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This research study was conducted to determine the relationship between beginning manuscript writing and reading achievement at the end of first grade. A review of literature revealed that manuscript writing became established as the beginning writing form because of its purported relationship to reading. Despite a lack of research concerning the relationship of writing to reading, the support of such a relationship from a theoretical framework existed.

Data for statistical analysis were obtained through the evaluation of the manuscript-writing samples of one hundred thirty-one first-grade children and from the reading achievement scores of those same children. Statistical analyses included two Pearson product-moment correlations and two multiple correlations.

The existence of a significant inverse relationship between manuscript-writing errors and reading achievement was determined. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients for combined error types and for combined frequencies were significant but not as great as the significant multiple-correlation coefficients for error types in combinations and frequencies in combinations. It was concluded that considering the error types and the frequencies of those errors in beginning manuscript writing would prove helpful in identifying those first-grade children who may have difficulty in learning to read.

USING TEXT COMPREHENSION AS A METAPHOR FOR UNDERSTANDING TEXT PRODUCTION: BUILDING BRIDGES BETWEEN READING AND WRITING

Order No. DA8321377

There has been increased interest by various segments in the academic community in how language users go about learning and producing written discourse. Accompanying this interest is an ever growing school of thought which insists writing should not be seen in isolation from communicative skills in general. Hypotheses formulated about writing are to be closely aligned with current theories of reading. From this perspective, reading and writing are not mirror images, one being the reverse of the other, but rather run in parallel and use the same basic information processing mechanisms.

This study explored sociological, psychological, and linguistic interrelationships between text production and text comprehension through (1) the delineation of process universals common to both reading and writing, (2) the incorporation of these universals within a macro theory and model of text production, the theory itself built through use of current theories of text comprehension as model analogues, and (3) the development, implementation, and evaluation of a writing-reading curriculum highlighting key transactions within the theory. The construct of global coherence was operationalized as the basis for data analysis and curriculum evaluation. Analysis of coherence was considered in regard to (1) writer growth and development in control of coherence, (2) the key "within-text" differences between texts high and low in coherence, and (3) the effects of text coherence on shared meaning among readers.

The analysis of texts produced throughout the semester by writers involved in the curriculum indicated that (1) writers increased their ability to generate more globally coherent texts, (2) control of coherence was not a monolithic ability and varied across tasks for all writers, (3) texts were considered to be high in coherence because they: contained more redundant cues supporting the generation of macrostructures, contained fewer propositions which either required the making of major inferences or were meaningless to the readers, and (4) high text coherence did not result in more shared meanings among readers transacting with the text.

COMPREHENSION OF DEICTIC CATEGORIES IN ORAL AND WRITTEN LANGUAGE

Order No. DA8328993

The research issue addressed in this study concerns the nature of the development of children's understanding of the deictic system and their ability to understand its use in oral and written language. The deictic system is used to link what one says to the situation and things in the world. The interpretation of deictic terms (i.e., terms such as "I," "you," "here," "there," "come," "go," etc.) requires the coordination and manipulation of a great deal of information concerning time, location, perspective and the identity and speech roles of participants in language events. Children's ability to coordinate such information in different tasks in oral and written language is investigated in this study.

Although children have acquired a great deal of pragmatic knowledge about how the deictic system operates in their early years of language development, they may find it difficult to apply the knowledge they possess in tasks which require complex mental processes. In particular, they may find it difficult to employ their knowledge in written language. Written language requires the mental representation of imagined individuals in imagined situations for the purpose of adopting a perspective for the interpretation of text.

Three groups of twenty-four second graders performed three tasks: (1) an oral language task in which they interpreted deictic terms in the context of an acted-out situation, (2) a written language task in which they interpreted deictic terms in written texts and (3) a picture task in which they selected a picture which represented conditions under which deictic terms could appropriately be used, based on their interpretation of a written text. The three deictic categories investigated were motion verbs, pronouns and locatives.

Planned comparisons between the oral and written language tasks indicated that written language tasks were more difficult than comparable oral language tasks. Although the children could "read" the words of the text, the world they envisioned in the process of interpretation often differed markedly from the world indicated by the text. Planned comparisons between the deictic categories within the oral and written tasks indicated that some deictic categories were easier for children to interpret than others. Comparisons between pragmatically different discourse contexts indicated that children found it easier to interpret deictic terms when they were participants than when they were merely observers of a conversation.

This study contributes to our understanding of children's understanding of the deictic system as it is represented in their oral and written language. It also contributes to our understanding of children's ability to transform their oral language representations into written language representations, and the extent to which their representations are interpreted correctly by listeners.
evidenced in their reading and writing activities. Students' degree of involvement in reading and writing ranged from reactive to transactive patterns of response.

Conclusion. Patterns of reading and writing responses embodying limited use of strategies beyond reporting were characterized as reactive. Patterns of responses indicative of flexible use of the six strategies were characterized as transactive. While the six strategies--reporting, conjecturing, contextualizing, structuring, monitoring, and repairing--were identified in both reading and writing processes, transactive patterns of response were parallel in both reading and writing processes for only three students. The response patterns of the other five students ranged from a midpoint between the two extremes to the reactive end of the continuum in reading and writing. Thus, in the reading and writing of these students, strategies used in one process were not always selected proportionately in the other process.

DISCOURSE SYNTHESIS: CONSTRUCTING TEXTS IN READING AND WRITING

Order No. DA8329878

Sipivey, Nancy Nelson, Ph.D. The University of Texas at Austin, 1983. 183pp. Supervising Professor: Charles R. Kline, Jr.

This study into reading and composition focused on discourse synthesis, the selecting and combining of information from various textual sources to form new, unique texts. The purpose of the study was to compare the performance of able and less able comprehenders on a discourse synthesis task.

The 40 subjects, university juniors and seniors, were assigned to either the able comprehender group or the less able comprehender group on the basis of scores on the Comprehension Subtest of the Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Form E. The students were given three descriptive texts on a single topic, each text containing some information present only in it, some information present in one of the other sources, and some information present in both of the other sources. The students produced their own synthesized versions during two writing sessions.

The groups were compared for differences in some, or some combination, of the variables in their composition products or in the process of constructing them. The variables for the compositions were organization and connectivity of the textual structure, quantity of content, and holistic quality. The variables for the synthesis process were visible planning, revision, and time spent on the task. After a multivariate analysis of variance indicated a significant overall difference between groups, a discriminant analysis showed the group differences to be on the variables for the composition products.

The two groups were also tested for differences in the selection of information of various levels of importance. Importance, as defined in this study, was determined both by height in the text base of a single text and by repetition across texts. A linear trend analysis revealed that, although both groups followed an importance principle in selecting information, the performance of the groups differed as the information became progressively more important.

The product and process variables were examined for intercorrelations. A combination of the variables produced a significant regression equation for predicting holistic quality ratings by specialists in the content area of the text topic.
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