847
9819653

42615
817050
3926101
1654
1707303

69541
78720
448629
788193
1056

142790
29734
100568
531066
91206

760159
23470
998135
1102368
68314

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 12

Instructions: Type the information below on another page. Then compare your typing with the original copy. If there are any differences, circle them on your typed copy.

Original Copy

All letters convey two messages. One is expressed in words; the other, by the impression it makes on the reader. The second is the hidden quality you put into an envelope each time you mail a letter. The written message is important; let there be no doubt on this point. A letter must say what it should, and it should say it clearly and succinctly. Nobody likes to receive fuzzy letters in which ideas defy interpretation. A clear letter is usually a welcome caller.

Almost everyone disapproves of men or women who overdress or who do not dress appropriately for their calling. As a writer remarked, "I hate to see men overdressed; a man ought to look like he is put together by accident, not added up on purpose." How you dress is very important; so are the letters you send out to represent you. They should reflect a company at its very best. Letters gain admittance more easily than callers, but this privilege should not be abused.

In an office setting, you must be observant of the many hidden qualities that are part of any good letter. A firm will often be judged on the typing and on the care you take in spelling, punctuating, and proofreading your work. Somehow, a letter that is faulty in these basic points does not impress a reader with the purpose of its message. The letters you type must express the dignity and sincerity with which a company conducts business affairs.

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 13

Instructions: Type the information below on another page. Then compare your typing with the original copy. If there are any differences, circle them on your typed copy.

Original Copy

13,570.32
2,456.80
13.85
3,870.49
14,899.77

2,581.39
14,875.66
2,980.95
85,432.50
100.89

3,580.41
295.88
2,750.65
18,451.87
23,405.00

2,586.36
11.23
500.49
385.60
2,780.41

4,358.49
256.15
298.30
5,781.10
11,183.33

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 14

Instructions: Type the information below on another page. Then compare your typing with the original copy. If there are any differences, circle them on your typed copy.

Original Copy

March 14, 1975

Mr. A. A. Allen
445 Davis Drive
Billings, MT 59102

Dear Mr. Allen:

SUBJECT: Loan No. 3758

We wrote you last month concerning the delinquency of payments on your loan. As yet, we have received neither a reply nor a remittance. Two installments, amounting to \$548.00, are now due.

It has always been our policy to be lenient whenever possible; however, we feel that we are entitled to some explanation when payments are not made on time.

Can you make a substantial payment on your account within the next ten days? If not, we shall have to request the trustees to institute sales proceedings in accordance with the terms of your trust deed. The expense of this action will be chargeable to you.

We sincerely hope that you will give this account your prompt attention and avoid the expense and inconvenience of the action mentioned above.

Very truly yours,

GRIGGS FINANCE ASSOCIATION

F. E. Blount, Secretary

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 15

Instructions: Type the information below on another page. Then compare your typing with the original copy. If there are any differences, circle them on your typed copy.

Original Copy

Mr. Walter Davis
3285 Jefferson Avenue
Salt Lake City, UT 84121

Mrs. Eugene Jones
3175 Smith Street
Newport News, VA 23601

Mrs. Judith Morris
2800 Loveland
Trenton, NJ 08610

Mrs. Ira Hancock
3813 Evergreen Street
Riverside, CA 92501

Morris Sporting Goods Store
258 Pinewood Avenue
Jersey City, NJ 07302

Baker and Baker, Inc.
401 Brady Building
Hartford, CT 06107

Miss Janice Meeker
450 Hancock Drive
Durham, NC 27703

Mrs. A. J. Davids
1334 Charleston
Dayton, OH 45427

Miss Angela Applebury
3140 Cottonwood Street
Wichita, KS 67203

Mrs. Mark Sims
485 Combs Building
Augusta, GA 30904

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 16

Instructions: Type the information below on another page. Then compare your typing with the original copy. If there are any differences, circle them on your typed copy.

Original Copy

47836
972143
13839
108141
368429

213540
2346
83419
56455
100344

23349
968423
783490
684110
2793

334591
54126
61445
723111
413689

67125
293144
365972
1583
45961

Name _____

PROOFREADING. EXERCISE NO. 17

Instructions: Type the information below on another page. Then compare your typing with the original copy. If there are any differences, circle them on your typed copy.

Original Copy

There are only a half dozen operating parts of a typewriter that are used frequently. You can add several words to your rate by using expertly any one of the six. Getting high typing rates is more often a case of eliminating useless motions than working more rapidly. Just analyze what you do when you use the shift and tabular keys, the space bar, the carriage return, the margin release, or backspace key. Note the movements you make. Cut out any that are not necessary.

Manipulating the shift is part of the typing. You should employ the correct method in shifting for a capital. If you are using a standard machine, hold your left elbow in regular position, stretch the little finger to the shift key, depress and hold down until the capital has been struck and released. If you do an inadequate job so have a capital suspended in midair or only partly visible, there is a better way to type. Practice until you improve.

Do you begin without a pause after a carriage return is made on a manual typewriter? If not, practice to improve. When you return the carriage, use a short throw with the elbow held close to the body. When a return is completed, drop the hand to normal position, and begin typing on the next line without pausing. The entire operation takes only split seconds, and it will, if you practice the techniques correctly.

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 18

Instructions: Type the information below on another page. Then compare your typing with the original copy. If there are any differences, circle them on your typed copy.

Original Copy

85,321.96
2,788.30
5,912.25
301.45
27.50

345.90
2,710.46
5,431.85
291.49
23,886.98

4,810.35
5,988.66
65,432.81
4,212.00
3,771.17

8,388.85
9,141.00
285.33
6,124.27
325,418.70

456.81
3,910.25
7,874.12
29,685.31
4,786.29

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 19

Instructions: Type the information below on another page. Then compare your typing with the original copy. If there are any differences, circle them on your typed copy.

Original Copy

May 24, 1975

Mr. Steven F. Scott
256 Crockett Drive
Austin, Texas 78705

Dear Mr. Scott:

Subject: Meeting of June 13

The Board of Directors will meet on Friday, June 13.

There are several items that must be considered before our meeting date in July. It is very important that the special committee reports be presented for criticism so that any suggested revisions can be considered by the committee. Action must also be taken on two new resolutions that will greatly affect our operations during the coming months.

The meeting will begin promptly at 1:30 in the Grand Conference Room. A copy of the agenda is enclosed for your information.

Very truly yours,

Robert Alcock

jpd

Enclosure

Name _____

PROOFREADING EXERCISE NO. 20

Instructions: Type the information below on another page. Then compare your typing with the original copy. If there are any differences, circle them on your typed copy.

Original Copy

Bond-Barnes Equipment Company
3875 Maine
South Bend, Indiana 46637

Mr. Ralph Morton
21855 Civic Circle
St. Lauderdale, Florida 33311

Mr. Francis Cossell
951 Washington Avenue
Montgomery, Alabama 36105

Mr. Robert Danielson
315 Commerce Building
Phoenix, Arizona 85022

Mrs. Albert Freeman
7610 Stanfield Lane
Ogden, Utah 84403

Mr. Peter Allen
240 Adams Avenue
Bridgeport, Connecticut 06607

Mr. Whitney Greene
4452 Davis Drive
Newark, New Jersey 07104

Mr. Charles A. Cochran
8750 Memorial Drive
Spokane, Washington 99203

Miss Anne Jamison
2765 Seventeenth Avenue
Houston, Texas 77022

Mr. James Ziemer
40 Livingston Lane
Springfield, Missouri 65821

APPENDIX B

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

TABLE XVIII
INDIVIDUAL GRADE POINT AVERAGES

Control Group		Experimental Group	
Student No.	Grade Point Average	Student No.	Grade Point Average
1	3.028	1	3.322
2	2.619	2	2.321
3	2.866	3	3.456
4	3.087	4	3.522
5	1.285	5	1.958
6	2.155	6	2.413
7	1.892	7	2.034
8	1.941	8	2.245
9	3.000	9	2.900
10	4.000	10	2.774
11	2.300	11	3.307
12	2.043	12	2.215
13	3.414	13	3.000
14	3.172	14	2.750
15	2.557	15	2.916
16	3.178	16	3.900
17	3.633	17	2.203
18	3.285	18	3.000
19	2.088	19	3.266
20	2.625	20	3.269
21	3.157	21	2.000
22	2.900	22	3.300
23	2.833	23	2.357
24	2.389	24	3.016
25	2.642	25	2.362
26	2.343	26	2.266
27	3.896	27	2.612
28	2.111	28	2.180
29	1.542	29	3.250
30	2.892	30	3.508
31	3.700	31	3.344
32	2.733	32	2.793
33	3.048	33	2.766
34	3.531	34	3.655
35	2.653	35	2.516
36	2.616	36	2.472
37	3.000	37	3.482
38	3.800	38	2.503
39	2.806	39	3.127
40	2.750	40	2.431
41	2.965	41	3.823
42	2.774	42	3.125
Mean	2.792	Mean	2.849

TABLE XIX
INDIVIDUAL ACT SCORES*

Control Group		Experimental Group	
Student No.	ACT Score	Student No.	ACT Score
1	22	1	15
2	18	2	16
3	14	3	22
4	21	4	19
5	24	5	10
6	17	6	23
7	15	7	--
8	--	8	--
9	18	9	16
10	28	10	16
11	12	11	--
12	07	12	09
13	19	13	--
14	17	14	19
15	16	15	17
16	21	16	25
17	24	17	17
18	17	18	19
19	19	19	--
20	23	20	15
21	18	21	11
22	17	22	22
23	19	23	21
24	--	24	18
25	17	25	20
26	21	26	13
27	28	27	23
28	17	28	24
29	17	29	18
30	19	30	23
31	29	31	23
32	14	32	21
33	--	33	13
34	28	34	21
35	20	35	--
36	--	36	20
37	16	37	21
38	21	38	--
39	10	39	13
40	16	40	15
41	18	41	24
42	20	42	21
Mean	18.868	Mean	18.371

*No ACT score was available for transfer students.

TABLE XX
INDIVIDUAL BUSINESS/NON-BUSINESS MAJORS

Control Group		Experimental Group	
Student No.	Business/ Non-Business	Student No.	Business/ Non-Business
1	Business	1	Business
2	Non-Business	2	Business
3	Business	3	Non-Business
4	Business	4	Business
5	Business	5	Business
6	Business	6	Business
7	Business	7	Non-Business
8	Non-Business	8	Business
9	Business	9	Business
10	Business	10	Non-Business
11	Business	11	Business
12	Business	12	Business
13	Business	13	Business
14	Business	14	Non-Business
15	Non-Business	15	Business
16	Business	16	Business
17	Business	17	Business
18	Business	18	Business
19	Business	19	Business
20	Business	20	Business
21	Business	21	Business
22	Business	22	Business
23	Business	23	Non-Business
24	Business	24	Business
25	Business	25	Business
26	Business	26	Business
27	Business	27	Business
28	Business	28	Business
29	Business	29	Business
30	Business	30	Business
31	Business	31	Non-Business
32	Business	32	Business
33	Business	33	Business
34	Business	34	Business
35	Business	35	Business
36	Business	36	Non-Business
37	Business	37	Non-Business
38	Business	38	Business
39	Business	39	Business
40	Business	40	Business
41	Business	41	Business
42	Business	42	Business

TABLE XXI
INDIVIDUAL GRADE CLASSIFICATIONS

Control Group		Experimental Group	
Student No.	Classification	Student No.	Classification
1	Freshman	1	Freshman
2	Sophomore	2	Freshman
3	Freshman	3	Sophomore
4	Senior	4	Freshman
5	Freshman	5	Freshman
6	Sophomore	6	Sophomore
7	Freshman	7	Freshman
8	Freshman	8	Sophomore
9	Freshman	9	Freshman
10	Freshman	10	Freshman
11	Freshman	11	Freshman
12	Freshman	12	Sophomore
13	Sophomore	13	Special
14	Freshman	14	Freshman
15	Sophomore	15	Sophomore
16	Freshman	16	Freshman
17	Freshman	17	Sophomore
18	Freshman	18	Freshman
19	Sophomore	19	Freshman
20	Freshman	20	Freshman
21	Sophomore	21	Freshman
22	Freshman	22	Sophomore
23	Freshman	23	Freshman
24	Special	24	Sophomore
25	Freshman	25	Junior
26	Junior	26	Freshman
27	Sophomore	27	Freshman
28	Freshman	28	Junior
29	Sophomore	29	Freshman
30	Freshman	30	Sophomore
31	Sophomore	31	Freshman
32	Freshman	32	Freshman
33	Sophomore	33	Freshman
34	Freshman	34	Freshman
35	Freshman	35	Junior
36	Junior	36	Sophomore
37	Freshman	37	Senior
38	Freshman	38	Senior
39	Freshman	39	Senior
40	Freshman	40	Sophomore
41	Freshman	41	Freshman
42	Freshman	42	Sophomore

TABLE XXII
INDIVIDUAL CLASS ABSENCES

Control Group		Experimental Group	
Student No.	Absences	Student No.	Absences
1	1	1	6
2	1	2	11
3	12	3	9
4	2	4	14
5	10	5	17
6	13	6	30
7	3	7	13
8	3	8	8
9	4	9	1
10	5	10	12
11	1	11	6
12	0	12	6
13	5	13	2
14	0	14	9
15	8	15	0
16	4	16	13
17	3	17	11
18	11	18	21
19	12	19	7
20	11	20	1
21	5	21	23
22	2	22	0
23	2	23	17
24	2	24	10
25	7	25	17
26	2	26	14
27	9	27	9
28	2	28	8
29	10	29	6
30	4	30	3
31	6	31	5
32	0	32	7
33	10	33	19
34	1	34	5
35	9	35	16
36	11	36	6
37	3	37	8
38	0	38	14
39	2	39	3
40	4	40	3
41	0	41	7
42	7	42	2
Mean	4.929	Mean	9.500

APPENDIX C

PROOFREADING ERROR RECORDS

TABLE XXIII

INDIVIDUAL PROOFREADING ERRORS ON TIMED WRITINGS
BY CONTROL GROUP

Student No.	Timed Writing No.																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1	1	1	0	2	1	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
2	3	3	2	2	2	0	1	3	3	2	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	1
3	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	-	-	2	0	0	2	3	4	2	1	2	1
4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
5	2	0	3	1	1	1	1	-	-	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
6	3	6	1	6	5	1	2	5	3	3	2	1	1	0	0	-	-	2	7
7	8	8	9	5	8	9	3	8	-	28	19	5	8	11	8	6	26	22	8
8	4	0	2	0	3	4	4	-	-	2	3	0	0	2	0	1	2	1	3
9	2	0	0	3	2	1	0	3	4	1	5	-	-	3	2	0	0	5	5
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	-	-	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
11	0	1	0	2	2	6	7	11	8	16	16	3	4	3	6	6	8	3	12
12	0	0	3	0	0	3	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	1	1
13	2	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	0	1	0	0	0
14	4	0	3	2	1	2	3	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	4	2
15	0	-	-	2	3	3	2	-	-	2	4	3	0	1	0	3	2	1	1
16	1	0	2	0	0	1	3	1	4	0	1	3	1	3	0	3	6	1	0
17	0	0	0	-	-	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18	3	0	1	-	-	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
19	-	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	0	-	-	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
20	3	-	-	3	0	3	3	-	-	1	12	6	4	3	0	1	0	4	2
21	-	1	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
22	0	0	0	2	4	0	1	3	1	8	5	1	1	2	1	2	2	0	1
23	2	4	4	1	2	1	3	0	1	3	3	4	1	1	3	2	1	2	0
24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
25	4	9	2	-	-	6	3	-	-	2	5	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	2
26	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	4	2	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	-

TABLE XXIII (Continued)

Student No.	Timed Writing No.																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
27	2	-	-	0	1	-	-	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	1
28	4	10	3	3	6	5	1	7	4	6	3	0	1	10	8	4	2	6	4
29	1	9	5	6	3	8	8	15	31	13	12	1	4	16	6	6	8	11	8
30	2	1	0	6	1	3	5	-	-	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	1
31	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	1
32	2	0	1	3	2	2	7	3	1	1	1	2	3	2	1	2	3	8	6
33	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	0	0	0	-	-	1	2
34	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	0
35	-	1	1	0	1	2	2	-	-	0	3	-	-	1	0	2	0	0	0
36	0	0	1	5	0	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	0	0	1	2
37	0	0	2	1	0	1	1	4	3	4	5	-	-	0	2	2	3	2	0
38	0	0	1	1	-	1	3	2	9	0	1	1	0	3	2	0	1	0	0
39	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	-	-	4	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	1
40	2	0	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	2	1	3	2	3	1	0	2	3	4
41	1	1	1	2	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	1
42	0	1	1	0	-	0	-	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0

TABLE XXIV

INDIVIDUAL PROOFREADING ERRORS ON TIMED WRITINGS
BY EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

Student No.	Timed Writing No.																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1	0	1	0	1	-	0	1	2	0	1	3	0	3	1	2	0	4	1	6
2	2	0	1	1	-	2	0	3	4	0	1	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	4	4	8	5	4	2	0	1	10	1	15	6	0	2	4	2	7	2	3
4	3	0	1	4	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	2	1	2	1	-	-	5	3
5	-	4	4	3	3	1	2	5	8	-	-	2	4	0	0	2	1	2	5
6	0	2	0	1	-	1	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	4	0	0
7	0	-	-	2	0	3	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	4	0	1	1
8	-	3	3	0	2	2	0	2	4	4	1	0	2	6	2	6	5	3	2
9	0	6	5	3	2	3	1	1	7	0	1	1	0	1	1	5	2	0	1
10	5	3	10	4	8	4	3	7	4	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	2
11	0	3	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	3	1	3
12	1	3	2	2	0	0	-	2	4	0	2	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	4
13	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
14	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	0	3	3	1	2	0	2	4
15	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	7	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	4	0
16	0	1	2	2	-	1	-	0	1	1	1	3	7	1	-	6	6	3	4
17	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	2	0	0	1	3	2	1	4	0
18	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	1
19	1	2	6	4	0	2	0	-	-	0	-	0	1	3	0	0	1	1	1
20	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	-	4	1
21	1	1	0	4	-	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	1
22	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
23	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	0	0	2	0	1
24	3	1	2	4	7	3	0	-	-	3	4	2	0	1	3	1	6	3	2
25	0	2	1	0	-	2	3	1	-	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	1	0	0
26	3	4	5	3	2	3	0	-	-	4	4	4	3	2	-	3	-	2	0

TABLE XXIV (Continued)

Student No.	Timed Writing No.																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
27	4	2	4	2	2	3	1	-	-	3	2	0	-	1	0	-	-	1	3
28	3	2	1	2	1	1	-	-	-	4	2	0	-	1	3	2	2	4	2
29	0	0	1	1	-	2	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
30	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
31	2	0	2	3	2	1	1	8	1	2	1	0	1	0	-	2	3	2	2
32	0	1	2	3	1	2	-	3	9	0	1	3	2	0	1	2	0	0	2
33	7	4	16	5	-	4	-	5	2	5	2	-	-	0	3	3	2	1	2
34	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	1
35	2	-	-	3	2	4	0	13	1	1	0	2	-	2	0	2	5	2	0
36	2	2	2	-	-	0	1	0	2	0	1	-	-	3	2	2	0	2	3
37	1	5	2	0	1	0	4	1	2	1	2	0	2	1	3	0	1	-	-
38	1	2	2	1	0	2	-	1	3	0	1	0	2	2	1	0	1	1	1
39	-	1	1	0	1	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
40	2	3	2	1	2	0	2	1	3	0	2	3	6	1	0	3	2	2	1
41	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3
42	2	3	1	1	1	2	0	6	2	0	1	1	2	3	0	1	2	0	1

TABLE XXV
 PROOFREADING ERROR AVERAGES
 ON TIMED WRITINGS

Control Group		Experimental Group	
Student No.	Error Average	Student No.	Error Average
1	.684	1	1.444
2	1.579	2	.824
3	1.294	3	4.211
4	.235	4	1.857
5	.765	5	2.875
6	2.824	6	.889
7	11.056	7	.941
8	1.824	8	2.611
9	2.118	9	2.105
10	.412	10	3.316
11	6.000	11	1.158
12	.947	12	1.389
13	.737	13	.684
14	1.579	14	1.474
15	1.800	15	1.053
16	1.579	16	2.438
17	.176	17	1.105
18	.588	18	.842
19	.563	19	1.375
20	3.000	20	.944
21	.250	21	.889
22	1.789	22	.737
23	2.000	23	.500
24	.368	24	2.647
25	2.533	25	1.000
26	1.111	26	2.800
27	.733	27	2.000
28	4.579	28	2.000
29	9.000	29	.778
30	1.765	30	.368
31	.421	31	1.833
32	2.632	32	1.778
33	.867	33	4.067
34	.632	34	.421
35	.929	35	2.438
36	1.211	36	1.467
37	1.765	37	1.529
38	1.389	38	1.167
39	1.294	39	.500
40	1.929	40	1.895
41	1.263	41	.526
42	.412	42	1.526
Mean	1.872	Mean	1.581

TABLE XXVI

INDIVIDUAL PROOFREADING ERRORS ON PRODUCTION MEASUREMENTS
BY CONTROL GROUP

Student No.	Production Measurement No.													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	0	0	1	5	2	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	1
2	0	0	3	2	1	2	0	0	3	0	2	-	1	1
3	1	3	1	2	2	5	1	5	0	0	0	0	2	1
4	1	0	1	3	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	2	1	1
5	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	3
6	4	5	11	1	3	5	3	2	2	2	1	2	-	8
7	2	5	1	9	2	1	3	3	4	0	2	1	2	6
8	1	2	0	1	2	5	0	1	4	1	3	2	0	0
9	0	0	0	1	0	7	1	2	0	1	2	5	6	2
10	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
11	2	3	4	7	7	14	0	5	7	7	5	3	3	6
12	0	1	2	2	2	6	1	1	2	0	2	2	2	1
13	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
14	2	1	24	5	1	2	1	2	0	1	1	2	2	0
15	0	3	3	5	2	1	1	0	2	2	1	3	1	3
16	0	0	1	4	2	4	3	1	1	0	1	0	7	1
17	0	0	-	1	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	1	0	0
18	0	3	0	2	1	9	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
19	0	2	0	0	4	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	2
20	1	2	1	14	0	0	1	0	-	0	0	4	1	1
21	0	4	3	0	3	1	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	1
22	10	0	4	1	2	12	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	4
23	1	1	2	4	2	6	1	3	2	3	2	1	0	3
24	0	1	0	3	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	1
25	2	0	1	1	3	2	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	1
26	3	2	1	4	1	0	2	1	0	1	1	1	2	1

TABLE XXVI (Continued)

Student No.	Production Measurement No.													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
27	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	3
28	4	0	4	7	4	7	1	1	1	4	0	4	8	1
29	15	13	16	7	-	6	3	-	4	2	17	14	8	7
30	0	2	3	1	0	4	0	4	-	0	0	2	2	3
31	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	1
32	2	0	1	6	2	5	0	4	2	2	1	3	1	0
33	1	4	2	2	3	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	-	4
34	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1
35	0	0	2	2	2	3	0	1	1	2	-	3	1	0
36	0	0	3	5	2	5	0	0	-	1	1	0	3	3
37	1	0	5	2	6	8	0	8	3	0	2	3	3	4
38	0	1	1	3	0	1	0	0	-	1	1	4	4	1
39	0	1	1	2	5	2	0	1	0	3	3	0	2	2
40	0	2	2	3	2	3	0	1	3	2	0	1	1	1
41	1	6	2	1	5	3	0	2	1	0	1	2	3	0
42	0	5	0	2	5	4	1	2	0	2	0	1	2	1

TABLE XXVII

INDIVIDUAL PROOFREADING ERRORS ON PRODUCTION MEASUREMENTS
BY EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

Student No.	Production Measurement No.													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	4	2	2	0	3	1	0	2	0	11	0	2	0	1
2	13	4	6	2	3	5	0	11	3	1	1	3	0	2
3	3	5	32	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	2	4	3	5
4	2	1	2	5	8	1	1	2	2	2	2	7	-	0
5	-	3	8	-	3	3	2	5	1	-	12	4	1	3
6	4	3	3	1	2	2	3	6	2	3	8	4	2	2
7	2	-	4	0	4	1	1	2	0	0	2	5	1	1
8	25	6	3	4	3	1	5	7	3	5	7	5	2	7
9	14	2	2	2	0	3	0	4	0	1	3	4	1	2
10	9	8	4	6	6	17	2	6	0	1	1	4	1	4
11	0	2	1	2	2	1	1	0	3	1	0	3	2	0
12	3	1	1	2	1	0	0	-	2	0	0	2	1	0
13	5	1	1	2	3	3	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	0
14	8	1	1	3	3	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	3	2
15	13	2	1	4	4	3	1	0	0	3	3	4	1	3
16	4	3	2	4	4	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	6	3
17	4	6	6	7	1	2	0	4	0	1	1	2	0	2
18	3	1	1	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1
19	3	5	7	1	0	1	0	2	2	3	2	2	1	1
20	2	5	1	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	1	5	0	1
21	13	3	4	3	9	2	2	-	0	3	3	6	4	3
22	2	4	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	10	0	3
23	1	8	1	1	2	1	-	1	1	3	1	0	0	4
24	1	2	6	1	2	4	0	2	1	2	0	2	3	1
25	5	0	2	0	0	2	1	4	1	1	1	2	7	4
26	2	2	4	6	3	1	1	3	3	2	4	10	1	8

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Student No.	Production Measurement No.													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
27	11	1	6	2	5	1	0	1	1	2	2	0	1	2
28	3	2	1	3	2	3	0	2	0	3	3	1	0	3
29	2	0	4	3	0	0	2	2	0	3	2	0	4	1
30	3	2	1	3	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	1
31	16	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	1	5	1	3	0	2
32	1	0	2	4	2	21	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	4
33	1	6	5	5	1	4	5	5	3	3	-	10	12	2
34	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	1
35	3	5	10	2	8	8	4	5	3	1	9	5	4	2
36	9	4	4	7	9	6	3	5	2	5	-	4	1	9
37	4	2	4	5	2	1	2	1	0	2	2	5	4	-
38	2	0	1	1	1	1	-	2	0	4	3	2	3	1
39	-	1	4	0	2	1	2	3	0	1	2	4	1	1
40	8	5	4	4	4	1	2	2	1	3	5	1	1	3
41	1	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1
42	0	1	1	3	4	6	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	1

TABLE XXVIII
 PROOFREADING ERROR AVERAGES
 ON PRODUCTION MEASUREMENTS

Control Group		Experimental Group	
Student No.	Error Average	Student No.	Error Average
1	1.286	1	2.000
2	1.154	2	3.857
3	1.643	3	4.786
4	1.000	4	2.692
5	1.000	5	4.091
6	3.769	6	3.214
7	2.929	7	1.769
8	1.571	8	5.929
9	1.929	9	2.714
10	.786	10	4.929
11	5.214	11	1.286
12	1.714	12	1.000
13	.643	13	1.429
14	3.143	14	1.857
15	1.929	15	3.000
16	1.786	16	2.429
17	.615	17	2.571
18	1.286	18	1.143
19	1.143	19	2.143
20	1.923	20	1.429
21	1.214	21	4.231
22	2.786	22	1.714
23	2.214	23	1.846
24	.929	24	1.929
25	1.143	25	2.143
26	1.429	26	3.571
27	.714	27	2.500
28	3.286	28	1.857
29	9.333	29	1.643
30	1.615	30	1.286
31	.571	31	2.429
32	2.071	32	2.929
33	1.846	33	4.769
34	.571	34	.786
35	1.308	35	4.929
36	1.769	36	5.231
37	3.214	37	2.615
38	1.308	38	1.615
39	1.571	39	1.692
40	1.500	40	3.143
41	1.929	41	.929
42	1.786	42	1.500
Mean	1.918	Mean	2.608

TABLE XXIX
 AVERAGE NUMBER OF PROOFREADING ERRORS
 ON EACH TIMED WRITING

Control Group		Experimental Group	
Measurement Number	Error Average	Measurement Number	Error Average
1	1.461	1	1.513
2	1.513	2	1.825
3	1.342	3	2.350
4	1.763	4	1.805
5	1.722	5	1.375
6	1.850	6	1.452
7	2.077	7	.706
8	2.689	8	2.108
9	3.071	9	2.457
10	2.829	10	1.000
11	2.927	11	1.692
12	1.077	12	.975
13	1.179	13	1.250
14	2.071	14	1.143
15	1.357	15	1.051
16	1.375	16	1.625
17	1.900	17	1.763
18	2.310	18	1.634
19	2.098	19	1.780
Mean	1.927	Mean	1.553

TABLE XXX
 AVERAGE NUMBER OF PROOFREADING ERRORS
 ON EACH PRODUCTION MEASUREMENT

Control Group		Experimental Group	
Measurement Number	Error Average	Measurement Number	Error Average
1	1.381	1	5.250
2	1.762	2	2.707
3	2.634	3	3.690
4	3.024	4	2.537
5	2.146	5	2.833
6	3.476	6	2.786
7	.762	7	1.125
8	1.537	8	2.500
9	1.395	9	1.024
10	1.048	10	2.049
11	1.390	11	2.300
12	1.976	12	3.357
13	2.075	13	1.854
14	1.905	14	2.366
Mean	1.894	Mean	2.598

APPENDIX D

COMPARISONS OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION
WITH PROOFREADING ERROR RECORD

TABLE XXXI

COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL GRADE POINT AVERAGES
WITH PROOFREADING ERROR AVERAGES

Control Group			Experimental Group		
Student No.	Above/Below GPA*	Mean PR*	Student No.	Above/Below GPA*	Mean PR*
1	Above	Below	1	Above	Below
2	Below	Below	2	Below	Above
3	Above	Below	3	Above	Above
4	Above	Below	4	Above	Above
5	Below	Below	5	Below	Above
6	Below	Above	6	Below	Above
7	Below	Above	7	Below	Below
8	Below	Below	8	Below	Above
9	Above	Above	9	Above	Above
10	Above	Below	10	Below	Above
11	Below	Above	11	Above	Below
12	Below	Below	12	Below	Below
13	Above	Below	13	Above	Below
14	Above	Above	14	Below	Below
15	Below	Above	15	Above	Above
16	Above	Below	16	Above	Below
17	Above	Below	17	Below	Below
18	Above	Below	18	Above	Below
19	Below	Below	19	Above	Below
20	Below	Above	20	Above	Below
21	Above	Below	21	Below	Above
22	Above	Above	22	Above	Below
23	Above	Above	23	Below	Below
24	Below	Below	24	Above	Below
25	Below	Below	25	Below	Below
26	Below	Below	26	Below	Above
27	Above	Below	27	Below	Below
28	Below	Above	28	Below	Below
29	Below	Above	29	Above	Below
30	Above	Below	30	Above	Below
31	Above	Below	31	Above	Below
32	Below	Above	32	Below	Above
33	Above	Below	33	Below	Above
34	Above	Below	34	Above	Below
35	Below	Below	35	Below	Above
36	Below	Below	36	Below	Above
37	Above	Above	37	Above	Above
38	Above	Below	38	Below	Below
39	Above	Below	39	Above	Below
40	Below	Below	40	Below	Above
41	Above	Above	41	Above	Below
42	Below	Below	42	Above	Below

* Grade Point Average

**Proofreading Error Average on Production Measurements

TABLE XXXII

COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL BUSINESS AND NON-BUSINESS MAJORS
WITH PROOFREADING ERROR AVERAGES

Control Group			Experimental Group		
Student No.	Business/Non-Business	Above/Below*	Student No.	Business/Non-Business	Above/Below*
1	Business	Below	1	Business	Below
2	Non-Business	Below	2	Business	Above
3	Business	Below	3	Non-Business	Above
4	Business	Below	4	Business	Above
5	Business	Below	5	Business	Above
6	Business	Above	6	Business	Above
7	Business	Above	7	Non-Business	Below
8	Non-Business	Below	8	Business	Above
9	Business	Above	9	Business	Above
10	Business	Below	10	Non-Business	Above
11	Business	Above	11	Business	Below
12	Business	Below	12	Business	Below
13	Business	Below	13	Business	Below
14	Business	Above	14	Non-Business	Below
15	Non-Business	Above	15	Business	Above
16	Business	Below	16	Business	Below
17	Business	Below	17	Business	Below
18	Business	Below	18	Business	Below
19	Business	Below	19	Business	Below
20	Business	Above	20	Business	Below
21	Business	Below	21	Business	Above
22	Business	Above	22	Business	Below
23	Business	Above	23	Non-Business	Below
24	Business	Below	24	Business	Below
25	Business	Below	25	Business	Below
26	Business	Below	26	Business	Above
27	Business	Below	27	Business	Below
28	Business	Above	28	Business	Below
29	Business	Above	29	Business	Below
30	Business	Below	30	Business	Below
31	Business	Below	31	Non-Business	Below
32	Business	Above	32	Business	Above
33	Business	Below	33	Business	Above
34	Business	Below	34	Business	Below
35	Business	Below	35	Business	Above
36	Business	Below	36	Non-Business	Above
37	Business	Above	37	Non-Business	Above
38	Business	Below	38	Business	Below
39	Business	Below	39	Business	Below
40	Business	Below	40	Business	Above
41	Business	Above	41	Business	Below
42	Business	Below	42	Business	Below

*Proofreading error mean on Production Measurements

TABLE XXXIII

COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL GRADE CLASSIFICATION
WITH PROOFREADING ERROR AVERAGES

Control Group			Experimental Group		
Student No.	Grade Classification	Above/Below*	Student No.	Grade Classification	Above/Below*
1	Freshman	Below	1	Freshman	Below
2	Sophomore	Below	2	Freshman	Above
3	Freshman	Below	3	Sophomore	Above
4	Senior	Below	4	Freshman	Above
5	Freshman	Below	5	Freshman	Above
6	Sophomore	Above	6	Sophomore	Above
7	Freshman	Above	7	Freshman	Below
8	Freshman	Below	8	Sophomore	Above
9	Freshman	Above	9	Freshman	Above
10	Freshman	Below	10	Freshman	Above
11	Freshman	Above	11	Freshman	Below
12	Freshman	Below	12	Sophomore	Below
13	Sophomore	Below	13	Special	Below
14	Freshman	Above	14	Freshman	Below
15	Sophomore	Above	15	Sophomore	Above
16	Freshman	Below	16	Freshman	Below
17	Freshman	Below	17	Sophomore	Below
18	Freshman	Below	18	Freshman	Below
19	Sophomore	Below	19	Freshman	Below
20	Freshman	Above	20	Freshman	Below
21	Sophomore	Below	21	Freshman	Above
22	Freshman	Above	22	Sophomore	Below
23	Freshman	Above	23	Freshman	Below
24	Special	Below	24	Sophomore	Below
25	Freshman	Below	25	Junior	Below
26	Junior	Below	26	Freshman	Above
27	Sophomore	Below	27	Freshman	Below
28	Freshman	Above	28	Junior	Below
29	Sophomore	Above	29	Freshman	Below
30	Freshman	Below	30	Sophomore	Below
31	Sophomore	Below	31	Freshman	Below
32	Freshman	Above	32	Freshman	Above
33	Sophomore	Below	33	Freshman	Above
34	Freshman	Below	34	Freshman	Below
35	Freshman	Below	35	Junior	Above
36	Junior	Below	36	Sophomore	Above
37	Freshman	Above	37	Senior	Above
38	Freshman	Below	38	Senior	Below
39	Freshman	Below	39	Senior	Below
40	Freshman	Below	40	Sophomore	Above
41	Freshman	Above	41	Freshman	Below
42	Freshman	Below	42	Sophomore	Below

*Proofreading error mean on Production Measurements

TABLE XXXIV
 COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL CLASS ABSENCES
 WITH PROOFREADING ERROR AVERAGES

Control Group			Experimental Group		
Student	Above/Below Mean		Student	Above/Below Mean	
No.	Absences	Proofreading*	No.	Absences	Proofreading*
1	Below	Below	1	Below	Below
2	Below	Below	2	Above	Above
3	Above	Below	3	Below	Above
4	Below	Below	4	Above	Above
5	Above	Below	5	Above	Above
6	Above	Above	6	Above	Above
7	Below	Above	7	Above	Below
8	Below	Below	8	Below	Above
9	Below	Above	9	Below	Above
10	Above	Below	10	Above	Above
11	Below	Above	11	Below	Below
12	Below	Below	12	Below	Below
13	Above	Below	13	Below	Below
14	Below	Above	14	Below	Below
15	Above	Above	15	Below	Above
16	Below	Below	16	Above	Below
17	Below	Below	17	Above	Below
18	Above	Below	18	Above	Below
19	Above	Below	19	Below	Below
20	Above	Above	20	Below	Below
21	Above	Below	21	Above	Above
22	Below	Above	22	Below	Below
23	Below	Above	23	Above	Below
24	Below	Below	24	Above	Below
25	Above	Below	25	Above	Below
26	Below	Below	26	Above	Above
27	Above	Below	27	Below	Below
28	Below	Above	28	Below	Below
29	Above	Above	29	Below	Below
30	Below	Below	30	Below	Below
31	Above	Below	31	Below	Below
32	Below	Above	32	Below	Above
33	Above	Below	33	Above	Above
34	Below	Below	34	Below	Below
35	Above	Below	35	Above	Above
36	Above	Below	36	Below	Above
37	Below	Above	37	Below	Above
38	Below	Below	38	Above	Below
39	Below	Below	39	Below	Below
40	Below	Below	40	Below	Above
41	Below	Above	41	Below	Below
42	Above	Below	42	Below	Below

*Proofreading error mean on Production Measurements

APPENDIX E

PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST RESULTS

TABLE XXXV
INDIVIDUAL PRE-TEST RESULTS

Control Group		Experimental Group	
Student No.	Proofreading Errors	Student No.	Proofreading Errors
1	0	1	3
2	1	2	5
3	1	3	5
4	1	4	1
5	1	5	14
6	1	6	1
7	10	7	2
8	6	8	4
9	2	9	1
10	0	10	3
11	3	11	1
12	2	12	0
13	0	13	10
14	2	14	13
15	4	15	1
16	1	16	1
17	1	17	2
18	0	18	0
19	1	19	0
20	2	20	2
21	3	21	2
22	1	22	1
23	2	23	0
24	1	24	4
25	1	25	0
26	6	26	3
27	2	27	1
28	7	28	7
29	13	29	4
30	1	30	1
31	0	31	2
32	2	32	2
33	1	33	5
34	1	34	0
35	2	35	10
36	2	36	4
37	1	37	4
38	0	38	1
39	0	39	4
40	2	40	4
41	2	41	1
42	1	42	1
Mean	2.143	Mean	3.095

TABLE XXXVI
INDIVIDUAL POST-TEST RESULTS

Control Group		Experimental Group	
Student No.	Proofreading Errors	Student No.	Proofreading Errors
1	1	1	1
2	1	2	3
3	4	3	2
4	1	4	5
5	1	5	5
6	11	6	3
7	8	7	3
8	7	8	5
9	1	9	1
10	1	10	1
11	3	11	3
12	9	12	1
13	0	13	1
14	2	14	1
15	6	15	2
16	0	16	1
17	0	17	2
18	0	18	1
19	0	19	1
20	1	20	1
21	1	21	2
22	1	22	0
23	5	23	0
24	3	24	1
25	0	25	1
26	2	26	10
27	1	27	1
28	6	28	3
29	15	29	7
30	2	30	0
31	1	31	5
32	0	32	3
33	3	33	7
34	3	34	1
35	3	35	4
36	3	36	3
37	2	37	5
38	1	38	3
39	2	39	1
40	5	40	7
41	1	41	1
42	0	42	1
Mean	2.786	Mean	2.595

APPENDIX F

STATISTICAL DATA

Statistical Data Used = t-test

To test: $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$

$$t = \frac{(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2) - (\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{s_{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}}$$

where

$\mu_1 - \mu_2$ = expected value as stated in null hypothesis (0)

$$s_{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2} = \sqrt{\frac{(\sum x_1^2 + \sum x_2^2)}{n(n-1)}}$$

$$\sum x_1^2 = \sum X_1^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{N}$$

$$\sum x_2^2 = \sum X_2^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{N}$$

$$df = N_1 + N_2 - 2$$

VITA

Judith Canfield Simon

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE EFFECT OF DIRECTED PROOFREADING PRACTICE ON THE
DEVELOPMENT OF PROOFREADING SKILL IN A COLLEGE-LEVEL
TYPEWRITING CLASS

Major Field: Business Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Tulsa, Oklahoma, November 2, 1939, the
daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ira Canfield.

Education: Graduated from Stillwater, Oklahoma, High School, in
May, 1957; received Bachelor of Science degree in Business
Education from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater,
Oklahoma, in 1961; received Master of Business Administration
degree in Business Education from West Texas State University,
Canyon, Texas, in 1969; completed requirements for the Doctor
of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1976.

Professional Experience: Secretary, Cabot Corporation, Pampa,
Texas, 1961-1967; Business Teacher, Pampa, Texas, High School,
1967-1974; Business Department Chairman, Pampa, Texas, High
School, 1971-1974; Part-time Instructor, Oklahoma State
University, 1974-1975; Assistant Professor, Memphis State
University, 1975 - present.

Professional Organizations: Life member of National Education
Association and Texas State Teachers Association; member of
National Business Education Association, Southern Business
Education Association, American Business Communications
Association, National Association of Teacher Education for
Business and Office Education, Tennessee Education Associa-
tion, Tennessee Business Education Association, West
Tennessee Business Education Association, Delta Pi Epsilon,
and Beta Gamma Sigma.