ED 203 316   CS 206 329

AUTHOR   Meyers, Douglas
TITLE   The Influence of Using Speaking as a Pre-Writing
                Activity on Community College Freshman Composition
                Pupils' Performance in Writing.
PUB DATE   [79]
NOTE   36p.: Research prepared at the University of
                Maryland.

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   College Freshmen: *Prewriting: *Speech Communication:
                Teaching Methods: Two Year Colleges: Writing
                (Composition): Writing Evaluation: *Writing
                Instruction: Writing Processes: *Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS   *Talk Write Method

ABSTRACT
                Freshman composition students at a community college
in Maryland participated in a study to determine whether the
talk-write method of writing instruction would have a more positive
effect on freshman writing than would more conventional methods of
instruction. Four classes totaling 58 students were randomly divided
into an experimental and a control group. The experimental group used
the talk-write method, a prewriting activity in which pairs of
students talk over their writing plans with one another, while the
control group received instruction in grammar, punctuation, and
outlining. All students then wrote narrative, descriptive,
expository, and argumentative essays, which were independently
evaluated to find differences in the mean scores for each group. The
papers were judged on 12 measures falling into the areas of general
merit, mechanics, and total evaluation. The results revealed
significant differences favoring the experimental group. The
talk-write method produced statistically significant positive effects
on students' performance in writing for eight out of the twelve
measures considered, with the area of general merit benefiting the
most. (HTH)

ED203316

The Influence of Using Speaking as a Pre-Writing Activity on Community College Freshman Composition Pupils' Performance in Writing

Douglas Meyers
Assistant Professor
Department of English
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742
telephone: (301) 454-2529

2

Background

Although speaking activities are not part of the traditional paradigm of composition instruction, pedagogical theories and psychological findings--even homespun pieces of wisdom-- indicate that speaking might be used to facilitate growth in writing. The interest in researching the relationship between speaking activities and writing has been a relatively minor trend, however, given all of the disciplinary divorces that have occurred during the last half century of our profession. Yet, the interest has been ongoing: the first volume of Research in the Teaching of English, in fact, included a piece (Tovatt and Miller, 1967) which discussed the attempt to use speaking activities to improve the writing of ninth-graders.

It is not at all an unusual objective to get students to write as easily as they talk, and at least one writing teacher's advice has been " . . . simply to write by ear; as you write your thoughts, listen in your mind to your own voice sounding the syllables." (Walcott, 1959) Klein (1977) argues that "the joint development of talking and writing is a desirable thing and a complementary thing," aphoristic indeed for teachers of the countless students who can orally discuss a topic with vigor, but when it comes to writing about it, are so phobic that they hardly write anything at all.

Falk (1979) insists that "Writing, as a written representation of language, and speech, as an oral representation, different but co-equal means to express language," and it would surprise few persons that oracy is vital to literacy, a vitality well summarized by Moffett (1968):

3

> The best strategy for discussing a certain
> topic might be exactly the strategy the
> student should adopt in <u>writing</u> about that
> topic. And this is the point: through dis-
> cussion, students can learn together about
> handling some of the problems of abstract
> writing, from how to assert single state-
> ments to how to phrase an attack on a sub-
> ject. Interaction between discussion and
> writing is essential.

For the elementary school-aged child, the telling in-
fluence of speech on personal and social development has been
well documented. Bruce et al. (1978), for instance, account
for some of the difficulty children have in learning to write
by attributing it to the disparity between their conversation
and their written expression. King and Rentel (1979) discuss
the necessity of sustained talk or narrative for young children
preparing to write, and Kirkton (1971) has summarized that
researchers in the elementary language arts recommend that
children "talk out" prior to writing. Talking as a useful
prelude to writing has been affirmed by Lopate (1978), and
Folta (1969) praises it because it helps young writers to
discriminate relevant details from irrelevant ones. One prin-
ciple of the Story Workshop method of teaching children to
write, as Schultz (1978) has described, requires a good deal
of oral telling and oral reading as a way to harness and
to study

> the relationship of the physical voice to
> writing, the extension of physical voice
> into another medium that employs symbols in
> print to enable another person to recognize,
> to 'hear,' and receive the voice of its
> communication.

For the secondary school-aged adolescent, recommendations have also been voiced for the practice of speaking as a meaningful pre-writing activity. Hannan (1975) advocates pre-writing oral brainstorming, as does Schwartz (1979), emphasizing its tension-reducing benefits. Tovatt (1965) has found that teen-agers who received composition instruction in which they were given an opportunity to speak their ideas into tape recorders and then to listen to them before writing profited by becoming more aware of their idiosyncratic skill weaknesses and by becoming more favorably disposed to the subject of English. (The procedure benefited most the students with poor verbal abilities.) Golub (1970), in experimental research with ninth-graders, contrasted an experimental group who practiced a methodology incorporating a controlled discussion prior to writing with a control group that did not discuss prior to writing. When writing performances were compared, the discussing group did significantly better. Wixon and Stone (1977) describe junior high school students' pairing up into teams prior to writing in which each teammate, prior to writing a sentence, says it out loud to the other, who may possibly want to talk about it more. This technique, they elaborate, promotes pupils' building their developing writing skills with speaking skills that are already fairly well-developed.

Graham (1971) has concluded that in the secondary school English classroom, oral activities exemplify the most natural alternative to the lecture method because

> . . . they represent the interest of the
> learner as opposed to those of the lecturer.

> . . . students come to the traditional lec-
> ture classroom engaged in personally moti-
> vated conversation and activity which must
> first be erased . . . [but] talk begins]
> with student interest--where the action is.

At the college level, Kettner's thesis (1974) reviews the integral relationship between oral and written communication that may be exploited by coordinating writing and speaking in the Freshman Composition curriculum. Educators have discussed the cognitive benefit to skills. As early as 1933, Anderson wrote encouragingly of his experience teaching a college-level "Oral and Written English" course in which writing and speaking became structured complementary enterprises, while fifteen years later, Loy's "Written and Spoken English" course (1948), which embodied the same principle of writing and speaking functioning in tandem, was still labeled "a new approach."

Educators have also discussed the affective benefits that accrue from injecting speech into the composing model. Snipes (1973), for instance, insists that "to build from this oral self-confidence, the oral composer's first language base, is the job of the English teacher." Along the same line, Kelly (1972) recommends speaking activities in Freshman Composition for the feeling of liberation they yield when one uses one's "own voice." Macrorie (1976) considers peer-oriented oral activities prior to writing as a key to promoting a milieu that counters that stilted for-the-teacher-only prose that he calls "Engfish."

Many college compostion teachers advocate oral group-work

prior to writing. Laque and Sherwood (1977) note, for instance, that peer pairs work especially well, for students who are shy about talking in larger groups have a chance to share their ideas and to receive immediate feedback in such an intimate "group." O'Neal (1975) favorably relates having his college composition students pair up to talk and write together.

Overall, then, a recognition of the usefulness of speaking as a pre-writing activity has occurred at each educational level. A writing pedagogy, however, cannot simply be grounded in pragmatics. It requires a theory of learning and of language. Robert Zoellner, who coined the term "talk-write" in his 1969 College English monograph, and whose ideas in this area have been the most germaine to others interested in investigating the talk-write nexus, sets this theoretical foundation.

After observing that his own college composition pupils who had written poor essays could quite adeptly explain their ideas by speaking with him, Zoellner began to regard poor writing as maladaptive scribal behavior. This conception contrasts sharply with others' hypothesis that poor writing basically manifests inadequate thinking. Extrapolating the principle of operant conditioning to the composing process, Zoellner conceives of writing as a verbal conditioning by which systematic applications of reinforcers can influence the probability of various verbal behaviors. With this interpretation, and with the methodological emphasis firmly focussed on empirically observable activities and the act of writing, talk-write is based in behaviorism.

It is also built on the cornerstone of the concept of
intermodal transfer, that skills in the vocal modality may be
exploited by skills in the writing modality via a talk-write
dialogue. Supporting this idea are the principles of inter-
modal integration, that the disjunction between writing and
speaking can be overcome, minimizing the difference between the
way both sound; and the principle of autogenetic specification,
that talking can indeed be used as a specification for writing.

Although Zoellner does not detail the various similar-
ities and differences between writing and speaking, many of
his critics h···ight the differences between the two. Cer-
tainly the dispai...es between writing and speech are real,
and a discussion of these may be traced back as far as Book III
of Aristotle's Rhetoric, where perhaps the traditional prejudice
against incorporating speaking into the composition model ori-
ginates.

Modern linguists and psychologists have revealed numerous
diverse and complex differences between speaking and writing,
and while a thorough review of these is beyond the scope of
this research, a synthesis of the findings of Britton (1971),
Bruce et al. (1978), Cayer and Sacks (1979), Emig (1976),
Flower (1966), Golub (1969), Klein (1977), Portnoy (1973), Rad-
cliffe (1972), Schallert (1977), Tovatt and Miller (1967), and
Vygotsky (1962) permits a contrast of certain salient features.
Speaking, exploiting the auditory modality, is a first-order
language process which is normally (i. e., barring deafness
or developmental disorders) early and informally acquired and
which functions colloquially. Writing, on the other hand, ex-

ploits the visual modality, and as a second-order language
process, is acquired later and with some kind of formal instruc
tion and it serves literary purposes. Generally occurring in
the presence of another person acting as audience, speaking
promotes interaction and feedback (and is therefore not very
autonomous, i. e., independent of context) while lasting only
temporarily. Writing, however, usually sans immediate audience,
incites less immediate feedback, possesses greater autonomy, and
endures permanently. When compared to writing, speaking is
more redundant, and its referents are usually more concrete;
speaking possesses less syntactic complexity amd word diversity,
though it does have prosodic features which writing lacks. These
differences are summarized in Figure 1:

Figure 1

Contrastive Features of Speaking and Writing

FEATURE	SPEAKING	WRITING
Modality	auditory	visual
Process	first-order	second-order
Acquisition	early/informally	later/formally
Function	colloquial	literary
Interaction/ Feedback	greater	lesser
Autonomy	lesser	greater
Permanence	temporary	permanent
Redundancy	greater	lesser
Referent Concreteness	greater	lesser
Syntactic Complexity	lesser	greater
Word Diversity	lesser	greater
Prosodic Features	present	absent

None of these differences seriously jeopardizes the postulation that speaking and writing, rather than being two distinct systems of language, differ essentially in style and manner of encoding. To recognize these differences is to conclude that writing is not merely talk transcribed onto paper and that writing and talking are not identical. Neither of these conclusions invalidates the main premise of a talk-write pedagogy, that talking is a valuable form of pre-writing. Both speaking amd writing, to be sure, are _originating_ communicative processes, and it is this similarity which may also enable one to be used in the service of the other.

Falk (1979) presents a model for learning to write that analogizes such learning to oral language acquisition. Just as spoken language is not acquired by mastering a set of discrete skills, writing cannot be learned by mastering autonomous parts of written form; rather, in Falk's words, writing is achieved

> . . . through the tacit internalization of patterns and principles that are acquired through extensive exposure to and practical experience with the use of language in actual, natural contexts and situations.

In the context of academic writing, immersion in language itself, allowing overt "teaching" and innate linguistic capacities to interact with one another, would seem an ideal setting for accomplishing the composing process.

Of all kinds of speech episodes, dyadic communication offers the optimum opportunity for using oral language skills to strengthen writing. As a face-to-face information-sharing

process engaging two persons who function both as speaker and listener, dyadic communication embodies the essence of all communication in its interaction and reciprocity, mutually benefiting both participants. Torrance (1971) has shown that generally, the dyad format fosters a greater willingness to undertake difficult tasks and that it encourages creative and original thinking. Simply, dyadic communication is a microcosm of what civilization is founded upon, namely, the impulse to work together.

Rosenbaum (1973) notes that peer-mediated learning, of which the talk-write dyad is a version, is relatively independent from specific course content, but this instructional arrangement accommodates especially well to composition teaching. The context of classmates conversing about writing topics typifies the setting described by communication theorists as effective and emotionally rewarding. First, as Triandis' research shows (1960), when two communicators are cognitively similar--oriented in like ways to the significant aspects of their environment--communication is likely to succeed. In the "environment" of a specific writing assignment, it may be presumed that students share like concerns. Furthermore, as Triandis' work also demonstrates, communicators' using similar language promotes clarity and affinity. In the talk-write communication dyad, it is probable that peers use the same kind of language when addressing one another. In sum, the talk-write communication dya exploits the principle of homophily, that the more similar two people are, the more likely it is that their efforts to communicate will succeed.

11

Communication theorists also focus on the positive effects that feedback usually yields. By increasing the effectiveness of communication, as Leavitt and Mueller (1951) detail, feedback increases one's certainty that one is getting one's point across, thereby increasing one's confidence as a communicator. That the feedback is positive augments its potency. Positive feedback definitely maintains--if not increases--communication, as Verplanck (1955) notes. In addition, positive feedback contributes to emotional stability and mental development, for as Watzlawick et al. (1962) report, this kind of confirmation from others leads to confirmation of self. Since one's self-esteem as a communicator carries decisive impact on one's ability to communicate, as Brooks and Platz (1968) recognize, initial success talking could easily facilitate later success writing.

Mitchell and Taylor (1979) believe that the audience, however intangible, always motivates writing. In the talk-write model, this is deliberately and consciously so. Although growth in writing involves internalizing the audience, of course, an actual listening person may be the perfect intermediary for writers unable to traverse alone the egocentric route from themselves to a totally abstract other. This kind of dialogical navigation may be exactly what their monological full-fledged writing needs.

Dyadic communication is also valuable for making students responsible for their own learning and responsive to one another. This kind of collaborative learning encourages students to unite as what Kelly (1972) calls a "community of learners," cooperative rather than competitive. It helps to make writing

"real," according to O'Neal (1975), by removing it from seque-
stration and placing it in a public arena. It promotes the
kind of experiential learning described by Rogers (1969) as
personally involving, self-initiated, self-evaluated, and per-
vasive.

With this background, this study sought to determine
whether a methodology incorporating speaking as a pre-writing
activity would have any significant positive effect on the
writing performance of community college freshman composition
students. The specific hypothesis being tested was the following:

> In each of the rhetorical modes of dis-
> course (description, narration, exposition,
> and argumentation), the writing performance
> of students participating in the talk-
> write methodology will be superior to that
> of students instructed with traditional
> methodology.
> A. Superiority will occur in general merit.
> B. Superiority will occur in mechanics.
> C. Superiority will occur in total evaluation.

The limitations applied were as follows:

Rhetorical modes of discourse are part of the scholarly
tradition based on the idea that all writing may be classified
on the basis of four forms, each possessing its own content,
as follows: description--objects of sense experience; narration--
events organized in time and space; exposition--ideas; and
argumentation--issues.

Writing performance refers to a completed written essay,
produced by subjects, initially 100 and finally 58 day-students
enrolled in Freshman Composition at Prince George's Community
College, Maryland. Subjects averaged 19 years and 3 months
of age, and almost all reported just having graduated from
high school the June preceding the Fall 1979 Semester, when

this research was conducted. Overwhelmingly (95%) they resided
in Prince George's County, Maryland, and the great majority
(88%) attended the College on a full-time basis although many
(82%) also worked an average of 20 hours per week. Three-
quarters expressed an intention to transfer to a four-year
institution of higher learning after finishing at the College,
while the remaining quarter were enrolled in a career cur-
riculum terminating with an A. A. degree. Female students
accounted for 56% of the sample and males for 44%; whites
numbered 77%, blacks 22%, and Orientals 1%. On the average,
these students had earned a grade of "C" in English in the
twelfth grade, and all but three spoke English as their native
language. These subjects were enrolled in four intact fresh-
man composition classes that were randomly divided into two
groups, control and experimental. Two instructors--both full
professors with equivalent years of teaching experience--each
taught one section of each group.

For the independent variables, _traditional methodology_
refers to teacher-conducted lessons with the entire class on
the principles of grammar, punctuation and outlining, typical
activities for Freshman Composition. _Talk-write methodology_
refers to practices embodying Zoellner's the ctical ideas (1969)
and Radcliffe's procedural recommendations (1972). It engages
pupils in pre-writing activity requiring them to team up in
communication dyads in order to converse with one another about
what they are planning to write. This partnering occurs
during a class period between when the writing assignment has
been specified and when the completed essay is due. For ap-

proximately twenty minutes per role, each pupil is both the
talker-writer (for one's own paper) and the listener (for
another's paper) during one class meeting. After having as-
sumed the role of talker-writer, the pupil takes five minutes
to note in writing the ideas and suggestions that have emerged
from the conversation which may be helpful in composing the
finished essay. As talker-writer, the expectation is that one
speak about one's topic, and that as listener, the expectation
is that one be attentive, ask questions, and provide positive
feedback, behaviors united by the guiding principle of re-
inforcement. In this study, students were informed of these
expectations ahead of time, by a handout explaining the talk-
write dyad.

The dependent variable, student writing performance, was
assessed from a team of three outside raters' evaluations of
essays using the Diederich Scale for Grading English Composition,
which was modified by the researcher to eliminate the category
of "Handwriting." As Figure 2 shows, the Diederich Scale is
a device containing seven essay features: 1)quality and de-
velopment of ideas; 2)organization, relevance, and movement;
3)style, flavor, and individuality; 4)wording and phrasing;
5)grammar and sentence structure; 6)punctuation; and 7)spelling.
Each of these features may be characterized along a five-point
scoring line, yielding scores of 5, 4, 3, 2, or 1 (except in
the case of the first two features, which Diederich considers
so substantially more important than the others that their
values are doubled). The first four features' scores added
together are the general merit subtotal; the next three features'
summed scores are mechanics; all scores taken together make up

the _total_ _evaluation_.   For this study, essays were evaluated
by a team of three University of Maryland Freshman Composition
teaching assistants who had successfully participated in a training
workshop on the utilization of the _Diederich_ _Scale_.

Figure 2

The Modified _Diederich_ _Scale_ _for_

Grading _English_ _Composition_*

ESSAY NUMBER_____   READER_____

	LOW		MIDDLE	HIGH
Quality and development of ideas	2	4	6 8	10
Organization, relevance, movement	2	4	6 8	10
Style, flavor, individuality	1	2	3 4	5
Wording & Phrasing	1	2	3 4	5 _____ subtotal
Grammar & Sentence Structure	1	2	3 4	5
Punctuation	1	2	3 4	5
Spelling	1	2	3 4	5 _____ subtotal

_____
TOTAL

* From Diederich, Paul B. _Measuring_ _Growth_ _in_ _English_.
  Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English,
  1974, p. 54; modified by the researcher to eliminate the
  original's category of "Handwriting."

Method

     To test the hypothesis that in each of the rhetorical
modes of discourse (description, narration, exposition, and
argumentation), the writing performance of students participating
in the talk-write methodology would be superior to that of
students instructed with traditional methodology and that this
superiority would occur in general merit, mechanics, and total
evaluation, the non-equivalent groups design was employed, as
follows:

$$S - R_1 \begin{cases} P_1 - X_1 - D_{1, 2, 3, 4} \\ P_1 - X_2 - D_{1, 2, 3, 4} \end{cases}$$

    During the first day of class, in August 1979, all subjects--
students enrolled in four intact Freshman Composition classes
(two experimental and two control)--wrote diagnostic essays
for approximately thirty minutes. In addition to providing
information to the instructors, for the purposes of this re-
search, the diagnostic essays were evaluated by the team of
outside readers as a pre-test in order to ascertain whether
the experimental and control groups had any pre-existing dif-
ferences in writing performance. It was not expected that any
significant differences would occur, for at Prince George's
Community College, no attempt is made to register Freshman Com-
position students homogenously by ability. Rather, pupils
schedule themselves for classes whose meeting times are con-
venient for them. (In all likelihood, the fact that pupils
are "average" also limits the regression threat to the internal
validity of this study.) It was thought judicious, neverthe-
less, to ensure that any pre-existing differences be accounted

for, as the nonequivalent groups design necessitates.

For the rest of the semester--including the thirteen weeks
of the experimental period--all students used Writing With A
Purpose (McCrimmon, 1976) as their textbook and followed a
course syllabus designed by the instructors to fulfill the ob-
jectives of Freshman Composition. All group discussions and
non-essay assignments served as a basis for assessment for the
instructors rather than for the researcher, and while the in-
structors graded and returned all essays to their student-authors,
these grades were never made known to the researcher.

Each class convened for two-and-a-half hours per week.
Because of a large drop-out rate, the size of the research sam-
ple diminished throughout the semester. Withdrawing from class
at the College may occur at any time and incurs no academic
penalty. This mortality threat was beyond the researcher's
control, and while detrimental to the amount of data collected,
it is by no means atypical of the College's Freshman Composition
course, which many pupils repeat in order to pass.

The control group and the experimental group engaged in
differentiated activities on four days (class meeting numbers
10, 18, 24, and 32). Immediately preceding each of these dates,
instructors informed students of their essay assignments, which
required finished compositions averaging 750 words long. The
sequence of assignments, following the traditional order of
increasing difficulty, went from 1) description to 2) narration,
to 3) exposition (specified as comparison-and-contrast) to
4) argumentation.

On these four days, the control group pupils participated

in teacher-led lessons on the principles of grammar, punctuation, and outlining. Pupils remained seated in rows, directing their attention to the front of the room to the teacher who, using the blackboard and/or the textbook, explained the material at hand. Occasionally students completed exercises at their desks, and these were later collectively checked.

On the identical four days, the experimental group pupils participated in the talk-write methodology. Students paired up with one another in order to converse about the subject matter about which they were planning to write their essays. In order to facilitate these conversations, desk-top chairs were arranged so that pupils in each dyad faced one another. Pupils placed pens and paper on their desks, and while some brought papers on which ideas were already jotted down, most did not. The handout describing the talk-write dyad format that the students had read beforehand advocated a plan in which one person did most of the talking for a twenty-minute chunk of time while the other did most of the listening and reinforcing, but the students' communication dyads assumed the form of more natural conversations, with a more evenly distributed give-and-take between both participants occurring throughout the entire conversation. This naturalness was interpreted as an asset, and no attempt was made to implement the original distinct roles. Occasionally during the conversations, students would note something in writing, but most notes were taken at the conclusion of the conversation, after approximately forty minutes.

The initial plan for the communication dyads included

having pupils select different partners for each pairing. Thus, instructors were asked to request pupils to choose new conversation partners, but some students did not cooperate with this request, preferring to remain with their original partners.

On the days following these classes essays were collected. As with the previously collected diagnostic essays, every composition was photocopied before being marked and coded with a number replacing any of the original identifying information.

Results

The primary objective of this study involved determining whether using speaking as a pre-writing activity has any significant positive effect on the writing performance of community college pupils enrolled in Freshman Composition. The mean scores of the two groups--the (talk-write) experimental and the (traditional) control--were compared for the Diederich Scale variables of general merit, mechanics, and total evaluation, for four different essay assignments--description, narration, exposition, and argumentation. Because having equivalent group size is an advantage when making this kind of comparison, several essays in each set were randomly eliminated in order to equate the two group sizes for each assignment.

To ascertain whether any significant pre-existing differences between these groups' writing performance would be a factor in interpreting the results, a directional t test was performed on the data from the pre-test diagnostic essays. It was determined, at the .05 level of confidence, that the differences between these groups' mean scores for general merit,

mechanics, and <u>total</u> <u>evaluation</u> were not statistically signif-
icant and would therefore play no role in interpreting all sub-
sequent results. The data from which this conclusion is for-
mulated appear in Table 1.

Table 1

Comparison of Means Between Experimental
and Control Groups on the Pre-Test
Diagnostic Essay

<u>Diederich Scale</u> Component	Group	N	Mean	SD	Difference Between Means	t Value
General Merit	Experimental	25	15.29	3.30	.05	.05[a]
	Control	25	15.24	3.69		
Mechanics	Experimental	25	9.69	1.77		
	Control	25	10.17	1.83	.48	.92[a]
Total Evaluation	Experimental	25	24.98	4.07		
	Control	25	25.41	4.14	.41	.36[a]

[a] Not significant at the .05 level of confidence;
t_{crit} = 1.68 (48 df)

For the first essay, the <u>description</u> essay, an analysis
of the differences between the two groups' mean scores, using
the t statistic with a .05 confidence level, revealed that for

<u>mechanics</u> only was the difference statistically significant.

Table 2 summarizes these findings.

Table 2

Comparison of Means Between Experimental
and Control Groups on the <u>Description</u>
Essay Assignment

Diederich Scale Component	Group	N	Mean	SD	Difference Between Means	t Value
General Merit	Experimental	37	17.96	2.50		
	Control	37	18.40	4.07	.44	.52
Mechanics	Experimental	37	11.36	1.58	.72	1.76[a]
	Control	37	10.64	1.99		
Total Evaluation	Experimental	37	29.32	2.86	.28	.27
	Control	37	29.04	5.13		

[a] $p \leq .05$; $t_{crit} = 1.67$ (72 df)

For the <u>mechanics</u> feature of a <u>descriptive</u> essay, then, the
null hypothesis was rejected; for other features, it was not.

For the second essay, the <u>narration</u> essay, an analysis
of the differences between the two groups' mean scores, using
the t statistic with a .05 confidence level, revealed that
for <u>general merit</u> and <u>total evaluation</u> the difference was

statistically significant.   Table 3 summarizes these findings.

Table 3

Comparison of Means Between Experimental
and Control Groups on the Narration
Essay Assignment

Diederich Scale Component	Group	N	Mean	SD	Difference Between Means	t Value
General Merit	Experimental	34	19.03	3.24	1.58	2.08[a]
	Control	34	17.45	2.82		
Mechanics	Experimental	34	11.19	1.48	.12	.30
	Control	34	11.07	1.75		
Total Evaluation	Experimental	34	30.22	3.34	1.70	1.84[a]
	Control	34	28.52	4.00		

[a] $p \leq .05$; $t_{crit} = 1.67$ (66 df)

For the general merit feature of a narrative essay, and for its total-evaluation, then, the null hypothesis was rejected; for mechanics, it was not.

For the third essay, the exposition essay, an analysis of the differences between the two groups' mean scores, using the t statistic with a .05 confidence level, revealed, again, that for general merit and total evaluation the difference was

statistically significant.   Table 4 summarizes these findings.

Table 4

Comparison of Means Between Experimental
and Control Groups on the Exposition
Essay Assignment

Diederich Scale Component	Group	N	Mean	SD	Difference Between Means	t Value
General Merit	Experimental	29	20.08	2.76	2.20	2.89[a]
	Control	29	17.88			
Mechanics	Experimental	29	11.21	1.02	.36	.88
	Control	29	10.85	2.09		
Total Evaluation	Experimental	29	31.29	3.48	2.55	2.50[a]
	Control	29	28.74	4.60		

[a] $p \leq .05$; $t_{crit} = 1.67$ (56 df)

For the general merit feature of an expository essay, and for its
total evaluation, then, the null hypothesis was rejected; for
mechanics, it was not.

For the final essay, the argumentation essay, an analysis
of the differences between the two groups' mean scores, using
the t statistic with a .05 confidence level, revealed that for
all variables--general merit, mechanics, and total evaluation--
the difference was statistically significant.   Table 5 sum-
marizes these findings.

Table 5   -23

Comparison of Means Between Experimental
and Control Groups on the <u>Argumentation</u>
Essay Assignment

Diederich Scale Component	Group	N	Mean	SD	Difference Between Means	t Value
General Merit	Experimental	26	19.14	3.57	1.72	1.83[a]
	Control	26	17.42	2.94		
Mechanics	Experimental	26	11.20	1.26	1.02	2.37[a]
	Control	26	10.18	1.68		
Total Evaluation	Experimental	26	30.35	4.39	2.75	2.18[a]
	Control	26	27.60	4.38		

[a] $p \leq .05$; $t_{crit} = 1.68$ (50 df)

For all features of the <u>argumentative</u> essay, then, its <u>general</u> <u>merit</u>, <u>mechanics</u>, and <u>total</u> <u>evaluation</u>, the null hypothesis ·was rejected.

Summary

An analysis of the differences between the mean scores · for four sets of compositions' <u>general</u> <u>merit</u>, <u>mechanics</u>, and <u>total</u> <u>evaluation</u> was performed to test the difference in writing performance between the experimental (talk-write) group and the control (traditional) group. The results revealed sig- nificant differences favoring the experimental group (and therefore permitting rejection of the null hypotheses) as follows: for description, in mechanics; for narration and exposition, in general merit and total evaluation; and for argumentation, in

general merit, mechanics, and total evaluation.   Table 6 sum-marizes these findings.

Table 7

Summary of Results

Diederich Scale Component	Essay Assignment			
	Description	Narration	Exposition	Argumentation
General Merit	-	a	a	a
Mechanics	a	-	-	a
Total Evaluation	-	a	a	a

[a]Significant at the .05 confidence level

Discussion

Using speaking as a pre-writing activity in a community college Freshman Composition course produced statistically significant positive effects on students' performance in writing for eight out of the twelve measures considered.

The composition feature profiting more was general merit. Because general merit's four components are "naturals" to benefit from using speaking to improve writing, this outcome is not surprising. Speaking about a topic ahead of time means devoting and exchanging thought to and about it that will later be written; it also means uttering a verbal substratum that will be rhetorically useful for communicating these thoughts on paper.   These activities promote the production of writing that embodies what one wishes to communicate and they therefore enhance the quality of the first component of general merit-- quality and development of ideas.   Via the transactional inter-

action of a person-to-person conversation, spoken communication
can be shaped into effective written expression. With an audience
providing feedback and helping to check any conceptual gaps,
irrelevancies or redundancies, the second component--organiza-
tion, relevance, movement--is also strengthened: a speaker
carefully explicating points and relating them to a main theme
in order to meet the needs of an actual listening audience
likely performs the same service for the more abstract reading
addressee later. The criterion for a high score on the third
general merit component--style flavor, individuality--is that
one sound sincere and candid. Engaging in a communication dyad
apparently fosters this, for it is difficult to produce "com-
mittee-ese" when conversing with a supportive peer, a fact that
discourages stilted writing. Similarly, a concomitant positive
effect occurs for general merit's fourth component--wording
and phrasing--for any obfuscatory details can be noted in speaking
and therefore can be clarified by the time of writing, pro-
moting an exact written usage of words and phrases. For a
combination of possible reasons, then, this study indicates
that using speaking as a pre-writing activity benefits an
essay's general merit.

This observation seems especially true for writing done
in the modes of narration, exposition, and argumentation, for
which the results of this study reveal a statistically sig-
nificant positive effect. In each of these modes, the writer
is challenged by a considerable content to conceive and by
many details to permute. In the descriptive mode, on the other
hand, for which the results reveal no statistically significant

effect, it might be postulated that the content, prior to writing, is more or less pre-formed: the task of writing description requires not so much invention as it does a verbal recreation of phenomena. This re-creating might be refined, of course, but apparently it is not subject to the overall amelioration delivered to the other modes by using speaking as a pre-writing activity. (There is also the possibility that the nonsignificant outcome is not a function of the descriptive mode _per se_, but occurs as a consequence of the fact that this was the first communication dyad and that it needed to be practiced in order to yield the positive effects that it later did.)

Although the mode of description manifested no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group for _general merit_, the results of this study do reveal a statistically positive effect on the description essays' mechanics--grammar and sentence structure, punctuation, and spelling. To explain this seemingly anomalous outcome, it can be theorized that writing the "content" of the description essay was made less difficult (though not improved) by having earlier talked it out. At the time of the written composing, therefore, pupils could channel energy which is usually reserved for generating information into attending to these formal concerns, composing essays that demonstrate a marked superiority in using the conventions of written literacy.

In an analogous manner, for the most complex assignment-- argumentation--it may be conjectured that the significant positive effect on writing mechanics was facilitated by the

fact that students were placed in a "comfort zone" with their
content by having previously articulated it. It is likely,
for instance, that any nagging doubts about the supports for
one's argument would be greatly reduced during a conversation
in which one voiced and discussed these proofs. This confidence
with the content, then, would enable pupils to devote more
effort to ensure that the mechanical aspects of their com-
positions were correct.

Apparently for writing in the middle ground of com-
plexity--in the modes of exposition and narration--although a
positive difference exists between the experimental group and
the control group, this difference is not great enough to
be statistically significant.

For these two modes of discourse--exposition and narration--
plus that of argumentation, using speaking as a pre-writing
activity produced a statistically significant positive effect
on the essays' total evaluation. For argumentation, given
the two statistically significant subtotal results, the outcome
was inevitable. For narration and exposition, the fact that
total evaluation was carried in favor of the experimental
group is a result of 1) the modified Diederich Scale's weighting
general merit twice as important as mechanics, and for these
modes, statistical significance occurred for the former but
not for the latter; and 2) the fact that although mechanics'
effects were not statistically significant, they were never-
theless positive.

It can be concluded, then, that using speaking as a pre-
writing activity produces significant positive effects for each

of the modes of discourse, with these benefits increasing throughout the sequence of rhetorical modes, as follows: for description--one benefit, in mechanics; for narration and exposition--two benefits, in general merit and total evaluation; for argumentation--three benefits, in general merit, mechanics, and total evaluation. Whether this cumulative progression is a function of the natures of the rhetorical modes of discourse or occurs as a consequence of an increased potency of the communication dyad produced by practice remains for other research to determine.

The results of this study support Robert Zoellner's hypothesis (1969) that a " . . . preponderant skill in the vocal modality can be exploited by means of the talk-write dialogue to achieve . . . an increase in skill in the scribal modality." The theoretical cornerstone on which the practice of using speaking as a pre-writing activity is built, the principle of intermodal transfer, is also supported. Although writing is hardly ever just speaking transferred onto paper-- certainly the completed essays produced during this experiment were not simply the communication dyads' speaking recorded verbatim on paper--it can be deduced that the differences between the two modalities are not sufficiently large to preclude one's being used in the service of the other.

The limitations of a study of this nature must be noted. The results cannot be generalized beyond the particular population of interest, adolescents enrolled in a regular Freshman Composition class during the fall semester at a suburban com-

munity college. Rather than only offering definitive answers, the results of this research raise other questions. In this regard, the following possibilities are proposed for promising future investigation.

1. This study should be replicated to measure changes that occur in writing composed during class time. All essays collected for this study consisted of compositions that students had written outside of class, submitting them at least five days after they were originally assigned. It is recommended that this time factor be investigated using procedures that have pupils speak about what they are planning to write and then to proceed more immediately to write, in class.

2. In this study, experimental treatment was an isolated phenomenon occurring on four pre-determined occasions; the study, then, should be replicated in a writing curriculum in which speaking is an integrated and pervasive component. Investigation is recommended for the effects of an infusion of other kinds of oral activities (e.g., using speaking as a post-writing activity to facilitate revision) into the composing process.

3. This study should be replicated with the assignments in the four modes of discourse rearranged in a manner other than the present traditional sequence. Changing the order of these assignments would help to determine whether the effects noted in the present study are a function of the specific nature of a certain mode or whether they occur as a consequence of chronology (i. e., the history of the practice devoted to the talk-write communication dyad.)

4. To provide information that would maximize the effectiveness of the talk-write methodology, this study should be replicated to compare the effects of assigning different partners for each communication dyad versus maintaining one pair of partners throughout all communication dyads.

5. Although this particular research was conducted at the college freshman level, other research suggests that using speaking as a pre-writing activity could be efficacious at the elementary and secondary school levels. Thus, this study should be replicated with students enrolled at other educational levels.

6. To explore the possibility of using the talk-write methodology of coordinately developing speaking and writing skills for persons whose native language is not English, this study should be replicated with English-as-a-second language pupils.

7. This study should be replicated with students who are speakers of non-standard dialects of American English to determine whether these pupils, for whom traditional methodologies are often ineffective, can strengthen their writing skills by participating in the talk-write methodology.

References

Anderson, H. R.   An Experiment in Oral and Written English.
    School and Society, 1933, 38, 808-9.

Aristotle. Rhetoric. Trans. Lane Cooper. Englewood Cliffs,
    New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1932.

Borden, G. A., R. B. Gregg, and T. G. Grove. Speech Behavior
    and Human Interaction. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:
    Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Britton, J. Talking to Learn. In Language, the Learner and
    the School. Ed. D. Barnes, J. Britton, and H. Rosen.
    Revised ed. Baltimore: Penguin, 1971, pp. 79-115.

----------, et al. The Development of Writing Abilities (11-18).
    London: Macmillan Education, 1975.

Brooks, W. D., and S. M. Platz. The Effects of Speech Training
    Upon Self-Concept as a Communicator. Speech Teacher, 1968,
    17, 44-49.

Bruce, B., et al. A Cognitive Science Approach to Writing,
    Technical Report No. 89. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Bolt,
    Beranek and Newman, 1978. (ED 157 039)

Campbell, C. A. Think-Talk-Write: A Behavioristic Pedagogy
    for Scribal Fluency. College English, 1969, 31, 208-15.

Cayer, R. L., and R. K. Sacks. Oral and Written Discourse of
    Basic Writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 1979,
    13, 121-28.

Connors, R. J. The Difference Between Speech and Writing: Ethos,
    Pathos and Logos. College Composition and Communication,
    1979, 30 285-90.

Daly, J. A., and M. D. Miller. Apprehension of Writing as a
    Predictor of Message Intensity. Journal of Psychology,
    1975, 89, 175-77.

Emig, J. Writing as a Mode of Learning. College Composition
    and Communication, 1976, 27, 122-28.

Falk, J. S. Language Acquisition and the Teaching and Learning
    of Writing. College English, 1979, 41, 436-47.

Flower, F. D. Language and Education. London: Longmans,
    Green, 1966.

Folta, B.   Writing as Leading the Reader to a Discovery.
    59th Annual Convention of the National Council of Teachers
    of English, Washington, D. C., November 1969. (ED 039 227)

Golub, L. S. Linguistic Structures in Students' Oral and
    Written Discourse. Research in the Teaching of English,
    1969, 3, 70-85.

----------. A Model for Teaching Composition. Journal of Educational Research, 1970, 64, 115-18.

Graham, M. R. Talk-Drama as an Alternative to the Lecture. In Lecture Alternatives in Teaching English. Ed. S. Judy. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Campus Publishers, 1971, pp. 25-38.

Half Our Future: A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England). London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1963.

Hannan, D. J. Learning to Juggle Oranges: The Pre-Writing Experience. 5th National Council of Teachers of English Secondary School Conference, Seattle. 11-12 March 1977. (ED 139 028)

Kelly, L. From Diabgue to Discourse. Glenview, Illinois, Scott, Foresman, 1972.

Kettner, J. S. Z. Oral Communication in the Freshman English Course. M. A. Thesis, Texas A & M University, 1974. (ED 103 889)

King, M. L., and V. Rentel. Toward a Theory of Early Writing Development. Research in the Teaching of English, 1979, 13, 243-53.

Kirkton, C. M. NCTE/ERIC Report: "Learning to Write: Steps in the Process." Elementary English, 1971, 48, 303-11.

Klein, M. L. Talk in the Language Arts Classroom. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1977.

Laque, C. F., and P. A. Sherwood. A Laboratory Approach to Writing. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1977.

Leavitt, H. J., and R. A. H. Mueller. Some Effects of Feedback on Communication. Human Relations, 1951, 4, 401-10.

Lopate, P. Helping Young Children to Write. In Research on Composing. Ed. C. R. Cooper and L. Odell. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1978, pp. 135-49.

Loy, W. D. A New Approach. College English, 1948, 9, 206-12.

Macrorie, K. Telling Writing. 2nd ed., revised. Rochelle Park, New Jersey: Hayden, 1976.

McCrimmon, J. M. Writing With a Purpose. 6th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.

Mitchell, R., and M. Taylor. The Integrating Perspective: An Audience Response Model for Writing. College English, 1979, 41, 247-71.

Moffett, J. A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum, Grades
    K-13: A Handbook for Teachers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

O'Neal, M. J. Dramatic Situations for Pre-Writing and Writing
    Assignments. 26th Annual Meeting of the Conference on
    College Composition and Communication, St. Louis, Missouri.
    13-15 March 1975. (ED 103 865)

Portnoy, S. A Comparison of Oral and Written Verbal Behavior.
    In Studies in Verbal Behavior: An Empirical Approach.
    Ed. K. Salzinger and R. S. Feldman. New York: Permagon,
    1973, pp. 99-151.

Radcliffe, T. Talk-Write Composition: A Theoretical Model
    Proposing the Use of Speech to Improve Writing. Research
    in the Teaching of English, 1972, 6, 187-99.

Rogers, C. R. Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles R.
    Merrill, 1969.

Rosenbaum, P. S. Peer-Mediated Instruction. New York:
    Teachers College, 1973.

Sarbin, T. R. On Zoellnerism: Notes on Extending the Talk-
    Write Metaphor. College English, 1969, 30, 645-48.

Schallert, D. L., et al. An Analysis of Differences Between
    Written and Oral Language, Technical Report No. 29.
    Cambridge, Massachusetts: Bolt, Beranek and Newman, 1977.
    (ED 144 038)

Schultz, J. Story Workshop: Writing from Start to Finish. In
    Research on Composing. Eds. C. R. Cooper and L. Odell.
    Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English,
    1978, pp. 151-87.

Schwartz, M. Talking Your Way Into Writing. English Journal,
    1979, 68, 42-44.

Snipes, W. C. Oral Composing as an Approach to Writing.
    College Composition and Communication, 1973, 24, 200-05.

Torrance, E. P. Stimulation, Enjoyment, and Orginality in
    Dyadic Creativity. Journal of Educational Psychology,
    1971, 62, 45-48.

Tovatt, A. Oral-Aural -Visual Stimuli for Teaching Composition.
    English Journal, 1965, 54, 191-94.

----------, and E. L. Miller. The Sound of Writing. Research
    in the Teaching of English, 1967, 1, 176-89.

Triandis, H. C. Cogntive Similarity and Communication in a
    Dyad. Human Relations, 1960, 13, 175-83.

Verplanck, W. S. The Control of the Contents of Conversation:
     Reinforcement of Statements of Opinion. Journal of Ab-
     normal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 668-76.

Vygotsky, L. S. Language and Thought. Ed. and Trans. E.
     Hanfmann and G. Vakar. Cambridge, Massachusetts:
     M. I. T., 1962.

Walcott, F. G. Writing by Ear. Education, 1959, 80, 189.

Watzlawick, P., J. H. Beavin, and D. D. Jackson. Pragmatics
     of Human Communication. New York: W. W. Norton, 1967.

Wixon, V., and P. Stone. Getting It Out, Getting it Down:
     Adapting Zoellner's Talk-Write. English Journal, 1977,
     66, 70-73.

Zoellner, R. Talk-Write: A Behavioral Approach for Composition.
     College English, 1969, 30, 267-320.

----------. Response. College English, 1969, 30, 667-68.

----------. Mentalizing S. R. Rodent. College English, 1969,
     31, 215-30.