perhaps within the community of composition scholars, is at odds with a positivist interpretation preferred by many scientists who do not welcome the burden of writing across the curriculum.

The "think tank" portion of the workshop was devoted to a discussion of the different research designs and to brainstorming for new approaches. Among the suggestions were research aimed at testing long-term recall of material and research employing the procedures of George Hillocks where the control and treatment groups are not asked to recall previous material but to apply skills to new situations.

EXPLORING MODIFICATIONS OF PRIMARY TRAIT SCORING: DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE WRITING OF STUDENTS IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Peter J. A. Evans, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

The chief objective of this presentation/workshop was to acquaint teachers with a variety of kinds of descriptive analysis of a sample of the writing of Grade 9 students in Canada's Northwest Territories. Our analyses can lead to development of resources of use to teachers in writing programs with attention to all students but with particular focus on the achievements and needs of students of native-language background who make up about half the student population tested annually 1985-1988.

We provided participants with an overview of the scoring procedure (holistic) and the various types of analysis (analytic scoring, error counts, variations on "primary trait") that were applied subsequently to a large random sample stratified by score (the holistic score originally obtained). The general performance comparisons (native and non-native) revealed a number of differences among these writers as to narrative and exposition points of view.

We illustrated the descriptive analysis in greater detail, using graphs to show how particular features related to holistic score: i.e., which seemed to have closest association with over-all achievement, which seemed present or absent in the writing of most students, and what this information suggested concerning stages of writing development or particular blockages for some students. The results influenced decisions made concerning resource development for the writing program.

Participants applied these variations on primary trait scoring first to Grade 6 writing of fantasy (from another source) and then to three point-of-view essays from the Northwest territories 1987 Assessment.

The variations on primary trait employed here provide more scope for capturing the range of student response than the American NAEP version, and include features that may be simply identified (with their frequency) as well as those that may be scaled.

WRITING ASSESSMENT IN PHYSICS, HUMANITIES AND ENGLISH: A FEMINIST APPROACH

Fran Davis, Arlene Steiger, and Karen Tennenhouse, Vanier College, Montreal

This session was organized by three members of an interdisciplinary research team presently testing feminist pedagogical strategies with the aid of a grant from the Quebec Ministry of Education. Two of the areas under investigation are the importance of writing in the educational experience of women students and the kinds of writing assessment which are most encouraging of these students' development and growth. Since the research was still in progress in April, the team was not able to present a project report; instead, the presentation focused on the assessment strategies that these researchers have defined as feminist.

We briefly outlined the research, which indicates that, both in self-esteem and commitment to continue their education, women are much more easily discouraged than men. We also summarized the research demonstrating that women students talk less in classrooms, fare less well in competitive situations, and are less comfortable in purely intellectual, nonaffective situations. We showed how this research on women's educational experience led the present
research team to formulate its hypothesis that assessment strategies that emphasize a collaborative rather than a hierarchical writer-reader connection. Next, we described the kinds of assessment interactions which may create this constructive learning climate. The teacher/reader is asked to communicate her/his reading process of the student text and how this process leads to the final grade. Simple "I" statements are used throughout the responding process. The strategy is designed to emphasize reading process as learning process on the part of the teacher, rather than prior mastery of material by the teacher against which the students' efforts are measured.

We discussed the ways in which this process has changed the way we assess formal work. Assessing journals and essays in a reactive, non-judgmental way helped us to begin to listen to student beliefs, to identify the world view of each student, and to discover how the teacher can speak to it in an atmosphere of dignity and mutual respect.

We continued with a description of an experiment with formulating a writing assignment in a physics course, showing how we had assessed the work. Since we were teaching in a fairly structured situation with a great deal of material to cover, we were unable to devote a great deal of class time to the writing project. Our major communication with the students was through written response to the developing stages of the project's freewriting, topic definition, drafts, and final copies. We showed the group the kinds of interventions we made, all "I" comments, all reader reactions showing the student how a reader might or might not be able to follow the reasoning or description in various passages. We noted that it was time consuming, but that we felt most students had developed a far deeper understanding of the chosen physics topic than would normally be the case.

There were some questions throughout the presentation, particularly about the research on women's learning experiences. At the end, there was time for discussion of assessment in various disciplines. Some of the participants noted the importance of affective and interactive writing for mature women students. There was also interest in writing assessment in the sciences.

MULTIPLE INDICATORS OF ASSESSMENT: TOWARD A COLLABORATION OF TEACHING AND TESTING

A. Frederic Cheney, Maine Department of Education and Cultural Services

The session began with an explanation of my role as language arts consultant to the Maine Educational Assessment, a direct assessment of writing administered to all 4th, 8th, and 11th graders in the state. The objectives measured by the Maine Educational Assessment are as follows:

I. The writer comprehends and manages the writing process.
   A. The writer will demonstrate the ability to generate writing and apply strategies to refine that writing.
   B. The writer will demonstrate the ability to organize and present information in such a way that the writing fulfills its purpose and makes sense to its intended audience.

II. The writer makes an individual response.
   A. The writer's voice is evident.
   B. The writer will demonstrate interest and involvement with the task.

III. The writer will aid the reader by conforming to the conventions of standard American English: punctuation, usage, capitalization, spelling, legibility, and format.

I then presented the Analytic Scoring Guide used to score the Maine tests. Papers are rated from 1-6 in each of six analytic traits—topic development, organization, details, sentences, wording, and mechanics; the guide, also, defines the criteria for each rating. Because papers get two readings, the raw scores range from 12-72. Next came an overview of objectives, scoring formats, and rhetorical modes tested in other