

# UC Berkeley

## The CATESOL Journal

### Title

ESL Students Entering the University of California

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4122g7v4>

### Journal

The CATESOL Journal, 9(1)

### ISSN

1535-0517

### Authors

Lane, Janet

Brinton, Donna

Erickson, Melinda

### Publication Date

1996

### DOI

10.5070/B5.36528

### Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

JANET LANE  
*University of California, Davis*

DONNA BRINTON  
*University of California, Los Angeles*

MELINDA ERICKSON  
*University of California, Berkeley*

---

## ESL Students Entering the University of California

The English as a second language (ESL) population attending the University of California (UC) comprises a wide variety of ethnicities and first language backgrounds. Undergraduate ESL students tend to be largely immigrants (permanent residents or citizens), with the majority having completed high school (and many middle school) in California.<sup>1</sup> ESL students who gain admission to UC immediately after high school are academically among the top one eighth of students graduating from high school. They are motivated, bright students who are generally determined to succeed academically. The same statements hold true for the majority of ESL transfer students, with the qualification that most of these students did not place among the upper one eighth of graduating high school students and therefore would not have gained acceptance to a UC campus at that stage of their educational career. Even more than their first-year counterparts, transfer students tend to be first-generation college students and may also come from slightly more disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds. The number of ESL students making their way to UC is increasing, thereby challenging the University to examine intersegmental agreements and practices affecting these students.

### Identification of Students as ESL

Students are identified as ESL by their respective campuses. In general, the UC systemwide Subject A Examination serves as the primary means of identification. This exam is required of all entering freshmen who have not satisfied the University Subject A Requirement through coursework or test scores prior to admission. When students are identified by this exam as

potentially in need of ESL instruction,<sup>2</sup> the individual campuses to which they have been accepted make decisions about their placement. On most campuses, they are screened further. This screening takes various forms—most often a reanalysis of the Subject A composition, a review of biographical information provided in the student's application for admission<sup>3</sup>, and/or consideration of the results of further diagnostic instruments.<sup>4</sup>

In contrast, transfer students enter the UC system having already satisfied their freshman composition requirement. Thus, campuses do not identify students from this group as ESL or hold students to a requirement. The one notable exception is the UCLA campus, where transfer students can, in fact, be tested and held for ESL courses.

### Articulation Agreements

Articulation agreements among the three postsecondary segments of education—California Community Colleges (CCC), California State University (CSU), and University of California (UC)—govern the courses which a student must have completed before being admitted to the next higher education segment. They also govern which courses taken at one institution are granted course equivalency at another. As outlined in Celce-Murcia and Schwabe (this volume), in the UC system the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) establishes articulation policies between UC, high schools, and two- or four-year transfer institutions. ESL students are governed by the same articulation agreements as all other students.

High school students, including ESL students, must meet the *a-f* requirements of the existing articulation agreement between the high school and the UC system (see Appendix A) in order to be UC eligible. The *b* requirement (English) demands that students complete four years of college preparatory high school English instruction, one year of which may be an advanced ESL course.<sup>5</sup> An additional year of advanced ESL can be counted toward the *f* requirement (college preparatory electives).<sup>6</sup>

Transfer student admission is governed by a similar set of articulation requirements. To be UC eligible, transfer students must present a certain grade point average in CC courses which have been articulated as UC transferable. Students are encouraged to complete courses required for their intended major at UC and also to take courses to satisfy general education (GE) requirements. To satisfy the latter, students may complete the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) (see Appendix B). Unlike the *a-f* requirements, the IGETC is not an admission requirement, but rather a recommendation. However, students are wise to complete these requirements because doing so improves their chances for

admission. Beginning with students entering UC in fall 1998, transfer students also will be required to complete a specified course pattern, including two transferable courses in English composition, in order to be eligible for admission. These new course requirements were instituted by BOARS to strengthen the level of overall preparation of transfer students, and in particular their academic literacy and mathematical skills. Thus, by 1998, virtually all transfer students entering the UC system will have already satisfied the freshman composition requirement.

One repercussion of the articulation agreements for ESL students, both incoming first-year students and transfer students, is that in order to complete the requisite courses for UC admission as well as any additional ESL coursework the student might be required to take by the high school or community college, ESL students may require slightly longer than their native English-speaking (NS) peers. For high school graduates, the provision that an advanced ESL course taken in high school can now count toward the *f* elective requirement is a very positive step toward assisting students in developing strong language skills. At present, there is no parallel provision for such an advanced-level ESL course at the CC to count toward a student's fulfilling transfer requirements.

### Academic Preparedness: Expectations Versus Reality

Given that the UC system accepts as freshmen only the top one eighth of the state's high school graduates (see Ching, Ford, & McKee, this volume) and that as part of their *a-f* requirements these students have completed four college preparatory English courses, one would expect that students entering the system would have attained a high degree of academic literacy skills. Similarly, one would expect that transfer students who enter the system already having completed one course beyond freshman composition would have literacy skills allowing them to function at a high level of academic performance. This "best of all worlds" scenario, unfortunately, does not hold true.

As documented elsewhere in this volume, there are clear reasons for the discrepancy between the expectation of academic readiness and the reality of vast numbers of underprepared students (both first-year and transfer) entering the system. Not the least of these reasons is the increased cognitive and linguistic demands as students move from segment to segment in the educational system. The problem of underpreparedness is compounded by numerous other factors in the high school and CC systems, such as the lack of proper assessment measures to guide the placement of students into ESL classes, the inappropriate tracking and counseling of ESL students into developmental English courses taught by instructors

who are not trained to work with ESL students, premature mainstreaming of ESL students; and the lack of consistent grading standards and criteria for passing students from one course to another. Finally, ESL students (even when identified by the institution as needing ESL instruction) may opt to circumvent ESL courses and enroll directly into transfer-credit English courses because of limitations on community colleges' ability to mandate prerequisites.

### Entering First-Year Students

The linguistic preparedness and academic readiness of entering first-year undergraduates varies somewhat from campus to campus, with Berkeley and UCLA attracting a larger percentage of the most qualified applicants. For example, in 1987, the first year the Subject A Examination was administered statewide, the mean score on the verbal section of the SAT for students admitted to Berkeley and UCLA was 498. The mean score for students entering Riverside and Irvine was 451; not unexpectedly, these two campuses had the highest percentage of students who took the Subject A Exam and were designated *E* (for ESL) - 10.01% and 15.07% respectively (see Scarcella, this volume, for additional discussion of Irvine's ESL population).

ESL course offerings for entering first-year students vary depending on the UC campus students attend. On some campuses, students may be held for one or more ESL courses (credit-bearing on all but two campuses) prior to completing freshman composition. At UC Davis, for example, entering freshmen can be held for one, two, or three quarters in an ESL composition course series before taking the Subject A-level course and then freshman composition. On the other hand, two campuses (Berkeley and Santa Cruz) do not require ESL courses.

### Transfer Students

Transfer students exhibit certain characteristics which differentiate them from the entering first-year ESL students and which can place them further at academic risk. This population of ESL students appears to be a growing one. Figure 1, drawn from statistics compiled at UCLA, compares the undergraduate student population in two academic years. In 1990-91, 37.8% of the undergraduate ESL population were transfer students. Only four years later, in 1994-95, this percentage had increased to 46.8%.

**Figure 1**  
**The Undergraduate ESL Student Population at UCLA**  
**(1990-91 vs. 1994-95)**

<i>Population</i>	1990-91	
	%	<i>n</i>
Freshmen entering from U.S. secondary schools . . . . .	55.4	.268
Transfer students . . . . .	37.8	.183
International (F-1 visa) students . . . . .	6.8	.33
<b>TOTAL . . . . .</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>.484</b>
	1994-95	
<i>Population</i>	%	<i>n</i>
Freshmen entering from U.S. secondary schools . . . . .	38.5	.129
Transfer students . . . . .	46.8	.157
International (F-1 visa) students . . . . .	14.0	.47
<b>TOTAL . . . . .</b>	<b>99.3</b>	<b>.335</b>

*Note.* Total percentages do not equal 100% due to rounding.

This trend toward a larger transfer population at UCLA (and UC in general) may be explained by economic factors, which can prevent many immigrant students from enrolling in a four-year institution initially. It may also be attributed to increased and improved articulation over the years between UC and the transfer institutions, which has greatly facilitated the transfer process. This increase in the percentage of transfer students highlights the importance of continuing and expanding effective articulation among the segments.

The language proficiency of these transfer students is an additional consideration. Figure 2, displaying data from the UCLA English as a

Second Language Placement Examination (ESLPE), shows that, although some transfer students place out of ESL upon testing, many still place into an ESL course. In fact, a larger percentage of transfer students than of entering freshmen places into the three lowest levels of a four-course ESL sequence, and some even place into a preuniversity ESL course<sup>7</sup>. This fact is especially of concern because all these transfer students have satisfied freshman composition through the CC, and many have even taken one course beyond freshman composition in order to fulfill the IGETC guidelines. Thus, while these transfer students should be more prepared than the entering freshmen because they have satisfied freshman composition, this is clearly not the case for a significant number of students.

**Figure 2**

**The ESL Placement Examination Results of Transfer Students vs. Freshmen Entering From a U.S. Secondary School From 1991 to 1995**

<i>ESL Course Placement</i>	<i>Transfer Students</i>		<i>Entering Freshmen</i>	
	<i>%</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>n</i>
Preuniversity ESL (noncredit) . . . . .	1.6	12	0.7	3
Low intermediate ESL . . . . .	5.2	39	2.4	10
Intermediate ESL . . . . .	15.2	115	10.0	41
Advanced ESL . . . . .	22.3	168	36.2	148
ESL composition . . . . .	17.1	129	34.7	142
Exempt . . . . .	38.5	291	15.8	65
<b>TOTAL . . . . .</b>	<b>99.9</b>	<b>754</b>	<b>99.8</b>	<b>409</b>

*Note:* Total percentages do not equal 100% due to the rounding off of decimals.

UCLA, which tests any entering nonnative-speaking (NNS) transfer students who did not receive a grade of B or better in the two transfer English courses, is currently finding that many ESL transfer students—even those who have completed two transfer-credit composition courses at the CC—still have a significant need for additional ESL instruction. Increasing numbers of these students are even placing into a pre-university level of ESL and demonstrate a critical need for additional ESL and developmental composition courses. Appendices C–E consist of writing samples from students representing this transfer population. Such lack of prepara-

tion in academic English skills significantly impedes students' ability to graduate in the expected two-year timeline; additionally, it places them at higher risk of being placed on subject-to-dismissal status or of being dismissed from the university.<sup>8</sup>

No other UC campus tests the English language skills of entering ESL transfer students.<sup>9</sup> However, there is growing concern about the language proficiency of these students who enter UC from community colleges. Clearly there is a need for ESL instruction for this growing number of ESL transfer students. In fact, some campuses are currently taking initial steps to develop courses to meet the linguistic needs of these students.

**Additional Issues**

There remain a number of additional issues which affect ESL students as they transition from other educational segments into UC. These include the early mainstreaming of ESL students, the use of SAT screening leading to conditional admission of ESL applicants, the underuse of bridge programs by ESL students, and the outsourcing of Subject A to other segments.

**Early Mainstreaming of ESL Students**

Many ESL students who come directly from high school to UC are surprised when they are identified at UC as ESL. These students have often received above-average grades in high school classes; they may have never been told that their writing exhibits ESL errors. Early mainstreaming of ESL students, that is, their enrollment in classes with native speakers, occurs in high schools for a number of reasons (see Sasser, this volume). At some high schools, ESL courses are not offered. But even when ESL instruction is available, nonnative speakers who have been in this country for more than three years are usually not eligible to take it even if they need it. For those who are eligible, it is not uncommon for the parents of college-bound ESL students to request that their children be excused from ESL, perhaps mistakenly thinking that an ESL course on their children's transcripts may make them less competitive for UC admission. In interviews conducted with ESL students at UC Irvine (Earle-Carlin & Scarcella, 1993) students reported that they desire to complete ESL courses as quickly as possible or even sometimes avoid them altogether in order to meet the college preparatory English requirement.

Early mainstreaming of ESL students also occurs within the UC system. ESL transfer students have already met English requirements that exempt them from ESL work. The result of this situation is that many transfer students never get ESL assistance even if they exhibit ESL features

in their writing that would have placed them in an ESL class were they entering freshmen.

Recently, a similar problem has begun occurring at the freshman level. ESL students can fulfill the Subject A requirement at a community college during the summer before starting their UC studies. Many students have realized that by satisfying Subject A at a community college, they can bypass a number of ESL courses and Subject A at UC. In other words, by completing one CC course in the summer, an ESL student can arrive at UC in the fall eligible for or having satisfied freshman composition. Although taking a summer writing course can certainly be very helpful, these students are usually not able in such a short time to bring their writing skills up to the level expected for freshman composition and successful work at UC.

### **SAT Screening and Conditional UC Admission**

With an increasing number of applicants and diminishing resources to serve them, the University is looking for ways to identify students who require substantial faculty resources and are at high risk not to graduate. Recently on some UC campuses, SAT scores of entering freshmen who qualify for UC admission are being looked at as a possible way of identifying high-risk students. Although this screening must be applied to all students, the result of this particular screening has affected ESL students almost exclusively. At least two campuses (San Diego<sup>10</sup> and Davis<sup>11</sup>) have attempted to offer students identified as high-risk a conditional or deferred admission with the requirement that they complete prescribed CC coursework before entering UC. The assumption here is that these students would return to UC with higher level skills.

The implementation of this new screening process is of concern for several reasons. First, it is not clear that this screening can, in fact, accurately predict which students will succeed and which will fail. Based on 1994-95 student data gathered by the ESL program at UC Davis, at least 50% of the ESL students who might have been identified as high risk based on the SAT screening scores were, in fact, making perfectly normal progress in their English composition courses. Furthermore, we cannot assume that students who have completed CC English courses, even with high grades, will necessarily have strong enough English skills for successful UC work. Thus, while we agree that some students may be better off at other educational institutions, it is exclusionary to apply an additional screening to students who meet UC's requirements for eligibility. Rather than try to predict a student's chance for academic success, UC should provide the needed linguistic instruction that its eligible students need.

### **Underuse of Bridge Programs by ESL Students**

All the UC campuses offer special summer bridge programs. These programs are designed to help students prepare not only for campus life but also for academics and usually consist of academic coursework (often math and English), study skills development, and advising. Many of these programs offer special sections for ESL students in the language development/writing segment of the program. Although there is often only a small number of ESL students in these programs, those who do attend benefit greatly from the introduction to UC coursework in a small classroom situation, from individual feedback on their language skills, and from the advising services offered. Most importantly, ESL students who attend get an idea early on of UC expectations for English language use and, at the same time, receive some early feedback on their own English skills. Although invitations are extended to all students who qualify for these programs, more aggressive recruitment of ESL students would be worthwhile so that more could take advantage of the programs' benefits.

### **Outsourcing of Subject A to Other Segments**

On two UC campuses (Davis and San Diego), courses which satisfy the Subject A Requirement and which were previously taught by UC faculty have been "outsourced" so that they are now being taught to UC students by a local community college. Students receive UC workload credit for this CC course while at the same time doing their other UC studies.

The outsourcing of Subject A presents a number of problems for ESL students. First, because ESL courses, when needed, are taken prior to Subject A, ESL students start their composition work on the UC campus. There they are working with UC faculty, UC writing tasks, and UC grading standards. Because of the outsourcing, they then have to shift to a CC class for Subject A before continuing on to freshman composition at UC. This jump to a CC Subject A equivalent class midstream in their composition sequence has proven difficult for ESL students not only because of the difference in grading standards<sup>12</sup> and curriculum but also because they are often moving to a class where there is little support for ESL writers. In the community college Subject A equivalent classes taught for UC Davis, for example, many instructors are part-time and are not required to hold office hours. This fact along with the larger class sizes means that ESL students get very little individualized attention. Also, instructor qualifications have proven to be inconsistent. Even sections specifically designated ESL/EOP sometimes have to be staffed by instructors with little or no ESL experience or training. One of the biggest problems at UC Davis with this arrangement is ESL students' inability to pass the Subject A exam despite having

successfully passed the CC Subject A class. They must then repeat the CC course and retake the exam. If they fail the exam yet again, they go through a portfolio review process to determine if their writing exhibits readiness for freshman composition. The majority of students who submit portfolios, most of whom are ESL writers, pass this review and go on to freshman composition even though they have been unable to pass the Subject A Examination.

Outsourcing seems to work against ESL writers, causing them great anxiety and frustration as well as delays in the completion of their UC composition requirement. The consequences of these delays are compounded by the fact that students cannot take any of their GE (general education) requirements until they have completed the Subject A Requirement.

### Conclusion

The increasing number of ESL students in California challenges UC to sharpen its approach to articulation issues. Admittedly, there is strong internal pressure within each segment of California's educational system to mainstream ESL students quickly in order to expedite their progress. In part, this pressure stems from state and local accountability models that view student completion rates as a measure of the system's success. Unfortunately, as a result of this pressure, many students exit a segment without sufficient linguistic proficiency to access the academic resources at the next higher segment effectively. Consequently, UC receives students who have not necessarily had the time or instruction needed to master academic language skills. UC must meet its obligation to these students by offering the language support they need to be successful students at the University.

Rather than viewing and treating ESL students as a liability, UC must see them as an asset bringing linguistic and cultural diversity to the state. In order to improve its practices, UC can look to its ESL faculty for guidance and support the involvement of ESL faculty in articulation efforts both within the UC system itself and among the segments of California's educational system. It can draw on its mandate as the state's research institution to support institutional research and develop sound approaches to identifying and educating ESL students, thereby contributing to a linguistically proficient student population. These students, after all, can form a multilingual, educated workforce, helping California function more effectively in the global marketplace, as long as they are proficient in English. ■

### Endnotes

1. Some ESL students, especially at the graduate level, are international (F-1 or J-1 visa status) students who apply from overseas either to complete studies or to pursue a nondegree objective (e.g., in the university's Education Abroad program). Due to the focus of this volume on articulation between educational segments in the state of California, this group will not be dealt with in this article.
2. Trained ESL raters examine any Subject A essay which has been identified as "ESL" on its first read and reread the essay to confirm this identification. See Celce-Murcia and Schwabe, this volume, for further discussion.
3. This information includes factors such as home language, length of residence in the U.S., language of primary and secondary schooling, and so on.
4. On some campuses, even if a student is not identified by the Subject A Examination as ESL, admission factors such as citizenship status and SAT scores can be looked at to determine if the Subject A essay should be reread for possible ESL placement.
5. ESL courses may be acceptable for a maximum of one year (two semesters) of high school English provided they are advanced college preparatory ESL courses, with strong emphasis on reading and writing. Such courses must deal specifically with rhetorical, grammatical, and syntactic forms in English—especially those which show cross-linguistic influence—and must provide explicit work in vocabulary development (University of California, Office of the President, Student Academic Services, 1995, p. C-3).
6. An advanced-level English as a second language (ESL) course may be acceptable provided it meets the standards outlined under the *b* requirement (University of California, Office of the President, Student Academic Services, 1995, p. C-3).
7. When students place into this preuniversity ESL course, their admission is deferred until they are able to demonstrate that they can perform work at the low-intermediate level.

8. This statement is supported by data provided by UCLA's Letters and Science counseling division.
9. Some colleges at UC Davis require an upper division advanced composition course. If upper division students do not pass the English composition exam, they must take this course if their college requires it. Special ESL sections of this course are not offered.
10. In fall '95 and '96, any student applying for admission to UCSD with a GPA lower than 3.5 and an SAT verbal of less than 480 was provisionally admitted and required to take one CC English class during the summer and pass it with a grade of C or better before starting UC studies in the fall.
11. Beginning in fall '96, students applying to UC Davis with both an SAT verbal of less than 290 and math of less than 510 were screened for possible deferred admission. Twenty-six students, all nonnative English speakers, were deferred for a year and asked to attend a CC for one year. To be admitted to UC Davis, they must maintain a CC GPA of at least 2.40 and take at least two English courses and pass them with grades of C or better.
12. In the UC Davis Subject A equivalent course now taught by a local community college, there are no uniform grading standards for the course. As a result, grading varies widely from instructor to instructor.

## References

- Earle-Carlin, S., & Scarcella, R. (1993, March). *Immigrant Students at Risk in ESL Writing Classes*. Paper presented at the meeting of California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Monterey.
- University of California, Office of the President, Student Academic Services. (1995, August). *The University of California 1996-97 quick reference for counselors*. Oakland, CA: Author.

## Appendix A

### a-f Requirements for Admission as a Freshman to the UC System

- a) **History/Social Science**—2 years required.  
*Two years of history/social science, including one year of U.S. history or one-half year of U.S. history and one-half year of civics or American government; and one year of world history, cultures, and geography.*
- b) **English**—4 years required.  
*Four years of college preparatory English that include frequent and regular writing, and reading of classic and modern literature. Not more than two semesters of 9th grade English can be used to meet this requirement.*
- c) **Mathematics**—3 years required. 4 years recommended.  
*Three years of college preparatory mathematics that include the topics covered in elementary and advanced algebra and two and three dimensional geometry. Math courses taken in the 7th and 8th grades may be used to fulfill part of this requirement if your high school accepts them as equivalent to its own courses.*
- d) **Laboratory Science**—2 years required. 3 recommended.  
*Two years of laboratory science providing fundamental knowledge in at least two of these three areas: biology, chemistry, and physics. Laboratory courses in earth/space sciences are acceptable if they have as prerequisites or provide basic knowledge in biology, chemistry, or physics. Not more than one year of 9th grade laboratory science can be used to meet this requirement.*
- e) **Language Other than English**—2 years required, 3 years recommended.  
*Two years of the same language other than English. Courses should emphasize speaking and understanding, and include instruction in grammar, vocabulary, reading, and composition.*
- f) **College Preparatory Electives**—2 years required.  
*Two units (four semesters), in addition to those required in "a-e" above, chosen from the following areas: visual and performing arts, history, social science, English, advanced mathematics, laboratory science, and language other than English (a third year in the language used for the "e" requirement or two years of another language).*

*Note.* From *The University of California 1997-97 Quick Reference for Counselors*. 1995, August. University of California, Office of the President, Student Academic Services. Reprinted by permission.



**Appendix B**  
**Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum**  
**Subject and Unit Requirements**

IGETC SUBJECT AND UNIT REQUIREMENTS

<i>Subject Area</i>	<i>Required Courses</i>	<i>Units Required</i>
1. <b>English Communication</b> One course in English Composition and one course in Critical Thinking/English Composition. Students transferring to CSU must take an additional course in Oral Communication.	2 courses*	6 semester units or 8-10 quarter units
2. <b>Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning</b>	1 course	3 semester units or 4-5 quarter units
3. <b>Arts and Humanities</b> Three courses with at least one from the Arts and one from the Humanities.	3 courses	9 semester units or 12-15 quarter units
4. <b>Social and Behavioral Sciences</b> Three courses from at least two disciplines or an interdisciplinary sequence.	3 courses	9 semester units or 12-15 quarter units
5. <b>Physical and Biological Sciences</b> One Physical Science course and one Biological Science course, at least one of which includes a laboratory.	2 courses	7-9 semester units or 9-12 quarter units
<b>Language Other than English*</b> Proficiency equivalent to two years of high school in the same language. Not required of students transferring to CSU.	Proficiency	Proficiency
<b>Total</b>	<b>11 courses*</b>	<b>34 semester units</b>

\* Students intending to transfer to CSU are required to take an additional course in Oral Communication and do not need to demonstrate proficiency in a Language Other than English.

*Note.* From *The University of California 1997-97 Quick Reference for Counselors*. 1995, August. University of California, Office of the President, Student Academic Services. Reprinted by permission.

**Appendix C**  
**UCLA Transfer Student #1**

Background:

Native language:	Vietnamese
Native country:	Vietnam
Major :	Applied Mathematics
Current UCLA GPA:	3.070
Other:	Fall '94 transfer student from LA-area CC with freshman composition credit

*Instructions:* You will have 60 minutes to plan, write, and revise a formal academic composition on one of the two topics on the next page. Choose only one of the topics for your composition. Your composition will be graded on content, organization, and language use.

*Writing prompt:* Examinees were asked if they believed that a quotation from President Jimmy Carter (in which he warns that we are losing confidence in the future and unity of purpose) applied to any group they were familiar with.

*Student writing sample:*

Losing confidence in the future is very worse. It is threatening to destroy the social. I'm still remember in 1987, after I finished high school at the age of seventeen. I lost my confidence in the future, because I lived under communist control, they were discriminate, they did not let me get me in university or college; Eventhough I got very high in my G.P.A. At that time, I did a lot of bad things, I drank the a liter vine per day, I smoked and I was a gang member. I didn't care any one. In my mind, I always think, I have not thing in the future. I was losing confidenc in the future. So I did a lot of bad things.

Righ now, I lived in the United State I have change go to school and I know that if I do good in School, I will have a bright future.

Therefore, I think that if someone losing his/her confidence in the future is very worse for social.

**Appendix D**  
**UCLA Transfer Student #2**

**Background:**

Native language: Chinese  
Native country: Taiwan (ROC)  
Major: Economics  
Current UCLA GPA: 2.236  
Other: Fall '94 transfer student from LA-area CC with freshman composition credit

*Instructions:* You will have 60 minutes to plan, write, and revise a formal academic composition on one of the two topics on the next page. Choose only one of the topics for your composition. Your composition will be graded on content, organization, and language use.

*Writing prompt:* Examinees were provided with two figures representing food production and industrial growth in developing countries and were asked to comment on the relationship between these two phenomena and the international movement to control pollution levels.

*Student writing sample:*

Develop or not, it always needs electric energy to provide the nation's development not only in food production but the famous problems how to solve it is art work.

Nowadays just in my country Taiwan ROC the inhabitants that a nuclear factory will be built in their small town disagree the police which the government has made Through the TV I can understand how badly this country need more electric energy and they always try to persuade these people to accept their idea and their garrantee of non-pollution. As everyone knows Taiwan is a good economic country now with its fast development in economic they surely have done many things compared to Mainland China. Taiwan has many factories many companies and a lot of heavy industrial factories. So with their fast development they need more electric energy in this small island, it is no doubted. Of course, they become a strong economic country but they just focused in economic development ignored pollution before when they planned to improve their nation economic construction. Nowadays everyone police the pollution, even the children. Because this pollution subconscious is planted in everyone's brain now instead of they have not known or later than other developed nations in this areas. So people take it seriously now in anywhere and anything. Nowadays even Taiwan government wants to have a new electric energy factory. It now takes them a big effort to explain this factory no pollution to their people.

Do the other side to see Europe Countries they do not have this argument in their country. Whatever their governments decide their people will follow but how

about their economic or food production. Certainly not reached as Taiwan has fast grown. It is pollution controls compared to economics. To see the US, US always notice pollution so US's food production is very good but US has a big land country. It is hardly to say US does not need electric energy for providing the food production that is US has a well-done foreseeing plan for the country so nowadays they do not have their argument in their nation.

Hopely my country Taiwan can have enough electric energy to develop the nation and less pollution to their people. Anyway it need to take wisdom no matter now or later.

**Appendix E**  
**UCLA Transfer Student #3**

**Background:**

Native language: Armenian/Farsi  
Native country: Iran  
Major: Pre-biology  
Current UCLA GPA: 2.454  
Other: Fall '95 transfer from LA-area CCs with 2 transfer-credit English courses

*Instructions:* You will have 60 minutes to plan, write, and revise a formal academic composition on one of the two topics on the next page. Choose only one of the topics for your composition. Your composition will be graded on content, organization, and language use.

*Writing prompt:* Examinees were asked to comment on a survey report regarding the responsibility of the government to provide its citizens with certain rights and privileges.

*Student writing sample:*

In any country each government tries to do best for his people in the communities. On the other hand each individual also needs a suitable and successful life. For doing this both government and people of that community have to work hard, and together find out the ways of having a good life. One of the major point is education and health, in which they both are important for a successful and happy life.

The children and teenagers who want to get education, in the first place they need to be healthy. So that they can study Better and get education and help others. Second, they need support for their academic years, in which they have to pay their tuition of the school and also to cover other experince in relate to the school.

Besides, the students themselves and their parent which can help them to get

their education, with a mind free of any other problems, the government is the second source of students support that can help and supports, those student who really want to educate and become a useful person in his or her country.

There are different kind of support and aide in which the parents and government can do to the children of the communities, specially those families with low income; health and medical care is one of them in which they should be open to all the low income and homeless people, since illnesses can makes study hard and if someone does not have physical and health problem, his or her mind also can work and understands the problems better, and so he can find the solution for those problems easily and in this way he can help the community. for example, the U.S.A president's health care plan probably is a good way to help the people of the lower category of the life, and its help them to become more hopeful, so that the health problem would not be a main problem to the students and the children who want to become educated.

The second source of help that the government can do and acially already is done in the schools, is the money support in which a student can get financial aid from the school and government, like myself, if the school couldn't help me with financial support I wouldn't be able to continue my education at UCLA, and thanks god and the government for this.

In addition having a good contry and community the people and the government have to help each other for having a healthy community with educated people who can have a successful and happy life. A healthy person, can understad better and also can find any solution to the problems faster and can helps people who need help.