

Writing as a Mode of Learning

In *Writing as a Mode of Learning* Emig is arguing that the uniqueness of writing is helpful when the learning process is taking place. I agree that writing itself is a whole different from learning than talking or reading. One of the quotes that pointed that out was, "Writing involves the fullest possible functioning of the brain, which entails the active participation in the process of both the left and the right hemispheres." I liked this quote because when you are writing something it is important to have creativity so your writing keeps the audience engaged. When Emig was discussing the differences between writing and talking I found some of her arguments interesting. One of the differences she talked about that I did not agree with was, "Writing is learned behavior; talking is natural, even irrepressible, behavior." I did not agree with this point because talking is natural, however we are still taught words and speech as young children. I think that out of the three modes of persuasion the author Emig used ethos and logos the most in her argument. *Writing as a Mode of Learning* is an academic form of writing and there was little pathos in her argument to be found.

Question 1: Which form of learning does the class as a whole find more helpful; reading, writing, talking, or a combination of all three?

Question 2: Would everyone in the class think of writing as a mode of learning before reading this article about the uniqueness of writing?