Research related to methods for building competency in spelling has yielded information about three areas of teaching: word selection, generalizations to be taught, and application of spelling skills to writing. Research on word selection indicates that teachers should choose basic, high-frequency words for children to learn to spell, giving special attention to words which are persistently misspelled. The teaching of generalizations should be taught in conjunction with the use of whole-word techniques. Finally, research indicates that it is essential to teach spelling in conjunction with functional writing. Research related to methods for building handwriting skills deals with two major controversial areas: manuscript and cursive writing and the achievement of legibility. Research indicates that for some students, a shift from cursive writing back to manuscript writing should be encouraged beyond grade six. Although considerable research has been directed toward identifying factors affecting legibility of handwriting, researchers have failed to find agreement on such factors. The paper includes bibliographies of references on spelling and handwriting. (GW)
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Spelling

Research to support decisions about building competency in spelling was gathered in three areas about which issues have rather persistently revolved: word selection, generalizations to be taught, and application of spelling skills to writing.

The year of 1950 roughly divides two somewhat distinctive periods of research in spelling. Before 1950, the research of Horn, Hildreth and Fitzgerald had significant impact on spelling programs generally in use from the 1920's through the 1950's.

Beginning in the 1950's research in spelling took on a "new look", primarily due to influences--linguistics and computers. Gradually, recommendations about spelling programs began to reflect the findings of the Stanford group (the Hannas, Hodges, and Rudorf) published in the USOE report of 1966, but publicized rather widely in journals during the years preceding this final report. Research stimulated by the Stanford study--that of Personke, Yee, Venezky, Brengelman, Carol Chomsky, Graham and Rudorf, Kligman, Petty, Read, Simon, and others--permits some tentative conclusions that give direction for planning programs to build competency in spelling.

Word Selection. The most important words for children to learn to spell are the basic, high frequency words, with special attention given to demons or most persistently misspelled of these basic words. (This, in spite of recommendations that followed the Stanford study that words be selected and taught by spelling patterns.) Beyond the basic core of words should be added words of local interest and need, and for older children, a judicious inclusion of words needed in various curriculum areas.
Generalizations: The usefulness of teaching generalizations has gained sufficient support to discourage teaching each word as a separate learning act, i.e. primarily by rote memorization. Important evidence exists, however, to suggest that too exclusive reliance on generalizations—particularly on patterns of sound-to-symbol regularities—cannot be justified for several reasons: because encoding is different from decoding; because pronunciations vary with dialects and contexts of words within sentences, and because results of teaching some of them to students do not support their value for spelling words new to students.

Regularities beyond phonological ones must be taught, particularly to older students who should begin to recognize variant forms of the same word. The recognition of such regularities helps to discourage the overuse of pronunciation, and to alleviate spelling problems attributed to dialect differences.

If generalizations are to be of maximum usefulness, students should be tested, not just on word lists studied, but on their ability to apply generalizations to words whose spelling is unknown.

The use of generalizations should be supplemented by whole word techniques. These techniques must work together rather than compete. The question is how rather than whether to use each.

Recent research contains rather convincing evidence that children learn how to spell as well as being taught how to do it. Young children invent their own spellings and older ones learn some words as a by-product of reading and writing. These findings suggest that teachers recognize and reward increasingly more accurate approximations of correct spellings, rather than expect full conformity by students whose writing skills are as
yet immature. A teacher might well commend a child, then, for a good mis-
spelling of a word.

Application to Writing. Finally, the research strongly indicates that,
while direct instruction in spelling is necessary and should continue beyond
the elementary grades, teaching it in functional writing is essential. Such
teaching provides motivation for proofreading and encourages incidental
learning of many words. Proofreading makes imperative, also, the need to
teach older students the specific skills needed to use the dictionary to
spell words.

Research—both generates and thrives upon controversy. Researchers, like-
wise, are stimulated by it. Controversy is more likely, however, to frus-
trate and confuse classroom teachers, particularly when researchers rush
too hastily into prescriptions and production of materials. A good part of
the value of the Stanford research lay in the stimulation it is providing
for further research, and in the thoughtful interpretation it is generating—
rather than in the programs and materials it spawned. At the present time
there is available information culled from the best of past and recent research
in spelling that may be usefully applied in classroom practice, provided it
is put in a form to make sense to non-researchers. A few researchers are
themselves suggesting that teachers, given the information, make decisions
about application to classroom practice. One of them says, "... he who has
never taught even one child to read and write should certainly be reticent
in offering advice to those who have made it their career."

Handwriting

Research in handwriting pertinent to building skills for achieving com-
petency deals with two major areas of controversy: manuscript and cursive
writing and legibility as a standard to be achieved. The research conducted and surveyed by Anderson, Freeman, and Herrick provide the basis for most of the issues and generalizations regarding handwriting instruction generally practiced today.

Manuscript and Cursive Handwriting. The teaching of manuscript as the initial handwriting form, followed by changeover to cursive in the second or third grade, is standard practice in most schools today. Time honored reasons exist for observing this sequence.

Beyond grade six, if, as the research shows, standard forms give way to personal styles, and if such styles are in the direction of simplifying letter forms for the sake of legibility, then manuscript writing, well established as the simpler form, has advantages to recommend its use. The shift from cursive back to manuscript might well be encouraged, particularly for students planning to enter certain kinds of job training. Such a practice suggests raising, in a new context, a question long asked by those who have struggled to change children over from manuscript to cursive, "Why teach cursive handwriting at all?" Getting the public to consider such a revolutionary possibility is probably comparable to getting enthusiastic support to raise taxes.

Legibility. Legibility has been extensively cited as the principal objective in handwriting programs today. Considerable research has been directed toward identifying factors affecting legibility of handwriting. Those most commonly named are letter formation, slant, and spacing. Simplicity of letter formation is advocated. Personal variations of standard forms appear in the upper elementary grades and such individuality is generally encouraged, provided the writing is legible.
Illegibility increases in the handwriting of older children. Reduction in such illegibilities comes about as the writer is helped to identify specific malformations. Such knowledge is essential if older students are to independently proofread and correct illegibilities.

According to Groff, who reviewed current recommendations for teaching handwriting, the future of legibility as a standard appears to be toppling from its place at the head of the list of objectives. He points to the failure to find agreement on factors significant for determining legibility, to the declining value of using writing scales, to the leveling off of improvement in writing in grades 4-6, and to the decline in quality beyond grade six when direct instruction disappears from school programs. He suggests abandoning efforts to improve legibility and looking toward technology for communication with others, and for new forms of shorthand for personal needs.

The lull in research effort in handwriting in recent years may be a prelude to research that takes new directions described in Groff's futuristic speculations. In the meantime, teachers should not be surprised to hear a discernible ground swell of demand that teaching handwriting be emphasized through the eighth grade.
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