

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Marilyn Quinn Jacobson entitled "Listening Improves Voice in the Writing of Students." I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Curriculum and Instruction.

Thomas K. Ryan
Thomas K. Ryan, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Kathleen P. Bennett

C. Glennon Rowell

Accepted for the Council:

W. Minkal
Vice Provost
and Dean of The Graduate School

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's degree at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of the source is made.

Permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this thesis may be granted by my major professor, or in his absence, by the Head of Interlibrary Services when, in the opinion of either, the proposed use of the material is for scholarly purposes. Any copying or use of the material in this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature Marilyn L. Jacobson
Date April 25, 1989

LISTENING IMPROVES VOICE IN THE WRITING OF STUDENTS

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Science

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Marilyn Quinn Jacobson

May 1989

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my husband, Dr. Harry C. Jacobson, and to our children, Kara, Stephen, Paula, and Aubrie, for their loving encouragement, their patient understanding, their practical wisdom, and their unwavering confidence in my ability.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express appreciation to Dr. Thomas K. Ryan for his guidance throughout this study, to Dr. Kathleen P. Bennett and Dr. C. Glennon Rowell for their helpful participation as members of the writer's committee, to Ann Reed for her statistical analyses, to Dr. Charles L. Faires for his advice and materials, to Ann Howley for her help and friendship, and to Dr. Harriet Broeker for her support throughout the study.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study was to determine if listening exercises would improve the use of voice in the writing of developmental composition students. Two comparable classes were provided with conventional instruction in the writing of paragraphs, including the use of voice. One of the classes, the experimental group, was also exposed to listening exercises that emphasized personal voice with self as audience, formal voice with an audience other than self, and the voice of one other than self with an audience other than self.

The study included two pretests and a posttest. In each case the students were required to write in each of these voices listed above. Four experienced composition teachers were instructed in and practiced the evaluation rubric specified for the experiment. Each student was also asked to complete a questionnaire about demographic and biographic matters as well as listening and reading habits and family educational background. Further, the conference required for all composition students included a discussion for the experimental groups' individual reactions to and perceived effects of the listening exercises.

A statistical analysis of the examination results indicated that the experimental (E) and the control (C) groups were completely comparable at the outset and that on the posttest the E students wrote papers that were significantly better than those of the C students in each of the three voices. (The largest p value in the

experimental group for the ANOVA comparison was 0.004.)

To ensure that the results were not spurious, several checks were performed. The interrater reliability was tested in two ways and was found to be consistently reliable at the 0.9 level or better. The questionnaire and conference results were analyzed qualitatively to look for effects that would alter the fundamental result of the study and none was found. The conclusion is that the use of listening exercises will significantly improve the ability of developmental students to write in a unique, individual manner, in a formal context, and to write as another person would. The conferences with the E students also elicited some pertinent comments about the advantage of the listening protocol for other aspects of writing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
Introduction	4
Significant Listening Research	6
Problems in the Field of Listening: Measurement, Theory, Definition, and Instruction	7
Kinds of Listening in General; Appreciative Listening in Particular	11
Listening and its Relationship with the Other Language Arts: Reading, Speaking, and Writing	13
Significant Writing Research	19
Voice and its Place in Writing	25
Summary	29
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURE	31
Subjects	31
Procedures	33
Experiment	34
Evaluation	40
Analyses	42
IV. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	45
Statistical Analysis	45
Summary of Statistical Results	57
Questionnaire Results	60
Conference Results	66
Paragraph Analysis	67
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	75
Summary	75
Conclusions	77
Recommendations	79
REFERENCES	80
APPENDIXES	87
Appendix A. Consent Form	88

CHAPTER	PAGE
Appendix B. Rubric for Voice in Writing	89
Appendix C. Reader Rater Sheet	91
Appendix D. Questionnaire	92
Appendix E. Sample Paragraphs	95
VITA	99

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. The Means, Standard Deviations and Range for the Experimental Group, First Pretest, Personal Voice	46
2. The Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges for Both Groups and All Voices	48
3. Percentage Increase between Pre and Post Tests	49
4. Analysis of Variance to Compare the Results of E and C for the Totals of the Three Tests	50
5. t-Test Results to Study the Assumption that Pretest Scores can be Averaged by Voice: Variable = DIFFPRE	51
6. ANOVA Results by Voice to Test the Null Hypothesis that E and C are not Different on the Pretest Average	52
7. t-Test Results for Mean Difference between Posttest and Pretest Scores by Group and by Voice	52
8. ANOVA Results to Compare Mean Scores in Voice 1 for E and C	55
9. ANOVA Results to Compare Mean Scores for E and C	55
10. Regression to Establish Whether it is Reasonable to Use Pre as a Covariate in an ANCOVA	56
11. ANCOVA: Unequal Slopes to Determine Whether the E and C Regression Lines were Parallel	56
12. ANCOVA: Equal Slopes Result to Determine if E and C Differed when Group was the Independent Variable, Post Dependent Variable and Pre as Covariate	57
13. Pearson Product Moment and "Top-Quarter Tetrachoric" Results for Reliability of Essay Grades	59

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Compositions of first year college students commonly suffer from a variety of weaknesses. Some of the most salient problems are a lack of individuality and tone for audience and purpose, as well as ineffective word choices, sentence structure, and rhetorical devices. These elements taken together are called voice in the following study. In 18 years of teaching high school and college students, the author has employed a variety of strategies to cultivate the use of voice in the writing of students.

The idea of using listening as a means to improve voice in writing was first motivated by reading Way's (1967) Development Through Drama, which described some exercises that raised the consciousness of students about sounds around them. Curiosity led to a review of listening literature and importantly to the works of Ronald and Roskelly (1986) and David Rankin (1985), both of which are described in Chapter II of this study. Neither article reported empirical results, but both suggested that listening exercises appeared to affect the writing of their students. Rankin was interested in the relationship between listening and the internalizing of grammar, and Ronald and Roskelly reported that listening exercises helped their developmental students compose.

After a more complete review of the literature in all areas of listening, it appeared that voice, as described above, would be the

most interesting aspect of the writing process to explore with a listening strategy.

Two comparable classes of developmental composition students were provided with instruction in the writing process of paragraphs that included instruction in voice. The experimental class also received a systematic exposure to listening exercises that focused on the elements of voice described above and which provided examples of the voice of self with self as audience, the voice of formal self with a specific audience, and the voice of another with other as audience.

Two pretests and a posttest were completed by both groups, and each student was required to write in each of the three voices on all three tests. Four composition teachers were instructed in the evaluation rubric and practiced on pilot essays. A complete statistical analysis was designed to establish whether the paragraph scores for the groups were comparable at the outset, whether either group grew significantly as a whole, and whether the experimental group grew more than the control group in each of the 3 voices and overall. To confirm the conclusions the interrater reliability was tested in two ways. Three other sets of data were collected. A questionnaire of demographic and biographic information as well as listening and reading habits was requested from the students. The experimental group, in conferences with the instructor, provided a discussion of the impact of the listening exercises. Finally, the investigator analyzed sample paragraphs in detail to study the relative growth.

The objective of the last three analyses was to ensure that other factors were not introducing spurious results. The questions, conferences, and paragraph analysis were also included to provide suggestions about possible limitations and about implications for additional research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In order to place the reader into the context of the field of listening as it evolves toward integration with writing, this review of literature has been divided as follows:

- A. Introduction
- B. Significant Listening Research
- C. Problems in the Field of Listening: Measurement, Theory, Definition, and Instruction
- D. Kinds of Listening in General; Appreciative Listening in Particular
- E. Listening and Its Relationship with Other Language Arts: Reading, Speaking, and Writing
- F. Significant Writing Research
- G. Voice and its Place in Writing
- H. Summary

Introduction

Listening has been designated as an essential skill in the language arts since 1978 by the amended Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The fact that this skill was not recognized as important until that time is significant in itself. Although studies for 60 years have reported its frequency of use through the educational years, in adult

life, and in the business world, there has been a hesitancy on the part of educators to enhance this skill vital for communication. Its importance does not end with the word communication. Good listening skills develop a deeper awareness of what is being said. Listening does not end with hearing words literally but continues with one discriminating, evaluating, and then responding. Moreover, there is appreciative listening that begins in childhood with the daily listenings of wonderful books like The Red Balloon, a listening that provides a child with the first concepts of language, a listening that has been allowed to atrophy rather than to evolve. The hesitancy to make this skill a real part of the language arts finds its source on the college level where teachers learn their craft and where methods of instruction for the teaching of listening are minimal. The business world, on the other hand, recognizing listening as one of the chief ingredients for reaching people has instituted workshops, seminars, and symposia on listening, using the expertise of some of the most renowned scholars in the field of listening.

Significant Listening Research

The literature, developed over a 60 year period, began in 1926 when Rankin reported that a significant amount of daytime communication was used by listening, 42.1% as compared to talking, 31.9%, reading 15%, and writing 11% (Duker, 1971). Replications of his work (Bird, 1952, 1953; Breiter, 1957; Wilt, 1949; Markgraf, 1957) confirmed his findings, and subsequently, studies of how well people used this

listening time were initiated. It soon became clear that listening deteriorated as an individual increased in age (Nichols, 1954). On the one hand, young children learned their language and language concepts by listening (Brown, 1987); on the other hand, Nichols (1954) reported that college students lost 75% of a lecture within 48 hours. Researchers, realizing the dilemma this loss brought about in a society bombarded by lectures in colleges and universities, orders by supervisors, directions by doctors and lawyers, and choices by priests, by politicians, by commercials, and by propaganda, proposed listening strategies that would improve communication and would be used in all levels of education (Nichols, 1954; Steil, 1983; Barker, 1971; Wolvin & Coakley, 1988). Even business leaders, realizing the importance of listening in sales and promotion, utilized the expertise of Nichols (1957) and Steil (1983) who developed a personal listening profile for the Sperry Corporation in 1980. Studies by Hollow (Duker, 1966), Nichols (Duker, 1966), Gates and Myers (1968) reported significant gains in listening by students who were provided with brief concentrated or long range listening training.

In 1966 and in 1971 Duker published two texts of 106 readings about listening that included parts or all of the recognized scholarly articles and research that had been completed during the 40 years of listening history. His texts include articles and research on the nature of listening, the process of listening, its relationship with other language arts, the kinds of listening, the teaching of listening in elementary, secondary, and college levels, listening in business

and industry and compressed speech, a theory that would speed up a lecture to increase comprehension, in that one can comprehend 300 to 400 words a minute, whereas a speaker speaks 100 to 125 words a minute (Duker, 1971). These texts are a valuable contribution to the field and are an excellent summation of what scholars had completed up to that time.

Problems in the Field of Listening: Measurement, Theory, Definition, and Instruction

Measurement and Theory of Listening

Roberts (1988) reported that research in listening suffered a dramatic decline since the mid sixties which he attributes to the criticisms about measurement. Measurement of listening was introduced in 1950 by Brown and Carlsen (Duker, 1986); other tests followed: the Step III Listening Test; the Kentucky Comprehension Listening Test, and the Watson Barker Listening Test, but the complication of an imprecise theory and the lack of an acceptable definition of listening has caused considerable confusion. In an analytical study of these tests, employing factorial analysis, Hauser and Hughes (1987) reported that their findings strongly suggest that the listening skill concepts supposedly measured by the four listening tests are not "empirically confirmable." They state that "reliability is a necessary condition for (test) validity. One source of unreliability is measurement error. And a major cause of measurement error is that items in a scale are not measuring the same phenomenon" (p. 147). Roberts (1988) states

that Erway suspects that the lack of a definition was the cause of the decline in research, a position also held by Roberts who summed up the problem by stating that "the theory of listening should be understood first before the skill is measured" (p. 3).

Conceptual confusion in the understanding of the listening process is evident in recent literature. Wolvin and Coakley (1988) point out that there are at least 20 definitions of listening that span the history of the field. Moreover, they report that "most of the literature and research in the field of listening stress the source and disregard the role of the listener" (p. ix). Goss (1982) thinks that "this sort of disagreement is not unusual and is often attributable to the varied interests and purposes of the people involved in listening" (p. 304). He continues, "Until we focus more centrally on the process itself and develop an integrated point of view about the nature of listening, our confusion will continue" (p. 304).

Definitions of Listening

The most recent definitions of the listening process overlap in some of the components but the handling of the feedback or response component is viewed differently. Goss (1982) defines listening as a "process of taking what you hear (signed processing) and organizing it into verbal units (literal processing) to which you can apply meaning (reflective processing [critical analysis/appreciation])" (p. 304). Although he does not include feedback in his definition he does allow that since listening is an active process there will be feedback.

Wolvin and Coakley (1988) describe their structural definition of listening as "the process of receiving, attending to and assigning meaning to aural stimuli" (p. 98) which as defined differs little from Goss' definition; however, in their model of the process of communication, unlike Goss' model, they include "the communication component responding overtly" (p. 91).

Floyd and Reese (1987) state that the listener "as an active participant in the communication process has the responsibility of attending to, comprehending, analyzing/evaluating and responding to the speaker" (p. 87). In their view the listener is "anything but a passive receptor of a message. He or she is, instead, an active participant, cooperating with the speaker in order to continue the message" (p. 87).

Barker (1971) defines listening as

the selective process of attending to (focused perception of visual and/or verbal stimuli), hearing (the physiological process of receiving aural stimuli), understanding (assignment of meaning to the message received), and remembering (storing of meaningful information in the mind for the purpose of recalling later) (p. 41).

He also includes feedback (response) in his communication model.

Steil's (1983) definition based on the acronym SIER (sensing, interpreting, evaluating, and responding) considers responding critical. In Perceptive Listening, Wolfe, Marsnik, Tracey, and Nichols (1983) explain that their definition includes covert response but point out that once the response becomes overt the listening process has ended.

Hauser and Hughes (1988), after reviewing the existing literature defining the process of listening, point out that although some agreement does exist about components, there is not a consensus for one combination of components to be included in the definition. The authors consider such a consensus incumbent upon listening scholars before an acceptable definition or a theory of listening can be developed.

Instruction in Listening

Another concern in the field of listening is that the schools today are providing little in developing good listening skills, even though available studies point out frequency of use in listening and the value of instruction in listening. Lundsteen suspects that teachers are not prepared to teach listening (Wolvin & Coakley, 1988). Raines (1979) has reported that methods courses for elementary school teachers emphasize literal listening, the lowest level in the literal, inferential, evaluative taxonomy of thinking. Further, Strother (1987) has informed us that a survey in 1985 revealed that 33 states had made some move to include listening in elementary and secondary schools but some of the ingredients to make the programs effective were missing. In addition, Basic Skills programs surveyed indicated that a limited number of projects had included programs to develop listening and speaking skills. Another interesting fact is that although many states had developed good curricula for listening and speaking skills, few were adequately implemented.

Kinds of Listening in General; Appreciative Listening in Particular

When scholars define the process of listening, they go another step and also define taxonomies of listening to be used in different situations. In order for an individual to be an effective listener in the communication process that person should be aware of and use the strategies and objectives required for these different categories of listening. First, discriminative listening (Wolfe et al., 1983; Wolvin & Coakley, 1988) is used in informative presentations. The listener stores ideas for future use. Second, evaluative (critical) listening helps the listener make judgments after considering all the evidence of the speaker (Nichols, 1957; Lundsteen, 1963; Wolfe et al., 1983; Duker, 1971; Barker, 1971). Third, appreciative listening is the responding to stimuli that appeal to the senses, the creative part of the listener (Wolvin & Coakley, 1988; Waack, 1987; Wolfe et al., 1983; Friedman, 1986; Barker, 1971; Nichols, 1954) and last, the most recent category, emphatic listening (therapeutic) responds to the needs of the speaker (Wolvin & Coakley, 1988; Floyd & Reece, 1981; Wolfe et al., 1983).

It is the contention of the discussions about kinds of listening that elementary, secondary, college and university levels should prepare students to cope with these forms of listening so that when they are in a type of listening situation they can respond effectively without drifting and losing a significant portion of what is being heard. Each scholar provides a number of strategies that will enhance students'

listening, therefore, enhancing their listening time and the communication process. "Both understanding and skill in listening are fundamental competencies to master" (Friedman, 1986, p. 28).

All of the types of listening relate to language arts development, but for the purpose of a potential effect on writing and writing voice, a closer view of what listening scholars have to say about appreciative listening is in order.

The appreciative listener listens for the power and beauty of well-chosen words . . . that describes people, places, things, qualities and abstractions. The color and mood of languages . . . and the rhythm of language are immeasurable except in an appreciative context. As the listener listens appreciatively to the reading of literature . . . , he or she will be listening to appreciate the words of others, to identify with the experience, and to establish an emotional bond with them (Wolvin & Coakley, 1988, p. 323).

Nichols (1975a) points out that "the enjoyment and appreciation of literature can often be heightened through listening to it" (p. 22).

We listen appreciatively when we listen to aural symbols in order to gain pleasure through their reception. We listen to relax, enjoy ourselves, or to increase our cultural or emotional understanding. Such listening can . . . enhance the quality of our lives (Wolfe et al., 1983, p. 59).

"To enhance students' enjoyment or aesthetic appreciation of works of art, listening to an artistic piece that is a musical presentation or a selection from literature achieves that response" (Friedman, 1986, p. 24).

A strategy to enhance students' appreciation of style that includes precision of ideas, appropriateness, conciseness and power of language can be achieved by listening to the rhetorical language of effective speakers. Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech is an example of effective repetition of key words and structures and metaphorical language. John Kennedy's inaugural address is an example of many effective rhetorical devices, especially repetition of structures, as is evident in the conclusion of his speech, "And so, my fellow Americans: Ask not what your country can do for you--ask what you can do for your country. My fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man" (Wolvin & Coakley, 1988, p. 324).

Appreciative listening was the kind of listening used in the study that will be presented in Chapter III. The purpose of the listening exercises as to provide a listening experience that would enrich the students' grasp of language that is powerful in individuality, tone, word choices, sentence structures, and rhetorical devices.

Listening and its Relationship with the Other Language Arts:

Reading, Speaking, and Writing

Lundsteen (1971) calls our attention to the fact that "Listening commands a primary position in the instruction of language arts. Chronologically children listen before they speak, speak before they read, and read before they write" (p. 3). She quotes Brown whose study in 1954 indicates "a progressive sequence or hierarchical dependence among these language skills" (p. 3).

Reading

A demonstration of the connection between reading and listening is provided by Duker (1971) who discusses parts of 23 major empirical

studies. In a table of representative investigations (Biggins, 1961; Bonner, 1960; Hall, 1954; Joney, 1955; Lewis, 1954; Many, 1953; Rankin, 1926; Spearritt, 1961; Toussaint, 1961; Watkins, 1960) the coefficient of correlation between reading and listening ranges from .45 to .70. Duker's observation is that all of these studies show a strong positive, relationship between reading and listening (p. 69).

In addition Duker (1971) reports other studies (Dundie, 1961; Madden, 1959) that have indicated statistically significant improvement in reading as a result of listening instruction. A conclusion Duker (1971) draws after reviewing the results of 30 investigations is that "The effective planning of reading instruction is made impossible when the interrelationships between reading and listening are ignored" (p. 80).

However, the controversy about measurement of listening, which was a fundamental part of all empirical studies completed in the fifties and sixties, places the results of these studies in question. In fact, Petrie in a joint article with Duker (1964) argued that a controversy existed not only about measurement but also about listening instruction.

Clearly there are questions about all of the early studies using listening measurement to show relationships between listening and reading, intelligence, thinking, and achievement. Questions of these kinds of relationships should be continually investigated empirically; however, they are not because of the indefiniteness of definition and theory of listening.

Speaking

Nichols (1954) was the force behind the change in curriculum from Freshman Composition to Freshman Communication Skills in many colleges and universities. He has stated that the freshman composition has required so much from teachers and students, but the course has provided small returns. On the other hand, the communication elements, listening and speaking, are used most frequently as was established by Rankin et al. (Duker, 1961). Nichols (1954) has integrated the recognized elements of written composition (ideas, organization, thesis, style, mechanic, usage, audience, and purpose [argument, persuasion, comparison/contrast, cause/effect, process, classification and definition, description, and narration]) into his protocols of listening and speaking. His text Listening and Speaking provides 20 activities to develop effective speaking and listening skills. All of these activities can be used in a composition course, a fact that Nichols has supported. However, he has not included writing as a part of his activities.

Writing

One of the earliest empirical studies that included listening and writing in its data was produced by Horowitz and Berkowitz in 1967 (Duker, 1971). Their study involved the processes of acquisition of memory traces through listening and reading and the processes for the reproduction of the memory traces through speaking and writing.

Elementary school children listened to or read "The War of the Ghosts" and were told they would be questioned for recall. The

reproduction was to be either speaking or writing. For scoring purposes the story was divided into cognitive units to determine omissions, distortions, and additions.

Using analysis of variance, the researchers concluded that although speaking and writing reproduction were not significantly different, the students who listened produced "a greater body of material, had more ideas, fewer omissions, and were stylistically superior. However, their responses included more distortions than those of the readers" (Duker, 1971, p. 117).

Ronald and Roskelly (1986) reported the effect that a listening protocol had on the act of composing for students who were considered unskilled writers in freshman composition. These students had little understanding of word order, sentence structure, and sentence endings. The authors found that the students

had trouble "hearing" or "seeing" what was on the page of the texts they wrote or read. They also seemed unable to hear our instructions. They read the instructions for improvement, but they could not seem to apply them to their own work in any independent, active way (p. 29).

Ronald and Roskelly (1986) decided to emphasize listening to help their students write since it was the one skill that had been neglected in their teaching procedure. Questioning themselves about listening they concluded that "a listener is one who hears 'voices.' Those voices may be spoken or written, one's own or another" (p. 29). From this point in their thinking they went one step further to speculate "that basic students don't write well because they haven't learned to listen

to their own words or the words of others" (p. 39). They haven't learned to listen "for."

In the protocol of listening, which they designed for their students, the strategy was to assist students not only to become active listeners but also to learn "to listen for the unspoken as well as the spoken meaning" (Ronald & Roskelly, 1986, p. 31). Three pieces of literature were used: Orwell's 1984, Parker's "You Were Perfectly Fine," and Shakespeare's King Lear. Students read, listened to and for meaning, and wrote about what they had heard and read. After the procedure was completed, several conclusions were drawn, one of which was that each student could find something "unique" to write, another was that students became capable of transferring the listening protocol to their own writing, listening for the meaning in their own papers.

It is the authors' determination that "All of us who teach composition should want to teach listening. When students learn that they can listen for, they begin to hear the sound of their own voices" (Ronald & Roskelly, 1986, p. 38). Ronald and Roskelly (1986) did no research to support their contentions. In fact, except for the work of Horowitz and Berkowitz (Duker, 1971) apparently none of the literature prior to this study reports any empirical research on whether listening experiences could actually affect writing.

David Rankin (1985) reports a procedure he uses to help students internalize proper grammatical usage. It has been his experience that success in grammar and mechanics practice drills rarely transfers to composition writing since students who are poor writers have so many

other elements to think about while composing. He says that the student is "overloaded."

The procedure has not been tested empirically, but Rankin (1985) indicates that it has worked for his students. The protocol that he describes uses reading, listening, and writing, similar to protocols used to teach a second language, which English has become to many disadvantaged students.

The procedure is long and must be repeated several times a week in order to provide positive results. Rankin (1985) says that "in general, the two major improvements I notice both occur at the sentence level: sentence boundaries are recognized and properly indicated; phrasing becomes more direct and accurate" (p. 55).

The procedure is as follows:

1. The student selects a passage of approximately 300 to 400 words.
2. The instructor reads passage onto a tape using intonation to stress structural joints and word endings.
3. While reading a passage, the student listens to tape of teacher reading the same passage.
4. Student records same passage which teacher checks. The reading must be correct; if not, the student redoes the tape.
5. The student again reads the passage while listening to his tape.
6. Next the student transcribes the passage without visual access to the passage. It helps if the recorder has a pause button.

7. Student returns to the printed text and copies verbatim.
8. The student and the instructor discuss the passage for phrasing, syntax, boundaries (pp. 52-53).

Rankin's (1985) efforts to use listening to improve grammar was one of the stimuli for the present study. There are few empirical studies linking listening with writing, but one scholar in the field of language, James Moffett (1982), writes that

It may be helpful for teachers to regard listening and reading, say, as assimilating someone else's outer speech into one's ongoing inner speech. Evidences of this hearing or reading may evince themselves minutes or years later when our receiver becomes sender in turn and synthesizes his own continuity for others (p. 139).

Moffett also indicates that inner speech as expressed in literature can be a strong motivation to the writer. One of his suggestions is "to listen to tapes of literature, for literature lends itself to performance" (p. 146).

Significant Writing Research

For the last 20 years there has been a steadily evolving change in the way researchers view writing, composing. Until the sixties, the only thinking about composing was that students must write correctly and must produce a product that followed a form. It was considered faulty if one did not prepare an outline before one started to write. The composition books such as Warriner or Tressler emphasized grammar; in turn, the teacher emphasized grammar. It was, and in many cases still is, the traditional approach to composition. Researchers have

discovered that students are so caught up in form that they are not allowing themselves to express what they really know. As a consequence, much of their writing is the type that has been described by Macrorie (1979) as Engfish, a word used by a student who, said Macrorie,

had given me a name for the bloated, pretentious language I saw everywhere, in the students' themes, in textbooks on writing . . . a feeling nothing, say nothing language, dead like Latin, devoid of the rhythms of contemporary speech (p. 18).

The new approach in writing is actually a rediscovery of the classical tradition of Aristotle. Emphasis goes beyond style and form; invention and audience are again a part of the paradigm. Writing is now considered a process. Murray (1982) says that the process has three stages: The prewriting, the writing, and the rewriting. Prewriting is the stage of invention. It is at this time the writer gets the raw material. This is the preparation time, the gathering time, the research time, the meditating time. Murray thinks that a student should stay at this juncture for at least 84% of his writing time; he considers prewriting that important. So does Graves (1978) who calls this stage the rehearsal. Britton, Burgess, Martin, McLeod, and Rosen (1975) identify this stage as the conception and incubation. The second stage is the writing of the rough draft, the commitment. Murray (1982) thinks that this stage requires less time, especially if one has taken advantage of the prewriting period. The final stage, the rewriting, is the time for revising, focusing toward an audience, editing, preparing the final product. Throughout this whole process, "writers move back and forth through all stages . . . as they search

for meaning and attempt to clarify it" (Murray, 1982, p. 73).

One of the most significant empirical studies that has led to the new approach to writing is The Schools Council Project on the Written Language of 11-18 Year Olds directed by James Britton. The authors, Britton et al. (1975) worked 9 years on this part of the project. In that time they constructed a theory of the process of writing, which they identified as inception, incubation, and production. They also categorized the functions of writing: expressive (language close to the self), transactional (expository), and poetic (formally arranged language that exists for its own sake). Lastly, they categorized audience: self, teacher, wider audience (known), and unknown audience. The project addressed two issues: the function of a piece of writing and the audience. The researchers examined 2,000 papers in all subjects, from 85 classes in 65 schools. The results of the study indicated that transactional writing, written for the teacher as examiner, was dominant, approximately 95% of the papers. One of the implications from the study was that as the students advanced in school, their writing became more limited. Students restated what they had read and what they had learned from their teachers. It was the conclusion of the group that if students are to grow as writers, their audience must be enlarged. Providing information in correct form for the teacher is not going to excite the inner self in the way arguing a point about an idea to a friend can. Writing reveals what one really knows, and if it is limited to transactional, correct exposition that restates someone else's ideas, what has this writer learned, internalized, about the subject?

This inability to emerge as individuals in writing is not limited to the students in England where Britton et al. (1975) conducted their investigation. Emig (1983) who studied the composing processes of twelfth graders reported similar results in her case study of Lynn, who is bright, has the ability to think, to be inventive, to delve into something that excites her but who doesn't accept the challenge. Instead, she writes about the easiest subject, the most impersonal, and worries about her punctuation, spelling, and word choice. Why? She knows what her teacher considers the most important.

Sommers (1980) interviewed students about their revision strategies and learned that the appearance of the composition is more important than the substance. If their reasoning is not logical, they have difficulty fixing it because they are tied to a thesis that was written in the first paragraph. Changing directions or ideas is much too complex. They edit rather than revise. Whatever they do is teacher-based; they comply with the rules.

Another dimension that has affected the teaching of composition occurred when universities and colleges opened their doors to all students. The writing field that had been conservative in studies, both pedagogically and experimentally, was thrust into seeking solutions to correct incompetence in writing. At first, the crisis focused on minority students which motivated Shaughnessy (1977) to write Errors and Expectations, a guide for teachers of basic writing. However, it soon became evident that students in general did not know how to write. Studies about the process of writing proliferated. Graves

(1978), Kinneavy (1980), Hayes and Flower (1980), Appleby (1981), Bridwell (1980), Perl (1979), Murray (1982), and Hillocks (1982) all focused on this process. Also, studies about the relationship between speaking and writing demonstrated that such a protocol could have a very positive effect on the composing process. Significant studies were carried on by Kroll (1981), Kantor and Rubins (1981), Elbow (1975), and Garrison (1978). The most interesting experiment was that of Garrison who advocates conferencing with students on a one-to-one basis through each of the steps in the process of composing. He tested his method on the Los Angeles Community College district in both Freshman English and Remedial Composition classes on four campuses. There were two controlled classes on each campus following Garrison's conferencing strategy. The students wrote two papers, one in February and one in May. Each essay had two evaluators. The students in the controlled Freshman English class made significant gains, and the controlled remedial composition class made significant gains over the traditionally taught classes.

Wedded to the increasing interest in writing and writing as learning is the movement toward writing across the curriculum, which places the responsibility for the teaching of writing in all disciplines. Several college catalogues list classes that are writing intensive, which means that a student is required to write essays comparable in quality and number as one would write in freshman composition. This concept was developed in a 3 year project directed by Martin to disseminate the findings of The Schools Council's project directed

by Britton. This project Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum 11-16, authored by Martin, D'Arcy, Newton, and Parker (1976), had as its theme "The role of language in all parts of the curriculum" (p. 9).

In light of the fact that research in composition has grown so dramatically in recent years, it is important to note that results are reported for all levels of education by journals and reports of The National Council of Teachers of English. Several universities also publish writing journals; one of particular interest is Indiana's Journal for Teaching Writing. Further, summer programs have been instituted to enhance teachers' understanding of writing in the learning process. For example, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville hosts the Smoky Mountain Writing Project.

Thus, the research in writing indicates that the teaching of composition is moving from a focus on grammar to a strategy of prewriting, writing, and rewriting. Interest has been taken in writing that is transactional, expressive, and poetic. Unfortunately, the research shows that students write for the teacher which stultifies any kind of creativity. The other dimension that influences the literature is the fact that significant numbers of college students require remedial work in composition. One of the interesting strategies relates to the speaking and writing relationship. Moreover, the implementation of writing across the curriculum is a quantum leap forward.

Voice and its Place in Writing

Voice in writing is the personality, the heart of a written piece. "Without voice writing is dead, mechanical, faceless" (Elbow, 1981, p. 287). "With it, there is a sound, rhythm, texture of a unique consciousness" (Rico, 1983, p. 136). The need for voice is expressed with passion; however, the literature is limited to an agreement that voice will be exhibited only if the writer fully understands and internalizes the subject and focuses on an audience.

Macrorie (1970) labeled student writing as English; however, he was directing his criticism not only to voiceless writing but also to the unfair expectations of instructors. He realized after years of teaching that students should not be expected to write about "there" until they have written about "here." Topics assigned should have relevance. For example, if students are asked to write in political science, they should not be expected to discuss Washington and state capitol politics. That assignment would be a "there," something the students have not experienced first hand. Instead, they should discuss political science in its relation to student councils or student government, a definite "here" (p. 168). Macrorie insists that students will have a voice in their writing if they understand a subject from their personal observations.

Others have discussed this need for internalization before an audience can be approached and success can be achieved. Britton et al. (1975), Moffett (1981, 1983), Murray (1982), Elbow (1981), Flower

(1979), Perl (1979), and Schwartz (1987). Before students can write passionately and uniquely, they must discover what they know through self expression, expressive writing, writing for self, before they can commit themselves to an audience.

Moffett (1983) has devised a program that integrates all the language arts as we know them. He insists that thinking is crucial and should be considered a significant part of language arts. His writing assignments will move students--who have observed their subjects personally, talked about them, listened to other thoughts about them, thought about them themselves, and, if pieces of information are missing, have read about them--from self as audience to a formal audience, to an unknown audience. Simply, the students spend time learning and discovering what they know about their subjects in the writing of journal articles and investigation articles. When students understand or internalize what they know, they are in a position to explain, describe, compare, or discuss the subject uniquely for an audience. In time, Moffett believes, the students are capable of turning their first unorganized thoughts into a literary piece.

Flower's (1979) writer based prose and reader based prose theory provides more evidence of the importance of writing for self. Writer based prose lacks communication for an audience and is unacceptable as a finished product, but Flower says it can be "a major functional stage in the composing process" (p. 34) and can lead the writer toward the acceptable reader based prose that does communicate.

An article by Root (1985) supports Flower's (1979) theory and a model of writing proposed by Bereiter. The model contains five steps for a writing process: (1) associative writing, which is the simplest stage, much like the writer based prose described by Flower; (2) performative writing, which indicates an awareness of rules, style, and mechanics; (3) communicative writing, which indicates an awareness of audience, a reader; (4) unified writing, which adds the skill of critical judgment in both literary and logical terms; and (5) epistemic writing, the culmination stage, which integrates a writer's reflective thought with his skill system (emergence of voice). This model is not a procedure followed each time a writer composes, for some of the levels will eventually be internalized. It is Bereiter's conclusion that with the traditional method of teaching, still much in evidence, a college freshman rarely moves beyond the performative stage.

Creating other voices is a writing strategy that can help students understand the triad (Gibson, 1969) of voice, subject, and audience. Speaking of writing in another persona strengthens students' understanding of their own voice. "A person who can 'impersonate in writing' many different voices is an accomplished stylist, for style in writing is largely a matter of giving voice to what is silent" (Scholl, 1986, p. 267). Students, creating other voices, must be able to control the other voice consistently, use language appropriate to the character, and write on subjects through this character's point of view. Gibson provides insightful details about different kinds of persona. He describes the Huck Finns and the Holden Caulfields

as users of contractions, active verbs, loose sentences, second person, and subordinate clauses at the ends of their sentences whereas the David Copperfields are users of passive voice, periodic sentences, parallel structure, subordinate clauses at the beginning of sentences, and non users of contractions and second person. One of his writing applications is for students to write a brief autobiography in their own voice and then rewrite it as though they were Huck, Holden, or David. Another discussion about voices that Gibson has detailed is his Tough, Sweet, and Stuffy which identifies tough as monosyllabic and simple, sweet as sticky with adjectives and nominative absolutes for the advertising world, and stuffy as hollow and devoid of personality. These are the voices we read in detective stories, newspapers, campaign literature, and advertisements. Gibson's point of view is that such voices should be modified.

Thus the literature insists on significant understanding of the subject as the essential prerequisite to voice, though there are no empirical data to demonstrate this. This reflective writing is relaxed, casual, and non threatening, writer based as Flower (1979) has defined it, or the prewriting stage outlined by Murray (1982). Britton et al. (1975) define expressive writing as the matrix of all writing which leads to the other forms: transactional and poetic. Moffett (1983) explains that as one struggles to put personal experience into language, the experience itself becomes perceived, clarified, distanced, ordered, understood, and even mastered, which leads the students' writings toward more than one type of audience. Moreover, assuming other voices is

considered a valuable strategy by Gibson (1969) and Scholl (1986).

The information on voice did influence the present experimental design in the sense that it reinforced the author's experience. The essay topics were chosen to conform with subjects the students were most likely to be familiar with. Also the literature provided no reason to depart from the original conception of a hierarchy of abilities with voice: self, formal, other.

Summary

The highlights of the literature review, for the purposes of this paper, are as follows. There is uniform agreement about the vital importance of listening and, by inference, the importance of developing a fuller understanding of the process through research. Unfortunately, research has faltered from a lack of agreement on a definition of listening, the absence of an acceptable theory, and unreliable measurement procedures. The current research design was devised to avoid these problems which have been discussed in the literature. Almost all of the writers who offer definitions also include taxonomies. One common listening protocol is appreciative listening (responding to stimuli that appeal to the senses, the creative part of the listener). This dimension of listening is basically the difference in what the experiment (E) and the control (C) groups experienced.

There is substantial research on the relation of listening to reading, less on speaking, but only a handful on the relation to writing. Of these, only one appears to report empirical research.

The writing literature in the last 20 years documents the move from grammar as the essential emphasis for the teachers and students to strategies that include invention and audience. Some of the newer approaches suggest the potential that listening exercises could play.

The voice literature describes which writing is with and without voice and discusses ways to help students acquire the ability to write as a unique person. Adapting the writer's voice to the voice of others is also discussed.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURE

Subjects

The students who participated in this study attend a small historically black college whose mission statement calls for educating students to reach their potential, especially the students who had failed to get an adequate preparation in high school. Students who attend this college fall into three academic preparatory categories identified through testing: strong, moderate, and low. When the students entered as freshmen, they took a set of placement tests in English and mathematics. To determine levels of competence in English, students took the Nelson Denny Reading Test and composed a writing sample on a predetermined topic. Students were then placed in one of four levels of English composition: Fundamentals, Elementary Composition I, Elementary Composition III (Elementary Composition II was not an entry level course), or English Composition I. The reading level of students in Fundamentals was below the eighth grade and their writing skills were minimal. These students met nine regular class periods weekly, emphasizing reading and study skills development and the fundamental skills in language arts, which included recognizing parts of speech in simple sentences, spelling, and vocabulary development. Students assigned to Elementary Composition I level had

reached the eighth grade reading level and had some understanding of sentence structure. The object of Elementary I and II, taught as a sequence, was to teach students the writing of sentences and short passages that were free of major errors in grammar, mechanics, punctuation, diction, and sentence effectiveness. Elementary Composition III was either a first level composition class or it built on skills developed in I and II. The objectives of this level included concentration on paragraph development and introduction to short compositions. The students who participated in this study entered the freshman class on the Elementary Composition I level in September of 1987. The study involved them when they reached the Elementary Composition III level in the spring of 1988.

Prior to the study in the spring quarter of 1988, a decision was made to involve two classes in the study on listening effects: an experimental group (E) that would receive the listening protocol and the control group (C) that would not. (Hereafter the experimental group will be denoted as E, and the control group as C.) Since the quarter schedule was printed in advance of the quarter, the researcher chose the experimental and control sections by a toss of a coin. When the students registered for the quarter, they signed into sections according to their schedules. There were five Elementary Composition III sections. Twenty-four students signed into each of the sections; before the quarter ended, 3 students dropped from the experimental section and 4 from the control section. The total population included 25 women and 16 men.

Procedures

The experiment included two pretest assignments that required three different voices: informal self with self as audience, formal self with a specific audience, and a voice of someone other than self toward a specific audience. Informal self was the unique voice of the individual, distinguishable from others, as it would be expressed in reflective writing. Formal self was the voice of the writer in essay, speech, or letter writing, using language appropriate for the occasion and for the audience. The last, voice other than self, was the creation of the voice of a story character or of someone the writer knew, using appropriate language for the character and for the audience. Two pretests were recommended in writing research to insure the validity of the pretest information. A posttest using the same protocol of three voices was completed as the last segment of the study.

In order to validate the topics for the pretest and posttest writing assignments, the researcher piloted 10 possible topics in the Elementary Composition III class during the previous quarter. These papers were filed for use in instructing this study's readers who evaluated the pre and posttests. Topics that were perceived by the instructor as unclear, complicated, or confusing were discarded.

According to The University of Tennessee's policy on research with human subjects, the students were required to sign a consent form that explained the purpose of the study and gave them the option of not participating. All of the students signed the forms (see Appendix A).

Experiment

The study was scheduled for a 7 week period. During the first week of the spring quarter when all of the students were present, students in each of the groups, the experimental and the control, were given two pretests on their ability to write in different voices. Each student received a copy of the assignment. The students were instructed to write on one side of the papers and place their names and sections on the back of each sheet.

The first pretest assignment was as follows:

1. Informal self with self as audience. One of your friends has been unjustly accused of violating one of the dormitory rules at the college and has been suspended. You know that he/she is innocent. In a paragraph, write how you feel about this injustice.
2. Formal self to a specific audience. Your friend needs support to clear his/her name. You are the only one who knows the truth. Write a letter to the Dean on his/her behalf.
3. Another person's voice to a specific audience. Write a letter that the Dean would send to you in appreciation for the information you had sent.

The second pretest assignment was as follows:

1. Informal self with self as audience. Studies in recent years have rated cities according to their qualities for good living. In a paragraph, write your true feelings about your home town or city.

2. Formal self to a specific audience. You have been asked to write to a rating panel about your home town or city. In a paragraph describe and give your opinion about your home town or city.

3. Another person's voice to a specific audience. Write a letter that your favorite cousin would send to you about your home town or city after he/she has visited you for the first time.

During weeks 2 and 3, the instructor helped students in both groups explore their inner selves. They were introduced to the process of writing that takes them from prewriting to writing a rough draft to rewriting the final draft. For the prewriting stage they learned to brainstorm, to cluster, to free write about things that interested them. They were encouraged to be open, to take risks, to be honest, to express their feelings about experiences that they had while growing up: their homes, their friends, special family events, reflections on high school or the new college experience. As a class, they explored these techniques with the instructor, using the chalkboard. They, then, tried them out as individuals. For a week and a half, they wrote brief pieces in journal form which were not graded. At first, all of the writing was completed in class to familiarize the students with the prewriting process and to give the instructor the opportunity to circulate among the students and to provide immediate positive comments such as, "That writing sounds like you," "Good voice," "What a strong sentence," "You have expressed your feelings very effectively." Instruction in the topic sentence took place during this period, and students practiced writing topic sentences about themselves that would

introduce paragraphs. The text that was used throughout the study by the students was Kathleen Sullivan's (1984) Paragraph Practice which provided model paragraphs that the students read and discussed. The instructor supplemented that text with lectures derived from the works of Rico (1983) and Kirby and Liner (1981), as well as Gibson (1969). At the end of the 2 weeks, students wrote paragraphs about a significant event in their lives, using their previous writings as source material. Both the experimental and control groups received the same instruction and had the same writing opportunities. In addition, the experimental group listened to a tape made by an upperclassman that included a selection from Frederick Douglas' autobiography, The Biography of a Slave, "Who, Me?" "Speaking Out in Class," and "Unwanted Houseguest" from James Moffett's (1986) Active Voices IV, and "Death--More Than a Word," From the Theme Vault Anthology 1979-80. The listening during the first session took place twice a week for 15 minutes. The selections demonstrated personal self expression either for an audience or no audience. The decision for choosing the specific listening materials was based on two sets of criteria. The first set of criteria pertained to the writing instruction: voice, audience, and rhetorical devices. The second set was related to the students participating in the study: their age, race, and interests. The design was to meld these sets of criteria in the selections of parts of journals, biographies, essays, letters, speeches, and short stories.

During the first 2 week segment, when the writing instruction focused on the development of personal voice and self as audience,

the listening selections not only emphasized personal, informal voice but also engaged the listeners through the reflections and recollections of college students and those of a slave when he was a child. The writings of the college students expressed anxiety about college, a concern about an elementary school situation, a reaction to a live-in grandparent, and the reality of death. This last personal essay, "Death--More Than A Word, A Reality," was particularly relevant. Three students in their journal entries described their feelings about sudden death. Each had witnessed a murder--a father, a boyfriend, and a brother.

Weeks 4 and 5 continued the emphasis on the inner voice, the voice of self expression, but with language appropriate for a formal audience. Letters to the editor, definitions of terms, comparisons, and argument were the forms of writing studied. Through the process of prewriting, topics were pulled from personal experiences. After the instructor discussed appropriate language and provided practice time on the chalkboard, the students wrote brief pieces about tolerance, prejudice, drugs, success, discrimination, schools, brothers, sisters, malls, sports, and dormitories. Again, the instructor looked at and commented upon individual practice papers. Besides the different forms of writing, the instructor discussed support sentences, details, limited repetition of key words and transitions. The assignment at the end of the 2 weeks required each student to write a letter to the editor of a newspaper who had labeled the student's high school as one of the five worst schools in the state. The experimental class also listened to

recordings of parts of Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech, John Kennedy's "Inaugural Address," and the "Yes" sequence of Molly Bloom in the final passage of Ulysses (Rico, 1983). Letters to the editor from the Knoxville News Sentinel regarding magnet schools, "That Boy" from the Theme Vault Anthology of 1979-80, and "Easy Money" from Moffett's (1986) Active Voices IV were taped for the listening protocol. The selections included for listening (again twice a week for 15 minutes) expressed self but for an audience; three of them ("I Have a Dream," "The Inaugural Address," and the "Yes" selection) also provided examples of imagery and repeated key words, phrases, and structures. The letters about the magnet schools interested the students. Twelve of them had attended magnet schools, created to desegregate their school systems. The essays discussed relevant issues: discipline in high schools and attitudes toward money.

The final period, weeks 6 and 7, called for students to explore writing in a voice other than their own, using all facets of the writing process. Composition instruction for both classes covered revising, editing, and dialogue. Students took on voices of classmates, characters from soap operas, characters from situation comedies, brothers, sisters, grandparents, and characters they created. Again, the instructor reviewed their papers while they were composing in the classroom to provide immediate feedback, both positive and instructive. For their final assignment, students were permitted to choose their own character and write in his/her voice. The experimental class heard selections, twice a week for 15 minutes, from Salinger's The Catcher

in the Rye, Twain's Huckleberry Finn, Langston Hughes' "Thank You, M'am," Chester Himes "Marihuana and a Pistol," and Dorothy West's "The Richer, the Poorer." Three of the short stories, written by Black authors, created characters within the realm of the students' experiences, and the word choices of Holden Caulfield and Huck Finn were clearly those of young boys although created by adult writers.

At the end of the study, the students were given a posttest and the assignment was as follows:

1. Informal self with self as audience. You have been elected student body president of your college. In a paragraph, reflect on your feelings about this honor and new responsibility.
2. Formal self to a specific audience. Write a letter to the acting president of the college about issues that you, as student body president, feel must be addressed.
3. Another person's voice to a specific audience. Write a letter that your mother or father would send you upon learning about your election.

All of the papers, pretest and posttest, were copied, numbers were assigned to the copies, and the original papers were stored in a file.

Each student had a conference with the instructor, which is part of the requirements of the class syllabus. At that time, students from the E group were asked to comment on the listening exercises, their satisfaction, the selections, and their perceptions of the effect of listening on their composing. The main focus of the conference

was a discussion about the students' progress in class and their writing folders. In addition, students in both groups filled out a questionnaire which provided demographic and biographic data.

Evaluation

A rubric for evaluating voice in students' writing was designed by the instructor after consulting a section of a composition evaluation procedure developed by Diederich (1974), labeled Flavor. Descriptors for high, average, and poor papers evolved from discussions about voice in the writings of Diederich (1974), Rico (1983), Liner and Kirby (1981), Moffett (1981b, 1983), and Macrorie (1970). The categories for evaluation were as follows: individual, tone for audience, tone for purpose, and style (words, structures, and devices). The instructor weighted the sections so that the highest score that could be earned would be 100. Since individual was the most significant category, it was valued at 40 points; tone, 30 points; style, 30 points. The purpose of the weighting was to simplify the quantitative analysis. The rubric also included a rating scale for content, organization, and usage, but that part of the data was not used in this study (see Appendixes B and C).

Four readers were selected to evaluate the students' papers. All of them were composition teachers, were familiar with the grading procedure, and had taught students of similar ability. Further, the researcher knew them personally, either as a colleague, a friend, or through school board responsibilities. All of them have earned reputations in the community as competent English teachers.

Prior to evaluating the papers, the readers discussed the assigned topics, the objectives of voice and audience, the rubric, and the purpose of the study. It was emphasized that their ratings should not be influenced by the students' lack of high performance in English usage. The descriptors for a high, average, and poor paper were reviewed: the voice in a high paper sounds like an individual; the persona is evident; the writer is unique. The tone for audience and purpose is clear, vigorous and consistent. An average paper makes an attempt to sound like an individual but has inconsistencies in tone for audience and purpose. A poor paper is lifeless, lacking in personality with little evidence of audience or purpose. After this discussion, the readers rated papers from the winter quarter class that was used to pilot topics. When it was clear that the readers were within a point of one another in a scale from 1 to 5, the evaluation procedure began. In order to prevent bias, the researcher shuffled the papers so that there was no indication as to which papers were pretest or posttest.

In the cases where there were wide discrepancies in the evaluation process, a fifth reader, who is an English department chairperson in the Knox County school system, was asked to evaluate the papers in question. Her score replaced the one that was farthest from hers. This procedure has been validated by Diederich (1974) who states that "this procedure usually had the effect of increasing the reliability of essay grades by at least 10 points" (p. 101).

Analyses

Quantitative

The statistical analysis of results was designed to test the significance of the basic research question (Will listening improve the writing voice of students?) and also to explore other potential outcomes that listening exercises might have.

The statistical analysis had to address a variety of questions.

1. Were the essay evaluations sufficiently reliable to warrant an average score of the readers?
2. Were the students in E and C comparable on the pretests or did some statistical adjustment have to be made?
3. Were the results of pretest 1 and pretest 2 comparable so that they could be averaged?
4. On the whole, and for each voice (1, 2, 3) did E students and C students grow significantly?
5. Finally, did the E group make a more significant gain than C and did one voice grow more than the others?

Since "The null is a technical necessity in using inferential statistics" (McMillan & Schumacher, 1984, p. 249), calculations were designed to test the following null hypotheses:

There are no statistically significant differences in total scores on pretest 1 or pretest 2 between the experimental (E) group and the control (C) group.

There are no statistically significant differences between pretest 1 results and pretest 2 results in any voice for either E or C.

There are no statistically significant differences between pretest total scores and posttest total scores for E and C.

There is no statistically significant difference between the slopes of the straight lines fitted to pretest-posttest data for E and C.

There are no statistically significant differences between pretest scores and posttest scores in any of the three voices for E or for C.

To answer these questions, a descriptive set of statistics had to be developed to organize the more than 775 individual pieces of information into means, standard deviations ranges, etc. In some cases t-tests would produce interesting comparisons between pairs, but the complexity of the experiment with two groups and three tests with three voices indicated a need for analysis of variance calculations. Next, confirming ANCOVA calculations were projected to ensure that pretests were valid predictors of posttests, to determine whether the regression lines were statistically parallel and finally to see if E did grow more than C. This stage proved to be especially valuable since the results clearly demonstrated that a previously untested protocol appears to have a dramatic effect on the writing of students.

Qualitative

Three other explorations were planned though none was central to the basic study. A questionnaire (see Appendix D) was formulated to elicit demographic and biographic information, and it was completed,

voluntarily, by almost all students. The intent was to garner general information about the students' background, as well as to attempt to establish whether the students had a visual or aural orientation through questions about their listening, reading, and writing habits. For the analysis to be manageable, a sample of the 5 students who gained the most in voice 3 in E and C and the 5 who gained the least in E and C were arbitrarily reviewed for this purpose.

A second qualitative discussion was focused on the students' reactions to the listening exercises as reported during regular conferences. The intent was to identify student satisfaction and to explore the possibility that other things happened to the experimental group, besides improvement in written voice.

The third qualitative analysis was a review of the paragraphs designed to investigate the fundamental, but difficult question, "In what sense, or capacity did the writings of the students grow or fail to grow?" Again, for the purpose of management, the pretest 2 and the posttest paragraphs of the student who gained the most in the experimental and the control groups were analyzed.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Statistical Analysis

The analyses fall into three categories: the descriptive statistics that organize more than 775 individual elements of scoring information; the analyses of variance, t-tests, analyses of covariance, and regression analyses to test the hypotheses, and finally, the tests to establish the reliability of paragraph graders.

Descriptive Statistics

Three tests were taken by the 21 students in the experimental (E) group and by the 20 students in the control (C) group. The tests are labeled Pre 1, Pre 2, and Post. Each of the tests had three parts: voice 1, personal voice; voice 2, formal; and voice 3, other. Each paper was graded for 6 elements: individual; audience and purpose which taken together were called tone; and words, structures, and devices which, when combined, were called style. Each paper was read at least twice. (In situations where the total grade differed by 10 or more points, the grade from a third reader replaced the one farthest away). Each of the 6 elements was weighted so that a perfect paper would receive a grade of 100 (see Appendixes B and C). Table 1 shows typical detailed results.

The intention of this paper is to study the results of listening exercises on the ability of college students to use voice, not on

Table 1*

THE MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND RANGE FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL
GROUP, FIRST PRETEST, PERSONAL VOICE

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Value	Maximum Value
Individual	42	22.86	3.34	16.00	32.00
Audience	42	8.43	1.90	6.00	12.00
Purpose	42	7.79	1.76	6.00	12.00
Word Choice	42	6.09	1.08	4.00	8.00
Structure	42	5.57	1.04	4.00	8.00
Devices	42	5.47	0.99	4.00	8.00
Tone	42	16.21	3.38	12.00	24.00
Style	42	17.14	2.54	12.00	24.00
Total	42	56.00	7.11	40.00	71.00

*The results in Table 1 and throughout this chapter have been rounded.

particular aspects of voice. The full set of data is available for subsequent studies. However, the focus from this point will be on total scores.

Table 2 contains the descriptive data for each of the 18 papers (3 tests, 3 paragraphs per test, 2 groups) as well as a total average of the 3 voices for the 6 examinations. Note that data are furnished for "Pre." Results described below indicate that the results of Pre 1 and Pre 2 are not different and should be averaged.

The results in Table 2 clearly suggest more growth on the part of E than of C. Table 3 summarizes this information in a non-technical fashion in terms of percentage increases for each voice in E and C. The average increase for E was 36.7% and for C, less than half as much, 15.5%.

As indicated in Chapter III, there were three basic questions to be answered about the data. First, are the groups E and C comparable in performance on the pretests? (At this point it is necessary to explain why the two pretest scores were averaged.) Second, were the gains in E or C for any voice significant, and if so, at what level? Third, a determination was planned to establish whether the progress of the E group was significantly different from C. Finally, the reliability of the results of reading each paper at least twice had to be established to justify averaging the scores.

The statistical procedure requires that a significance level be established in anticipation of the calculation. In this study, there are no prior standards to approach. As a consequence, the level, alpha, was set at 0.05.

TABLE 2

THE MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RANGES FOR BOTH GROUPS AND ALL VOICES

Group	Test	Voice	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Value	Maximum Value
E	Pre 1	1	56.0	7.1	40.0	71.0
		2	57.0	4.7	44.0	68.0
		3	52.4	13.2	0	68.0
		Total	55.2	9.2	0	71.0
E	Pre 2	1	58.7	6.5	34.0	77.0
		2	56.9	6.4	40.0	68.0
		3	54.7	7.6	20.0	67.0
		Total	57.0	6.9	20.0	77.0
E	Pre	1	57.5	5.1	48.0	66.7
		2	56.9	3.1	52.0	62.5
		3	53.6	9.7	14.5	62.5
E	Post	1	75.1	7.8	60.0	96.0
		2	73.8	11.4	40.0	100.0
		3	77.9	8.4	65.0	98.0
		Total	75.6	9.4	40.0	100.0
C	Pre 1	1	57.3	6.3	38.0	74.0
		2	54.3	6.9	38.0	63.0
		3	53.5	16.9	0	94.0
		Total	55.0	11.2	0	94.0
C	Pre 2	1	59.9	8.8	34.0	90.0
		2	54.3	8.5	33.0	71.0
		3	57.5	5.6	44.0	78.0
		Total	57.6	8.2	33.0	90.0
C	Pre	1	58.5	5.5	52.3	74.8
		2	54.3	6.8	37.8	64.3
		3	55.5	9.9	23.3	73.5
C	Post	1	65.9	9.2	46.0	94.0
		2	64.2	10.2	35.0	80.0
		3	64.3	7.5	42.0	80.0
		Total	64.8	8.9	35.0	94.0

TABLE 3
PERCENTAGE INCREASE BETWEEN PRE AND POST TESTS

Group	Voice	Test	Mean	Percentage Increase
E	1	Post	75.1	30.6
		Pre	57.5	
	2	Post	73.8	29.7
		Pre	56.9	
	3	Post	77.9	45.3
		Pre	53.6	
C	1	Post	65.9	12.6
		Pre	58.5	
	2	Post	64.2	18.2
		Pre	54.3	
	3	Post	64.3	16.1
		Pre	55.5	

In order to compare the ability of E and C at the outset, the totals for the pretests were compared. The null hypothesis that the groups are the same cannot be rejected (see Table 4). (Table 4 also shows that the null must be rejected for the two groups on the posttest.) The Tukey test also showed that E and C were not significantly different on Pre 1 and Pre 2, but that they were different on the Post. Thus, no adjustment for Pretest differences was necessary in the subsequent analysis.

TABLE 4
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TO COMPARE THE RESULTS OF E AND C
FOR THE TOTALS OF THE THREE TESTS

Test	Model DF	Corrected Total DF	F	P
Pre 1	1	245	0.01	0.9
Pre 2	1	286	0.38	0.54
Post	1	245	85.39	0.0001

The next question to be addressed was whether there were significant differences between the results of Pre 1 and Pre 2. If not, the scores should be averaged. This would clearly simplify the analysis, as well as provide support for the contention that the pretested topics were indeed comparable. A series of t-tests were conducted to compare the differences between the means of pretest 1

and pretest 2 for each voice. The null hypothesis was that there would be no difference in the total scores for either group in any voice. The results, which are displayed in Table 5, show clearly that at the 0.05 level, the differences are not significant. Thus, Pre 1 and Pre 2 should be averaged.

TABLE 5

t-TEST RESULTS TO STUDY THE ASSUMPTION THAT PRETEST SCORES CAN BE AVERAGED BY VOICE: VARIABLE = DIFFPRE

Group	Voice	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p
E	1	21	-3.02	8.4	-1.65	0.11
	2	21	0.17	8.2	0.09	0.93
	3	21	-2.31	8.1	-1.31	0.21
C	1	20	-2.58	9.8	-1.18	0.25
	2	20	0	5.6	0.00	1.00
	3	20	-4.00	13.6	-1.32	0.20

Table 4 contained information to show that E and C were not significantly different on Pre 1 and Pre 2. The analysis was then extended to an ANOVA comparison by voice of the averaged pretest (Pretot). Again, Table 6 shows that E and C are not different at the 0.05 level.

Gains by Voice

The next question posed was whether the gains in E and C for any voice were significant. Table 7 summarizes the t-test analysis

TABLE 6

ANOVA RESULTS BY VOICE TO TEST THE NULL HYPOTHESIS THAT E AND C
ARE NOT DIFFERENT ON THE PRETEST AVERAGE

Voice	Model DF	Corrected Total DF	F	p
1	1	40	0.38	0.54
2	1	40	2.63	0.11
3	1	40	0.38	0.54

TABLE 7

t-TEST RESULTS FOR MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN POSTTEST AND PRETEST
SCORES BY GROUP AND BY VOICE

Group	Voice	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	p
E	1	21	17.6	6.6	12.2	0.0001
	2	21	16.9	9.7	8.0	0.0001
	3	21	24.3	11.7	9.5	0.0001
C	1	20	7.3	8.9	3.7	0.0017
	2	20	9.9	8.8	5.0	0.0001
	3	20	8.8	9.0	4.4	0.0003

established to compare the means for the experimental and the control group in each voice between posttest and pretest. The null hypothesis was that there was no difference in any of these comparisons. Clearly the null must be rejected in all cases. Differences would exist even if the confidence level had been set as low as $\alpha = .002$.

The next step required two analyses of variance (ANOVA) tests to establish whether there was a significant difference between Testdiff for the total voice in the E and C groups. The results for the E group were $F(2, 60) = 3.87$, $p = .026$. Thus, at the .05 level the differences in growth in the total of three voices, required that the null be rejected. For the C group $F(2, 57) = .42$, $p = .66$, so the null hypothesis cannot be rejected for C. Even though the t-tests showed significant differences for all three voices in E and C (Table 7), the ANOVA for the totals show difference in the total of E, but not for C.

Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) was run for Testdiff. At $\alpha = 0.05$, the means of the E group were not significantly different for voice 1 (personal) compared to voice 2 (formal), or when compared to voice 3 (other). However, the growth in voice 2 and voice 3 were significantly different. The difference in post and pretest means for C were not significantly different for any of the voices.

At this point the analysis has shown that E and C are comparable in the abilities tested at the outset and that the pretests should be averaged. The t-tests show gains for both groups in all voices. However, the ANOVA shows that the gains for E on the total

were significant, but for C they were not. Finally, the Tukey test showed that there was a difference in growth for E between the formal voice and the other voice. The next issue was to compare the results of E and C by voice.

Voice 1

Groups E and C were compared earlier in this section for the pretest results. Table 8 summarizes the results for pre and post tests. (Table 9 summarizes these results for all three voices.)

Next, a regression was calculated to establish whether it is reasonable to use Pre as a covariate in an ANCOVA. The result was $F(1, 39) = 3.02$, $p = 0.09$. Thus Pre is an adequate predictor of Post, and, secondly, one can argue that there is a linear relationship between Pre and Post (see Table 10). Then, an unequal slopes ANCOVA was run to determine whether the regression lines for E and C were parallel. The analysis fitted straight lines to the data in which the pretest result for each student was the dependent variable and the posttest result was the independent variable. The null hypothesis required that the lines be parallel or more specifically that the slopes be equal. However, $F(4, 37) = 0.51$, $p = .48$ (see Table 11). Thus the null hypothesis that the slopes are equal and the lines parallel clearly cannot be rejected.

Finally, an equal slopes ANCOVA was run with the group as independent variable, Pre as covariate and Post as dependent variable. The result, $F(3, 38) = 17.1$, $p = 0.0002$, demonstrated that E is definitely different from C (see Table 12).

TABLE 8

ANOVA RESULTS TO COMPARE MEAN SCORES IN VOICE 1 FOR E AND C

Test	Model DF	Corrected Total DF	F	p
Pre	1	40	0.38	0.54
Post	1	40	13.53	0.0007

TABLE 9

ANOVA RESULTS TO COMPARE MEAN SCORES FOR E AND C

Test	Voice	Model DF	Corrected Total DF	F	p
Pre	1	1	40	0.38	0.54
	2	1	40	2.63	0.11
	3	1	40	0.38	0.54
Post	1	1	40	13.53	0.0007
	2	1	40	9.57	0.0037
	3	1	40	35.18	0.0001

TABLE 10

REGRESSION TO ESTABLISH WHETHER IT IS REASONABLE
TO USE PRE AS A COVARIATE IN AN ANCOVA

Voice	Model DF	Corrected Total DF	F	p
1	1	40	3.02	0.09
2	1	40	10.19	0.0028
3	1	40	0.71	0.40

TABLE 11

ANCOVA: UNEQUAL SLOPES TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE E AND C
REGRESSION LINES WERE PARALLEL

$$H_0: B_e - B_c = 0$$

Voice	Model DF	Corrected Total DF	F	p
1	4	41	0.57	0.48
2	4	41	0.46	0.50
3	4	41	1.25	0.27

TABLE 12

ANCOVA: EQUAL SLOPES RESULT TO DETERMINE IF E AND C DIFFERED WHEN GROUP WAS THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLE, POST DEPENDENT VARIABLE AND PRE AS COVARIATE

Voice	Model DF	Corrected Total DF	F	p
1	3	41	17.1	0.0002
2	3	41	6.5	0.015
3	3	41	39.0	0.0001

Voices 2 and 3

The analyses for voice 2 (formal) and 3 (other) were conducted in the same fashion. Tables 9 through 12 report the results for voices 2 and 3. As was the case for voice 1, the data show that the E group performance was strikingly better than C.

Summary of Statistical Results

In recapitulation, the descriptive statistics showed growth for both groups but apparently a much greater growth for E (37%) than C (16%) (see Table 2, page 48, and 3, page 49) with the largest gain in voice 3 for E (45%). The ANOVA to compare E and C indicated that they were comparable on both pretests ($\underline{p} = 0.91$ and $\underline{p} = 0.54$) (see Table 4, page 50) and different at a $\underline{p} = 0.0001$ on the posttest. Extending the analysis to individual voices with t-tests and ANOVA calculations (see Table 5, page 51, and Table 6, page 52)

again demonstrated that the pretest results should be averaged and that E was not different from C. Both the conventional and the listening aided instruction showed t-test gains at typically the 0.0001 level with one at 0.0017 (see Table 7, page 52). However, ANOVA results showed growth of E beyond C for voice 1, 2, and 3 at the $p = 0.0007$, 0.0037 , and 0.0001 level.

Finally, the regressions showed that the pretests were suitable as covariates for an ANCOVA, that the regression lines were parallel (see Table 11), and that once more E and C differed greatly in growth (voice 1, $p = 0.0002$; voice 2, $p = 0.015$; and voice 3, $p = 0.0001$).

Reliability of Essay Graders

In the methods section, the reader training and grading procedure were described in detail. Each paper was graded independently by two readers. The reliability of the scores was determined in two ways, both of which indicated high correlation between each pair of readers.

The standard procedure to test such correlations is a Pearson Product Moment analysis. To test the significance of the correlation coefficient, Bruning and Kintz (1977) recommend a t-test if the sample size is less than 30 and a critical ratio z test if the N is greater than or equal to 30. Table 13 shows the results for r, z, and t (in a borderline case. The Pearson r is significant at the 0.05 level using a two-tailed test if $z < 1.96$. The t-test in the case of $N = 29$ should be greater than 2.05 for 0.05 significance (Appendix B) (Bruning & Kintz, 1977). Thus, the product moment results show clear reliability at the 0.05 level.

TABLE 13
PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT AND "TOP-QUARTER TETRACHORIC" RESULTS
FOR RELIABILITY OF ESSAY GRADES

Readers	Tetrachoric		Product Moment			
	Percent in Top Quarter	Reliability	N	r	z	t
1-2	21.4	0.98	29	0.916	4.84	11.86 (2.05 for .05)
1-3	22.0	0.99	32	0.917	5.11	39.85 (2.04 for .05)
1-4	22.0	0.99	32	0.894	4.98	
2-3	15.6	0.86	32	0.852	4.74	
2-4	21.4	0.98	32	0.900	5.01	
3-4	15.6	0.86	32	0.732	4.07	

Diederich (1974) describes a simple procedure to test the reliability of two readers, what he calls a "top-quarter tetrachoric (p. 32). The idea is to determine how many of the same papers were put in the top 25% by both of the readers of the paragraphs. This number is converted to a percent of the total number of papers. The percent is then converted to a "Reliability sum or average" (p. 33) using the table in Diederich. Note that in Table 13 the lowest result is 0.86 and 4 pairs show reliability at the 0.98 level or above.

Questionnaire Results

The basic results of the study are contained in this chapter. However, a voluntary questionnaire (see Appendix D) had been completed by almost all of the students in the study. Analysis of these results was not a goal of this paper nor was the correlation of answers with test results intended. However, a sampling of the answers was planned, first, to determine if the demographic and biographic profiles of E and C students were roughly comparable, and, second, to see if students who did very well differed in any special way from those who did not do as well.

The gain of E and C students in voice 3 (other) between Pre 2 and Posttest was tabulated. As it was indicated in Chapter III, all of the questionnaires were not reviewed. The questionnaires of the 5 most successful students and the 5 with the smallest gains in each group in voice 3 were reviewed qualitatively in an effort to identify commonalities and differences.

Experimental Group

Gains for voice 3 defined as posttest total minus pretest 2 total ranged from +51 to +12. The 5 students with the largest gain (L) and the 5 with the smallest gain (S) did not exhibit any meaningful differences in their questionnaire answers. (Hereafter the group with the largest gain will be denoted as L, and the group with the smallest gain as S.) The E group itself had 14 females and 7 males; all were freshmen. The L group had 4 females and the S group 3. They ranged

in age from 18-22 (one S was 29). All 10 went to high schools in metropolitan areas (one was from Oak Ridge) that generally ranged from 700-4,000 (exceptions were 200 students in a private school and Austin-East in Knoxville). Nine of 10 knew their high school GPA, but less than half knew an ACT composite or SAT total. For the L group 4 reported high school GPA scores that averaged 3.05, and for S, 5 averaged 2.73. The total average for E was 2.89. One of 10 had a college preparatory English class; the rest had standard classes.

The next set of questions focused on the use of spare time to determine whether the students used visual or aural modes, whether or not they listened or read. The intention of the questions was to find out if the students listened more than they read. That information would be important in interpreting the results of the study. Nine could name 2 recent books they had read. Some of the titles were Native Son, Color Purple, Super Flirt, and Flowers in the Attic. The families get, typically, 3 to 4 magazines at home with Ebony, Jet, and Essence the most common. Generally the students get no magazines at college though all have read magazines in the past 6 months. All play cards, checkers, and other board games. One also played chess and Scrabble and another played marbles. Letter writing ranged from daily to monthly to hardly ever. In the L group 3 of 5 prefer to study in quiet, 1 with radio, and 1 both. The S group had 3 quiets and a "both." The L group listens to the radio about 1.7 hours a day while the S group reports 1.8. Nine of 10 have a cassette collection. On the issue of T.V., the use ranges from one half hour per day to 10, with the

average for L at 4.35 hours a day, and for S at 3.6. Three of 10 have cable. The popular shows are Cosby (8 of 10), Different World (6), 227 and Miami Vice (4 each) followed by Hunter, Sonny Spoon, and the soaps.

The third set of questions was also oriented toward the identification of an aural or literal orientation. Seven of 10 take notes in class and the other 3 do sometimes. They all keep lists, typically appointments and tasks. None of them was in a reading lab. When asked if they preferred to read or to listen to stories, 8 students preferred to read, 1 preferred both, and 1 preferred to listen. The students had no sense of oral tradition. The questions that asked how far back can you trace your family history, and how do you know, indicated that basically the world began for them between 1930 and 1950. Only 3 students could trace a history beyond grandparents; 2 knew of great grandparents and 1 knew of a great, great grandmother (that particular student has a father who has started a company with his 2 brothers).

The final set of questions was asked to establish some sort of family context. Six of the students are the first in their families to attend college. The results of L and S were identical; 3 in each group were the first to go to college. Each group had a student with a father who managed a business and a mother who was a teacher or a secretary. One had a father who was a steel worker and the mother a nurse. The rest were retired, dead, cooks, maids, cement workers, cosmetologists, etc. The projected salary ranges reflected the fact

that freshmen don't usually know the family income. For example, the student with a father who was a custodian and a mother who was a maid reported \$40,000-\$50,000 while the student whose father was a steel worker and the mother was a nurse said "I don't know."

Control Group

The comments here parallel those in the E group presentation. The gains for the control group ranged from +21 to -8 on the voice 3 test, post-pre 2. The student with the largest gain (+21) declined to complete a questionnaire. The next highest gain was +17. The C group had 11 females and 9 males. The L group had 1 male and the S group had 1 female. Two of the S group were sophomores. Again, the ages ranged from 18-20 with 1 student 25. High schools were in metropolitan areas (Minneapolis, St. Louis, Toledo, Dayton, Chicago) with school sizes from 700-2,000 except for a 500 student school in Decatur, Georgia. As with the E group, 9 of 10 knew their high school GPA but only 2 of 10 knew the ACT composite or the SAT total. The L group had a high school GPA of 3.14 but the S group had an average (4 students) of 2.15. This 2.6 average should be compared with 2.89 for the E group. Three of the L group had had an honors high school English class while 1 of the S group did.

In the set of questions designed to explore students' use of spare time, the L group identified two books, and the S group listed The Assassination of Malcolm X, Wanderlust, and Boys and Sex. Generally the families of C subscribed to 2 magazines. Three students subscribe to magazines at college. All but 1 reported that they read 1 or more

magazines at college: Ebony, Sports Illustrated, Time, Family Circle, Business World. Three of the students read a daily newspaper. Again, the students in both L and S play card games and board games such as Monopoly and Backgammon. One student reports Trivial Pursuit; another, dominoes. Letter writing frequency ranged from "once in a blue moon" to twice a week. For study, the L group preferred quiet 60% of the time, 1 said both, and 1 did not respond. The same result occurred for the S group: 3 for quiet, 1 both, 1 radio. The results are similar to the E result. The L group listens to the radio 4.5 hours (E, L, 1.7) a day, based on 3 to 5 reports, while S listens 3.3 hours (E, S, 1.8). These numbers are larger than the E group results, for no explicable reason. Seven of 10 have cassette collections. Interestingly, the L group says (4 of 5) that they watch T.V. about 2.1 hours a day while S watches 3.5 hours. These numbers are less than E (L, 4.35) hours and S, 3.6 hours). The same results that were indicated for E were indicated for C. The most popular shows were Cosby (9 of 10) and Different World (4 of 10).

The third set of questions, again seeking information about aural or literal orientation, indicated that notes are taken by all 5 of L and by 3 of S with 2 reporting sometimes. One of the S students was in a reading lab. The L group was divided about preference to hear or to read a story (2, 2, both) while S was 3 read, 2 listen. This result differed from the E result where 1 of 10 said listen and 1 said both. The L group had no knowledge or interest in family. The S group reported "two generations" and "not too far."

On the issue of first generation in college, 60% of L and 80% of S said no. The converse was true of E, i.e. 60% were the first generation in college. The occupations data indicated that L and S were the same for C and no different from E (L or S). For example, the fathers in L worked as a laborer, carpenter, clerk, construction worker, and analyst. In group S the fathers were retired, dead, or in construction. The L group had no idea about salary and the S group indicated \$15,000 to \$50,000 plus.

Comparison

The qualitative analysis of 20 questionnaires indicated that the high and low scorers for E were not different in demographic or biographic detail. For C, the only striking difference was that, in a conventional setting, the students who did well in high school (average GPA--3.14) were in the L group and the students who did less well in high school (average GPA--2.15) were in the S group. A noteworthy difference between the E and the C groups was the response to the "first generation in college" question. The E group reported that 40% of one or both parents had attended college. However, 70% was reported by the C group. This information is interesting for two reasons. One, the students in the C group had not grown as significantly in their writing voice through conventional composition instruction, even though they had come from an educationally enriched background. Two, the students in the E group, almost all of whom were first generation college students, grew dramatically in their writing voice, which supports the effectiveness of the listening exercises.

Conference Results

Each student participated in a conference over half way through the quarter for an evaluation of written work. The conferences were informal. In addition to the discussion about writing progress, E students were asked to comment about the listening exercises. In particular they were asked if they considered the experience helpful. The conference results suggested three things, all positive, about the students' attitude toward the listening exercises. First, everyone enjoyed them. It was "a change," "interesting," "piqued my interest," "I liked hearing how they expressed themselves." More importantly, the students suggested a variety of ways in which they felt the exercises had a direct impact on their writing. They felt that the exercises helped them organize their thoughts, gave them ideas for their own writing (7 responses), helped them concentrate on one thing, helped them focus their thoughts, helped them understand that they could write about topics that were "really deep" and motivated them to do the same (write about problems of a friend, feelings toward racism), and aided them in visualization ("instead of words in one ear and out the other"). One student liked the definitions. Hearing the definition of "tolerance" made defining a word in a whole paragraph easier to understand. Another detail reported was an interest in hearing support sentences as well as the kind of repetition and comparisons used by Martin Luther King. Another student said that in reading compositions (models of), "I miss the point."

The third category of responses fell in "the listening raised my consciousness" category. The exercises "helped me understand assignments" and "learn what other people think about." They motivated me "to get tapes of books from the library," "broadened my thinking," "motivated me to check out some of the authors," "made me think about myself." Another student said "I like to write, and after hearing the tapes I felt less stupid because now I can write what I feel." In summary, the instruction was fun for the students and profitable for a composition class.

Paragraph Analysis

For these analyses the paragraphs of pretest 2 and the posttest of 2 students, the ones who gained the most in E and C, were reviewed. The criteria were individuality, tone (audience and purpose), and style (word choices, structures, and devices). (Complete sample paragraphs are included in Appendix E.)

E Group Student

Pretest 2. The first pretest paragraph, a reflection of one's home town or city, was a list of places in the student's city. The tone was not personal. "Being from _____, I truly feel good about the location, the appearance, the people and the activities" was the only reflective sentence. Every sentence began with the subject and only one sentence of 10, total, employed an action verb. The verb "to be" was dominant. Word choices were commonplace. "The city is

along a coastline," "There are many schools," and "The Population is not large."

The second paragraph, whose objective was to describe one's city to a panel of raters, repeated the same information. There was no evidence of individuality nor audience. The sentences were brief, the verbs linked, and the word choices were commonplace: "_____ is located on the coast line," "There are many plants," "The format is nice," and "There are many activities to keep you out of trouble."

The third paragraph, the voice of a cousin, had a strong beginning, "In seeing _____ for the first time, I was very impressed." The remainder of the paragraph listed a few of the items mentioned in paragraphs 1 and 2. E did not follow the assignment to write a letter; consequently, there was no audience.

Posttest (E). The first paragraph, the student's reflection as the new student body president, began, "Today has been great and exciting." The sentences were varied: "As student body president, I believe . . . ," "The future of education depends upon mutual understanding and cooperation." Feelings were expressed in "I am honored," "I promise to fulfill my responsibilities of office," "Education is the right of every young person." The tone was serious and mature.

The second paragraph, a letter to the acting president of the college, contained sentence variety: declarative, exclamatory, and imperative, "I hope this letter will give you and the faculty an idea of what to do," "We as students know the rules!" "Look at the facts."

Sentences began with both independent and dependent clauses. "When we break this rule, we . . . ," "If Dean _____ continues suspending students, you . . . ," "I have a suggestion that I would like to propose." Verb choices were strong: "abide," "break," "caught," "suspended," "propose." Word choices were direct: "first," "facts," "grounds for," "therefore," "right," "rest assured." There is a voice and an audience.

The third paragraph, a letter from a parent recognizing the student's new office, demonstrated a concerned attitude: "We want you to think about what you are getting involved in and what grounds you will have to stand . . . ," "Think of the commitments . . . ," "Will you be able to fulfill them in the proper manner?" "We give you . . . our prayers." The overall impression of the letter indicated a letter from a parent to a grown child.

C Group Student

Pretest 2. In the first paragraph, a reflection about the student's city, listed 12 facts. The sentences were simple declarative in subject verb order. The places listed were "wonderful," "clean," "great," "I love my city." The tone, bright and positive, was consistent. The words lent themselves to this observation.

The second paragraph, the report to a rating panel, opened with "I'm including my brief summary all the positive and negative surroundings." The student relisted the facts of the first paragraph and finished with "We have three slums because the people have a don't

care attitude." This last sentence is the only complex sentence. The audience was not evident and the word choices shifted from bright reflective words to a matter of fact description.

The third paragraph, the voice of a favorite cousin, is a series of short declarative sentences that expressed where the cousin "went" which is used 5 times. All the sentences are declarative; 1 sentence demonstrates humor, "My cousin's city makes my city look like a backyard." Although the sentences were short and the words simple, there was a hint of playfulness in the humor. There was, however, no audience. The piece was a reflective expression of the writer, not a letter to the writer.

Posttest (C). The first paragraph in which the student reflects on the election contained 2 compound sentences, "I think the students made a lovely decision, and they won't regret their decision," and 2 complex sentences, "I must keep the promises that I gave to the fellow students," 1 complex sentence, "I will rest good tonight and I will write an acceptance speech tonight so I will make the students believers not followers." The paragraph was a reflection; the voice of the student came through. Again the humor, though immature, has potential for development.

The second paragraph written to the acting president of the college contains a series of simple declarative sentences: "I'm the new president of SGA," "I speak for the students, not against them," "I'm concerned about many things." The student lists items in elliptical form: "grass needs cutting," "hedges too," "improving facilities."

There is one complex sentence, "I would like a conference with you before we leave school." The student was not consistent in appropriate language for audience or purpose. The sentences in this paragraph were less mature than the sentences in the first paragraph.

The final paragraph was a letter from the student's father, congratulating the new president. The letter contained a variety of sentences that revealed a parent's concern: "We hope that you can make some changes in the system," "You have to strive and you have to make things happen," "I was president in my class and I earned a lot of respect from my class members." The voice and audience were evident; the word and verb choice were appropriate throughout the paragraph.

Discussion

Both E and C had difficulty expressing their feelings about their cities in Pretest 2, although C is more expressive, "I love my city." Their sentences, brief, immature in development, listed places that existed in their cities. Their second paragraphs did not move toward an audience. Both students introduced the paragraph with "I am writing to a rating committee to tell them about my city." The lists of places were continued. In the final paragraph E had more difficulty than C although this student's topic sentence, "In seeing _____ for the first time, I was very impressed" had the potential to introduce a good paragraph; however, E went back to the original list. C, on the other hand, expresses a child's humor in "My cousin's city makes

my city look like a backyard." Neither E nor C were able to assume the voice of a cousin writing a letter to them.

Although both E and C demonstrated growth in the posttests, E grew more dramatically in each of the paragraphs. From the bland, matter of fact voice about the city, this student emerged as a person who is thoughtful (reflection), direct to audience (formal self to audience), and capable in assuming the voice of a parent to a grown child. On the other hand, C still had difficulty with formal self to an audience, but both reflection and adapting another voice were effective. This student's humor continued to develop, "I think the students made a lovely choice," "I will make the students believers, not followers," and "I speak for the students, not against them."

General Observation About the Writings of E and C

The writing experience for the students in E and C was a growing experience. Once they adapted to the writing process, they generated enough material for their paragraphs to grow from the initial 8-10 lines to 25+ lines. Another observation was that the students, at first, were not able to write a letter in the classroom situation. Not one used "Dear _____" in the pretest letters. Moreover, they showed reluctance in believing that they could write as individuals. One student commented, "Are you saying that if I feel like using 'stink' I can?"

The students in E were more orderly than those in C. The listening exercises were part of that order. The students looked forward to them and settled into listening in a relaxed manner. Enthusiasm for

the protocol of informal self, formal self, and voice of another was demonstrated at a high level for voice of the other. All sorts of characters were voiced, the most popular was "Alf."

Examples of Posttest Sentences by Other E Students

The following examples are included to show the ability developed by the experimental group.

Reflections. "I am so happy I can barely write." "I have been waiting for this day to come for years, the day when I have the authority, the opportunity to show leadership." "We as students learn alot from teachers, but we need to learn some things on our own. I am going to fight for what is right on this campus and make _____ what it used to be a proud Black institution."

Formal self to a specific audience. "As student body president, it is my responsibility to bring student concerns to you and ask you to do something about it." "With the execution of a few small things I am sure it would make a difference." "I am concerned about problems on campus. I took a survey of the student body and I found that several problems kept popping up."

Other. "Hi Baby. We have a surprise for you when you come home for spring break. I am not going to tell you but let's just say you've always wanted it." "It gives us so much pleasure . . . to tell everyone that our daughter is president (of the student body) Sweetheart we know that the times are going to be mighty rough and you will have

many obstacles to overcome . . . keep your hand in the Lord's."

"I can't believe that you are president of the student body. I always knew from when you were little that you had good potential and would be something in life."

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The present research was motivated by a desire to enhance the ability of first year composition students to write with vitality, character, and meaning. The goal of the study was to determine if a set of listening exercises would enhance the ability of the experimental group to use three types of voices: informal self, formal, and other when compared to a control group that received conventional composition instruction in the use of these voices.

The participants in the study were students in developmental composition classes in a historically black college. Two classes of students took part: one was the experimental (E) group, and the other, the control (C) group.

The first step in the experiment included two pretests. For each pretest, the students wrote three paragraphs using different voices: paragraph 1, informal self with self as audience; paragraph 2, formal voice with a specific audience; and paragraph 3, other voice with a specific audience.

During the six-week period that followed the pretests, students in the E and C groups received the same instruction about writing and voice. In addition, the E group listened to tapes and records of materials that were chosen for two purposes: first, voice and

audience, and second, to suit the age, race, and interests of the students.

Students in both groups completed a questionnaire designed not only to elicit demographic and biographic information but also to obtain information about their listening and reading habits. Further, the E group, during regular conference time, responded to questions concerning the listening experience.

A posttest concluded the experiment, at which time the students wrote 3 paragraphs using 3 different voices. All of the paragraphs, the pretests and the posttest, were read and evaluated by 2 readers.

In the quantitative analyses, the first procedure (ANOVA) determined that both groups were comparable in the pretests. The second procedure (t-tests) determined that both groups were comparable in the writing of each voice in pretest 1 and in pretest 2. Thus, the pretest scores were averaged and the average is called pretest. Third, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) to establish differences between the pretest total scores of E and C and the posttest total scores of E and C indicated that there was a significant difference between the pretest total and the posttest total of E, $p = .026$. However, the difference between the pretest total and the posttest total of C was not significant, $p = .66$. Lastly, an analysis of the growth in the writing in each voice between pretest and posttest indicated significant growth in the posttests of E, $p = 0.0007$, 0.0037 , and 0.0001 level.

The qualitative analysis of the 20 samples of the questionnaire pointed out general comparability between the E and the C groups. However, one noteworthy difference was that the majority of the C group were second generation college students. The interviews of the E group suggested additional gains from the listening experience: organization, understanding of topics discovering ideas, and motivation to listen to other tapes of stories. Finally, the analysis of paragraphs of 2 students, 1 from each group, demonstrated the growth of each student but more significant growth in the voice of the student from the E group.

Conclusions

The results of this particular study indicated that the listening experience had a statistically significant effect on the voice of students' writings. The voices in the experimental students' writings grew more significantly than those of the students participating in a composition class that focused on the reading of paragraph models. The students in the control group did grow in their use of voices, but clearly the listening materials added a significant dimension to the experimental students' writing experience. Their total writing growth was significant, and the growth for each voice was significant. From this particular study, it appears that listening should be included as part of a writing class syllabus.

Limitations to this study included the population participating and the investigator as instructor. The methods and procedures were

standard. With adjustments in the selection of listening materials, similar investigations should be completed with other populations and instructors. This step would be necessary to provide support to this study's result that listening improves the voice of students' writings.

The implications from this study became apparent in the interviews of the experimental group. Their comments provided several insights about the effectiveness of the listening experience. The purpose of the study was to enhance the ability of these students to write with voice; however, the E students pointed to several other outcomes: they learned to organize, to understand topic and support sentences, to think about sentence structure, and to consider "really deep" topics. Moreover, the listenings were an incentive to get tapes from the library.

Although research studies were limited in demonstrating the relationship between listening and writing, some reports had indicated that there is a relationship, for example, Lundsteen's (1971) monograph. Two journal articles reported using listening for developmental students. Rankin (1985) used listening to aid students in mechanics and grammar, and Ronald and Roskelly (1986) used listening exercises to improve their students' composing.

The evidence from this particular study underscores the effectiveness of appreciative listening on the writing voice of a specific population. Clearly listening must be viewed seriously as a language skill in its relationship with writing.

In her One Writer's Beginnings, Welty (1984) told her readers: "Ever since I was read to, there has never been a line read that I didn't hear It isn't my mother's voice, ... It is to me the voice of the story or the poem itself" (p. 11).

Recommendations

The success achieved by students in the experimental group in comparison with the control group indicates the desirability of additional research.

1. The results of the present study should be replicated.
2. Research should be undertaken with students at different educational levels: elementary, middle school, high school, standard and honors classes, and college. The research should also include racially balanced groups.
3. Several details need to be considered. How much of the class time should the listening exercises take? Should listening be taught to prepare students for exercises? Should listening be assigned outside of the classroom? Is it necessary to select listening content that appeals to a specific group?
4. Research should be undertaken to determine if listening can improve grammar, mechanics, and organization.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Applebee, A. (1981). Writing in the secondary school. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Ambrester, M., & Julian, F. (Eds.). Speech communication reader. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press. *File 9*
- Barbara, D., M.D., F.A.P.A. (1971). How to make people listen to you. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Barker, L. (1971). Listening behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bird, D. (1953, November). Teaching listening comprehension. The Journal of Communication, 3(2), 127-130.
- Braddock, R., Lloyd-Jones, R., & Schoer, L. (1963). Research in written composition. Champaign, IL: NCTE. ✓
- Bridwell, L. (1980, October). Revising strategies in twelfth grade students' transactional writing. Research in the Teaching of English, 14, 197-222.
- Britton, J., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A., & Rosen, H. (1975). The development of writing abilities (11-18). Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Brown, J. (1987, Spring). Listening-ubiquitous yet obscure. The Journal of the International Listening Association, 1(1), 3-14.
- Bruning, J., & Kintz, B. L. (1977). Computational handbook of statistics. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Comprone, J., & Ronald, K. (1985, Spring). Expressive writing: Exercises in a new Progymnasmata. Journal of Teaching Writing, 4(1), 31-53.
- Cooper, C., & Odell, L. (Eds.). (1978). Research on composing. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Diederich, D. (1974). Measuring growth in writing. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- DiGaetani, J. (1982, March). The Sperry Corporation and listening: An interview. Business Horizon, 34-39.

- Duker, S. (Ed.). (1966). Listening: Readings (Vol. 1). New York: Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Duker, S. (Ed.). (1971). Listening: Readings (Vol. 2). New York: Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Duker, S., & Petrie, C. (1964, December). What we know about listening: Continuation of a controversy. Journal of Communication, 14, 245-252.
- Elbow, P. (1975). A method of teaching writing. In R. Ohman & W. B. Coley (Eds.). Ideas for English 101 (pp. 19-29). Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Emig, J. (1983). The web of meaning. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cash.
- Flower, L. (1979, September). Writer-based prose: A cognitive basis for problems in writing. College English, 41, 19-37.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1980). The cognition of discovery: Defining a rhetorical problem. College Composition and Communication, 31(2), 21-32.
- Floyd, J., & Reese, R. (1987, Spring). Listening theory in modern rhetorical thought. The Journal of the International Listening Association, 1(1), 87-102.
- Friedman, P. (1986). Listening processes: Attention, understanding, evaluation. Washington: NEA.
- From the Theme Vault. (1979-1980). Unpublished anthology of freshman writing, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
- Garrison, R. (1974, Spring). One-to-one: Tutorial instruction in freshman composition. New Directions for Community Colleges, 2(1), 55-83.
- Gibson, W. (1962). The limits of language. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Gibson, W. (1966). Tough, sweet, & stuffy. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Gibson, W. (1969). Persona: A style study for readers and writers. New York: Random House.
- Gorrell, D. (1987, Fall). Freedom to write-through imitation. Journal of Basic Writing, 6(2), 53-59.

- Goss, B. (1982, Fall). Listening as information processing. Communication Quarterly, 30(4), 304-307.
- Graves, D. H. (1978). Balance the basics: Let them write. New York: Ford Foundation.
- Hauser, M., & Hughes, A. (1987, Spring). A factor analysis study of four listening tests. The Journal of The International Listening Association, 1(1), 129-147.
- Hauser, M., & Hughes, M. A. (1988, Spring). Defining the cognitive process of listening: A dream or a reality. The Journal of The International Association of Listening, 2, 75-88.
- Hillocks, G. (1982, October). The interaction of instruction, teacher comment, and revision in teaching the composing process. Research in the Teaching of English, 16, 261-278.
- Horowitz, M., & Berkowitz, A. (1971). Listening and reading, speaking and writing: An experimental investigation of differential acquisition and reproduction of memory. In S. Duker (Ed.), Listening: Readings (Vol 2) (pp. 111-120). New York: Scarecrow Press.
- Hughes, L. (Ed.). (1967). The best short stories by negro writers. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Kantor, K., & Rubin, D. (1981). Between speaking and writing: Processes of differentiation. In B. Kroll & R. Vann (Eds.), Exploring speaking-writing relationships: Connections and contrasts (p. 56). Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Kinneavy, J. (1980). A theory of discourse. New York: Norton.
- Kirby, D., & Liner, T. (1981). Inside out. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Koch, C., & Brazil, J. (1978). Strategies for teaching the composition process. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Kroll, B., & Vann, R. (Eds.). (1981). Exploring speaking-writing relationships. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Larson, R. (1982). The rhetoric of the written voice. In W. Tanner & J. Bishop (Eds.). Rhetoric and change (pp. 115-125). Mesquite: Ide House.
- Lundsteen, S. (1971). Listening its impact on reading and other language arts. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

- Macrorie, K. (1970). Uptaught. Rochelle Park, NJ: Hayden Book Company, Inc.
- Markgraf, B. (1966). Demands on listening skills of secondary school pupils. In S. Duker (Ed.), Listening: Readings (Vol. 1) (pp. 90-94). New York: Scarecrow Press.
- Martin, N., D'arcy, P., Newton, B., & Parker, R. (1976). Writing & learning across the curriculum. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- McMillan, J., & Schumacher, S. (1984). Research in education. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Moffett, J. (1981a). Active voice. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Moffett, J. (1981b). Coming on center. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Moffett, J. (1983). Teaching the universe of discourse. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Moffett, J., Baker, M., & Cooper, C. (1986). Active voices IV. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Moffett, J., & Wagner, B. J. (1983). Student-centered language arts and reading, k-13: A handbook for teachers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Murray, D. M. (1982). Learning by teaching. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cash.
- Myers, R., & Gates, L. (1968). Personal characteristics of academically talented college freshmen seeking training in cognitive listening: An exploratory study. Muncie, IN: Ball State University.
- Nichols, R., & Lewis, T. (1954). Listening and speaking. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.
- Nichols, R., & Stevens, L. (1957a). Are You Listening? New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nichols, R., & Stevens, L. (1957b, September-October). Listening to people. Effective Communication--Harvard Business Review (21073), 31-38.
- Perl, S. (1979, December). The composing processes of unskilled writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 13, 317-336.
- Raines, S. (1979). Listening-thinking tasks in selected language arts materials. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.

- Rankin, D. (1985, Fall). Reading, listening, writing: An integrated approach to teaching exposition. Journal of Basic Writing, 4(2), 48-55.
- Rankin, P. (1966). Frequency of use of listening. In S. Duker (Ed.), Listening: Readings (Vol. 1) (pp. 51-62). New York: Scarecrow Press.
- Reams, E. W. J. (1978). The relationship between listening and related subject areas among selected fifth grade pupils. Unpublished master's thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
- Rico, G. (1983). Writing the natural way. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Roberts, C. (1988, Spring). The validation of listening tests: Cutting the gordian knot. The Journal of the International Listening Association, 2, 1-19.
- Ronald, K., & Roskelly, R. (1986, Fall). Listening as a composing act. Journal of Basic Writing, 5(2), 28-40.
- Root, L., Jr. (1985, Spring). Style and self: The emergence of voice. Journal of Teaching Writing, 4(1), 77-85.
- Scholl, P. (1986, Spring). The uses of impersonation. Journal of Teaching Writing, 5(1), 267-280.
- Schwartz, M. (1987, Fall/Winter). Developing the self through writing. Journal of Teaching Writing, 6(2), 247-258.
- Shaughnessy, M. (1977). Errors and expectations: A guide for the teacher of basic writing. New York: Oxford Press.
- Sommers, N. (1980, December). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. College Composition and Communication, 31, 378-387.
- Spradley, J. (1980). Participant observation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Steil, L., Summerfield, J., & de Mare, G. (1983). Listening it can change your life. New York: John Wiley.
- Strother, D. (1987, April). On listening. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 625-628.
- Sullivan, K. (1984). Paragraph practice (5th ed.). New York: Macmillan.

- Waack, W. (1987, Spring). Appreciative listening: The aesthetic experience. The Journal of The International Listening Association, 1(1), 78-86.
- Way, B. (1967). Development through drama. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities press.
- Weaver, C. (1972). Human listening. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Weaver, C. (1987, Spring). Someone should do something about that (a comment about listening research). The Journal of The International Listening Association, 1(1), 29-31.
- Welty, E. (1984). One writer's beginnings. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wilt, M. (1966). Demands on the listening skills of elementary school children. In S. Duker (Ed.), Listening: Readings (Vol. 1) (pp. 63-80). New York: Scarecrow Press.
- Wolfe, F., Marsnik, N., Tracey, W., & Nichols, R. (1983). Perceptive listening. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Wolvin, A., & Coakley, C. (1988). Listening. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORM

In order to help you write more effectively, I would like to incorporate some in-class listening exercises for your class this quarter. You will receive the same instruction and writing assignments as a traditional composition class. The only difference will be the additional listening exercises.

The purpose of this study of listening exercises is to determine whether or not they will enhance your writing voice.

Your identity will be kept confidential. Only I will have access to your name. Any reference to individual performance will not reveal the person's identity. There are no risks involved.

If you have any questions, either now or later, please contact me, Marilyn Jacobson, in my office, the Colston Performing Arts Building, Knoxville College, or call 524-6590. Your participation in this study is voluntary, and you may refuse to participate. You may withdraw at any time during the study without penalty.

I have read and understood the explanation of this study and agree to participate.

Name

Date

Signature

APPENDIX B

RUBRIC FOR VOICE IN WRITING

	5	4	3	2	1
	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Weak</u>	<u>Poor</u>
I. Writer sounds like an individual. Writer's persona is evident; Writer is real, credible, and unique	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
II. Tone is clear, vigorous, appropriate, and consistent to the audience. (happy, hopeful, humble, ironic, persuasive, imaginative, convincing, touching, etc.)	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
III. Tone is clear, vigorous, appropriate, interesting, and consistent to the purpose of the writer. (focused, authentic, convincing, committed, caring, enhances content, etc.)	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
IV. Stylistic devices are evident.					
A. Interesting, surprising imaginative words. Effective detail section Strong, active verbs	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
B. Appropriate sentence length Interesting sentence arrangement	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>

C. Distinctive rhythm

Resonance

imagery

recursiveness of key words
and phrases

<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

V. Content

Clear, interesting, vigorous

<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

Organization

Beginning, middle, end or
appropriate arrangement

<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

Usage of language

Grammar and sentence structure

<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

APPENDIX C

READER RATER SHEET

Rater I.D. _____

Student I.D. _____

Paper I.D. _____

I. Individual _____ x 8 _____
II. _____ x 3 _____
III. Tone-Purpose _____ x 3 _____
IV. Style
 A. Words _____ x 2 _____
 B. Structure _____ x 2 _____
 C. Devices _____ x 2 _____

Total _____

V. Content _____
 Organization _____
 Usage _____

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire will provide information that will help me correlate a teaching strategy with biographical data in order to improve students' composition writing. All information will be kept confidential. If you choose not to answer any of the questions, that is your right, although I would appreciate a completed form.

1. Name _____
2. Age _____
3. Birthplace _____
4. Current residence _____
5. High school's name _____ City _____
6. Total number of students in high school _____
7. Number in your graduating class _____
8. Year you graduated _____
9. Did you receive a G.E.D.? _____
10. High school GPA _____
11. Type of English class (honors, standard, accelerated etc.) _____
12. SAT scores _____ Math _____ Verbal _____
13. ACT scores--Composite _____
14. Major at Knoxville College _____
15. Classification (Freshman etc.) _____
16. How many hours attempted _____ How many passed? _____
17. What are the titles of the last two books that you have read that were not required by a class? _____
and _____

18. What magazines does your family subscribe to or buy at the newsstand?

19. What magazines do you get at college? _____

20. Which magazines have you read in the past six months?

21. Do you read a newspaper daily, weekly, or not at all? _____

22. What kinds of games do you play? (checkers, Trivial Pursuit, chess, cards [names] etc.) _____

23. How often do you write letters? _____

24. How often do you telephone home? _____ Friends? _____

25. Do you study best while listening to the radio or in quiet?

26. Do you take notes in classes? _____

27. What kinds of lists or calendars do you keep? (appointments, grocery, shopping, tasks to do, etc.) _____

28. Approximately how many hours do you listen to the radio each day?

29. Do you have a cassette tape collection? _____

30. What kinds of tapes are your favorites? _____

31. Approximately how many hours do you watch T.V. in a day? _____

32. Do you have cable? _____ a VCR? _____

33. Do you subscribe to a movie channel? _____

34. In order of preference, list your five favorite T.V. programs

35. Are you currently in a reading lab? _____ What number? _____
36. Do you prefer to read or listen to stories? _____
37. How far back can you trace your family history? _____
38. How did you learn about your family history? _____
39. Are you the first generation in your family to attend college?

40. If not, which members of your immediate family have attended college?

41. What is your father's occupation? _____
42. What is your mother's occupation? _____
43. What is your guardian's occupation? _____
44. In what area would you place your family's income? _____
\$10,000-\$20,000, \$20,000-\$30,000, \$30,000-\$40,000, \$40,000-\$50,000,
other

APPENDIX E

SAMPLE PARAGRAPHS

Experimental student
Pretest 2

The voice of self with self as audience: In recent years cities has been rated according to their qualities of good living. Being from _____, I truly feel good about the location, the appearance, the people and the activities. _____ is along the coastline of the Gulf of Mexico. _____ is by many water reservoir and oil reservoir. There are many nuclear plants. the appearance of _____ is a nice format. Within _____ there are many schools, elementary, two junior highs, and one high school. The population is not very large, but the demand for things is not high. Many people are friendly and willing to help one another. There are many activities for one to do, mud racing, rodeos, skating and dancing. Therefore, I feel that _____ has met the qualities of good living in many different ways.

The formal voice with a specific audience: I, appear before this committee today to help you all study _____. _____ is on the coastline of Gulf of Mexico. There are many water and oil reservoirs. There are many nuclear plants. The format of _____ is nice. _____ containing four elementary, two junior highs, and one high school is educating students. The population is not large, but the people are friendly and willing to help one another. There are many activities to keep one out of trouble. Therefore, I hope that this little information will help the committee.

Voice other than self to a specific audience: In seeing _____ for the first time, I was very impressed. The population was not too large and the people were friendly. The city is by the Gulf of Mexico. There elementary schools, two junior highs, and a high school. I liked the city.

Posttest

The voice of self with self as audience: Today has been great and exciting. I have been elected President of the student body! I feel honored to accept this position, and I promise to fullfil all responsibilities and commitments I make to the students. I will seek

ways to make this campus better for everyone. As President, I believe that an education is the right of every young person and that the future of the college depends upon mutual understanding and cooperation of everyone.

The formal voice with a specific audience:

Dear Sir:

As President of the student body, I am writing concerning visitation rights. I hope this letter will give you and the faculty an idea of what to do.

First, we as students know the rules and regulations of the college. We all try to abide by them, but many of us break the "No Co-ed visitation" rule. Upon breaking this rule, we know it is grounds for suspension. But, look at the facts! About 50% of the students brake this rule, and everytime someone is caught, they are suspended. So, therefore, if Dean _____ continues to suspend students, you will have but a handful of students and money. I have a suggestion to propose, and I hope you and the faculty will take it under consideration in dealing with this problem. For one week, try an give the student body a chance to show that they will carry out this right in an adult manner. For example, give them the right to have visitation from 2:00 pm to 11:00 Sunday thru Thursday and 1:00 pm to 1:00 am Friday and Saturday. I can rest assured that if this right was given, there will be less visitation from the opposite sex.

Thank you for your attention to this letter.

Sincerely yours,

Voice other than self to a specific audience:

Dear _____,

Hi, how are you doing? How is school coming along? Work is okay, but I am as busy as a bee. I am writing to tell you that your father and I are concerned about you being elected as President of the student body.

First, congratulations on this election. We sure hope you can handle the responsibilities as the President. We want you to really think about what you are getting involved in and what grounds you will have to stand. Being President is fine, but the responsibilities are not easy.

Secondly, Think of the committments you will have to make. Will you be able to fullfil them in a proper manner?

If you think you can understand what we are saying and you feel

you can handle the position, we give you the best of luck and all prayers along with it. Good luck.

Love

Mother

Control student
Pretest 2

The voice of self with self as audience: My home city is _____. The living conditions are wonderful, the law is strict on everything. The justice system is cracking down heavy than other cities. Crime rate has fail alot in the city. The communities are sticking together. The neighborhoods are mainly clean. There's a few rural places with welfare candidates that destroy housing. The work is there but people are lazy. Public facilities are great. There is a lot of entertainment. There are nightclubs. There are motels and hotels. I love my city.

The formal voice to a specific audience: My city is being rated. I am including in my brief summary all the positive and negative surroundings. We have the famous river front stadium and the colesum. The city has many factories and big and small businesses. Crime rate has fail. People stick together. The city has a good judicial commitment and good law enforcement officers. We have three slums because the people have a don't care attitude. We have good public transportation. We have good entertainment. The city is still growing.

Voice other than self to a specific audience: I went to visit my cousin last weekend. The city is bigger than my hometown. My cousin's city makes my city look like a backyard. I went to a amusement park. I went to their water front. I went to a concert. I went to visit neighbors. I am going back next week since I like that city.

Posttest

The voice of self with self as audience: I have just received notice of winning the election. Now that I won the election I must keep the promises that I gave to fellow students. I must make changes in my lifestyle. I think the students made a lovely decision, and they won't regret their decision. My reason for taking this position was to make a change. I will rest good tonight and I will write an exceptance speech tonight so I will make the students believers not followers.

The formal voice to a specific audience:

Dear Sir:

I am writing you in aspects of making some changes. I am the new SGA President of the student body. I speak for them not against them. I am concerned about many things. The top of the list is dorm living. The upkeep of the yard, grass needs cutting, hedges too. Improving facilities that we have. I would like a conference with you before we leave school.

Thank you,

Voice other than self to a specific audience:

Dear _____,

Hi, How are you doing? Your mother and I are glad to hear you are the new President of the student body. We hope that you can make some changes in the system at school. We heard your complaints when you came. Son, you have to strive and you have to make things happen. I was president of my class and I earned alot of respect from my class members. Sometimes you have faults and sometimes you accomplish. Remember, it is how much you try. I have to go now. See you Saturday.

Love,

Dad

VITA

Marilyn Quinn Jacobson was born in New Haven, Connecticut. She graduated from St. Louis' Elementary School, Lauralton Hall Academy, and Albertus Magnus College. She taught honors, standard, and remedial classes in English at the junior and senior high school levels in Connecticut.

She married Harry C. Jacobson and moved to Knoxville, Tennessee in 1964. She was active in a variety of organizations and served as President of the Board of the Knoxville Montessori Association, President of the Sequoyah PTA, Chairperson of the John XXIII Parish Council, and Vice-President of the Knoxville-Knox County League of Women Voters. She has been a patient advocate at Lakeshore Hospital and has served on the board of the Knoxville Women's Center. She is currently President of the board of Catholic Social Services and is secretary and member of the executive committee for the Mental Health Association of Knox County. She was elected to the Knoxville City School Board for three terms.

She taught freshman composition at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville on a part-time basis, and since 1984 she has been a full-time faculty member at Knoxville College. She entered the Graduate School at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville on a part-time basis in 1984, and she received the Master of Science degree with a major in Curriculum and Instruction in May 1989.

She is a member of Phi Delta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi, Pi Lambda

Theta, The National Council of Teachers of English, and the International Listening Association.

She and her husband have four children: Kara, Stephen, Paula, and Aubrie.