2006

Increasing Elementary Students' Writing Skills Through an Integrated Language Arts Program

Leshelle Scott Seay

INCREASING ELEMENTARY STUDENTS' WRITING SKILLS THROUGH AN

INTEGRATED LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in

Leadership and Education in

the Adrian Dominican School of Education of

Barry University

by

Leshelle Scott Seay, B.A., M.A.

* * * * *

Barry University

2006

Area of Specialization: Leadership

INCREASING ELEMENTARY STUDENTS' WRITING SKILLS THROUGH AN

INTEGRATED LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM

DISSERTATION

by

Leshelle Scott Seay

2006

APPROVED BY:

_____
Catharina M. Eeltink, Ph.D.
Chairperson, Dissertation Committee

_____
Zorka Karanxha,Ed.D.
Member, Dissertation Committee

_____
A. Eugene Tootle, Ed.D.
Member, Dissertation Committee

_____
Terry Piper, Ph.D.
Dean, Adrian Dominican School of Education

ABSTRACT

INCREASING ELEMENTARY STUDENTS' WRITING SKILLS THROUGH AN

INTEGRATED LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM

Leshelle Scott Seay

Barry University, 2006

Dissertation Chairperson: Dr. Catharina Eeltink

Purpose

This research study was designed and implemented to help increase students'
writing skills through an integrated language arts program.

Method

A quasi-experimental action research design was used to assess the effectiveness
of a researcher-developed innovative language arts program. A selected group of fifth
grade students participated in the following activities: attended a series of reading and
writing workshops; wrote to assigned and chosen prompts; responded to a variety of
literature sources on a daily basis; published and shared their writings school-wide; and
conferred regularly with the teacher, volunteers, and peers. The treatment was applied
over a fourteen (14) week period.

Major Findings

The experimental group was compared to an equivalent fifth grade control group
who received standard writing instruction using a traditional methodology. Standardized
pre and post test measure were taken assessing narrative and expository writing skills.
T-tests showed that the experimental group post test scores were significantly higher than
the control group scores in all but one instance, suggesting the experimental methodology

was more effective than the standard methodology for this age group. The objectives of

the study were achieved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are three groups of people that I would like to acknowledge who were very influential in my life as I completed this degree: professors, school-community, and family.

First, I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the professors who were instrumental in my research. Their belief and support throughout different stages of this study has made it possible for me to produce a program that is on the forefront of developing effective writing instructions in the elementary classroom. The journey on this road has been long, but I am sincerely appreciative to all professors who traveled it with me.

Next, I am deeply appreciative to my principals for making adjustments to the schedules and classes so that I could implement this program. In addition, I am sincerely appreciative to all my volunteers (business partners, cafeteria manager, custodian foreman, guidance counselor, media specialist, and teachers) who visited my classroom weekly to listen in on my students' writing conferences and read to them. A very special thank you to my students for participating in the study. If I had to rate their performance during this study, they would earn an exemplary rating.

Last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank my family for their continual support and unconditional love. From the beginning to the end, you all supported me. Throughout this journey, you all held my hand. It was not just me working on a PhD, but you all too. The support that you all gave me made it possible for me to balance college, career, and family. I am forever grateful to God for placing you all in my life.

In conclusion, I would like to acknowledge various groups of people who were influential in my completing this degree: the professors, school-community, and my family. You all have made it possible for me to attain the degree of PhD, and I will forever thank God for placing you all in my life.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation and its research finding to all teachers in the world who believe that writing and reading are connected. The data that you collect on your students, the research that you conduct in the area of writing and reading, and the transfer of this knowledge into the classroom will lead you to make effective instructional decisions. As educators, we are learning continuously.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The development of writing skills is a primary concern of all elementary school teachers. When compared to test scores nationally, Florida students perform poorly on measures of effective writing. Working at an elementary school with students in grades pre-kindergarten though fifth grade, the author noticed the students' scores on the Florida Writes Examination were much lower than the district's average. Last year, on measures taken at the site school, students were given 45 minutes to read their assigned topic, plan what to write, and write their responses. Students were assessed on a rubric scale (Appendix C) of one to six (six being the highest, three being the middle, and one being the lowest). The topics were writing to explain (expository), and writing to tell a story (narrative). As a group, the students did not perform well, suggesting that current methods of instruction were not effective for the population.

Background of the problem

The site school had several programs to help meet the needs of exceptional students. The school is classified as a Title 1 school because 81.2% of the students participated in the free and reduced lunch program. Programs included Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD), Language Learning Disabilities (LLD), Emotional Handicapped (EH), English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), and Accelerated Learning Program for students of High Ability (ALPHA). The percentage of students that made up these programs were SLD 8.7% and LLD, 2.8% EH, 2.8% ESOL, and 5.9% ALPHA.

After studying the declining scores, the writer developed a needs assessment instrument (Appendix A). The results of the survey revealed that 22 of 25 teachers at the site school were concerned about the lack of basic writing skills. Some causes of the declining scores listed by the teachers were lack of parental involvement, lack of basic sentence structure to create a paragraph, and limited real-life experiences.

Teachers wrote comments on the survey that a lack of parental involvement may be a major cause of this problem. The students had been exposed to very little other than their immediate neighborhood. Many of them came from homes with limited incomes. Parents were working and could not or chose not to come to the school to learn more about the school curriculum and expectations. In addition, many parents did not come to the school for a conference when contacted.

To help increase parental involvement, the school scheduled two parent/teacher meetings each year. Of 1,200 parents and guardians, only 40 attended the first meeting and 70 attended the second meeting. The School Advisory Committee cited parental involvement as an area that needed improvement.

The School Advisory Committee also identified the need to improve basic writing skills as an objective for the 1998-1999 school year. Parents and community members expressed their concerns during a planning session, and teacher representatives and principals reported that writing skills were below average.

Theoretical Framework

There are two approaches to teaching writing: text book prescribed and student prescribed. The text book prescribed approach involves teaching writing according to what order the text book publisher states the skills should be taught. This approach is

also known as Bottom Up theory, which is supported by behavior theories. It emphasizes teaching writing in isolation of reading (Kovalik & Olsen 2004).

On the other hand, the student prescribed approach or Top-down theory is supported by cognitive psychologists. According to Vygotsky, as cited by Mahn (1999), social interaction is essential in cognitive development. Vygotsky created The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). In the ZPD model, the level of learning is substantially increased when others are interacting with the student, as the interaction among the student, peers, and adults gives the student the opportunity to learn from others. Other researchers have presented models similar to Vygotsky's model. For example, Bruner (1965) stressed how the growth of the mind is always increasing when assisted from the outside. Bandura (1978) contended that psychological functioning involves a continuous reciprocal interaction between behavioral, cognitive, and environmental influences and Perry, Nordby, and Vandekamp (2003) recommended tailoring instructions and activities to the needs of the student.

Several authors suggest that combining reading and writing instruction is optimal for developing writing skills. For example, Atwell's (1997) writing workshops provide students with an environment that incorporates reading to maximize the overall learning experiences. Calkins (1989) stresses the importance of using reading and writing workshops in meaningful activities to facilitate students' everyday writing. Graves (1995) focuses on providing writers with choices during writer's workshop.

<div align="center">Problem Statement</div>

At the site, results of the Florida Writes Examination were considerably lower than the district's average (Table 1). If the school's scores did not improve within the

next year, the federal government would intervene, making mandatory decisions, and in addition to government intervention, the school would have an unfavorable reputation because it would be listed as a critically low-performing school.

Table 1

Comparison of Site School and District-wide Florida Writes Scores.

Possible Scores on Florida Writes	Site School Expository		Site School Narrative		District Expository		District Narrative	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1
5.5	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	1
5	0	0	0	0	5	1	41	2
4.5	0	0	0	0	17	1	55	2
4	1	3	1	1	55	2	178	8
3.5	0	0	4	9	105	4	314	14
3	11	27	7	15	328	13	604	27
2.5	10	24	4	9	403	16	235	10
2	7	17	9	20	755	31	412	18
1.5	5	12	12	26	403	16	235	10
1	7	17	9	20	384	15	161	7
Sum	41		46		2457		2252	

Note: The values in the "Site School" and "District" columns represent the number of students in each category who received that score/percentage.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine if a researcher-developed language arts program for fifth grade students would improve their basic writing skills. This approach incorporated teaching reading in conjunction with writing in order to improve writing skills.

Research question

Will students who participate in a researcher-developed language arts program improve their writing skills more than a group taught with standard methodology?

Hypothesis

At the end of the study, test scores of students participating in the researcher-developed language arts writing program will be significantly higher than those of students taught with the standard school methodology.

Limitations

Although each class was matched according to various domains, some differences between groups may have been present. The results may not generalize to students with different demographic characteristics.

Definition of Terms

<u>Convention</u> - commonly accepted rules for editing American English (spelling, usage, capitalization, punctuation, and variation in sentence structure).

<u>Expository writing</u> - writing that gives information, explains why or how, clarifies a process, or defines a concept.

<u>Florida Writes Assessment</u> - test given to students in grades 4, 8, and 10. For this assessment, each student is given 45 minutes to read the prompt independently, plan their responses, and write their responses in a folder. A separate sheet is provided for planning and prewriting activities, such as outlining, clustering, mapping, and jotting down ideas. Within each classroom, students are randomly assigned one of two prompts. Fourth grade students respond to a prompt that asks them to explain (expository writing) or tell a story (narrative); eight and tenth grade students respond to a prompt that asks them to explain or persuade (persuasive writing).

<u>Focus </u>- the relationship of ideas to the main theme, point of view, or unifying point.

Holistic Scoring - method by which a trained reader evaluates a piece of writing for its overall quality.

Narrative Writing - recounts a personal or fictional experience or tells a story based on a real or imagined event.

Persuasive Writing - attempts to convince the reader that a point of view is valid or that reader should take a specific action.

Prompt - writing assignment that states the writer's task, including topic and purpose of writing.

Rubric - the scoring criteria at each score point of a scale.

Writing Process - recursive steps of prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, evaluating, and sharing that are used in the development of a piece of writing.

Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) - a program designed for students with specific learning disabilities which is a condition that affects one of the basic psychological processes involving gathering, storing, or retrieving information through sensory channels.

Language Learning Disabilities (LLD) - a program designed for students with a language disability. Speech and language impairments affect these students' ability to understand or appropriately use speech and language systems.

Emotional Handicapped (EH) - a program designed for students who are emotionally handicapped. Characteristics may include an inability to learn that cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors. The student is unable to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers or teacher. In addition, hyperactivity, aggressive responses, severe depression, and withdrawal are also characteristics.

English for Speakers of Other Language (ESOL) - a program designed for students who have a second language other than English. The student does not speak English fluently and has a primary language that is not English.

Accelerate Learning Program for students of High Abilities (ALPHA) - an accelerated learner program for students with high learning abilities. Students learn with little practice; interpret nonverbal cues and draw inferences independently; work independently at an earlier age and for longer periods of time; and can attack complicated material and analyze it systematically.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I presents an overview, background, theoretical framework, and purpose for the study. Chapter II reviews essential literature to provide the reader with an understanding of the subject area. The methodology, participants, procedures, and data analysis techniques are described in Chapter III. The results of the study are presented in Chapter IV. Chapter V contains the conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

For many years, teachers have taught reading and writing in isolation, however, the latest research studies lead one to believe that this methodology may not be the best approach. Weaver (1996) stated, "Studying grammar as a system, in isolation from its use, is not the best use of instructional time if better writing (or reading) is the intended goal of grammar study" (p. 179).

McGrath (1996) stated, "Writing is inextricably connected to reading" (p.16). When students read frequently, their writing skills improve. From studying the experimental results, McGrath identified four qualities of effective writing. First, effective writing is focused on the topic and does not contain unrelated information. Second, effective writing has an organizational pattern that enables the reader to follow the flow of ideas because it contains a beginning, middle, ending, and uses transitional devices. Third, effective writing contains supporting ideas that are elaborated through the use of details, examples, vivid language, and mature word choice. Fourth, effective writing follows the conventions of standard written English and has variation in sentence structure. McGrath concluded that good habits of speech will improve one's writing, but a better training method is to read examples of effective writing.

According to the Florida Writes assessment book (1997), students' success in writing can be enhanced by giving them frequent opportunities to express themselves through writing, beginning in kindergarten. The skill of effective writing cannot be taught in simply several easy lessons. A vast amount of emphasis in reading, as well as

spoken written language in all subject areas and all grade levels is needed to increase students' ability to write.

An earlier review by Burkland and Peterson (1986) revealed that reading and writing were considered solitary activities, but new studies indicate that writers develop knowledge through shared and discussed information (Bushman & Bushman, 1997). When students read frequently, their writing is favorably influenced a great deal. Many students begin to experiment with their writing by trying techniques they see published authors using. Bushman and Bushman support the theory that children learn to write from reading, and children learn to read from writing, although traditionally reading and writing have been taught in isolation.

A survey of the literature by Belanger (1987) and Stoksky (1983) revealed a high correlation between good readers and good writers and between poor readers and poor writers. They found that better writers read more than poor writers, and that better readers produced more complex writing than poorer readers.

The Interrelationship between Grammar, Reading, and Writing Skills

In order for students to be able to read anything from the classics to complex nonfiction, students need to understand the way sentences are put together. How well you speak is governed by your understanding of grammar and syntax. Grammar is who you are. Also, knowledge about the parts of a sentence enables students to understand writing. However, the staff of the Princeton Review (1996) further state, "Grammar class too often becomes an exercise in memorizing lifeless terminology and endless rules that have no apparent connection to anyone's life" (p. xiv).

Elbow (1981) points out that the purpose of a writing program is to produce more

capable writers. Although teaching writing in isolation may improve certain skills, students need to see the visual model. When making the connection between reading and writing, students do not need to use the grammar book to learn the language conventions used in writing literature. Through the use of literary works, students are able to see the usage of metaphor, simile, dialogue, imagery, and many other conventions that authors use.

Consistent with these ideas, Weaver (1996) recommended that teachers teach grammar in the context of reading. Weaver suggested that students should learn how to use different sentence structures through reading various reading materials. He felt teachers should "Promote acquisition and use of grammatical constructions through reading" (p. 26). Literature is a powerful medium for conveying good writing skills to students, and teachers should immerse students in literature that is interesting for them to read.

Zaragoza and Vaughn (1995) contended that students' perceptions are important because they provide insight into types of teacher practices that are helpful or appreciated. In one of the studies conducted, students were interviewed on the topic of written expression. The interviewers followed the same set of students for three years and told the students that they were interested in learning how young children learned. The interviewers concluded that students prefer to be given opportunities to choose their own topics, but they also enjoy being assigned topics by the teacher. When it came to checking for conventions, students needed some type of published work to aid them in their learning. The results indicated that students felt the teacher should not be solely

responsible for teaching punctuation, but that students should have some responsibility

to learn it on their own by reading stories and analyzing various skills in the books.

According to Graves (1995), teachers should encourage students to choose their

own writing topics, write almost every day, use revision as a natural tool of writing, and

learn the mechanics of writing in the context of reading and writing. There was evidence

that good readers and writers themselves differ from poor ones in their processing of

expository text.

Loban & Marasculo (1969) found that language processing is basic to both

reading and writing.   In a 12 year longitudinal study that revealed reading and writing

were related to each other and to oral language. When people are engaged in formal or

informal conversations, they use language that they heard other speaker use in

conversations, and what they learned from reading.

<div align="center">Traditional Teacher Preparation</div>

Kucer (2001) reported that teachers are required by federal policies to focus on

reading and mathematics and ignore writing, even though research has supported that

cognitive skills are needed to acquire reading and writing skills. With this being said,

beginning teachers coming out of internship to the classroom are challenged on how to

teach writing. Teachers are restricted to teaching reading only to meet standardized

testing policy. Some school districts require teachers to follow a system set in place by

their institution.

Beginning teachers come equipped with background knowledge obtained through

internship studies and teacher preparation classes. Pardo (2006) examined various

researchers' systems for organizing teachers' knowledge. As expressed by Kennedy

(2002), teachers' fund of information consists of three kinds of knowledge: craft, systematic knowledge, and prescriptive knowledge. Craft is acquired through experience; systematic knowledge is learned in internship studies; and prescriptive or professional knowledge is obtained through instruction. Between strict federal policies and lack of experience, beginning teachers find it a challenge to teach writing effectively.

Teachers' preparations have been influenced by traditional practices to teach reading in isolation from writing. The practice of integrating reading and writing cannot flourish in a standardized environment. In spite of research supporting positive influences of integrated reading and writing curriculums, many schools have supported skill-oriented approaches.

According to Kahn, Walter, and Johannessen (1994), there is supportive evidence for the need to combine instruction in reading and writing. Literature and composition are both essential parts of the language arts and English curriculum. However, they have been separated rather than integrated within these curricula. Classroom instruction has been planned around concrete units of each: a literature unit, followed by a language or composition unit, and so forth. To help increase students' skills, the English curriculum should instead find ways in which literature and composition instruction can complement one another. Children learn to read from writing and learn to write from reading; the skills complement each other.

New Approaches to Teaching Writing

Moxley (1989) contended that teachers need to re-examine their theories and practices in the classroom. Moxley examined the research of other writers and developed the following principles that should be included in a writing program: (1) the primary

focus of all writing courses should be on the students' writings; (2) students need an

equally strong background in writing and literature course; (3) writing can be learned; (4)

writing is valuable in and of itself and does not need publication to validate it;

(5) American high schools and colleges should foster students' language and literacy by

requiring students to enroll for at least one course in creative writing; (6) teachers need to

talk about writing holistically and in the context of the creative process; (7) writers

should know that writing and the teaching of writing are life long apprenticeships, writers

and teachers are perpetual learners; (8) writing teachers must be writers, and they should

model to students their own writings; (9) writers go through different developmental

stages throughout their writings; (10) successful writer take risks; (11) learners have to

learn to draw on their own intuitive, prelinguistic, bodily feeling; (12) writers must be

persistent; and (13) writing is cognitive and affective process. Moxley emphasizes

throughout his book how important it is for readers to be writers. Teachers need to teach

students to read like writers, and teachers should teach students how to become active

readers.

   Atwell (1997) shared personal stories about learning to teach language arts in the

classroom. When Atwell first started teaching, only a few of the students were meeting

the desired learning outcomes of the language art curriculum. Atwell recognized the

discrepancy and decided to implement a strategy to meet the needs of all the students. .

Using the work of Graves (1983, 1984), Murray (1984, 1985), Calkins (1986), Sowers

(1982), and Giacobbe (1984) as a guideline, Atwell started a reading and writing

workshop to help facilitate student learning, and the results were astounding. Atwell's

students' increase in achievement made it possible to receive funds from Title IV-C.

Atwell (1997) shared personal stories about learning to teach language arts in the classroom. When Atwell first started teaching, only a few of the students were meeting the desired learning outcomes of the language art curriculum. Atwell recognized the discrepancy and decided to implement a strategy to meet the needs of all the students. . Using the work of Graves (1983, 1984), Murray (1984, 1985), Calkins (1986), Sowers (1982), and Giacobbe (1984) as a guideline, Atwell started a reading and writing workshop to help facilitate student learning, and the results were astounding. Atwell's students' increase in achievement made it possible to receive funds from Title IV-C. With the funds a new curriculum was developed. The new curriculum included these principles to address student learning: writers need regular chunks of time to think, write, confer, read, and organize their thoughts; writers need their own topics; writers need to know adults who write; writers need to read; and writing teachers need to take responsibility for their own knowledge.

Warner (1993) questioned in an article why teachers continue to use methods of teaching that are not appropriate for their students. He found that many educators taught grammar because it is dictated from the curriculum or higher authorities, not because they wanted to. Warner also stated that some teachers lacked certain skills to teach grammar because in their past teacher training courses they were not taught how to teach grammar. As a result, most teachers used the method of teaching they learned from their own experience in school, and even if strategies were used in the classroom to add creativity to the lessons, the students still did not achieve the desired outcomes. The writing curriculum for what students are expected to learn has changed tremendously.

Studies of Piaget, Lawrence, and Kohlberg, as cited by Warner (1993), indicated

that the teacher should be aware of individual student levels of cognitive development. Warner's research reflected that only about half of the adolescent population reaches the highest levels of formal operation thinking, which may be the level of abstraction required to achieve the fundamentals of traditional English grammar. Warner concluded that language develops through the use of language and not through exercise in the naming of parts.

Beach and Marshall (1991) believed that reading, discussing, and writing about literature help students to better understand what text means. The study of literature provides practice in reading comprehension and can greatly enhance students' vocabulary as well as their ability to synthesize and think critically about the material they are asked to read. The best way to teach writing is to engage students in the writing process. This includes planning, writing, revising, and editing. A well-written piece can best be described as incorporating elements of writing in such a way that a reader can experience the writer's intended meaning, understanding, and premise, and then accept or reject the writer's point of view.

Langer (1992) studied the current practice in the teaching of the English language area. Constructivist approaches have made a large contribution to theory guiding the teaching of writing and reading, but have less clearly developed a relationship to the teaching of literature. Older frameworks, derived from stressing basic skills, liberal education and person growth, continue to assert themselves. Newer frameworks derived from constructivist principles, have gained influence but have yet to result in well-articulated guidelines for curriculum instruction.

Lewis, Wray, and Rospigliosi (1994) explained how teachers could use reading

strategies to help students understand text and incorporate these strategies into their written responses. The practitioners in the Exeter Extending Literacy Project (EXEL) focused their project on children's responses to nonfiction text. The result of the study revealed improvements in student paragraph writing and reading comprehension. The authors state "Paragraph frames can help familiarize children with the written forms to be found in different nonfiction genres" (p. 529).

Ferrante (1997) shared the transformation of knowledge learned as a student transitioned from grade school to the college. Instead of being influenced by what outsiders said would work inside of the classroom, Ferrante decided to do what worked for the students. In developing an individual approach to teaching, the author became a student again, "The teachers' process of defining herself or himself as a writer means becoming a student again by walking in the shoes of the pupil" (p. 16). In addition, the author made reference to how literary texts influenced approaches to teaching, and how punctuation marks were learned by imitating the ones used throughout the texts of published authors.

Calkins (1986) expressed how drills on missing punctuation have little carryover into students' writings. It does not matter whether students can list the sixteen uses of a comma or define a prepositional phase. Instead, what does matter is that the student can apply the correct punctuation mark when necessary. English can be learned best through purposeful activities that are manifested in reading and writing workshops.

Arnold, Smith, Flood, and Lapp (1989) stated, "Equally important as reading to the development of literate citizens is the ability to write fluently and responsibly on a variety of topics" (p. T13). Throughout the use of literature, the teacher can help students

to see the role of the writer through reading, and the role of the reader through writing. Teachers should encourage students to respond and react to literature through writing. According to Wordsmith (2005) many schools have integrated reading and writing as part of their literacy programs and have seen positive results. Some schools have become winners of national reading awards. Success for one school lead to an event called "Drop Everything and Write." Drop everything and write allowed students to stop whatever they were doing and begin to write. These sessions allowed students to write freely while maintaining relevancy.

For several years, one particular school was the winning participant in an event called the "Rochland Read-In-Day." During this event students spent the whole day reading and recording their time. Events like these motivated the students and led to a biannual Write-In-Day. It is believed the school's success in writing is attributable to the reading and writing workshop that taught skills of reading and writing together. During workshop discussions, students' responses to literature took place. The workshop used rich literature to increase the reading and writing connection.

Routman (1997) shared similar views as Pardo. After viewing information about California's low test scores, and seeing integrated curriculum taking the blame, Routman come to the defense of supporting integrated language. Routman found other contributing factors that played a role in the low scores. There were a large number of second language students, staff were improperly trained, and limited resources were provide for proper instruction of the integrated curriculum. Routman believed reading and writing instruction can be enhanced with highly knowledgeable teachers rather than prescriptive manuals of how and what to teach. Narratives written by prize winning

authors and illustrators should be utilized to accomplish successful writing across the curriculum. When educators are given sufficient time, training, and resources for whole language instruction, the results are positive. Consequently, the students would be exposed to true representation of the writing and reading processes which lead to enhanced writing. Integrated curriculum once implemented correctly can provide a rich literature-based environment. Despite low scores, California continued to incorporate integrated curriculum along with skilled oriented tasks to provide a balanced environment.

Cited in a review of Canadian Modern Language (2006), a review of Kucer's *Dimensions of Literacy: A Conceptual Base for Teaching Reading and Writing in School Settings* (2005) book depicted his dissatisfaction with the American literacy system. He suggested that most schools' reading and writing texts covered the minimum level of text features. They are controlled by federal and institutional policies as reported previously, and instead he holds that texts should emphasize all genres of literatures. To support a more integrated curriculum, Kucer has written literature on how to implement an integrated curriculum and produced hand-on activities to help build literacy. Kucer motivated educators and inspired them to instruct the best way possible for better readers and writers.

Culham (2006) proposed to tackle the writing dilemma by developing six traits. These traits would help address some of the issues that plagued poor writing. The traits helped students and teachers discuss components of writing which were ideas, organization, voice, word choice, sentence fluency, and conventions. Presentation of writing would be added later. These terms reverberated between teachers and students to

increase understanding of quality writing. Students would relate to these terms and use them in their writing. The traits are used as assessment tools to talk about writing. To make a powerful combination, traits are combined with the writing workshop. Once the writing workshop was incorporated, the infusion of literature supported writing and reading skills. The traits along with the writing workshop provided new knowledge and instructional practices toward reading and writing. These two approaches empowered the writing process. In the classroom, the writing process was used to help writers figure out what to say and how to write it.

Culham (2006) stressed the use of the writing process during the writing workshop and she used the traits for language development during the workshop. The traits and workshop incorporated the skills of reading and writing along with other skills that are essential to better writing. Writing workshops allowed students to think, write, reflect, revise, edit, and collaborate. These traits responded to real writing. The workshop benefited teachers also. Teachers were provided with a built-in model that assisted students in learning writing. The writing workshop and the six traits helped students and teachers become successful in the writing process. The combination of the two components - the traits and writing workshop - strengthened the knowledge of how text in reading and writing is constructed.

It was through trial and error that Hawkins (2006), who had given a school assignment, realized how reading and writing can be used for writing content. Her students worked on a history research paper and finished it for presentation. The teacher noted at this point that students did not comprehend the assignment and their writing reflected it. The teacher called into action a plan to enhance content and writing.

The plan would be called "Writing for Content." The plan suggested the students need to build background on topics before doing writing. Reading literature about the topic of their interest provided knowledge. Reading skills enhanced comprehension of text and writing. In this way text structure, writing, and reading concepts are explored through literature.

McConachie, Hall, Resnick, Ravi, Bill, Bintz and Taylor (2006) reported that some schools' leaders have taken on different approaches to school literacy instruction. Disciplinary literacy is introduced by the school leaders on the basis that students can acquire meaningful and conceptual knowledge in a discipline only by using the habits of reading, writing, speaking, and thinking. This model of integrated arts instruction has been shown to support comprehension. One organization, The Institute for Learning at the University of Pittsburg, introduced a disciplinary Framework in 2002 based on five principles. The principles supported inquiry-based instruction that integrated academic content with thinking in disciplines. The principles suggested that before any knowledge can be developed in any discipline, students need opportunity to read, write, investigate, and speak about content.

While most researchers focused on classroom use of integrated literacy, the report of Perry, Nordby and Vandekamp (2003) focused on comparing home to the classroom learning environment of high and low achievers. All students came from similar family backgrounds. Parents of the students provided background information on the learning environment at home. They were asked how do their children learn to read?

In relation to two theories of teaching reading, classroom instruction and home learning environment were compared. Some students' home learning environment

resembled the classroom and others did not. In some of the home environments, reading

was more pronounced than in the classroom, parents did a lot of reading, and students

were provided with a variety of resources for reading and writing.

Some parents reported their children learned to read by using words they already

knew to figure new and difficult words. This approach relates to the theory called "Top-

Down" theory. The Top-Down theory emphasizes the comprehension skills of reading.

Homes that followed the Top-Down theory provided a richer and meaningful reading and

writing environment.

Other parents reported children learned to read by acquiring skills in a particular

order which relates to the "Bottom-Up" theory. The Bottom-Up theory has specific

reading and writing skills taught in order. Literature was provided, but used differently to

teach literacy. They followed the skill-oriented process. Skills were taught in a

particular order.

In the classroom, reading and writing were presented in comprehensive and

meaningful activities. Students controlled their actions toward learning which is known

as "self regulating" according to the authors (Perry, Nordby & Vandekamp 2003). The

teacher followed a Top-down theory of instruction in the classroom. Activities centered

on cognitive skills which included making and checking predictions. Storybooks

examples of letter writing were used as prompts. Students' writing of letters to a

classmate utilized all writing aspects of writing process of planning, drafting, checking

revising, and publishing. The teacher provided students with the freedom of choice to

control what to read, write, and draw. The writings were used to check mechanics and

grammar. Evaluation of thinking and writing was made through predictions.

The sharing of students' writings with each other influenced discussion and support for each other. The activities characterized reading and writing skills existing together. In the homes of high achievers, classroom activities were similar. Homes of low achievers did not reflect the Top-Down theory of learning in the classroom that promoted high achievers of reading and writing.

This study showed how the Top-Down theory of reading and writing used in the home and classroom increased student achievement. The Bottom-Up theory reported the reverse. Instruction of Bottom-Up theory resembles traditional ways of learning that teaches reading in isolation from writing. Skills are followed in a particular order and students scored lower on reading and writing assignments. Tailoring instruction and activities in Top-Down theory supported students' development in reading and writing, and improved performance.

Other supporters of integrated curriculum, Brock and Raphael (2003), reported how integrated reading and writing aided children in writing a formal piece of work to be published. Students were to write about how the Book Club program in school influenced them. This project would teach them how to write for an unknown audience that included editors and scholars. Attention was giving to the writing process as well as how to write for different audiences. The audience dictated the writing styles. For instance, a letter to a friend was less formal than writing to a teacher. The progression of the project was carefully facilitated by teachers while letting children maintain control of their own voices and ideas. The students wrote about skills and strategies learned in book club and how they incorporated these skills in the doing this project. Books read in the club covered a variety of skills. Reading and discussion of books were evaluated.

Literary responses allowed students to develop character maps of stories, draw pictures, and write in logs. Ideas that were important to the students were discussed and written about. The students followed the writing process of planning, drafting, revising and editing related to written literature. After reporting and writing about the experience of the book club, the students produced their first draft. It was edited and revised. Facilitated by teachers, the students were able to finish the writing project that incorporated reading and writing skills learned in book club. They had written the chapter to be presented and published for a new audience of editors and scholars. Book club allowed them to become better writers. Graves (1983, 1994) and Hansen (1983, 1987) noted that writers learn to write by writing and not by rules. The production of language should not be taught in isolation from writing.

Wang and Odell's (2003) case study comparing reformed and traditionally-based instruction sought to solve conflicting beliefs of preservice teachers and their mentors about instructional practices of reading and writing. The data were composed from surveys and interviews. Preservice teachers' ideas and views were quite different from that of their mentors in reading and writing instruction. Their teaching knowledge conflicted with their mentors, standardized policies, and institutional context.

A plan needed to be implemented to solve conflicting views related to writing instruction. A program was proposed in hopes of solving the conflicts. Here again, the writing workshop was implemented. During the program, preservice teachers explored how students developed their own thinking about text, acquired conventions through literature, and how students elicited responses about their writing from teachers and peers. The workshop supported students to take control and ownership of their work.

Through the writing workshop, preservice teachers learned to use literature to integrate reading and writing skills and showed students how to take control and ownership over their work. As a result, it reformed preservice teachers' way of thinking about writing.

In hopes of correlating preservice teachers and mentors' beliefs on instruction practices, the writing workshop included the mentors. Mentors participated in seminars that covered mentoring and new philosophies. They were shown the new strategies that supported integrated reading and writing and how to let students maintain control of their work.

After taking part in the program, the preservice teachers' beliefs gradually changed. Their traditional ways of thinking of reading and writing instruction changed. Previously, they believed teachers should control the students by telling them what to do. However, when students are told what to do, their ideas reflect the instructor's ideas and the students have less control and ownership of their work. In this study, the mentors' beliefs also changed towards writing instruction. They realized that writing instruction should promote students thinking and communication skills. These skills are supported through reading and background experience. This would help them grow as learners. In conclusion, the two sides came together with new ideas from writing workshop that influenced students' writings.

Smith (2003) is another supporter in favor of reading and writing instruction as equal. He examined the term and methodology of literature-driven integrated language. "Literature-driven" curriculum used literature such as short stories, novels, poems for language arts programs. The reading experience is dominated by literature-based as opposed to skill-oriented. This approach to language arts is referred to as integrated in

which reading, writing, and grammar are treated equally. This approach targeted students' performance in the reading and writing areas.

The study sought to find out if a literature-based approach worked toward the skilled-oriented objectives to improve grammatical skills of low achieving fifth graders. A teacher incorporated a webbing technique with children's literature to teach skills and concepts essential to literacy. Read-alouds were used over an eight month period to increase vocabulary. Students were exposed to 515 vocabularies during the eight month period. Based on research by Tunnell and Jacobs (1989) and Elley (1989) read-alouds exposed students to vocabulary. The teacher assessed the webbing technique and read-alouds by comparing scores of students' Iowa Tests of Basic Skills at the end of the year to scores the previous years. The teacher noted extraordinary improvement in vocabulary, reading, and spelling. This case study further supported how integration of reading, writing skills can be enhanced through a Literature -based approach (Smith, 2003).

Feng and Powers (2005) contributed to the integrated curriculum of reading, writing and other language arts areas. Feng and Powers did a study on the long and short term effects of error-based grammar instructions on writing for fifth grade students. Error-based grammar used mini lessons to target errors in students' previous work. This error- based grammar approach believes that grammar should be taught in reading and writing. Weaver, McNally and Moerman (2001) state, "to teach or not teach grammar is not the question; it is a matter of what and how to teach it" (p. 2). Feng and Powers were opposed to isolated teaching of grammar rules and concepts. Their approach involved using mini lesson charts and an overhead projector to display

text with errors. Corrections were then made to the text.

Throughout the year, the long term effect of mini lessons decreased the number and types of grammatical errors found in writing. The error-base approach enhanced instruction and learning of grammar and writing processes. The students found errors that were intentionally placed in text literature. Finding errors in text help students to correct their own writing. They also made corrections to their own writing after practicing finding in text errors that were intentionally placed. This approach gave teachers new techniques for teaching reading and writing together. Mini lessons placed on overhead projectors displayed text of literature to be corrected and provided a better image and view of the lessons. Feng and Power concluded that students in the study improved in accuracy of grammar related items. Mini lessons helped students increase awareness of error in text. Cramer (2004) says, "Teaching grammar in context of writing means stressing revision, editing, teacher-modeling grammatical concepts through mini lesson, and mechanical topic drawn from an analysis of students' weaknesses and strengths" (p. 4).

Alanis (2004) reviewed several views on integrated curriculum. Graves (1983) shared how children who examine writing in the writer's workshop instead of going through a basal reader, learned to read while they learn to write. Journals and interactive writing are activities used to support reading and writing. Alanis (2004) suggested as children learned to read they learn how spoken and written language related to each other. Interacting with readers, writers, and speakers children became aware language. Through story book read-alouds children learned new words, new ideas, and sentence structure.

Teaching reading involves other areas of knowledge and teaching it in isolation does not teach the whole child. Developing literacy depends on a child's knowledge about the writing system. A writing system that involves integrated reading, writing, and a spoken language promotes whole literacy. Teaching either in isolation does not support whole language. Alanis (2004) commented that literature read alouds promote oral language which supports written language. Marie Clay (1991)suggests "it is valuable to draw students' attention to the distinctive characteristics of written languages" (p. 11). Read-alouds can help define special features of writing. Marie Clay suggested that readers need to read like writers and write with an audience in mind.

Johnston and Giorgis (2003) also contributed to the reading and writing connections. They suggest children "read, read, read; children learn to write whenever they open a book" (p. 6). Sharing the same beliefs as others who supported integrated curriculum, Johnston and Giorgis contend that storytelling can help in recognizing format, writing a poem and how characters reflect real people talk. Through storytelling, important skills are taught: grammar, sentence structure, and conventional spelling. Also, expressed by the authors, books can teach writing. Writing bestows value in students when ownership of their ideas is controlled by them. "You Have to Write," by Janet Wong and Teresa Flavin (2002) encourages readers to be personal in their writing. Wong states "No one else can say what you have seen and heard and felt today" (p. 6).

Joining the phenomenon of integrated reading and writing curriculum, McDonough (2006) shares this view. McDonough's view is related to Calkin (1986,

1990) and Graves (1983, 1994) view of using the writing workshop approach to literacy. McDonough implemented a program called Power Writers in the classroom. Power Writers incorporates the writing workshop into its design. Power Writer's staff came to the school weekly to help with the writing program. Power Writers have had positive effects in the school that was described as very disadvantaged. The program helped develop a community of caring between students and staff. The program enlisted local writers, novelists, and poets to come share their work. Power Writers work with schools to build a literate, professional, and productive staff. Teachers supported Power Writer 100%. Power Writers suggest that an effective learning environment includes rich literature, eight weeks writing cycles that end with publication, ongoing assessment of students work, weekly evaluation of instructional improvement, and weekly demonstration of lessons provided by staff developers of power writers. All should be implemented in a whole school caring environment which involves parents' participation. Once these steps are in place along with the writing workshop approach, students develop a positive approach to writing.

In a position paper Perrone (1991) evaluated how standardized tests influence writing. Testing does not lend itself to the integrated approach of reading and writing. Also, testing has boxed in the creative and personal experience writing has to offer. The classroom setting for writing is controlled by traditional approaches that leave little room for creativity and ownership of students' work. Students' work is influenced by standardized test that confined students' writing abilities to a one time session. Therefore, writing cannot be adequately evaluated when meeting criteria for standardized test.

Seeing where standardized tests produce mediocre results, educators planned for change (Perrone, 1991). With an understanding that a child's writing abilities cannot be assessed in a one time sitting, a single piece of work, and controlled by classroom practices, educators redirected their approaches toward assessment of writing. Perrone expressed that teachers who encourage active writing programs must be aware that writing takes thought, time, and personal experience, and it is connected to an individual's way of interpreting the world. To know subject area content is to know how to write about it. For better instruction and learning, teachers realize the classroom setting should be accommodating to meet the writing needs of students. Improvement in instructional practice, ownership in work, and abundance of books must be apart of the learning process. Perrone states, "teachers recognize that children have *much more* to talk and write about in settings where the ongoing school experience of the students is rich; teachers read a great deal to children, giving emphasis to authorship and personal style; books are plentiful; active learning is promoted; the world is permitted to intrude, to blow through the classroom (p.8).

In this sense, writing is not something apart; rather, "it has a context and that context is important to understanding the writing" (Perrone, 1991, p.10). The author further explained how one school district redirected its traditional approach to an integrated approach to improve literacy. The district of Grand Forks, North Dakota decided to change its approach to enhance students' writing. The district allowed teachers control of implementing the integrated curriculum. Teachers in the district collaborated plans that would benefit the writing curriculum. They took the responsibility of evaluating students' writings because they worked closest to students.

Teachers incorporated the writing workshop approach to teaching writing. They shared ideas and experiences about their own practices. They reflected and read work produced by students in the workshop setting. Teachers documented and recorded students' writing samples to track progression. Teachers evaluated students through a holistic process. Criteria for writing included clear message, logical sequence, voice, and mechanics. Teachers were able to respond to writings that met these criteria effectively. The incorporation of the writing workshop approach supported the integration of reading and writing. It also helped teachers improve their own writing and evaluation. Teachers did ongoing assessment at the beginning, during, and end of the year. Through the writing workshop, the district vision to change a traditional approach of writing to an integrated approach enhanced the learning environment.

Koumy and Salam (1997) assessed the effect of integrated reading and writing for native speakers and non-native speakers. The results were positive for native speakers, but not for non-native speakers. It is suggested that differences may lie with the instruction methods, language proficiency, or language spoken outside the classroom. A suggestion to improve integrated instruction of reading and writing was made by simultaneous teaching of reading and writing from the beginning of language instruction. Also, teachers need better training and preparation. A classroom environment supported by integrated reading and writing would benefit students that are natives and non-natives. Research in the reading and writing relationship is "necessary if we are to guide curriculum development in reading and writing more soundly and effectively" (Stotsky, 1983, p.2).

As expressed by Beaugrande (1979) some educators believed integrating reading

and writing would reverse the thinking process of how we learn. This theory is known as "Bottom-Up" theory in the report of Perry, Nordby, and Vandekamp (2003). It is suggested that school curriculums that identify with this theory suffer because of improper instruction in reading and writing treated as separate. Literacy as researched is best taught through integrated curriculum of reading and writing with an emphasis in literature.

Mckusick, Holmberg, Marello, and Little (2001) point out that the development of this new approach of integrating reading and writing has been expanding across the school communities. Some school districts have taken quick steps to try out the new approach. Some have been apprehensive and are gradually moving toward integrated curriculum. Others have investigated and researched the theory before diving in. In the attempt to define the new approach that would benefit educators who are apprehensive, the authors share viewpoints of other theorists. Psycholinguistics Kintsch and Van Dijk (1978) suggest "a reader employs cyclical processing of microproposition, using selective memory, and prior knowledge to create a new mental text" (p. 2). To grasp an understanding of a new concept one must retain ideas that are relevant to the topic and have a background experience related to content knowledge. Students construct meaning based on prior knowledge (Bruner, 1965).

Rosenblatt (1978) contends that comprehension is a transaction between the reader and the work. Understanding of text is related to prior knowledge and is a bond that the reader shares with the task at hand. Other theorists, Pearson and Tierney (1984) developed a "composing model." Readers will use this model as they read and work on activities of planning, composing, editing, and monitoring. Readers would develop an

understanding of meaning through ongoing questioning of the topic as they read.

"Reading to write" a concept by Flower (1990) suggested, critical literacy necessary for success in college includes emphasis on questioning source information and transforming ideas to use them for new purposes. According to Bartholomae and Petrosky (1986) suggests that students take control of their abilities to make new ideas, read and write for their own reasons. Students need an environment to express their writing freely. They should be able to learn through literature of their own interest. Their writing would be more personal to them.

According to McKusick, Holmberg, Marello, and Little (2001), theorists have proposed supportive concepts on the topic of integrated reading and writing. McKusick et al. reported on the experience of one school's approach to integrating reading and writing. The new approach has worked wonders for some which inspired the upper-level school to try the new concept of teaching reading and writing together. While the idea of change seems logical to help students understand the connection between reading and writing, one most precede with caution if he has not been properly prepared. So as the investigation progressed the school was ready to explore the integrated curriculum. Their plan consisted of two teachers who in the past taught reading and writing separately. The teachers decided to teach as a team. The goals were to give students control of their own voice and ideas through meaningful and thematic activities. The teachers felt positive about the new approach because they had some knowledge about reading and writing.

Soon after, problems with time constraints and lack of knowledge as to how to integrate the reading and writing frustrated the teachers. They were finding it difficult to cover both areas. They grew discouraged and abandoned the plan to integrate reading

and writing. Sometime after, they went into revision and discovered why the plan failed the first time. Because of inadequate teacher preparation, the plan did not work. Before reproaching the new concept again, the teachers spent time building knowledge that surpasses their past experience. They attended conferences that helped them to develop new models toward integrated curriculum. Once equipped with their new knowledge they re-implemented their plan and it was successful. To conclude, the researchers realized how lack of prior knowledge and poor teacher preparation caused the new approach to fail. After revision, new knowledge and focus helped successfully revive the integrated approach.

Tamborrino (2004), a fifth grade teacher, presented her philosophy of integrated language arts. Ms. Tamborrino stated, "instructing through a literature-based integrated reading and language arts program is driven by my philosophy that the components of language arts should not be fragmented." She also stated, "the parts are interdependent, and integration is the key to an effective language arts/reading program," (Tamborrino 2004, p1). Integrating literature and literacy has fueled new energy into her daily teaching plans. The classroom now provides a literature rich environment that fosters responsive listening, speaking, reading, and writing. She balances her integrated approach with the fifth grade proficiency standards for language arts. Through a thematic approach and a host of award winning literature she has created a motivating environment that focus on the integrated reading, writing, and oral language skills.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

The importance of teaching writing through the context of literature can be broken down into several components. According to researchers, the Top-Down Theory

approach emphasizes a meaningful language arts curriculum by teaching writing through reading (Perry, Nordby & Vandekamp, 2003). The purpose of any writing program should be to produce more capable writers (Elbow, 1981). There is a high correlation between good readers and good writers (Belanger, 1987 and Stoksky, 1983). When students read frequently, their writing improves (McGrath, 1996).

Literature is a powerful, visual model to use for conveying good writing skills. Students are able to analyze how accomplished writers write. As a result, students start applying similar writing techniques to their own writings (Zaragoza and Vaughn,1995). According to researchers, teachers should teach writing through the context of reading with the student's own writing being at the center (Weaver, 1996; Atwell, 1997; Graves, 1995; Calkins, 1986; Perrone, 1991; and Culham, 2006).

Writing requires the writer to have an understanding of the topic he or she must write about. For this reason, it is important to build background knowledge about the topic. To grasp an understanding of new concepts, one must retain ideas that are relevant to the topic (Kintsh and Van Dijk , 1978). Students come to school with varied background knowledge; therefore, it is paramount for teachers to select instructional materials that will assist in the building of background knowledge (Dorr, 2006).

A writing system that involves teaching writing through reading provides opportunities for students to listen to the spoken language. Literature read alouds facilitates oral language which supports written language (Johnston, Giorgis 2003 & Alanis, 2004). The language process is basic to both reading and writing (Loban & Marasculo, 1969). When people are engaged in formal and informal conversations, they use language they heard others use. In addition, read-alouds exposed students to

vocabulary Tunnell, Jacobs (1989) and Elley (1989).

<div align="center">Importance of the Study</div>

Teaching writing through the context of reading may be the solution to increasing student achievement in writing. Educational leaders must base curriculum decisions on such data-driven research. The study of teaching writing through reading compared to teaching writing in isolation of reading will provide educators with the needed information to make an informed decision. This research will impact theory and policy in the field of leadership in education because the question of teaching writing in isolation of reading compared to teaching writing through the context of reading will be answered. The results of the comparison will answer the question as to whether to implement such a program.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Introduction

This study was designed to determine if a researcher-developed language arts program would improve the basic writing skills of fifth grade students.

Research Design

This research emphasizes a combination of action research, using a treatment and control group, and a Quasi-experimental design. The researcher implemented an integrated language arts program inside the classroom using two classes of 5th graders for a period of 14 weeks. The control group did not receive the experimental treatment and had a standard methodology that employed the county-prescribed curriculum that has been traditionally used in the past. Standardized pre and post test measure were taken assessing narrative and expository writing skills

Description of the Participants

The participants were two 5th grade classes, ages ranging between 10 and 11 years old. Gender included 13 girls and 12 boys in each class for a total of 25 students per class. Socioeconomic status was relatively low based on the number of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch. The school was an authorized Title 1 school (federal funds), as 81.2% of the students participated in the free and reduced lunch program. Many of the students came from low income rural communities and small towns with little or no industry.

Classroom Assignments

At the end of each year, the administrators and teachers used test data and Special Education classification to create classes for the next school year. The criteria were based on the following: reading ability (Initial Reading Inventory), special program placement (ESE, ESOL, and ALPHA), and Writing ability (Writing Portfolio Assessment). The administration team was aware of the study that the researcher was going to implement; therefore, emphasis was placed on creating two classes that were very similar in all respects. The treatment group had three students in ESOL, two in SLD, and one in ALPHA. Initial Reading Inventory results revealed that four students were reading above grade level; 15 on grade level; and six were below grade level. The control group consisted of four students reading above grade level; 17 on grade level; and four below grade level. The control group had three students in ESOL; one in SLD; and two in ALPHA.

To further ensure that the experimental and control groups were equivalent prior to beginning the study, the researcher analyzed each of the students background in the area of writing. The scores for the Writing Portfolio for the experimental and control groups are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2

Writing Portfolio Assessment

Score	Experimental Group Expository	Experimental Group Narrative	Percentage	Control Group Expository	Control Group Narrative	Percentage
6.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
5.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	2	2	16	3	2	20
2.5	2	1	12	2	2	16
2.0	11	3	56	7	4	44
1.5	1	3	16	0	5	20
1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: The values in Experimental group and Control group columns represent the number of students in each category who received that score. The chart reflects the experimental and control group each having 25 students. During this study all students were pretested with rubric scale to establish a baseline from which to assess their progress.

Independent variable

The methodology for teaching writing to fifth grade students was the independent variable. The experimental group was given a special, research-developed language arts program. The control group had a standard curriculum.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable was the score on a site developed rubric scoring key that measured student writing ability. A pretest was given during the first week of the program, a midterm test at the seventh week, and a posttest at the fourteenth week. In addition, the researcher used observation checklists (Appendixes D, E, F, G, and H) to monitor students' weekly progress toward reaching the desired goal.

Procedure

This program was implemented over a period of fourteen weeks during the1997/1998 school year. The experimental group participants were taught how to write effective paragraphs through an integrated whole language approach. The control group received the standard methodology using traditional materials prescribed by the county.

The control group was taught spelling, reading, and writing separately. The students used their spelling book to learn about new words. To help students with defining the definitions of the words, the students referred to the glossary in the back of the book. For reading, the students read one story a week and completed the assignment at the end of the story. For writing, the students used the English textbook and completed the assignments at the end of each lesson.

In contrast, the experimental students read and disseminated their reading stories on a weekly basis by identifying the spelling, punctuation, and grammar rules that apply. These experimental students wrote an essay in response to the reading story on a topic by the teacher. Also, volunteers visited the classroom and read to those students on a weekly basis to model to students the importance of reading and writing.

To assess experimental students progress, students were closely monitored throughout the entire 14 weeks through teacher observation, formal evaluations (beginning, middle, end), and individualized progress charts. To assess control students' progress, the teacher evaluated how they performed on the textbook assignments. The researcher chose fourth grade teachers to evaluate students' essays because of the intensive training in writing they have received at the district level. Reading volunteers were chosen

The researcher taught the experimental group, while a teacher of similar ability and experience taught the control group. Table 3 presents a comparison of the background of the two teachers and the ethnic makeup of the students in the two classes. In the experiential group, materials and supplies included Landscape Reading book, novels, newspapers, and construction paper to display the weekly spelling list on the word wall. In addition, the students participated in a weekly writing workshop. Finally, the teacher of the experimental group used an overhead projector to aide students with visualizing what effective writing mirrors.

Table 3

Teacher and Class Demographics

Categories	Teacher A (Experimental)	Teacher B (Control)
Years of teaching	3 years	3 years
Grades taught	3rd, 4th, and 5th	2nd, 4th, and 5th
Gender	Female	Female
Class ethnic group*	10(C), 9 (A), and 6 (M)	16 (C), 6 (A), and 3 (M)

*Caucasian (C), African American (A), and Mexican (M)

Student Evaluation

Prior to the study, the researcher reviewed the students' writing portfolios from the previous year and conducted a pre test. A team of trained fourth grade teachers evaluated the students' pretest to establish a baseline. The evaluation team consisted of the researcher and five teachers of fourth grade. Teachers received intensive training through highly qualified trainers from the district office and had a rubric they were taught to use. Every three weeks, throughout the study, the teachers assessed the experimental students' essays using formative evaluation and provided feedback to the students. In addition, the researcher used a weekly checklist (Appendix B) to monitor each student's progress toward reaching the project objectives. The criterion objectives identified below were used to guide the study and assess its effectiveness.

At the end of 14 weeks, eighty percent of the experimental group was expected to be able to:

a. Write a summary paragraph in response to literature in the form of topic sentence, detail sentences, and conclusion sentence.

b. Correctly use simple sentences, coordination conjunctions, and conjunctive adverbs.

c. Identify and use the writing process to write an effective essay as measured by qualified fourth grade teachers.

d. Identify and demonstrate the use of semicolon, comma, and period.

During the last week of the study, the researcher administered the post test which was evaluated by the evaluation team. The posttest assessed narrative and expository writing skills.

Experimental Activity

The experimental procedure consisted of the followings:

1. Pretests were given to determine students' current writing and reading levels.

2. Volunteers (principals; parents; special area teachers: music, art and physical education coach; computer teacher; and other school staff to include cafeteria manager; head custodian; guidance counselor; media specialist; and business partner) visited weekly to listen in on students' writing conferences, and on occasion they read to students.

3. Students identified parts of speech from their reading story daily.

4. Students wrote an essay on the topic of their choice or researcher's choice weekly.

5. Researcher read a story to the class on a daily basis.

6. Students read independently daily.

7. A volunteer came into the class weekly to read a story to the students.

8. Students read in whole group on a weekly basis.

9. Students read to another grade level.

10. The researcher conducted mini-lessons as determined by observation in groups.

11. Students performed a dramatic play based on a story from their reading book and performed it at the Parent Teacher Association meeting.

12. The student and a partner read and presented a poetry selection biweekly in the classroom.

13. Students read the newspaper on a weekly basis.

14. The researcher made observations weekly by using a checklist. The observation checklist (Appendix B) identified skills that the students mastered towards the objectives.

15. Using the reading story, students skimmed and scanned their reading story to locate punctuation marks they were not familiar with, and the researcher taught a mini-lesson. The researcher taught a mini-lesson on the unfamiliar punctuation marks and sentence structures according to students' request and students' observation checklist from their writing assignments.

16. Students participated in writing contests in children' magazine on a monthly basis.

17. In groups, students wrote their own commercial scripts and a dramatic play every three weeks.

Time line

The strategy used with experimental group covered 14 weeks during which the objective activities listed above were implemented. The week prior to implementation, the researcher (classroom teacher) invited parents to attend an informal meeting to learn about the program. The researcher also signed-up parent volunteers and staff members at the school.

Weekly Activities

Week 1

This week was designed for the pretest and presentation of an overview of the program to students.

Week 2

During this week, the researcher:

a. Taught students the stages of the writing process.

b. Taught students the strategies to use for learning the meaning of unfamiliar words (context clues).

c. Read a story to the class.

d. Used the overhead projector, modeled how to write a response to a reading story.

e. Had a volunteer visit the class to read to students.

f. Had each student read the book of his or her choice.

g. Had students read the newspaper.

Week 3

During this period, the researcher:

a. Taught students how to use figurative language.

b. Had students read poetry selection of their choice.

c. Used a highlighter to model to students how to locate the topic and supporting details

from a paragraph in the reading story.

d. Had the students use figurative language in their response after they read the literature

 to express how they felt about the story they read.

e. Had a volunteer read to students and listened in on a writing conference.

f. Had students in groups dramatize their poetry selection.

g. Had students read the newspaper.

Week 4

During the fourth week, the researcher taught students how to write a variety of complex

sentences.

a. The students used at least one complex sentence in their responses to literature.

b. The students dissected paragraphs of their choice from the class reading story.

c. The volunteer read to students and listened in on writing conference.

d. The students read the story of his or her choice.

e. The students wrote an expository essay (student's choice of topic).

f. The students read to another class.

g. The students read the newspaper.

Week 5

Several activities were accomplished during week five, specifically:

a. The researcher read a story to the students

b. The researcher had students copy a paragraph from their reading story, and with a

highlighter the students identified the main idea, supporting details, conclusion sentence,

and complex sentence.

c. The students read the book of their choice.

d. The students responded to literature and used a complex sentence.

e. The students wrote a narrative essay (teacher's choice of topic).

f. The students wrote an expository essay (student's choice).

g. The students made puzzles combining complex sentences.

h. The students presented their poetry selections.

I. Students read to another grade level.

j. Students read the newspaper.

Week 6

During week six,

a. A volunteer read to students.

b. The researcher read to students.

c. The students read in groups.

d. Each student read with a partner.

e. The students responded to literature by writing an expository essay.

f. Students read to another grade level.

g. Students read the newspaper.

Week 7

The mid term evaluation was administered during week seven.

Additionally,

a. The students in groups of fours wrote their own commercial script.

b. The researcher and volunteers assisted students in preparing for their commercial

presentation.

c. The students dramatized the plot from the reading story.

d. Students read the newspaper.

Week 8

During the eighth week,

a. The students modified their projects based on evaluation.

b. The students read independently the story of student's choice and responded in writing

to the literature.

c. The students listened to the researcher read a story from the class reading story.

d. The students listened to a volunteer read a story to a group of students. The volunteer

also sat in on a writing conference.

e. The students wrote a narrative essay (students' choice of topic).

f. The students read to another grade level.

g. The students read the newspaper.

Week 9

During this period,

a. The students read a story selected by the researcher.

b. The researcher read a story as determined by the students.

c. A volunteer listened in on groups reading.

d. The students responded to the literature they read.

e. The students wrote an expository essay (teachers' choice of topic).

f. Read to another grade level.

g. Dramatized the solution to the story.

h. Students read the newspaper.

Week 10

During the tenth week, the researcher brought into class a variety of children's magazines
and instructed students choose a contest, and write an expository or narrative essay to his
or her parent(s).

Week 11

During week eleven,

a. The students read in groups.

b. Students read independently.

c. A volunteer read to students.

d. The researcher read to students.

e. The students wrote a response to literature.

f. The students read and researcher wrote an invitation to invite all of the volunteers to
come view their dramatic play the following week.

g. Students pantomimed the plot of the poetry selection.

h. Students read the newspaper.

Week 12

During the twelfth week,

a. The students wrote a letter of thanks to the fourth grad teacher and all of the volunteers

b. Students sent out reminder notices to volunteers to attend their reader theater.

c. The students performed at the Parent Teacher Association meeting

d. The researcher read to the students

e. Students read the newspaper.

Week 13

The post test evaluation was conducted during week thirteenth.

Additionally,

a. The students read to another grade level.

b. The students wrote an expository essay explaining to the researcher how they felt about the project.

c. The researcher wrote an expository essay to the students to show appreciation for their participation in the program.

d. In groups, the students wrote and dramatized their own poetry selection.

e. Students read the newspaper.

Week 14

Students shared one of their best writings with the principals.

Method Used by Control Group

Unlike the experimental group, which was required to write and orally answer questions throughout all literary works, the control group used their English textbook to learn effective writing skills by completing various written exercises from the textbook. The control group used traditional materials and methods prescribed by the county.

Research Question

Will students who participate in a researcher-developed language arts program improve their writing skills more than a group taught with standard methodology?

Hypothesis

At the end of the study, test scores of students participating in the researcher-developed language arts writing program will be significantly higher than those of students taught with the standard school methodology.

Data Analysis

During the last week of the study, the researcher administered the post test which was evaluated by the evaluation team. Using SPSS, the researcher then compared pre and posttest results by means of t-tests to determine whether the groups differed significantly in their achievement levels.

Summary

Using two classes of 5th graders, an experimental group who received a researcher-developed innovative language arts program was compared to an equivalent control group who received standard writing instruction using a traditional methodology. Standardized pre and post test measure were taken assessing narrative and expository writing skills, and a statistical analysis of the results was conducted.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Findings

The purpose of this study was to determine if a researcher-developed language arts program for fifth grade students would improve their basic writing skills. Chapter IV contains the results of the study. T-tests were used to assess fifth grade group mean differences within and between groups on the narrative and expository tests. The reader should consult Appendixes D, E, F, G, and H for a detailed account of the various periodic assessments that were made during the study as the experimental subjects progressed through the fourteen week treatment period.

Raw Scores

Tables 4 and 5 identify the pretest and posttest raw scores achieved by the subjects in this study. A close review of these data reveals that all students did not achieve equally. In 17 cases, the experimental group posttests on the narrative test were higher than their pretest scores. Five scores remained the same, and three scores were lower on the posttest than on the pretest. However most of the experimental students did score higher on the expository posttest than on the pretest. On the expository posttest eighteen students scored higher on the posttest than on the pretest, three remained the same, and four received lower scores on the posttest than on the pretest.

In the control group, eight students scored lower on the narrative posttest than on the pretest. Six students scored the same and eleven scored higher. On the expository test, six students scored lower on the pretest, seven scored the same on both the pretest and posttest, and twelve scored higher on the posttest. This seems to suggest the instructional

50

approach used in the control group is effective for only half of the students in the group, regardless of whether the focus is narrative or expository. If these scores are valid and typical of the average students' performance at this grade level, the experimental approach is more promising as a tool to improve the writing performance of fifth grade students than the currently used standard methodology. Tables 4 and 5 present the individual pretest and posttest raw scores achieved by the participants in the study.

Table 4

Pretest-Posttest Scores: Experimental Group

Student Number	Narrative Pretest	Narrative Posttest	Expository Pretest	Expository Posttest
1	2.0	3.5	1.5	3.0
2	3.0	3.5	2.0	3.5
3	2.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
4	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0
5	4.5	4.5	4.0	5.0
6	2.0	3.5	2.0	3.0
7	1.0	3.5	2.5	3.5
8	1.0	1.0	3.0	2.0
9	4.5	4.0	2.0	3.0
10	2.0	3.5	3.0	3.0
11	1.0	3.0	2.0	4.0
12	2.5	2.5	2.0	3.0
13	3.0	3.5	1.5	3.0
14	0	1.0	0.5	1.5
15	4.0	5.0	2.5	4.0
16	3.0	3.5	5.0	4.5
17	0	3.5	3.0	3.5
18	4.0	3.0	3.5	3.0
19	3.0	3.5	2.0	4.0
20	2.0	3.5	2.5	4.0
21	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0
22	3.5	5.5	4.5	6.0
23	2.0	1.5	1.0	2.0
24	2.5	4.0	4.0	4.0
25	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.5

Table 5

Pretest-Posttest Scores: Control Group

Student Number	Narrative Pretest	Narrative Posttest	Expository Pretest	Expository Posttest
1	2.0	3.0	3.5	3.5
2	2.0	2.0	3.5	3.0
3	3.0	2.5	2.0	3.5
4	3.5	3.0	2.5	3.0
5	3.0	3.5	2.5	2.5
6	2.5	4.0	4.0	4.5
7	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.5
8	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5
9	3.5	3.5	2.0	4.5
10	2.0	2.5	1.0	1.5
11	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.5
12	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.0
13	3.5	4.0	2.0	1.5
14	2.0	2.5	3.5	3.5
15	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0
16	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.5
17	3.5	3.0	1.0	3.0
18	2.0	1.5	0	2.5
19	3.5	3.0	2.0	3.0
20	2.0	3.5	3.5	2.5
21	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0
22	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.0
23	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5
24	4.0	4.5	3.5	3.5
25	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0

Table 6 presents t-test results calculated to determine if gains made by the experimental group on the narrative and expository tests during the study were statistically significant. The .05 confidence level was established for these analyses. Since the research hypothesis was directional, a one-tailed test was used. The mean gain for the experimental group on the narrative test was .96. This was significant at the $p <$ .01 level. The mean gain for the experimental group on the expository test was .78. This was also significant at the $p < .01$ level.

Table 6-Mean Gains between Pretest and Posttest Scores

Experimental Group

	Narrative Pretest	Narrative Posttest	Mean Gain	Expository Pretest	Expository Posttest	Mean Gain
N	25	25		25	25	
M	2.38	3.34	.96* *	2.66	3.44	.78**
SD	0.999	1.062		1.106	0.95	
t value			3.29			2.67

Critical Value of t = 1.684
 **Significant at the .01 level

Table 7 presents t-test results calculated to determine if gains made by the control group on the narrative and expository tests during the study were statistically significant. The mean gains for the control group on the narrative and expository tests was .14 and .40, respectively. These gains were not significant at the p < .05 level.

Table 7

Mean Gains Between Pretest and Posttest Scores

Control Group

	Narrative Pretest	Narrative Posttest	Mean Gain	Expository Pretest	Expository Posttest	Mean Gain
N	25	25		25	25	
M	2.68	2.82	.14	2.60	3.0	.40
SD	0.922	0.954		0.859	0.957	
t value			0.52*			1.55*

Critical Value of t = 1.684
*Not Significant

Tables 8 and 9 were calculated to assess end-of-study mean differences between the experimental and control groups. This analysis was conducted to test the researcher's hypothesis that at the end of the study, test scores of students participating in the researcher-developed language arts writing program will be higher than those of students taught with the standard school methodology. As in the previous analysis, the .05 confidence level was established to determine statistical significance.

The end-of-study mean difference score for the experimental and control groups on the narrative test was .52. This was significant at the p < .05 level. The end-of-study

mean difference score for the experimental and control groups on the expository test was

.44. This was not significant at the p < .05 level.

Table 8

Posttest Comparisons: Narrative Test

Experimental Group	Control Group	Mean Difference Score
N = 25	N =25	
M = 3.34	M = 2.82	.52**
SS = 27.092	SS = 21.44	
SD = 1.062	SD = 0.945	
t value		1.82

Critical Value of t = 1.684
**Significant at the .05 level

Table 9

Posttest Comparisons: Expository Test

Experimental Group	Control Group	Mean Difference Score
N = 25	N = 25	
M = 3.44	M = 3.0	.44*
SS = 21.66	SS = 22.0	
SD = 0.95	SD = 0.957	
t value		1.63

Critical Value of t = 1.684
*Not Significant

Summary

The data analysis revealed that the experimental group mean gain scores were significantly higher than the control group gain scores on both the narrative and expository writing tests. The experimental group had significantly higher end of study scores on the narrative test as compared to the control group. This implies that the experimental treatment was more effective than the standard methodology for teaching writing to this age group. In Chapter V, the researcher will explain the reasons that accounted for these significant findings.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The data displayed in Chapter IV indicate superior performance by the experimental group in this study. Using t-tests to assess within-group and between-group performance, experimental group mean scores exceeded control group means, and the differences were statistically significant. The following discussion addresses the data provided in Chapter IV.

Restatement of Methodology

This study was designed to determine if a researcher-developed language arts program would improve the basic writing skills of fifth grade students. This research emphasizes a combination of action research, using a treatment and a control group, and a quasi-experimental design (Isaac & Michael 1995). The researcher implemented an especially-designed integrated language arts program inside the classroom for a period of 14 weeks. The control group did not receive the experimental treatment. It used a standard county-prescribed curriculum methodology that had been traditionally used.

Within-Group T-Test Results

Although the control group started out with a higher mean (2.68) on the narrative pretest than the experimental group mean of 2.38, the experimental group surpassed the mean of the control group's posttest of 2.82 by obtaining a posttest mean score of 3.34 (Tables 6 and 7). In addition, the experimental group mean on the expository pretest was 2.66 and the post test mean increased significantly to 3.44. The control group mean on the same pretest was 2.60 and the posttest was 3.0. Once again, the experimental group mean surpassed the control group's, regardless of the pretest advantage of the control

group. The researcher believes that the experimental group used more sophisticated sentence structures in their essays on both narrative and expository. The experimental group had developed confidence in experimenting with a variety of sentence structures because of the ones they saw being used in the different literary works to which they were exposed. This is consistent with research previously done by Zargoza and Vaughn (1995) who found that writers apply strategies to their own writings that they have seen published authors use.

In summary, both groups made gains during the course of the study on the narrative and expository writing tests. However, the final experimental group means were higher than the control group means on both writing tests even though the experimental group students started out at a lower level than the control group.

Between Group T-Test results

In comparing the expository and narrative posttests (Tables 8 and 9), the researcher believes that the significant increase was attributed to students using what they learned in reading and applying it to their writings. Students were not afraid to take a risk in answering questions because the questions were not based on one answer. As long as the student could justify his or her answer, the answer was acceptable. The students used the stages of the writing process on a daily basis. In a study by Culham (2006), the writing process was used as an integral part of the writing workshop. Once the writing workshop was incorporated, the infusion of literature supported writing and reading skills.

As for the current study, the students completed reading a story, they responded to the literature in many different forms. In one of the informal observations the researcher

observed a group of students experimenting with metaphors and similes during a read-aloud session. The researcher of this paper noticed that the students were interested in wanting to learn the difference between metaphors and similes, and decided to teach a mini lesson on this topic. Later on in the study, the researcher found that on the posttest seventeen of the twenty five students used some type of figurative language in their essays. In a similar study conducted by Feng and Power, (2005) the researchers used the student's writing as a vehicle to guide instructions. In one example, the student made continuous mistakes with sentence structures. Using this information, the researcher used mini-lessons to teach the skill to the student by placing mistakes into certain categories: no subject, incorrect subject-verb agreement, and sentence fragments. As a result of the mini-lessons, the students improved in their writing skills.

<div align="center">Implications</div>

The data and research that is contained in this dissertation validates the interactive writing program as being more effective than the traditional methodology. A study conducted by Perry, Nordy, and Vandecamp (2003) shows the superiority of an integrated writing and reading over teaching in isolation. In addition, the scores for the experimental group were compared with other 5th graders on the Math section of the FCAT and it was found that the experimental group scored higher than three of the four other 5th grade classes at the school. It was concluded that students in the experimental group performed better than most of the fifth grade students at the school because of their participation in the integrated writing program. The students were able to explain their answers more in detail. At the present time, there is a growing body of research in the fields of mathematics education and literacy which supports the inclusion of children's

literature with the teaching of mathematics (Ward, 2005). Since this study was

implemented in 1997, the district, as well as the state, has partially implemented the

philosophy of the author. At the present time reading and writing are taught together.

According to Just Read Florida (2006), The Florida Legislature has allocated funds for

reading and in order for districts to receive these funds, districts have to write a K-12

Comprehensive Research-Based Reading Plan (CRBP). The K-12 CRBP for the author's

district states, "Teachers will address writing within the 90 minutes reading block before,

during, and after reading the Comprehensive Core Reading Program (p. 55)."

<div align="center">Recommendations</div>

After analyzing the data collected from the study, it was concluded that further

study into several areas is warranted. Specifically, it was determined that a longitudinal

study using the methodology from the current study be implemented for a longer time

frame starting in grade one. It is also recommended that this study be used with students

of varying exceptionalities. In addition, studies should be expanded to include English

for Speakers of Other Languages. Another study of interest may be to include different

ethnicities to see how effective the program would be with diverse populations. Also,

from studying the experimental and control groups scores on the narrative and expository

essay, the researcher noticed that both groups scored higher on the expository; further

study should be directed in this area as well.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

There are many methodologies being used in schools; however, they are not all

the most effective method for teaching students. Teachers' preparations have been

influenced by traditional practices to teach reading in isolation from writing. Educators

should research the different practices and philosophies to help them choose the most appropriate teaching method. Administrators in the United States education system must have a keen awareness of high-quality reading instructions, so they can serve their teachers and help their school meet the requirements of Reading First (Womble, 2006). The researcher has reviewed and analyzed past and current practices in the areas of writing and reading and believes that an integrated writing program is an effective approach to increase students' achievement.

REFERENCES

Alanis, Iliana (2004). Effective Instruction: Integrating Language and Literacy. p15.

Arnold, V., Smith, C., & Lapp, D. (1989). Connections: Landscape. New York: MacMillian Publishing Company.

Atwell, N. (1997). In the Middle. New Hampshire: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Bandura, A. (1978). The Self System in Reciprocal Determinism. American Psychologist Association, Inc.

Bartholomae, D. & Petrosky, A. (1986) Facts , Artifacts, and Counterfacts: Theory and Method for a Reading and Writing course. Upper Monticlair, NJ: Boynton-Cook.

Beach, R., & Marshall, J. (1991). Teaching Literature in the Secondary Schools. Fort Worth: Hartcourt Brace College Publishing.

Beaugrande, R. (1979). The Process of Invention. Association and Recombination. College Composition and Communication. 30 (3):260-267.

Belanger, J. (1987). Reading Achievement and Writing Proficiency: A Critical Review of Rresearch.

Burkland, J.N., & Peterson, B.T. (1986). An Integrative Approach to Research: Theory and practice. In B. T. Peterson (ED.), Convergences:Trasactions in Reading and Writing (pp.189-203). Urbana, Il: National Council of Teachers of English.

Brock, C & Raphael, T (2003). Guiding Three Middle School Students in Learning Academic Discourse. Elementary School Journal, 103.5, p481.

Bruner, J. (1965). The Growth of Mind. American Psychologist, Vol. 20 (12), Dec. 1965. pp. 1007-1017.

Bushman, J., & Bushman, K. (1997). Using Young Adult Literature in the English
  Classroom. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Calkins, L. (1986). The Art of Teaching Writing. New Hampshire: Heinemann
  Educational Books Inc.

Calkins, L. (2000). Let the Words Work Their Magic.Instructor,110(3),25.

Calkins, L. & Harwayne, S. (1990). Living Between the Lines. Portsmouth, NH:
  Heinemann.

Canadian Modern Language Review (2006) of Kucer, S.B. Dimension of Literacy A
  Base for Teaching Reading and Writing in School. 62.3, 492-494.

Clay, Marie (1991) Becoming literate. The Construction of Inner Control. Portsmouth,
  NH.

Cramer, R. (2004) Language arts. A Balance Application to Teaching Reading, Writing
  Listening, Talking, and Thinking. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Culham, R (2006). The Trait Lady Speaks Up. Educational leadership, 64, no2, 53-6.

Dorr, R. (2006) Something Old is New Again: Revisiting language experience.
  Reading Teacher, 60 (2), 138.

Elbow, P. (1981). Writing with Power. New York: Oxford University Press.

Elley, W. (1989). Vocabulary Acquisition From Listening to Stories. Reading Quarterly,
  24(2), 174.

Feng, S. & Power, K (2005). The Short and Long Term Effect of Explicit Grammar
  Instruction on Fifth Graders' Writing. Reading Improvement, 42.2, p67.

Ferrante, A. (1997, September). Writing Teacher, Writing Student: A Blend of Selves in
  Time. The Writing Teacher, p. 16-19.

Florida Writes. (1997). Results of the 1997 Florida Writes Assessment. Department of
    Education.

Flower, L. (1990). Introduction: Studying Cognition in Context. In Flower, V. Stein, J.
    Ackerman, M.J. Kantz, K. McCormick, & W.C. Peck (Eds.), Reading to write:
    Exploring a Cognitive and Social Process (pp.3-31). New York: Oxford University
    Press.

Giacobbe, M. E. (1984, October). Helping Children Become More Responsible for Their
    Writing. Live Wire.

Graves, D. (1983) Writing: Teachers and Children at Work. NH: Heinemann.

Graves, D. (1984). A Researcher Learns to Write. Portsmouth, NH:Heinemann

Graves, D. (1994). A Fresh Look at Writing. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Graves, D. (1995, November) Sharing the Tools of the Writing Trade. The Instructor,
     p. 38.

Hansen, J. (1983). Authors Respond to Authors. Language Arts, 60 (8), 970-976

Hansen, J. (1987). When Writers Read. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann

Hawkins, J (2006). Think Before You Write. Educational Leadership, 64, no2, 63-6.

Isaac, S., & Michael, W., (1995). Handbook in Research and Evaluation. San Diego,
    CA:EdITS.

Johnston, N & Giorgis, C (2003). Literature in The Reading Curriculum. Reading
     Teacher, v56, n7, p704-12.

Kahn, E., Walter, C., & Johannessen, L. (1994). Writing about Literature. ERIC
     Clearinghouse and the National Council of Teachers of English.

Kennedy, M. (2002). Knowledge and Teaching. Teachers and Teaching. Theory and

practice, 8 (3/4), 355-370.

Kintsh, W., & Von Dijk, TA. (1978). Toward a Model of Text Comprehension and

Production. Psychological Review, 85 (5), 363-394.

Kovalik, S. & Olsen, K. (2001). Exceeding Expectations: A User's Guide

to Implementing Brain Research in the Classroom. Third Edition.

Kucer, S.B. (2001) Dimensions of Literacy. A Conceptual Base of Teaching Reading and

Writing in School Settings. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Koumy, EL & Salam, A (1997). Exploring The Reading Writing Relationship. (143).

ERIC, Document Reproduction Service No. ED 413781.

Langer, J. (1992). Literature Instruction: A focus on Student Response. Urbana: National

Council of Teachers of English.

Lewis, M., Wray, D., & Rospigliosi, P. (1994, April). "…And I Want it in Your Own

Words. The Reading Teacher p. 528.

Mahn, H. (1999) Vygotsky's Methodological Contribution to Sociocultural Theory.

Remedial and Special Education, v.20,n6, Dec./Nov.

Marascuilo, L. & Loban, W. (1969). An Empirical Study of the Dominating Predictive

Features of Spoken Language in a Representative Sample of School Pupils: A

Multivariate Description and Analysis of Oral Language Development.

McConachie, S., Hall, M., Resnick, L., Ravi, A., Bill, V., Bintz., J., & Taylor, J (2006).

Task Text and Talk. Literacy for All Subjects. Educational Leadership. 64, no2, 8-4.

McDonough, B. (2006). Developing Teachers, Developing Writers, Through The Writing

Workshop for Elementary Classroom. New Horizons Learning,

Http://www.newhorizons.org.

McGrath, C., (1996). The Secret of Successful Student Writing. The Writing Teacher, X (2), p. 16.

Mckusick, Holmberg, Marello, & Little (2001). Integrating Reading and Writing: Theory to Research to Practice. www.nade.net/documents /scp97/scp97.12.pdf.

Moxley, J. (1989). Creative Writing in America: Theory and Pedagogy. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.

Murray, D.M. (1984). Write to Learn. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Murray, D.M. (1985). A Writers Teaches Writing (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Pardo, L (2006). The Role of Context in Learning to Teach Writing: What Teachers Educators Need to Know to Support Beginning Urban Teachers. Journal of Teachers Education, 57.4, p378.

Pearson, P.D., Tierney, R. J. (1984). On Becoming a Thoughtful Reader. Learning to Lead Like a Writer. A Purves & H. Niles (Eds.) Becoming Readers in a Complex Society for the Study of Education.

Perrone, V (1991). ACEI Position Paper On Standardized Testing. Association for Childhood Education International. www.acei.org/ on standard.htm.

Perry, N., Nordby, C & Vandekamp, K (2003). Promoting Self Regulated Reading and Writing At Home and School The Elementary School Journal. 103.4, p317.

Rosenlatt, L. (1978). The Reader, the Text, the Poem: The Transational Theory of the Literary Work. Carbondale, IL. Southern Illinois University Press.

Routman, R (1997). Back To The Basics of Whole Language Educational leadership, 54, n5, 70.

Smith, Carl. (Ed.). (2003) Literature-Driven Integrated Language Arts, Report No TBC-

030015.

Sowers, S. (1982). Reflect, Expand, Select: Three Responses in the Writing Conference. In T. Newkirk & N. Atwell (Eds.), Understanding Writing: Ways of Observing, Learning, and Teaching. Portsmouth, NH:Heinemann

Stotsky, S. (1983). Research on Reading and Writing Relationships: A Synthesis and Suggested Directions. Language Arts, 60:627-642.

Tamborrino (2004.updated). Integrated Language Arts. www.mccsc.edu/-wtamborr/class/language.html.

The Staff of The Princeton Review (1996) Grammar Smart. New York: Random House Inc.

Tunnell, M., & Jacobs, J., (1989).Using "Real" Books: Research Findings on Literature Based Reading Instruction. Reading Teacher , 42 (7), 470.

Ward, R. (2005). Using Children's Literature to Inspire K-8 Preservice Teachers' Future Mathematics Pedagogy. Reading Teacher, 59(2),132.

Warner, A. (1993, September). If The Shoe No Longer Fits, Wear it Anyway? The Writing Teacher, p. 76-80.

Wang, J & Odell. S (2003). Learning to Teach Toward Standard-Base Writing Instruction: Experiences of Preservice Teachers and Mentors in an Urban Multicultural Classroom. The Elementary School Journal, 104.2, p147.

Weaver, C. (1996). Teaching Grammar in Context. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Weaver, C., McNally, C., & Moerman, S. (2001). To Grammar or Not to Grammar: That is not the Question!.Voices From the Middle, 8 (3), 17.

Womble, S. (2006) Understanding and Implementing Reading First Initiatives. The

Changing Role of Administrators. International Reading Association (NJ3).

Wong, J. (2002) You Have to Write.Ill. T. Flavin. New York:

McElderry.unpaged.ISBN0-689-83409-8

Wordsmith (2005). Helping Students Develop as Writers Ideas for Administrators

Reading Today, 22.5, p14.

Young, J. (1997, April). Assessing Florida Writes. Paper presented at the meeting of the

Instructional Support Teacher Room, Florida.

Zaragoza, N., & Vaughn, S. (1995). Children Teach us to Teach Writing. The Writing

Teacher, 49 (1), p. 42-47.

Appendix: A
Needs Assessment Survey

*Results are based on percentage points of responses from 31 classroom teachers.

Please take 5 minutes to answer these questions.

1. What is your current position?

2. What grade level do you teach? PK K 1 2 3 4 5

3. Are you satisfied with the current writing curriculum at the school?

4. Based on the site developed writing assessment, did your students score
    Excellent   Good   Fair   Poorly

5. Do you integrate reading and writing inside the classroom?
      Yes   No

6. Are your students competing in writing contests at the district or state level?
      Yes   No

7. Do you believe the materials for teaching writing are adequate in reaching all the
   students in your classroom? Yes   No

8. Do you believe the materials for teaching reading are adequate in reaching all the
   students in your classroom?
   Yes   No

9. List three reasons why students may lack basics writing skills
A.
b.
c.

10. Share with me a teaching strategy that you use in your classroom that works well in
the area of reading/writing_____
_____
_____

Appendix: B
Checklist of Skills

Focus
Address the prompt?
On the Topic?
No unrelated information?

Organization
Beginning, Middle, Ending?
Transitional words?

Support
Expanded main ideas?
Details, examples?
Descriptive language?

Conventions
Spelling
Capitalization?
Punctuation?
Usage?

Appendix: C
Rubric Scale

Student's number___
Student's Score (circle) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6

Unscorable
The paper is unscorable
A. Did not address the topic . B. Illegible

1 Point
The writing may only minimally address the topic because there is little, if any, development of supporting ideas, and unrelated information may be included.

2 Points
The writing may be slightly related to the topic or may offer little relevant information and few supporting ideas or examples.

3 Points
The writing is generally focused on the topic, although it may contain some extraneous or loosely related information. The paper may lack a completeness or wholeness.

4 Points
The writing is generally focused on the topic, although it may contain some extraneous or loosely related information. The paper demonstrates a sense of wholeness and completeness. There has been an attempt to use a variety of sentence structures, although most are simple constructions.

5 Points
The writing is focused on the topic with adequate development of supporting ideas. The paper demonstrates a sense of completeness and wholeness. The conventions of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling are generally followed. Various sentence structures are used.

6 Points
The writing is focused on the topic, has a logical organizational pattern and has ample development of the supporting ideas. The paper demonstrates a sense of completeness or wholeness. The writing demonstrates a mature command of the language including precision in word choice. Subject/verb agreement and verb and noun forms are generally correct. Various sentence structures are used.

Appendix: D
Table 10

Class: Experimental
Objective: At the end of the 14 weeks, 75 percent of the 25 students in the experimental group will be able to…

1. Identify and use the stages of the writing process to write an essay as measured by qualified fourth grade teachers.

Student Number	Identify the stages of the writing process	Use the stages of the writing process
1	Yes	Yes
2	Yes	Yes
3	Yes	Yes
4	Yes	Yes
5	Yes	Yes
6	Yes	Yes
7	Yes	Yes
8	No	No
9	Yes	Yes
10	Yes	Yes
11	Yes	Yes
12	Yes	No
13	Yes	Yes
14	No	No
15	Yes	Yes
16	Yes	Yes
17	Yes	No
18	Yes	Yes
19	No	Yes
20	No	Yes
21	Yes	Yes
22	Yes	Yes
23	Yes	No
24	Yes	Yes
25	Yes	Yes

Appendix: E
Table 11

Class: Experimental
2. Use simple sentences, coordinating conjunctions, and conjunctive adverbs.

Student Number	Use Simple Sentence	Use Coordinating Conjunction(s)	Use Conjunctive Adverb(s)
1	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Yes	Yes	Yes
3	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	Yes	Yes	No
5	Yes	Yes	Yes
6	Yes	Yes	Yes
7	Yes	Yes	Yes
8	Yes	Yes	Yes
9	Yes	Yes	Yes
10	Yes	No	No
11	Yes	Yes	Yes
12	Yes	Yes	Yes
13	Yes	Yes	No
14	Yes	No	Yes
15	Yes	Yes	Yes
16	Yes	Yes	Yes
17	Yes	No	No
18	Yes	Yes	Yes
19	Yes	Yes	Yes
20	Yes	Yes	Yes
21	Yes	Yes	Yes
22	Yes	Yes	Yes
23	Yes	No	No
24	Yes	Yes	Yes
25	Yes	Yes	Yes

Appendix: F
Table 12

Class: Experimental
3. Identify semicolon, comma, and period.

Student Number	Identify semicolon	Identify comma	Identify period
1	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	No	Yes	Yes
3	Yes	No	Yes
4	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Yes	Yes	Yes
6	No	No	Yes
7	Yes	Yes	Yes
8	Yes	Yes	Yes
9	Yes	Yes	Yes
10	Yes	Yes	Yes
11	No	Yes	Yes
12	Yes	Yes	Yes
13	Yes	Yes	Yes
14	Yes	Yes	Yes
15	Yes	Yes	Yes
16	Yes	Yes	Yes
17	Yes	No	Yes
18	Yes	Yes	Yes
19	Yes	Yes	Yes
20	Yes	Yes	Yes
21	Yes	Yes	Yes
22	Yes	Yes	Yes
23	No	No	Yes
24	Yes	Yes	Yes
25	Yes	Yes	Yes

Appendix: G
Table 13

Class: Experimental
3. Demonstrate use of semicolon, comma, and period

Student Number	Use of semicolon	Use of comma	Use of period
1	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Yes	Yes	Yes
3	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Yes	Yes	Yes
6	Yes	Yes	Yes
7	Yes	Yes	Yes
8	No	Yes	Yes
9	Yes	Yes	Yes
10	Yes	Yes	Yes
11	Yes	Yes	Yes
12	No	No	Yes
13	Yes	Yes	Yes
14	Yes	Yes	Yes
15	Yes	Yes	Yes
16	Yes	Yes	Yes
17	No	Yes	Yes
18	Yes	Yes	Yes
19	No	Yes	Yes
20	Yes	Yes	Yes
21	Yes	Yes	Yes
22	Yes	Yes	Yes
23	Yes	Yes	Yes
24	Yes	Yes	Yes
25	Yes	Yes	Yes

Appendix: H
Table 14

Class: Experimental

4. Write a summary paragraph in response to literature in the form of topic sentence, detail sentences, and conclusion sentence.

Student Number	Summary Paragraph
1	Yes
2	Yes
3	Yes
4	Yes
5	Yes
6	Yes
7	Yes
8	No
9	Yes
10	Yes
11	Yes
12	No
13	Yes
14	No
15	Yes
16	Yes
17	No
18	Yes
19	Yes
20	Yes
21	Yes
22	Yes
23	No
24	Yes
25	Yes