DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 079 797 CS 500 363

AUTHOR Lynn, Elizabeth Meagher
TITLE The Development of an Oral/Aural Speech Placement Test for Disadvantaged College Students in an Experimental Branch of the SEEK Program.
PUB DATE Dec 72
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Assn. (58th, Chicago, Dec. 27-30, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Performance; Aural Learning; College Students; *Communication Skills; Educational Programs; *Grouping (Instructional Purposes); *Language Arts; Language Usage; Nonstandard Dialects; Performance Tests; *Student Placement; Verbal Ability
IDENTIFIERS *SEEK Program (City University of New York)

ABSTRACT

The SEEK (Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge) Program, offered by the City University of New York at each of its college campuses, is a program of compensatory education devised to bridge the gap between college standards for matriculation and the existing academic level of its educationally unprepared student population. Placement at the correct level of language arts competence has proven critical to SEEK students' academic success in all courses. The use of reading scores as the determinant for placing SEEK students in speech courses, however, has proven inaccurate and invalid. The speech faculty at an independent branch of SEEK (the University Center) created an aural/oral test (with writing/reading elements) which produces a miniature pattern of each student's communicative ability. The test resulted in accurately placing students in speech courses commensurate with their abilities. (Author/LG)

The Development of an Oral/Aural Speech Placement Test for Disadvantaged College Students in an Experimental Branch of the SEEK Program

Elizabeth Meagher Lynn
Indiana University
SCA Convention
Chicago, Illinois
December 28, 1972

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ORAL/AURAL SPEECH PLACEMENT TEST FOR DISADVANTAGED COLLEGE STUDENTS IN AN EXPERIMENTAL BRANCH OF THE SEEK PROGRAM (CUNY)

Within recent years the speech profession has expressed growing interest in the educational problems created by the admission of inadequately-prepared, "disadvantaged" students to college.[1] The interest is welcome. Solutions, however, are still distant. In an effort to continue the sharing of experience in this area, the following paper is submitted describing a listening placement test developed at the University Center, an experimental branch of the SEEK program.

THE SEEK PROGRAM

Defined: SEEK (Search for Education, Elevation and Knowledge) is an extensive program of compensatory education conceived by Dr. Leslie Berger in 1965 and now offered by the City University of New York at each of its senior college campuses.

Purpose: The purpose of the SEEK program is to bridge the gap between senior

[1] Numerous articles have appeared in Speech Teacher in the past few years which bear upon the education of the disadvantaged student. Articles of particular relevance to college-level disadvantaged students include: Robert E. Hawkins, "A Speech Program in an Experimental College for the Disadvantaged" (March, 1969); Robert A. Sinzinger, "Speech in Upward Bound Projects" (January, 1970); the entire March, 1970, issue of Speech Teacher, which was devoted to the Black speech experience; Walt Wolfram, "Sociolinguistic Premises and the Nature of Nonstandard Dialects" (September, 1970); Richard R. Lee, "Linguistics, Communication and Behavioral Objectives; A Remedial Curriculum" (January, 1971); Theodore S. Hopf, "The Teaching of Oral Communication to Disadvantaged Students in Community Colleges" (September, 1971); and Dennis R. Preston, "Social Dialects and College English" (November, 1971).

college standards for matriculation and the existing academic level of its educationally-unprepared student population. A basic philosophy of SEEK is that an opportunity for higher education may be made available to all without diminishing academic standards.

Benefits: In order to maximize the SEEK student's chances for success, the SEEK program includes:

1) special courses in math, English, and speech. Students may take college level courses wherever they are qualified.
2) diagnostic/remediation programs in academic skills.
3) extensive counseling services (approximately 1 counselor to each 30 students).
4) tutoring.
5) financial assistance. All fees are paid, books are free, and weekly stipends are available to the most needy.

For students who request leaving academically-detrimental home environments, a limited number of dormitory rooms may be had on a free, space-available basis. As a future goal, students and faculty are pressing for day-care facilities for students with children.

Enrollment: Since the 1965 pilot program of 110 students,[2] SEEK enrollment has grown to 7,500 students in 1971, with an anticipated 10,000 by 1975.[3] The original concept of SEEK limited admission to students with an average of 70 or better in academic subjects,[4] but the most recent practice has been to admit

---

[2]Leslie Berger, "University Programs for Urban Black and Puerto Rican Youth," Educational Record, (Fall, 1968), 383.

[3]Letter, Julius C. C. Edelstein (Vice Chancellor for Urban Affairs, CUNY) to Robert E. Marshak (President, City College of New York), Dec. 11, 1970. Author's copy.

[4]Berger, op. cit., p. 384.

by lottery any student possessing a high school diploma (of any kind, from any country), or equivalency diploma, who is younger than 30, has not attended college before, does not meet senior college admission requirements, and lives in a politically-designated economically-deprived area of New York City.[5] Due to the population distribution of New York City, SEEK student enrollment runs roughly 55% Black, 35% Puerto Rican, and 10% white and other.

The University Center: Within this framework, a special off-campus experimental program began in February, 1968, for the overflow of SEEK students, designated as the University Center. Between Fall, 1968, and Fall, 1969, the Center operated as a separate and distinct institution offering only compensatory and basic first-year courses for over 600 students. The Speech Department at this time consisted of 8 full-time faculty who worked only with SEEK students. Eventually, the University Center came under the administrative aegis of City College of New York (Fall, 1969), and in Fall, 1971, was physically moved onto the CCNY campus.

My remarks in this paper concern developments at the University Center between Fall, 1968, and Fall, 1969, since only during this period did it have the complete freedom to function as a major and unique experimental element within the overall SEEK concept.

University Center Faculty: Since the faculty at the University Center was not typical of most colleges, a word on this may be in order. In September, 1971, Theodore Hopf reported from a survey indicating that most college teachers of

[5] Linda Weingarten Scheffler, "What 70 SEEK Kinds Taught Their Counselor," New York Times Magazine, November 16, 1969, p. 54.

disadvantaged students were coerced into this work by their administrations.[6] In contrast, the University Center faculty were not internally transferred or even solicited fro. the various campuses of CUNY. Whatever their prior employment, the original sixty teachers and counselors had to convince the SEEK-University Center administration that they were qualified for this unusual experimental opportunity because of training or experience which demonstrated abilities to relate with the SEEK student population, or job experience that could be especially pertinent to SEEK student needs. Special credit is due Prof. Irving Branman, former Director of the Center, now in Speech Education at City College of New York, who encouraged maximum faculty experimentation outside traditional educational methods.

In addition to Hopf's points about the needs for specially-trained teachers and for positive teacher attitudes, another dimension must be considered in building a strong faculty for compensatory programs: The heavy faculty turnover at the University Center, which occurred after affiliation with CCNY proved poignantly to demonstrate that the success of such a program may depend equally upon a stable, committed, continuing faculty and a strongly-supportive administration.

University Center: Language Arts Objectives and Standard English

As originally designed, the SEEK program was intended to emphasize "standard English" and to teach it as a second language.[7] At the University Center, however, as has happened at other colleges,[8] the absence of a predomi-

[6] Theodore S. Hopf, "The Teaching of Oral Communication to Disadvantaged Students in Community Colleges," Speech Teacher, XX (September, 1971), 212.

[7] Berger, op. cit., p. 385.

[8] Former teachers at Chicago City College and Bethune Cookman College (Daytona, Fla.) report that no automatic effort was being made at these institutions to revise the language habits of nonstandard speakers or to teach them standard English as a second language.

nantly white or standard-English speaking student population made the teaching of standard English a futile exercise.

By spring semester, 1969, one year after the University Center had opened, English and Speech faculty shifted their attention away from dialectal differences and began to focus instead on the use of language for cognitive tasks, which we saw as constituting a greater communicative need of the students than dialect change. Admittedly, this position is controversial, but there was strong sentiment on our faculty that nonstandard speakers in our program needed greater overall verbal development in any dialect acceptable to them. Two principle arguments formed the support for our position. One, the majority of our students resented efforts to force standard English upon them as a "more marketable" dialect. Preston's descriptions of nonstandard speaking students' attitudes toward standard English[9] could have just as easily been a description of the attitudes held by our students. Point two, the extensive batteries of standard tests run on our students indicated that they needed verbal development, regardless of dialectal differences.

In 1970, Nash wrote "the speech profession has not thus far developed any philosophy of speech communication education suitable to meet the special needs of the black child."[10] Extending this argument, neither has the speech profession come to grips with modern linguistic theory that all dialects are equally complex and equally communicative. Most of the articles published in speech journals in the past five years or so, are still focusing on methods to change nonstandard (go to p. 6)

[9]Dennis R. Preston, "Social Dialects and College English," Speech Teacher, XX (November, 1971), 240.

[10]Rosa Lee Nash, "Toward a Philosophy of Speech Communication Education for the Black Child," Speech Teacher XIX (March, 1970), 97.

dialects, although the subject has, of late, been treated somewhat more sensitively than in earlier studies. Change is now directed towards those wishing change; speech development for students wishing to retain nonstandard dialects, however, has been largely ignored--with two significant exceptions. The September, 1970, Wolfram article explored the significance to the speech field of nonstandard dialects being different-but-equally-complex-systems,[11] and the November, 1971 Preston article has presented an exciting approach for the speech profession to use in teaching the communicative effectiveness of diverse dialects.[12] This is a significant start. But other directions need exploration, too.

The faculty at the University Center set out to explore some of the other directions.*

In speech classes at the University Center, intelligibility to classmates became the criterion for acceptability of dialect or accent. Once that level had been met, course objectives centered around those areas where our students had been observed to be deficient. Teacher observations pointed to specific non-dialectal educational weaknesses of the SEEK students which affected their oral communication:

1) low reading-comprehension level, and low listening-comprehension level, with difficulty in drawing inferences, detecting subtleties, and in extracting and applying abstract concepts.

2) inadequate preparation in research methods and organization skills. (A particular difficulty of our students was recognizing or exercising objectivity as a research method. Their experience had led

---

[11] Walt Wolfram, "Sociolinguistic Premises and the Nature of Nonstandard Dialects," Speech Teacher, XIX (September, 1970), 177-184.

[12] Preston, op. cit., 237-246.

*The Speech faculty involved in the development of the tests described in this paper included: Lowell Lynn, Kenneth Wydro, Ann Hopewell, John Hannon, Diane Behrenhausen, Margery Morton, Susan Goldstein, and the author.

them to view most of the reality they cared about from a one-sided, narrow, highly-subjective perspective.)

3) lack of training in critical thinking and logic. As a SEEK counselor pointed out in the New York Times, it is common for students to come to SEEK "literal-minded, deficient in handling abstract concepts and unable to make appropriate generalizations. Their lives and their schools had taught them how to memorize but not how to reason in academic work."[13]

Overall, the student needs we perceived as being of top priority are in sharp conflict with Hopf's survey findings that most speech instructors perceive the communication needs of disadvantaged students primarily in terms of voice and language production.[14]

University Center: Nature of the Basic Speech Courses:

College Level Course (3-credit, 4 hours): Stemming from these observed needs, the content of the college-level basic speech courses at the University Center stressed lessons in: communication theory, perception, objectivity, basic logic and rhetorical theory, critical listening, and exercises in abstracting and making valid generalizations, as well as in making abstract ideas concrete and specific. Since SEEK speech students met four hours a week in classes of 12-15 students, there was more time than in the usual college speech class for combining theory with performance assignments. Most students performed 6-8 presentations in the course of one semester, practicing concept

[13] Scheffler, op. cit.,

[14] Hopf, op. cit., p. 210.

development, organization, and delivery techniques. A minimum grade of "C" (average college level work) was required to pass the course. Once students passed, they had completed their speech requirement.

Pre-College Level Course (non-credit, 4 hours per week): This course was geared to be more individually designed according to the needs of students. For instance, one special section was established for foreign students learning English as a second language. In other sections, instructors attempted to determine the verbal level of students early in the semester, and to work from that point in conjunction with English and Academic Skills teachers to bring each student as far as possible in oral development in one semester. Grading was on a "Pass/ Pass-Qualify/ or Repeat" basis. If a student passed, he could enroll in the college-level course the next semester. "Pass-Qualify" meant that the student had met the minimal standards of the non-credit course, but it was recommended that he wait one semester before taking the college-level speech course--and, in the meantime, strengthen English and Academic Skills areas.

UNIVERSITY CENTER: THE NEED FOR AN APPROPRIATE SPEECH PLACEMENT TEST

Since a basic philosophy of the SEEK program was to create a flexible educational program in which students can succeed, and since there was such a wide range in the ability level of the University Center SEEK students, placement tests served a critical function.

The Existing Speech Placement Test: The test used to place students for Fall semester, 1968 had been borrowed from CCNY and consisted of asking each student to read an editorial out loud and briefly discuss its content. The decision to place students in a credit or non-credit course depended upon such factors as: 1) faltering in oral reading; 2) exhibiting nonstandard grammar; 3) language

deficiency; 4) voice or articulation problems; 5) reticence; and 6) apparent grasp of the intellectual content of the editorial (a New York Times editorial).

Within the first few weeks of the Fall, 1968, semester it was evident that this test had created more problems than it had solved. No provision had been made for bright students who were poor oral readers, or whose visual vocabularies were more limited than their listening/speaking vocabularies. No provision had been made for students who had "passed" the test, but proved to be unable to function at the college level. No provision had been made to weed out the "bright, but reticent" students from the reticent, less-advanced students. And, no provision had been made for the infinite language-level possibilities of those students for whom English was a second-language, or at whose homes no English was spoken at all.

Since oral reading did not appear to accurately test the communicative ability-level of our students in terms of the courses we had conceived, we began to search for another method to identify those students who would most likely be ready for and who could succeed in the college-level course.

Tests Used in Other College Programs for Disadvantaged Students to Determine Speech Level: Hopf's survey of eight Eastern and Central U. S. programs for disadvantaged students in community colleges has revealed that national college (reading) aptitude tests are the most frequently used methods to channel people into remedial or lower-level speech courses. Some institutions add on a brief oral reading/question-answer test; but an oral/aural placement test was obviously an exception, rather than the rule.[15] In another geographical area, one Southern

[15]Hopf, op. cit., p. 210.

four-year college (Bethune Cookman in Daytona, Fla.) also was reported to use reading results as the main determinant of speech placement level.[16]

While this data is hardly substantial, it does indicate a practice of equating reading/writing skills with listening/speaking skills. The error in this assumption is serious and may be causing significant discrimination against disadvantaged students. Every intelligent, but poorly-educated, adult is living proof that reading and writing skills are not indicative of speaking or listening ability. In addition, statistical evidence of this has been available since the development of the 1953 Brown-Carlsen Listening Test, which has particular application in interpreting verbal test results of disadvantaged students. Brown and Carlsen found substantial correlation between listening comprehension and intelligence level; but, in contrast, they found that the correlation between reading comprehension and listening was so low, the two skills could in no way be equated.[17] The conclusion follows that if reading tests cannot predict listening comprehension levels (and both of the latter are receptive skills, so have something in common), reading tests will be even poorer predictors of speaking ability, an expressive skill.

University Center: Observed Relationships between Reading/Writing and Speaking/Listening Skills: In line with this thinking, the speech department at the University Center agreed that silent reading tests for comprehension and essay exams conducted by our English department would not accurately reflect the

---

[16] As reported by a former instructor.

[17] James I. Brown and G. Robert Carlsen, "Brown-Carlsen Listening Comprehension Test: Manual of Directions: Forms A_M and B_M (High School Level)", (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1955), p. 18.

oral abilities of our students.

We had already observed that a student whose reading/writing level of communication was high might turn out to be a foreign student who had minimal oral/aural skills in English; or, if a native English-speaker, the student might prove to be reticent or simply unaccustomed to the academic demands of oral expression.

On the other hand, students who scored poorly on reading/writing tests (some as low as 4th grade reading level) generally needed equally massive work in oral development--but we had witnessed outstanding exceptions to this, whose oral/aural development far surpassed reading/writing ability. Since these exceptions were not the rule, however, the speech department agreed to automatic placement of the latter students in the non-credit course. Individual speech teachers then assumed the responsibility for verifying this placement as accurate. Within the first two weeks of classes, all non-credit students were to be orally screened in class for the purpose of detecting potential students to transfer into credit-bearing courses. When detected, a conference was held with the student explaining the various options open to him; so, the choice of taking the more difficult course, or remaining in the non-credit course was the students'.

For students who scored well on reading/writing tests and who had been placed in college-level English courses, a more accurate speech placement method seemed essential. Since the credit-bearing course was a terminal course, we had to be confident that students completing that course would be ready to cope with the oral/aural demands of the next four years of college. Since these students had already passed reading/writing screening, what we needed was an oral/aural test to detect those students who needed an extra semester of speech. Students who failed to pass such a test would be assigned to the non-credit speech sections.

Standardized Tests: An investigation of existing standardized listening tests (STEP-high school, Brown-Carlsen) proved fruitless. Apart from their various virtues and flaws, the tests were too long for our purposes. If we were to test listening, we needed a briefer test that could be administered to several hundred students a semester, and--at the same time--allow a significant portion of our testing time for oral exchanges with each student. Ideally, the test we needed would provide a miniature sampling of all four communicative skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking), to give us a quick guide to the relative strengths and weaknesses of each student's total communication pattern.

Knowing of no other more suitable test, we decided to create our own.

University Center: "The Aesop Test"

By spring semester, 1968, we had professionally taped three of Aesop's fables[18], chosen for culture-free content and abstract messages that required extraction and interpretation. The plan was to play the duplicated tapes for each student (100-200 in all) and orally question each student about each fable, its meaning, and its relevance in his experience (application). The placement results of this method proved more accurate than the previous method of judging the student's oral reading. That is to say, students who needed extensive oral/aural work were identified, and students who did pass were considered to have the potential for passing our college-level course. Serious handicaps

[18] A taped method was chosen for maximum consistency and because we had a professional newscaster/announcer on the staff. Using tape for listening testing is supported by a 1963 study conducted by Johnson and Frandsen who administered the Brown-Carlsen Listening Comprehension Test using a filmed, taped, and live presentation. According to Sam Duker, "The taped presentation had the highest reliability and also yielded the highest score." Sam Duker, "Listening," in Listening: Readings, ed. by Sam Duker (New York; Scarecrow Press, 1966), p.167.

of "The Aesop Test" quickly emerged, however:

1) The brevity and simplicity of each fable limited the dimensions of listening acuity which could be tested.

2) Playing the tape each time for each of the 100-200 students proved mentally exhausting to the speech teachers and reduced subsequent interviewing effectiveness.

During the spring semester of 1969, our department reviewed the advantages and handicaps of "The Aesop Test" and hammered out a potentially more useful test. In determining the specific test objectives, the department came up with a "bare minimum" list of speech areas we wanted the test to probe:

A. Listening: Understanding of Spoken English

-sound discrimination
-factual recall
-recall of ideas in sequence
-recognition of main idea(s)
-ability to follow directions

B. Listening/Reasoning: Conceptual Ability

-ability to draw inferences
-ability to generalize
-ability to apply abstract concepts to concrete situations

C. Severe Deficiencies in Listening, Speaking, or Writing Vocabularies

D. Clinical Problems

E. Severe/Obvious Reticence

F. Language Deficits Due to English Being a Second Language

Once these objectives were agreed upon, the next problem was to create a test instrument which would provide us with adequate information on each student for accurate placement--and, at the same time, to create a controlled test which could be administered to large numbers of students in a relatively short period of time. The resulting test (see Supplement #1) combined

listening, speaking, and writing skills, with a test introduction intended to be silently read as an aid for foreign students. A description of the test follows:

University Center: "The Odysseus Test"

The test used in the Fall of 1969 consister of two principle parts: I.) Listening/Writing, and II.) Oral Interview:

I. Listening: Each student listened to a story about Odysseus which had been specially re-written for this purpose and which was carefully recorded to ensure consistent pronunciation, articulation, and paced to allow the ideas to register in the mind of the student. The content was divided into two parts: Part I involved 1:10 minutes of listening. At the end of Part I, students were allowed six minutes to write answers to four written questions which drew upon factual recall. (Student's test form is Supplement #2).

Part II of the Listening content ran 3:30 minutes, with four more questions to be answered within sixteen minutes. One question (#5) called upon the student to interpret meaning; one question (#6) called upon the student to remember content and write a sequence of events; one question (#7) called for inferences; and the final question (#8) required the student to abstract a moral or lesson from the story.

II. Oral Interview: As each student completed his written answers, his test was given to a speech instructor who read the answers and then called the student into an office for a private interview. The interview consisted of two parts:

A. Explanation of Written Answers: On questions #1-#7, any particularly interesting, confusing, or incomplete answers were pursued by the interviewer. All interviewers asked all students

for a further oral explanation of their written answer to question #8, since this provided our only key to how well the student could deal at an abstract level. (If a student had written satisfactory answers to questions #1-#7, orally explained them, and could orally explain his answer to question #8 satisfactorily, he was placed in a college-level freshman speech course.)

B. Personal Interview: A further sampling of the student's speech pattern was obtained by asking questions about himself: "How did you find out about the SEEK program?" "What do you hope to accomplish in college?" "Have you taken speech before?" "What kind of jobs have you had?" "Were you active in student activities in high school?" Where an accent appeared to hamper a student in expressing himself, the interviewer tried to get a brief history on how long the student had spoken English, how long he had lived in New York City, and to what extent friends or members of the family spoke English.

Besides detecting students who had difficulty with English-as-a-second language, the interview helped us detect severe vocabulary deficiencies, clinical problems, and severely reticent students.

III. Method of Evaluating: While final evaluation of the students and their tests remained up to the subjective judgment of each individual teacher/interviewer, the department had agreed in advance upon the content it sought, or would accept, for each answer. When a placement decision was particularly difficult, teachers called upon each other for advice while the student was still present.

In order for a student to be placed in the college-level course, he had to be able to: 1) write coherent, acceptable answers to the questions, 2) orally

expand upon his answers, 3) logically defend the abstract moral he had drawn from the story, and 4) talk about himself in the interview fairly smoothly, coherently, intelligibly, and without undue anxiety.

If a student faltered significantly in any of the above four areas, the teacher/interviewer tried to obtain enough information to determine whether: 1) one semester of oral practice at the pre-college, non-credit level would bring the student up to the college level, or 2) if the student appeared to be in need of even more intensive remedial work in English before beginning any speech study, as in the case of newly-arrived foreign students.

Placement Test Results and Post-Evaluation: The test instrument which emerged was far from perfect, but it reasonably met those objectives given priority. Through this test, we obtained more specific information on a student's overall command and understanding of the English language than through any other test we had discovered. And, in the judgment of our speech staff, the "Odysseus Test" gave us highly improved results in placing students in a speech course commensurate with their needs and level of language skill.

The shortcomings of the Odysseus story as a fable-vehicle were:

1) Some students were already familiar with one version of this story and didn't listen well, assuming our version would be identical to the one they knew.
2) Students who had had no exposure to the story or to Greek mythology were somewhat confused by its content.
3) Many Spanish students heard "ship" and "sheep" as the same word and could make little sense of the story--a major oversight on our part. In these cases, oral interviews had to be extended to assure accurat placement.

Overall, there was no question in our minds, however, that we had hit upon a significant and workable test format. And while we were not completely satisfied with the Odysseus story as a vehicle, we felt strongly about continuing to employ the longer fable/story as a device enabling us to quickly test a variety of listening dimensions.

While modification of this test is still called for, it is hoped that other compensatory programs will continue our efforts to devise an aural/oral/written test that will accurately depict the communicative abilities of disadvantaged students.

Speech Placement Test

SUPPLEMENT #1

SPEECH PLACEMENT EXAMINATION - Listening Test

Odysseus was a Greek warrior, famous for his quick thinking in dangerous circumstances. After the Trojan War, Odysseus and his men sailed back towards their homeland of Greece. But they stopped at the port of Crete when their supply of meat had run out.

When the ship had anchored early in the morning, Odysseus sent out twelve men to go hunting in the mountains of Crete. At sunset, the men had not returned to the ship and Odysseus left the ship to search for them, armed only with his bow and arrows. He wandered one whole night before he finally found the tracks of his men at dawn. He followed the tracks until they led him to a gigantic cave high up on a mountain. Outside the cave, Odysseus saw a herd of huge, shaggy sheep, each one the size of a horse. Somehow he felt as if he were heading into a trap, but he knew he had to rescue his men. So he rolled away the boulder that guarded the entrance of the cave. He stopped short, shocked at the sight before his eyes. (Time--1:10 min.)

Question #1: Who was Odysseus?

Question #2: What kind of man was Odysseus?

Question #3: Why did Odysseus leave the ship?

Question #4: Was there anything unusual about the sheep in front of the cave?

(Students were allowed 6 minutes to write their answers.)

Inside the cave, a thousand torches lit up the cave as if it were mid-day. Odysseus saw nine of his men gagged and tied to a stake. He looked for the other three and saw their mangled bodies in a huge pot.

Odysseus crept carefully down the passageway until he heard a groan as loud as thunder. He stood paralyzed for a moment as something moved. It was a man twenty feet tall, weighing at least 500 pounds.

Odysseus hid as the monster woke up. The creature had one huge eye in the middle of his forehead, and he rubbed it to get the sleep out. The giant walked around sleepily and stopped at the stake where the men were tied. The giant said to them in a loud angry voice:

"I am a Cyclops, and there is nothing that a Cyclops enjoys more for breakfast than human flesh." And he laughed as he killed a sailor and began to eat him. "You men followed the sheep to kill and eat them. Now you are my sheep. I will kill and eat you." He threw his head back and laughed as if he enjoyed the horror of the captive men.

Odysseus knew that he could not beat the Cyclops in a hand-to-hand fight, so he planned out a method of attack. He waited for night for the Cyclops to go to sleep. Then, he tied two torches together so that they would make one big fire.

Speech Placement Test
Supplement #1 (cont.)

He crept up to the sleeping Cyclops, careful not to make any noise. He lifted the torch and plunged it deep into the Cyclops' only eye. The Cyclops howled in pain and swung wildly trying to hit back at his attacker.

Odysseus ran up to the entrance and chased the sheep into the cave. He untied the men and motioned for each one of them to get under a sheep, holding onto the long shaggy wool of the sheep's belly. When all of the men were holding onto the sheep, he chased the sheep towards the entrance. But the Cyclops ran to the cave entrance, blocking it. He felt the sheep go out one by one, but he did not feel the underside. And the men escaped. The Cyclops yelled and cursed.

"Who has done this to me? Who has blinded me and has taken away my strength?"

Odysseus yelled: "No Man. My name is NO MAN, and I have done this because you killed four of my men."

The Cyclops shouted back: "No Man, I will call my brothers, and we will find you and eat you, too."

Odysseus laughed loudly, as he rode a sheep out of the cave. Odysseus and his men ran away quickly as they heard the Cyclops climbing out of the cave. As they ran down the mountain, they heard the Cyclops calling to his brothers.

"Help! Help me, brothers! I am blind!"

And the Cyclops' brothers rushed from their caves to help him. "Who has done this to you?" they asked.

"No Man has done this to me," the Cyclops answered. "No Man has blinded me. We must kill No Man."

His brothers were puzzled. "If no man did this to you, who did? Who blinded you?"

"No Man blinded me. His name was No Man."

The brothers said to the blind Cyclops, "If no man did this, we can punish no man." And they led him away. (Time--3:30 min.)

Question #5: Why did the Cyclops want to eat the men from Odysseus' ship?

Question #6: What was Odysseus' plan to rescue his men?

Question #7: What advantages did Odysseus have over the Cyclops?

Question #8: What is a moral or lesson of the story of Odysseus and the Cyclops?

(Students were allowed 16 minutes to write their answers.)

Speech Placement Test

SUPPLEMENT #2
(Student Answer Form)

After filing in blanks for his name, the date, and the time of the test, the student was asked to write answers to the following two written questions and to read an explanatory passage:

Is this your first semester at SEEK? _____

Have you ever taken a Speech course before, either in high school or in college?

_____

_____

This Speech Placement exam is divided into two sections. After each section, there will be four questions. You are to listen carefully and answer the questions on the answer sheet. Answer the questions as completely as possible with as many details as you can remember.

There is no passing or failing this test. It will merely place you at a level where you will be able to learn most.

The story on the tape is about an ancient Greek warrior, Odysseus, and his adventure with the Cyclops.

Do not turn to the second page until you are instructed to do so by the Proctor.

The following page contained the first four questions (see Supplement #1) with adequate space for responses; and the page after that contained the last four questions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS:

Duker, Sam, ed. Listening: Readings. New York: Scarecrow Press, 1966.

ARTICLES:

Berger, Leslie. "University Programs for Urban Black and Puerto Rican Youth." Educational Record (Fall, 1968), 382-388.

Hopf, Theodore S. "The Teaching of Oral Communication to Disadvantaged Students in Community Colleges." Speech Teacher, XX (September, 1971), 208-214.

Nash, Rosa Lee. "Toward a Philosophy of Speech Communication for the Black Child." Speech Teacher, XIX (March, 1970), 88-97.

Preston, Dennis R. "Social Dialects and College English." Speech Teacher, XX (November, 1971), 237-246.

Scheffler, Linda Weingarten. "What 70 SEEK Kids Taught Their Counselor." New York Times Magazine (November 16, 1969), pp. 54+.

Wolfram, Walt. "Sociolinguistic Premises and the Nature of Nonstandard Dialects." Speech Teacher, XIX (September, 1970), 177-184.

LETTERS:

Edelstein, Julius C. C. to Robert E. Marshak (Dec. 11, 1970). Author's copy.

INTERVIEWS:

English, Philip. Former instructor in program for disadvantaged students at Bethune Cookman College in Daytona, Fla. (CEAP) Interview: March, 1972.

Thorne, Edward. Former instructor at Chicago City College. Interview: March, 1972.

TESTS:

Brown, James I. and Carlsen, G. Robert. "Brown-Carlsen Listening Comprehension Test. Manual of Directions: Forms A_M and B_M (High School Level)." New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1955.

"Cooperative Sequential Tests of Educational Progress. Directions for Administering and Scoring Listening, 2A." Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1957.