1989

A comparison of whole language and traditional methods of teaching writing in the first grade

Teresa Nagle
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Nagle, Teresa, "A comparison of whole language and traditional methods of teaching writing in the first grade" (1989). *Master's Theses*. 3210.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.xes5-mxs8>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/3210

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 1339636

**A comparison of whole language and traditional methods of
teaching writing in first grade**

Nagle, Teresa R., M.A.

San Jose State University, 1989

U·M·I

300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

A COMPARISON OF WHOLE LANGUAGE AND
TRADITIONAL METHODS OF TEACHING
WRITING IN FIRST GRADE

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Elementary Education
San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

By

Teresa Nagle

December, 1989

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF
ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

Dr. Amy Strage

Dr. Owen Boyle

Dr. Robert Ramonda

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

Serena H. Stanford

ABSTRACT

A COMPARISON OF WHOLE LANGUAGE AND TRADITIONAL METHODS OF TEACHING WRITING IN FIRST GRADE

by Teresa Nagle

This thesis studies methods used to teach writing in five first grade classrooms. It examines the literature to identify fundamental concepts and characteristics of the whole language and traditional methods of teaching writing. A comparative analysis of teaching methods is conducted using teacher interviews and student writing samples collected from five first grade classrooms. Both analytic and holistic methods were used to score the samples.

The research shows that, in general, differences in student performance are insignificant regardless of the teaching method used. In addition, both analytic and holistic methods are equally effective in scoring first grade samples.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to acknowledge the professional support and valuable assistance provided by the first grade teachers at La Mesa School. Special thanks to Dr. Amy Strage for her professional guidance and patience. Thanks to Dr. Owen Boyle, and Dr. Robert Ramonda, for their expertise in the field of writing.

An additional note of thanks goes to my husband, Richard J. Nagle, for his continuous support during this challenging endeavor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER ONE	1
Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	6
Questions	7
Importance of the Study	7
Overview of the Methodology	8
Delimitations	9
Assumptions	10
Definition of Terms	10
CHAPTER TWO	12
Review of Related Literature	12
Writing Development	13
Whole Language	18
Related Studies	21
Evaluation in the Whole Language Classroom	23
Holistic Scoring	25
Summary of the Literature	27
CHAPTER THREE	28
Research Methodology	28
Summary	28
Materials	29
Data and Data Collection Procedures	29

	Page
Observations of Classrooms	30
Interviews of Teachers	30
Collection of Writing Samples	31
Treatment of Writing Samples	33
Summary	36
CHAPTER FOUR	37
Results of the Study	37
Results of Teacher Interviews	37
Mrs. Smith	38
Mrs. Walsh	42
Mrs. Duffy	45
Mrs. Green	48
Mrs. Jones	51
Discussion of Sample Results	54
Comparison of Teachers Under Different Methods of Scoring	55
Scoring Methods and Components for Individual Teachers	57
Pearson's Product-Moment Correlations	61
Mrs. Green	65
Summary	69
CHAPTER FIVE	71
Discussion, Summary, and Conclusion	71
Discussion of Findings	72

	Page
Researcher's Comments	73
Summary	74
Limitations	75
Recommendations	75
REFERENCES	76
APPENDICES	82
A. Questions	83
B. Instructions	84
C. Holistic Scoring	85
D. Research Protocol	86
E. Descriptions of Reading Materials and Instructional Methods	88
F. Comparison of Class Means for Different Scoring Methods	89
G. Comparison of Mean Holistic and Analytic Scores .	91
H. Comparison of Mean Holistic and Analytic Component Scores	93
I. Comparison of Mean Scores for Males and Females	95

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Comparison of Teachers	56
2. Comparison of Overall Analytic and Holistic Scores	59
3. Comparison of Analytic Component Scores and Holistic Scores	60
4. Correlation Coefficients Between Holistic and Analytic Scoring Methods	63
5. Correlation Coefficients Between Analytic Scores and Component Scores	64
6. Ratio of Boys to Girls	66
7. Summary of Sex Differences	68

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The difficult task of teaching students how to write has long been a challenge for educators. The formal teaching of writing begins when children enter kindergarten and continues through high school, and in some cases college. Students are expected to learn specific skills at each grade level and to demonstrate mastery of these skills in their writing. One of the most important concerns of educators is how to teach writing skills most effectively. Traditionally, emphasis has been on punctuation, grammar and spelling. Drill and practice exercises and workbook assignments are common methods used to reinforce skills. This method is commonly known as the traditional approach, or the skills specific method of teaching, and is the method most often used (Hemphill, 1981). Yet in spite of its popularity, students taught by this method often leave school unable to write effectively, making it necessary for many colleges to offer remedial writing classes. Similarly, numerous businesses have had to offer writing assistance to newly hired employees.

The research on writing throughout the last decade has challenged many of the traditional views about teaching writing. Most notably, current thinking is that writing begins long before children enter school, and that young

writers progress through developmental stages whether formal instruction has taken place or not. Children demonstrate a desire to communicate a message on paper as young as eighteen months of age. Many of the spelling errors that beginning writers make are significant indicators of the developmental stages and progress. Numerous researchers agree that children are formulating rules and testing out their theories through the use of invented spellings (Sulzby & Teale, 1986; Clay, 1985; Genishi & Dyson, 1982). Social interaction is thought to play a significant role in writing development (Edelksy, Draper, & Smith, 1984). Studies conducted by Long and Bulgarella (1985), have led them to conclude:

Interaction in small groups is desirable because it leads to clashes of points of view that encourage children's development of individuality, creativity, and ability to think. (p. 171)

Most importantly, reading and writing develop together, and are interdependent (Sulzby & Teale, 1975; Dyson, 1982). As Sulzby states, "There exists a dynamic relation between writing and reading because each influences the other in the course of development" (1985, p. 9).

A new philosophy has emerged in the field of education based on this research. The terms "whole language" or "process approach" have been used to describe a program in

which reading, writing, and oral language are integrated throughout the curriculum. No longer is instruction dependent upon basal readers and curriculum guides. Children are exposed to a variety of reading materials, oral presentations, and writing experiences. Many opportunities are available for children to write, and getting thoughts down on paper takes precedence over correct spelling and punctuation. It is believed that the more experiences children have reading and writing, the better able they will be to use language. Mere repetition and rote memorization is not adequate (Farris & Daczmariski, 1988). Long and Bulgarella (1985) address this issue in their study of the effect of social interaction on writing development. They state:

Drill and practice may produce higher test scores. Educators must ask themselves however, whether our goals are to produce higher test scores, or to turn out individuals who can think critically, and creatively, and who have the intrinsic motivation to seek excellence. (p. 171)

This research is having a tremendous impact on the field of education. With the development of The Bay Area Writing Project at the University of California, in Berkeley, similar projects have appeared all over the United States. These are workshops in which teachers meet on a

regular basis, to discuss techniques that have been successful in their classrooms, and to work together to better understand the stages of writing, and the most effective ways to teach writing skills. Instruction and practice in new techniques for evaluating writing are also part of these programs. Many educators and former educators have put together books and packages, and offer workshops using their materials to help teach whole language classrooms. Publishers are quickly trying to develop programs that will meet the needs of teachers as they begin to follow a more holistic curriculum.

The state of California is currently experiencing a revolution in education. It has recently adopted new curriculum guides based on the latest research in education. The Language Arts framework embraces the idea of an integrated curriculum, and emphasizes that children must have many experiences with language in order to be able to use it effectively. The core of the program is a strong literature base with skills used as aids for children, rather than an end in themselves. Writing instruction in kindergarten through grade three is to allow children to communicate in ways that are developmentally appropriate for them (Language Arts Framework, 1987). Sulzby and Teale (1986), have concluded:

It is critical that we recognize literacy as

developmental. By writing, using their own systems, and reading, before they are capable of independent reading, children are actually practicing and mastering real reading-writing skills and strategies, not merely "playing around." These children move toward conventional writing and reading when they are provided with appropriate demonstrations of writing, writing materials, and encouragement (p. 11).

The research in the last decade contradicts many of the beliefs held on writing development. Much of what has been emphasized in writing programs and the methods used to teach writing has been deemed as inappropriate and ineffective. If required to follow the newly adopted frameworks, many educators will have to teach in a way that they don't necessarily support, or understand. These educators question the reliability of the research, and some believe this to be just another phase in education that will fade away like many others. Many teachers cannot accept this new way of thinking and would find it very difficult to teach this way even if they were sent to workshops.

One of the major concerns of many teachers is the lack of research to support those who believe that this is the best method to use to teach writing to children. It is difficult to accept the idea that children will learn to spell without having mistakes corrected, or that they will

learn punctuation, grammar, and spelling rules if they are not memorized. There is concern about how children taught by the whole language approach will do on the national exams they must take. Many teachers are finding themselves in compromising positions. While holding on to some of the traditional ways of teaching, they are trying to incorporate some of the new ideas. Others are totally abandoning traditional methods because they have not been satisfied with them, and integrating as much of the new as possible. Still others cannot accept the new philosophy for whatever reasons, and are sticking with what "works" for them. It is obvious that not all children will be taught writing by the same method, and that educators will be looking for signs that support their program. The purpose of this paper is to research and compare the effectiveness of several methods used to teach writing.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine what effects the methods used to teach writing have on students' writing ability. Are students taught by one method better story writers than those taught by other methods? Do the scoring methods used to evaluate the writing samples rate samples differently? This study compares the stories written by students in five first grade classes being taught by whole language/process approach, a traditional program, and a

combination of both, in order to assess the skills and strategies children are using, and to evaluate whether the method used to teach writing seems to make a difference in the stories written.

Questions

The following questions will be examined in this study:

1. Are children's writing skills affected by the method used to teach writing?
2. Does one method's evaluation/scoring criteria rate a given writing sample as more advanced than the criteria used by the other method?

Importance of the Study

The ability to communicate one's ideas effectively is extremely important in today's society. Without this skill the opportunities available to us become very limited. How well we are able to communicate can determine what schools we are able to attend and what kind of jobs we secure. Many colleges and universities now require incoming freshman to produce a written essay, and some job applications require more than short responses. Despite the availability of computers and word processors, the job of communicating a message continues to be the writer's responsibility.

The concern over better writing skills has prompted additional research in this area. Much of this research, unlike that conducted prior to the late seventies, has

focused on the writing of young children who have not yet received formal instruction. Many of the findings raise serious questions about traditionally held beliefs, and the methods most effective for teaching writing skills. Many educators who support the whole language approach to teaching argue that its literature based, integrated, process approach to teaching writing is most consistent with the latest research.

Beginning in the fall of 1989, the school districts in the state of California will be expected to adopt the ideals of this framework. Inservices and workshops will be offered throughout the state so that teachers can implement the framework in their classrooms. Publishers will offer texts designed to meet the new standards set by the framework committee. Some programs have already been piloted by teachers in order that their school or district might select materials to meet their needs. There clearly needs to more research conducted to determine the effectiveness of the whole language method of teaching, especially as compared to a traditional or combination approach. This study will examine a range of classrooms to determine if the various methods used to teach writing in these classrooms affect writing skills development.

Overview of the Methodology

The method used for this study was an in depth study of

five first grade classrooms located at La Mesa Public School in Monterey, California. The principal, Mr. Pete Krasa, was contacted in order to obtain approval for the research. A Human Subjects Protocol was submitted to the San Jose State University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, and upon approval this study was undertaken. A questionnaire was designed, and each teacher was interviewed individually. Each classroom was visited three times for the purpose of observing, and descriptions of the rooms, teachers, and children were written in a notebook. Two lessons were taught during the regular writing period and students were asked to write a story after each lesson. Writing samples were randomly assigned numbers for blind scoring. All papers were scored using analytic and holistic scoring methods. After all scoring was completed, the scores were analyzed. A more complete discussion of these procedures can be found in Chapter Three.

Delimitations

1. This study will only examine writing samples of first grade students and therefore conclusions cannot be generalized to other grade levels.
2. This study will only be conducted during the spring semester of the school year; therefore, progress made from the fall to the spring will not be evaluated. Limited causal inferences can be made from differences observed

between classes.

Assumptions

1. It is assumed that all of the subjects in the study are exposed to some form of writing instruction in the classroom.

Definition of Terms

Analytic Scoring - separate scores for a number of organizational and grammatical features of a sample (Greenberg, Weiner, & Donovan, 1986). For the purposes of this study, content, creativity, and conventions were analyzed.

Holistic Scoring - a method used to evaluate samples, in which the whole of a piece of writing is greater than any of its parts. Samples are read for an overall impression, rather than focusing on individual aspects of writing skills, such as organization, punctuation, diction, or spelling (Holistic Scoring, 1978).

Lippincott - a basal reading series with a strong emphasis on phonics.

Skills Specific Approach - a setting in which specific skills are taught in isolation. Workbook exercises and drill and practice activities dominate the environment. Basal readers are the primary literature source (Hemphill, 1981).

Whole Language Classroom/Approach - A setting where reading, writing, and oral language activities are integrated throughout the classroom. There is a strong emphasis on literature with little use of workbooks and basals designed explicitly for teaching reading and writing (Atwerger, Edelsky, & Flores, 1987).

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

Whole language or process teaching is becoming a reality in many grammar schools throughout the United States. The literature describing the characteristics of whole language classrooms and ways of implementing this method of teaching is large. Unfortunately the perception among many educators is that whole language is another fad that will suffer the same fate as the open classroom movement of the sixties. However, if those who support whole language are successful, this approach will not disappear, but will eventually become the predominant teaching method used in our schools. The lack of research seems to be the largest stumbling block for whole language advocates. More information is needed to assess the benefits of this method and how it can best be integrated into the school system.

This study will attempt to determine what effects the methods used to teach writing have on students' writing ability. It will attempt to answer the following research questions:

1. Are children's writing skills affected by the method used to teach writing?
2. Does one method's evaluation/scoring criteria rate a given writing sample as more advanced than the criteria

used by the other method?

A review of the literature was conducted to determine if any studies have been undertaken to compare traditional or skills specific instruction with the whole language or process approach. Although no references directly addressed this issue, several studies did deal with aspects related to this area. This chapter will be divided into three sections: (a) a review of studies on the development of writing skills published in the last ten years; (b) a review of the research on the whole language/process approach-- this will include works about the general characteristics of a whole language classroom, the philosophy behind this method of teaching, the teacher's role, and methods of evaluation used in whole language settings; (c) a review of the holistic method of evaluating writing samples.

Writing Development

There has been an unprecedented amount of research conducted on writing throughout the last decade, much of which challenges many of the traditional views held about writing development. This section will discuss the most significant of these: (a) the various developmental stages, and (b) the integration of writing throughout the curriculum.

Early research focused on the writing of school age children, since it was believed the illegible marks that

children made on paper held little or no significance relative to writing (Sulzby & Teale, 1985). However, in the early eighties Glenda Bissex (1980), and Marcia Baghban (1984), conducted longitudinal studies with their own preschool age children to investigate reading and writing development. Their research led them to conclude that reading and writing development begins long before children enter school. Prior to being able to spell her name, Baghban's daughter, Giti, continually used the same combination of scribbling and conventional letters which she identified as her name. Many other researchers support the theory of early writing development. Sulzby and Teale's study involving infants, documents children as young as eighteen months of age intentionally making marks on paper (Sulzby & Teale, 1985). Ferreiro and Teberosky (1982) report observing three-year-olds drawing wavy lines and small circles in deliberate imitation of adult writing. DeFord's (1980) work collecting and analyzing young children's writing samples has enabled her to go one step further, by identifying specific areas of development.

Young writers intend for their scribble to have meaning, demonstrate concepts of linearity and left to right directionality, and are aware of words and spaces. (p. 4)

Evidence suggests that children use many forms of

writing, beginning with scribbling, moving on to drawing and letter-like forms, to strings of letters and phonetically based invented spelling, and eventually to conventional spelling (Sulzby & Teale, 1986; Ferreiro & Teberosky, 1982; DeFord, 1980; Hilliker, 1982; Clay, 1975). Ferreiro (1982) conducted interviews with four- to six-year-old children in Argentina who received no instruction in reading and writing. Children were asked to write various words and names of family members. Ferreiro found evidence of developmental stages in these children despite the lack of instruction. First-stage children used the same squiggles for everything they wrote. Second-stage children believed in order to write different words, letters had to be reordered. They practiced this type of writing with as little as two or three letters. Stage three, the syllable stage, occurred when children thought that each "letter" stood for one syllable. The fourth stage, called the alphabetic hypothesis stage, occurred when children's analysis went beyond syllables. For example, Susana is written SANA. Finally, the fifth-level children used conventional alphabetic writing.

Majorie Fields believes that writing development parallels language acquisition. She compares scribbling to babbling and cooing; repetitive/linear drawing to language intonation; letter-like forms to native language sounds;

letters and early word symbol relationships to words; invented spelling to creative grammar; and standard spelling to adult speech (Fields, 1988). For example, a comparison of invented spelling to creative grammar would be a child saying "ba" for ball and writing "noc" for knock. Many researchers now believe that young children are actually experimenting with the rules of spelling, and that the mistakes they make contain information about the hypotheses they hold about writing (Sulzby & Teale, 1986; Dyson, 1985; Atkins, 1984). Susan Sowers' (1986) observations of young writers have led her to conclude:

Inventive spellers' errors are systematic. Their judgments result from their tacit knowledge about our system of sounds, but they don't know all our conventions for written language. Like children learning to talk, they construct a series of increasingly elaborate rule systems. (p. 7)

The term emergent literacy is often used when describing the child's development as a reader-writer. Those who use the term believe that it is impossible to distinguish a particular time in which literacy begins for children, since they are continually developing their literacy awareness. There is abundant evidence to support the idea that reading and writing occur simultaneously, and not as two separate entities (Sulzby & Teale, 1986; Dyson,

1985; Bissex, 1980; Newman, 1984). Sulzby and Teale (1986) state:

Writing and reading develop in coordination with each other. Reading is integrally involved in becoming a writer. When children write, they read their own texts and thereby monitor their production. (p. XIX)

Florio and Clark studied children in a second/third grade classroom for one year to determine if writing took place only during planned writing times. Children were observed throughout the school day writing class rules, cards, and letters, keeping diaries, and completing a science workbook. They concluded that writing takes place throughout the curriculum (Florio & Clark, 1982). This is consistent with what Griffin (1982) found in her research. She used audio and video tapes, and took observational notes to study how reading occurs during a school day. She concluded:

A great deal of what went on during the official reading lessons had little to do with learning to read, but more to do with learning how the group was organized and managed. On the other hand, a great deal of reading went on throughout the curriculum as children read, not only primers, but trade books, math worksheets, bulletin boards, each other's writing and so on. (p. 17)

Whole Language

In the last decade, early childhood education has been influenced by a method of teaching called whole language, or process teaching. Though there is no single agreed upon definition of whole language, there are several characteristics that are common to this approach. This section will: (a) discuss the characteristics of the whole language approach to teaching, and (b) discuss studies related to the effectiveness of the whole language method of teaching.

The key characteristics of the whole language/process approach are: (a) the integration of all elements of language arts; (b) child centered learning; (c) authentic oral and written language experiences; (d) peer interaction; (e) emphasis on indirect instruction.

(A) The whole language approach integrates writing, reading, and oral language throughout the curriculum. Workbooks and basal readers are virtually nonexistent.

Whole language is an attempt to get back to basics in a real sense--to set aside basals, workbooks, and tests, and to return to inviting children to learn to read and write by reading and writing "real stuff" (Goodman, 1986, p. 78).

Equal amounts of the school day are spent speaking, writing, listening, and reading (Hemphill, 1981). It

is believed that these skills develop interdependently, and that all are equally important. Children's personal experiences are an integral part of the reading, writing, and oral language activities in the classroom.

(B) Central to the whole language approach is the concept that learning should be meaningful to children, and instruction should build on the knowledge that children bring with them to the classroom. Research indicates that children who have had the opportunity to experiment with written language have formulated some hypothesis about how this system works (Dyson, 1985; Sulzby & Teale, 1986). This is the point at which whole language instruction should begin. Children are encouraged to experiment with language so they can better understand how the process works.

(C) It is believed that in order for writing to be meaningful for children, it must be authentic. This means providing opportunities for them to write on topics that they have some knowledge about and are interested in. They need experience writing for different purposes and audiences. Writing is not confined to a "writing period," but occurs in all subject areas throughout the day.

(D) Social interaction is believed to be an important aspect of any authentic writing program (Long & Bulgarella,

1985; Sulzby & Teale, 1986). When given the opportunity to work in groups, children learn to express and clarify ideas and defend their points of view. It is the interaction between the writers and the audience (i.e. teachers, peers, parents) that helps them to learn about the writing process.

(E) The role of the teacher in a whole language classroom is that of a guide or facilitator (Rich, 1985; Graves, 1983). They help children to construct knowledge for themselves by providing the opportunities for children to participate in meaningful activities. Teachers of whole language do not rely on textbook curriculum guides to establish their objectives, but begin with what is developmentally appropriate for the children they are working with. A whole language program is flexible so that the diverse needs of the students can be met. Teachers provide a risk-free environment in which children are encouraged to experiment with language. Teachers are active participants in the classroom, and can be seen reading and writing along with their students.

Adults who work from an emergent literacy perspective spend a great deal of time structuring the environment so that certain kinds of experiences will be likely to occur. They encourage children's exploration and experimentation, intervening only to "scaffold" the child from one level of understanding to the next

(Strickland & Morrow, 1988, p. 71).

Related Studies

Much of the criticism of whole language centers around the lack of curriculum guides and basal readers. Teachers are concerned about children not learning basic skills and vocabulary words, and being unable to compete on the standardized tests they are required to take. The results of these tests reflect both students' achievement and the effectiveness of the teachers. The area of vocabulary has been researched by Shapiro and Gunderson (1988) using first grade students in whole language classrooms and basal reader programs. They collected writing samples from both groups for one year and compared the vocabulary generated by the children. The results from the research indicated there was virtually no difference in high frequency words among the two groups. Low frequency words used by the whole language students tended to be more contemporary (reflecting classroom and outside activities) than those in the basal reading program. Shapiro and Gunderson (1988) reported:

While there is an initial slowness in the generation and acquisition of reading/writing vocabularies, these vocabularies are at a minimum, equal to the vocabulary developed in a basal reader program. Additionally, the findings suggest that whole language programs result in acquisition of phonics skills and the application of

these skills in spelling. (p.45)

Donald Graves (1973) conducted a study of eight seven-year-olds to determine if a relationship existed between various aspects of writing behaviors and "formal" and "informal" classroom settings. Graves observed groups of children, interviewed and observed individual children, and analyzed compositions. His research revealed that children in "formal" classroom settings, in which they were required to write on topics typically assigned by the teacher, tended to write less frequently, and produce shorter compositions. Graves believes that assigned writing significantly inhibits the topics children write about, the clarity of expression and the length of their stories.

Mary Starvish (1984), a teacher in New Hampshire, has been conducting research in her kindergarten classroom. Children are able to choose from many different activities during free-choice time every day, but they are required to write at least one story a week. She encourages children to get their ideas down on paper in whatever way they are capable. For some this may mean scribbling; others may use strings of letters and invented spelling, or a combination of all three; still others use conventional spelling. She conferences with them individually, and uses these opportunities to assess childrens' progress and teach skills in context. She reports a learning sequence similar to what

Dolores Durkin described in the late sixties. This is: (a) scribbling and drawing; (b) copying objects and letters of the alphabet; (c) questioning spelling; (d) reading.

Starvish adds that her research has led her to believe:

In a classroom where kindergartners are required to write one story a week, the children are better speakers, earlier readers and generally, more careful communicators. (p. 40)

All three researchers believe that children being instructed using the whole language method do at least as well, if not better than those taught by the traditional approach.

Evaluation in the Whole Language Classroom

Although, children in whole language classrooms take state-required standardized tests, many teachers use informal observations to evaluate these children in the classroom. Most often teachers use student's stories to evaluate vocabulary, sentence type, fluency, structure, and ideation (Minner, Prater, Sullavan, & Gwaltney, 1989). Some teachers use inventories or check lists or descriptive accounts of children's behavior (Teale, 1988). In addition, teachers conference with students individually to address specific areas they may need guidance with, and to determine what progress they are making in their writing. Many teachers keep folders of children's writing samples in order

to show parents and administrators where children began and how far they have come in their writing development. Support for this kind of assessment can be found in the writings of Teale (1988).

Informal observations and structured performance sample assessments are more appropriate than standardized tests for measuring early childhood literacy learning. Observations and performance samples are more consistent with the developmental characteristics of the young child. Furthermore, because observations can be conducted in conjunction with instruction and performance samples are more like actual teaching practices, these procedures yield information more useful for teachers. (p. 173)

Ideally, assessment should aid teachers in improving classroom instruction. However, researchers have found that in many instances this is not the case (Stiggins, 1985; Frederiksen, 1984; Lerner, 1981). Teachers, instead, end up teaching to standardized tests, and getting little information that is useful in helping them identify individual strengths and weaknesses. In addition, standardized tests evaluate students on bits and pieces of information with little emphasis on critical thinking skills. This encourages rote learning, memorization, and the simplification of complex ideas.

If completed on a regular basis, informal assessment can be used to help educators determine if the method they are using to teach is appropriate for each of their students. Polloway and Smith (1982) believe that the use of informal measures will enable teachers to:

Stress the evaluation of specific skills in the context of a student's own writing samples and to develop instructional programs geared directly toward application and generalization. (p. 342)

Considering the renewed emphasis on accountability in education, it is important that teachers have available to them a method of evaluation that is reliable and valid.

Holistic Scoring

With the demand for better writing skills among high school graduates and the development of remedial writing classes for college freshmen comes the need to evaluate how well these programs are working. Testing students' writing ability is very difficult, since there is little agreement on the criteria for good writing. Opponents of traditional testing methods (i.e. multiple-choice, short answer tests) believe that this kind of evaluation leads to "teaching to the test" and encourages students to memorize bits and pieces of information. It is believed that writing is made up of more than just grammar, spelling, and punctuation skills.

Writing is a complex process of discovering and conveying meaning, a process that involves rhetorical, structural, and mechanical choices governed by purpose and audience rather than by compositional rules (Greenberg, Wiener & Donovan, 1986, p. 180).

The National Testing Network in Writing (NTNW) was designed to help resolve some of the issues related to testing. NTNW has access to the latest research on writing, and makes this information available to its members. NTNW's position on writing evaluation is:

In addition to emphasizing process over product, there is an insistence on assessing writing by sampling writing, not by responses to multiple-choice questions; a call for attention to whole paragraphs and essays rather than to sentences only; and an important focus on meaning more than on errors. (p. VIII)

Using the holistic method (Appendix C) involves collecting writing samples from students and selecting sample essays that are representative of each point on the score scale. Sometimes score guides are used which describe the characteristics to be looked for on papers at different points on the scale. At least two readers must judge each writing sample, and any discrepancy of more than two points must be discussed and resolved. The scores from both readers are added together to make up the holistic score

(Geenberg, Wiener, Harvey & Donovan, 1986). Two strengths of the holistic method of scoring are that it is relatively inexpensive and reliable and, most importantly, that it is most consistent with the latest research on writing.

Summary of the Literature

A summary of the literature reveals that writing development begins long before children enter school, and that developmental stages have been identified in children's writing despite the lack of formal instruction. Current research indicates that writing and reading develop "concurrently" and "interrelatedly" for young children (Dyson, 1982). Additional studies indicate that children instructed by the whole language method of teaching do at least as well as children taught by the traditional method. Children given more freedom choosing topics to write about, seem to write more often and produce longer stories. In addition, holistic scoring is an inexpensive and reliable means for evaluating writing samples, and can be used successfully with first grade children.

CHAPTER THREE

Research Methodology

The purpose of this paper was to study a range of first grade classrooms to determine if the various methods used to teach writing in these classrooms affect writing skills development differently. The following questions were examined in this study:

1. Are children's writing skills affected by the method used to teach writing?
2. Does one method's evaluation/scoring criteria rate a given writing sample as more advanced than the criteria used by the other method?

This chapter will be divided into three sections: (a) a description of the subjects; (b) a description of materials used; (c) a description of the procedure used to conduct the research.

Subjects

The subjects participating in this study were five first grade teachers, and 93 of their students, ranging in age from six to eight years old, attending La Mesa Public School in Monterey, California. These children were selected because they attended a school with a large number of first grade classes. Eighty percent of the students attending La Mesa were from military families, since the school is located in the La Mesa Navy Housing Unit, one and

a half miles from the Naval Post Graduate School in Monterey, California. At least one of their parents was pursuing a Masters or Ph.D. degree from the Post Graduate School. The remaining twenty percent of the students attending La Mesa are non military. The teachers and children were studied for a six month period.

Materials

Materials used to conduct the research were: (a) interviews with teachers; (b) children's written stories; (c) holistic and analytic methods of scoring. Teachers were interviewed individually, and asked to respond to 14 questions designed by the researcher (Appendix A). Children were taught two separate lessons by the researcher and asked to write a story about each. Analytic (Appendix B) and holistic (Appendix C) methods of scoring were designed by the researcher.

Data and Data Collection Procedures

The data collected were (a) observations of the teachers and children; (b) interviews with teachers; (c) samples of children's writing. The researcher contacted the principal of La Mesa School, Mr. Pete Krasa, and requested a meeting with him to present a proposal of the problem to be studied and request permission to conduct the research at La Mesa School. Mr. Krasa contacted each teacher to inquire if they would be interested in participating in the study.

Once all five responded, and the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board from San Jose State University approved the project, the researcher was permitted to proceed.

Observations of Classrooms

Each teacher was contacted by the researcher in order to schedule three periods for the purpose of observing. Descriptions of the room, teachers and children were all written in a notebook. On the third visit, each classroom teacher introduced the researcher to the class as a student attending San Jose State University interested in seeing what first graders write about. The researcher passed out the Human Subjects Consent forms (Appendix D) and asked students to take them home to their parents.

Interviews of Teachers

The researcher scheduled a time to interview each teacher individually for approximately twenty minutes after school. The researcher brought a questionnaire (Appendix A) to refer to and tape recorded the entire interview. After the interviews were completed, the gist of the conversations were transcribed for further reference. Upon completion of the observations and the interviews, the researcher was able to identify the method of instruction each teacher used in her classroom.

Collection of Writing Samples

Writing samples were taken on two occasions during the study. The researcher used the regular writing period to teach a lesson and have children write a story. The first lesson was an extension of the whale theme that all the first grade classes had been studying about for several weeks. The children were told by their teacher that they would be writing a story with the researcher, and were asked to sit on the carpeted area in the front of the classroom. The children were asked what they knew about whales. Approximately fifteen minutes of discussion occurred with children supplying the information. The book Amos and Boris, by William Steig (1977), was shown to the class and the following questions were asked:

- 1) What do you see on the cover of the book?
- 2) What do you think the book is about?
- 3) Do you think there are people in the story?
- 4) Do you think there are other animals in the story?

The story was then read to the children. At the end of the story the researcher asked several more questions.

- 1) What kind of whale do you think Boris is?
- 2) Why?
- 3) Why wasn't Boris able to live on the land with Amos?
- 4) Why wasn't Amos able to live in the sea with Boris?

5) What does sounding mean?

6) What does it mean when a whale is stranded?

Children were then asked to think about words they might want to know how to spell for their story. These words were listed on the board. Children were instructed to write a whale story, and to say as much as they could about what they knew. They were told they could use the words on the board or throughout the room, but that spelling wasn't important, to just concentrate on getting their ideas down on paper. If they could not possibly sound the word out, they could raise their hand for help. Children wrote for approximately twenty minutes.

The second writing sample was taken approximately six weeks later. This time a lesson about clouds was taught to the children. None of the five classes had yet spent time studying clouds. The Cloud Book, by Tomie de Paola (1975), and Questions and Answers About Weather book, by M. Jean Craig (1973), were used as references. The children were asked to sit on the rug in their classroom, and the researcher asked them what they knew about clouds. Children raised their hands and brainstormed for about ten minutes. The researcher then introduced them to four different clouds (Cirrus, Cumulus, Stratus, and Nimbus). The shapes of the clouds were drawn on the board and the names written underneath. The nicknames given to the clouds were also

discussed and written on the board. Information was given to the children on how clouds are formed, where they appear in the sky (high or low), and how they look. Since fog was mentioned by children in every classroom, information on how fog forms was also included. A quick review was conducted with the researcher asking the students questions about what they had learned. Students were then asked to write a story about clouds. Each student was given a sheet with pictures of the four different clouds and the names written underneath. They were told they could use the paper to help them remember what was talked about. They were asked to write as much as they knew about clouds. The researcher asked if there were any questions. Several children asked if they should put a title on the paper. They were told to write their story just as they would write it for their teacher. Children wrote for approximately twenty minutes. When they were finished, their story was collected and they were told they could color the paper that was given to them.

Treatment of Writing Samples

In order to adequately evaluate first grade writing samples it was necessary to develop an assessment tool that would take into account the special needs of this age group. Various existing methods were studied and evaluated, and combinations of the methods were used in conjunction with the researchers own ideas. The researcher was advised by

Dr. Ramonda to contact the Cupertino School District, since they were pursuing a holistic method of scoring papers in their district. Phyllis Vogel, the chairperson of this project, informed the researcher that the first grades were excluded from their program due to the difficulty of evaluating first grade writing samples. All other methods of scoring samples were equally difficult to use with first graders.

In the end, two separate scoring sheets were devised to evaluate the papers. The first was Holistic Scoring (Appendix C) adapted from the document published by The Santa Clara County Committee on Writing. The second was analytic (Appendix B) scoring which looks at individual pieces of writing, devised using a combination of the Cupertino School District model and the official publication for assessing writing from Los Angeles. These references were the most adaptable to the special needs of evaluating first grade writing. The analytic method was chosen, because it looks at specific pieces of writing and is more comparable to the methods of testing used by traditional teachers.

Each writing sample was assigned a random identifying number for blind scoring, written on the back left corner of each paper, and a master list was filed for future reference. All papers (186) were scored using holistic

scoring. The method involves each sample being read quickly by two readers and scored using a scale between 1 and 4, with 4 being the highest. Each paper was read by the first reader, who then placed their score in the left hand corner of the paper and folded the corner back. The second reader then read the paper and placed their score in the upper right hand corner of the paper. Scoring took place during two one hour sessions. Scorers were given the opportunity to score several practice papers. Generally, scorers were to judge papers on the overall effectiveness of conveying a message, rather than concentrating on spelling, punctuation, and neatness. If there was a discrepancy of more than two points between the two rater's scores, a third reader assigned the final score. This was only necessary for seven of 186 samples. After the scoring was completed, the papers were collected, entered, and tallied on a computer. All three readers were students pursuing a Masters Degree in Education from San Jose State University.

Seventy three of the 186 samples were also scored by the analytic method of scoring in which three component parts (content, creativity/originality, and conventions) of writing were evaluated. The content component concentrated on the expressions of ideas. Once again, a scale from one to four was used for each component, with the highest possible score of 12. A class of education students

attending San Jose State University scored a random sample of papers. Due to the number of papers and the limited amount of class time available for this, it was agreed upon by both the researcher and Dr. Ramonda to ask students to score seventy three randomly selected papers. The class was divided into seven groups with three readers in each. Once again, several practice papers were scored first. If a discrepancy of more than two points existed, all three readers reread the paper and reached a consensus. It was only necessary to do this with three of the seventy three samples. Papers were then collected, and scores were entered in a computer and sorted into respective classes.

Summary

The data used for this study came from observations of classrooms, interviews with individual teachers, and samples of children's writing. The observations and interviews were used to determine the type of teaching method used in each of the five first grade classrooms. Each class was taught two lessons approximately six weeks apart, and asked to write a story during children's regular writing period. The writing samples were numerically coded for blind scoring, and evaluated using both holistic and analytic scoring methods. These scores were entered on a computer so that an in-depth analysis could be conducted. Further discussion of the analysis can be found in Chapter Four.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if the method used to teach writing affects writing skills development, and if one method's evaluation/scoring criteria rates a given writing sample as more advanced than the criteria used by the other method.

Current literature suggests that children receiving writing instruction under the whole language method of teaching perform at least as well as those taught by the traditional method. In addition, indications are that holistic scoring is an inexpensive and reliable method that can be used successfully to evaluate writing samples.

Results of Teacher Interviews

The five first grade teachers at La Mesa School are all experienced teachers who have taught from two to twenty years at this grade level. Four of them use the Lippincott reading series adopted by the Monterey Unified Public School district. One teacher uses a variety of children's literature and other types of reading materials. All five have stated that they are under no pressure from the district or the principal regarding how they teach writing, and they feel free to use other reading series in conjunction with the Lippincott. Every class in La Mesa is divided in half, which allows for the classes to receive

their reading instruction in smaller groups. The "early birds" arrive an hour early in the morning, and the "late birds" stay an hour later in the afternoon. These groupings are determined on the basis of: (a) the screening teachers give each child entering their class; (b) the detailed reports from the La Mesa kindergarten teachers; (c) the maturity of the child. Generally, the "late birds" are made up of those children capable of handling a slightly faster paced curriculum. In addition, La Mesa School allows parents to request a teacher for their child, with the understanding that their choice is not guaranteed, but will be honored if possible. The children in the first grade take the Lippincott Reading Series Tests and the CTBS toward the end of the school year. They are evaluated for spelling, handwriting, and composition on the report card. (Note: teachers' names have been changed to preserve their anonymity).

Mrs. Smith

Mrs. Smith has been a first grade teacher for approximately sixteen years. She also has taught second and third grade, and she has been a reading consultant and a librarian. She has attended workshops on the California Writing Project (Appendix E), the MacCracken (Appendix E) method of teaching reading and writing, and the California language arts framework. Mrs. Smith does not use the

Lippincott Reading Series (Appendix E), but has always taught according to the "total reading" philosophy of integrating phonics, writing, and word skills analysis using children's literature. She is currently piloting a new reading series for the district entitled "Imaginations." This is part of an effort to adopt a program that incorporates children's literature, and comes closer to meeting the goals and objectives of the language arts frameworks. Mrs. Smith makes it very clear that, in her opinion, no reading series can adequately meet the needs of all students. She emphasizes the importance of using a large variety of good children's literature.

Mrs. Smith does not give weekly spelling tests, but periodically gives children individualized quizzes on words related to their writing. Mrs. Smith believes that children become better language users by practicing it, not by getting good test grades. She evaluates children's writing informally, checking to see if they are able to spell words they've previously had difficulty with, and generally improving in their writing development. As the school year progresses she wants to see if children are able to handle first grade words without making simple mistakes. In the past, Mrs. Smith tested children to determine if they would be "late birds" or "early birds." However this year she had parents choose the time period they preferred and is very

satisfied with this. The resulting groups are heterogeneous rather than homogeneous.

The children in Mrs. Smith's class sit two-to-a-table with three tables grouped together. As children write, they are permitted to talk among themselves, and move about the room. At times the noise is quite loud. The bulletin boards are covered with children's writing and projects. The room is filled with books which children are free to read at various times throughout the day.

Mrs. Smith begins her writing program by reviewing single letter sounds and letter forms during the first two weeks of school. Children then progress to putting sounds together to form words to get the idea of how to encode a word. She then uses literature to help get children started writing. She solicits children's reactions to the literature and encourages them to write down their ideas.

She encourages children to concentrate on getting their thoughts down on paper first, and not to worry about spelling. Mrs. Smith is not overly concerned with how the words are spelled and doesn't spend time correcting if children can read what they have written. She views spelling mistakes as part of the learning process, and tries not to overemphasize them, especially in the beginning.

Most of the children's writing does not get recopied until later in the year when they are displaying their work

and writing books. Children are taught that when they write for an audience, they have to write so that other people can read what they have written. Mrs. Smith has conferences with children during the writing sessions, to attend to individual needs. During this time she points out things they should be aware of and answers any questions they may have. Once children are writing books, Mrs. Smith spends more time helping them to see the correct spelling of words, so that others may be able to read what they write.

Mrs. Smith believes that writing, as any subject, should reflect the notion that children grow at their own individual pace. Not all children need the same information at the same time, and what is important is the progress they make relative to their own previous work, not to someone else's work. She continually encourages children to try new things, but is careful not to pressure them.

When she is not piloting a reading series, Mrs. Smith gives children individualized books, consisting of words that come out of their writing, which they should be able to spell but are having difficulty with. They are encouraged to learn them, and are then tested by writing the words on the blackboard. Mrs. Smith does not feel that she could ever totally rely on a basal reading series with its curriculum guide determining the goals and objectives for her class. Mrs. Smith believes she would be teaching less

than she knows the children can learn.

Mrs. Smith hopes that by the time these children leave her class they will feel comfortable using writing as an avenue of expression. She wants them to know that it is something that no one can take away from them, and that they will always be able to write. Even if they are attempting to write adult words that are beyond their ability, all they have to do is try because they have the basic skills needed to get started.

Mrs. Walsh

Mrs. Walsh has taught first grade for thirteen years, and has had training in the McCracken method of teaching writing. She uses the Lippincott reading series and weekly readers along with Modern Curriculum Press (Appendix E), Bill Martin books (Appendix E), and a variety of literature to supplement her program. She tests all children entering her class in the beginning of the year and uses these results along with the information passed on by the kindergarten teachers to determine the placement of children. The children in Mrs. Walsh's class sit two to a desk, with three desks grouped together. One large bulletin board is used to display children's stories, another contains materials related to the theme currently being studied, and another is dedicated to the child of the week. Charts and graphs related to various projects in science,

math, and other subjects line the walls. Children are free to talk and move about the room while they are engaged in writing activities.

Mrs. Walsh begins her writing program by asking children to draw a picture and write something about it. She accepts and praises them for whatever they are able to do. After they are finished, Mrs. Walsh asks them to share what they've done with the class. Once they gain some confidence, children move on to dictating stories, writing stories as a group, and finally, independent writing. In order to help children get started, Mrs. Walsh has the class brainstorm about the topic they are writing on and copies their ideas on the board. She reminds students that it is important to get their ideas down on paper first, and that spelling can be attended to later. They are told to try to sound out any words they are having trouble spelling. If several children are having difficulty with the same word, Mrs. Walsh will get everyone's attention and write the word on the board. In addition to the writing children do in class, they are encouraged to write at home. Everyday, stuffed animals go home with three children, who are required to write about the animal's adventures with them that evening, and to share the story with the class the next day. The first time the children take the animals home they are allowed to dictate the story to their parents, but the

second time they must write it themselves.

At the beginning of the school year, children participate in writing group stories, but also write in journals and keep a book of stories related to monthly themes. As the year progresses they continue journal writing, but spend more time writing stories independently rather than as a group. Mrs. Walsh holds individual conferences with children to help them with spelling, and sentence structure if needed. She does not overemphasize these areas, and tries to encourage children by focusing on their strong areas. Children do very little recopying of stories, since Mrs. Walsh sees very little advantage to this in first grade. She feels that children want to write, know how to write, and will write if they are free to do it their way. Towards the end of the year, children participate in a book fair, in which they write, edit, design a cover, and publish a book. At this time, Mrs. Walsh has children rewrite their stories, and she discusses the need for this when writing for an audience.

Mrs. Walsh has used this method to teach writing for the past three years. Prior to this she took a more traditional approach, putting more emphasis on spelling, grammar, and punctuation, and allowing very little opportunity for children to write independently. When asked why she has changed her method of teaching, she explains

that until recently, children were not given the opportunity to write until they had learned spelling, punctuation, and grammar rules. Once she saw that children could write, she could not use a method that did not allow them to do what they were capable of. Mrs. Walsh believes the biggest step is believing that children can write. The next step is convincing them that they can do it. Mrs. Walsh hopes that by the time children leave her class, they will have little difficulty writing a story. Mrs. Walsh uses a combination of whole language and traditional methods, with her program leaning more towards holistic practices.

Mrs. Duffy

Mrs. Duffy has taught first grade for two years, and also has experience teaching French and Spanish in sixth, seventh, and eighth grade. She has participated in the Bay Area Writing Project (Appendix E) summer workshop and McCracken workshops. In addition to the Lippincott series she uses Oddessy Books (Appendix E), Modern Curriculum Press (Appendix E), books from the McCracken series, and a variety of good children's literature. She gives weekly spelling tests in which words are taken from children's reading books, with the "early birds" and "late birds" each receiving different tests. The grades reflect the scores on weekly spelling tests, and the records kept from the daily dictation of sentences, phrases, and words. Composition

grades are taken from their stories. Correct punctuation is not Mrs. Duffy's concern here, since she believes the degree of risk children are willing to take when writing is more important in first grade.

The children are seated two to a desk, with desks grouped together in threes. They talk quietly to one another while writing and some even move about the room reading and talking about classmate's stories. The room is filled with stories the children have written, graphs and charts of various things students are comparing, and a McCracken pocket chart hangs on the board.

Mrs. Duffy begins her writing program by asking children to write in a journal shortly after they begin the school year. Most children look at her in complete shock and explain that they don't know how to spell anything. She tells them not to be concerned with spelling, but to concentrate on what they want to say, and to draw pictures for words they don't know. After much coaxing, they are able to get a few words written and some pictures drawn. The first few pages of their journals continue like this, until they become more comfortable with writing and gain confidence in themselves. They learn that it is all right to misspell a word, and that entries as short as a few sentences are acceptable. For homework, they are encouraged to dictate at home to their parents, and copy their stories.

By January, most children are able to write their own stories. The children write in their journals periodically throughout the year. They have a folder filled with stories they have written about each month's theme. They do some form of creative writing at least twice a week. This consists of writing in their journal, writing about a topic they have been studying, or something that a guest speaker has come to talk to them about, or any area of interest to them. Children are encouraged in all their creative writing activities not to worry about spelling. Mrs. Duffy believes this gives them the freedom to write on a wide variety of topics without limiting the words they can use. She believes children become too frustrated and give up when spelling is overemphasized. Many of her writing ideas come from the McCracken series, since children seem to respond enthusiastically to them. There is a lot of repetition in these stories and children are able to predict what comes next. This helps them with their writing, since they are able to make up their own story using the McCracken pattern.

Mrs. Duffy occasionally has her class recopy their stories, but feels this is a very difficult and frustrating task for first graders. Though she sees some value in children seeing the words spelled correctly, and knowing that published works need to be edited, she believes that rewriting should be infrequent at this grade level.

Typically, when the children write stories, Mrs. Duffy will have them read what they have written and she will write the correct spelling above the words. This is done mostly for parents so they can understand what their child has written. Children are reminded that getting their ideas down on paper is most important. Mrs. Duffy is more concerned that children are able to express themselves in a descriptive and imaginative way. She tries to familiarize children with sentence structure and conventions such as sentences beginning with capitals and ending with periods, but accepts their lack of consistency.

By the time the children leave Mrs. Duffy's class, she would like them to know that a story has a beginning, middle, and end close together. She wants them to be able to write a story that is creative, uses a lot of adjectives, and is interesting to read. Her curriculum is a combination of whole language and traditional methods.

Mrs. Green

Mrs. Green has been teaching first grade for twenty years. She has also had some experience teaching kindergarten, second, and third grade. She screens every child entering her classroom in the fall to see if they know their long and short vowel sounds, and if they can read. Mrs. Green uses the Lippincott reading series, and the Odyssey Reading Series (Appendix E). Children are given

weekly spelling tests which consist of words from their reading books, themes they have studied, and the Dolch list (Appendix E) of high frequency words. They are evaluated on how well they can spell these words. Their composition grade is based on the stories they write. If children are unable to write, Mrs. Green has them dictate a story to her and she copies it. She evaluates them on how much effort they put into trying to write or dictate a story. Their handwriting is evaluated for neatness and formation of letters.

Mrs. Green has a quiet manner, and requires students to raise their hand to be called on, and sit properly in their seats, especially while writing. The children in Mrs. Green's class are seated two to a desk, with desks in rows. While children are writing, a small amount of conversation can be heard, but most often they work quietly and independently on their stories. The walls of the room are covered with charts and messages displaying rules of a sentence, punctuation marks, word endings, and class rules. Children's corrected and recopied stories appear on the bulletin board.

Mrs. Green introduces writing to her children by writing stories on the board. The class practices reading them together, copies and illustrates them, and reads them again. Mrs. Green presents many exercises using action

words, nouns, and opposites to help increase children's vocabulary. Their first attempts at writing without copying are very controlled. Mrs. Green lists words on the board that can be used to begin sentences, words that can be used as verbs, and adjectives. Children are not encouraged to come up with their own words, instead they are told to use those written on the board. Once this is completed they are to draw a picture of the person, place, or thing that they wrote about. When children move on to writing independently, Mrs. Green uses a thematic approach. Their story will be related to something they have studied or read about. Frequently, she will give them a topic to think about over night and have them write on it the next day. Sometimes she will give them a beginning sentence to get started. The children each have a word book filled with alphabetized high frequency words. They are encouraged to look up the spelling of words in these books when they are writing. If they are trying to use a word they do not know how to spell, they raise their hand and Mrs. Green will write it in their book for them. She believes the word books help children learn to spell, reinforce reading skills, and teach them how to use a dictionary.

This year Mrs. Green has tried letting the class dictate stories to her early in the year. The children chose to write about a bat they named Mildred, and have

dictated a total of four stories throughout the year. Mrs. Green writes the stories on the board, the class practices reading them together first, and then individuals are called upon to read. Mrs. Green has the story copied for them so they can take it home and share it with their parents. Mrs. Green usually does not begin independent story writing until the last report period, because she believes that children should be better readers, and writers before they try that. She thinks it is very discouraging if children have not had the spelling practice. Mrs. Green usually has children do a "sloppy copy" first followed by a "neat copy," especially if the stories are going to be put into books for the classroom, or displayed in the room. She likes to see a nice finished product. She is aware that some teachers believe this discourages creativity, but she disagrees with them. She likes to see some creativity in children's writing, but also wants them to learn to write correctly.

Mrs. Green does not want to put too much pressure on the children to write. She hopes that by the time children leave her class they will enjoy writing. Mrs. Green is traditional in her teaching style.

Mrs. Jones

Mrs. Jones has a Masters degree in Education with a concentration in reading. She has taught first grade for many years but has some experience in second through sixth

grade. She has recently participated in the Bay Area Writing Project summer workshop. Mrs. Jones uses a variety of programs to supplement the Lippincott series which include, Scott Foresman Unlimited (Appendix E), and Odyssey (Appendix E) reading programs. She also incorporates a home reading program in which students take a book home each week to share with their parents. She gives weekly spelling tests which include words from the themes being studied, words from the basal readers, and high frequency words. Mrs. Jones assigns spelling grades based on the weekly spelling tests, the Lippincott reading series, and how children use words in their creative writing. Their composition grade comes from stories they have written, and her evaluation of their handwriting is based on how neat and well formed their letters are.

The children in Mrs. Jones's class are seated two to a desk, with three desks grouped together. As children write, they are permitted to talk quietly, but may not leave their seats. Writing takes place in a highly structured, teacher dominated classroom, in which large group instruction is predominate. Children's corrected and recopied stories related to topics currently being studied hang on the bulletin board.

Mrs. Jones's writing program begins with children copying stories, which she writes on the board using a

letter sound the class has been learning. The stories consist of about three sentences that the children are capable of reading and illustrating. Mrs. Jones continues to work through short and long vowel sounds using this method. She proceeds by giving children a starter sentence, and brainstorms about the possible things children can write. She spends almost half of the writing time drawing out children's ideas so they have help thinking through what they want to say. She chooses the writing topic, but tries to focus on an area that is related to something they have done or have had some kind of experience with. The next step is to introduce the "sloppy copy" which is their first attempt to get their ideas down on paper. Mrs. Jones spends several minutes reviewing spelling, punctuation, and grammar rules. She encourages children to focus on what they are writing, rather than spelling words correctly, but encourages them to raise their hand for help with words they are not sure of. Once children write their "sloppy copy," Mrs. Jones holds individual conferences with them to correct their spelling and punctuation errors. She points out how close they have come to the conventional spelling, then draws a line through the incorrect form and writes the correct spelling on top. The children then rewrite their stories using correct spelling, and this becomes their final copy. Mrs. Jones believes that it is very important for

children to see the correct form of the words, so they can learn how to spell them. She emphasizes the need to talk about proper sentence structure, such as sentences beginning with capitals and ending with periods, so that children will know these are important. She also likes one-on-one contact so attention may be given to individual needs. She believes that children must be reminded continuously of the proper way to write. Repetition is important to her, since she believes that is how things eventually become internalized. Virtually every piece of writing these children produce is recopied.

Mrs. Jones hopes that by the time these children leave her class in June, they will be able to write a story. She wants them to know how to keep all the ideas that relate to one another together in a paragraph. They should know how to center a title, and to capitalize at the beginning of a sentence, and put periods at the end. She hopes that by the time they go to second grade they will be able to fill up a long sheet of paper without repeating the same things. She would like them to feel comfortable with writing, and encourages them to practice writing through the summer. Mrs. Jones is the most traditional of the five teachers.

Discussion of Sample Results

To answer the first question, one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if there were

significant differences between methods used to teach writing and writing skills development. Two statistical methods were used to study the second question. ANOVA was used to analyze whether there were significant differences between scoring methods, and then Pearson Product-Moment Coefficients of Correlation were computed on subsets of the samples to analyze the relationships between the two scoring methods. The results of hypothesis tests from these analyses are discussed in the following sections.

Comparison of Teachers Under Different Methods of Scoring

In this section, for each scoring method and component, one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to identify significant differences among teachers. An ANOVA was performed for each of the two scoring methods (holistic and overall analytic scores). ANOVA's were also run on each component of the analytic score.

Table 1 presents comparisons of the five teachers under holistic and analytic scoring methods. Also included are comparisons of the teachers for the three component scores of the analytic method. The number of scores in each sample vary since sample sizes were not the same for all teachers.

As shown, there are significant differences between samples in both the holistic score, and in the creativity component of the analytic score. Differences are not significant between samples in the other three scores. By

Table 1

Comparison of Teachers

Score	Smith (N=14)	Walsh (N=15)	Duffy (N=18)	Green (N=11)	Jones (n=15)	F	p
Holistic	2.250	2.666	2.389	3.091	1.933	3.420*	.013
Overall Analytic	2.460	2.947	2.920	3.282	2.695	2.290	.690
Content	2.666	3.067	3.186	3.546	2.933	1.910	.118
Creativity	2.595	2.889	2.981	3.546	2.645	3.060*	.022
Conventions	2.119	2.888	2.592	2.788	2.511	1.860	.128

examining scatterplots of the 95 percent confidence intervals (Appendix F), it appears Mrs. Green's samples are the cause. Performance of an ANOVA without Mrs. Green's samples included reveal the means of the remaining four teachers' samples were not significantly different from each other. Although significant differences do not appear to be present, some general points of interest can be noted from the scatterplots. In all five of the samples, Mrs. Smith (the most holistic of the five teachers observed) and Mrs. Jones (the most traditional of the five teachers observed) scored lower in all areas than Mrs. Walsh and Mrs. Duffy, the two teachers who integrate elements of both the traditional and holistic methods in their teaching approach. Between Mrs. Jones and Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Jones scored higher in all analytic components as well as the overall analytic score, and Mrs. Smith scored higher in the holistic score. Mrs. Green scored higher in both overall traditional and holistic scores, and in the creativity and content components of the traditional score. In conventions, she scored higher than all teachers, with the exception of Mrs. Walsh's class. The superior performance of Mrs. Green's class will be discussed in the final section of this chapter.

Scoring Methods and Components for Individual Teachers

In this section, for each teacher one way analysis of

variance (ANOVA) was conducted between different scoring components to look for patterns between teaching methods and skills development. Two ANOVA's were performed for each teacher. First, an ANOVA between the overall analytic score and the holistic score was conducted. The second ANOVA involved comparison of holistic scores with each component of the analytic score.

Table 2 presents a comparison of the overall analytic and holistic scores. As can be seen, at a $p \leq .05$ level, there were significant differences between the two samples in both Mrs. Duffy's and Mrs Jones's classes. Examining scatter plots of the 95% confidence intervals (Appendix G) reveals that for all five teachers, the overall analytic score tended to be higher than the holistic score.

Table 3 presents comparisons of holistic scores with each of the components of the analytic score. As shown there are significant differences between the samples in the cases of Duffy, Green, and Jones. Looking at scatter plots for these samples (Appendix H), it can be seen that for all five teachers, the content component was the highest scoring component of the analytic score, and the creativity component was the lowest scoring component. The mean holistic score was lower than the means for each of the component scores in the analytic method for Walsh, Duffy, and Jones. In the case of Duffy and Jones, the samples are

Table 2

59

Comparison of Overall Analytic and Holistic Scores

Teacher	N	Holistic Mean	Analytic Mean	F	p
Smith	14	2.250	2.460	0.410	.526
Walsh	15	2.667	2.947	0.850	.366
Duffy	18	2.389	2.920	4.600*	.039
Green	11	3.091	3.282	0.500	.487
Jones	15	1.933	2.695	6.530*	.016

Table 3

Comparison of Analytic Component Scores and Holistic Scores

Teacher	N	Holistic Mean	Content Mean	Creativity Mean	Conventions Mean	F	p
Smith	14	2.250	2.666	2.595	2.119	1.140	.343
Walsh	15	2.667	3.067	2.889	2.888	0.560	.646
Duffy	18	2.389	3.186	2.981	2.592	3.890*	.013
Green	11	3.091	3.546	3.546	2.788	3.910*	.015
Jones	15	1.933	2.933	2.645	2.511	3.930*	.013

significantly different as a result of this. It therefore appears that, the more traditional the teaching style, the lower is the holistic score relative to the analytic score (or its components). For Mrs. Smith, the most holistic of the teachers studied, the difference between the holistic score and the analytic scores (overall or components) was smallest. The difference increases as the teaching style becomes more traditional. This does not compare the actual scores of one teacher against another. It merely looks at how each teacher scored under the holistic scoring method as compared to how she did under the analytic scoring method. In other words, the difference between the scoring methods is greater for more traditional teachers than is the case for holistic teachers.

Pearson's Product-Moment Correlations

Correlation coefficients were computed to analyze the relationships that existed between each of the various scores assigned for each class. Specifically, for the set of samples collected from each teacher, correlations were run between:

The holistic scores and the overall analytic scores;

The holistic scores and the components of the analytic scores

The overall analytic score and each of its components;

Each component of the analytic score and the other components of the analytic score.

The results of correlations between holistic scores and analytic scores and components are presented in Table 4. The results of correlations between the analytic scores and their three component scores are presented in Table 5. Teachers are arranged in both tables from the more holistic to the more traditional teaching style.

The results show that, with the exception of one teacher (Green), there is a positive correlation between the holistic score and the analytic score, as well as between the holistic score and each component making up the analytic score at a significance level of .01. If the significance level is reduced to .05, the same observation can be made for correlations between the overall analytic score and each of its components. Finally, the same observation can be made for correlations between the individual components of the analytic score.

If Mrs. Green is excluded from the analysis, there is a significant correlation between both the two scoring methods and between the components of the analytic method and the overall scores of either method. This implies that either method is suitable for scoring first grade writing samples.

There appears to be no clear pattern to the uncorrelated pairs of data in the case of Green; however,

Table 4

Correlation Coefficients Between Holistic and Analytic Scoring Methods

Variable A	Variable B	Smith N = 14	Walsh N = 15	Duffy N = 18	Green N = 11	Jones N = 15
		(Holistic	----->	Traditional)		
Holistic	Analytic	.847**	.639*	.706**	.563	.760**
Holistic	Content	.765**	.767**	.602**	.296	.678**
Holistic	Creativity	.769**	.778**	.590**	.673*	.691**
Holistic	Conventions	.843**	.623*	.773**	.377	.712**

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 5

Correlation Coefficients Between Analytic Scores and Component Scores

Variable A	Variable B	Smith N = 14	Walsh N = 15	Duffy N = 18	Green N = 11	Jones N = 15
		(Holistic	----->	Traditional)		
Analytic	Content	.931**	.944**	.956**	.756**	.572*
Analytic	Creativity	.961**	.913**	.925**	.510	.636
Analytic	Conventions	.912**	.523*	.899**	.893*	.584*
Content	Creativity	.877**	.940**	.871**	.152	.787**
Content	Conventions	.740**	.744**	.780**	.581	.625*
Creativity	Conventions	.814**	.529*	.714**	.180	.832**

*p < .05. **p < .01.

further discussion regarding the samples from her class will be addressed later in this chapter.

The discussion above does not address the magnitude of the correlations, and examination of the correlation coefficients in Tables 4 and 5 do not show any clear pattern; however, correlations tend to be weaker among the more traditional teachers.

Mrs. Green

The conclusions drawn in the previous sections of this paper were made without considering Mrs Green's class, since her samples seemed to deviate from what otherwise seemed to be consistent trends. There are four general areas which, in this author's opinion, could have contributed to the different behavior of Mrs. Green's class.

First, the ratio of boys to girls was lower for Mrs. Green's class than for any of the other teachers. Table 6 shows the ratio of boys' samples to girls' samples for each of the five classes.

One way analysis of variance was used to compare the mean score of all boys with those of all girls in each of the scoring methods and components. Table 7 shows the resulting F-statistic and critical value for ANOVA's comparing the boys to girls in each of the scores and components. There were a total of 36 boys and 37 girls among all five classes studied for the analytic score.

Table 6

Ratio of Boys to Girls

Teacher	Ratio	Percentage
Smith	6 Boys : 8 Girls	42.8
Walsh	7 Boys : 7 Girls	46.7
Duffy	11 Boys : 7 Girls	61.1
Green	4 Boys : 7 Girls	36.4
Jones	8 Boys : 7 Girls	53.3

As shown in Table 7, boy's scores are significantly different from girl's in both the holistic score and two of the three components of the analytic score (content and creativity). The difference is not significant between boys and girls in conventions. For the overall analytic score, at a significance level of .05, the difference in means between boys and girls is not significant, but does come close ($p=.054$). As can be seen in the scatterplots for the 95% confidence intervals (Appendix I), in all five areas, boys scored lower than girls. In the author's view, this is the primary reason for the difference in outcome of Mrs. Green's class.

Second, Mrs Green's class provided the smallest number of samples for the study.

Third, although children in all five classes have their own personal dictionary of frequently used words, they were asked to write without them for this study. While children in the other four classes abided by this request, Mrs. Green's class was very reliant on the books, and struggled greatly without them. Consequently, many children used them, which may account for the higher scores in Mrs. Green's class.

Finally, it is possible that the combination of random assignment and parent requests resulted in a group of first graders that were developmentally more advanced in their

Table 7
Summary of Sex Differences

Score	Boys (N=36)	Girls (N=37)	F	p
Holistic	2.139	2.716	8.210*	.005
Overall Analytic	2.675	3.012	3.840	.054
Content	2.824	3.297	6.020*	.017
Creativity	2.676	3.126	6.240*	.015
Conventions	2.527	2.622	0.230	.631

writing skills.

For this reason, nonparametric Mann-Whitney tests (or Kruskal-Wallis tests where more than two samples existed) were also run. For nineteen of the twenty tests conducted, the results were the same, regardless of whether a non-parametric or parametric procedure was used. Only one test for differences between boys and girls using the overall traditional scoring method yielded a different result between the Mann-Whitney (nonparametric) test and ANOVA (parametric) test. This result did not change any of the conclusions drawn, as test statistics from both of these tests were extremely close to the critical value for acceptance or rejection of the null hypothesis. Conclusions drawn from all of the hypothesis tests conducted are therefore the same, regardless of whether parametric or nonparametric statistical tests are used. Since parametric testing makes full use of the ordinal values for the datapoints in the samples, the results of the parametric tests rather than nonparametric tests are presented in this study.

Summary

The findings of the research indicate there is a significant correlation between both the two scoring methods and between the components of the analytic method and the overall scores of either method; however, the correlations

tended to be weaker among the more traditional teachers. Comparison of the means for these samples using ANOVA showed that for all five teachers, the analytic score was higher than the holistic score. The difference was significant, however, only among the more traditional teachers. The research also showed that the average boy's score was significantly lower than average girl's score for both the holistic score and the overall analytic score. Significant differences existed in two of the three components of the analytic score (content and creativity). Perhaps most important was finding that the teachers using the most traditional and the most holistic methods of teaching had lower mean scores than teachers who integrate both methods. These differences however, were not significant.

CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion, Summary, and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to determine what effects the methods used to teach writing have on students' writing ability. Specifically, the study sought to determine if first grade children's writing skills were affected by the method used to teach writing, and whether one scoring method evaluated a given sample as more advanced than the other method.

A review of the literature on the whole language/ process approach to teaching showed that writing development skills of children taught in whole language classrooms are at a level comparable to those of children taught in traditional classrooms. The literature also indicates that holistic scoring is an effective method for evaluating writing samples.

The method used for this research involved the study of the different teaching methods used in five first grade classrooms. The classrooms were observed and teachers were interviewed individually. Children were taught two lessons approximately six weeks apart, and asked to write a story at the end of each lesson. These stories were collected, assigned numbers for blind scoring, and scored using analytic and holistic scoring methods. The scores for each of the five classes were entered on a computer, sorted and

analyzed. Hypothesis tests were performed on the data using Pearson's Product-Moment Correlations between different scoring methods and components. One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to perform hypothesis tests between sample means for the different scoring and teaching methods studied.

Discussion of Findings

Excluding Mrs. Green's class from the analysis, no significant difference was found between the mean scores for students in each of the four remaining classes, regardless of the scoring method used. It is interesting to note however that the mean scores were consistently higher in classes with teachers that integrated the holistic and traditional teaching methods as compared to classes being taught in a more holistic or a more traditional setting.

Analysis of scoring methods revealed that although the mean scores were higher under the analytic method for all five teachers, there were significant correlations between the two methods, which implies that either method is equally effective for scoring first grade samples. The correlations were strongest however for the more holistic classes. Analysis of the means confirmed that the analytic score was significantly higher than the holistic score for students in the more traditional classes, and that there was no significant difference between the two for students in the

more holistic classes.

Finally, a significant difference was found to exist between the mean scores of boys and the mean scores of girls, with boys performing consistently lower. This suggests that at the first grade level, boys are slower in developing writing skills than girls.

Researcher's Comments

In this researcher's visits to the five classes, two of the classes observed were taught by teachers who integrated both whole language and traditional methods of teaching. These teachers were very enthusiastic about the writing children did in their classes and emphasized the positive aspects of children's writing rather than focusing on mistakes. The teachers willingly participated in this study, and while they remained in the classroom during the researchers visits, they did not interfere at all during the lessons. The children in these classrooms were extremely enthusiastic writers, and when asked to write a story for the researcher had little difficulty. In general students in these two classes scored higher than those children being taught by more traditional or more holistic teachers.

The two more traditional teachers spent large amounts of time correcting mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation and encouraged students to use their individual dictionaries. These teachers remained in the classroom

while the researcher taught the lessons and during the writing of the stories moved throughout the room reminding students of grammar spelling and punctuation rules. The students in these classes had a much more difficult time writing stories, and those in Mrs. Green's class in particular relied heavily on their dictionaries. This could account for the unusually high scores in her class.

Summary

Currently, the whole language method of teaching is quite popular in elementary schools. Although there is still much controversy surrounding its use, many of the features characteristic of whole language are being implemented in elementary school curriculums. However, the experimental literature to date does not clearly support the position that children in whole language classrooms perform at least as well as those in traditional settings.

In fact, relatively little experimental research has been done in this area. This researcher has been unable to find any studies comparing the two methods of teaching and the skills development of the students taught by these methods. Studies need to be conducted over a longer period of time, with a larger sample size. They should involve a variety of teachers who are well-trained and familiar with the instructional style used.

Limitations

1. This study is limited by the availability of first grade teachers willing to participate in this research.

2. This study is limited by the amount of time available to conduct the research.

Recommendations

Further studies need to be conducted involving a larger number of samples collected throughout an entire school year. It is also recommended that studies be conducted involving various grade levels. It would also be helpful to study a larger number of teachers to determine if one teaching method seems to enhance the development of specific skills. In addition, it is recommended that further research involve a long term study which tracks children from the first grade through high school, to determine if the method used to teach writing makes a significant difference in later years. Further studies need to be done to acknowledge that boys are developmentally slower in writing skills than girls. Finally, it is recommended that studies be conducted for other age groups to determine if the results of this study are similar for various grade levels.

REFERENCES

References

- Atkins, C. (1984). Writing: Doing something constructive. Young Children, 40(1), 3-7.
- Atwerger, B., Edelsky, C. & Flores, B. (1987). Whole language, what's new? The Reading Teacher, 41(2), 144-154.
- Baghban, M. (1984). Our daughter learns to read and write. Newark Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Bissex, G. L. (1980). Gnys at work. Cambridge Massachusetts and London England: Howard University Press.
- Bulgarella, L., & Long, R. (1985). Social interaction and the writing process. Language Arts, 62(2), 166-171.
- California State Department of Education. (1987). English-language arts framework: Kindergarten through grade twelve. Sacramento, CA.
- Clay, M. M. (1975). What did I write? New Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Craig, M. J. (1973). Questions and answers about weather. New York: Four Winds Press.
- Daniels, H., & Zemelman, S. (1985). A writing project: Training teachers of composition from kindergarten to college. New Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books
- DeFord, D. E. (1980). Young children and their writing. Theory Into Practice, 19, 157-169.

- Dolch, E. W. (1941). Teaching primary reading. Champaign, Ill: Garrard.
- De Paola, T. (1975). The cloud book. New York: Holiday House.
- Dyson, A. H. (1985). Puzzles, paints, and pencils: Writing emerges. Language Arts, 13, 13-16.
- Ferreiro, E., & Teberosky, A. (1982). Literacy before schooling. Exeter, New Hampshire: Heinemann.
- Fields, M. V. (1988). Talking and writing: Explaining the whole language approach to parents. The Reading Teacher, 41, 898-903.
- Frederiksen, N. (1984). The real test bias. American Psychologist, 39, 193-202.
- Greenberg, K. L., Wiener, H.S., & Donovan, R. A. (1986). Writing assessment: Issues and strategies. New York: Longman Inc.
- Griffin, E. F. (1982). The island of childhood: Education in the special world of nursery school. Columbia University, Teachers College Press.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1983). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Graves, D. H. (1975). An examination of seven year old children. Research in the Teaching of English, 9, 227-241.

Greenberg, K. L., Wiener, H. S., & Donovan, R. A. (1986).

Writing assessment: Issues strategies. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hemphill, J. (1981). Language Arts Instruction: A continuum of possible models. Language Arts, 58(6), 643-651.

Hilliker, J. (1982). Labelling to beginning narrative: Understanding writing. Clemsford, M. A.: Northeast Regional Exchange, Inc.

Hipple, M. L. (1985). Journal writing in kindergarten. Language Arts, 62(3), 255-261.

Imaginations (1989). Chicago: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Johnston, M. M. (1987). Total reading. United States: Total Reading Inc.

Lerner, B. (1981). The minimum competency testing movement: Social, scientific, and legal implications. American Psychologist, 36, 1057-1066.

Lippincott Reading Series (1975, 1981). New York: Harper and Row.

Long, R., & Bulgarella, L. (1985). Social interaction and the writing process. Language Arts, 62(2), 166-171.

Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools. (1979). A common ground for assessing competence in written expression. Downey, CA.

- Martin, B. & Grogan, P. (1972). Instant readers series. New York: Halt, Rhinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- McCracken, R. A. & McCracken, M. J. (1972). Reading is only the tiger's tail. Washington, D.C. NAEYC.
- Minner, S., Prater, G., Sullavan, C., & Gwaltney, W. (1989). Informal assessment of written expression. Teaching Exceptional Children, 21, 76-79.
- Modern Curriculum Press. (1987). Cleveland, Ohio: Modern Curriculum Press, Inc.
- Morrow, L. M., & Strickland, D.S. (1988). Emerging readers and writers: New perspectives on young children learning to read and write. The Reading Teacher, 41.
- Odyssey Books. (1982). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Polloway, E. A., & Smith, J. E. (1982). Teaching language skills to exceptional learners.
- Scott Foresman Reading Unlimited. (1976). Glenview, Ill. Scott Foresman and Company.
- Shapiro, J., & Gunderson, L. (1988). A comparison of vocabulary generated by grade 1 students in whole language classrooms and basal reader vocabulary. Reading Research and Instruction, 27(2), 40-46.
- Sowers, S. (1986). Understanding writing: Ways of observing learning and teaching, K-8. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

- Starvish, M. (1984). In a classroom where kindergartners are required to write one story a week, the children are better speakers, earlier readers and, generally more careful communicators. Learning, 12, 40-41.
- Steig, W. (1977). Amos and Baris. Melrose Park, Ill. Lake Book Manufacturing, Inc.
- Stiggins, R. J. (1985). Improving assessment where it means the most: In the classroom. Educational Leadership, 43, 69-74.
- Sulzby, E., & Teale, W. (1985). Writing development in early childhood. Educational Horizons, 64(1), 8-12.
- Teale, W. H., & Sulby, E. (1986). Emergent literacy, writing and reading. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Teale, W. H. (1988). Developmentally appropriate assessment of reading and writing in the early childhood classroom. The Elementary School Journal, 89(2), 172-183.
- Starvish, M. (1985). In a classroom where kindergartners are required to write one story a week, the children are better speakers, earlier readers and, generally, more careful communicators. Language Arts, 62(3), 40-41.
- Sulzby, E., & Teale, W. H. (1985). Writing development in early childhood. Educational Horizons, 8, 13.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Questions

- 1) How many years have you taught first grade? Have you taught any other grades?
- 2) Do you give any type of readiness test in the beginning of the school year? Are these results used to determine if children will be "late birds" or "early birds?"
- 3) How do you begin your writing program? How do you build on this approach throughout the year?
- 4) What type of writing do students participate in?
- 5) How often do children write?
- 6) How do you evaluate children's writing? Is writing evaluated on the report card? How?
- 7) Is children's writing evaluated by any means of formal testing?
- 8) Do you correct spelling errors? How?
- 9) How do you determine children's spelling grade?
- 10) Do you consider content and form to be equally important?
- 11) Have children in your classes throughout the years participated in similar types of writing programs?
- 12) What are your reasons for following the program you use? How much freedom do you have in planning your writing curriculum?
- 13) What is your goal for these children? What do you hope they are able to accomplish by the time they complete first grade?

APPENDIX B

Instructions

- 1.) Read the information contained on the cover sheet regarding the two lessons.
- 2.) For each sample, take a blank score sheet and enter the **Sample Number** (from the back of the sample) in the appropriate spaces.
- 3.) For each of the three basic categories below (Content, Creativity/Originality, and Conventions), rate the subcategories with a numerical score between 1 and 4 where:
 - 1 = Absent
 - 2 = Poorly Developed
 - 3 = Partially Developed
 - 4 = Reasonably Well Developed
- 4.) Do not refer back to other grade sheets in assigning your scores. Try not to compare one score sheet with another.

SAMPLE NO:**CONTENT**

Ideas are expressed in a logical, orderly, and consistent manner. Ideas are descriptive and concise, and related to selected topic.

CREATIVITY/ORIGINALITY

The sample represents original thinking. Vocabulary is varied and multiple syllable words are attempted.

CONVENTIONS

Sentences begin with capitals and end with periods. Sentences convey a complete thought and words are spelled conventionally.

APPENDIX C

Holistic Scoring

While there is no specific form for holistic scoring, there are some general guidelines to follow. The method involves each sample being read quickly by two readers and scored using a scale between one and four, with four being the highest. Each paper is read by the first reader, who then places their score in the left hand corner of the paper and folds the corner back. The second reader then reads the paper and places their score in the upper right hand corner of the paper. Scorers are given the opportunity to score several practice papers. Generally, scorers are to judge papers on the overall effectiveness of conveying a message rather than concentrating on spelling, punctuation, and neatness. If there is a discrepancy of more than two points between the two rater's scores, a third reader assign the final score.

APPENDIX D

Agreement to Participate in Research at San Jose State University

RESPONSIBLE INVESTIGATOR: Teresa Nagle

Your child is invited to participate in a research study that is investigating various methods to teach writing. Please read sign and return the following form if you consent to your child's participation.

I understand that

- a) my child will be asked to write 2 brief "stories" for the investigator during his/her regular writing period. This work will be collected between 12/88 and 3/89.
- b) there are no risks if my child participates in the study. If for any reason my child doesn't want to participate, or doesn't want to complete any of the stories, he/she does not need to.
- c) The possible benefits of this study to my child are: the teachers may find this information about their students' writing skill strengths/difficulties helpful as they plan their instructional strategies and curriculum.
- d) the results from this study may be published, but any information from this study that can be identified with my child will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with my permission or as required by law. Although my child's name will appear on his/her samples for purposes of charting his/her progress, these samples will be viewed only by my child's teacher, the researcher and her advisor.
- e) any questions about my child's participation in this study will be answered by Teresa Nagle at 372-3499. Complaints about procedures may be presented to Dr. Amy Strage at 924-3715. For questions or complaints about research subject's rights, contact Dr. Serena Stanford (Associate Academic Vice President for Graduate Studies) at 924-2480.
- f) my consent is given voluntarily without being coerced; my child may refuse to participate in this study or in any part of this study, and I may withdraw my consent at any time, without prejudice to my relations or my child's with SJSU.
- g) I have received a copy of this consent form for my file.

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE, I HAVE MADE A DECISION WHETHER OR NOT MY CHILD MAY PARTICIPATE. MY SIGNATURE INDICATES THAT MY CHILD MAY PARTICIPATE AND IS WILLING TO PARTICIPATE.

DATE

PARENT'S/GUARDIAN'S
SIGNATURE

PRINT CHILD'S NAME

RELATION TO CHILD

Dear Parents,

My name is Teresa Nagle, and I am a graduate student at San Jose State University. As part of the requirements to obtain a masters degree in elementary education I must complete a thesis. I have chosen to research writing skills development, and would like to conduct my research in the first grade classrooms at La Mesa School. Your child's participation in this study in no way poses any risk to them, and in fact could have potential benefits. I have attached an "agreement to participate" sheet that outlines what I will be asking your child to do. Your child's teacher and the school principal Mr. Krasa have agreed to participate in this project, but you are in no way obligated to do so. If you have further question or concerns please contact me at 372-3499. If you are interested in participating, please fill out the lower portion of this paper and return it promptly to your child's teacher. Keep the information sheet for your own records. I look forward to working with your child and thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Teresa Nagle

Having read the information provided, I have make a decision whether or not my child may participate. My signature indicates that my child may participate and is willing to participate.

Date

Parent's/Guardian's
Signature

Print child's name

Relation to Child

APPENDIX E

Descriptions of Reading Materials and Instructional Methods

Modern Curriculum Press - a basal reading series consisting of a carefully controlled phonetic vocabulary

Odyssey Literature Program - a reading series offering students a solid foundation in literary appreciation while helping to build skills in reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

McCracken - this is an individualized language program using an integrated thematic approach to teach reading and writing skills.

Bay Area Writing Project Workshop - programs in which teachers meet on a regular basis to write, share their work with colleagues, to study recent composition theory and research, to reexamine their own classroom practice, and to develop their own classroom plans for improved instruction (Daniels & Zemelman, 1985).

Imagination - a literature based program that thoroughly integrates reading, writing, listening, and speaking with thinking. Techniques are used that actively engage students in thinking critically, creatively, and logically (Imaginations, 1989).

Total Reading - a complete language arts program for the Primary Grades, integrating the teaching of reading, writing, spelling, and speech. A decoding phonetic approach is used in reading with strong emphasis on comprehension and vocabulary growth. Oral readiness precedes every step. The method is used with library books for which literal, evaluative, and interpretive comprehensive questions have been written (Johnston, 1987).

Appendix F

Comparison of Class Means for Different Scoring Methods

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Holistic Scores

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	4	9.829	2.457	3.42	0.013
ERROR	68	48.829	0.718		
TOTAL	72	58.658			

(Critical Value* : 2.5066)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED SIDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	
SMITH	14	2.2500	0.8263	(-----+-----)
WALSH	15	2.6667	0.9386	(-----+-----)
DUFFY	18	2.3889	0.7584	(-----+-----)
GREEN	11	3.0909	0.8006	(-----+-----)
JONES	15	1.9333	0.9037	(-----+-----)
POOLED SIDEV = 0.8474				1.80 2.40 3.00 3.60

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Overall Analytic Scores

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	4	4.777	1.194	2.29	0.069
ERROR	68	35.521	0.522		
TOTAL	72	40.298			

(Critical Value* : 2.5066)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED SIDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	
SMITH	14	2.4600	0.8990	(-----+-----)
WALSH	15	2.9473	0.7181	(-----+-----)
DUFFY	18	2.9200	0.7262	(-----+-----)
GREEN	11	3.2824	0.4034	(-----+-----)
JONES	15	2.6947	0.7172	(-----+-----)
POOLED SIDEV = 0.7228				2.50 3.00 3.50

Comparison of Class Means for Different Scoring Methods

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Content Component of Analytic Score

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	4	5.285	1.321	1.91	0.118
ERROR	68	46.953	0.690		
TOTAL	72	52.237			

(Critical Value* : 2.5066)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	
SMITH	14	2.6664	0.9356	(-----+-----)
WALSH	15	3.0667	0.9533	(-----+-----)
DUFFY	18	3.1856	0.8425	(-----+-----)
GREEN	11	3.5455	0.4023	(-----+-----)
JONES	15	2.9333	0.8091	(-----+-----)
POOLED STDEV = 0.8310				2.50 3.00 3.50 4.00

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Creativity Component of Analytic Score

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	4	6.975	1.744	3.06	0.022
ERROR	68	38.721	0.569		
TOTAL	72	45.696			

(Critical Value* : 2.5066)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	
SMITH	14	2.5950	0.9800	(-----+-----)
WALSH	15	2.8893	0.7939	(-----+-----)
DUFFY	18	2.9806	0.7190	(-----+-----)
GREEN	11	3.5455	0.4539	(-----+-----)
JONES	15	2.6453	0.6846	(-----+-----)
POOLED STDEV = 0.7546				2.50 3.00 3.50

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Conventions Component of Analytic Score

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	4	4.943	1.236	1.86	0.128
ERROR	68	45.285	0.666		
TOTAL	72	50.228			

(Critical Value* : 2.5066)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	
SMITH	14	2.1193	0.9656	(-----+-----)
WALSH	15	2.8880	0.6867	(-----+-----)
DUFFY	18	2.5917	0.7880	(-----+-----)
GREEN	11	2.7882	0.7342	(-----+-----)
JONES	15	2.5113	0.8708	(-----+-----)
POOLED STDEV = 0.8161				2.00 2.50 3.00

* Critical Values shown are computed at a significance level of .05

Appendix G

Comparison of Mean Holistic and Analytic Scores

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Mrs Smith

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	1	0.309	0.309	0.41	0.526
ERROR	26	19.381	0.745		
TOTAL	27	19.690			

(Critical Value* : 4.2253)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	
HOLISTIC	14	2.2500	0.8263	(-----+-----+-----+-----)
ANALYTIC	14	2.4600	0.8990	(-----+-----+-----+-----)
POOLED STDEV = 0.8634				2.10 2.45 2.80

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Mrs. Walsh

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	1	0.591	0.591	0.85	0.366
ERROR	28	19.554	0.698		
TOTAL	29	20.144			

(Critical Value* : 4.1959)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	
HOLISTIC	15	2.6667	0.9386	(-----+-----+-----+-----)
ANALYTIC	15	2.9473	0.7181	(-----+-----+-----+-----)
POOLED STDEV = 0.8357				2.45 2.80 3.15

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Mrs. Duffy

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	1	2.539	2.539	4.60	0.039
ERROR	34	18.744	0.551		
TOTAL	35	21.283			

(Critical Value* : 4.1300)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	
HOLISTIC	18	2.3889	0.7584	(-----+-----+-----+-----)
ANALYTIC	18	2.9200	0.7262	(-----+-----+-----+-----)
POOLED STDEV = 0.7425				2.10 2.45 2.80 3.15

Appendix G(continued)

Comparison of Mean Holistic and Analytic Scores

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Mrs. Green

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	1	0.202	0.202	0.50	0.487
ERROR	20	8.036	0.402		
TOTAL	21	8.238			

(Critical Value* : 4.3513)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	-----+-----+-----+-----+-----
HOLISTIC	11	3.0909	0.8006	(-----*-----)
ANALYTIC	11	3.2824	0.4034	(-----*-----)
POOLED STDEV = 0.6339				-----+-----+-----+-----+-----
				2.70 3.00 3.30 3.60

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Mrs. Jones

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	1	4.347	4.347	6.53	0.016
ERROR	28	18.635	0.666		
TOTAL	29	22.982			

(Critical Value* : 4.1959)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	-----+-----+-----+-----+-----
CHOLALL	15	1.9333	0.9037	(-----*-----)
COVLALL	15	2.6947	0.7172	(-----*-----)
POOLED STDEV = 0.8158				-----+-----+-----+-----+-----
				2.00 2.50 3.00

= Critical Values shown are computed at a significance level of .05

Comparison of Mean Holistic and Analytic Component Scores

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Mrs. Smith

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	3	2.941	0.980	1.14	0.343
ERROR	52	44.862	0.863		
TOTAL	55	47.803			

(Critical Value* : 2.7826)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	
HOLISTIC	14	2.2500	0.8263	(-----+-----+-----+-----+-----)
CONTENT	14	2.6664	0.9356	(-----+-----+-----+-----+-----)
CREATIVITY	14	2.5950	0.9800	(-----+-----+-----+-----+-----)
CONVENTIONS	14	2.1193	0.8656	(-----+-----+-----+-----+-----)
POOLED STDEV = 0.9288				2.00 2.50 3.00

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Mrs. Walsh

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	3	1.207	0.402	0.56	0.646
ERROR	56	40.480	0.723		
TOTAL	59	41.687			

(Critical Value* : 2.7695)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	
HOLISTIC	15	2.6667	0.9386	(-----+-----+-----+-----+-----)
CONTENT	15	3.0667	0.9533	(-----+-----+-----+-----+-----)
CREATIVITY	15	2.8893	0.7939	(-----+-----+-----+-----+-----)
CONVENTIONS	15	2.8880	0.6867	(-----+-----+-----+-----+-----)
POOLED STDEV = 0.8502				2.45 2.80 3.15

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Mrs. Duffy

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	3	7.073	2.358	3.89	0.013
ERROR	68	41.190	0.606		
TOTAL	71	48.264			

(Critical Value* : 2.7395)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	
HOLISTIC	18	2.3889	0.7584	(-----+-----+-----+-----+-----)
CONTENT	18	3.1856	0.8425	(-----+-----+-----+-----+-----)
CREATIVITY	18	2.9806	0.7190	(-----+-----+-----+-----+-----)
CONVENTIONS	18	2.5917	0.7880	(-----+-----+-----+-----+-----)
POOLED STDEV = 0.7783				2.50 3.00 3.50

Appendix H(continued)

Comparison of Mean Holistic and Analytic Component Scores

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Mrs. Green

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	3	4.542	1.514	3.91	0.015
ERROR	40	15.479	0.387		
TOTAL	43	20.022			

(Critical Value* : 2.8387)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	
HOLISTIC	11	3.0909	0.8006	(-----●-----)
CONTENT	11	3.5455	0.4023	(-----●-----)
CREATIVITY	11	3.5455	0.4539	(-----●-----)
CONVENTIONS	11	2.7882	0.7342	(-----●-----)
POOLED STDEV = 0.6221				2.50 3.00 3.50 4.00

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Mrs. Jones

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	3	7.950	2.650	3.93	0.013
ERROR	56	37.776	0.675		
TOTAL	59	45.726			

(Critical Value* : 2.7695)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	
HOLISTIC	15	1.9333	0.9037	(-----●-----)
CONTENT	15	2.9333	0.8091	(-----●-----)
CREATIVITY	15	2.8453	0.6846	(-----●-----)
CONVENTIONS	15	2.5113	0.8708	(-----●-----)
POOLED STDEV = 0.8213				2.00 2.50 3.00

* Critical Values shown are computed at a significance level of .05

Appendix I

Comparison of Mean Scores for Males and Females

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Holistic Scores

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	1	6.082	6.082	8.21	0.005
ERROR	71	52.576	0.741		
TOTAL	72	58.658			

(Critical Value* : 3.9758)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	-----+-----+-----+-----
BOYS	36	2.1389	0.8751	(-----*-----)
GRLS	37	2.7162	0.8461	(-----*-----)
POOLED STDEV = 0.8605				-----+-----+-----+-----
				2.10 2.45 2.80

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Overall Analytic Scores

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	1	2.066	2.066	3.84	0.054
ERROR	71	38.232	0.538		
TOTAL	72	40.298			

(Critical Value* : 3.9758)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	-----+-----+-----+-----
BOYS	36	2.6752	0.7882	(-----*-----)
GRLS	37	3.0116	0.6767	(-----*-----)
POOLED STDEV = 0.7338				-----+-----+-----+-----
				2.50 2.75 3.00 3.25

Appendix 1(continued)

Comparison of Mean Scores for Males and Females

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Content Component of Analytic Score

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	1	4.085	4.085	6.02	0.017
ERROR	71	48.153	0.678		
TOTAL	72	52.237			

(Critical Value* : 3.9758)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	
BOYS	36	2.8242	0.9110	(-----+-----+-----+-----+)
GRLS	37	3.2973	0.7285	(-----+-----+-----+-----+)
POOLED STDEV = 0.8235				2.70 3.00 3.30 3.60

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Creativity Component of Analytic Score

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	1	3.692	3.692	6.24	0.015
ERROR	71	42.004	0.592		
TOTAL	72	45.696			

(Critical Value* : 3.9758)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	
BOYS	36	2.6761	0.8455	(-----+-----+-----+-----+)
GRLS	37	3.1259	0.6869	(-----+-----+-----+-----+)
POOLED STDEV = 0.7692				2.70 3.00 3.30

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE : Conventions Component of Analytic Score

SOURCE	DF	SS	MS	F	p
FACTOR	1	0.164	0.164	0.23	0.631
ERROR	71	50.064	0.705		
TOTAL	72	50.228			

(Critical Value* : 3.9758)

INDIVIDUAL 95 PCT CI'S FOR MEAN
BASED ON POOLED STDEV

LEVEL	N	MEAN	STDEV	
BOYS	36	2.5269	0.8663	(-----+-----+-----+-----+)
GRLS	37	2.6219	0.8131	(-----+-----+-----+-----+)
POOLED STDEV = 0.8397				2.40 2.60 2.80

* Critical Values shown are computed at a significance level of .05