1-1-1984

College Spelling Texts: The State of the Art

I. Y. Hashimoto

Roger Clark

College Spelling Texts:
The State of the Art

I. Y. Hashimoto / Roger Clark

Almost all major publishing houses offer some kind of spelling book for college students—big ones, thin ones, programmed ones, and ones with tear-out flash cards and crossword puzzles. Yet despite the number of spelling texts on the market, none stands out as particularly successful or significantly better than the rest.

That spelling texts are as a whole inefficient is obvious. Students across the country plow through such texts, memorizing words, learning rules, and taking cumulative exams—and when they're done, they go on to write papers as if they have never had instruction in spelling. Certainly most of the poor spelling students we have worked with on the college level have had massive doses of spelling instruction of one kind or another; most, in fact, claim that "nothing has ever worked" and frown in dismay or shake their heads in doubt when we show them new and so-called "different" spelling books. What may not be so obvious, however, is the number of ways such texts are inefficient.

First, it is possible that spelling texts are inefficient because textbooks in general are inefficient. In his criticism of composition textbooks, for instance, Mike Rose observes that knowledge of any complex process becomes simplified and rigidified when it is conveyed in print.[1] Such simplification is certainly apparent in spelling texts. Patricia M. Fergus, in the 4th edition of *Spelling Improvement: A Program for Self-Instruction,*[2] advocates a "multisensory" approach to spelling—an approach which basically boils down to learning how to break words down into syllables, pronouncing them, and writing them down. It is unclear what makes the program particularly more "multisensory" than other programs unless there is something particularly "multisensory" about syllabication, and Fergus does not actually explain how such a "multisensory" program was conceived or why it is supposed to work. Elsewhere, Harry H. Crosby and Robert W. Emery in *Building*

2   *The Writing Center Journal*

College Spelling Skills,[3] emphasize that "research repeatedly has shown that fifty to eighty-five percent of all misspellings are caused by the inability or the unwillingness to proofread" and that their book is "about proofreading."[4] To learn this proofreading, students learn the "S-P-E-L-L" system: "*stare, pronounce, engrave, look,* and *link.* "[5] This is, of course, a nicely structured system—with a mnemonic device for memorizing the steps—yet it is unclear how the system will cure the "inability or the unwillingness to proofread."

Particularly relevant for spelling might be Rose's reminder that textbooks tend to emphasize memorizing and recalling knowledge—only the simplest of cognitive tasks—whereas any task that requires *using* such knowledge is far more complex and different to master.[6] And, in fact, memorization and recall are precisely the tasks that spelling books tend to emphasize. Crosby and Emery write to students:

> As you work in this book, you will be discovering what kind of a memory you have: an eye memory, an ear memory, a muscle memory, or a logical memory.[7]

James I. Brown and Thomas E. Pearsall, in *Better Spelling: Fourteen Steps in Spelling Improvement,* write to students:

> Keep this little book handy to your writing desk. When you do, as we all do, forget a rule, find the correct chapter and check the rule. . . . In time you will know the spelling rules as well as you know other complicated mental sequences. Multiplication tables, street addresses, telephone numbers, song lyrics—none of these are really easy to memorize. You have learned them through constant repetition. Put the same principle to work in your spelling.[8]

The comparison between memorizing rules for spelling and memorizing arithmetic tables or phone numbers is not, of course, exact. Those who memorize multiplication tables, for instance, memorize a limited number of combinations of numbers that are related in a highly systematic, invariable manner; those who memorize spelling rules memorize procedures that are, at best, helpful some of the time, are somewhat arbitrary, and have important exceptions. As Michael Stubbs has pointed out, English spelling is a "mixed system" created by a series of different "sub-sets" of rules based on different, not obviously related principles—principles that lead "inevitably" to conflict.[9]

Because memorization is only part of the problem, students when they write may not be able to apply what they have memorized. Even if they have been tested over their spelling and even if they can recite abstract rules for syllabification, letter-sound correspondences and exceptions, when they write their own papers, they often forget their lists, don't break words into syllables, and do not apply principles because,

in the act of writing, spelling is no longer a simple problem of memorization viewed in isolation, but rather only one of a series of problems that take place within the constraints and attention-draining demands of a complex series of cognitive tasks.

This tendency toward oversimplification in spelling texts may, in fact, be symptomatic of a more deeply rooted problem—the problem of traditional oversimplification of the problems of poor spellers. Even though over the years writers in major reviews have called attention to the limitations of studying affixes, inflectional endings, phonics, and syllabification, textbook writers are apparently unwilling to give up tradition.

In one of the more thorough presentations of roots, prefixes and suffixes and their definitions, Joan G. Roloff and Roslyn Snow devote sixty-four pages to such prefixes as *ad-, com-, ag-, contra-, at-, circum-, di-, e-, sub-, ef-, sup-, im-, super-,* and *ob-,* and suffixes like *-ance, -erion, -ee, -ial, -ible, -ure, -ist, -ant, -ite,* and *-ual*—lists most spelling teachers would have trouble with.[11] Pointing out that "one cannot be expected to memorize the spelling and definitions of all the prefixes and suffixes listed,"[12] Lewick-Wallace still persists in introducing students to a list that includes *a-, ac-, ad-, il-, in-, ir-,* and *-able, -ary, -en, -ent,* and *-hood.* Such lists may not be all bad. Students might profit by knowing that word formation is not simply whimsical; on the other hand, the attention given such information can give the impression to students that such knowledge is somehow essential or at least very important in learning to spell—and that is certainly not the case.

Most texts teach some amount of syllabification. Syllabification is part of Crosby and Emery's "spelling fix"—"the word is locked in memory *by pronouncing each syllable in an exaggerated way, by writing the word in its correct form, syllable by syllable, and by seeing the correct sequence of syllables"* (italics by Crosby and Emery).[13] Patricia Fergus in particular emphasizes syllabification, writing to students:

> To be correctly spelled, some words seem to defy rules, pronunciation guides, or meaning guides, and about the only way to master them is to divide them into syllables.[14]

She then proceeds to discuss vowels, consonants, semivowels, dipthongs, roots, syllabic consonants, and accents plus the rules for separating words into parts. Such reliance on syllabification, although traditional, gains no support in the research. Even back in 1969, Thomas Horn, writing in the *Encyclopedia of Educational Research,* refuted such efforts, stating:

4   *The Writing Center Journal*

> The visual presentation of words in syllabified form has not demonstrated any advantage over the undivided method of presentation, and for some words (e.g. purpose, therefore) there is a negative effect.[15]

And students still learn what must be one of tradition's most deep-seated notions—that they can learn to spell by using phonics. Texts, for instance, still emphasize pronunciation as one way to overcome spelling difficulties. Crosby and Emery, for instance, tell students, "as you sound a word out according to the phonic spelling given in the dictionary, *exaggerate* the sound of the separate syllables. Say the word aloud several times using this exaggerated pronunciation."[16] Practically speaking, we know few poor spellers who will take the time to look the word up in the dictionary in order th learn the sounds they must exaggerate in separate syllables. And non-native speakers and speakers of variant forms of English will be further disadvantaged because what they hear is not necessarily what they see, even with the help of pronunciation guides.

Furthermore, the Crosby and Emery system comes close to advocating changes in pronunciation that are highly impractical and strange-sounding. In one section, they have students spell *roommate.* When the students are done, Crosby and Emery comment:

> If you always spell it right, it is because you hear all the phonemes including the *m*'s of both *room* and *mate.*
>
>   Chances are that you spelled the word right, but many, many students, when they use the word in a theme, leave out one *m*. The reason is that they have not become sensitive to the exact pronunciation of the word. They do not know what phonemes should be included in the word.[17]

There is, of course, nothing "exact" about pronouncing both *m*'s in *roommate,* a task which is, in fact, very difficult—and improbable in spoken English.

Elsewhere, Richard Baggett, in *A Programmed Approach to Good Spelling,* bases two chapters on the principle that "the good speller thinks of vowels as being either long or short," a principle for which he offers no support.[18] In fact, the research on good spellers has not identified this as a characteristic of them, and an informal survey of our students and colleagues who are good spellers suggests that they do not think of vowels at all as they spell, much less as being long or short.

Perhaps most strongly in favor of phonics are Patricia Fergus and Mary Lewick-Wallace. Fergus writes:

> Research in linguistics has shown that the English language is more phonetic than we realize (approximately eighty-five percent), and that a number of spelling patterns are predictable. Because the language is quite phonetic and patterns are predictable, we *can* spell correctly.[19]

And Lewick-Wallace points out that her text "is written with the realization that a student must first hear a word and then break that word into its parts before correctly rebuilding that word in writing."[20]

This "realization" gets the unqualified support of her editor, Alton Raygor:

> A main feature of Ms. Lewick-Wallace's approach focuses on how *sounds* are *spelled* (italics Raygor's). Most spelling and word recognition materials focus on sound-symbol relationships as they are used in reading. The attention is given to how certain letters and combinations of letters are pronounced. Since spelling involves the writing down of sounds, the sound-to-spelling approach taken in this book is more direct and effective.[21]

Such an emphasis also gains some support from the work of Hanna and others at Stanford University. Using sound-to-letter relationships, these researchers were able to program a computer to spell correctly 89.6 percent of the individual phonemes and 49 percent of the words given it.[22] However, the implications of such research are still unclear. Whether 49 percent spelling accuracy is good or bad may, in fact, depend on whether one is talking about a machine or a student. It certainly does not warrant Fergus' optimistic claim that "because the language is quite phonetic and patterns are predictable, we *can* spell correctly."

Furthermore, the belief that students must "first hear a word and then break it into its parts" may not be at all accurate. A colleague of ours who once taught at a school for the deaf in Brooklyn claims that his deaf students were far better spellers than other students without hearing impairments.[23] And certainly many other people can spell words correctly that they learn through reading, have never heard spoken, and cannot pronounce correctly.

Thus far, we have been looking at spelling texts as if they were designed to teach spelling to all age groups. But these are *college-level* texts designed for college-age students and ought to reflect some consciousness of the specific problems of this population. Unfortunately, however, instead of addressing college-age students, the authors appear to address a population of youngsters who must be motivated, exhorted, and otherwise convinced of the value of hard work.

To address this young audience, some writers have adopted a particularly patronizing tone. Lewis, for example, has college-level units entitled "How to Have Fun with *Homophones*" and "How to Conquer 10 Super-Demons."[24] Roloff and Snow have their college students make "cue cards":

> You will make them and put them on your bathroom mirror, refrigerator

door, notebook cover, desk top, stereo, bedside table, closet door, or telephone. You will make them with
>   bright colors
>   bold, clear lettering
>   words clipped out of magazines
>   words cut out of coarse sandpaper
>   colored plastic lables.[25]

In conjunction with the principle that good spellers think of vowels as short or long, Baggett teaches students rules such as the "policeman principle": "one vowel reaches back across one consonant to make the first vowel tell its name."[26] While this principle may be sound, at least with words ending in *e,* its cute label and phrasing do not seem particularly helpful mnemonically, and it could be phrased in a much more direct fashion.

Along with an often patronizing tone are patronizing exercises. Lewick-Wallace has students do the following exercise:

> In the spaces below, write the letters of the alphabet which are consonants.
> a,_____,_____,_____,e,_____,_____,_____,i,_____,_____,_____,_____,_____,o,_____,
> _____,_____,_____,_____,u,_____,_____,_____,_____,_____,_____[27]

In an exercise in "developing a sense of doubt," Falk S. Johnson asks the following rather transparent questions:

> —Other things being equal, can poor spellers with a good sense of doubt write as few misspellings as good spellers with a poor sense of doubt?
> —Should you be doubtful about the spelling (a) of strange new words like *proceleusmatic,* (b) of common but troublesome words like *accumulate,* or (c) of both?[28]

And Baggett offers the following fill-in-the-blanks based on the reading (we have supplied the answers in brackets):

> —It is important to know the spelling of common words. In addition it is essential to know the spelling of key words in your____(career)____, ____(school subjects)____, and ____(hobbies)____.
> —By the time you finish this program, you should know the basics of ____(good spelling)____.[29]

Even if texts do not have the patronizing tones or patronizing exercises, the majority rely on some kind of patronizing exhortation. Norman Lewis, for instance, emphasizes "You *Can* Be a Better Speller":

> Yes, you can be a much, much better speller!
> You can learn to spell correctly—not some of the time, but *all* of the time.
> You can gain self-confidence and security in spelling.
> You can train yourself to recognize *correct* spellings, to reject incorrect spellings.
> You can accomplish all this by working with this book. The method you

will use is as easy as ABC![30]

Lee C. Deighton exhorts students to feel "confident":

> *Confidence* is the key to improving your spelling. Perhaps you have heard people say, "I can't spell. I never could learn." This is just not true. They can spell the name of the town and the street where they live. They can spell better than they think they can. They just lack confidence.[31]

And the editors at Cambridge (the "adult education company") set up a similar exhortation:

> If you have spelling difficulties, if you cannot communicate successfully in writing, this book and some hard work can help. But if you tackle this book with a defeatist attitude, feeling that no one can help you out of your spelling difficulties, this volume of helpful rules and exercises will be of little value to you.[32]

Work, of course, is the key to this kind of exhortation. "Learning how to spell correctly is neither exciting nor adventurous. It is necessary, however, and it is work," says Lewick-Wallace.[33] Yet there is something wrong with such exhortation. First, these writers betray their negative attitude toward their students—students who must be either lazy or stupid or uncooperative. These authors also suggest that students can, in fact, be motivated by the invocation of the work ethic. And students who do not become motivated to "work" find themselves at fault no matter how bad the instructional materials are.

Even more important, however, is a curious failure in all this exhortation to address the specific needs of college-age students—students who are *not* children and who are, in fact, willing to work. We know, for instance, that many college-age students are pragmatic learners. As adults, they do not have as much time or as much desire to spend in long term projects or projects that they view as less productive than others. Some of this pragmatism is the result of being in college—where time is valuable, especially for average students who must weigh the benefits of working on something like spelling or working on particular reading assignments in preparation for approaching midterms. Some of this pragmatism is also the result of students being in a particular economic climate in which they perceive good grades as precursors to better paying jobs. And some of this pragmatism is the result of changing populations in many colleges brought about by increased recruitment of older, more mature students who desire to learn quickly and desire immediate application of their knowledge.[34]

Yet the spelling books we have looked at make the task of learning to

spell seem interminable, and, therefore, impractical. Lewick-Wallace, for instance, spends 134 pages on consonants alone. Norman Lewis takes fifty pages in ten separate units to teach students rules for silent *e*, verbs ending in *-ee*, words ending in *-e*, *l*, and *y*, fourteen *ei* words, thirty *ie* words, long *e*, ten "super-demons," and words ending in *-ine* (in such words as *gabardine, tambourine, quarantine* and *mezzanine*)—and once students can do those, they still have thirty more units to go. Several texts such as Fergus' *Spelling Improvement* include sections on word origins. One of Fergus' exercises requires students to match two columns of items. One has words with missing letters:

    a. recei____
    b. colum__
    c. __salm
    d. r__inoceros
    e. vi__tuals

The other has a list of word origins:

    L. *recipere*, to take
    L. *columna*, pillar
    G. *psallein*, to pluck, sing to the harp
    G. *rhin*, nose, + *keros*, horn
    L. *victus*, sustenance[35]

Evidently, the exercise is supposed to help students to recognize the reason why some words look the way they do, but if students take such exercises seriously, they might begin to think that not only must they learn to spell, but they must also learn an apparently unlimited number of word origins in order to spell strange-looking words.

    To make recognition of success even more distant, writers do not adequately explain what success means. Crosby and Emery, for example, write:

> The book dispels three myths: that misspelling is hereditary, that the language is so inconsistent that its spelling is an impossible puzzle, and that secretaries are the ones who handle misspelling. We have taught in eight institutions from high school to graduate school and have seen hundreds of students use this approach effectively. It is the subject of Professor Emery's doctoral study. Probably no other spelling workbook is the product of so much classroom experience and intensive formal research. The system is individual and efficient, and it works.[36]

Success, here, obviously is related to faith. Whatever Professor Emery did in his doctoral study is left unclarified as is the "classroom experience and intensive formal research" (if that is different from the doctoral study). Students are left to believe the system "works"—even

though they don't know why or how its "work" was measured or judged—or how they might measure or judge their own work.

Elsewhere, Johnson tells students, "Regardless of how you use this book, it can, with your help, improve your spelling." Later, he says, "Earlier editions of this book have helped thousands of students to improve their spelling. In the same way, this new edition can help you. Use it."[37] But what Johnson means by "help" is not very clear—certainly not clear enough for students to recognize or formulate appropriate goals for themselves. And Baggett tells students:

> Just beneath the surface of the hodge-podge of spelling rules and exceptions, our spelling system is highly predictable.... The point is that the good speller knows that our system is largely predictable. The poor speller does not. If the poor speller were confident that spelling made some sort of sense most of the time, the job of learning to spell might seem worth undertaking.
>
> The good speller, then, is really the subject of this program—what he knows, how he looks at words, what relationships he sees. I hope that the unsure, nervous, unconfident speller comes to identify with the good speller.[38]

Evidently, one of the signs of success here is being confident that spelling makes "some sort of sense most of the time"; another has something to do with identifying with good spellers—both goals which are fuzzy enough to appear unrealizable.

Not only must college-age students be able to recognize and evaluate the practical aspects of the programs they engage in, but they must also contend with their past failures and the strong interference of a long held body of orthographic misinformation. No research has yet been reported on the problem involved in learning new spellings for old words or learning new approaches to spelling problems to replace old ones—precisely the kind of activities that college students must undertake—yet what is known about adult learners suggests that this might be one of the most difficult problems for many students. Alan Knox, for example, points out that problem-solving experiments with adults reveal that many develop ineffective problem-solving strategies, either repeating nonproductive solutions or repeating concepts and strategies that have been effective in the past but do not apply to present situations.[39] Furthermore, experienced people may learn a completely new task more easily that they learn familiar tasks in new ways. Indeed, Jane Zahn claims that learning a familiar task in a new way is "the most difficult task for an adult."[40] Discussing the problems basic writing students have learning to spell, Mina Shaughnessy appears to

address this same issue as she describes the problems poor spellers have correcting errors they "would themselves recognize if they could see them":

> Accustomed to seeing whole words rather than word parts and to seeing the beginnings of those configurations more clearly than the middles, where letters tend to coagulate, the student must re-train his eyes to see in terms of schemas he is only beginning to acquire.[41]

Shaughnessy emphasizes that such "re-training" problems are "among the most difficult to get at by direct intervention."[42]

One important way to address the problems related to ineffective strategies and past experience is to help students to become actively engaged in diagnosing their own spelling problems. By recognizing their own systems and approaches, they can begin to evaluate and *change,* adopting newer, more efficient systems and approaches. Unfortunately, however, current texts offer very little help to students who wish to diagnose their approaches to spelling. Diagnostic texts, if included, often contain too few items for accurate diagnosis. The tests range from fifty items (Deighton) to one hundred and fifty (Fergus) with the average around one hundred. Moreover, it is questionable whether the tests included are valid—whether they are able to test whether a student can actually spell a word. For instance, Brown and Pearsall test only for the ability to spell hard spots with test items such as:

> She was hop__g first on one foot then on the other.[43]

Falk Johnson also uses this kind of test but with an additional eight items that test students' ability to recognize words that need to be hyphenated.[44] Thirty of the fifty items in Deighton's test examine only whether a student can recognize a correct spelling—a task far different from *producing* a correct spelling. In fact, of current texts, only Roloff and Snow's *Spelling* has a diagnostic test (based on dictation) that tests the students' ability to spell words for themselves—and that test contains only fifty items.[45]

Such tests are not designed to help students diagnose their own spelling difficulties. Their length precludes testing more than a few specific problems and does not allow much room for students to analyze errors for themselves. The answers, in fact, are generally keyed and make diagnosis a rather mechanical affair. Furthermore, because such tests often do not require students to spell out entire words, they may not help students to recognize problems that occur only when they write words down for themselves. Finally, such tests are not designed to

help students to recognize the size and scope of their spelling problems. A hundred item test cannot help students to recognize, for instance, how many words in their vocabularies they *can* spell correctly—an important piece of information for any spellers who want to set their own goals.

There are numerous solutions to the problems of spelling texts, some more exciting than others. Among the least exciting, for instance, is to agree that most spelling texts aren't very useful but to use them anyway because although they may not work for everyone, they "can't be harmful" and they're "all we have." Another unexciting solution is to point out that, after all, spelling is a rather recent convention and ought not get as much attention as it has. This sort of live-and-let-live approach simply ignores the problem: that many of our students can and must improve their spelling to succeed in school and career. Finally, we might wait for the new microcomputer generation whose word processing programs will cure all sorts of spelling problems. Whereas computers will certainly help a number of students, we would hesitate to suggest that they will be a cure-all for all spelling problems. Moreover, reliance on any piece of hardware—and software—may not necessarily give students the autonomy and self-confidence they require to be literate, respected, educated people.

But there are more exciting possibilities, too. First, there is room for decent spelling textbooks—books that do not oversimplify the problem or set up formulaic approaches to complex processes, that recognize recent findings in the teaching of spelling, that present clearly articulated rationales to students, that address college students as college students and not as big elementary school children, that help students to develop clear criteria for measuring and evaluating their own progress.

And there is also room to re-examine the goals of typical spelling programs that use textbooks. Why is it, for instance, necessary for students to memorize correct spellings? rules? exceptions? (Might they succeed better, for example, if they simply learn to *recognize* words they misspell and to look up words?) How much, in fact, can teachers and students do in sixteen weeks (at the most) and how can the work they do encourage students to continue to work on their spelling *after* they have finished their spelling program? How can programs address the needs of adult learners—the kind of program Shaughnessy calls for that will allow students to use their "adult powers of awareness and self-direction for the time [they] cannot regain"?[46] Answers to such

12   *The Writing Center Journal*

questions might help us to re-direct our efforts and, possible for the
first time, begin to attack in a logical, theoretically sound fashion the
problems of teaching spelling to college-age students.

Notes

[1]Mike Rose, "Speculations on Process Knowledge and the Textbook's Static Page,"
College Composition and Communication, 34 (1983), 208-213.

[2]Patricia M. Fergus, *Spelling Improvement: A Program for Self-Instruction,* 4th ed.
(New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983).

[3]Harry H. Crosby and Robert W. Emery, *Building College Spelling Skills* (Boston:
Little, Brown, 1981).

[4]Crosby and Emery, p. vi.

[5]Crosby and Emery, p. 31.

[6]Rose, p. 210.

[7]Crosby and Emery, p. 6.

[8]James I. Brown and Thomas E. Pearsall, *Better Spelling: Fourteen Steps to Spelling
Improvement* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1978), p. 105.

[9]Michael Stubbs, *Language and Literacy: The Sociolinguistics of Reading and Writing*
(London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980), p. 66.

[10]See, for instance, Donald Graves, "Research Update: Spelling Texts and Structural
Analysis Methods," *Language Arts,* 54 (Jan. 1977), 86-90; Robert J. Fitzsimmons and
Bradley M. Loomer, *Spelling Research and Practice* (Des Moines: Iowa State Department
of Public Instruction and the University of Iowa, 1977); Ruel Allred, "Spelling: The Ap-
plication of Research Findings," National Education Association Curriculum Series
(West Haven, Conn.: NEA, 1977) (ERIC ED 135 033); Terry D. Johnson, Kenneth G.
Langford, and Kerry C. Quorn, "Characteristics of an Effective Spelling Program,"
Language Arts, 58 (1981) 581-88.

[11]Joan G. Roloff and Roslyn Snow, *Spelling* (Encino, Cal.: Glencoe, 1980).

[12]Mary Lewick-Wallace, *Spelling* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1981), p. 303.

[13]Crosby and Emery, p. 118.

[14]Fergus, p. 19.

[15]Thomas Horn, "Spelling," in *Encyclopedia of Educational Research,* 4th ed. (New
York: Macmillan, 1969), p. 1289.

[16]Crosby and Emery, p. 115.

[17]Crosby and Emery, p. 24.

[18]Richard Baggett, *A Programmed Approach to Good Spelling!* (Englewood Cliffs,
N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1981), p. 23.

[19]Fergus, p. 3.

[20]Lewick-Wallace, p. xiii.

[21]Lewick-Wallace, p. iii.

[22]See, for instance, Paul R. Hanna et al., "Needed Research in Spelling," *Elementary
English,* 23 (Jan. 1966), 60-66, 89.

[23]See also Barbara Dodd, "The Spelling Abilities of Profoundly Prelingually Deaf
Children," in *Cognitive Processes in Spelling,* ed. Uta Frith (New York: Academic Press,
1980), pp. 423-440.

[24]Norman Lewis, *Instant Spelling Power for College Students* New York: Amsco College Publications, 1976).

[25]Roloff and Snow, p. 19.

[26]Baggett, p. 25.

[27]Lewick-Wallace, p. 5.

[28]Falk S. Johnson, *Improving Your Spelling,* 3rd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979), p. 22.

[29]Baggett, pp. 4-5.

[30]Lewis, p. vii.

[31]Lee C. Deighton, *Spelling* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979), p. vii.

[32]Cambridge Book Company, *Spelling* (New York: Cambridge, 1976), p. 1.

[33]Lewick-Wallace, p. xv.

[34]See, for instance, Donald H. Brundage and Dorothy MacKeracher, "Adult Learning Principles and Their Application to Program Planning," ERIC 181 292 (1980), p. 35; Malcolm Knowles, *The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species* (Houston: Gulf Publishing, 1978), p. 58.

[35]Fergus, p. 73.

[36]Crosby and Emery, p. vii.

[37]Johnson, p. 7.

[38]Baggett, p. ix.

[39]Alan Knox, *Adult Development and Learning* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977), p. 445.

[40]Jane C. Zahn, "Differences between Adults and Youth Affecting Learning," *Adult Education,* 17 (1967), 72.

[41]Mina Shaughnessy, *Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing* (New York: Oxford, 1977), p. 174.

[42]Shaughnessy, p. 174.

[43]Brown and Pearsall, p. 1.

[44]Johnson, pp. 146-151.

[45]Roloff and Snow, pp. 4-5.

[46]Shaughnessy, p. 186.