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CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Knowledge of the way written texts are organized is an important element in a reader's ability to construct meaning from the text. This knowledge of text structure is one of the several complex knowledge systems related to success in reading, for example: (1) knowledge of the structure of oral and written language, (2) knowledge of print conventions, and (3) world knowledge, developed through experience. Readers use their knowledge of the semantic and syntactic systems to form expectations as they approach written texts. They predict words and sentence patterns and then check and confirm those predictions by using visual information (Goodman and Burke, 1972; Clay, 1974). Readers may extend beyond the word and sentence levels to make predictions based upon text organization. There is abundant evidence that knowledge of text structure plays a role in the understanding and production of narrative texts. It is reasonable to infer that knowledge of text organization also plays a role in ability to read and understand expository texts.
Readers' sets of expectations, or story schema, about the internal structure of stories serve to facilitate both encoding and retrieval during reading (Mandler and Johnson, 1977). Even very young children appear to recognize form or structure in stories or narrative text (Applebee, 1977; Whaley, 1981). When asked to tell a story, children between the ages of two and five were capable of using simple narrative conventions to a significant degree. Seventy percent of the youngest children were able to use at least one of the conventions, and nearly 50 percent were able to use three conventions by the age of five (Applebee, 1977). Typical formats, sometimes referred to as schema, (Rumelhart, 1977) such as "once upon a time" or "they lived happily ever after", signal a story of a certain type to children and can assist the child in remembering the story elements through expectations of the order of the tale.

Hardy (1977) suggests that all of life is lived out through narrative; we dream in narrative, daydream in narrative, remember, anticipate, hope, despair, believe, doubt, plan, revise...In order really to live, we make up stories about ourselves and others, about the personal
as well as the social past and future. Pearson Et Al, (1981) and McGee and Richgels (1985) theorize that most of a child's experiences with words are encountered through the narrative forms. Children's picture books, television programming, and basal textbooks are primarily in a narrative format.

Background of the Problem

Fitzgerald and Spiegel (1983) used instruction in narrative structure to enhance fourth grade readers' comprehension as well as story structure knowledge. The children in this study were identified as average and below average readers without a "keen sense of narrative structure". Since an understanding of story structure is beneficial to the reader, it has been proposed that teachers make children aware of the structure of stories or story models.

A common observation among reading teachers and reading researchers is that children of all ages have difficulty processing expository text structure (McGee, 1982; Taylor, 1980). Further research by Taylor (1984), showed that there is a breakdown in many students' attempts to make the transition from narrative forms to
both reading and writing of expository text. Data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress has indicated that 9-13 year old students have difficulty processing factors related to writing informative text (Taylor, 1985). A National Commission (Anderson Et Al, 1985) found that children would be helped to make the transition to nonfiction text if early basal readers contained more high quality nonfiction material.

Studies on text structure suggest that competence with story structure precedes competence with expository structure (Meyer, Brandt, & Bluth, 1980). Mandler and Johnson (1977) suggested that story schemata differed at various points in development and there were qualitative differences in recall. If there is greater competence with story grammars than expository structures that may be because we live out our lives in story-like formats (suggested by Hardy) or it may be due to an earlier and greater exposure to narrative forms.

Newkirk (1987) posed a viewpoint contrary to Moffett’s "narrative must do for all" view. He suggested that perhaps "another angle of vision" is needed to discover the competence of children’s writing expositions. He believed that an incremental view which
looks at children's successful approximations may provide the needed angle; that is, success rather than a deficit angle.

Newkirk's (1987) study of the structures of 100 pieces of non-narrative writing composed by children in grades 1, 2, and 3 indicated that younger children's "stories" (so called by their teacher) were in reality labeling. Children in the upper grades were more able to sustain a coherent relationship among statements than children in the first grade. Newkirk believed that as students develop, they build more coherent links between statements and hierarchical structures. On the basis of his analysis, he has questioned accepted developmental models claiming that children begin by producing "expressive" writing (Britton, 1975) close to speech. According to Newkirk (1987), unless one gives an "almost hopeless range to the concept of expressive writing", the concept does not account for his findings. Children in Newkirk's study were not producing speech written down; rather, they were discovering their power to do something that speech cannot do, that is, to sort and display information. This study indicates that given the opportunity, children can and do make considerable
advances toward more mature writing of exposition. It appears that the low esteem given children's writings as deficit models may stem from a lack of serious instruction or study of expository writing in the elementary years.

Much research and most applications of research regarding text characteristics, narrative and expository structures, have been directed at secondary students (McGee, Richgels; 1985). At these upper grade levels, where exposition becomes the dominant type of writing, the most blatant difficulties appear in children's ability to comprehend and write expository texts. Armbruster & Anderson (1987) found that middle-grade students' comprehension of expository text was enhanced through instruction in structures typically found in their social studies text books. Students' ability to abstract the macrostructure of problem/solution texts read independently was improved by this training to recognize top-level structure. This top-level structure is the overall organizational scheme used by the author. Cause and effect is an example of top-level structure.

Meyer and Freedle (1984) and Thorndyke (1977) found that passages were more easily remembered when they had
a clear organizational structure with hierarchically related components. Students, however, who were not aware of structure or lacked knowledge of text structures did not benefit from texts written with these signals.

Armbruster and Gudbrandsen (1986) examined five social studies programs at fourth and sixth grade levels to determine how much and what kind of teaching of comprehension was provided in teachers' editions. Direct instruction in skills was rare, and studying skills were primarily taught or developed through practice of those skills that the students were presumed to already have acquired. The authors suggest that much confusion exists about what constitutes reading skills in this content area.

**Statement of the Problem**

With a considerable body of research available on text analysis, we have relatively little knowledge about young children's tacit understandings of expository text and the ways in which these understandings are developed in students' readings and writings. The purposes of this study were (1) to investigate the relationships between exposure to expository texts and/or informational books
and changes in third grade students' understandings, attitudes and interests; and (2) to examine the impact of direct instruction of expository text and/or informational book structures on students' reading and writing across ability levels.

Rationale and Purpose

Evidence from an earlier study (Ryan, Krakoff, & Skillings, 1988) suggests that third grade students are reasonably articulate about their perceptions of themselves as readers. Also, an examination of the third grade curriculum indicates that at this level, students are likely to come into contact with more expository text and that the focus of instruction changes from learning to read toward reading to learn. Finally, research (Taylor, 1984) indicates that at about fourth grade level many students have difficulty when they attempt to make the transition from narrative to expository forms in both reading and writing. Research of instructional studies indicates that students of all ability levels in grades 4-12 have difficulty in studying and linking together the concepts presented in science and social studies texts (Aulls, 1986). An examination of readers, a year before
this breakdown, would provide insights into children's macrostructure knowledge of texts just as they enter the critical period. The study would additionally provide information about ways in which teachers, textbook publishers, and developers of educational materials can support and facilitate learning.

Research Questions

The following questions guided the collection and analysis of the data:

(1) How does direct instruction in expository text structures impact on students' awareness and understanding of expository/informational books?

- What do students know about narrative text structure?
- What do students know about expository text organization?
- What are the tasks involved in expository text instruction?
- How do students of different abilities respond to expository structure instruction?
- How does degree of previous experience with writing affect student response to expository text instruction?

(2) How does direct instruction in expository text structures impact on students' writing products?

- How do students use information gained from instruction in their writing products?

(3) How does direct instruction in expository text structures impact on students' ability to gain knowledge from reading?
(4) How does direct instruction in expository text structures impact on students' attitudes and behaviors toward informational books?

- How do students make choices related to their reading and writing topics?
- What are students' opinions related to what makes a book easy or hard to read?
- How do these opinions relate to student ability?

(5) In what ways do students who receive instruction in expository text structures compare with students who receive traditional methods of science instruction?

- How do students' writing behaviors differ?
- How do students' writing products differ?
- How do students' scores on science tests differ?

Approach to the Study

In shaping the approach to the study, the researcher drew on a wide range of related and relevant research from many fields including: (1) children's literature; (2) reading; (3) textual analysis; (4) literary theory; (5) process writing; and (6) sociolinguistics. A naturalistic approach was selected as most appropriate to permit close study of routine talk together with routine reading and writing activities within the "speech community" (Hymes, 1974) of the classroom. As part of the research design, some qualitative techniques were used to gather data about materials, student and teacher behaviors of the participants in the study. These
sources of data included: (1) interviews; (2) observations; (3) audio and video recordings; (4) field notes; and (5) student writing samples following researcher text structure instruction. The researcher acted as a teacher participant in the classrooms involved in the study.

Scope of the Study

The study was conducted in three major phases, beginning in September of the 1988-89 school year and ending in May, 1989. Within each major phase, there was an auxiliary phase of examination of teaching strategies and materials and reorganization of the instruction. Each phase took approximately six weeks. Days and times of instruction, observation, and interviewing were decided in cooperation with classroom teachers. For each phase, activities were designed to answer the research questions. Analysis of the activities and outcomes of Phase One influenced the direction of each subsequent phase. These activities, materials, and assessment measures are discussed in Chapter Three.
Sample

The setting for the study was a suburban community school district in Central Ohio. Data were collected from children in three elementary schools, each housing kindergarten through fifth grade. The population of the community was predominately white, middle to upper-middle socio-economic status. Purposive sampling was used as the teachers worked cooperatively with the researcher in the selection of students from each of the three third grade classrooms. The following were selected: two students of high ability, two of average ability, and two of low ability. Descriptions of selected students (N=18) and demographic details of the school population are presented in chapter three.

In each school, the classroom teacher received technical assistance from the researcher in implementing a thematic unit of study. This unit was developed based upon those suggested from An Integrated Language Perspective in the Elementary School: Theory into Action, by Pappas, C.C., Kiefer, B.Z, and Levstik, L.S. (in preparation). The researcher also instructed the teachers in the expository structures that would be taught to children in their classrooms as well as the
writing and reading behaviors to be examined in the study. A complete discussion is presented in Chapter Three.

**Summary**

This study was designed to investigate the ways in which instruction in expository text structure influenced third grade students' understandings about how such texts are organized. The study was based on the assumption that after exposure to explicit instruction, students' written products would indicate a movement from expressive writing to the use of structures typical of expository texts. It was further hypothesized that after instruction in expository text structures, students would reveal higher levels of knowledge of expository text organization. Data for the study included: (1) video taped sessions; (2) student writing samples; (3) student and classroom teacher interviews; and (4) field notes from instructional sessions.

Chapter Two presents related literature; methods and procedures of the study are described in Chapter Three. Results of the study are presented in Chapter Four. Data analyses and implications for instruction and curriculum
development, and directions for further research are presented in Chapter Five.

Limitations

This research is limited as to the generalizability of the findings (Miles & Huberman; 1984) to populations and contexts other than those examined. This population is from a particular group with their own particular cultural orientation. Moreover, random sampling from the school population was not utilized. The results of this study cannot be generalized to the total population and have implications only for classrooms of children of similar backgrounds and experiences with writing; however, many of the kinds of reading and writing tasks presented here are typical in United States education. The researcher has attempted to present as rich a description and as much detail as possible relating to the methodology and materials, books, graphs and charts about the phenomena of study. Thus the study does provide information that will be of interest to teachers of reading and writing as well as the content areas. The study also has potential for providing insights as to how young children develop strategies for breaking the
author's code and learn and remember discourse.

Since the researcher provided instruction for the thematic unit, the study is limited by the possibility of researcher effects (Miles & Huberman; 1984). This limitation was minimized because the researcher's position as reading-language consultant provided frequent opportunities to be in the classrooms prior to the study and to become part of the local landscape (Miles & Huberman; 1984).

Another limitation is the existence of researcher bias. To reduce bias, the researcher observed behavioral phenomena in a variety of ways: (1) pre and post-study student interviews, (2) teacher interviews, (3) student writing samples, and (4) ratings of student responses and writing samples provided by two teachers not involved in the study. In a training session, the researcher and teachers collaboratively scored the responses of several students based on criteria previously established. Following the session, the remaining responses were independently rated with interrater agreement of 92%.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This review of literature includes: (1) a description of the nature of learning the composing process; (2) school contexts for learning to write; (3) a review of process writing approaches; (4) a discussion of genre theories; (5) a discussion of text analysis systems; (6) a review of instructional studies of text structure; and (7) a discussion of this study as it relates to the existing body of research of text structure.

The Nature of the Composing Process

The motivation to represent ourselves to others in print creates the need to learn the conventions of arrangement and space of the symbols that make it possible for others to comprehend a written message (Halliday, 1973, 1975; Clay, 1973). The same forces that shaped the child's reasons for speaking, act as the impetus for writing. Halliday (1973) described the young child's experiences as "learning how to mean", where new purposes are discovered for using language through
experiences with language. Bruner (1983) described the young child’s developing capacity to refer and to mean as the function or communicative intent; how to get things done with words. Experiences with the signs and symbols, books and stories children share with parents and other caregivers (Harste, Woodward, Burke, 1984) provide opportunities for children to desire to compose, to get things done with print.

The learner’s degree of awareness of the functions of written language depends on the degree of information received from the environment (Birnbaum, 1980). Research of early writers indicated similar social environments that included: (1) no direct instruction; (2) parents responded to children’s questions concerning writing; and (3) parents or caregivers displayed interest and pleasure in the writer’s efforts (Durkin, 1966).

**School Contexts for Writing Instruction**

For most children the first exposure to written language has been in the classroom. Research studies indicate that educational experiences for all children should be directed toward the meaningfulness of written language (Clay, 1977). This is particularly vital for
those children who have had little or no access to written language or for those from social environments where greater emphasis has been placed on television or oral communication. (Clay, 1977; Graves, 1979).

The Teacher’s Role

Teachers need to know children’s understandings about written language in order to begin to teach them successfully. Research (Harste, Woodward, and Burke, 1984) indicates that children know more about written language before they begin school than had been assumed. Studies revealed that many classroom writing activities initiated by teachers may in fact be debilitating to the learner rather than facilitate the process of writing development (Harste, Burke, 1980).

Traditional Instruction as Set of Skills

Historically, the child's first academic experiences have been directed toward subskills, rather than meaningful uses of written language (Birnbaum, 1980). More recently research has been directed toward looking at literacy learning not as a set of skills; rather, it is the result of a social environment that allows
children to participate in the literate community (Mckenzie and Pinnell, 1989). Traditionally, writing was not so much taught; rather, it was assigned and corrected (Calkins, 1986). The emphasis was on the final product, not on the processes that produced them.

**Process Writing Approaches**

Studies of teachers who gave more attention to function and meaning than to grammar and vocabulary drill, enabled students to develop language more effectively (Pinnell, 1975). There has been a significant change in the field of writing instruction. Major studies on how children develop as writers have shown that learning is an active process; we learn to write by writing (Moffett, 1968; Murray, 1968; Graves, 1975; Atwell, 1984; Calkins, 1986). Graves considered a number of factors crucial to the development of successful writers including: (1) teacher modeling of the various elements of the writing process; (2) publishing to develop the sense of audience; (3) provision of time for daily writing sessions; (4) peer and student-teacher conferencing related to writing; and (5) working with children through various draft stages. Important aspects
of this view of writing instruction are the development of voice and ownership in young writers.

Children need to write every day and receive a response to their voices, to know what comes through so that they might anticipate self-satisfaction and the vision of the imprint of their information on classmates or the vision of their work in published form. It is the forward vision, as well as the background vision, that ultimately lead to major breakthroughs in a child’s writing. (1983, p. 160)

Donald Murray (1982) defined the process as rehearsal, drafting, revision and editing. Teachers are encouraged to become researchers in their classrooms, to turn their classrooms into literate cultures enfranchising students as writers, to listen to what the writer has said rather than to how it was said. The aspect of student choice of writing topic in the movement toward process writing has not addressed the issue of assisting young writers to develop a wide variety of genres or modes of writing. Expressive writing has received the bulk of attention from teachers.

**Genre Theory**

Genres, in the context of this review, are the conventions or modes of writing that have distinctive meaning potentials within specific contexts. This
definition is used broadly, for there are generic choices within genres. Within narrative genre there are short stories, novels, poems, and so on. In expository genre there are such models as scientific texts, historical texts, or technical texts, to name a few. For the purpose of this study, expository genres are considered non-narrative writing.

Genre is one of the most controversial topics in reading theory today (Reid, 1987). The debate about genres in education appears to come from at least two schools of thought: those who propose that all patterns of discourse should be taught in the schools, (Rothery, 1985; Christie, 1987; Martin, 1987), and those who feel that those patterns have too rigid boundaries (Sawyer, Watson, 1987; Dixon, 1987).

Expository text or non-narrative writing instruction is also a subject of dissension among researchers. Recent studies indicated that children can and do write non-narrative texts (Newkirk, 1987). This appears contrary to the developmental schemes of Britton (1975, 1986) and Moffett (1968). Britton drew heavily on Vygotsky (1962) and his theory of the inner voice preceding the outward expression in writing.
Written language demands conscious work because its relationship to inner speech: the latter precedes inner speech and presuposes its existance (the act of writing implying a translation from inner speech). The change from maximally compact inner speech to maximally detailed written speech requires what might be called deliberate semantics - deliberate structuring of the web of meaning. (pp.99-100)

Britton suggested that even a child can be objective at the level of concrete narrative or description; however it is "an achievement of late adolescence to theorize objectively, to handle highly abstract concepts...at a concrete level or empirical level" (1986, p 262). Britton proposed that most of the writing in the Primary School, and the earliest forms of written down speech, are expressive or transitional between expressive and the poles of transactional (writing that elicits a response, a counter-argument), and poetic. He viewed the mastery of transactional language to be developed through using it; however, he appeared to leave it to the secondary schools to develop an "agreed policy for language across the curriculum" (1986, p 264). Moffett, along the same lines wrote, "children must for a long time make narrative do for all" (1968, p49).
Christie (1987), a linguist, adopted a broad categorical approach to generic analysis. She viewed language as patterned in deliberate ways and language learning as exercising the appropriate linguistic choices relevant to those functions or meanings needed at a particular time. Christie analyzed text and developed a list of features that exemplify a scientific text. These features include:

(1) The sentences constitute generalizations.
(2) These are asserted (presumably rather than tentatively proposed as questions).
(3) The verbs are in the universal present tense.
(4) The verbs identify experiential processes.
(5) In principle the assertions are verifiable.
(Dixon, 1987 p 11)

Dixon, Sawyer, and Watson (1987) disagreed with Christie and stated that the genre-like stereotypes currently circulating around the world did not recognize the child's own ability to construct meaning. They are concerned about the classroom implications of "drawing firm generic boundaries" and the kind of explicit drill-type teaching which puts constraints on children's writing.
The problem still remains that if children are not given opportunities to witness and to experience different generic models, to receive supportive audience, they are not able to begin to make those generic choices.

Kress (1987) proposed that there are "a small and fixed number of genres". He also saw genre as part of a political process. He viewed genres as dynamic and responding to the dynamics of other parts of social systems. They are subject to change; recognized and used by members of a social group; and therefore acquire a social status of their own. He, like Dixon, (1987) was fearful of describing a range of genres that would lead to prescriptive teaching practices in writing and in turn force young writers into "sterile molds". Kress and Martin (1987) saw accessing appropriate genres as being unevenly distributed in society along the lines of social structure.

To the child from the literate middle-class home the exhortation to express her/himself is no threat - she or he will implement the generic forms acquired at home. A child from the inner-city slums of Sydney cannot respond in the same way (Kress, 1987 p 43).

Individual creativity and knowledge of genres of power are those genres which are more easily accessed by those
who are from the literate segments of society (Martin, 1987).

Martin, Christie, and Rothery (1987) referred to genres as social processes since members of a culture interact with each other to achieve them. Because they have evolved as a process of getting things done, genres were seen as goal-oriented, and also as staged because it usually takes many degrees to achieve a goal. Since genres are evolved systems, they represent the most efficient ways of getting something done that a culture has at a given point in time. In this sense a genre is functional.

Christie's research (1986) provided evidence that the most important factor influencing what children write is not their particular stage of development, but rather how the teacher had set up the writing context. Christie noted that in her research, the teacher asked the children to write a 'little story' about chickens that eliminated the children's possibility to generalize. She stated that teachers must be clearer about generic choices that are stated or suggested to students.

Rothery (1987) suggested a genre-based approach to
teaching writing to include the following:

1. Introduce a genre - Model a genre implicitly through reading to or by the class, for example reading Little Red Riding Hood.

2. Focus on a genre - Model explicitly by naming its stages; e.g. identifying the stages of Orientation, Complication and Resolution in Little Red Riding Hood.

3. Jointly negotiate a genre - Teacher and class jointly compose the genre under focus; the teacher guides the composition of the text through questions and comments that provide scaffolding for the genre.

4. Researching - Select material for reading, notemaking and summarizing, and assembling information before writing.

5. Drafting - The students individually construct the genre under focus.

6. Consultation - The teacher and pupil confer with direct reference to the meanings of the writer's text.

7. Publishing - The students write a final draft that may be published for the class library providing another input of genre models, and enjoyable reading. (1987, pp 68-69)

Martin, Christie, and Rothery (1987) questioned current trends toward process writing instruction (Graves, 1983) and the emphasis on personal choice of writing topics. They cited cases of children with a limited range of personal experience and few opportunities for making choices about their writing topic and mode of writing. These children, claimed Martin, Christie, and Rothery (1987) are disabled rather
than enabled by the freedom to make topic choices in a progressive process writing curriculum.

Martin (1985) maintained that writing and learning to write are modeled from the dialect of the ruling class. His views of writing pedagogy were based to a degree on the essays of British educational sociologist Basil Bernstein. Martin, like Bernstein, saw process writing as ensuring the success of those children whose primary socialization made them better able to respond productively to this new "freedom" in the classroom. This freedom system he called "capitalist" because it controlled children by withholding knowledge of powerful writing until the last possible moment. The system thus controls large segments of the community for which capitalism cannot provide work. Like Bernstein, Martin believed that since World War II, language education has purposely made what had to be learned less and less visible, and the process writing proposed by Graves is the latest of such initiatives. Process writing approaches which stress ownership, voice, and choice of topics, "reluctance to intervene positively and constructively during conferences; and mystification of what is to be learned" promotes a system in which only
the middle-class, brightest children with a rich print and language experience can learn.

Martin also saw process writing approaches as childist and sexist. In his view the instructional system has developed a way of "not teaching children to write" that keeps them as powerless as possible. Children, Martin charged, can and do write factual texts and can and do read for information. If taught the skills to do research, they will use them; there is no need to restrict them to expressive writing alone. Process writing is a sexist system in that our culture promotes sex differences in writing. Martin wrote that boys are being unconsciously turned towards the kinds of writing that are powerful in our culture - that of information/factual writing. Hence girls are depowered from the very first stages of literacy.

Freadman (1987) posed relevant questions relating to genre. She asked what one is to do with a form that one has never been taught to fill out? What can students do with theoretical writing if they have been exposed only to narrative in reading and writing? How can one understand a parody, if one has never met a genre that spoofs? Freadman claimed if writing is a craft, we
should think of it as an apprenticeship like learning any other craft. An apprentice learns the job, acquires the practice of tasks, tools, and techniques. Knowing a genre also means knowing when and how to take it up.

Text Analysis Systems

Researchers interested in reading comprehension have sought to describe and classify text structure. Instructional studies in the area of textual analysis (Tierney and Cunningham, 1984), focus on both informational or expository text and narrative texts, often called "story grammars". Expository text analysis procedures are usually criticized for their "presumption of objectivity in representing what is in the text" (Mosenthal & Tierney, 1982). These systems impose coherence measures on the text as a result of the reader’s and writer’s ideas of how the text should function.

Meyer (1975) developed a procedure for examining text structure as composed of content units and relationship units. Each content unit and relationship unit could be scored as present or absent, in a particular protocol. Meyer (1985) viewed the
identification of the structure of text as a necessary methodological tool for:

1) scoring recall from text,
2) for generating models of text memory as well as to examine variations between the models and structure and content contained in reader's recall protocols,
3) for identifying significant dimensions on which texts differ to clarify limits in generalizing experimental results.

Meyer identified three levels for analyzing expository text: (1) the microproposition level, the relationships within and between sentences; (2) the issue of the logical organization and argumentation, the macropropositional level; and (3) the overall organization of text as a whole, the top-level structure. For example, problem/solution is the top-level structure that subsumes all of the content and relationships in this text type. Five basic logical relations in exposition were also specified: collection, causation, response, comparison, and description (1985).

**Top-Level Structures and Recall**

Researchers (Meyer, Brandt, & Bluth, 1980) examined the variabilities between the text structure and analyses of recall protocols of ninth-grade learners (poor,
average and good readers) when text structures were varied systematically. The researchers investigated whether or not signals provided by the author explicitly stating the top-level structure would facilitate the students' use of this structure in their written retellings and the amount of information recalled. Results indicated that an author's explicit statement of the text's top-level structure did not affect the retrieval strategy employed by the ninth grade students since less than 50% utilized the author's strategy at least once in their reading and recall tasks. Only 22% utilized the author's explicit statement of top-level structure consistently on the four protocols written. Most of the students rated by their teacher and standardized tests as high in reading comprehension, used the same top-level structure for organizing their recall protocols as the author of the passage, while most students with low reading comprehension skills did not. Students who employed this strategy of using the text's top-level structure recalled much more information from the passage than those who did not. Finally, students who used this strategy could discriminate better between information consistent with the semantics of the passage.
and intruded information on the same topic than students who did not employ top-level structure. The results suggest that the ability to utilize the text's top-level structure appeared to be an important organizational strategy for remembering information in text.

Meyer & Freedle (1984) examined the relationship between discourse type with memory and learning. The study suggested that the more organizational components of a discourse schema, the more facilitation for memory. The discourse types of comparison and causation facilitated learning and memory over the discourse type collection of descriptions. The researchers suggest that the structures of comparison, causation, and possibly problem/solution provide more effective mnemonic devices, and should serve more frequently as structures for discourse with collections of descriptions being a subordinate structure.

Cohesion and Coherence

The terms cohesion and coherence are frequently used interchangeably by researchers to describe text quality in terms of wholeness or unity of meaning. This unity, which enhances a reader's comprehension of text, is
determined by the cohesive relations, the degree to which a piece of writing is rhetorically interconnected (Halliday and Hasan, 1975). This method of examining cohesion has been used extensively to investigate the relationships among features of text and its use in reading comprehension research. Analysis systems work from the top down, imposing coherence measures on text determined by the reader’s and the writer’s ideas of how a text should function in communication. Mosenthal and Tierney (1982) advise researchers and educators to be wary of the "dilemma that grows from using text-analytic methods as a way of modelling comprehension". They suggested that these text analysis systems should be viewed as tools for managing texts while investigating questions of comprehension, and not as tools for describing textual coherence or for explaining or predicting comprehension. Halliday and Hasan’s taxonomy of textual cohesive ties which have a linking effect across T-units, or clauses, include: (1) pronoun referents (2) substitutions (3) ellipsis (4) conjunctions (5) lexical ties, items related together by repetition, and (6) collocation.
Mosenthal and Tierney considered Halliday and Hasan's approach to cohesive analysis problematic in that cohesion was presented as a causal or constitutive element of coherence, "coherence being placed in the text for the reader". Morgan and Sellner (1980) made similar criticisms of this cohesion concept. Tierney and Mosenthal (1981) found that cohesion analysis did not predict or determine textual coherence for the reader. When the subjects of their study wrote on two different topics, cohesion analysis of the texts indicated significant differences between the texts written on the different topics; no significant differences were found between products of writers familiar with the topic and writers unfamiliar with the topic when they wrote on a common topic. They found that cohesion is more likely to be a consequence than a determiner of content coherence and content differences. It is not likely to be a consequence of coherence differences between writers who were familiar or unfamiliar with the topic. In another study (Tierney and Mosenthal, 1983), the results indicated no causal relationship between proportional measures of cohesion and coherence in twelfth grade students' essays. Implications of text analysis,
according to these researchers, were best when used to single out possible sources of ambiguity or confusion to the reader. The awareness of textual characteristics would help in identifying areas that affect reader interpretation.

McCulley (1985) used Halliday and Hasan’s textual cohesion features to investigate relationships of writing quality, coherence, and cohesion in persuasive papers written by 17 year-olds during the 1978-79 NAEP writing evaluation. He found that the cohesion indices represented valid constructs of writing quality even when the manuscript (number of T-units or clauses) was held constant. While the evidence strongly indicated that textual cohesion is a sub-element of coherence in manuscripts of the same length, the results of McCulley indicated that coherence consists of more factors than those identified by Halliday and Hasan. Not all of the cohesive strategies described in the taxonomy are important elements in determining either quality or coherence.

Another study which used Halliday and Hasan’s method for examining cohesion was conducted by Fitzgerald and Speigel (1986). For children in grades three and six,
they examined the relationship between cohesion and coherence in writing and the degree to which this relationship varied with quality and across grade level. In addition to using the coherence measure, they used Bamberg's (1984) technique for coherence, and a holistic rating for quality. They found a significant relationship between cohesion and coherence in children's writing. When a relationship emerged, there was generally more selective use of cohesive ties (such as reference words) and shorter distances between ties and their referents in writing considered to be of greater coherence. The relationship varied according to the content of the text, as did the Tierney and Mosenthal study (1983). On the whole, the relationship did not vary according to quality or according to grade level. Developmental trends were found in that there was an overall decline in use of ties from third to sixth grade. Their findings suggested that a more coherent story is tighter and more explicit.

Bamberg (1984) developed a method for assessing coherence based on linguistic theory and discourse analysis. Using this method, she analyzed essays written by 13 and 17 year olds who participated in the 1969,
1974, and 1979 NAEP writing project. Bamberg developed a holistic coherence scale that (1) assessed coherence holistically, rating the entire essay, (2) assessed coherence in terms of a list of features that created both global and local coherence; and (3) rated essays on a 4-point ordinal scale that conceptualized coherence as quality which the writer achieved with varying degrees of success. Results indicated that 17-year-olds' essays were substantially more coherent than 13-year-olds', and that coherence was an important element in holistic ratings of writing quality.

Kintsch and van Dijk (1978) developed a model for text comprehension and proposition recall based on the semantic structure of texts. They described this process model as having three sets of operations: (1) the meaning elements of a text become organized into a coherent whole, a process that results in multiple processing of some elements, and differential retention; (2) the second of operations condenses the full meaning of text into its gist; and (3) these processes generate new texts from the memory of the comprehension processes.

The semantic structure of discourse was characterized at the level of both microstructure, the
local level - the structure of the individual propositions - and of the macrostructure, the more global level - the discourse as a whole.

**Text Structure Studies**

Other procedures, such as networking (Dansereau, 1979) mapping (Anderson, 1978; Berkowitz, 1986), and flowcharting (Geva, 1980) - cited in Tierney and Cunningham (1984) - required students to show in some graphic manner how ideas and their relationships were presented in expository text. For example, Berkowitz (1986) used two methods of instructing sixth-grade students to organize ideas in content reading as a framework for studying. She found that students who used map-construction scored significantly higher on immediate free recall than students who used other study procedures. With regard to transfer conditions, no treatment effects were detected in the analyses of information recalled. These results suggested that when no overt studying takes place, treatment effects do not transfer.
Structural Organizers

Structured overviews or structural organizers (Slater, 1985) served as a device for presenting or organizing key ideas from the text in a diagram form. Slater used history textbook passages that were selected and edited for similar scoreable idea units and measured at the eighth grade reading level on the Fry Graph (1977). For ninth grade subjects participating in this study, structural organizers had a positive effect on student recall. Students who received a structural organizer and completed an outline grid recalled 77% more idea units than those who merely read the texts. Notetaking with structural organizers produced a more powerful effect than structural organizers without outline grids. Questions remain concerning how and if students would transfer structural organizers to other content areas.

Langer (1984) examined the relationship between topic-specific background knowledge and measures of writing quality, coherence, syntactic complexity, audience, and function in expository writing. She found that different kinds of knowledge are a predictive factor of success in different writing tasks. Overall, tenth-
grade students whose knowledge of a topic was reasonably well organized did better on teacher-developed topics that required them to compare and contrast relevant issues. Students whose knowledge was more extensive, but not well organized, did better on writing assignments that presented a thesis for them to provide the supporting evidence. The results suggested the importance of well-established techniques of prewriting activities that provide students with much needed relevant information and help students organize that information before beginning to write.

Text Schema

Structural schema training has been used to improve recall and comprehension in two studies, Brooks and Dansereau, (1983) of scientific prose schema instruction. The results indicated that training significantly facilitated recall of scientific text. These studies also suggested that organizing the presentation sequence of the major concepts according to the scientific schema improved recall. The lengthy training period (six hours of instruction— as opposed to only 1 and 1/2 hours) appeared to be critical to the significant results of
recall of a greater number of main ideas. Those who received less training time did not freely recall a significantly greater number of main ideas of details than those students who received no training. The results indicated that the students who received less time in training were not able to incorporate enough to use it effectively. Overall, it was found that structural schema training did increase the amount of information recalled from a moderate-length text. This training was beneficial when an adequate length of training time was given as in experiment number one.

Anderson Et AL. (1977) found that personal history, knowledge, and beliefs influenced the interpretations subjects gave to prose passages. Physical education and music education students were given passages that could be interpreted in two ways: (1) a prison break or a wrestling match or (2) a rehearsal session for a woodwind ensemble or an evening of card playing. Scores on a multiple choice test and a theme-revealing disambiguation (a paraphrase of an idea unit that shows the subject’s interpretation) in free recall revealed significant relationships to the subjects’ background. This confirmed the researchers’ predictions that the high-
level schemata the subject brought to the experiment would determine his/her interpretation. These findings, the researchers noted, indicate that the principle determinant of the knowledge a person can acquire from reading is the knowledge that s/he already possessed.

Singer and Donlan (1982) used a problem-solving schema for comprehending complex short stories with eleventh-grade students. Students in the experimental group were taught to derive story-specific questions from the schema-general questions as they read. The control group read to answer questions posed before reading by the teacher. The experiment lasted over a period of three weeks and the students each read six stories. It was hypothesized that readers can improve in comprehension of narrative prose by using more adequate and appropriate knowledge structures and by using a process for generating story-specific questions for interacting with the text. Their results indicated that students who were given story grammar instruction scored significantly higher on a criterion-reference test. No testing was done for further maintenance of learning or transfer of treatment.

Story grammar or narrative structure instruction has
been recognized to be important to children's comprehension of stories (Tierney & Cunningham, 1984), but research on children's sense of story has produced controversy about the efficacy of instruction in story structure to children beyond the intermediate grades. Results of a study by Dreher and Singer (1980) indicated there is little need for story grammar instruction with intermediate students because they already have a well-developed sense of simple story structure. Whaley (1981) found that good readers in third, sixth, and eleventh grades expected structure in stories; age related differences were apparent with the third-graders expecting certain structures less frequently than did sixth and eleventh-grade students.

Text Structure Awareness

In a study of fifth-grade good readers, McGee (1982) explored whether an awareness of structure influences recall. All subjects read and recalled expository passages; recalls were analyzed to determine how closely structure found in the retellings resembled the author's structure. The results indicated that fifth-grade good readers are more aware of text structure and recalled
more superordinate ideas than third-grade good readers. Third-grade good readers did not display an awareness of text structure and recalled more subordinate idea units. McGee suggested that young readers, as well as adults, can benefit from following the top-level structure to guide reading and remembering passage information, from short, tightly-structured passages. However, she noted that young readers were able to remember less than 40% of the information present in expository text. The results were inconclusive concerning when instruction would be most useful.

Taylor and Samuels (1983) investigated whether superior recall for expository text could be attributed to using text structure or to some other memory device. Fifth and sixth-grade students read and recalled normal and scrambled versions of text; subjects who were aware of structure recalled significantly more of the normal passages than the scrambled. Subjects who were unaware recalled no difference between the normal and the scrambled passages. The researchers also found that many elementary students had not yet learned how to use text structure as a retrieval aid.

In another text awareness study (Richgels, Et Al,
1987) researchers used recall measures for main ideas versus details, and recall or normal passages versus scrambled passages. Three measures of awareness were used: use of organization in written recall, use of organizations in composition, and response to interviews. The authors found consistently high awareness of comparison/contrast structure and low awareness of causation structure. The study supported the hypothesis that structure aware students were more likely to use a structural strategy when reading than unaware students.

**Hierarchy of Ideas and Recall**

Meyer and McConkie (1973) attempted to determine which aspects of information were more easily remembered from prose after one presentation and which were learned after additional presentations. Meyer (1975) found height in the content structure of a text to be the best predictor of the type of information recalled. Meyer's results indicated that the probability of recalling an idea was related to its position in the logical structure; ideas higher in the structure or having additional ideas strung from them were recalled by more subjects. Also clustering of ideas that occurred during
recall was related to the logical structure of the passage. After the first trial, however, position in the logical structure had little or no effect on the rate of increase of recall memory.

Paragraph structure functions as a kind of plan that influences recall (Aulls, 1975). This study investigated the influence of structure on sixth grade readers' literal recall scores. Internal and external structural properties in meaningful and nonmeaningful expository paragraphs were manipulated as to topic and subtopic distribution. The results indicated that paragraphs containing a more compact subtopic structure yielded significantly higher recall than those containing a discontinuous subtopic structure. The influence of the type of structure appeared to be relative to content meaningfulness even when sentence length and word frequency was held constant across paragraph content. The researcher concluded that meaningfulness must be included in the study of structural characteristics of prose believed to influence recall. In this study of expository prose, the title was less influential on recall as the main idea statement for the meaningful paragraph. For less meaningful paragraphs, the title in
combination with an introductory main idea statement increased recall significantly than the paragraph where neither title nor main idea statement was presented.

Summary

This review of the literature related to the study of expository text structures began with a discussion of the functional nature of the young learner's need to communicate meaning to others through manipulating written symbols. Control over these symbols comes from the child's opportunities to interact with print in the environment. Next literature on school contexts for children's formal instruction for writing were discussed. Traditionally, instruction within primary classrooms was geared toward product rather than the thinking processes the learner goes through while composing. Typically the emphasis in primary classrooms has been on teacher-constructed contrived writing exercises that were more concerned with copying the teacher's model of writing rather than with meaning-making. Expressive modes of writing were encouraged due to the assumptions that young writers were not capable of thinking or organizing ideas, facts, or details in an expository mode, and also
due to the fact that primary classrooms have not been equipped with well written examples of expository texts.

A review of process writing approaches was discussed. New domains of writing research are looking at empowering children to learn to control writing because they are part of a community of writers in the classroom. They begin to develop control as they discover writing as a long, joyful process of discovery through stages including: prewriting, drafting, revising, conferencing, and publishing.

The controversy of genre in education as it is viewed by linguistic theorists and researchers was discussed. The term genre has been widely and variably discussed in the literature. Important influences on genre instruction, expository writing in particular, included: (1) the necessity for teachers to provide appropriate genre modeling and clearer instruction; (2) some fears that describing a range of genres in the curriculum will develop sterile writing from prescriptive teaching methods; 3) the relationship of genres to power; that is, the accessing of genres may be social processes available only to certain children of the ruling classes; (4) and finally, factors related to acquiring a genre,
which like any other craft, demands having the opportunity to practice the task under many different conditions and over time.

Instructional studies of text analysis were discussed as they related to characteristics of text, reading comprehension, and recall. Various logical or organizational models for exposition were specified: collection, causation, response, comparison, and description. Prominent methods for examining cohesion and coherence were considered as they were used to investigate relationships among features of text and its use in reading comprehension research. A key finding in this review of text analysis systems is the suggestion that they be used as tools for managing texts in the investigation of questions of comprehension rather than used as tools for a description of text coherence or comprehension.

Instructional studies were presented that addressed other procedures related to comprehension and recall when the reader was aware of text structure. These studies required students to use some graphic manner to identify how ideas were organized in expository texts. Results indicated that when teachers take the time to create
structured overviews, organizers, story frames, or diagrams for students prior to reading a selection, students tend to score higher. However, results suggest that when no overt studying, or prereading-rewriting activities occur that provide needed relevant information for students in organizing their thoughts and ideas, treatment effects do not transfer.

The wealth of research concerning the difficulty students in grades 4-12 have in studying social studies and science textbooks and making necessary links in reading and writing concepts, have implications for this study. Educators have provided too little instruction in expository writing and too little exposure to quality expository reading. Explicit instruction in expository writing with a focus on long term unit of study has not been done.

The existing body of research presented here suggests the need to examine important aspects of classroom writing instruction: (1) a look at student writing following explicit instruction in expository text structure; and (2) to examine student understandings and attitudes toward expository texts prior to and following
explicit instruction of expository text structures.
Methodology for the study is presented in Chapter Three.
CHAPTER III
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purposes of this study were to investigate: (1) third grade students' knowledge of expository text structure; (2) the impact of explicit instruction of expository text structures on students' writing and reading across ability levels; and (3) the relationships between exposure to expository texts and/or informational books and changes in third grade students' reading and writing attitudes and interests.

Overview of Study

The study was conducted in three major phases, each with an auxiliary phase of reexamination and revision. Phase One, the pilot study, established a baseline methodology that provided direction for the second phase. During Phase One, methods and procedures for implementing the instructional unit of expository text structures were analyzed for appropriateness. Some were eliminated and others revised. The goal of Phase Two was to utilize explicit instruction of expository text structures in a third grade classroom using the revised measures. Phase
Three was conducted in another school with a third grade classroom to provide a perspective to examine differences that might exist between the students who received text structure instruction and those students who received traditional writing instruction (See Table 1, Figure 1).

Chapter Three includes descriptions of the pilot project, the design for the study, and the methods used to analyze the data for the study.

**Phase One-The Pilot Study**

The initial problem of the study was to explore the impact of expository text structure instruction on students' awareness and understanding of expository reading and writing and their attitudes toward informational literature before and after such instruction. The pilot study was undertaken to identify a potential methodology for the instruction of students in a variety of expository structures.
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The general objectives of this study are to examine the effects of an instructional unit in expository text structures, to examine possible explanations for success or failure of the unit, and to make instructional recommendations.
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Figure 1  Conceptual Framework for Expository Text Structure Instructional Study with Comparison Group
Subjects

The sample population came from, School A, an elementary school, housing kindergarten through fifth grade in a midwestern community with a predominately white middle to upper-middle class population. Scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test, HBJ, 1986, in combination with teacher judgment were used to identify these third-grade students into high, average, or low ability or achievement groups. The sample was further divided into male and female groups. Finally, two students, one male and one female, were randomly selected from each group. This sample of six students, three male and three female, were the subjects for the pilot study.

Classroom Teacher

The cooperating classroom teacher for the project was a professional of twenty years experience who was traditional in her approach to instruction. She used the textbook as the primary source of instruction for the content areas of the curriculum. In her initial interview with the researcher, she noted that she was interested in exploring new methods of teaching, "particularly with this group of students". This particular group of
students had a disproportionate number of children who "were behavior problems". In the areas of reading and writing, she "implemented the required Ginn textbook as much as possible". She was using literature to supplement the textook with her reading group; however, she had not "attempted much in the way of writing". She indicated that she did not use nonfiction books "much if at all with the class".

Role of the Researcher

In both the instruction of a science unit and the corresponding instruction of the expository structure, the researcher was an active classroom participant. The nature of the research suggested procedures that were qualitative; therefore, employing a participant-observer perspective and collecting qualitative data were appropriate. The approach used in this study is consistent with the characteristics of qualitative research, described by Florio-Ruane (1988) as "teaching process study". The approach includes the following actions:

1) Go to the people - This involves extended contact with people in the speech community of interest.
2) Pay attention to what is said - Ethnographers document talk and activity as they occur in real time.

3) Proceed inductively - Data is collected from various sources for cross checking inferences.

4) Be alert to interpretation - Interpretation is subject to the judgment of the researcher.

5) Find locally meaningful units of analysis - The researcher attempts to discover units of analysis.

6) Balanced explanation - A balance is achieved through narration and verbatim examples.

7) Look for disconfirming evidence and discrepant cases - The researcher tests the claims made by seeking evidence to disconfirm them.

Teaching process study attempts to determine which teaching processes are effective in relation to desired outcomes such as student performance (Koehler, 1978).

Procedures

The Pilot study took six weeks, from January, 1989, through the third week of February, 1989, (See Table 2). The study required a diverse group of children. The researcher used the science class as the setting for the instruction. The science class was part of home room and the 27 children were not grouped according to ability. The pilot study subjects (N = 6) were part of this class.
Prior to the lessons the researcher visited the classroom to gain familiarity with the students and classroom procedures.

Prior to beginning classroom intervention, data were gathered on target students. Subjects were interviewed (See Appendix A) to gain information relative to their perspectives and to elicit behavior that would indicate what children knew about narrative and expository text. A pretest (See Appendix B) similar to the textbook publisher's end of chapter test was administered to all students. This was administered to gain insights into students' prior knowledge of topics to be covered in the earth science unit, (See Appendix B). Additionally, to gather information about students' images of the subject matter, each subject was asked to draw a picture of an earthquake and a volcano.

Acting as teacher, the researcher implemented a science unit of instruction based on the textbook used in the classroom. Science lessons were conducted in the morning for extended periods of thirty to forty minutes, three days a week. To reduce confusion on the part of the students, the science lessons were consistent in content to the third grade curriculum as presented in the
adopted textbook.

The researcher introduced the unit by reading aloud to the entire class, *The Magic School Bus Inside the Earth*, by Cole. This fiction book contained many of the concepts taught in the unit as well as an amusing storyline. Selected students were asked to retell (See Appendix C) the story, and these retellings were audio taped and transcribed to provide information about students' knowledge of the structure of narrative text.

For five weeks, three days a week, the researcher conducted science lessons. A typical lesson began with the researcher reading aloud to the children a selected nonfiction book. Books were selected according to their potential for extending the lesson and through activities that would increase students' awareness of expository text. The researcher then used a variety of activities (See Appendix D) to involve students in learning the content as well as learning about text structure (See Appendix D). The researcher developed a collection of nonfiction books for the students to use for leisure reading and for models of expository text (Rothery, 1987). A graffiti wall was used to help students use new vocabulary in their writing. Unit materials also
included: bulletin board photos of volcanoes and earthquake destruction, graphs, and charts, rock collections, and volcano model displaying fast and slow changes in the earth.

Charts (See Appendix E) were used to demonstrate simplified versions of Meyer’s (1975) representation of the five logical relations in exposition: collection, causation, response, comparison, and description. As determined by an analysis of books for children, the response category was not well represented in children’s literature for the age group under study; therefore, that category was eliminated. The four category charts contained clue words, or structural markers, and phrases to help students identify a particular type of exposition. The researcher developed a game with color coded flags in envelopes representing the four different types of expository writing under discussion. The students worked in teams looking at groups of nonfiction books to identify clues the author gave as to the type of structure used in the book. The first group to place all of their flags, received stickers. The researcher and classroom teacher circulated around the room assisting the students in locating the clues.
Consistently, and within every lesson, the researcher explained to the students that the writing being examined was not a story but a model for organizing the piece of writing (Christie, 1987). The best way for students to develop competence in expository writing is to become writers themselves (McGee & Richgels, 1985; Newkirk, 1987); therefore, the researcher encouraged the students to write their own nonfiction "books". To elicit interest in students who were reluctant to write, the researcher constructed pop-up books and sequence books for each student; seventy-five books were completed to insure an adequate number for class writing activities. To demonstrate how writing is a sequential activity with steps to be determined by the writer, the researcher became a writer with the students, writing daily and sharing with them. This action created a context in which the nature of writing was a self-determined, sequenced activity.

Students were encouraged to decide upon a topic, preferably one from the earth science unit, and to determine the best way to display the information in text. The classroom teacher assisted the researcher by circulating around the room and discussing their writings
with students. Prior to and after completion of the instructional unit, writing samples were taken from the target students and from the entire class.

Results

Three types of data were collected during the pilot study: (1) video tapes; (2) writing samples; (3) retellings; and (4) field notes. These data were analyzed to determine whether the procedures and implementation were appropriate for the study.

Analysis of video tapes of classroom work indicated that, in general, students found it difficult to cope with the complex tasks demanded of them by the science program. The classroom teacher revealed that in her class most of the daily work sheets supplied by the publisher had to done as a whole-class exercise. Although some students could read and understand textbooks quite well, many found the readings too difficult to sustain attention. Content texts differ widely in vocabulary, concept load, fact relationships, types of reasoning, and background information. The researcher eventually paired less able readers with more able readers and the class did more classroom discussion
activities over the major concepts of the unit. This same range of abilities existed in writing activities. Analysis of audiotapes and field notes of individual children and classroom behavior in general revealed that writing was a difficult task even after lengthy classroom exposure to a variety of activities with the vocabulary, games, and group activities with the volcano and weathering demonstration. The researcher's field notes revealed that, for example, a target child began to weep and put her head down when asked to write some of her ideas about an earthquake on a piece of paper for her seatmate.

The majority of writing samples could be categorized as labeling of students' pictures. Some students wrote about subjects related to the earth science unit; but they turned the writing into a more familiar form, for example, a story (See Appendix F). A major objective of the pilot study was to examine the impact of the instructional unit on students' production of expository text structures. Results were not evident in the writings of the target students. While the more able writers and readers were capable of naming the various text organizers, for example, compare and contrast, few
were able to use even a simplistic version in their texts.

Students' scores on the Metropolitan Test did not appear to be a good predictor of writing ability, since analysis of class writing samples revealed that students' overall achievement scores were not accurate indicators of writing ability.

Analysis of the retellings of the introductory book, *The Magic School Bus inside the Earth*, by Cole revealed that aspects of the text may have interfered with understanding the major plotline of the story. Students appeared to be confused by the heavy concept load in the "sideline" sections. For example, several students forgot what happened next in the story of Ms. Frizzle and her class when they became interested in this typical side note to the reader which tells how to remember

```
WHICH IS WHICH:
The word *Stalagmite*
has a 'g' for ground.
The word *Stalactite*
has a 'c' for ceiling.
```

The purpose of the retellings was to provide information to use as a baseline for assessing students' progress in knowledge of story. Confusions related to the story
confounded the information; therefore, a new way to gather baseline data was designed.

During the pilot study, the researcher used charts to demonstrate four expository models; describing, cause-effect, comparing, and collection. These charts contained examples of clue words, or markers, authors sometimes use to signal a particular type of text organization to the reader, for example, the words alike, and phrases - different from, or similar to, indicate comparing organization. The charts proved to be too complex and abstract for third graders. Videotapes revealed that children repeatedly asked questions about the describing clues (See Appendix E). Explanations were given, for example, "Facts may be given in a time order from the earliest date until the latest date". The researcher drew many different diagrams indicating what came first in time and events that came later in time to illustrate that concept. The constraints of time of instruction for science and time for text structure instruction became a severe limitation on the study.

Based on the information from the pilot study, many aspects of the study were reevaluated, including: the role of the researcher as teacher, the method of sample
selection, and the approach to instruction.

Changes in Researcher as Teacher

Videotapes of the instructional sessions revealed that the combined science and expository writing classes were too complex and demanding on attention spans of the students. The necessity of completing the prescribed number of minutes of instruction in the science curriculum put limitations on the amount and quality of time spent for instruction of the expository writing unit. Therefore, the researcher determined that the science unit for Phase Two would be taught by the classroom teacher. The researcher would implement the science unit under study with appropriate nonfiction books, bulletin board materials, games, and expository writing instruction.

Changes in Sample Selection

Since students' scores on the Metropolitan Test did not prove to be predictors of writing ability in the pilot study, the researcher changed the method of sample selection. The researcher determined that the classroom teacher would rank students according to writing ability
from high to low. The sample (N=6) would be taken, two each, from high, average, and low writers.

Changes in Instruction Methods

The instruction methodology was scrutinized during and following the pilot project and several alterations were made. Since the retellings from the read aloud, The Magic School Bus inside the Earth, proved to be confusing to students, this segment of data collection was replaced by interview questions relating to identification of fiction and nonfiction writing. It was determined by the researcher that this process of recognition of story text versus expository text would provide information as to the students' knowledge of text structure differences. The charts for the various expository models proved to be too complex and abstract; collection and description models were frequently mistaken for each other. The researcher combined structures to make three distinctively different structures of exposition. This process resulted in a simplified model that would be more appropriate for subjects in the study. The pretests and drawing of images of the science concepts were determined by the researcher and the classroom teacher to take too
much time away from the instructional setting of science and expository writing. The researcher decided to eliminate these data collection devices since they did not provide clues to the students' perceptions about expository text.

Implications and Changes for Phase Two

Data from the pilot provided a test of instrumentation and procedures for explicit instruction about expository text structures. After these instruments and procedures were analyzed and altered significantly, the researcher began the second phase of the study. The following procedures were decided prior to beginning Phase Two: (1) Since writing samples were the most data in determining subjects' abilities to use text organizers, subjects would be selected on the basis of their ability to write, rather than according to general achievement levels on a standardized test; (2) the researcher would act as a participant-observer and would teach only the text structure material; (3) the three simplified charts of text structures would be used; (4) the students would categorize excerpts from fiction and nonfiction books as part of the interview process;
and (5) the pretest and drawings, while interesting in a broader context of students' understandings were not relevant or necessary for the second phase and would be eliminated.

Phase Two-Instructional Study

The purpose of this research study was to examine strategies for teaching expository text structures to third graders. Reading teachers and specialists in the field have recognized that using knowledge of text structure organization is an effective strategy for reading comprehension and recall (Niles, 1974). The following questions provided the impetus for the study:

(1) How does direct instruction in expository text structures impact on students' awareness and understanding of expository/informational books?

(2) How does direct instruction in expository text structures impact on students' writing products?

(3) How does direct instruction in expository text structures impact on students' ability to gain knowledge from reading?

(4) How does direct instruction in expository text structures impact on students' attitudes and behaviors toward informational books?

(5) In what ways do students who receive instruction in expository text structure compare with students who receive traditional methods of science instruction?
Population

The second phase, the expository instruction phase of this study, took place in School B of this same community. The target population for both the expository instruction group and the traditional group was comprised of third grade students within a 98% caucasian school community. Less than one percent of the children in the participating schools were on free or reduced lunch programs. In general, parents were young professionals of middle to upper-middle socio-economic status. Yearly community statistics released by the school district indicated that per capita income for the previous year was $13,996, with an estimated median household income of $45,359.

Subjects

Subjects for the study were randomly selected representing two each from the high achieving writers, two representing average writers, and two representing low achieving writers. Ranks were based on the classroom teacher's ranking of students. The sample was evenly divided among boys and girls in all ability levels of writing.
Setting

The expository text instruction took six weeks, extending from the second week of March through April, 1989 (See Table 1). The cooperating teacher for the study was recommended by the building principal as a teacher where "there are exciting things going on in the areas of reading and writing". She was a teacher of more than fifteen years experience who was using literature, primarily fiction, to supplement the basal text, and who was actively involving her students in process writing (Graves, 1983). Daily writing was a requirement in the classroom. Students wrote in journals to which the teacher responded, and they had experience in writing reports and stories.

Design of the Study

The design for the study required the combination of naturalistic approaches. Naturalistic inquiry as described by Spradley (1979) allows the researcher to look at and interpret a culture from the "native point of view". The design emerges as the investigator engages in continuous data analysis, with every new aspect of the investigation taking into account everything that was
learned along the way. This process is recursive and interactive (Spradley, 1979).

Inductive data analyses can be performed on a daily basis, so that insights, elements of theory, hypotheses, questions, gaps, can be identified and pursued beginning with the next day's work. (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p 209)

Many different methods of data collection were applied to the study to increase the credibility of the findings: interviews, writing samples, observations, videotapes, and corroboration of two peers not directly involved with the study. The researcher developed descriptive and structural interview questions, to gain a body of knowledge about student perceptions of text structure. Pre and post study interviews were audiotaped and conducted individually with each of the target students. Writing samples were collected before, during, and after the study. The researcher looked for order and workable units and patterns in the transcribed interviews and pre and post study writing samples.

As the study evolved, questioning, collecting, recording, and analyzing continued. Observations of the students operating within the context of the expository text instruction were directed by questions. These
observations provided other questions which guided further observation and analysis (Spradley, 1979). Videotaped recordings provided the means for examination of and comparison with other data. These recordings provided a "benchmark against which later data analyses and interpretations could be tested for adequacy" (Spradley, 1979, p 313).

Two teachers who were not involved in the study evaluated interviews and writing samples as to strong, weak, or no perception of text structure. These "different researchers" (Miles & Huberman, 1984) used parallel measures independently to confirm or support the findings.

**Procedures**

Prior to beginning Phase Two, the researcher visited the class on several occasions to become familiar with the procedures and classroom practices of the teacher and students. The videocamera was left and sometimes put in place without being turned on to help the students become comfortable and familiar with the machine.
Interviews

Prior to the interview, (See Appendix H) the researcher had already established rapport by being a regular participant in the classroom. Procedure for the interviews was first to open a conversation on any topic of interest and then to say, "Mrs. ___ tells me that you are a good writer. I'm interested in finding out what boys and girls do and what they think about when they read and write".

Student interviews were conducted prior to the beginning of the teaching unit. Students were given the same introductory explanation of the project and rapport was established through class visitation and personal contact with the class.

The questions on the student interview included the three types used in ethnographic studies: descriptive, structural, and contrast (Spradley, 1979). The most emphasis was placed on descriptive questions such as: "What kinds of writing do you usually do?" and "Tell me which book you would choose for these different situations." Structural type questions were used to discover information about domains, for example: "If I asked you to write or tell about these items on the
table, how would you go about it? What would you do first? What would you do next?" Contrast questions were used to elicit information about students' ability to differentiate between fiction and nonfiction texts, for example: "Tell me which paragraphs you think came from story and which came from nonfiction. Tell me why you think that way." Prompts were used, such as, "Could you explain that?" and, "And then what would you do?"

In all cases students responded quickly to questions and often spontaneously elaborated on their answers. Several students (N=4) expressed a desire to talk with the researcher again. Students not targeted for the study requested to be interviewed, and the researcher audiotaped conversations with them related to their writing.

**Instruction**

Instruction was designed to: (1) teach students the expository structures of Fact Collection, Compare-Contrast, and Cause-Effect; (2) acquaint students with quality nonfiction books of various textual structures; and (3) provide multiple opportunities for students to use text structures or organizers as writers of
nonfiction material.

The unit was introduced by the classroom teacher reading aloud *The Magic School Bus Inside the Earth*. The researcher's first session with the class began with the class retelling and discussion of the introductory book and the story frame (See Appendix I). Each session involved discussion of previous learnings about text structure and examples from books on the theme of earth science as well as other nonfiction books on different topics. This activity brought the class in contact with text structures and familiarized them with many good examples of nonfiction and nonfiction writers.

Instruction included activities such as: (1) examining and searching books for examples of ways to organize data; (2) demonstrating by the researcher including the flow-charts (See Appendix K); (3) displaying pop-up book on weathering data constructed by researcher; (4) reading aloud daily from selected nonfiction books on a variety of topics; (5) playing a game constructed by the researcher that prompted students to examine many books and analyze those texts to discover predominant structure and other forms with the book; and (6) selecting a topic for students' writing in their own
nonfiction books.

After introduction of three text structures; fact collection, cause/effect and compare/contrast, the researcher used excerpts from different books each session to encourage students to use their knowledge of terms and concepts in the discovery and familiarization with nonfiction structures.

Field Notes

Each session was videotaped; simultaneously the researcher took field notes. Following the sessions, meetings were held with the classroom teacher to confer about any misunderstandings or difficulties students may have had in developing understandings. Students' understandings were recorded by observation and field notations, student writings, student-teacher, student-researcher, and researcher-teacher conferences.

Materials

Following the pilot study, materials for the instruction of the thematic unit were refined. A major objective of the unit was to show students that the content of a nonfiction or expository passage consists
of ideas and information that have been organized in a meaningful way by the author. The researcher prepared a collection of more than twenty books related to the earth science unit for the students to examine and read (See Children's Bibliography).

Bulletin board materials were supplied to further support learning. These visuals included: graphs, charts, and picture displays of volcanic, earthquake, and weathering activity. In addition to these displays, the researcher provided rock collections and a volcanic model. A graffiti wall cut from brown chart paper resembling a large boulder was the focus for vocabulary word building as children found and collected new words while exploring their textbooks and the additional unit books.

The researcher constructed a game activity that required students to play detective while they worked as teams examining nonfiction books for word clues or markers used by the author to organize facts. Students received stickers when they could find the appropriate text organizer.

The researcher developed graphic organizing charts that represented a story frame, fact collection, cause-
effect, and compare-contrast chart. These charts visually presented to students the idea that information can be organized in a variety of ways (See Appendices I, J, K, L).

To help students recognize the structures authors use, they became authors themselves. For each student the researcher constructed a set of pop-up books and sequence books. Additional writing materials included: scraps of paper for pop-ups, extra books, pre-cut paper, pens, pencils, and colored felt-tip markers. A classroom library was started to include the students' books. These books became materials for further study.

Post Test Interviews

Following the study, target students were audiotaped again to determine changes in understandings of; (1) text structures, (2) expository writing, and (3) nonfiction books (See Appendix M). Questions were similar in nature to the pre-study interview; however, emphasis was on student recall of text models and what they had learned about expository text structures.
Classroom Teacher’s Role

Periodic conferences with the classroom teacher provided direction for understanding students’ responses. These informal conferences were held at least once a week. Brief field notes were made by the researcher following each session and these notes informed the instruction provided by the researcher. The classroom teacher kept notes to be compared with those of the researcher. The teacher’s notes on students attempting to use different modes of writing were beneficial in determining the momentum of the instruction and in collecting writing samples. In addition, the classroom teacher extended the researcher’s instruction through answering students’ questions about their reading or writing when the researcher was not present. The classroom teacher also recorded science scores on unit tests for the target students before and after the unit.

Analysis of Data

Student interviews were transcribed verbatim from audiotapes. The researcher analyzed the data using taxonomic analysis (Spradley, 1979) and pairing a list of descriptors and descriptive phrases of each student
with the corresponding ability and noncorresponding ability students in their perceptions of text structures.

Examination of student writing samples before and following the study provided a look at students' use of text organizers before instruction in text structure and students' attempts to use these structures following instruction. For example, students who used word clues such as larger, as big as, or smaller, indicated they were using comparing in their writing. These writings were evaluated by the researcher and two teachers not involved in the study on criteria of strong, moderate, or little evidence of use of text organization.

Phase III - The Traditional Instruction Group

Introduction

The study about expository text structure instruction had three major components which included; (1) a baseline methodology for teaching a unit about expository text structures, the pilot study; (2) an instructional unit with revised procedures and instruments, the second phase; and (3) a traditional science instruction group used to provide a perspective for comparing the writing approaches of both groups.
This aspect of the study provided a shift in the researcher's role, from active participant to observer. This phase of the study took place from April through May (See Table 2) in School C.

Table 2. THREE PHASES OF DATA COLLECTION
School Year 1988-89

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan.-Feb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March-April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April-May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose

Another group of third grade students provided a perspective for comparison between the student attitudes, writings, and understandings of students who had and had not received explicit instruction about expository text structures. The instructional, or treatment group, received direct instruction in expository text structures while the comparison group received the traditional approach, that of collecting information and writing
science reports.

Population

The sample population came from School C. Comparison children were approximately equivalent to the pilot and treatment groups, with 98% caucasian, and middle to upper-middle socio-economic status. Vital statistics concerning per capita income were discribed in detail on page 61.

Subjects

As in the treatment group, students were selected as samples each from the highest, average, and low writing ability as designated by the teacher. The classroom teacher ranked her students according to her perceptions of their achievement from highest writing ability to lowest writing ability. Since this phase of study took place in the spring, the teacher had thorough knowledge of student ability. The sample was evenly divided with boys and girls in all ability levels.

Setting

The classroom teacher was in her second year of
teaching third grade after almost twenty years experience teaching kindergarten and first grades. She was enthusiastic about allowing the researcher to observe in her classroom with the stipulation that her class receive instruction in the text structures after the study was completed.

**Procedures**

The comparison group was observed for five weeks, from the last week of April through May of 1989. These observations were conducted weekly.

Students were provided with the same nonfiction book collection, earth science materials, and blank books as the treatment group. Following the completion of the earth science unit, they were instructed by their teacher to write about any topic they had just covered in their science unit. Writing samples were collected and students' writings were analyzed and compared to those produced by the treatment group.

**Interviews**

Student interviews were audiotaped using the guide for the instructional group. These interviews were
conducted before the unit in order to explore the implicit understandings these students had related to text structure and nonfiction versus fiction writing. Students were provided the same introductory explanation of the project and rapport was established through class visitation and personal contact with the class. Interviews were transcribed verbatim from audiotapes.

Treatment

Students in this comparison group were exposed to all of the books, materials, and resources of the treatment group. They did not, however, experience the instructional model. The classroom teacher conducted the science lessons using the textbook and resource materials produced by the publisher. Students were assigned reports by the teacher. The researcher provided pop-up books and sequence books for the students to use in their writings.

Researcher's Role

The role of the researcher was to observe students as they participated in the classroom setting of the science class and as they wrote. Students volunteered
to share their writings with the researcher. Field notes were made following each visit, with notations about writing behaviors of target students and questions which would be addressed later in teacher-researcher interviews. The classroom teacher preferred not to be audiotaped, rather she desired to have informal conferences during her break during student specials. During those times, the researcher used field notes to clarify individual children’s behaviors while they wrote fiction and nonfiction texts.

Materials

The researcher provided bulletin board materials, rock collections, the volcanic model, a nonfiction book collection supporting the earth science unit, a graffiti vocabulary wall chart, and a classroom set of student pop-up and sequence books. Additional writing paper and materials were provided at the writing table for the class to use.

Summary of Methods and Procedures

This study was organized into three distinct phases each with an auxiliary phase and conducted in three
elementary schools. During Phase One, the pilot study was conducted and methods and procedures were analyzed for appropriateness and some were eliminated and others revised. Phase Two involved the instruction of expository text structures in a classroom of third graders using the revised measures. Phase Three provided an observation phase to provide a perspective about students' who were taught using a more traditional method of writing about a science topic.

The elaboration and transcribing of videotapes, audiotapes, field notes, and student writings added opportunities for the researcher to identify possible categories and raise questions. Each step in the process involved translation (Spradley, 1979, p.71). Finding out the informant's view of the world and writing the final description required a careful consideration of this translation process. The results and analyses of each phase are presented in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER IV

INSTRUCTIONAL STUDY OF EXPOSITORY TEXT STRUCTURES

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to report the results of a study comparing intervention instruction in expository text structures and traditional instruction. Data for the study were (1) student interviews; (2) student writing products; (3) test scores on end of level science tests; (4) videotaped classroom sessions; and (6) teachers' own reflections on student writing behaviors.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed by the study:

(1) How does direct instruction in expository text structures impact on students' awareness and understanding of expository/informational books?

-What do students know about narrative text structure?
-What do students know about expository text organization?
-What are the tasks involved in expository text instruction?
-How do students of different abilities respond to expository structure instruction?
-How does degree of previous experience with writing affect student response to expository text instruction?
(2) How does direct instruction in expository text structures impact on students' writing products?
   - How do students use information gained from instruction in their writing products?

(3) How does direct instruction in expository text structures impact on students' ability to gain knowledge from reading?

(4) How does direct instruction in expository text structures impact on students' attitudes and behaviors toward informational books?
   - How do students make choices related to their reading and writing topics?
   - What are students' opinions related to what makes a book easy or hard to read?
   - How do these opinions relate to student ability?

(5) In what ways do students who receive instruction in expository text structure compare with students who receive traditional methods of science instruction?
   - How do students' writing behaviors differ?
   - How do students' writing products differ?
   - How do students' scores on science tests differ?

**Chapter Organization**

The chapter is organized into the following sections: (1) a description of the context for the study including the classroom environment, the reading and writing events characteristic of the curriculum, and the teacher; (2) information about subjects' knowledge of text structure prior to instruction; (3) a description of the instructional unit, including activities, student
products, and features of texts used, and the impact on student comprehension scores in science.

Context for the Study

The Instructional Setting: Treatment and Traditional Instruction Classrooms

The complicated aspects of teaching-learning processes cannot be adequately investigated without taking into account the physical environment of the classroom where this learning takes place. The classrooms of both the treatment and the comparison groups were similar in size, arrangement of space and materials, and in colorful educational wall decorations.

Treatment Group

The physical features and arrangement of this classroom are represented in Figure 2. The large rectangular room, approximately 728 square feet, was arranged by the teacher to accommodate twenty-eight students' desks, and instructional materials and instruction. At one end of the room, two small windows with chalkboards between were located. The entrance to the hallway was at the opposite end of the room where the cupboards, bookshelves, coat rack and sink were located.
Figure 2. Treatment Group Room Arrangement
This larger area provided space for children to line up for leaving the classroom.

The teacher in this classroom arranged to have students' desks in small workable clusters leaving areas for group reading and writing activities. The arrangement was designed to foster collaboration and an attitude of community during writing and reading. Students were allowed to change seatmates about every six weeks; choices were made contingent on behavior. The teacher's approach to classroom management is illustrated by the fact that students knew where and what they were supposed to be doing, what their punishment would be if not on task, and their scheduled activities all times of the day.

Walls in the classroom were decorated with a combination of teacher constructed and commercial materials. Bulletin boards displayed seasonal material, rules for classroom decorum, schedules and news for the week. Student work, spelling lists, writing and reading papers were displayed on the doors of the back cupboards. For the duration of the six week study the researcher did not observe any other evidence of student products or extension projects.
Group activities took place at two large tables at the side and back of the room. Writing folders were kept on the side table. Students wrote daily in journals to which the teacher responded in writing.

A Radio Shack TRS 80 computer was stationed beside the teacher's desk on a display table. It was primarily used during indoor recess or as a free time activity.

At the back of the room a large bookshelf housed a set of encyclopedia and an assortment of several hundred fiction books for leisure reading. Nonfiction titles included biographies of famous Americans and a few books about animals. Students had easy access to all of the books and usually kept books at their desks to read when assigned work was completed. The teacher had collected titles from the school library to accompany the science or social studies units, and students were allowed to take those books to their desks to read.

**Traditional Instruction Group**

The three elementary schools in this district were all of the same floor plan, thus the traditional instruction classroom was very similar in size, shape, and organization. The floor plan is represented in
Figure 3 and differed only in that this room was an indoor classroom with no windows. There were twenty-seven students in the class, and the room was organized to accommodate free movement and access to materials and the door.

Students' desks were arranged in a single file horseshoe shape with the community area in the center for special interest units. Students who exhibited behavior problems were placed next to the teacher's desk. A student writing area took up one corner, with the teacher's desk in the adjacent corner. During the researcher's visits to the classroom students were observed working individually at the writing table for their expository writing assignment. The only collaboration among students or group exchange of ideas was observed to occur during the students' science period. At this time the teacher and students congregated in the central area for the teacher's science lesson and an exhibition of rocks and minerals. The teacher, Mrs. Baker, gave the lesson and the children asked questions and manipulated the rocks.

Displays of student spelling and math papers were hung from strips along the walls. Large bulletin boards
Figure 3: Room Arrangement of Traditional Instruction Group
at the front and back of the room displayed commercial teaching materials for student helpers, good study habits, and seasonal artwork.

This was the teacher's first year teaching at this grade level, and she did not have a large classroom library for children to use. Few nonfiction books were used in the room; children were encouraged to use the library to check out any books they needed.

**Instructional Style of the Teacher**

Classroom teachers play a dynamic role in establishing a favorable environment for learning. The decisions they make in the arrangement of the classroom and for the planning and organizing of reading-writing events, have important consequences for what is learned and how it is learned. The two teachers in this study were both successful professionals; however, they approached writing and learning tasks in their classrooms in different ways.

**Treatment Group**

During most formal instruction, the teacher, Mrs. Adams, addressed students as a total group and spoke from
the front of the room. Third grade students were grouped for reading and math. Mrs. Adams taught the high reading group; she indicated that few students in the group required individual sessions. She used the Ginn Reading series, supplemented with literature, for the reading program. For several weeks at a time the children read sets of books in groups. Grades were based on activities and assignments related to books. Mrs. Adams gave individual help to students she felt needed it.

Mrs. Adams indicated in an interview that she was attempting to encourage writing by her students with weekly journal assignments to which she made written comments. Her students wrote stories and made books as part of an assignment in preparation for Young Author's Conference. Expository writing was done once during the school year when students wrote reports on animals. The initial purpose of the instruction was to learn to use resource materials such as an encyclopedia to collect facts for writing a report.

**Traditional Instruction Group**

The teacher, Mrs. Baker, adhered closely to the texts in all subject areas since this was her first year
teaching third grade after many years of teaching kindergarten and first grades. In her initial interview she stated that she was, feeling her way with reading and writing. She was particularly "unnerved" by Literature Based Reading and process writing adopted by the school district. She stated she was, "branching out with more literature and outside speakers to add interest to the content areas."

Field notes taken during observations and conferences with her, Mrs. Baker indicated she typically approached nonfiction writing by assigning the topic animals, and by having the students ask questions. What do animals eat? Where are they found? Students proceeded then to answer the questions through research in encyclopedias. She commented that most students simply wrote straight from the resource book or reworded it in some way. She felt she was unprepared to teach any form of expository writing.

**Students’ Classroom Writing**

Prior to the study, the researcher observed the writings of students in both the treatment and the traditional groups to extend personal knowledge of how
the children approached writing tasks. The researcher examined the treatment students' journals and writings. Few writings were available from the comparison group students since very few writings were assigned or encouraged beyond the English textbook assignments.

Treatment Group

The range of writing ability is illustrated by examples from journal entries prior to the study. Examples were recorded in field notes. Students were regarded by their teacher as high, average, or low achievers in writing to be those with the highest grades. The researcher noted that the high achieving students tended to use more standard punctuation, and sentence structure than the average and lower achieving students. High achieving subjects also included illustrations; one student, Tamara, included her poetry. Average ability students displayed fewer and shorter journal entries, from two to three sentences to half of a page. High achieving subjects averaged a page for each entry. Valarie, an average subject, used simple sentences in her entries and wrote in manuscript. The low achieving students tended to use manuscript writing with
nonstandard spellings and punctuation.

Students wrote fiction stories. Most, 5 out of 6 of the target group, began with an opening that set up the story (See Appendices N, O, P, Q, R, S). Top writers, Tamara and Joey used the following story openings. Tamara set up her story with a time and place (See Appendix N).

One summer afternoon the zoo got a big tank with a note on it that said, OPEN DAISY IMMEDIATELY. So of course they opened it right away. Inside they found a baby DOLPHIN.

The influence of the Curious George series by H.E. Rey about a mischievous monkey was evident in Joey’s story titled The Banana Eaters (See Appendix O).

One time Harold, the man, brought Jimmy, the chimpanzee, to the jungle to eat bananas. They packed up carefully. They packed a cage, a battery, toy, bed, bananas, glasses, whistle, and a portable telephone. They went in the green car with the chimp seat.

Joey's piece of writing included five chapters of adventures with a clear setting, problem, and a resolution at the end. Valarie, an average writer, wrote a chapter book about a Russian girl (See Appendix P).

Once there was a little girl. Her name was Bucru. Bucru was 10 years old. She had to move to the U.S.A. She didn’t want to move because her father died in the war against the U.S.A. She was mad at her mom!
Eddie, also rated an average writer, knew how to set up a story (See Appendix Q).

The day when I was out on a boat I fell a sleep and the, I fell out. They didn’t know I fell out but I did. It was about four feet deep. I saw this mysterious big stone.

He proceeded to tell about finding a treasure while he was in the water and returned to the boat without anyone knowing he had been missing. Angie, who was rated as a low achieving writer, set up her story with a real experience and then branched out into fiction (See Appendix R).

One day I went up to my attic and I was looking around. I discovered an old box full of books that were my Grandmother’s. They had been stored there for a long time. Then I got down on the first step I saw a shadow looking at me.

She did not develop any answers for the reader but left the shadow to the readers’ conclusion when her father tells her not to enter the attic again. The other low achieving student, Matt, did not have a complete story in his folder; he had many beginning sentences. He did, however, have a completed animal report during the time preceding the data collection. The report was written from a reference book (See Appendix S) began with a discussion of monkeys.
Monkey animal of the group most like man
Monkey are very intelligent animals in this

group not

He then shifted to another subject entirely, money
orders. He wrote,

safe and convenient way to send money
through the mails is by monkey order
Money order are especially helpful to
persons who do not have checking
accounts.

It appeared that his goal was filling the page rather
than constructing meaningful text. Even though he lost
his place in the resource book, he continued to fill up
space.

Traditional Instruction Group

Writing instruction for the traditional instruction
group consisted of English assignments from the textbook.
The teacher indicated that students probably did some
writing in their reading classes; however, she did not
assign journals, writing projects, or particularly
encourage student initiated writing.
Pre Treatment Student Perceptions of Text Structure

Treatment Group and Traditional Group Combined

Student perceptions of text structure were gathered through audiotaped interviews as represented in Appendix H. A review of audiotapes of student-researcher exchanges provided evidence of a collaborative relationship between students and the researcher. Students were willing to talk and did not appear to be inhibited by the tape recorder.

Definition of Story

Target students in both the treatment and traditional groups were asked in interviews to tell in their own words what the word "story" meant. They were also asked to give an example of a story. Responses to questions (1 & 2) related to students' ability to define a story are displayed in Table 3. While none of the students gave an explicit definition of a story (a series of connected events with a beginning, middle, and end), 75%, or 9 of 12, named a fiction title and 83%, 10 of 12, students named a book title as a story. Seven out of twelve students, 58%, equated story with writing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Question 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Reread something you like</td>
<td>Charlotte's Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Tells you something real or unreal. A book.</td>
<td>Curious George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Write something down, long or short. You read it. Kids like it read to them.</td>
<td>Incident at Hawk's Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Snakes. A nonfiction book</td>
<td>Snakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>A book</td>
<td>Wild Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>A thing you write on paper Can be real or fake</td>
<td>Where the Red Fern Grows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Books that are interesting or fun to read.</td>
<td>Meg and the Disappearing Diamond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Writing and reading</td>
<td>Fox in Socks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>I can't think of anything.</td>
<td>Vinegar Pancakes and Vanishing Cream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Story means writing</td>
<td>Things that happen in school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>Can't think of anything.</td>
<td>Vinegar Pancakes and Vanishing Cream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12</td>
<td>It means write a book.</td>
<td>The Garbage Truck (Student named a story he planned to write.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identification of Fiction and Nonfiction Paragraphs

To find out what students knew about fiction and nonfiction forms prior to treatment, both groups of students were shown two paragraphs, one a narrative form from a fiction book, *Something Special for Me* by Vera Williams, and one expository form from a nonfiction book, *Sunken Treasure* by Gail Gibbons. These are represented in Appendix G. Students were asked to differentiate between these paragraphs.

In questions 3 & 4 of the interview (See Table 4), students were asked to explain how they would write a story. Students from the Treatment Group are represented by numbers 1-6 with the Traditional Group being 7-12. The coding of H, A, and L designates the high, average, and low achieving student. Overall, most students, 92% or 11 of 12, identified the expository text from the narrative text. One of four of the low achieving students did not determine which paragraph was a story (See Table 5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Identify Paragraphs</th>
<th>Why paragraph is or is not a story</th>
<th>Story parts needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sounds like you would put it in a story. Sounds like it would come from a fact.</td>
<td>Most interesting parts Most of details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Difficulty Self corrected</td>
<td>I can't really tell. Telling more story-like</td>
<td>State the main idea It's all about one thing. In order - makes sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sounds like something kids would like to hear. Not interesting.</td>
<td>Put in stuff kids would like. Stuff you think good to write about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The first thing gave the clue.</td>
<td>You need weird things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>No Confused Both</td>
<td>The beginning doesn't sound like a story. Looks familiar from a story.</td>
<td>Periods, capital letters, commas, and dashes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>It has a little story in it Doesn't sound like a story.</td>
<td>Beginning, Middle, ending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>This one tells facts. That one tells like a story.</td>
<td>Make believe or it can be like a trip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #</td>
<td>Identify Paragraphs</td>
<td>Why paragraph is or is not a story</td>
<td>Story parts needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A little bit fiction&lt;br&gt;A nonfiction book</td>
<td>No answer given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tells facts&lt;br&gt;Tells a story- &quot;One Saturday&quot;</td>
<td>A start out like &quot;once upon a time&quot; An end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>More like a story&lt;br&gt;&quot;large&quot; beginning is more report-like</td>
<td>Something to grab your attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(Didn't know)&lt;br&gt;Think it the way it begins</td>
<td>A title&lt;br&gt;How the story begins and ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>It starts &quot;One Saturday&quot;.&lt;br&gt;It starts &quot;large elbow&quot;</td>
<td>Copy it; rewrite it, final copy&lt;br&gt;A nice beginning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Ability to Distinguish Text Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Students Able to Identify Text Structure</th>
<th>N = 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Writing Ability</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Writing Ability</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Writing Ability</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most, or eight of ten, stated that beginning or how the text started was important to being designated a story. In Table 4, student number 1, a high achieving student and student number 6, a low achieving student, both commented that the text had a little story in it. Three of the low students, (N=4) student numbers 5, 11, and 12 were concerned with the more basic elements of mechanics of writing such as using punctuation, a title, revision, and a final copy. The students identified as average writers by their teachers (students 3, 4, 9, 10) focused on making a story that related to audience: for example, using attention grabbers such as "weird things". The high achieving students (students 1, 2, 7, 8) described a variety of perceptions about what was needed to make
a story: interesting parts with supporting details, having an order which makes sense, and the different genres of writing.

Student Genre Preferences in Writing and Reading

Students were asked how much they write and what their preferences were in reading and writing (See Table 6). Students are coded H, A, L, as in Table 5. In response to the question about quantity of writing, four of twelve responded "a lot" to the amount of writing they did, a response that provided limited information to the researcher. Others responded with, "once or twice a week at home in theme books" and "about a page, and the back and another page". Most of the students (10 of 12) indicated they preferred to write fiction, either stories or poems. Two students, Joey (student #2) a high student and Valarie (student #3) an average writer, liked to write both fiction and nonfiction. Valarie particularly liked to write true facts about animals. Nonfiction writing was primarily done as journal writing or other teacher assigned writing, such as reports.

Responses related to students' preferences in choosing books and their reasons for such choices are
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Quantity of Writing</th>
<th>Kinds of writing student usually does</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Write a lot</td>
<td>Stories; rarely non-fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Writes once or twice a week at home in theme books</td>
<td>Fiction and nonfiction; likes writing mysteries, nature, monkeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Sort of a lot</td>
<td>Usually writes about animals; some fiction, some nonfiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Not much of an author</td>
<td>Stories; start out true, switch to not true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Poems, stories, and spelling words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>Two or three pages</td>
<td>Stories; bunches of stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Not that much; a little bit</td>
<td>Stories; sometimes other stuff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Favorite subject, but don't do</td>
<td>Poems; sometimes reports, stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>About a page, the back and another page</td>
<td>Stories; nothing else unless assigned by teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>Mostly stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>Kind of a lot</td>
<td>Stories, math, spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12</td>
<td>Lots</td>
<td>Poems, riddles, stories; reports when assigned; writes stories best</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
displayed in Table 7. Students were shown a collection ( Twelve in number) of fiction and nonfiction books including science and reading textbooks. They were asked to select the book or books they thought they would like best. Students were told that they could name a book of their choice if they did not see one they thought they would like among the books in the collection. Students were asked to give reasons for making their selections.

As a group, nonfiction titles and texts were chosen by 58% (7 of 12) of the students. An interest in the subject or genre was the reason given for selection by 7 of 12. A breakdown of preferences by gender is given in Table 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Book Choice</th>
<th>Reason for choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td><em>The Witches</em> and <em>Science text</em></td>
<td>Looks interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Likes science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td><em>Science things</em></td>
<td>Like science, monkeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td><em>Sarah Plain and Tall</em></td>
<td>Sounds interesting and looks good picture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td><em>Bugs</em></td>
<td>I like bugs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td><em>The Witches</em></td>
<td>I'd know what to do if a witch came.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td><em>Science text</em></td>
<td>You can learn from it. Can't learn from it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td><em>Cam Jansen Mystery</em></td>
<td>I know I'd like it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td><em>The Dinosaurs</em></td>
<td>Likes dinosaurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td><em>The Dinosaurs</em></td>
<td>Loves subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Computers and chapter book</td>
<td>Likes fiction and nonfiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From the way it looks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caught my eye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td><em>Sarah Plain and Tall</em></td>
<td>Sounds like a good book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12</td>
<td><em>One about computers</em></td>
<td>Don't know much about the subject.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8  Reading Preferences by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls' Book Preferences</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Ability #</td>
<td>Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 1</td>
<td>Witches and science text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3</td>
<td>Sarah Plain and Tall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 5</td>
<td>Witches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 7</td>
<td>Cam Jansen Mystery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 9</td>
<td>Dinosaurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 11</td>
<td>Sarah Plain and Tall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boys' Book Preferences</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Ability #</td>
<td>Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 2</td>
<td>science things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 4</td>
<td>Bugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 6</td>
<td>science textbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 8</td>
<td>Dinosaurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 10</td>
<td>Computers and chapter book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 12</td>
<td>Computers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Girls reported a variety of interests, with 4 of 6 preferring fiction. A high student (#1) indicated that she liked both a novel and the science textbook because of her interest in science and the looks of the novel. Based upon a dual choice by this student, 33% or 2 of 6
(N=6) preferred nonfiction titles. Comments of "sounds good" or "I know I'd like it because I like mysteries", were made across ability groups. Student number 5, a low ability student, commented, "I'd know what to do if a witch came."

All boys (N=6) in both the treatment and traditional groups preferred nonfiction books. Three students made selections based on the subject of the book. The two low ability students (#6 and #12) related their selections of the science text and the book about computers to learning. Matt, (#6) commented, "You can learn from it. You can't learn from the others." Josh, (#12) stated that he "didn't know much about the subject."

Students were also asked to discern what books they select for various occasions and their reasons for making those selections (See Table 9). When asked what book they might choose for vacation reading from the sample collection or one of their own choosing, six students reported that they would choose fiction. Their reasons reflected their interests and the presumption that they would have considerable time to spend. Several students reported interest in a longer book or something to pass the time and keep their minds busy. Eddie, (# 4) wanted
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Vacation choice Reason</th>
<th>School choice Reason</th>
<th>Report choice Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Charlotte's Web</td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>An animal book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like to reread old favorites</td>
<td>Like to read funny books</td>
<td>Teacher assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amazing Things</td>
<td>for fun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have enough time to spend reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Reading and science (No reason)</td>
<td>The Witches</td>
<td>Bugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Looks good- Teacher assigns longer books to read</td>
<td>Already have books on subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Something about animals or rattlesnakes</td>
<td>Shortstop from Tokyo</td>
<td>Encyclopedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In case we go to the wilderness we could look out for them</td>
<td>A nice book and true</td>
<td>Has more animal facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>December Secrets Would read during Christmas vacation</td>
<td>Volcanoes</td>
<td>Mummies Made in Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would know more than the teacher</td>
<td>Know what to do when it was spooky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>December Secrets To pass the time</td>
<td>Science book To learn</td>
<td>Mummies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To learn from it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>The Mystery of the Monster Movie</td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>Computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gives you something to do</td>
<td>(No reason)</td>
<td>Tells facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #</td>
<td>Vacation Choice Reason</td>
<td>School Choice Reason</td>
<td>Report Choice Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H⁸</td>
<td>The mystery</td>
<td>Science book</td>
<td>Computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like to solve mysteries</td>
<td>Not good at</td>
<td>Find out a lot of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>science-will learn</td>
<td>different things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A⁹</td>
<td>December Secrets</td>
<td>Sarah Plain</td>
<td>Science book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First book read</td>
<td>and Tall</td>
<td>Tells facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enjoyed it</td>
<td>Like it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A¹⁰</td>
<td>The bugs</td>
<td>The Largest</td>
<td>I'd combine books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Might keep your mind</td>
<td>Dinosaur</td>
<td>Would write fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>busy</td>
<td>Like dinosaurs</td>
<td>cause it's easier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L¹¹</td>
<td>The Bugs</td>
<td>Sarah Plain</td>
<td>Paul Revere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like poems</td>
<td>and Tall</td>
<td>Learn about him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher assigned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chapter books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L¹²</td>
<td>A long one</td>
<td>Sideways Stories</td>
<td>A tiger book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For a long</td>
<td>Like funny stories</td>
<td>Did a report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>on tigers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to read about animals or snakes in the event he went to
the wilderness. When asked what book they would choose
for leisure reading in school, the students were evenly
divided, 50% each, in choosing fiction and nonfiction.
Two of the low achieving students expressed the desire
to learn when they selected the science text and one of
the collection of earth science books. One student
wanted to know more about the subject than the teacher
did in making her selection. A high student acknowledged
not being good at science and selected the science text
as an appropriate choice to read on his own in order to
learn.

For reading preparatory to writing a report, all
students reported they would select a nonfiction book or
reference book. They knew that they needed facts and
therefore needed a book that contained factual material.

Students were asked what made a book easy or hard
and to select an example of an easy and hard book (See
Table 10). Books with shorter words, less text, and
shorter sentences were typically ranked as easy. The
subject matter was not the consideration since most of
the selections were nonfiction books, several with
directions to follow. The hardest books were evenly
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Easiest Reason</th>
<th>Hardest Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td><strong>Window sill Garden</strong>&lt;br&gt;Words are spread out&lt;br&gt;Not many words</td>
<td><strong>The Witches</strong>&lt;br&gt;Lots of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td><strong>Window sill Garden</strong>&lt;br&gt;Short book&lt;br&gt;Looks like fiction</td>
<td><strong>Textbooks</strong>&lt;br&gt;Things to learn&lt;br&gt;Questions to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td><strong>Pebbles and Pods</strong>&lt;br&gt;Not a lot of words</td>
<td><strong>The Witches</strong>&lt;br&gt;Longer and no pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td><strong>Pebbles and Pods</strong>&lt;br&gt;Easier words</td>
<td><strong>The Witches</strong>&lt;br&gt;Hard words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td><strong>Window sill Garden</strong>&lt;br&gt;Only a couple of words</td>
<td><strong>Sarah Plain and Tall</strong>&lt;br&gt;This book would have a silver dot on it, and I wouldn't be able to read it. (His teacher color codes books for level of difficulty.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td><strong>The Largest Dinosaurs</strong>&lt;br&gt;Little kids would like to read it.</td>
<td><strong>Bug book</strong>&lt;br&gt;Hard subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td><strong>The Window sill Garden</strong>&lt;br&gt;Smaller words and directions</td>
<td><strong>Science book</strong>&lt;br&gt;Hard if you are not in the right grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td><strong>Window sill Garden</strong>&lt;br&gt;Easier words</td>
<td><strong>Computers</strong>&lt;br&gt;Bigger words and hard to understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td><strong>Paul Revere</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Window sill Garden</strong>&lt;br&gt;No big words</td>
<td><strong>Chapter books</strong>&lt;br&gt;I have a hard time staying with a book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td><strong>Cam Jansen mysteries</strong>&lt;br&gt;Easy words</td>
<td><strong>The Computer</strong>&lt;br&gt;Hard words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12</td>
<td><strong>The Window sill Garden</strong>&lt;br&gt;The size of the book</td>
<td><strong>Castles</strong>&lt;br&gt;It's long and has long pages of words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
divided between fiction and nonfiction and selected for a wide variety of reasons. Students most frequently mentioned length of the book and number of hard words when discussing difficulty of text. Students also describe characteristics of a hard book as having things to learn and questions to answer.

**Student Perceptions of Nonfiction Text Organization**

**Treatment and Traditional Groups**

To determine how much or how little target students already knew about expository structure, students were also asked questions about how nonfiction texts were organized (See Tables 11 and 12 and Appendix H, Questions 6, 7, 9). Children explained how they would execute a writing assignment about objects such as a collection of cars, books, or seashells. Students were also asked how they would advise other students in writing nonfiction and to speculate about how writers of nonfiction go about their writing. For this assessment it was necessary to rate student responses as to the level of knowledge about text. Student responses were evaluated independently by the researcher and two research assistants. Raters used a scale from 3 = high to 1 =
### Table 11
QUESTIONS RELATED TO PERCEPTIONS OF NONFICTION ORGANIZATION
Questions 6, 7, 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>How to write a nonfiction book? First? Second? Last?</th>
<th>How would you tell about books?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Write what kind it was</td>
<td>Tell what is sounds like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where it was found</td>
<td>Talk about the chapter books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What to do with it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describe them</td>
<td>Explain what they're about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What's in them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Categories mostly, like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>makeup stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Introduce things</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the middle describe the things.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do a little more describing at the end.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would describe things like the shells.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explain how they got their form.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Write it and then find out if kids like it. I'd read</td>
<td>If I wrote them, I'd tell what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>out of a book, encyclopedia.</td>
<td>the kids wanted to know how I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write about how they look.</td>
<td>did it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tell how shells sound like the sea when held to the</td>
<td>In the library, I'd put some in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ear.</td>
<td>nonfiction and some in fiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Take notes and then put them in your own words. Then</td>
<td>Baseball Players do Amazing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>write my story.</td>
<td>Things would go in fiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tell how smooth and shiny.</td>
<td>&quot;Window Garden&quot; would be like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>science-nonfiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pebbles and Pods would be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>easiest-nonfiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>Write a couple letters and what came after it. Start</td>
<td>Where they came from, cost,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>out with &quot;One day I went to the beach&quot;. I'd describe</td>
<td>where they could get some; say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>them, names of them.</td>
<td>the cost. I would also describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>I'd think about it, get a sloppy copy. Make your</td>
<td>I'd tell them all the good parts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>character, and how's your story going to end on paper.</td>
<td>Maybe they would like buy it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #</td>
<td>How to write a nonfiction book? First? Second? Last?</td>
<td>How would you tell about books?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Facts. I'd get a book, write down my facts and make them into a story. First, I'd tell what I was writing about—describe them.</td>
<td>Some are fiction and some are non-fiction. Some are long.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Figure out what I would write about; get a book and read it. Write down my ideas and make a story out of it. Describe it.</td>
<td>I'd read it and explain it. Tell it's a good book or a bad book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>Look for facts; put down something that we had to do, looked it up, wrote. I'd describe them.</td>
<td>Not sure how to tell about them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Look at them for a day or two and then write, get my story out of that. I'd put some characters into it.</td>
<td>Tell about each one. One is fiction and nonfiction, and one is a chapter book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>Read a book. Write some facts like how their childhood was. Describe them.</td>
<td>Tell about each book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12</td>
<td>Look up information about those things. Write down on a piece of paper and put in a story. Look up things like size, shape, where they were found; describe.</td>
<td>Tell how many books there are. Go to the first period and tell them what it said. Describe them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12  STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF TEXT ORGANIZATION
Questions 11 & 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Advice to others about writing</th>
<th>Perceptions of nonfiction writers' organizing strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Make it interesting in first few parts; not dull so they will want to finish it.</td>
<td>From other books; from experience. Put it all together and write a book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Write about something they know a lot about; their favorite thing. Can be either make believe or unmake believe. If they like real things, do nonfiction.</td>
<td>Do a report; get some books about it. Not copy, but facts. If you go on vacation and see volcanoes, you could study carefully; use the things you saw and write.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Tell them all about the stuff and they could interested and read more nonfiction books.</td>
<td>Have to study for a long time; learn a lot; get all this stuff together; figure out what they are going to do. Have to start writing and keep their mind on it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Write about the thing you know about the best. Tell them to reword it (facts).</td>
<td>Go to a library and get an encyclopedia, look it up. Take notes; write your report or story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>They should write a report. Instead of a story they could like write they were going somewhere.</td>
<td>Information first and then pictures. He went where they had volcanoes and asked questions. They probably used a tape recorder and stopped on a word and put it on paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>They go places where mummies and things are; they discover and see what's there. They take things back and write about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #</td>
<td>Advice to others about writing</td>
<td>Perceptions of nonfiction writers' organizing strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 7</td>
<td>Tell them to use their imagination on stories or facts from a book.</td>
<td>Probably like a story form and then fact form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 8</td>
<td>Think of what thing you want to do; pick something you don't know about; get some encycloped-</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dia for facts; put them together to make a story.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 9</td>
<td>Get as much information as you can</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 10</td>
<td>Get a lot of facts; put them on paper. Write your story a couple of times, your first draft.</td>
<td>They probably went places or sent postcards and asked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>them to take pictures and get a lot of facts; put it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in the typewriter. Probably organized it like all plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in a chapter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>Get as much information as you can</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12</td>
<td>Give them a subject, what it looks like, where you got your information. Write real good.</td>
<td>They look it up in different books. They get it and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>put it on paper. They sort it out like what should go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
low. Interrater reliability was 92%. Table 13 displays the questions related to text organization and individual ratings for students and questions.

The following examples indicate how ratings were determined. For questions 6/7 that asked the student how to write a nonfiction book about a collection of cars or shells or anything they could name, the evaluators gave a rating of 3 to a response such as that given by Tamara, student # 1 (See Table 11 and Rubric Appendix T).

Write what kind (cars or shells) it was. Where it was found and what to do with it. Describe them.

Raters assigned a 2 to a response to the same question by a low student # 11, Stephanie (See Table 11).

Read a book and write some facts like how their childhood was. Describe them.

A rating of 1 was given to the response of Josh (student #10) to questions 6/7 (See Table 11).

Look at them for a day or two and then write. Get my story out of that. I'd put some characters into it.

In general, the high and average ability writers were able to articulate what they do when they write. Low students responding to the same question tended to use a story-like framework for the facts.
Students were asked how they would tell someone about the collection of fiction and nonfiction books displayed to them by the researcher (See Table 11 Question 9 for responses). These responses were also rated as to how well the students explained what was different about the nonfiction books. Students’ responses were given a 2 rating for responses such as that given by Joey (Student H2).

Explain what they’re about, what’s in them. Categories mostly, like makeup stories.

Valarie, Student A3, was given a 3 for her response.

If I wrote them, I’d tell what the kids wanted to know how I did it. In the library, I’d put some in nonfiction and some in fiction.

To determine students’ perceptions about organizing their writing, students were asked to speculate about how they would advise others about writing (See Table 12, question 11). These responses were rated and are given in Table 13. Raters looked for evidence that students knew there had to be some form to their own writing. Overall raters found it difficult to give a high rating of three to any of the students. Student responses such
as that given by Angie, (Student #L5) was given a rating of 2.

They should write a report. Instead of a story, they could like write they were going somewhere.

A response such as Sarah's (Student #A9) received a rating of 1.

Get as much information as you can.

Students were asked to define how writers of nonfiction books organize their material (See Table 12, Question 13). Raters looked for evidence of students' awareness of a logical order or sequence of material in nonfiction books. Most of the responses, 8 of 12, were evaluated to be a rating of 2, a partial knowledge of text organization. Josh R.'s (Student A10) response was given a 3 rating because it demonstrated an understanding that factual material of the same subject should go together.

They probably went places or sent postcards and asked them to take pictures and get a lot of facts. Put it in the typewriter and probably organized it like all plants in a chapter.
### Table 13. Scores of Questions Related to Student Perceptions of Expository Text Organization Scores Prior to Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student # Ability</th>
<th>Questions 6/7</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Overall Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**
- 3=high
- 2=partial
- 1=low

### Scores of Questions Related to Student Perceptions of Expository Text Organization Scores of Traditional Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student # Ability</th>
<th>Questions 6/7</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Overall Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**
- 3=high
- 2=partial
- 1=low
Looking at both the treatment and the traditional groups, 21 of 48 responses were ranked as 2, or some knowledge of how expository texts are organized. This represents 44%. The majority of the responses fell into this category. The highest ranking of 3 was given to 19% of the responses; this ranking was almost evenly divided between the treatment and the traditional groups, with 4 in the treatment group and 5 in the traditional group. Even students of high writing ability did not demonstrate ability to describe how expository texts are organized. The lowest ranking of 1 was given to 37.5% of the responses.

**Treatment Group**

About 71% of the responses in this group fell in the 2 or 3 ranking, with 29% in the lowest ranking of 1, or little knowledge of text structure organization. The averages of group responses were: high 2.25, average 2.00, and low 1.375. The overall score of 1.875 represents the total scores divided by the number of responses for each group.

**Traditional instruction Group**

This group had 54% of the responses in the 2 or 3
ranking to questions relating to expository text structural knowledge. The lowest ranking of 1 went to 46% of the responses in this group. The averages of group responses were: high 1.75, average 1.875, and low 1.625. The overall score of 1.750 represents the total scores divided by the number of responses for each group.

Overall, the treatment group displayed 12.5% more knowledge relating to text structure as determined by their interviews than did the traditional group prior to the study. Neither group demonstrated high knowledge of text structure.

Description of the Instructional Unit

The instructional unit in expository text structures was conducted during fourteen 30 to 40 minute morning sessions. The instructional period extended for six weeks.

Beginning Sessions

The pre-instruction interview indicated that students in the treatment group had a high knowledge of story structure. Accordingly, the researcher began the instructional unit with a narrative text model. In the
first teaching session, children began to join in the
telling of events of the story *The Magic School Bus inside the Earth* (Cole, 1987) and they discussed how
those events were linked together (See appendix I).
Field notes and videotapes taken on that day reveal high
student involvement. There was little interest in the
camera set up in the back of the room. The researcher
commented,

> Have you ever made a chain of links to decorate a Christmas tree or your room?
The way these links hold together are much the same way a story holds together
with different events from beginning to end.

At this opening session, students were encouraged
to add clues to the vocabulary graffiti chart. This chart
was constructed out of brown paper and shaped like a
boulder, in keeping with the topic of earth science. The
vocabulary words could come from their science class
readings, from the news as it related to the earth
science unit, or from the collection of earth science
books. These words would provide support to students' writings as the instructional unit progressed.

Students were working on a teacher assignment.
Their work sessions provided an opportunity for the
researcher to demonstrate how data were arranged in different nonfiction books, encyclopedias, and their own science textbooks. The researcher asked students to search for clues as to the text structure, an activity she termed "Fact Collection" (See appendix J). Students examined their science books for topic headings, followed by examples, with terms like: first, on this date, second, next, and finally. Lauber's Volcano was part of the class collection the researcher brought to the earth science unit and was used as an example of this Fact Collection type of organization. The story-like format of this book, together with the vivid photographs made this book popular with the class. To emphasize the clue words used by the author to indicate the predominant organization, the researcher read several excerpts aloud.

Subsequent Sessions

After the introductory activity, each session began with a review of the previous session, an examination of the graffiti wall chart for new vocabulary, addition of new words, and excerpts read by the researcher from nonfiction books on various topics. The students used the clues to guess the type of organization of each text.
The theme of earth science provided a productive context for discussing cause and effect structures. The researcher demonstrated using a flow-chart (See appendix K) and assisted the students with clue words and strategies for analyzing cause-effect organization. Following each demonstration, students examined books in search of examples of ways to organize data. Hiscock's *The Big Rock* provided a tangible example of cause-effect. The researcher demonstrated this method of organizing data, emphasizing clue words in a pop-up book she had written about weathering. The emphasis was that all writers plan some type of organizing strategy when they write.

The researcher commented on videotape,

> When you see words such as because or cause, you should have red signals or lights telling you this is cause and effect structure. Effect is what happened; cause is what came first.

The researcher used *Saving the Peregrine Falcon* by Caroline Arnold as a particularly good example of this type of organization. This excerpt (p 12) demonstrates the use of clues:

> Scientists have found that DDT causes birds to lay eggs with shells that are too thin. When they measure the shells of hatched or broken eggs, they find
that the thinnest shells are those with the most DDT in them.

Students were encouraged to add clues to the chart and to demonstrate their knowledge of cause-effect terms by giving their own examples of cause-effect.

After demonstrating the compare and contrast structure, the researcher questioned the students: "What do you like to compare?" Students responded with topics such as puzzles, little cars, bikes, and marbles. Terms for this structure were demonstrated by chart (See appendix L). Students were told to look to see how objects could be alike and how they could be different. The children were active participators and made additions to the chart of terms as well as additions to the graffiti chart. Books such as Penguine, by Sylvia A Johnson and Headgear by Ron Hirsch were used by the researcher to demonstrate the mode of comparing.

Rehearsal of New Skills

The researcher provided opportunities for the students to practice the terms and organization styles they had learned through instruction. The researcher developed a game for the students to play. She started
the game by telling the students they were going to play detective, and then she questioned them about what detectives do. The detective game required students to look for terms or "clues" the author used to organize the facts. Students, working in teams, examined two to three nonfiction books and used color-coded flags to match the color of the text structure charts. Game sessions were videotaped. The researcher commented, "You have to show me the evidence to be good detectives. If you have headings arranged like the textbook you probably have what kind of organization?"

In general, the students demonstrated ability to use terms and supply reasons for their explanations. Informal discussions with the classroom teacher and students indicated they enjoyed the activity. Several students requested to play the game again.

Practice Through Writing

From the beginning of the sessions, students were encouraged to think of topics that could be subjects for writing. Each day's session brought new words to be added to the graffiti wall, shaped like a huge boulder. The researcher constructed a set of pop-up books,
sequence books, and "magic books" (Two pages with slits were attached together without staples or glue.) These were for the class to use as an additional inducement to be authors of books.

The research framed the writing tasks by questions such as "What can we write about?". "How would you organize your facts?" Students were encouraged to use facts or "topics which they knew a lot about." Students could use any of the three structures to organize their information.

As indicated by recorded observations and analysis of videotapes, students were able to use terms and organize their information in the text structures within a variety of writing topics. For instance, Chad elected to write about the history of basketball. The following scenario is typical of the writing sessions observed during the study.

Class interest appeared to be high. Students volunteered to show the researcher their latest written products or the progress they were making. The researcher circulated among each writing group or individual writer. Some students moved throughout the room finding writing partners with whom to share ideas and books.
Approximately half of the twenty-eight students remained at their seats to work with only an occasional move to conference with someone else, sometimes the teacher or researcher about a writing problem. A group of three boys gathered at the table at the back of the room with a collection of books and paper. When the researcher joined their group, they informed her that they were thinking of writing about the different ways they could "make a business." The researcher questioned what they meant, and they responded with, "We want to make some money."

The researcher asked the children who gathered about her to share their writing topics, "What is your game plan? How are you going to organize this information about basketball?" She encouraged the students in the classroom to keep referring to the charts stationed on the blackboard for clues and models for their writing.

The following conversation is transcribed verbatim from the videotape.

Jonathon - How can I write about earthquakes?
Researcher - Well, what happens when the earth quakes?
Jonathon - Things fall down. Everything shakes.
Researcher - O.K. How could you write that?
Jonathon - I can show houses falling down.
Researcher - If you want to illustrate the piece first and then write about it, that's
Jonathon - O.K.
Yah.
Researcher - Can you tell me what organization you might use? What your game plan might be?
Jonathon - (Pause)
Researcher - What organization model on the board would work?
Jonathon - Cause?
Researcher - I think you're right.

Some children were taking notes while several books were open on their desks. Ashley spent the entire period jotting notes and appeared to be deep in thought. Several students formed collaborative writing groups. They tended to select very broad topics. For example, one group decided to write about the universe. The researcher responded with, "That's a HUGE topic! Perhaps you should narrow your topic or you may go on forever. You might want to choose an area you know best and put your information together." Some students, worked close to others and occasionally conversed with a small group, but they did not write collaboratively. They were sharing ideas with each other while they wrote individual pieces. The researcher encouraged such interaction. Children began to branch off into all topics of interest. Joey was observed as he asked the teacher, "Is the heart an involuntary muscle?" His teacher responded by asking him
if he was doing a piece about the body. Joey answered, "I'm still trying to decide."

Treatment Group Students' Expository Writings

High Achieving Writers

In Figures 4-9 sample writings and student comments are displayed. Comments were from the students' post-instruction interviews. The sample shown represents each student's first attempt to use information collected either from the earth science unit or other nonfiction sources and to organize this data to write a nonfiction "book". A discussion of each of the treatment groups' expository writings together with their post-instruction interviews follows.

A high writer (See Figure 4), Tamara (#H1), discussed several methods of organizing text. Her concern was keeping her facts "in the right order." She tended to write short pieces and illustrate them with ornate drawings, much as she did her fiction writing. Her first nonfiction writing was about weathering. The subject lend itself well to a cause and effect mode of organization. While she did not use many markers of cause/effect, she used phrases "and then the rock that
Weathering is the wearing away of rock. Over the years rock will start to dissolve or crack and go away.

How would you organize your information to write about the cars or shells or anything else?  
T. Well, you could compare, you can compare this shell with this shell. And you can tell what it looks like and things like that.  
R. So that would be what kind of organization?  
T. Comparison and fact collection.  
R. Right!  
T. Well, to put them in the right order. Not to mix them up. To at least put pictures in them, cause that's what I like best in books.  
R. Is there one best way to organize that you like?  
T. Well, it's really just find facts and put em in your words and see what you come up with is really...
was once a smooth mountain is a lump of cracks", illustrating her ability to make connections to the beginning definition of weathering.

Even before instruction, both high writers, Tamara and Joey, were able to use all of the methods of organizing facts: fact collection, cause/effect, and compare/contrast. Joey (#H2) became excited about strange extinct animals from a book in the room collection. His first book was about extinct animals. In his post-instruction interview Joey described his strategy for organizing facts (See Figure 5).

I'd say, first I'd start out with a question in one paragraph like, "What does the animal eat?" or something, if I was doing it on animals. And then I'd say like, "This animal eats so and so; sometimes it traps and then eats so and so", like that. So I could like compare the two together after that in one sentence. I could do that. And say what it does, I could do like...when it's... I could say like, "When it's in a happy mood, it jumps around", and that would be like cause/effect.

Joey appeared to recognize that an author could use the same facts and organize them in many different ways. He selected several of the most unusual of these animals to write about. He first collected his data in the form of notes scribbled on a sheet of paper which he lost several
Figure 5. High Achieving Writer - Treatment Group

R: How would you organise it? I thought first I'd start out with a question in one paragraph. I'd write down the introduction. Then I'd write down the main points and so on. So I could like compare the two together after that in one sentence. So I could do that. And then I could like jump around. And that would be like cause-effect. So again, you would use some sort of form and you would tell them to use some sort of form to write.
times. He used a page for each of the animals and went about a fact collection style of writing about each one. In his interview and in his writing, he used his knowledge of the elements of comparing as well as cause-effect (See Figure 5). In his expository writing, he used the compare/contrast markers such as the phrases: "looks like", "is better in", and "stay under longer than".

It isn't a penguin. It just looks like one. It is funny on land But is better in water. They can go far under water and can stay under longer than a seal. Thier eggs are shaped for staying in the auk's nest. They are spishely marked so they can tell thier apart. Thier Island was destroyed by a underwater volcano and 50 survied. 48 were killed for spesamens and the last two were killed to add to a bird collection.

Average Achieving Writers

Of the average writers (See Figure 6) Valarie (#A3) wrote about earthquakes, gave general facts about them, and then personalized her writing, "how scary to be in a big earthquake." In her interview, Valarie explained how she could use facts and organize them in cause and effect or compare structures. In her first piece she started with a definition of an earthquake and proceeded
3. Look at these shells and cups. How would you organize the information that you had about these?
V. Um... like say I was going to write about the shells, say I was going to write about the sand dollars. Then I could write how if you dropped them, they could break them really easily. Cause they are really... Fragile?
R. Fragile?
V. Yeah, they are really fragile and everything. And then I could move on to different kinds of shells and tell how they are different.
R. So what you are talking about would fit what kind of text organization we learned about?
V. Cause and effect.

An earthquake is when rocks move under the earth and the earth quakes. Often a warning signal goes out 30 seconds before the earthquake. The earthquake may move continents. Whole continents will shift to another place under the earth. Mountains and rivers will move miles. Houses and furniture and supplies will move miles. People are where they are and don't have time to do what write, under a house. It would be crazy to live in a sign of earthquake.

By

Figure 6. Average Achieving Writer - Treatment Group
with examples of the effects of volcanic activity. She includes some of the cause-effect markers such as "when" and "makes".

When a volcano erups there might be an earthquake. A big earthquake may make cracks in the ground. It can damage towns, cities and countries. It will start to shake. When the earth pushes and pulls it will make plates.

In his interview, Eddie, an average writer, explained that he found nonfiction harder to write than fiction because of all the work involved of getting the facts down in your own words and then "trying to THINK of what you need to write". He discussed how he would compare various elements. His expository writing about volcanoes starts with a description of a volcano, and then he uses comparing markers such as "inside", "outside", "some", and "a few " (See Figure 7).

Inside the earth lava is called magma. Outside it's called lava. It's really melted rock. Some volcanoes are much more active than others. A few may be said to be in a permanent eruption.

**Low Achieving Writers**

Low students, (See Figures 8, 9) had difficulty
How would you go about writing or telling someone these items now that you've had instruction on the different models or ways to organize nonfiction material?

E. Well, um. I would also compare on these cause most of these shells are rough and most of the cars are smooth.
R. Would you compare the cars to the shells? Or the shells with each other? The cars to each other?
E. Yeah.
R. Which way to write is more difficult?
E. Um... trying to write a nonfiction.
R. Nonfiction is harder than fiction.
E. Cause you look in an encyclopedia and get all the information and then write it in your own words. And then that's easier than trying to THINK of a title and trying to THINK of what you need to write and everything than fiction.

Volcanoes

A volcano is an opening in the earth from which lava flows. Inside the earth lava is called magma. Outside it's called lava. It's really melted rock. Some mountains are much more active than others. A few may be said to be in a state of perpetual eruption. When lava cools it becomes rock. A volcano sprays out all kinds of gases when it erupts. It relieves gas easily.

Figure 7. Average Achieving Writer - Treatment Group
searching for data. The classroom teacher assisted the researcher in providing more individualized help with those students. In the absence of the researcher she supported the instruction through review of terms and concepts.

In the first interview, Angie (#L5) had difficulty articulating what she accomplished in writing. She, unlike the low writers in the comparison group, moved away from copying facts directly from the book. She made an attempt to place her facts into a textual framework of comparing markers "different" and "alike". She described volcanic activity in both compare-contrast organization and then a cause-effect organization.

It is hot underneath the ground. Rocks are different and some are like in many ways because it makes heat and pressure come up in it. And then it erupts. And it sends up lava.

Matt (#L6) worked over several days to bring together his facts about bull sharks. He proceeded to provide a fact collection about the bull shark. In his interview he discussed his writing. He identified his writing as a fact collection. He also volunteered additional ways he could have controlled the material by
Student # 5 Angie

The Inner Earth

By Angie

It is hot underneath the ground.
Rocks are different and some are like in many ways because it makes heat and pressure come up in it. And then it erupts. And it sends up these

R. Since we talked about all that writing in class. How would you write about them?
A. I think I'd tell a story about them. Like I wrote my story on interesting nerve (?) I could write shells that were interesting.
R. Give me an instance. What you might say in your book.
A. Here's a shell that is painted white. And...
R. Then what would you say?
A. It looks like...
R. This sounds to me like a fact collection. You are going to tell about each one?
A. Yes.

Figure 8. Low Achieving Writer - Treatment Group
The bull shark often lives in freshwater. The bull shark grows to about 11 feet or 3.3 meters long. It is known to attack swimmers.

Do you think you will write some more now?

M. I'm gonna write another one.
R. I'd like to see you write another one. You wrote here about sharks. What kind of form did you use?
M. Fact collection.
R. Could you have done it another way?
M. I could compare a shark to a whale?
R. Could you have done a cause and effect?
M. I wrote here...a shark attacked a swimmer.
R. So you did include some cause and effect.
M. Yeah.

Figure 9 Low Achieving Writer - Treatment Group
"compare a shark to a whale". With prompting, he also mentioned being able to include cause/effect when he wrote about the shark attacking a swimmer.

The bull shark obtains lives in freshwater. The bull shark grow to about 11 feet or over 3 meters long. It is known to attack swimmers.

Summary of Treatment Group's Expository Writing

The researcher conferred with the teacher about ways to move the students' writings beyond the usual fact collection mode of organizing text. Mrs. Adams indicated that student reports about animals usually followed this style: name the animal, describe its appearance, describe its habitat, and list any unusual characteristics.

Mrs. Adams indicated that a significant result of the instruction about expository text structures was the growth in writing of nonfiction the entire class. Students were involved with working collaboratively with other students to compile books on favorite topics. An example of this is the work of one group, three boys and one girl, who were working together to compile a book entitled Ways to Make Money. Videotaped sessions show this particular group deeply engaged in discussion and notetaking about who was going to contribute what to the
book, how it would be organized (fact collection), and gathering data through the use of the classroom encyclopedia. In an interview with the classroom teacher she stated, "There has been a surge of writing going on in the room." She set up an area for the class to have a library of their own works to check out for circulation. The support of the children's writing; the importance the teacher gave to it was an added inducement for the children to expand their interest in and expertise in writing nonfiction texts. This library grew in the next six weeks to include close to 90 books on nonfiction topics. Each time the researcher entered the room children would come ready to share a new addition or a work in progress.

Traditional Group's Expository Writings

Students in the traditional group received no instruction in expository text structures. They did receive all of the earth science collection of books, materials, bulletin board displays, and blank pop-up and sequence books for students to use. The teacher, Mrs. Baker, instructed the students to use the classroom books, the science text, encyclopedias, or library books,
"anything to get your facts for your writing." Students were told to collect their facts and use their blank books to write their finished copy of their writing assignment.

Students' responses in a pre-writing interview as to how they would go about writing about a collection of rocks, animals or cars are given together with their writings in Figures 10-15 (Students #7-12). Students were designated to be high, average, or low achieving writers by their teacher according to the grades they received in English.

High Achieving Students

Alison and Judd, high achieving writers, responded in the interview that they would collect facts for their nonfiction writing, and then put those facts into a story. Alison (#H7) told the researcher in this way.

I'd get a book.....Um...I'd write down my facts and then um...I'd write...put my facts into a story.

She started her writing in a story-like framework describing the setting before and after the eruption of Mt. Saint Helens. Her description was very much like the approach used in Volcano by Lauber, part of the earth
science collection (See Figure 10).

Mt. Saint Helens was a quiet volcano until May 8, 1980. People loved to take picnics there and enjoy themselves. After the volcano erupted nobody wanted to take picnics anymore because ash covered the ground instead of grass and trees.

Judd (#H8) had described a similar plan for accumulating facts and getting them written (See Figure 11).

The rocks, I would probably like have to look up in a book or something. The animals, I'd probably do the same thing. Cause I don't know that much about either one of them. First...try to figure out which one I was going to do and...then um...get a book and just read it. And then I might get some ideas from that and write down the ideas, and try to make a little story out of that.

Both of these writers gave details they researched about the topic of volcanoes, and they both have story-like qualities. Judd started with a description of the birth of a volcano and used cause-effect organization. He also used connecting words to tie his facts together in a story-like format ending with "A volcano is born."

At the bottom of a volcano there is melted rock called magma. When there gets to be a lot of magma rocks start to crack and lava rock starts to shoot out of the volcano and magma starts flowing. A volcano is born.

These writers appeared to have the capacity to look into
6. If I asked you to write a book about rocks or animals or cars or shells, how would you go about writing it? What would you do first or next?
A. Facts.
R. They're facts, but how would you go about getting them?
A. I'd get a book.
R. You'd go to books, and then what would you do?
A. Um... I'd write down my facts and then um... I'd write... put my facts into a story.

Mt. Saint Helens was a quiet volcano... until May 18, 1980. People claimed to take picnics there. And enjoy themselves.

After the volcano erupted, nobody wanted to take picnics anymore because ash covered the ground instead of grass and trees.

Figure 10. High Achieving Writer - Traditional Group
At the bottom of a volcano there is melted rock called magma. When there gets to be a lot of magma rocks start to crack and lava rock starts to shoot out of the volcano and magma starts flowing. A volcano is born.

6. If I asked you to write a book about rocks or animals or cars or shells, how would you go about writing it? What would you do first? Next?

J: The rocks, I would probably like have to look up in a book or something. The animals, I'd probably do the same thing. Cause I don't know that much about either one of them.

R: Ok. So what would you do first?

J: Well, try to figure out which one I was going to do and... then um... get a book and just read it. And then I might get some ideas from that and write down the ideas, and try to make a little story out of that.

Figure 11. High Achieving Writer - Traditional Group
a text structure implicitly. He, like Alison, mentioned making their facts into a little story.

**Average Achieving Writers**

Sarah's (#A9) method of writing as indicated by her interview was to look up the assigned topic and then write the facts, "just put down something we had to do." Sarah used a paraphrasing strategy from Seymour Simon's book, *Volcanoes* (See Figure 12). She collected her facts from several pages and put them in her own words. She used many cause/effect markers and connecting words such as: "an then...and soon soil fromm and then plants can grow."

Lava is very hot it comes out of a volcano. When lava gets to the water it steams and then the lava gets to the ground it pulls off trees and branches And then the lava hardens. And soon soil fromm and then plants can grow.

Josh (#A10) indicated that when he wrote he observed what he writing about and then got a "story" out of the facts. He wrote about a volcanic eruption in a cause/effect form. The reader must assume that "it" is the magma mentioned in the first sentence. Observations of him revealed his writing was highly dependent upon illustrations, which he completed first (See Figure 13).
Student #9  Sarah

6. If I asked you to write a book about rocks or animals or cars or shells, how would you go about writing it? What would you do first, next?
S. Well, I'd look in the...I would tell facts.
R. So you have to get facts? So how would you organize them to put them in a book?
S. Well, how we did it...is we put down something that we had to do, and then we looked it up, and then we wrote.

Lava is very very hot. It comes out of a volcano. When the lava gets to the water it shrinks. And when the lava gets to the ground it pulls off trees and branches. And when the lava hardens, and soil soil form, and then plants can grow.

Figure 12. Average Achieving Writer – Traditional Group
Solid rocks in the earth's crust hold magma down. It gets so hot it shoots up as steam.

8. If I asked you to write a book about rocks or animals or cars, how would you go about writing it? What would you do first, second?

J.R. Well, I would probably look at them maybe for a day or two and then write about them. I'd probably get my story out of that.

R. Ok. So first of all, you would look at them and collect information and then write.
Solid rocks in the earth's crust hold magma down. It goes so far down. It gets so hot it shots up as steam.

Low Achieving Writers

In response to the interview question about her strategies for writing nonfiction pieces, Stephanie (#L11) indicated that she knew she needed to read to get some facts and get some notes. When asked how to organize those notes, she responded, "...like how their childhood was and everything or something." She wrote a story-like description of a volcanic eruption and illustrated her "book" with detailed drawings. Her writing was taken directly from the book, Volcano by Lauber (p1) (See Figure 14).

For many years the volcano slept. It was silent and still, big and beautiful.

Josh (#L12) also mentioned doing research and writing down notes and then, "and then I'd put it in my story". He mentioned organizing his facts by answering questions about his topic. He, like Stephanie, used a book, Branley's Volcanoes (p 3 & 4) (See Figure 15).

In the year 79 Mount Vesuvius, a volcano in Italy, blew up.
For many years
the volcano slept
It was silent
and still, big
and beautiful

6. If I asked you to write a book about rocks or animals or cars or shells, how would you go about writing it? What would you do first, next?
S. (silence)
R. Your teacher said you are going to write a report. What kinds of things would you do?
S. Read a book.
R. Then what would you do?
S. Write some facts...or...
R. Do you know how you would go about organizing your facts?
S. Yeah. Like how their childhood was and everything or something.

Figure 14. Low Achieving Writer - Traditional Group
In the year 79 Mount Vesuvius, a volcano in Italy blew up and that melted rock from deep inside the earth pushed up and through the mountain ashes, cinders, and stones buried Rome in a great city below the mountain.

6. If I asked you to write a book about rocks or animals or cars or shells, how would you go about writing it? What would you do first, next?
J. I'd look up rocks, books, and cars are.
R. So you'd do research?
J. Yah.
R. Then what would you do?
J. I'd write it down on a piece paper. And then I'd put it in my story.
R. Do you have any idea how you would organize your facts?
J. Make questions and then answer them.

Figure 15. Low Achieving Writer - Traditional Group
Summary of Traditional Group's Expository Writing

Overall, the high and average students in the traditional instruction group gave evidence that they could collect facts and organize them into report-like writing. They did not have as many of the elements of the different methods of organizing text as the instructional group. The writings produced were part of an assignment to write about an earth science topic; following the earth science unit, the writing ended. In a follow-up interview with the classroom teacher, she indicated that the writing ended with the assignment, although the researcher left the writing books and materials in the classroom for several weeks.

From teacher interviews and videotaped observations, the traditional class and target students' writings were closely tied to paraphrasing or direct copying of facts from resource materials. Students in the group (4 of 6) spoke of their factual material as "stories" compared with 1 of 6 in the treatment group.

Compared to the traditional group, the treatment group subjects increased more in the volume of expository writing produced and to a greater degree moved away from dependence on resource books. Treatment group subjects
also grew in their ability to control factual material in an expository text structure.

Post-Instruction Interviews

Following the instructional unit about expository text structures, students were audiotaped and the responses were transcribed verbatim. Questions were paired closely with Pre-Instruction interviews to assess student growth in awareness and reported use of expository text structures.

Ability to Recall and Use Terms

In audiotaped post-instruction interviews, students were asked to reflect upon the instructional unit in expository text structures. They were asked to recall the terms used: fact collection, compare-contrast, and cause-effect in question 1 (See Table 14). In question 6 they were also asked to describe their favorite method of organizing their material when they wrote nonfiction pieces.

Student responses are displayed in Table 15. Overall, the high and average students were able to recall the names of the text structures without
assistance by the researcher. Matt, one of the low students, was able to recall one structure (compare), and another (fact collection) with prompting from the researcher. More students (4 of 6) were in favor of using fact collection as their favorite mode of writing expository texts.

Table 14

Post Instruction Interview

1. What do you remember about the instruction of text structures or writing models about how authors organize their books on nonfiction topics?

2. Would you share with me what you learned about writing since we studied different ways of organizing writing? What are some of the things you remember?

3. When I talked to you before about your likes and dislikes in books, you liked a certain kind of book. Could you tell me if any of your ideas have changed?

4. How would you go about organizing your information to write about cars or shells or any other topic?

5. If you had the opportunity to share with another boy or girl about writing on factual topics, what would you tell him or her?

6. What is your favorite way of organizing your facts for your nonfiction writing?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Ability to recollect at least two text model terms</th>
<th>Terms used most frequently</th>
<th>Favorite model used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cause/effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fact collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fact collection</td>
<td>All three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cause/effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fact collection</td>
<td>Fact collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fact collection</td>
<td>Cause/effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cause/effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Fact collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Compare</td>
<td>Fact collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students' Perceptions about Text Structure

Students were asked to talk about what they had learned about writing during the instructional unit. They were also asked to tell how they would advise other writers of nonfiction related to organizing information related to a collection of cars, shells, or any other nonfiction topic. Questions 2, 4, & 5 (see Tables 16, 17) were designed to gather evidence about students' ability to use the text structure terms, give evidence of comprehension of the meanings of those terms, and describe a method for organizing data.

Responses were evaluated independently by the researcher and two research assistants. Raters used a scale from 3 = high to 1 = low with interrater reliability of 92%. Response ratings are displayed in Table 18). Overall, 39% of the responses scored the highest rating of 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>How do YOU write?</th>
<th>Student advice to writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Nicer to put some fiction and some nonfiction in it.</td>
<td>Put facts in order. Put pictures in. Find facts and put in own words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Used all of the structures before instruction</td>
<td>Get facts and choose topic. Make into sentences. Start with a question and then answer it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Get all information together and know topic. Make sure it's right then make changes</td>
<td>Get things together - illustrate. Put in pictures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Not able to respond</td>
<td>Nonfiction is hard. Need to go to encyclopedia or someplace for information. Write in own words. Think of a title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>Like the pop-up and sequence books to write in. Like having researcher in room to help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>Helped to learn about fact collection model.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 17**  
**POST INSTRUCTION QUESTIONS**  
**WRITING ABOUT A NONFICTION TOPIC**  
**Question 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>How would you go about organizing your information and writing about shells or cars or any nonfiction topic?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| H¹        | Compare this shell with this one  
Tell what it looks like  
Tell what it feels like |
| H²        | First use fact collection-  
Say all the things it's about  
Say cause/effect-  
How it got formed  
Say compare-  
With another shell |
| A³        | If dropped they could break  
Different kinds of shells—how different  
Cause/effect—they'd break |
| A⁴        | Compare  
Shells are rough—cars are smooth  
Compare cars to each other |
| L⁵        | Tell a story about them (shells)  
Here's a shell that's painted white.  
It looks like...  
(R. suggests a fact collection. Angie responds affirmative.) |
| L⁶        | This could be a collection.  
You could say cars were going somewhere.  
Then you put in details.  
Do a fact collection. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Average Score By Group</th>
<th>Overall Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 3 3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 2 1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**
3=high
2=partial
1=low

The results shown in Table 18 indicate that 78% of the responses were in the high and partial perception of expository text structure categories. These results are difficult to compare with pre-instruction percentages since the post-instruction questions were collapsed into fewer questions. However, if comparable questions are compared, (Questions 6/7 Pre-instruction with Question 4 Post-instruction), (See Table 11 and Tables 16,17), the overall score of 2.16 following treatment represents 15.2% growth compared to the score of 1.875 overall on prior treatment interviews (See Table 13).
Post Instruction Genre Preferences

One of the secondary goals of this study was to heighten students' awareness and appreciation for nonfiction books. With each visit to the classroom the researcher brought new nonfiction books on a wide variety of topics for children to read. Question 3 (See Table 19) displays target students' responses to genre preferences before and after the instructional unit. Table 20 shows a graphic display of changes or a broadening of students' interests in nonfiction books choices.

Table 19 Pre and Post Instruction Genre Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Pre Instruction Choices</th>
<th>Post Instruction Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Fiction and Nonfiction</td>
<td>Fiction best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Nonfiction</td>
<td>Likes both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>Nonfiction about as good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Nonfiction</td>
<td>Nonfiction for details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>Mostly fiction</td>
<td>Now likes non-fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some nonfiction topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>choices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>Fiction and nonfiction</td>
<td>Nonfiction best</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Before Instruction</th>
<th>After Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F &amp; N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reading Preference

F = Likes Fiction Best; F & N = Likes Both; N = Likes Nonfiction Best

Students across ability groups had indicated a preference for nonfiction titles before the study by 4 of 6 students, or 67%. Following the instruction and the exposure to many nonfiction books, all four students in the low and average groups stated a preference for nonfiction. One student responded that she still preferred fiction to nonfiction. It was not the intention of the study to effect a change of preference from one genre to another, rather to assist students in developing a greater appreciation for reading nonfiction books.
Science Scores Before and After the Unit

One of the goals and purposes of this study was to attempt to improve students' awareness of how data are organized in nonfiction texts and to assess if this awareness impacted on students' scores on science tests. The results of the instructional group's scores are listed and compared with the traditional group scores in Table 21. Both group's scores are displayed prior to completing the earth science unit, Chapter 8.

Treatment Group

It was anticipated that Chapter 9 scores, the earth science unit used by the researcher as the theme for the instruction in expository structure, would be improved. This was not born out by the target students' Chapter 9 scores for the instructional group. The scores reveal that while two students' scores remained the same, 50% or 3 students of this group made lower scores. Only one, a low student, had a slightly improved score. Chapter 10 scores showed 50% improved scores, and the two lower achieving students had lower scores.
Traditional Group

The comparison group's scores prior to the earth science Chapter are displayed along with their Chapter 9 scores. These students showed a 50% improvement over their previous chapter test scores.

One explanation of these results might be that students were not taught strategies in using text structure to improve recall of data. Student textbooks were used to give concrete examples of text structure called Fact Collection.

Table 21. SCIENCE SCORES PRE AND POST INSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Group</th>
<th>Earth Science Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student # Ability Group</td>
<td>Ch. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1 Tamara</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 Joey</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Valarie</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Eddie</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5 Angie</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6 Matt</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traditional Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earth Science Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student # Ability Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7 Alison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8 Judd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9 Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10 Josh R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11 Stephanie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12 Josh F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The presentation of the results of the instructional group and the traditional instruction group was organized into three major sections. The first described the context for the study which included the following: the classroom environment, typical reading and writing events, and the classroom teachers. Next, information relative to subjects' knowledge of expository text structures prior to the study was given. Finally, a description of the instructional unit included the following: classroom activities, student writing products and features of texts used, and students' comprehension scores in science. Chapter Five reports the analysis and implications of the study.
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ANALYSIS OF STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to explore and describe the impact of expository text structure instruction on students' writing approaches and products and reading choices. Students' awareness and understanding of expository reading and writing and their attitudes toward informational books before and after expository text structure instruction were examined. Subjects for the study were third grade students in a suburban/rural community. The study was conducted in three phases. Chapter Five is divided into sections relative to the research questions that provided the framework for the study. Each question is followed by discussion of the outcomes.

Procedures

Prior to beginning classroom intervention, a pilot study was conducted to refine the procedures for instruction about expository text structures and to
determine classroom conditions under which the study could be successfully implemented. Additionally, to gain insights into students' prior knowledge of narrative and expository texts, a student interview was developed and tested. Based upon the results of the pilot, procedures and materials for the instructional unit were developed.

A significant amount of children's learning involves the use of models. Aspects of behavior are explained to children by parents and other caregivers. Children also adapt their behavior by observing others. For this reason, it seemed logical to incorporate into the instruction a variety of good models or examples of expository texts with well written and clearly developed top-level structures (cause-effect, fact collection, compare-contrast) (See page 30). An examination of nonfiction books for children revealed that authors sometimes use a variety of organizational modes or top-level structures within a single book. A primarily cause-effect top-level structure may also include comparing and contrasting examples; therefore, finding books with one clearly defined text structure useful in clarifying the top-level organizations for students
proved to be difficult.

The researcher used techniques in the instruction that were appropriate to third grade students' cognitive level of development: (1) models for fact collection, cause-effect, compare-contrast, and a (2) a narrative story frame organizational chart. These models gave a graphic display of organizational markers or phrases to assist children in identifying a particular type of text structure.

A variety of methods were developed to bring students in contact with top-level structures. The researcher collected thirty nonfiction books relative to the students' science unit for students to read and explore. This assortment of books was placed on the reading table for student use. Games were constructed to be played in the identification of top-level text structures. An important aspect of the intervention was the teacher read daily to students from the nonfiction books and materials. A variety of text types were available so that students could explore how different texts are organized, read, and written: for example, menus are different from model airplane directions and newspapers are different from dictionaries.
Based on the assumption that students would learn from the act of producing nonfiction texts, opportunities to write were also utilized in the instructional plan. The researcher made an assortment of blank books for each student: pop-up, sequence, and magic books. These books induced classroom writers to develop their own library of nonfiction books. The researcher provided materials so that students could make their own books. Many students voluntarily produced a book every two to three days. Students thus were afforded opportunities to produce the structures they were exploring.

Results of the pilot study led to alterations in Phase Two of the research. Target students in the pilot study were selected on the basis of their scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test. Students' scores were not a good predictor of writing ability; students who scored high were not particularly good writers and some who scored lower on the test appeared to have better writing skills. For Phase Two students were selected using teacher ranking of writing achievement.

The classroom setting for the pilot study was one where the students had few writing opportunities and experiences, and the teacher was not using process
writing techniques. Since a major focus of the study was writing, it was important that the instructional unit be conducted within a class where students wrote frequently. Such a classroom was subsequently selected. To provide perspective, a second classroom was used to compare writing and reading events in the treatment group with a traditional instruction group.

Findings from the pilot also made it necessary to change the researcher's role from that of active teacher to participant observer for the intervention instructional study. This change enabled the researcher to spend more time observing the students as they explored and wrote expository texts.

Research Questions

1. How does direct instruction in expository text structures impact on students' awareness and understanding of expository/informational books?

2. How does direct instruction in expository text structures impact on students' writing products?

3. How does direct instruction in expository text structures impact on students' ability to gain knowledge from reading?

4. How does direct instruction in expository text structures impact on students' attitudes and behaviors toward informational books?
5. In what ways do students who receive instruction in expository text structures compare with students who receive traditional methods of science instruction?

Students' Knowledge of Text

The first research question was, "How does direct instruction in expository text structures impact on students' awareness and understanding of expository/informational books?" Interview data together with field notes and video recordings were examined to address this question for students (N=6) in the treatment group. Low, average, and high ranked students were compared. Two paid research assistants verified the analysis. The data were subjected to content analysis and categories emerged from the analysis.

Comparison of Students by Rank

Narrative Texts

Interview data revealed that prior to the study, target students of all abilities could demonstrate knowledge of narrative texts through identification of fiction versus nonfiction paragraphs. Low ability students appeared to have more difficulty than high or average students when asked to respond explicitly to
questions that required them to explain the meaning of the word "story".

The majority of the students were able to name a story. The results from this question indicate that these students had knowledge of narrative text structure perhaps gained through exposure to stories in their home and school environments.

Expository Texts

Prior to the study, higher ability students displayed a broader base of learning than did those ranked lower in writing ability. Their responses indicated that they knew some rules of expository writing and could explicitly display this knowledge. Low and average ranked writers were not as able to explicitly state text structure rules. Higher ranked students may have had more contact with nonfiction. Since expository texts tend to have a higher density of concepts and difficult words, higher students may be self-selecting more nonfiction books than lower students. Also, classroom teachers are less likely to read nonfiction books to students; that circumstance, coupled with the fact that fewer nonfiction books are available in the
classroom collections, would work to make nonfiction books less available to the group at large, particularly lower ranked students.

**Students' Writing**

**Low Ranked Students' Writing Responses**

Compared to high rank students, low students tended to be less involved in classroom discussions during the instructional sessions. More one on one personal questions were directed to the researcher or classroom teacher such as, "I don’t know what to write about" than those of higher students. Low students had more aborted beginnings to writings than high and average writers. These students tended to be more concerned with penmanship and correct spellings than the high and average writers.

**Average Ranked Students’ Writing Responses**

These students tended to be more involved in group writing efforts than either the high or low ability writers. They sought out other students for ideas and more of their writings were illustrated. The instruction, together with opportunities to interact with
students of all abilities, appeared to make a difference in students' writings in terms of interest in writing nonfiction texts and syntactic maturity of texts.

High Ranked Students' Writing Responses

High students tended to be able to select a topic and get into writing more quickly than their less able counterparts. Students were more inclined to work alone on their writing without seeking help from either teacher or researcher or collaboration with other students. They were able to extend the instruction beyond the earth science topic into other areas for writing pieces.

Ability to Recall Terms of Instruction

Low Ranked Students

In interview questions directed to determine students' recall of the text structure terms, low students were not able to name at least two of the terms. After prompting and questioning by the interviewer, low students could tell some ways in which they would organize facts for expository writing. These two students selected fact collection as their favorite mode of organizing their expository writing.
Average Ranked Students

In response to interview questions relative to recalling at least two expository terms, students in this group demonstrated the ability 100% of the time. Students were evenly divided as to their favorite mode of organizing expository text and selected cause-effect and fact collection.

High Ranked Students

High students demonstrated the ability to name each of the models for expository writing 100% of the time. Students indicated that they used all three modes of organization but comparing was the favorite.

Growth in Understanding of Text Structures

Low Ranked Students

Low ranked students demonstrated growth by 32% in response to questions relative to understanding text structures and how they work. These students also showed an increased interest in reading nonfiction books according to post interview responses.
Average Ranked Students

Average ranked students maintained their level of understanding in interview questions relative to post-instruction growth in understanding of text structures and how they work.

High Ranked Students

Responses of both high students prior to the study indicated a high level of understanding of text structures and how they function. Following the instructional study, high students maintained this knowledge.

Summary

In perceptions of expository text structures, lower ranked students benefited more from the intervention than did average and high students. This result might be explained by a combination of variables. First, the instruction in text structures provided the opportunity to encounter a variety of models and to talk about them and write them in a supportive situation. In addition, these students, usually grouped with other low students, were afforded the opportunity to observe and
interact with students of all abilities.

Average and high students maintained their understandings of how narrative and expository texts work; they also learned new text structure terms and used them in discussing their writing.

**Impact on Students' Writing Products**

The second research question was, "How does direct instruction in expository text structures affect students' writing products?" Prior to the intervention, writing by students across achievement levels, was predominantly fiction. Within the treatment group, students' writing of expository texts increased substantially during the intervention period. Students continued writing after the intervention, and their products shifted to a broader range of nonfiction topics. The classroom teacher promoted writing by establishing a classroom nonfiction library. Publishing their works encouraged students to continue writing and sharing their books with others. The classroom teacher reported that writing continued from March through May with a library of student products containing approximately 90 books.

Students across levels of achievement were empowered
with the ability to manipulate the data they collected to create expository texts. Following instruction, high and average students could name and discuss all of the methods of organizing facts as they wrote.

Average and high students could both discuss text organization markers and use them in their writing. Average and high writers produced nonfiction books that displayed their control over ways to organize facts. Length and syntactic complexity of writing pieces were similar for average and high students.

Low students experienced difficulty discussing expository terms; however, their expository writing pieces provided evidence that they had used specific methods, for example textual markers and organization strategies. Those students fit text markers within the confines of sentence structures they used more frequently, that of simple sentences.

**Summary**

Students in the treatment group were taught to look for text structure markers in their reading and to use them in their writing. There was a distinction made between factual material and "story". The researcher and
the classroom teacher did not call student writing "stories". Instruction was meant to direct and empower the student writer to be the controller of the factual material and to view nonfiction writing as distinctly different from narrative writing.

Subsequent to instruction in text structure, students' written products showed evidence that they could and did use text structure markers in their writing. Moreover, regardless of achievement group, students expanded their writing, developed more flexible ways of organizing data, and increased their number of written products.

Students' Ability to Gain Knowledge from Reading

The third question was, "How does direct instruction in expository text structures affect students' ability to gain knowledge from reading?" One of the goals of this study was to assess if instruction about expository text structures would transfer to other areas of reading, for example, the content area of science. Target students' test scores on the end of level science test prior to the instructional unit were compared to their to their test scores subsequent to the instructional
unit. These were also compared with the Phase III groups' scores.

Overall, students maintained their level of achievement. Three of the four average and high students' scores slightly decreased on the exam immediately following instruction but returned to the previous levels on the next test. One lower ability student demonstrated a higher end of level science test score following instruction.

The scope of this intervention was not extensive enough to incorporate specific instruction on comprehending the textbook. The predominant structure used in the science textbook was fact collection. This structure is more difficult for students to use to recall facts. Because they were paying attention to a wide variety of texts, students may not have had as much time to spend with the science textbook; however, the slight dip in scores was not enough to provide concern. Indeed, it appears that students maintain fact collecting ability while at the same time expanding their ability to cope with a fuller range of texts.
Summary

While the instruction in the use of expository text structures did not appear to impact on students' science scores on the end of level test about earth science, the students maintained previous levels of achievement. Tracking the target students over a period of time might prove to reveal the use of expository text structure knowledge in their reading strategies preparatory to taking a test.

Attitudes and Behaviors toward Informational Books

The fourth question was, "How does direct instruction in expository text structures affect students' attitudes and behaviors toward informational books?" In pre-intervention interviews with treatment and comparison students, half (N=6) reported that they would select fiction for vacation reading. For school leisure reading, students were evenly divided between fiction and nonfiction.

Both high and low ranked students indicated that they sometimes made book selections based on the need to learn more about the topic, especially when they had reports to write. All students selected nonfiction books
for report writing.

Books of fiction and nonfiction that were rated as "easy" by students had characteristics such as shorter words, less text, and shorter sentences. Books designated "hardest" were longer and had more hard words. Hardest books were evenly divided between fiction and nonfiction. The most difficult books were described by students as those with things to learn and questions to answer.

Summary

During and following the instructional unit, treatment class students' interest in nonfiction books grew. All students demonstrated an interest in nonfiction on a wide variety of topics. This study demonstrated that given opportunity and exposure, students will select and use to learn from nonfiction books. Low achieving students tend to select nonfiction books with simple formats, but these books serve as a starting point for expanding the students' repertoire of knowledge about text. In most classrooms, a wide selection of nonfiction books is not available; therefore, students may not have opportunities to explore these texts. The majority of
nonfiction books in the study were resource books, usually of the fact collection model or biographies that are generally written in a narrative, story-like style or fact collection model. Without exposure to good nonfiction books, students are not becoming familiar with different methods of organizing nonfiction. This deficiency is particularly detrimental to low achieving students because they have the most difficulty learning from standard textbooks and most need a chance to find texts that will extend their knowledge. Without such opportunities they may not find their starting points.

Students in the treatment group became enthusiastic users of nonfiction books for their own reading and sources for writing topics during and following instruction. This study demonstrates that exposing children to a wide variety of nonfiction books made a difference in developing student interest in nonfiction topics.

Differences Between Treatment and Traditional Groups

The fifth question was, "In what ways do students who receive instruction in expository text structures compare with students who receive traditional methods of
science instruction?" At the end of Phase Three, when both groups had completed the earth science unit (one group with expository text structures and one group with traditional science instruction), the two groups differed in several ways. In response to the assignment to write a nonfiction book based upon the earth science unit, all students from the treatment group used their notes and developed a format for organizing their information. Some students indicated in interviews that they could have manipulated the information in several different ways. In response to the same assignment, the traditional group tended either to copy directly the information from a resource book or to paraphrase the book.

Students of all abilities in the treatment group demonstrated a textual plan and top-level structure markers in their writing. The traditional instruction students used some text structure markers, usually the ones found in the resource book.

Students in the treatment group continued writing across a variety of nonfiction topics following the assignment. Follow-up observations in this classroom revealed that students were still writing nonfiction
books six weeks after the study was completed. Traditional instruction students did not continue to produce writing after the completion of the assignment.

Students in the treatment group (5 of 6) referred to their writing as nonfiction. They appeared to have a clear understanding of the differences and uses of genres. Most of the students (5 of 6) in the traditional group continued to call their writing a "story." They did not exhibit the flexibility necessary to manipulate the notes or facts they had collected; rather, they used the direct words or rewording of the resource book.

Students in the treatment group produced more writing of high quality and demonstrated the ability to control their writing, that is, to produce a variety of genres and to be explicit about defining those genres.

Students in the two groups differed in the way they approached and planned textual products. The intervention empowered the treatment group to manipulate their writings in a variety of ways. They selected and used text organizational markers to demonstrate cause-effect, compare-contrast, or fact collection. They moved beyond the topic of earth science to use the text organizers to vary their writing about topics of interest
to them. The traditional group used only the organizational markers of the reference book they had used to collect the data. They did not move beyond the assignment to use the nonfiction books as models for other writing.

The results of the treatment group may be attributed in part to the classroom writing program which included personal journal writing to which the teacher responded. Traditional instruction students wrote only short assignments dictated by the English book, and these were referred to by both teacher and students as "stories." Thus, the writing program in the treatment classroom provided a strong base for the instructional intervention. The direct attention to text structure, however, expanded students' range of control and enabled them to be more aware of the relationship between structure and content.

Implications for Teaching

The findings from a naturalistic study are bound by the context; however, they may provide important insights and theories to be tested in other settings. The results of this study indicate that instruction in expository
text structures will be most effective under certain conditions.

Instruction in text structures is enhanced if the classroom teacher also provides students with a supportive literature system, frequent opportunities to write, and supports their development of writing processes. The classroom environment should include sufficient writing materials in an area where students can work independently or collaboratively with others. A self-contained classroom with children of all abilities interacting together as they write is particularly important for the success of lower ability students. Time is needed for in-depth work on writing process, that is, composing, drafting, and revising pieces.

Another important implication of this study is the effect of providing generic models for expository writing. We have erroneously assumed that since young students cope easily with narrative, expository texts should not be frequently used. The kinds of books typically provided for young readers have not offered expository text models, either good or bad. In fact, the classroom library should include a wide range of nonfiction books, as well as a collection of the
children's own writings. Additionally, children should hear good examples of nonfiction books read aloud by their teachers. This exposure to the genre will, over time, help students develop a wider range and more flexibility in the texts they can understand and use.

Teachers need to understand the nature of different generic writing choices for children to be better able to assist in the learning process. A familiarity with all genres and a working knowledge of appropriate terms is necessary. This knowledge would help teachers be more precise in their discussions (for example, students' writing should not always be called a "story"), and thus help students develop clear definitions.

**Implications for Nonfiction Publishers**

Textbook publishers, particularly in the areas of science and social studies, should consider developing study guides outlining models of expository writing. Classroom teachers could then use these guides to extend students' understanding in content areas. A note of caution should be inserted in this recommendation, however. Students learn best by immersion in books and through actively constructing their own texts. Any study
guides should lead to authentic expository writing rather than adding more exercises.

Recommendations for Further Research

The study was heuristic in that it provided evidence that children in this particular classroom could be taught to use expository models as an empowerment to vary their writing; however, more research is needed. The study does not suggest that short term intervention such as this one is appropriate; rather, it was completed to provide direction for further research into the nature of learning and its relationship to instructional practice. Since there are so many variables that influence outcomes of instruction in a classroom, ultimately, a true comparative study should be done. This instructional model could be tested as part of a larger study that combines methodologies.

The treatment used here could be reconceptualized and adjusted across grade levels. At earlier grades, the treatment would necessitate textual markers with simplified terms; however, very young children regularly write recounts and retellings of factual happenings as they negotiate their own neighborhoods.
Sustained treatment as part of the curriculum over a period of a year would have a greater impact on students. The processes of intervention and guidance toward learning a variety of generic models should begin very early and be sustained in a child's schooling. A study of a total school intervention program where the progress in expository writing was studied systematically would provide more in depth knowledge of students as they progress in their understandings of expository texts. Such a program could be designed with consideration for developmental stages of learning and the impact of a social group on children's writing.

The target students in this study could be followed over time to determine if the gains and interests they exhibited during and just following instruction have lasted over time.

Summary

This study examined what was the difference and what kind of difference was made in students' understandings and writings who received instruction about expository text structures and those who did not receive instruction. The focus was on a case by case look at
students; other text structure studies have not dealt with students at this level or in this manner. Many examples of students' responses and writings were presented and analyzed.

The stance taken in this study provided the framework, direction, and the results of the research. It is within the researchers' understanding systems that the conclusions were developed about target students' degree of initial understanding and post treatment understanding about expository texts and how they are organized and written. With a more flexible set of understandings, different conclusions would have been drawn.

This study provides information about instructional practices and situation specific student cognitive processes in reading and writing; however, because of the many variables at work within classrooms, the results cannot be generalized beyond those involved. Two groups of students with two different teachers were studied, and the influences and dynamics of different teachers cannot be denied. However, the teachers involved in the study were both highly successful professionals who were relatively equivalent in most aspects. Both classrooms
received all of the books and materials involved in the study. The perspective group did not receive instruction about expository text structures. The major variable of difference was a richer classroom environment.

The instructional stance was a multi-faceted approach about expository text structures. The instruction was both direct and indirect. Students were taught explicitly using simplified text structure models about text markers that identified particular expository structures. Indirect instruction was provided within a supportive literature system incorporated throughout the content area of science. A wide variety of experiences with expository text structures built a sense of exposition.

This study provided evidence that within the larger context of multi-faceted instruction about expository text structures, students at various levels of ability and experiences could be empowered with the capacity to control or adapt appropriate generic models in their writing. Additionally, the intervention had a positive impact on students' interest in reading and writing expository texts.
APPENDIX A

SAMPLE STUDENT INTERVIEW
STUDENT INTERVIEW PRIOR TO STUDY

1. Tell me what is meant by telling a story.

2. Give me an example of a story.

3. When you write or tell someone a story, what parts do you need to put in to make it a story?

4. If I asked you to write a book about rocks or animals or cars, how would you go about writing it?

5. See these things I have for you on the table? (On the table are six small cars and trucks of all shapes and sizes.) How would you tell or write about them? (Also a group of shells).

6. Which of the books you see here would you like best? (Researcher will have a display of books including various textbooks, fiction, and nonfiction titles.)

7. How would you tell someone about these books, if you couldn't show them?

8. I'm going to give you three situations. You tell me which book you would pick for each one. Which book would you take to read on vacation? Why? Which book would you like to read at school? Why? Which book would you like to use to write a report? Why?

9. I have to talk to some boys and girls about writing stories and reports. What would you tell them?

10. Which of these books in the collection do you think is easier to read? Why? Which book would you say is harder to read? Why?

11. Sometimes writers write books that give people information about things. How do you think writers put information in books?
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE STUDENT PRETEST
NAME _______________________

DIRECTIONS: There are three choices for each of the following questions. Each choice has a letter in front of it. Put an X on the answer space that has the same letter as the answer that you picked. A space has been left for you to use if you want to tell the answer in your own words.

1. A volcano is _____________.
   (a) movement of soil by water and wind
   (b) opening in the earth through which melted rock flows
   (c) the outer layer of the earth

2. An earthquake is _____________.
   (a) the hottest part of the earth
   (b) the movement of rock in the earth’s outer layer
   (c) melted rock

3. The outer layer of the earth where people, plants, and animals live is called the _____________.
   (a) crust
   (b) lava
   (c) core

4. The hottest layer of the earth is called the _____________.
   (a) outer layer
   (b) mantle
   (c) core

5. The layer of rocklike material under the outer layer is called the _____________.
   (a) mantle
   (b) magma
   (c) inner core
APPENDIX C

SAMPLE STORY RETELLING FRAME
Event Sequence Frame for Retelling of *The Magic Schoolbus Inside the Earth*.

(Events not included in the story)

Ms. Frizzle gave an assignment for the class to bring in a rock and almost everyone had an excuse for not doing it.

The class went on a fieldtrip to collect rocks.

The bus began to spin like a top.

Everything had changed. The children had on new clothes and the bus had turned into a steam shovel.

The class dug through the earth's crust and found different layers of rock and caves.

The bus sprouted a drill and started boring through rock toward the center of the earth where it was very hot.

The class was glad when Ms. Frizzle headed out again toward the crust and through a tunnel of black rock to the outside.

The class was on a volcanic island in the middle of the ocean.

The volcano erupted and the bus rode the lava into the sea. The hot lava made the water turn into steam which caught up the bus and carried it home in a cloud to the school parking lot.

The children got a great rock collection for their classroom.
APPENDIX D

SAMPLE EARTH SCIENCE LESSON PLAN
Monday, January 9  Day Three EARTH SCIENCE UNIT

CONCEPTS/BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES
The students will be able to:
- identify characteristics of unknown objects by using evidence.
- hypothesize about an object from its characteristics.
- describe how earthquakes and volcanoes cause fast changes in the earth's crust.
- begin to recognize differences in nonfiction text's structures.

TEACHER:
- reads aloud from Earthquakes and Volcanoes
- demonstrates activity TM 170
- lead discussion about observable changes in earth
- assign pp.171-173 to be read and discussed
- assign students to look at earth science books in groups of 2-4

STUDENTS:
- respond to book with comments
- suggest words for graffiti chart
- discuss and read aloud pp 170-173
- look at books in groups to find new information about earth's crust

RESEARCH EVENTS:
- videotaping of classroom interaction
- audiotaping of interviews with selected students
- discuss differences between content and structure
  (Ex. Many authors write books using collections of descriptions but topics are completely different.)

EVALUATION:
- amount/number of students involved in discussions
- quality of discussion/questions/answers
APPENDIX E

SAMPLE PILOT STUDY EXPOSITORY TEXT CHARTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLECTION Clue Words</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first</td>
<td>finally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second</td>
<td>third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next</td>
<td>last</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARE Clue Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>different from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resembles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSE EFFECT Clue Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a result of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIBES Clue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facts may be given in a time order from earliest date until latest date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facts may be listed under different topics, headings, titles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

PILOT STUDY WRITING SAMPLE
This is a story about a Volcano. Once my family and my next door neighbor lived Hawaii by a Volcano. It was asleep right now. Two years after the Volcano errupted and my next door neighbor got killed and he got away.
APPENDIX G

SAMPLE PARAGRAPHS FOR STUDENT IDENTIFICATION OF TEXT TYPE

Large elbow-shaped pipes, called mailboxes, are swung into place. The mailboxes are Mel Fisher’s invention. The whirling of the boat’s propellers forces water through the mailboxes, blowing large holes in the sand. If anything is buried, it will be uncovered. But only litter is found—nothing of value, nothing from the *Atocha*.


One Saturday Mama and I were sitting in the chair in our bathrobes. I kept trying to talk to Mama about my birthday which was going to be in just three days, but Mama wouldn’t listen. On her day off from her job at the Blue Tile Diner, Mama loves to sit and read her newspaper. Then she never even hears the things I tell her: I had to tickle her foot until she threw down the paper and jumped out of the chair. Then she chased me all over the house.
APPENDIX H

SAMPLE OF REVISED STUDENT INTERVIEW
REVISED STUDENT INTERVIEW

1. Could you tell what the word story means to you?

2. Give me an example of a story you like.

3. Tell me which of these paragraphs you think came from a story and which is not from a story and why. (Researcher has several selections from nonfiction and fiction.)

4. When you write or tell someone a story, what parts do you need to put in to make it a story?


6. If I asked you to write a book about rocks or animals or cars, how would you go about writing it? What would you do first? Next?

7. How would you tell or write about these items here on the table? (On the table are several small cars and trucks and a group of seashells.)

8. Which of the books in this display do you like the best? (Researcher has a collection of books including: science and reading textbooks, fiction, and nonfiction titles.)

9. How would you tell someone about these books, if you couldn't show them?

10. I'm going to give you three situations. You tell me which book you would pick for each one and why. Which book would you take to read on vacation? Which book would you like to read at school? Which book would you like to read to write a report? If there is a book not shown here you would use for each one, you may name it instead.

11. I have to talk to some boys and girls about writing stories and reports. What do you think I should tell them?

12. Which of these books in the collection do you think is easier to read and why? Which book would you say is harder to read and why?

13. Sometimes writers write books that give people information about things. How do you think THEY put information in THEIR books?
APPENDIX I

SAMPLE STORY MODEL
STORY FRAME
The Magic School Bus Inside the Earth
by Joanna Cole

Story setting - Once upon a time...

Ms. Frizzle's class - went on a field trip.

Their magic school bus dug a hole through layers of the earth

They dug to the center of the earth

What happened next

A volcano started to erupt! The bus wouldn't start!

Problem! Problem!

How problem solved

The bus rode lava into the sea and rose on steam into a cloud.

Ending -

The bus landed safely back at school.
APPENDIX J

SAMPLE FACT COLLECTION MODEL
FACT COLLECTION

Report

Mount St. Helens was the home for living things. It was also a dormant volcano.

In 1980 the mountain began to awaken from its sleep. First smoke and ash...

Then on May 18, Mount St. Helens erupted and started an avalanche.

By summer the mountain's surface looked like the moon...

When warm weather came again, sprigs of green began to appear.

The volcano destroyed, but the forest will grow again on the mountain.

Fact... first... On this date...

In 1980 the mountain began to awaken from its sleep. First smoke and ash...

Then on May 18, Mount St. Helens erupted and started an avalanche.

By summer the mountain's surface looked like the moon...

When warm weather came again, sprigs of green began to appear.

The volcano destroyed, but the forest will grow again on the mountain.

Fact... second... another... then...

Fact... third... next... later...

Fact... finally... last... when...

Ending - writer's choice... finally. How you told the facts.
APPENDIX K

SAMPLE CAUSE-EFFECT MODEL
CAUSE EFFECT

CLUES

NAME OF TOPIC
WHAT IS IT ABOUT?

↓

THIS HAPPENED
BECAUSE

↓

SO THAT...
THUS...
THEN...

↓

AND SO...
THIS IS THE RESULT

↓

AND FINALLY...
ENDING

↓

THIS BOOK TELLS WHAT HAPPENED WHEN...

↓

BECAUSE
CAUSE
EFFECT
THUS
AS A RESULT OF
IN ORDER TO
AND SO
SINCE
THIS IS WHY
THEN
THIS OCCURS WHEN...

↓

MOUNTAINS WERE FORMED WHEN

↓

THEN THE SNOW CAUSED...

↓

AS A RESULT, IT PUSHED THE HUGE

↓

AND SO...
WIND AND RAIN.
APPENDIX L

SAMPLE COMPARE-CONTRAST MODEL
APPENDIX M
SAMPLE POST INSTRUCTION INTERVIEW
POST INSTRUCTION INTERVIEWS

1. Would you explain what you remember about the nonfiction text writing models I showed your class that authors use to write their books about nonfiction subjects?

2. Would you share with me what you learned about writing since we studied the different ways of organizing information?

3. When I talked with you before about what kind of books you liked best, you liked a certain kind of book. Have your ideas changed? What kind of book do you think you like?

4. How would you go about organizing your information to write about a nonfiction subject?

5. If you had the opportunity to share with another boy or girl about writing about nonfiction topics, what would you tell him or her?

6. What is your favorite way/method of writing/organizing your facts for your nonfiction book?
APPENDIX N

SAMPLE PRE-TREATMENT WRITING/TAMARA
DAISY DOLPHIN

One summer afternoon the zoo got a big tank with a note on it that said, "OPEN DAISY IMMEDIATELY." So of course they opened it right away. Inside they found a baby DOLPHIN.

Who could this be from. The only thing the note inside the tank said was, "to the zoo, hope you like this gift, from JAPAN."

Open Daisy Immediately!

How can we accept such a glorious gift? We shall have to repay JAPAN some how, but what do we have to give them? How about that Orilids Monkey? Fine idea! Go get the monkey and put him in a box. The shipping instructions should read...TO JAPAN FROM THE ZOO.
APPENDIX O

SAMPLE PRE-TREATMENT WRITING/JOEY
The banana-eating Jimmy, the chimpanzee, to the jungle to eat bananas. They packed up carefully. They packed a cage, a battery, toy beds, bananas, glasses, whistle, and a portable telephone. They went in the green car with the chimp seat.

The chimp went wild while they got into the car. He threw his chimp seat out the door! Harold scolded him sharply and put the seat in the car.
APPENDIX P

SAMPLE PRE-TREATMENT WRITING/VALARIE
Valarie - Pre-Treatment Writing Sample

Average Achieving Writer

Chapter

Bycru and the U.S.A.

Once there was a little girl. Her name was Bycru. Bycru was 10 years old. She had to move to the U.S.A. She didn't want to move because her father died in the war against the U.S.A. She was mad at her mom! In fact when they got to their house in the USA she ran away. But her mother couldn't call any one because she couldn't speak any English. Her mom went looking for her. She looked all over the place but she couldn't find her anyway! She was very worrie
APPENDIX Q

SAMPLE PRE-TREATMENT WRITING/EDDIE
Appendix Q

Eddie - Pre-Treatment Writing Sample

Average Achieving Writer

Eddie

The mystery of the stone.

The day when I was out on

boat I fell a sleep and then

I fell out. They didn't know

I fell out but I did.

It was about four feet deep,

I saw this mysteriously

stone. So I swam toward

it. There was a giant fish

I was very scared down

up to the top-near fast. I looked

back in the water then I noticed

it was just a sunken boat with

a very large fish on the front

of it.
APPENDIX R

SAMPLE PRE-TREATMENT WRITING/ANGIE
Feb. 28, 1989 by Angie

One day I went up to my attic and I was looking around. I discovered an old box full of books that were my Grandmother's. They had been stored there for a long time.

Then I got down on the first step I saw a shadow looking at me. I was scared. I did not know what to do. So I yelled for my
APPENDIX S

SAMPLE PRE-TREATMENT WRITING/MATT
Monkey
Monkey Animal of the
group most like man
Monkeys are very intelligent
Animals in this group not
A safe and convenient
way to send money through
the money through the mails
is by monkey order. Money
orders are especially helpful
to persons who do not have
Checking accounts. They are
also useful in situations where
Unlike checks, money orders are
Although there are several
different types of money.
APPENDIX T

RUBRIC FOR SCORING STUDENT RESPONSES
### RUBRIC FOR RATING STUDENTS' RESPONSES ABOUT HOW EXPOSITORY WRITING IS ORGANIZED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1=Low Responses</th>
<th>2=Partial Responses</th>
<th>3=High Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Look at them (cars or shells) and then write. Get my story, Put characters into it.</td>
<td>Read...write some facts like how their childhood was. Describe them.</td>
<td>Write what kind (cars or shells) it was. Where it was found. What to do with it. Describe them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know.</td>
<td>Explain what (books) about, what's in them. Categories, make up stories.</td>
<td>I'd put some in fiction and nonfiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write about the thing you know about best.</td>
<td>First I'd tell what I was writing about; go to a library and take notes, write your report.</td>
<td>Introduce things in the middle; describe things Do a little more describing at the end. Describe how things go their form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get as much information as you can.</td>
<td>They (people) should pick something they don't know about. Put them together to make a story.</td>
<td>Put your facts in order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response.</td>
<td>Get all information together and know your topic.</td>
<td>Go places and get pictures and a lot facts; put it in the typewriter Organize it -like all plants in a chapter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX U

CHILDREN'S BOOKS
CHILDREN'S BOOKS


McNulty, Faith, _How to Dig a Hole to the Other Side of the World_, Harper, 1979.
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