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Abstract

This study looked at the effective of the interactive writing technique on primary teachers and their students over a six-month period. The study consisted of three, urban, first grade teachers and eighteen students. Teachers used a self-assessment rubric to rate themselves at the start and close of the study on how well they utilized the technique in the classroom. Teachers were also interviewed at the close of the study to determine if there were benefits or drawbacks associated with using the technique. Students were selected for the study by their performance on an emergent literacy survey. Two writing samples were gathered from each student, one at the start and one at the close of the study. The samples were examined for growth in writing skills for categories that included mechanics, spelling, and communicating through print. The writing samples were rated using a holistic rubric developed by a team from the school that study participants attended. All teachers in the study reported an increase in their ability to use the interactive technique in their daily writing instruction. The study showed an increase of 28% for instructors. Teachers described both benefits and drawbacks when using the technique including time requirements, refining basic skills and text elaboration. All students showed an overall increase in writing skills from the start to the close of the study of 36%. Several students surpassed first grade expectations on their writing pieces. These samples were scored using a second grade rubric. The study findings indicated the interactive writing technique has value as one element of primary writing instruction.
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CHAPTER I

Statement of the Problem

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine a group of first grade teachers' implementation and use of the interactive writing technique and the effect of the technique on student writing achievement.

Need for Study

Although current research does provide a "baseline of knowledge" (p.35) about writing in the primary years, investigators such as Dahl and Farnan, (1998) state "we still have many gaps in our knowledge about writing in the early grades" (p.35). This study will add to the known information in the area of primary writing for teachers and researchers.

Historically, writing in the 1970s was viewed as a cognitive process, which emphasized the planning and revising of written text. In the 1980s through the 1990s, writing research has focused more on the social construction of written texts. A key development in the movement from the cognitive to social aspects of written communication has been the whole language approach to reading and writing:
Whole language differs from other innovations in many ways. First, whole language is not a collection of methods or materials but a belief system that drives instruction. It is predicated on the views that (a) the child’s language is the basis for all reading instruction; (b) language is used primarily for communication; (c) meaning is central to language development; (d) reading, writing, speaking and listening are interrelated; (e) writing is a central component of literacy learning; (f) literacy learning activities should be authentic and meaningful. These beliefs provide a cognitive framework that guides teachers’ decision-making and instructional design. (Moss & Noden, 1993/1994, p. 342)

One practice common to whole language is shared writing which is presently utilized in many primary classrooms. In an effort to give young writers more control and access to their developing capabilities, researchers such as Fountas and Pinnell (1999) advocate using a technique known as interactive writing. This allows children to have ownership of the pen beyond what is typically seen during a shared writing event. The process allows teachers to instruct individual learners within a group setting and gives students control and power over the writing process. Under this instructional model children’s writing is valued and develops structurally.

The growing emphasis on written response–base assessments rather than on multiple-choice formats requires increasing instructional time on writing tasks at all grade levels. As with any human endeavor, practice leads to proficiency. Children who understand the construction of text may evidence their knowledge in their personal compositions. Interactive writing provides active, individualized instruction from the teacher within the context of a social writing experience. Investigation in the use of interactive writing may lead to further insights into
how children communicate in print.

Accurately assessing student writing is difficult using a standardized test. Holistic scoring is becoming increasingly acceptable to both educators and parents as teachers become more comfortable understanding patterns and trends in the developmental growth of young writers (Carey, 1997). As primary teachers become better informed on rubrics as an assessment and instructional tool both for themselves and their students, increased knowledge about the capabilities of young writers will ensue. This study will utilize a school rubric for student assessment and one for teachers' personal assessment of their ability to implement interactive writing in the primary classroom. The rubric will provide teachers with an opportunity to reflect on their own instructional practices. Dahl and Farnan state that such assessments, “function as part of the feedback loop between new learnings and increasing expertise” (1998, p.133).

**Research Questions**

1. How do teachers rate themselves as practitioners of the interactive writing technique?
2. What effect does the instruction in the technique have on first grade writing achievement?
3. What benefits or drawbacks do teachers who have utilized the interactive writing technique describe?
Definition of Terms

Interactive writing: A dynamic, collaborative literacy event in which children actively compose together, considering appropriate words, phrases, organization of text, and layout (Fountas & Pinnell, 2000, p. xv).

Holistic Scoring: Holistic scoring is a method of determining how well an individual's writing skills are developed in comparison to others of the same age or level of education (Harp, 1993) (Carey, 1997).

Rubric: A rubric is a set of criteria that provides information about student performance at various levels of proficiency (Rotta & Huser, 1995). (Carey, 1997,).

Limitations of the Study

A. The number of students involved in the study was small.

B. Four teachers originally volunteered for the study but only three were able to complete and submit writing samples.

C. Writing instruction was not limited to exposure to interactive writing in any classroom. Additional classroom instruction in language arts may have contributed to increases in student performance.
CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine a group of first grade teachers' implementation and use of the interactive writing technique and the effect of the technique on student writing achievement.

Emergent Literacy Framework

Research conducted by literacy investigators, including Clay, Adams, and Goodman (Popp, 1996) suggests that the framework for teaching the reciprocal processes of reading and writing to emergent learners should be grounded in wide exposure and access to quality literature. Read alouds, shared, guided, and independent reading and writing activities are key features of the early literacy framework (Button, Fergerson, & Johnson, 1996). Along with these key features, setting an authentic purpose for a literary experience and providing children with opportunities for interactive language engagement may be seen as fundamental in the development of literacy skills.

Melia (2000) states in her exploration of emergent literacy that "reading and writing are viewed as interrelated skills that are supportive of each other,
rather than as separate skills, which develop sequentially” (p 4).

The technique known as interactive writing can provide a “a bridge between oral and written language”, (Fountas & Pinnell, 1999, p.238) for the emergent learner. Interactive writing combines authentic purpose, exposure to literature and engagement of the learner in the primary classroom. The confidence and success of practitioners who implement the technique may heighten student-writing achievement in both subject matter and grammar skills.

**Authentic Purpose in a Social Context**

Cognitive theorists such as Vygotsky and Halliday believe that children acquire literacy skills much the same as spoken language usage, within a social context. The interactive model in the development and acquisition of language is based on the idea that children develop skills more readily when given an authentic purpose for communication within a social framework (Gove, Vacca, & Vacca, 2000). Young children are continually engaged in everyday purposes for reading and writing long before formal education begins through activities such as shopping, reading mail and cooking. The classroom environment then acts as an extension to the child’s existing knowledge base, with roots in the home and community environment, if literacy learning is purposefully provided within a social context.

Bredekamp, Knuth, Kunesh, and Shulman (1992) state that “to learn something new, children must become aware, explore, inquire, use, and apply” (p.5). In their research into early childhood education they found that
This process of learning occurs over time and reflects movement from learning that is informal and incidental, spontaneous, concrete referenced, and governed by the child’s own rules to learning that is more formal, refined, extended, enriched, more removed in time and space from concrete references and more reflective of conventional rule systems. (Bredekamp, Knuth, Kunesh, & Shulman, 1992, p 5.)

The sociocognitive perspective maintains that children gain access to literacy by “internalizing social action” (Chapman, 1995, p.164) in the context of language activities. Children from a sociocognitive viewpoint are seen as active participants rather than passive imitators in producing text, much more capable of writing than merely copying or duplicating the teacher’s model.

Schickedanz, (cited in Goves, Vacca, & Vacca, 2000) suggests that in order for children to learn literacy skills the curriculum should be developmentally appropriate and aligned with the individual learner’s level of emergent knowledge. Children learn and draw from common human events. Interactive writing is a social event that combines authentic purpose, oral language and instruction allowing primary children to become competent communicators, which is the goal of all written language.

**Multiple Exposures**

Children must have multiple exposures to written text. Teachers who utilize interactive writing have many occasions to expand and incorporate stories, poems, songs and expository texts in their classrooms. “By listening to stories again and again, children come to know how stories are structured. The
conceptual knowledge of narratives is fundamental to comprehending and composing stories” (Heller, 1991, p.21).

Narrative structure constitutes the majority of written text the young child is exposed to both at home and at school. Kamberelis (1999) reports that the form is heavily embedded in basal readers. Such emphasis is problematic, and, according to Kamberelis, may be limiting for children since “the types of writing required for achievement in school and beyond assume an awareness of a wide variety of specific genres and their functions” (Kamberelis, 1999, p. 452). Sanacore (1991) states that the organizational patterns found in expository materials such as, charts, graphs or captions can cause problems for children transitioning from narrative to non-fiction texts. Children can benefit from a wide exposure to expository information. Teachers who utilize interactive writing have multiple opportunities to introduce, teach, and create a variety of literature forms.

Kamberelis states that, “the more different kinds of genre that children learn to deploy, analyze, and synthesize, the deeper and broader their potential for cognitive, communicative, critical, and creative growth is likely to be” (Kamberelis, 1999, p. 453). Freeman and Person (1998) state that informational or expository texts can benefit children in the content areas. They are important in helping children focus on connections between content and concepts, promote critical thinking skills and problem solving.

Unfortunately, Duke (2000) found in her study that students in early grades are rarely exposed to informational texts nor do they have access to
informational libraries in their classrooms. The lack of expository texts was particularly low in low-SES classrooms. The researcher found an average 3.6 minutes per day was given to reading or exposure to expository text activities (p.215). In another investigation, Duke (2000) found that low-SES children had fewer exposures to print rich environments in their classrooms. The use of interactive compositions as accessible, revisited texts could add much needed materials to certain classroom environments.

Since children internalize the structure of texts they will imitate genres through interactive writing experiences then transfer such knowledge to personal composition. Establishing authentic purpose and providing opportunities for multiple exposure to quality literature pieces are essential components in “scaffolding the development and integration of all-literacy processes” (reading, writing, speaking, listening, thinking), (Button, Ferguson, & Johnson, 1996, p.447). Interactive writing may provide teachers with a means to incorporate a wider variety of text materials for the young learner.

**Engagement of the Learner**

Interactive writing serves as both a model of conventional writing and as a hands-on approach to written language where children act as literacy apprentices.

The term interactive writing was first created in 1991 by an Ohio State
University research group and teachers from Columbus, Ohio (Fountas & Pinnell, 2000). Interactive writing is an outgrowth of the shared pen technique related to the language experience approach championed by McKenzie in the mid nineteen eighties (Button, Ferguson, & Johnson, 1996). The technique allows for the individual engagement of the learner in the context of a shared experience with modeling of print conventions by the teacher. Subtle differences do exist between the technique of shared writing and interactive writing.

Shared writing has always been a feature of the language experience approach. Children talk and the teacher can act as a scribe turning ideas into modeled, written language. The final product of a shared writing experience may be a more involved text than children can compose themselves. One feature that separates interactive writing from shared writing includes the engagement of the student in actually writing text as opposed to teacher as scribe. Shared writing does mean both teacher and student are using the pen, the technique relies heavily on engaging the teacher to do the actual writing differing from interactive writing when children are writing. Interactive action has a high instructional value meaning “sharing the pen is not simply a ritual” (Fountas, McCrrier, & Pinnell, 2000,p.21). The physical appearance of text may look quite different than from shared writing pieces since children are doing the writing. Text may have standard features but may contain a great deal of variation; the completed piece while legible, may not be perfect. Less deviation from conventional form may be seen in shared writing pieces. Additionally, an interactive text may require several days to compose because of the intense involvement of the students.
Shared writing pieces can often be completed in one session. (Pinnell & McCarrier, 1994)

The key features of interactive writing include:

- Group children on learning goals.
- Write for authentic purpose.
- Share the task of writing.
- Use conversation to support the process.
- Create a common text.
- Use conventions of written language.
- Make letter-sound connections.
- Connect reading and writing.
- Teach explicitly

(McCarrier, Fountas, & Pinnell, 2000, p.10)

A description of the process of an interactive lesson are given in this example from McCarrier, Pinnell and Fountas (2000):

Students are composing a class story based on their readings of The Little Red Hen:
Ariel: The little Red Hen did all the work.
Ida (Teacher): (Repeats sentence.) That’s a good way to start.
Marcus: The Little Red Hen did all the work and then she got the idea that she would make pizza.
Ida: Oh, that’s a really long sentence. I think it might be a bit too long of a sentence.
I love all those ideas though.
Marcus: I can make it shorter.
Ida: How can you make it shorter?
Marcus: I can do it like this. I can write it then leave a little space and then do the other part.
Ida: Oh. So you mean just do a part of it. Do The Little Red Hen made a pizza?
Marcus: Then stop and rest. And then do more.

(Fountas, McCarrier, & Pinnell, 2000, p.89)
The teacher, having engaged the students in what will be written, now begins the process of calling children to the easel to write the text. The instructor uses his/her knowledge of the students to teach writing skills for example; using the initial consonants of students’ names to teach letter/sound relationships to spell words or teach concepts of print such as, left to right print conventions.

The technique can be utilized for a broad number of purposes such as extending, rewriting, or creating text. Interactive writing lends itself to explicit instruction and has been shown in an action research project by Bickel, Holsopple, Garcia, Lantz, and Yoder (1999) to foster independent writing, increased time on task and more expansive compositions in both kindergarten and first grade students.

“For both reading and writing, one must have knowledge both of the subject matter (prior knowledge or world knowledge) and of linguistic structure and conventions (linguistic knowledge)” (Cox, Shanahan, & Sulzby, 1990, p. 49). Interactive writing acts as a tool allowing the emergent learner to express himself/herself.

“Processes are built up and broken down in both reading and writing, but the concept may be easier for children to understand in writing. During early writing experiences, children naturally and purposefully attend to the details of print” (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996 p.13). Theoretically, such intense focus may
result not only in building stronger print concepts but also in the transfer of broader text elements to independent response.

**Teaching Writing**

As stated, the most common genre young children encounter in the classroom is the narrative. The structures and features of narrative stories include character, setting, problem and solution. Through multiple exposures children come to understand the structure of narrative. The classroom teacher’s challenge is to make use of such knowledge. According to Gearhart and Wolf, (1994) “We think that educators should *teach* narrative, not as an ever-shifting set of lovely stories to be lauded, but as a foundation for analysis, reflection, and criticism, which can, in turn, be used as a resource for children’s original writing” (p. 425).

The teacher’s role in interactive writing is critical to the success of students. According to Cantrell (1996), teachers who incorporate features used in interactive technique, including wide exposure to literature, authentic purpose and integration of reading and writing across the curriculum seem to be developing skills at higher levels than those that do not use such practices. Further evidence by LaMedica (1995) concurs that, “success of encouraging the writing process in primary grades depends largely on the teacher” (p. 35). Furthermore, “the teacher must show the students that she trusts them to own their own work”.

Research by Larson and Maier (2000) confirms that in the primary classroom the teacher acts as both model and co–author to facilitate the co–construction of texts and allows children to gain writing competence, to see
themselves as vital authors.

A study by Accomando, Gall, Jamrisko, and Linderman (1996) found that declines in student writing achievement are due in part from the manner in which writing is defined. “Writing has been viewed as a finished product to be graded, corrected, or analyzed by teachers” (p. 28) not as a developing process.

The report also found that in the past, time allotted for writing was insufficient and often interrupted. Writing was seen as an isolated task and that teachers evaluated writing assignments but did not participate in their production. Donald Graves (1994) states, “if students are not engaged in writing at least four days out of five days, and for a period of thirty – five to forty minutes, beginning in first grade, they will have little opportunity to learn to think through the medium of writing” (p.104).

Utilizing a technique such as interactive writing can help to alleviate some of these concerns. In combination, authentic purpose with experiential activities, multiple exposures to literature and interactive writing may heighten children’s awareness of narrative and expository structure in developing and writing their own stories and compositions.
CHAPTER III

Design Of the Study

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine a group of first grade teachers’ implementation and use of the interactive writing technique and the effect of the technique on student writing achievement.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. How do teachers rate themselves as practitioners of the interactive writing technique?
2. What effect does instruction in the technique have on first grade writing achievement?
3. What benefits or drawbacks do teachers who have utilized the interactive writing technique describe?

Methodology

Subjects

The subjects of this study included three first grade teachers and eighteen students from an urban school. Both students and teachers are from a variety of ethnic and racial backgrounds.
The teaching experience of the instructors ranges from two to five years. Each classroom involved in the study is self-contained with general education students. All teachers in the study had limited experience with using interactive writing in their classrooms before the study.

Students included in the study completed kindergarten and were not repeating grade one. The majority of the students come from low to mid socioeconomic backgrounds.

Materials

The Houghton Mifflin Emergent-Literacy Survey was used to identify students included in the study. (Appendix C)

Teachers completed a self-assessment rubric for interactive writing designed by McCarrier, Pinnell and Fountas 2000 (Appendix A). Teachers were asked to complete the survey at the start and at the close of the study. This provided the researcher with information about the extent that they utilized interactive writing as one part of their language arts curriculum.

Two student-writing samples were collected over a six-month period. The first sample was collected in November. The second sample was collected in April. These samples were used to compile the data for this study. The monthly topic or prompts were taken from the long-range plans of the first grade team at Enrico Fermi School #17. Student writing samples were assessed using a rubric developed by Enrico Fermi School #17 curriculum development team (Appendix B). Scoring was based on four descriptors for the kindergarten and first grade
rubric, printing/handwriting, communicating through print, grammar/punctuation and spelling. The second grade rubric descriptors were; content, vocabulary, mechanics and spelling.

The researcher at the beginning, middle and end of the six-month period took observational field notes of interactive writing samples posted in classrooms and hallways.

**Procedures**

Students selected for the study were identified by their classroom teacher based on their performance on the Emergent Literacy Skills Inventory contained in the Houghton Mifflin reading series administered in September and January of the 2000/2001 school year. (Appendix C) The survey includes a number of tested skills such as: a dictation sentence, letter identification, word recognition, concepts of print and phoneme blending. These basic skills form the foundation of beginning writing and are a key feature in instruction when utilizing interactive writing. Students were categorized on the basis of their performance on the initial screening test. Two students from each category were selected and identified with low, average and high literacy skills from each classroom for inclusion in the study. Selection of students was the task of each teacher.

All instructors in the study were required to use a basal reading series as the major component of their reading and writing instructional program. In an effort to improve first grade writing abilities, the teachers in the study agreed to implement the interactive writing technique in their classrooms over a six-month period. Interactive writing is a technique used to plan and compose text with
children. Key elements of interactive writing may include writing letters or words, using spaces and using punctuation. The elements selected for inclusion in the text are based on the individual needs of the student. The final text is a group effort built on individual instructional goals. Teachers tried to use the technique at least once a week for a variety of purposes such as creating functional, narrative, and expository texts.

Writing samples were submitted to the researcher over a six-month period. Writing samples were scored using the Enrico Fermi School #17 rubric for kindergarten through second grade.

**ANALYSIS OF DATA**

The researcher used two rubrics and observational field notes for scoring the data from this study. Additional descriptions from interviews with teachers and observational field notes are included. Data are presented qualitatively through descriptive interviews and quantitatively in simple graph form. The mean increase or decrease in teacher and student performance is calculated using arithmetic average from the start to the close of the study.

The teacher rubric, observational notes and teacher interviews were used to answer Research Questions 1 and 2. The teacher rubric described the instructor's ability to implement the technique in the classroom using several criteria; materials, lesson management, engagement, pace, composition, construction, teaching decisions, and text. A graph was used to present the
teachers' self-rating at the start and end of the project.

Any change in the perception of teachers' ability to utilize the technique from the beginning of the study until the conclusion is described from personal interviews. Teachers described any benefits or drawbacks associated with utilizing the technique in their classrooms.

Observational field notes describe any evidence of posted classroom examples of interactive writing for the six-month period from November to April.

The effects of utilizing the interactive technique on student writing achievement are detailed comparing skills at the start and close of the study. Although instruction utilizing interactive writing was not the sole component for students as described in the Limitations Section of Chapter I, specific targets of instruction contained in the student rubric are basic instructional goals of the interactive technique.

Children's writing samples were scored according to the Kid-Friendly Writing Rubric for Grades K – 1, and Grade 2. (Appendix B) The rubric is based on a point system used in the English Language Arts Assessment for New York State at the fourth grade level. Descriptors at the K – 1 level are printing/handwriting, communicating through print, grammar/punctuation, and spelling. The Grade 2 descriptors are content, vocabulary, mechanics and spelling. Student scores are presented in a table and in simple graph form at the start and end of the project for each corresponding teacher.
CHAPTER IV

Analysis of Data

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine a group of first grade teachers' implementation and use of the interactive writing technique and the effect of the technique on student writing achievement.

Research Questions

1. How do teachers rate themselves as practitioners of the interactive writing technique?
2. What effect does instruction in the technique have on first grade writing achievement?
3. What benefits or drawbacks do teachers who have utilized the interactive writing technique describe?

Results of the Study

Results of the investigation are reported in four sections. Data are presented in both qualitative and simple quantitative terms. First is teacher
reporting in response to the research question, “How do teachers rate themselves as practitioners of the interactive technique?” Table 1 represents teacher’s self-reporting. Average scores for teachers are depicted in Table 2.

In the second section student evaluations are reported answering the research question, “What effect does instruction in the technique have on first grade writing achievement?” Comparisons and patterns between teacher perception and student achievement are depicted in section three. The fourth section contains researcher reporting of interviews with teachers as they describe themselves as practitioners of the interactive technique and evidence of posted classroom examples of text.

**Teachers’ Rubric Results**

A teachers’ rubric was used to report and rate the practitioners’ perception on the level of competency from the start to the close of the investigation. Teachers’ are described as Teacher A, B, C. Each descriptor in the rubric was given a value from 1 – 4. One represents a low competency rating, four a high competency rating. Table 1 represents the criteria used to assess how comfortable teachers’ were in utilizing the interactive technique.
### Table 1

**Teacher Rubric Scores for November and April**

**Results From November**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Materials Management</th>
<th>Lesson Engagement</th>
<th>Pace</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Teaching Decisions</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results From April**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Materials Management</th>
<th>Lesson Engagement</th>
<th>Pace</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Teaching Decisions</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

**Mean Performance Scores of Teachers for November and April**

**Avg. Scores From Nov. and Apr.**

![Score Chart](image)
**Student Rubric Results**

Scoring of student writing samples was done using a rubric with descriptors given a value of 1 – 4. One is the least competent, four the most advanced for kindergarten and first grade reporting. The second grade rubric also uses values 1 – 4 but includes the descriptors, early/beginning, advanced/beginning, early/independent and advanced/independent. Student writing samples that exceed first grade criteria are reported as grade two scores. This indicates the student is writing above the first grade level and the second grade rubric was used to grade the writing. Blanks in the Table indicate the student did not score in this range. Student scores are A, B, C to correspond to the classroom teacher. Tables 3-8 detail student scoring for the months: November and April. A simple graph compares student scores.
Table 3

Teacher A Student Scores for November and April.

### Teacher A's Students (November Results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grades K-1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teacher A's Students (April Results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grades K-1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med.</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Teacher A Average Student Scores From November to April

Avg. Scores From Nov. and Apr.

![Bar chart showing average scores from November to April for low, medium, and high students.]
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Table 5
Teacher B Student Scores for November and April

Teacher B's Students (November Results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grades K-1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher B's Students (April Results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grades K-1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6
Teacher B Average Student Scores for November and April

Avg. Scores From Nov. and Apr.

![Scores Graph]

Low       Med.    High
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Table 7
Teacher C Student Scores for November and April

Teacher C’s Students (November Results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grades K-1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher C’s Students (April Results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grades K-1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8
Teacher C Average Student Scores for November and April

Avg. Scores From Nov. and Apr.

![Graph showing average scores for November and April](image)
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Interviews and Observational Field Notes

Personal interviews with teachers were conducted at the start, middle and close of the project in order to answer research question three, "What benefits or drawbacks do teachers who have utilized the interactive technique describe?" Interviews revealed some benefits and concerns with utilizing the interactive technique within the classroom setting. The two most frequent items, time and text predominated teacher concerns. All teachers at the start of the investigation until the close reported that using the interactive technique was time consuming given the instructional goals associated with the language arts schedule in each individual classroom.

Teachers reported they did become much more comfortable utilizing the technique with repeated practice. They also stated that making individual lesson points became easier as the year went on and they knew the skill levels of their students better. At first, in November, the teachers reported that they stressed skills all first grade students need to master such as, spacing, left to right and top to bottom orientation, simple sight words and capitalization. By April the three teachers had used the technique for more individual purposes, tailoring instruction to the student. For example, Teacher A related that she had a student that repeatedly misplaced quotation marks. After the child was given several opportunities to place the quotation marks in an interactive text the child’s
problem was resolved. Teacher B related that her students retained and remembered vocabulary contained in interactive pieces over long periods of time. Although the vocabulary often was far above the first grade level, students seemed to recall difficult words and concepts contained in the texts. All teachers stated that the technique also provided an opportunity to introduce a wider variety of text to their students than they had previously used such as, science reports, songs and plays.

The researcher took note of posted evidence of interactive writing from November through April. A wide variety of texts serving a wide range of purposes were observed. Teacher A had the highest number of compositions posted including, stories, letters, recipes and informational texts such as, social studies reports and math graphs with text detailing comparison statements. Teacher A changed the posted work every three to four weeks.

Teachers B and C also showed evidence of posted interactive writing compositions. Teacher B utilized her interactive writing pieces as reference tools. Texts stayed posted in the classroom much longer than in Teacher A’s room and the researcher observed the teacher making reference to work during instructional time. Children were encouraged to use the work for spelling words or using story grammar such as, first, next, and last.

Teacher C’s posted texts were generally shorter in length than teacher A and B’s pieces. Teacher C used interactive writing to develop new endings for
familiar stories, extending known text. Limited classroom wall space may have contributed to the number of posted compositions.

**Summary**

The data reveal an overall increase in teachers’ ability to implement interactive writing in the classroom and in student writing performance. Teacher rubric results indicate some increase in self-rating in three targeted areas Materials, Teaching Decisions, and Text. Teachers A and C showed the largest average increase in all categories from 2.6 to 3.3 for Teacher A and 2.6 to 3.5 for Teacher C. Teacher B showed few gains in all but the three mentioned categories showing a nominal increase from 2.2 to 2.7.

Student scores also show an increase for all groups rated Low, Medium and High in literacy skills at the start of the investigation. The increases for each group varied from teacher to teacher. For Teacher A the Medium rated group had an increase from 3 to 4.5. Teacher B’s High group showed the greatest increase from 3.5 to 6. Teacher C’s Lowest rated students showed an increase from 1.1 to 3.

Combined scores of Teachers self-reported skills at implementing interactive writing in the classroom increased 28% over the time period from November to April. All students in the study showed an overall increase of 36% for the same period.
CHAPTER V
Conclusions and Implications

Purpose
The purpose of this study was to examine a group of first grade teachers’ implementation and use of the interactive writing technique and the effect of the technique on student achievement.

Conclusions
Current research in primary literacy suggests that the framework for effective instruction in reading and writing requires wide exposure to quality literature, setting an authentic purpose for a literary experience and interactive language engagement. In addition, studies show that opportunities to read and write must occur frequently within the classroom environment. Ongoing classroom research by investigators also reveals that student engagement is a primary element in teaching young learners to read and write. Since these reciprocal tasks are social constructs, instructional techniques that support the primary student within a group setting continue to evolve. The technique known as interactive writing is an instructional framework that combines teacher modeling and student engagement to support the young learner. Teacher
researchers like the ones described in this study, continue to investigate and expand their knowledge of best practice in the primary classroom.

Although the data indicate that teachers and students did benefit from implementation and exposure to interactive writing, this study cannot conclude the technique is solely responsible for an increase in student writing achievement. All teachers in the study utilized additional language arts instruction in the classroom as part of their balanced literacy program.

In answering the first and last of the research questions concerning the teachers' ability to utilize a rubric to rate themselves and how valuable the interactive writing technique is in the primary classroom, the data point out that teachers were successful practitioners. However, the technique has some drawbacks. All teachers interviewed expressed concerns associated with time when using interactive writing. The most frequent commentary made by the teachers was that they found using the technique required too much intense instruction for a lengthy period of time. Teachers reported that, at first, they tried to complete a whole text in one lesson. This led to a number of problems such as, keeping all the students engaged since only one student is actually writing at a time and losing the focus of the text when pacing slowed down. Additionally, teachers felt returning to a longer piece over several days was not always practical given their intense, limited language arts schedules.

During the course of the study teachers reported they did become more proficient at planning and building texts slowly over a number of days which
helped them to focus on short term writing goals. By adding only one specific sentence or idea per writing session they were able to better manage the time involved in using the interactive technique. Teachers also remarked that rereading the text each day was beneficial because students were able to remember difficult vocabulary.

It is difficult to conclude whether the interactive technique affected student writing achievement given the data from this study. First, the screening tool used to select students, the Emergent Literacy Survey, did not test for only writing skills. The survey measures the incoming first grade student basic literacy skills including concepts of print, sight words and word writing. The rubric used to score writing over the course of the school year, (Appendix B) goes well beyond these basic skills. Concluding that exposure to interactive writing contributed to higher skills in writing for first grade students can be inferred but not proven.

Exposure to interactive writing does appear to enhance skills for a range of students since all students showed some improvement. The highest improvement in skill levels varied from teacher to teacher. In one classroom the lowest students improved, the middle group in another and the high group in the third. This range may be due in part to specific skills targeted by each instructor when using the technique. In the classroom that the lowest students showed the most improvement, the teacher’s posted writing samples were shorter and involved extending known text. The repetition of literacy elements such as punctuation
and basic sight words may have helped the lowest students refine basic skills. In the classroom that had the greatest improvement in students rated in the high group, posted writing samples were very sophisticated, involved difficult vocabulary and a variety of genres. For the high group, more advanced interactive writing may have carried over to more complex, personal composition.

**Implications for Research**

Further research in the area of primary writing utilizing the interactive technique could focus on and explore several important ideas not found to be conclusive in this study. First, a teacher’s ability to implement the technique may be improved if instructors were given modeling and instruction from qualified practitioners of the technique. This may eliminate concerns over timing or pacing associated with interactive writing. A study measuring teacher success at implementing interactive writing would be beneficial using some objective measure rather than self-rating as was done in this investigation. The self-rating by teachers did offer an opportunity to work with a holistic scoring tool that is a feature of many state scored tests; however the rubric relied too heavily on the instructor’s personal impressions, not on hard data. Secondly, a study that could control exposure to instruction limited to interactive writing in a primary classroom could conclusively reveal if the benefits outweigh the drawbacks associated with the technique. One way to investigate this may be to target and
provide instruction in a limited skill area such as grammar.

Research into how the technique could be utilized with older students could also be investigated. With state mandated testing now in effect in many areas, there is a need for innovative instruction that allows every learner in-depth tailored instruction in both narrative and expository writing. This technique may provide such instruction.

**Implications for Classroom Practice**

Writing expectations for the primary student have drastically risen over the last several years. As mandated testing becomes an instrument used to measure student and school district success, competent writing skills at every level of instruction are expected from parents, administrators and teachers. Primary teachers are actively searching for improved methods of instruction to make all students competent in written communication. Interactive writing is an engaging instructional technique that can enhance and motivate both teachers and students to appreciate and hone writing skills.

In the classroom, interactive writing seems to be most beneficial when lessons are focused on a student centered text, the teacher has targeted specific skills for the individual or group, and pacing maintains student interest. One way to heighten student engagement may be to provide small wipe-off boards or individual chalkboards so all students can practice a specific skill while one child
writes at the easel with the teacher. Another way to maintain group focus is to present the topic, break the students into groups and provide sentence strips for writing ideas on the topic. The teacher then circulates to provide interactive help, recalls the group and reassembles the whole text to be read and critiqued by the group.

**Summary**

The art of teaching, learning and critiquing writing is a difficult task for both the primary teacher and student. The novice learner of written communication is expected to progress from first uttered words to understandable written thought and expression in an amazing six or seven years. Young children require and can absorb many of the nuances, rules and exceptions in written language when given competent, inspired instruction from teachers. One method that may help children bridge the gap between non-literate to literate person is a technique such as interactive writing. Working together as builders of text, teachers and students can express themselves and communicate in written language as the role of apprentice and master shifts back and forth with the handling of a pen. While the present study does not indicate that interactive writing is a single method of producing competent primary writing teachers and students, the technique is valuable to the instructor and the young child.
References


# Appendix 3
## Self-Assessment Rubric for Interactive Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher __________________________</th>
<th>Grade level ________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment:</strong> General ______ OR 1 lesson (length of time): ______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Directions** Mark the characteristic that most clearly describes your teaching at this time.

### Materials
My goal is to have all necessary materials present, organized, and accessible for use during the lesson.

- [ ] I do not have the materials I need for interactive writing.
- [ ] I have some materials but I am at a beginning point in my organization.
- [ ] I have all necessary materials but am just beginning to organize them and make full use of them.
- [ ] I have all the materials I need, including easel, white tape, paper, markers, white board, Magna-doodle, pointer, etc.; they are organized and accessible.

### Lesson Management
My goal is to manage the lesson well with children demonstrating that they know the routines and to have all teaching procedures in place, in appropriate order.

- [ ] My management of the lesson is uneven; children do not understand the routines and need a great deal of direction.
- [ ] I have the general procedures of interactive writing in place but there are times when children do not attend and the lesson “bogs down.”
- [ ] All procedures are in place for interactive writing; children know the routines; I am working on a better-managed pace.
- [ ] My lesson is well managed with all procedures in place; children know what is expected of them and initiate action.

---

## Engagement
My goal is to engage children's attention throughout the lesson.

- The lesson is often interrupted by attention to behavior or by materials not being accessible; children's attention is inconsistent across time and group.
- My materials are accessible and I can engage children for periods of time but engagement is not consistent; some groups are more difficult than others.
- Children are generally engaged (all groups) and the lesson goes smoothly.
- Engagement is high; children are attentive and eager to participate and this is consistent across groups.

## Pace
My goal is to produce the interactive writing message fluently and to keep the lesson moving at an appropriate pace.

- Lessons are slow and consistently take too long and this disrupts the rest of my schedule.
- The time of the lesson is about right but we do not accomplish much because "sharing the pen" takes a long time; the pace is slow.
- My lessons are about the right length of time and are moderately fast-paced; we are able to produce (with children's sharing the pen) print and read it.
- For the most part, my lessons are fast-paced and exciting; we produce a large amount of print in a short time.

## Composition
My goal is to elicit individual ideas, get children to agree on a group composition and to guide the composition skillfully so that the material has contains a range of language and vocabulary.

- I have not yet begun to involve children in composing the message for interactive writing; generally I make up the message.
- I invite children to participate in composing but have difficulty in generating what I think is a good message; either I direct too much or there are so many ideas I can't bring them together.
- I invite children to participate in composing and we usually have a successful collaboration; I would like to work more on generating messages with more potential for language and word learning.
- I guide the composition to demonstrate the composing process and to assure that children understand how to produce a text; the message constructed has opportunities for expanding language and studying words.

---

Construction

My goal is to involve children in producing the message, word by word, keeping in mind the meaning and giving attention to words, letters, and punctuation.

☐ I usually write the message myself or have children participate a little; they have trouble attending to word construction; I am just beginning to learn how to link writing to what they know; there is little rereading.

☐ I involve children in writing the message as much as possible but the process is uneven; I have some trouble with management; the process is slow; I do not consistently have them reread when needed in order to anticipate the next word or phrase.

☐ I have established “sharing the pen,” and we consistently reread the message when needed during writing. I need to work on teaching for strategies that writers will be able to use independently.

☐ The message is collaboratively produced, smoothly managed, and reread many times; I draw attention to word construction through hearing and writing the sounds and through linking known words to writing new ones.

Teaching Decisions

My goal is to select powerful teaching examples that are based on what the children need to learn how to do as writers and that illustrate how written language works.

☐ I am not sure how I make my teaching decisions but I have difficulty connecting with what children know; I am not observing shifts in learning. I tend to have too many teaching points and the lesson drags.

☐ I am implementing the mechanics of the situation but am not yet involving children in a way that lets me focus on my teaching decisions and get more power. I still have either too many teaching points or too few.

☐ I am comfortable with the procedures and consistently reflect on my teaching decisions. I generally make an appropriate number of teaching points but am still working to select the most powerful for learning.

☐ My decisions are well timed and powerful in illustrating processes and allowing children to use what they know in a strategic way.
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Text  My goal is to use interactive writing as a tool for helping children understand, read, and write a variety of texts.

☐ I have used interactive writing in a limited way, tending to produce only 1 or 2 kinds of texts. I have not yet found ways to link interactive writing to literature or content area study and to combine shared and interactive writing effectively.

☐ I have experimented with several different kinds of texts, including narrative, functional, and informational, but tend to use only 1 or 2 kinds of texts on a daily basis. I still need to link texts more to children's own writing, to literature, and to areas of content study. I am incorporating shared writing at times.

☐ With the children in my class, I regularly compose and construct several different kinds of texts, including functional, narrative, and expository. I still need to link texts more to children's own writing, to literature, and to areas of content study. I incorporate shared and interactive writing to make texts more informative and readable.

☐ I consistently link interactive writing texts with content area study, literature, ongoing classroom events, word study, and children's own writing. Children in my class compose and write a wide variety of narrative, functional, and expository texts on a daily basis. I incorporate shared writing in a skillful way to make texts richer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTORS</th>
<th>GRADE ONE</th>
<th>KINDERGARTEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING/HANDWRITING</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I print sentences neatly and on</td>
<td>I can copy words I see in my class</td>
<td>I can write the capital and lower case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the lines so other people can</td>
<td>and school.</td>
<td>letters of the alphabet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read it.</td>
<td>I use spaces between my words.</td>
<td>I can write left to right starting at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I write words on the lines starting at</td>
<td>the top of the page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the top of the page.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATING THROUGH PRINT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can write a story that has</td>
<td>I can draw a picture, write a complete</td>
<td>I can draw pictures and write words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a beginning, middle, and an end.</td>
<td>sentence about it and read it to others.</td>
<td>about the pictures using the beginning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can draw pictures and write words</td>
<td>sounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>about the pictures and name what they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAMMAR/PUNCTUATION</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I start my sentences with</td>
<td>I start my sentences with a capital</td>
<td>I am learning how to write numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capital letters.</td>
<td>letter some of the time.</td>
<td>and letters of the alphabet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I end my sentences with a period or a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>question mark.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I end my sentences with a period or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>question mark some of the time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPELLING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can spell some words correctly.</td>
<td>I try to spell my words with as many</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the sounds I hear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I try to spell my words using the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beginning and ending sounds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zero Paper: Unrelated to the topic or an illegible paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTORS</th>
<th>4-ADVANCED INDEPENDENT</th>
<th>3-EARLY INDEPENDENT</th>
<th>2-ADVANCED BEGINNING</th>
<th>1-EARLY BEGINNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTENT</td>
<td>I use all the parts of writing a story (beginning, middle, end, characters, setting, main idea). My writing is organized. I use correct sentence structure. I can proofread my own writing and correct most of the mistakes.</td>
<td>I am beginning to use the important parts of writing a story (beginning, middle, end, characters, setting, main idea organized, and detailed sentence structure), but I still make mistakes. I am beginning to read and correct some of my mistakes.</td>
<td>I have good ideas and can write a story that has a few sentences. I have trouble putting my story in order. I need help correcting the mistakes in my sentences.</td>
<td>I can write a sentence. I have trouble reading back what I wrote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOCABULARY</td>
<td>I use descriptive words and details in my writing. I write my stories so other people can read them and enjoy them.</td>
<td>I am using descriptive words and details in my writing most of the time. I am starting to write my stories so other people can read them.</td>
<td>I am using descriptive words and details in my writing some of the time. I can read back what I have written.</td>
<td>I am learning to write using descriptive words and details with my teacher's help. I still don't know too many words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECHANICS</td>
<td>I know when to use punctuation and capitalization. I have a clear understanding of how to use paragraphs in my writing.</td>
<td>I am using proper punctuation, capitalization, and spacing most of the time. I know that a paragraph is a group of sentences that tell about one main idea.</td>
<td>I am beginning to use correct punctuation, capital letters, and spaces between my words. I am learning to indent at the beginning of a paragraph.</td>
<td>I can write words from left to right and top to bottom on my paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPELLING</td>
<td>I can spell most words correctly. I can spell words by the way they sound. I can spell a lot of sight words correctly in my writing.</td>
<td>I can connect sounds with letters to invent words. I can spell some sight words correctly.</td>
<td>I connect sounds with letters to invent words. I can spell some sight words correctly.</td>
<td>I can spell some words I know on my own. I am starting to connect sounds with letters to spell words.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zero Paper: Unrelated to the topic or an illegible paper.
Child's Name

Examiner

Date

Appendix C

Letter Name Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Word Recognition

1. the
2. of
3. and
4. to
5. in
6. you
7. for
8. it
9. was
10. on
11. that
12. is
13. he
14. are
15. as
16. with
17. his
18. they
19. at
20. this
21. from
22. have
23. by
24. one
25. had
26. bat
27. ten
28. pig
29. hop
30. mud
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhyme</th>
<th>Beginning Sounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. bat</td>
<td>1. /s/ ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. head</td>
<td>2. /p/ ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. fan</td>
<td>3. /m/ ore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. got</td>
<td>4. /d/ onkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. rug</td>
<td>5. /l/ ion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. be</td>
<td>6. /f/ ast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. fog</td>
<td>7. /ch/ ildren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. mill</td>
<td>8. /b/ aloon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blending Onsets and Rimes</th>
<th>Segmenting Onsets and Rimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. /m/ an — man</td>
<td>1. /f/ fit (it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. /f/ all — fall</td>
<td>2. /g/ gate (ate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. /t/ able — table</td>
<td>3. /s/ sink (ink)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. /b/ ill — bill</td>
<td>4. /l/ land (and)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. /r/ at — rat</td>
<td>5. /b/ bend (end)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. /g/ old — gold</td>
<td>6. /p/ pup (up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. /m/ other — mother</td>
<td>7. sh/ shape (ape)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. /l/ earn — learn</td>
<td>8. k/ couch (ouch)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Phoneme Blending

1. /t/ /ä/ /p/ (tap)
2. /m/ /ē/ /n/ (men)
3. /j/ /ö/ /g/ (jog)
4. /k/ /ü/ /t/ (cut)
5. /l/ /l/ /d/ (lid)
6. /b/ /ã/ /k/ (bike)
7. /w/ /ä/ /v/ (wave)
8. /s/ /ö/ /f/ /t/ (soft)

Phoneme Segmentation

1. pat /p/ /ä/ /t/
2. leg /l/ /ē/ /g/
3. sip /s/ /l/ /p/
4. tub /t/ /ü/ /b/
5. rock /r/ /ö/ /l/
6. mean /m/ /ē/ /n/
7. joke /j/ /ö/ /k/
8. fast /f/ /ä/ /s/ /t/

Concepts of Print

1. letter
2. word
3. sentences
4. where start reading
5. left to right
6. return sweep
7. voice/print match
8. written/spoken word correspondence