ED 398 548 CS 012 566

AUTHOR Codling, Rose Marie; And Others

TITLE The Teacher, the Text, and the Context: Factors That

Influence Elementary Students' Motivation To Write.

Reading Research Report No. 59.

INSTITUTION National Reading Research Center, Athens, GA.;

National Reading Research Center, College Park,

MD.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED),

Washington, DC.

PUB DATE 96

CONTRACT 117A20007

NOTE 69p.

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) --

Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Classroom Environment; Classroom Research; Elementary

Education; Grade 3; Grade 5; Qualitative Research; *Student Motivation; *Teacher Role; *Text Structure;

*Writing Attitudes; Writing Research

IDENTIFIERS *Writing Motivation

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the writing motivation of 145 third- and fifth-grade students. Because self-perceived competence and task value interact in important ways to influence an individual's motivation, these two constructs were used as the basis for measuring children's motivation to write. Students responded to the Motivation to Write Scale (MWS), a 2-part survey designed to tap students' self-perceived competence as writers and the value they place in writing. In addition, 80 students participated in an interview to discuss their writing experiences. Classroom observations were conducted to learn more about the typical writing activities of these students. A qualitative analysis revealed the important role of three factors in students' writing motivation: the teacher, the type of text students encounter, and the classroom context. (Contains 37 references and 4 tables of data. Appendixes present a classroom observation form, the Motivation to Write Scale, interview questions, teacher survey, data, and a scoring rubric.) (Author/RS)



The Teacher, The Text, and The Context: Factors that Influence Elementary Students' Motivation to Write

Rose Marie Codling
Linda B. Gambrell
Aileen Kennedy
Barbara M. Palmer
Mary Graham
University of Maryland College Park

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION Office of Educational Research and Improvement EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.



National Reading Research Center

READING RESEARCH REPORT NO. 59
Summer 1996

9



NRRC

National Reading Research Center

The Teacher, the Text, and the Context: Factors that Influence Elementary Students' Motivation to Write

Rose Marie Codling
Linda B. Gambrell
Aileen Kennedy
Barbara Martin Palmer
Mary Graham
University of Maryland College Park

READING RESEARCH REPORT NO. 59

Summer 1996

The work reported herein is a National Reading Research Project of the University of Georgia and University of Maryland. It was supported under the Educational Research and Development Centers Program (PR/AWARD NO. 117A20007) as administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The findings and opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of the National Reading Research Center, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or the U.S. Department of Education.



NRRC

National Reading Research

Center

Executive Committee

Donna E. Alvermann, Co-Director
University of Georgia
John T. Guthrie, Co-Director
University of Maryland College Park
James F. Baumann, Associate Director
University of Georgia
Patricia S. Koskinen, Associate Director
University of Maryland College Park
Jamie Lynn Metsala, Interim Associate Director

University of Maryland College Park Nancy B. Mizelle, Assistant Director

University of Georgia Penny Oldfather University of Georgia John F. O'Flahavan

University of Maryland College Park

James V. Hoffman
University of Texas at Austin
Cynthia R. Hynd

University of Georgia Robert Serpell

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Betty Shockley

Clarke County School District, Athens, Georgia

Linda DeGroff
University of Georgia

Publications Editors

Research Reports and Perspectives

Linda DeGroff, Editor
University of Georgia
James V. Hoffman, Associate Editor
University of Texas at Austin
Mariam Jean Dreher, Associate Editor
University of Maryland College Park
Instructional Resources
Lee Galda, University of Georgia
Research Highlights
William G. Holliday
University of Maryland College Park
Policy Briefs
James V. Hoffman
University of Texas at Austin
Videos

NRRC Staff

Barbara F. Howard, Office Manager Kathy B. Davis, Senior Secretary University of Georgia

Shawn M. Glynn, University of Georgia

Barbara A. Neitzey, Administrative Assistant Valerie Tyra, Accountant
University of Maryland College Park

National Advisory Board

Phyllis W. Aldrich

Saratoga Warren Board of Cooperative Educational

Services, Saratoga Springs, New York

Arthur N. Applebee

State University of New York, Albany

Ronald S. Brandt

Association for Supervision and Curriculum

Development

Marshá T. DeLain

Delaware Department of Public Instruction

Carl A. Grant

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Walter Kintsch

University of Colorado at Boulder

Robert L. Linn

University of Colorado at Boulder

Luis C. Moll

University of Arizona

Carol M. Santa

School District No. 5

Kalispell, Montana

Anne P. Sweet

Office of Educational Research and Improvement,

U.S. Department of Education

Louise Cherry Wilkinson

Rutgers University

Production Editor

Katherine P. Hutchison University of Georgia

Dissemination Coordinator

Jordana E. Rich University of Georgia

Text Formatter

Angela R. Wilson
University of Georgia

NRRC - University of Georgia

318 Aderhold University of Georgia Athens, Georgia 30602-7125 (706) 542-3674 Fax: (706) 542-3678 INTERNET: NRRC@uga.cc.uga.edu

NRRC - University of Maryland College Park

3216 J. M. Patterson Building University of Maryland College Park, Maryland 20742

(301) 405-8035 Fax: (301) 314-9625 INTERNET: NRRC@umail.umd.edu



About the National Reading Research Center

The National Reading Research Center (NRRC) is funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education to conduct research on reading and reading instruction. The NRRC is operated by a consortium of the University of Georgia and the University of Maryland College Park in collaboration with researchers at several institutions nationwide.

The NRRC's mission is to discover and document those conditions in homes, schools, and communities that encourage children to become skilled, enthusiastic, lifelong readers. NRRC researchers are committed to advancing the development of instructional programs sensitive to the cognitive, sociocultural, and motivational factors that affect children's success in reading. NRRC researchers from a variety of disciplines conduct studies with teachers and students from widely diverse cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds in pre-kindergarten through grade 12 classrooms. Research projects deal with the influence of family and family-school interactions on the development of literacy; the interaction of sociocultural factors and motivation to read; the impact of literature-based reading programs on reading achievement; the effects of reading strategies instruction on comprehension and critical thinking in literature, science, and history; the influence of innovative group participation structures on motivation and learning; the potential of computer technology to enhance literacy; and the development of methods and standards for alternative literacy assessments.

The NRRC is further committed to the participation of teachers as full partners in its research. A better understanding of how teachers view the development of literacy, how they use knowledge from research, and how they approach change in the classroom is crucial to improving instruction. To further this understanding, the NRRC conducts school-based research in which teachers explore their own philosophical and pedagogical orientations and trace their professional growth.

Dissemination is an important feature of NRRC activities. Information on NRRC research appears in several formats. Research Reports communicate the results of original research or synthesize the findings of several lines of inquiry. They are written primarily for researchers studying various areas of reading and reading instruction. The Perspective Series presents a wide range of publications, from calls for research and commentary on research and practice to first-person accounts of experiences in schools. Instructional Resources include curriculum materials, instructional guides, and materials for professional growth, designed primarily for teachers.

For more information about the NRRC's research projects and other activities, or to have your name added to the mailing list, please contact:

Donna E. Alvermann, Co-Director National Reading Research Center 318 Aderhold Hall University of Georgia Athens, GA 30602-7125 (706) 542-3674

John T. Guthrie, Co-Director National Reading Research Center 3216 J. M. Patterson Building University of Maryland College Park, MD 20742 (301) 405-8035



NRRC Editorial Review Board

Peter Afflerbach

University of Maryland College Park

Jane Agee

University of Georgia

JoBeth Allen

University of Georgia

Janice F. Almasi

University of Buffalo-SUNY

Patty Anders

University of Arizona

Harriette Arrington

University of Kentucky

Marlia Banning

University of Utah

Jill Bartoli

Elizabethtown College

Eurydice Bauer

University of Georgia

Janet Benton

Bowling Green, Kentucky

Irene Blum

Pine Springs Elementary School Falls Church, Virginia

David Bloome

Amherst College

John Borkowski

Notre Dame University

Fenice Boyd

University of Georgia

Karen Bromley

Binghamton University

Martha Carr

University of Georgia

Suzanne Clewell

Montgomery County Public Schools Rockville, Maryland

Joan Coley

Western Maryland College

Michelle Commeyras

University of Georgia

Linda Cooper

Shaker Heights City Schools Shaker Heights, Ohio

Karen Costello

Connecticut Department of Education Hartford, Connecticut

Jim Cunningham

Gibsonville, North Carolina

Karin Dahl

Ohio State University

Marcia Delany

Wilkes County Public Schools Washington, Georgia

Lynne Diaz-Rico

California State University-San
Bernardino

Mark Dressman

Maik Diessillan

New Mexico State University

Ann Duffy

University of Georgia

Ann Egan-Robertson

Amherst College

Jim Flood

San Diego State University

Dana Fox

University of Arizona

Linda Gambrell

University of Maryland College Park

Mary Graham

McLean, Virginia

Rachel Grant

University of Maryland College Park

Barbara Guzzetti

Arizona State University

Frances Hancock

Concordia College of Saint Paul, Minnesota

Kathleen Heubach

University of Georgia

Sally Hudson-Ross

University of Georgia

Cynthia Hynd

University of Georgia

Gay Ivey

University of Georgia

David Jardine

University of Calgary

Robert Jimenez

University of Oregon

Michelle Kelly

University of Utah

James King

University of South Florida

Kate Kirby

Gwinnett County Public Schools Lawrenceville, Georgia

Linda Labbo

University of Georgia

Michael Law

University of Georgia

Donald T. Leu

Syracuse University



Susan Lytle

University of Pennsylvania

Bert Mangino

Las Vegas, Nevada

Susan Mazzoni

Baltimore, Maryland

Ann Dacey McCann

University of Maryland College Park

Sarah McCarthey

University of Texas at Austin

Veda McClain

University of Georgia

Lisa McFalls

University of Georgia

Randy McGinnis

University of Maryland

Mike McKenna

Georgia Southern University

Barbara Michalove

Fowler Drive Elementary School

Athens, Georgia

Elizabeth B. Moje

University of Utah

Lesley Morrow

Rutgers University

Bruce Murray

University of Georgia

Susan Neuman

Temple University

John O'Flahavan

University of Maryland College Park

Marilyn Ohlhausen-McKinney

University of Nevada

Penny Oldfather

University of Georgia

Barbara M. Palmer

Mount Saint Mary's College

Stephen Phelps

Buffalo State College

Mike Pickle

Georgia Southern University

Amber T. Prince

Berry College

Gaoyin Qian

Lehman College-CUNY

Tom Reeves

University of Georgia

Lenore Ringler

New York University

Mary Roe

University of Delaware

Nadeen T. Ruiz

California State University-

Sacramento

Olivia Saracho

University of Maryland College Park

Paula Schwanenflugel

University of Georgia

Robert Serpell

University of Maryland Baltimore

County

Betty Shockley

Fowler Drive Elementary School

Athens, Georgia

Wayne H. Slater

University of Maryland College Park

Margaret Smith

Las Vegas, Nevada

Susan Sonnenschein

University of Maryland Baltimore

County

Bernard Spodek

University of Illinois

Bettie St. Pierre

University of Georgia

Steve Stahl

University of Georgia

Roger Stewart

University of Wyoming

Anne P. Sweet

Office of Educational Research

and Improvement

Louise Tomlinson

University of Georgia

Bruce VanSledright

University of Maryland College Park

Barbara Walker

Eastern Montana University-Billings

Louise Waynant

Prince George's County Schools

Upper Marlboro, Maryland

Dera Weaver

Athens Academy

Athens, Georgia

Jane West

Agnes Scott College

Renee Weisburg

Elkins Park, Pennsylvania

Allan Wigfield

University of Maryland College Park

Shelley Wong

University of Maryland College Park

Josephine Peyton Young

University of Georgia

Hallic Yopp

California State University



About the Authors

Rose Marie Codling is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Maryland. She is a former classroom teacher and research assistant at the National Reading Research Center. She currently teaches undergraduate courses in reading methods. Her research interests are in the areas of motivation and reading disability. Ms. Codling is a member of the International Reading Association. Herpublications have appeared in *The Reading Teacher*, and *Literacy: Issues and Practices* (journal of the State of Maryland International Reading Association Council).

Linda B. Gambrell is Associate Dean of Faculty Research and Professor of Curriculum at the University of Maryland. She is also a principal investigator with the National Reading Research Center and a former classroom teacher and reading teacher at the elementary school level. In recent years, Dr. Gambrell's research has focused on comprehension processes and the role of children's literature in the reading program. She has published in *The Reading Teacher*, *Journal of Reading*, and *Reading Research Quarterly*. She has served as co-editor of the *Journal of Reading Behavior* and on the Board of Directors of the International Reading Association.

Aileen Kennedy is a doctoral student at the University of Maryland College Park. A former classroom teacher, she has worked as a building-level Reading Specialist, a Head Teacher in an alternative learning center for learning-disabled children, and a Chapter I Inservice-Teacher Trainer. Her research interests include student motivation and classroom assessment practices.

Barbara Martin Palmer, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor of Education at Mount Saint Mary's College, Emmitsburg, MD. Previously, Dr. Palmer taught high school Spanish. As a Reading Specialist, she taught reading and study skills at a variety of levels. In addition to literacy motivation, her research interests include comprehension, metacognition, and teacher education. Presently, Dr. Palmer serves on the Board of Directors of the College Reading Association, sits on several review boards, and edits Literacy: Issues and Practices, the journal of the State of Maryland International Reading Association Council. Her publications have appeared in the National Reading Conference Yearbook, Educational Psychologist, Contemporary Psychology, and The Reading Teacher.

Mary Graham is the Language Arts Specialist for Projects for Arlington Public School, Arlington, Virginia. Recent areas of interest in literacy projects include establishing a balanced readers' and writers' workshop approach in elementary classrooms. Publications on several of the special projects have appeared in the Greater Washington Reading Council's Annual Journal. In 1992, Mary received the Leigh Culley Memorial Action Research Grant from the Greater Washington Reading Council for a kindergarten intervention program, and, in 1995, the Virginia State Reading Association's Research Award for research on The Literature Response Workshop, a variation on readers' workshop.



National Reading Research Center Universities of Georgia and Maryland Reading Research Report No. 59 Summer 1996

The Teacher, the Text, and the Context: Factors that Influence Elementary Students' Motivation to Write

Rose Marie Codling

Linda B. Gambrell

Aileen Kennedy

Barbara Martin Palmer

Mary Graham

University of Maryland College Park

Abstract. This study investigated the writing motivation of 145 third- and fifth-grade students. Because self-perceived competence and task value interact in important ways to influence an individual's motivation, these two constructs were used as the basis for measuring children's motivation to write in this study. Students responded to the Motivation to Write Scale (MWS), a two-part survey designed to tap students' self-perceived competence as writers and the value they place on writing. In addition, 80 students participated in an interview to discuss their writing experiences. Classroom observations were conducted to learn more about the typical writing activities of these students. A qualitative analysis revealed the important role of three factors in students' writing motivation: the teacher, the type of text students encounter, and the classroom context.

Studies of the emergent literacy period reveal that when allowed and encouraged to explore literacy, young children learn about written language very naturally (Harste, Woodward, & Burke, 1984; Holdaway, 1979; Strick-

land & Morrow, 1989). In fact, young children often show an interest in writing before they actually read (Bissex, 1980; Durkin, 1966; Hall, Moretz & Statom, 1976). Calkins (1986) contends that human beings have an innate need to write which helps us to understand and organize our personal experiences.

Despite this seemingly natural inclination to write, teachers often encounter students who do not view writing as a meaningful or purposeful activity, or one in which they would engage by choice. Some children appear to be highly motivated to engage in writing while others will go to great lengths to avoid any task that involves writing. Calkins (1986) goes on to point out that many students will complete assigned writing tasks without ever becoming "deeply and personally involved in their writing" (p. 5).

Engaging students in writing and providing them with sustained opportunities to write is important for improving their writing abilities



(Applebee, Langer, Mullis, Latham & Gentile, 1994). This was one of several important findings which resulted from the most recent National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) conducted among 4th-, 8th-, and 12thgrade students around the nation. A second finding was that many students find writing difficult and perform poorly on certain types of writing. Students found narrative writing tasks the least difficult while the majority of students produced only "minimally developed" responses to the informative writing tasks. Students at all three grade levels found persuasive writing the most difficult, especially the task of providing evidence to support their arguments. Additionally, students who reported enjoying writing had higher average writing proficiency than students who said they did not like to write.

Teachers are more interested than ever before in how to motivate children to write and how to help them become good, effective writers. The current interest in writing is largely a result of the knowledge that writing proficiency is a critical factor in educating students for the diverse demands of today's society (Freedman, Dyson, Flower, & Chafe, 1987; Graves, 1995).

What initiates and sustains students' motivation to write? How do teachers nurture and support students in their writing development? These questions guided the present investigation.

Motivation

Motivation has been studied from many perspectives in a number of different fields.

From this body of work, we know that motivation is a fascinating and complex phenomenon in which various factors interact to produce different patterns of motivational behavior (Ford, 1992; McCombs, 1991; Oldfather, 1993). Two factors that have consistently emerged in past research on motivation are task value and self-perceived competence.

Expectancy-value theory posits that the value an individual places on a task or goal determines whether or not the individual will expend the effort necessary to accomplish it. For example, imagine an individual who learns that her company is expanding and will be opening a new branch office in two years. Having had 15 years of experience in the field and 10 years with the company, she feels that she would have a tremendous advantage for promotion. However, she also realizes that she will need to complete her college degree in order to qualify for a new position. Her decision to complete her schooling will be largely influenced by the value she affords to the new position. If she feels that acquiring the new job is personally valuable to her, she is likely to spend an inordinate amount of time doing whatever is necessary to reach that goal.

Other theories of motivation also attach importance to the construct of "value." In Ford's (1992) Motivational Systems Theory, goals are most likely to be pursued if they are personally relevant and important. Self-determination theory posits that individuals will be more willing to engage in activities, even those that are not of inherent interest, if the ultimate goal is of personal value (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991). In addition, research has shown that students who perceive



a task as important will engage in the task in a more planful and effortful manner (Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck & Elliott, 1983; Paris & Oka, 1986).

A second factor that influences an individual's motivation is self-perceived competence. An individual's sense of personal competence at achieving a goal directly influences that person's decision to pursue the goal. In the previous example, the worker who has fulfilled past job requirements efficiently is likely to have a sense that she can handle new responsibilities. In addition, if she has experienced success at school experiences in the past, she may be willing to take the classes necessary to complete her degree. Conversely, if she has had difficulty fulfilling her present job requirements, has been unsuccessful at schooling in the past, or for some other reason anticipates being unable to reach her goal because she lacks competence, she is not as likely to pursue the new position.

This example demonstrates how an individual's expectations of success or failure, based on his/her sense of personal competence, influence motivation. Many studies lend support to the important role of self-competence in task engagement (Bandura, 1989; Covington, 1985; Deci et al., 1991; Dweck, 1986; Spaulding, 1992; Weiner, 1990).

Because task value and self-perceived competence interact in important ways to influence motivation, they became the focal points for assessing students' levels of writing motivation in this study. A survey instrument which focuses on these two constructs was developed and used with students.

Social Context of Learning and Motivation

Children come to understand written language in much the same way they learn spoken language. It is through interaction with other people engaged in the authentic uses of written language that meaning is constructed (Dyson, 1989).

Recent views of learning acknowledge the important role of social factors in the classroom learning environment (Hamilton, 1983). In fact, a number of social factors have been shown to mediate behavior, affect, and cognition. For example, Forman and Cazden (1994) demonstrated through an intensive set of investigations that peers working in either a tutoring or collaborative setting can accomplish cognitive tasks together that they could not accomplish alone. This extends the Vygotskian (1978) concept of scaffolding in which cognitive growth results from the interaction between a child and an adult. More importantly, it highlights the important role of peer interaction in the classroom setting.

A number of studies support the important role of social factors in motivation. Ames (1984) found that structural characteristics of school systems affect motivation. For instance, competitive environments encourage students to engage in social comparisons and their goal becomes one of trying to "look better" than other students. Within this context, ability is valued more than effort. A cooperative environment, in contrast, focuses on mastery of the task and learning as an end in itself. In this case, one competes only with oneself and effort becomes salient over ability. Other investigations have also found that motivation is



enhanced when the teacher provides an environment which encourages students to adopt a learning-oriented, rather than a performance-oriented stance (Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck, 1986; Nolen, 1988).

The Study

The present study explored children's motivation to write using a variety of data sources. Classroom observations, student surveys, student interviews, and teacher surveys revealed layers of detailed information on what motivates children to create meaning about written language within the social context of the classroom. The analysis of data from several sources enabled an integrative interpretation which provided a view of the lived experiences of these students (Moss, 1994).

Participants and Setting

The populations of the schools in which this study was conducted represent a range of ethnic and socioeconomic groups. Three schools and a total of 145 students participated. These students came from eight classrooms in the schools described below. Four of the classrooms were comprised of third graders (N = 72); four were comprised of fifth graders (N = 73).

School A is located in a community of approximately 186,000 people, just outside a large metropolitan city. The school has a student enrollment of 568. The ethnic majority is Hispanic (44%). Other nationalities represented include African American (34%), Caucasian (12%), and Asian (9%). Sixty-seven

percent of the students qualify for the free/reduced lunch program.

School B is situated in a rapidly growing suburb of the same city, with a population just over 100,000. The school enrolls 565 students. Seventy-six percent of the students are Caucasian, 19% are African American, 2% are Asian, 2% are Hispanic, while less than 1% is American Indian. The free/reduced lunch program is utilized by 17% of the students.

School C is located in a nearby community of approximately 60,000 people and is described by the principal as primarily a farming community. The school has an enrollment of 921. The majority of students are Caucasian (90%) followed in number by African American (6%). Free or reduced lunches are received by 3% of the students.

The experience of the eight participating teachers ranged from 1 year to 21 years, with a mean of 12 years of experience. The teachers in this study reported learning how to teach writing from undergraduate and graduate courses and from inservice sessions. Two teachers rated their writing instruction as satisfactory, while four rated themselves as good and two as excellent.

The eight teachers in this study reported using a variety of approaches to reading instruction. All of the teachers use children's literature or a combination of basal readers and children's literature. They reported involving their students in a variety of activities. For example, the children engage in brainstorming, creative writing, and revision most often. Many students also write in some type of journal. Teachers themselves appear to make use of mini-lessons, written



feedback, holistic scoring, and teacher-student conferences.

Procedures and Materials

Data for this study were collected through classroom observations, student surveys, and student interviews. In addition, teacher surveys were administered. The study was conducted over a 4-month period. First, full-day observations were conducted in each of the target classrooms in November and December. These observations provided an overall sense of the literacy program which existed in each classroom. The observations also served to validate teacher and student reports about typical classroom activities. In early January, the students responded to a survey, the Motivation to Write Scale (MWS). The MWS is a two-part questionnaire designed to elicit information about students' self-perceived competence and the value they place on writing. Toward the end of January, 10 students were randomly selected from each classroom to participate in the Motivation to Write Interview. The interview provided personally relevant information about the writing of individual students. In early February, the teachers completed a written survey which tapped information about their backgrounds and typical writing instruction in their classrooms.

Classroom Observations

Research assistants observed each class for 2 full days, for a total of 4,277 min. In order to preserve the integrity of the existing program, the observers did not overtly participate

in the ongoing classroom activities. Extensive field notes were recorded on a Classroom Observation Form (Appendix A). The form, which was constructed by the researchers, was used to record general information about the composition of the class, the physical arrangement of the room, and instructional activities conducted throughout the day. Part A, General Information, included information about the size of the class and the number of boys and girls. It also included the grouping criterion for the class and information about exceptional students included in the regular class. The second part of the observation form, Physical Environment, included a rough sketch of movement patterns and the layout of furniture and centers in the room. The interest areas and special centers were described in terms of materials and typical activities. Instructional o Activities were recorded on the third part of the observation form. Times, topics, and teacher and student behaviors were recorded. For each instructional activity, the type of (1) social interaction, (2) materials, and (3) grouping were recorded.

Motivation to Write Scale (MWS)

Based upon the important influence of task value and self-competence on motivation, an instrument was developed by the researchers to focus on these constructs. Part A, "What Do You Think About Writing?" explores the value children place on writing (Appendix B). It includes 14 likert-type items, each with four possible responses. In order to avoid repetition in the presentation of the response alternatives and to control



for the threat of "response set" (i.e., children selecting the same response for each item), some response alternatives proceed from most to least positive while others are ordered in the opposite way. Items focus on issues that reflect the value students attach to writing tasks, such as writing narrative and informational text, sharing writing, and time spent writing. The last item in Part A of the MWS (#15) requests students to indicate which one of several options they would select if they were given a choice of writing activities. Students are directed to check one activity to show their preference.

Part B, "How Do You Feel About Your Writing?" examines students' self-concepts as writers (Appendix C). It contains 12 items designed to detect how students feel about their competence as authors of expository and narrative text. This scale also includes likert-type items and the four response options again alternated from positive to negative or negative to positive. The last item in Part B (#13) taps information about the writing activities students engage in on a regular basis. This item requests students to indicate the kinds of writing they have done this week.

The two parts of the MWS were administered to 72 third- and 73 fifth-grade students in their own classrooms. They were administered by research assistants on different days during the same week. Students were given directions to listen as the items were read aloud by the research assistant and then mark their answers. The MWS items were read aloud to remove reading ability as a possible confounding variable.

Motivation to Write Interview

An Interview was developed by the researchers for use in this study (Appendix D). Researchers have a long-standing tradition of using interviews to gather information about the experience of others (Fontana & Frey, 1994). Listening to the perspectives of research subjects reveals important insights for understanding their world (Seidman, 1991). In order to capture the essence of students' opinions and experiences, the semistructured interview used in this study utilized open-ended questions (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Silverman, 1993). However, the questions were used flexibly and interesting leads were explored by the interviewer.

The Interview questions were primarily open-ended and children were encouraged to elaborate with prompts such as "Tell me about that" and "Can you tell me any more?" Prior to general use, the Interview was pilot tested to clarify the wording of questions and estimate time requirements.

Interview questions focus on five areas of interest with regard to writing. First, we were interested in learning about specific writing experiences of the students. Students recalled and described a specific piece of writing they had recently completed. Second, we inquired about the more general writing experiences students had. We asked questions such as, "Do you ever talk to anyone at home about the things you write?" A third area of interest was the connection students made between their past and present literacy experiences, a concept called intertextuality (Cairney, 1990). We asked, "Do you ever think of stories you've



read when you are writing a story?" Fourth, we asked questions about planning, drafting, and revising in order to acquire information on students' engagement in the writing process. Finally, we focused on the students' perceptions of their own writing competence. Forty students at each grade level were randomly selected to participate in the interviews. The students were interviewed individually, for approximately 30 min, in a quiet area away from the classroom to avoid distractions. The interviews were tape recorded and transcribed for later analysis.

Teacher Survey

At the conclusion of the data collection period, teachers were asked to respond to a survey which was designed to provide information about their backgrounds and writing instruction in their classrooms (Appendix E). Responses to the survey were then compared with the writing instruction that was observed.

The two-page survey contained general questions about grade level, teaching experience, training in writing instruction, and practices related to writing. The teachers were also asked to indicate the frequency with which they utilize certain student and teacher activities such as journal writing, revision, and minilessons.

Data Analysis

Classroom Observations

Each of the eight classes in the study was observed for 2 full days. The field notes from

the observations were read in their entirety several times to search for information about elementary-aged writers and to confirm the information provided on the teacher survey. Specifically, the researchers looked at the type of writing in which students engaged and categorized the writing as either perfunctory or sustained. Perfunctory was defined as writing done to accomplish a routine or as writing involving one sentence or less. Sustained writing consisted of one or more paragraphs. In the context of the sustained writing opportunities, we looked at the amount and type of instructional support provided by teachers. For each of the writing activities, we also analyzed the type of social interaction prevalent (teacher-student, student-student), the materials utilized, and the way in which students were grouped.

Motivation to Write Scale (MWS)

The two-part MWS provided information about the value students place on writing and their self-perceived competence. For each item on the MWS, the percentage of students responding to each option are presented in Appendix F.

Motivation to Write Interview

The Interview, which was designed to elicit students' personal insights about writing, was tape recorded and transcribed verbatim. In order to determine patterns of response, a rubric was developed which quantified much of the information provided by students (Appendix G). Two research assistants read through



10% of the transcribed interviews at each grade level and scored the student responses according to the rubric. When results were compared, interrater agreement was .94 for third grade and .95 for fifth grade. Responses on the remaining interviews were then analyzed according to the rubric.

The transcripts were then studied qualitatively using the constant comparison method of analysis for conceptualizing and categorizing data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Both research assistants read through the interviews several times, then compared notes on patterns that emerged from the responses. Consistent patterns were identified as "themes" which became the focal point for the final analysis.

Teacher Surveys

The surveys completed by the teachers at the culmination of the study provided information about the teachers' background and writing practices. Percentages, means, and standard deviations were calculated for the numerical items. In addition, the questions were analyzed qualitatively to determine the type of environment teachers created for enhancing writing development. Teachers' responses on the surveys were also compared with field notes made during the classroom observations.

Results

Each piece of data collected over the course of this study added a dimension to the picture that emerged of the elementary-aged

writer. The MWS revealed how children felt about themselves as writers and the writing in which they engage. Specifically, the student surveys provided information about the value students place on different kinds of writing and their self-perceived competence as writers. The Interviews provided in-depth information about individual students which corroborated the MWS data, contributing to the overall picture of the writing experiences of elementary-aged students. The classroom observations shed light on the social context in which writing occurs. They also served to corroborate information provided on the teacher survey. The teacher surveys provided still more information, revealing insights about the teachers themselves.

Several patterns emerged when the data were examined. The patterns can be reflected in the following categories.

- (1) purpose and value of writing
- (2) self-concept as a writer
- (3) social influences
- (4) text-related factors
- (5) instructional influences

Purpose and Value of Writing

Children at both grade levels seemed to have a good grasp of what writing is "all about." During the Interview, they described a variety of important reasons why people write, reasons which emphasize the functional, purposeful nature of writing.

 To teach people things, and so there would be story books for their kids.



- Maybe because they are in a different country than their friend is and they want to write to them.
- Well, to improve your grades in school and to get a letter to someone.
- Oh, to make stories for kids to read and stuff.
 So kids would be interested if they didn't have no toys or stuff to play with.
- For when they're older and stuff, and they get a job.
- To get information.

In addition, many fifth graders saw writing as a vehicle for expressing personal feelings.

- I think it expresses your ideas and it gets things off your mind when you're feeling frustrated.
- Depression. They want to write it down so they can forget about it and put it away. Sometimes if you're happy you want to write about your day in your journal.
- I think they write to enjoy themselves because writing you can express a lot of feelings or what you did that day. We just read a book, *Bridge of Tarabithia*, and there's a little part in the book that said that the author used her feelings to express this story, so I think you can really share your feelings with what you write or get a message across to people that you want them to know or do.

Several items on the MWS also indicated that students value writing as a worthwhile activity (see items 6, 8, 9, & 10 in Table 1).

For instance, many share their writing with others and anticipate writing when they are older. It is interesting to note that approximately 25% of students reported seeing little or no writing being done by family members. Despite this, at both grade levels, students' responses indicated that they are aware of the importance of writing.

Self-Concept as a Writer

While many children in this study reported that they were satisfied with their writing ability and enjoy sharing their writing, a relatively large percentage of the students view themselves as "poor" or simply "OK" writers (see items 1, 4, 5, & 6 in Table 2).

Perceptions of others played a large role in children's developing sense of themselves as authors.

 Well, if they write some stories that a lot of people like, then that must make them a good writer, and if they have a good feeling about theirself, they might be a good writer.

In addition, children reported feeling a particular way about themselves as a result of the grades they receive, spelling or handwriting skill, and ability to come up with good ideas.

- Most of my reports get O's on them and I think that that's why.
- Because I have good ideas. I think I write pretty good words.
- I showed everybody in my class and then they said my handwriting is good.



Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations for Items Reflecting Students' Self-Perceptions of the Value of Writing*

		Gra	de 3	Grad	e 5
Item		М	SD	М	SD
1.	I would like for my teacher to let us write STORIES	2.80	.898	2.85	.844
2.	I would like for my teacher to let us write REPORTS	2.29	.999	1.88	.644
3.	I share what I write with my classmates.	2.97	.804	3.04	.611
4.	Writing STORIES is something I like to do.	3.21	.786	3.38	.700
5.	Writing REPORTS is something I like to do.	2.67	1.075	2.26	.898
6.	Knowing how to write well is	3.58	.687	3.58	.686
7.	People who write a lot are	3.18	.909	3.19	.700
8.	I share what I write with my family.	3.56	.710	3.21	.942
9.	Other people in my house write	2.99	.831	2.97	.816
10.	When I grow up I think I will spend	3.17	.692	3.11	.756
11.	I save the things I write.	3.03	.855	3.11	.859
12.	I think writing STORIES is	3.07	.909	3.04	.964
13.	I think writing REPORTS is	2.57	1.161	2.03	.833
14.	I write something	3.06	1.019	3.14	.805

^{*}Students responded to a likert-type scale in which 1 represented the most negative option and 4 represented the most positive option.

- I don't get that much good ideas. Some of my books are boring.
- I'm not terrific because I always do make mistakes, but I do make it very interesting



and nice and long normally, and I really like that.

Despite how they view themselves as writers, a large majority (90% of third graders and 95% of fifth graders) were able to tell about something they have written recently with which they were very pleased. They described a number of reasons why.

- Well, it was like two pages, one page, and I spelled all the words right and my parents and my sister liked it.
- Well, this story that I wrote in third grade, that scary story, I really liked writing that. 'Cause I had a lot of funny, funny ideas plus scary ideas mixed together in them.
- It was neat, kind of like a fantasy. It was neat
 because I enjoyed writing it and things came
 into my head that I thought was interesting.
 Like when you read a story, you're like
 "WOW" and when I wrote it, I was like
 "WOW" when I wrote it. That was cool.
- Because I knew I did a good job and I elaborated more.

When asked questions about their feelings related to their story and report writing, students were consistently less confident in their ability as authors of expository text (see items 2 and 3 in Table 2). This was especially true for fifth graders who showed a marked increase in negative feelings toward report writing. The finding that expository writing is troublesome for elementary students is an important one that

surfaced repeatedly on both the MWS and Interview.

Social Influences

On the MWS and during the Interview, students indicated how their writing was influenced by other people. Particularly salient were other people's reactions to the students' writing. For example, to the question, "Have you ever felt really good about something you've written?", children's responses often revealed that it was other people's comments that supported their feelings.

- Well, one story that I wrote yesterday. I really thought that it was really good because everybody liked it, what I wrote.
- Everyone like, like read it and they would love it. And I got a good applause too.
- It felt good writing it and my mom told me that she liked it a lot. She thought I did a nice job.
- When I shared it with her (cousin) she was like, she, she was just jumping on the bed laughing at the story cause she liked it!

In response to the question, "What kind of writer do you think you are?", comments again reflected the influence of other people.

- Some kids say that some of my, um, letters and stories are really good.
- One of the stories I wrote, which was *The Magic Totem Pole*, which was probably the best one



Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations for Items Reflecting Students' Self-Perceived Competence as Writers*

		Gra	de 3	Grad	le 5
Item		М	SD	М	SD
1.	My friends think I am a writer.	3.11	.815	2.99	.677
2.	When I write STORIES, I feel	3.60	.685	3.27	.768
3.	When I write REPORTS, I feel	3.17	.919	2.97	.781
4.	I like to read what I write to others.	2.75	.989	2.59	.879
5.	When I write STORIES, I think I am	3.35	.754	2.88	.744
6.	When I write REPORTS, I think I am	3.15	.850	2.75	.795
7.	When I don't know what to write about, I	3.46	.604	3.56	.666
8.	The STORIES I write are usually	3.53	.649	3.11	.636
9.	The REPORTS I write are usually	3.00	.979	2.66	.786
10.	What others think about my writing is important to me.	3.26	1.021	3.01	.965
11.	Writing STORIES is	3.42	.765	3.33	.765
12.	Writing REPORTS is	3.04	.830	2.64	.888

^{*}Students responded to a likert-type scale in which 1 represented the most negative option and 4 represented the most positive option.

one I've written so far was um, like we did a, me and my friends did a play out of it because they thought it was so good.

- When I'm done writing, um, I show her (mom) the story and she says, "That's great!" and then, in school my teacher usually, um, does the same thing.
- Well, I think I'm a good writer because everyone likes my books.
- Sometimes I don't really want to write, but deep inside I do want to write so I write better stories and people like them so. And one day, my teacher she like them so much,



she read them to the class. And that's why I think I'm a good writer.

- I'm a terrific writer because a lot of people think my writing is well and that I do really good work. Usually I use what other people think, then what I think, because I think what other people think is what really matters.
- A lot of people think my work is good.

The children at both grade levels spoke positively about the feedback they receive from classmates with regard to their writing. Overall, they seem to enjoy sharing their work and feel that classmates' editing assistance is valuable.

- I feel good because I mean, I can't do everything perfectly and they're trying to help me do it better the next time. So I feel good.
- I feel good because I know that my friends are not afraid to say something to me.
- I heard he (classmate) is a really organized writer and he knows a lot about writing and organizing his work so I mostly take his word.
- I usually feel good cause then I know I can improve my story and make it better.
- I could learn by watching other people like Jody and Katie and take suggestions from them and ask them what they do to make their writing really good and try some of their ideas.

When asked, "Do you ever talk with anyone about your writing?", a majority mentioned family members. When questioned about these conversations, students indicated that parents and siblings offer a strong support system in a number of ways.

- They used to write stories when they were little
 and they would share them with me because we
 keep like a scrap box, and then I want to have
 some when I grow up so I started to write
 some.
- I talk to my mom and I talk to my dad and sometimes I talk to my sister 'cause she comes to my room when I'm writing. And she reads it and she asks me questions about what am I doing. And I tell her that I'm writing stories. They tell me someday you might become an author and you might become an author with, with your turkey and rooster stories. And I tell them, "Okay, I'll try."
- If I'm doing a report, most of the time I'll ask
 my mom like if she knows anything about the
 topic and then she'll usually give me ideas and
 then I'll look up some of those ideas.
- Some of them I share with my mom. She, and she has this little box that you put all of our good work in.
- One time I couldn't wait until my mom got home to show her a story I'd been writing.
- Whenever I publish a book, I share it with my whole family. I bring them to the living room and read it.



- Yeah, they (mom and dad) make suggestions and tell me if this sentence is good or not.
- I don't know where to end and start a sentence, so I have to ask my mom, and when my mom's not home, I have to ask my dad.
- Yes, I talk to my mom and she'll help me with my spelling and she'll, um, tell me if it's the correct pronunciation. Well, she looks over it and she'll tell me if it's sloppy or nicely done.

Students reported that teachers were the individuals who most often excite them about writing. Especially at the fifth-grade level, students were quick to respond that their teacher sparks their interest in writing. Parents were also mentioned in this context but not as frequently.

- My teacher makes me interested a little bit in stories cause how she write her stories, it makes me think I want to write one too.
- My first-grade teacher, she really inspired me on writing because she was a really good writer. We wrote original stories every single day in the morning, so she like gave us really good ideas, and whenever we did a really good job on it, she put it outside the classroom so everyone who passed by could see it.

Some informal social interaction among students was observed. However, despite the obvious positive impact of social interaction on these students, teachers were not observed to set aside time for, or sanction, social interaction related to students' writing.

Text-Related Factors

Narrative and expository writing. Throughout the Interview students spoke about various pieces of writing. With few exceptions, the discussions revolved around narrative writing. Only 18% of third-grade and 3% of fifthgrade students discussed writing informational text.

I don't like writing reports. That's the only thing I don't like writing. I think they take too long. I like writing paragraphs, like two paragraphs or three at the most on a piece of paper. But I don't like writing reports!

The MWS responses also revealed consistent differences in the way children view narrative and expository writing. Students were less confident in their ability to write expository text and seem to place less value on informational text. For the items that explore narrative and expository writing, regardless of grade level, children were more positive about narrative writing (see items 1 and 2 in Table 1, and items 2 and 3 in Table 2).

When the students were asked to choose from among 11 options the activity they would choose if they could do any writing in the next 20 minutes, the most frequently reported response was "write a story" for both fifth graders (32%) and third graders (33%). Only 8% of third graders chose "write a report," while no fifth graders chose that option.

Professional authors. A few children described the influence of professional authors on their writing. This was interesting in light of the fact that we did not specifically ask about authors.

ERIC

- Especially James Howe. He's my favorite author. He gets me going because he writes the best stuff. The way he tells them, it really gets you going and he also gives you good ideas.
- I really like Tomie DePaola, so I try to be like him.
- When I read Fudgemania, you could tell when they went to Maine it was probably an experience that happened to the writer.

One child, when asked to reflect on what makes a good writer, considered an author he was currently reading.

• I'm reading this story called Fellowship of the Ring by J.R.R. Tolkien, and it like shows every little detail. You know in some stories they say, "We must go here" and then one sentence later they are there. But in this story, they show them hiking. Write them like they are hiking and it showed that and the little songs that they sing.

Intertextuality. Among the third graders, 70% reported that they think of stories they have read when writing their own stories. Of that number, 75% referred to books while a few mentioned newspaper or magazine articles that related to their writing. A total of 93% of fifth graders reported thinking of stories they read while writing. Of those, 83% referred to books and 8% referred to their classmates' stories. Some students' comments were general. Others were very specific, mentioning titles that influenced their writing.

• By reading a lot, you get ideas of writing.

Or I'll read a story and like it, and I go and try
to write a story that's like that or has the
same point that they tried to get across, the
same theme. I would try to put it in one of my
stories.

Instructional Influences

The classroom observations and teacher surveys provided information about instruction. Additionally, the following section describes (1) the amount and kind of daily writing in which students engage, and (2) the kinds of things teachers appear to focus on such as elaboration, process writing, and teaching strategies. Even though there were not specific questions on the MWS about the instructional setting and activities, children's responses revealed the strong impact of the instructional curriculum.

Daily writing. Third graders appeared to engage in daily writing more often than fifth graders. Overall, however, many children reported doing very little writing during the school day. To the item, "I write something _____," 35% of third graders and 23% of fifth graders responded only "once in a while" or "hardly ever." The writing they engaged in most frequently included writing for fun, writing in journals, and writing notes to friends.

Based on the classroom observations, it was difficult to calculate the number of minutes that children were engaged in writing because the writing activities were frequently integrated with other activities such as discussion, sharing, feedback from others, or reading. Over the 2-day period, however, every teacher was observed to assign at least one sustained

ERIC FOUNDS DEVERING

Student Activities	Mean	SD
brainstorming	3.25	.708
creative writing	3.00	.756
revision	3.00	.756
peer conferences	2.88	.641
reading their writing to others	2.75	.707
response journals	2.63	.916
portfolios	2.50	1.07
persuasive writing	2.00	.535
report writing	2.13	.353
dialogue journals	2.00	1.07

Table 3. Student Writing Activities Reported by Teachers

Rating Scale: 1 = never; 2 = sometimes; 3 = usually; and 4 = always.

writing activity. Journal writing was observed in five of the classes, while a sixth teacher reported that her students write in journals several times per week. The observations revealed that with the exception of a "creative writing" period in one class, all writing topics, including journal topics, were selected by the teacher.

There was wide variability in teachers' reports of the writing activities their students complete. Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations for the frequency with which teachers assign these activities. The following activities were reported to be done at least sometimes in all classrooms surveyed: brainstorming, persuasive writing, report writing, creative writing, peer conferences, revision, reading their writing to others. Many of these activities were not observed, perhaps owing to the limited observation time. Seven out of eight teachers reported some use of

portfolios, although this was not observed in any of the classrooms.

The writing activities observed varied considerably. Some examples follow.

- Students read a passage about the hardships faced by the early colonists. Then, on a problem/solution graphic organizer, they were to list the problems the colonists encountered and possible solutions. Using this information, they constructed a paragraph.
- The students planned by writing three things they "felt" and three things they "knew" about homework, then drafted a convincing editorial.
- After reading Pandora's Box, students used a Venn diagram to list similarities and differences between themselves and Pandora. Students then wrote a personal response about a time they were curious like Pandora.



- Students engaged in creative writing about a Christmas topic.
- The teacher presented a mini-lesson on paragraphs and main ideas and encouraged children to focus on main ideas in their writing. As students wrote, the teacher conducted individual conferences.
- Students brainstormed a list of things they like about America. Then they chose one thing from the list about which to write.
- The teacher hung an object from a string attached to the ceiling and instructed students to write directions that would enable a person to get from a designated place in the classroom to the object.
- Students brainstormed a list of fictional characters, then chose one for a letter-writing assignment.

Instructional emphasis. On one question, differences became apparent when responses across classrooms were analyzed. When fifth graders were asked, "How can you become a better writer?", the responses of the students in two classes focused on mechanical aspects of writing such as handwriting and spelling. In another class, students focused on improving their writing by using bigger words or more variety in word choice. In still another class, the students focused on elaborating and reading more to obtain information to include in their writing.

 She wants us to be as elaborate as possible. She always tells us to pretend we are writing to somebody who never knew anything about the

- story. So you have to give enough elaboration to tell the people what's going on.
- My teacher is big on elaborating, and I like elaborate on stuff, and then she says elaborate on the elaboration!
- I wrote paragraphs, but I don't think they're that good because I don't elaborate good.

Many students discussed engaging in process writing. Among third graders, 80% described planning their writing and 83% talked about revising it. Among fifth graders, 85% plan their writing, while 93% revise it. Although most third graders answered affirmatively to revising their writing, many had some difficulty explaining why they revise.

- If I write like something and I messed up, I put the wrong thing in, I change it.
- At first I didn't think it was my best work, and after the teacher helped me, I thought it was my, one of my best work.
- It didn't sound good to me.

Those who were more articulate tended to focus on either revising for meaning or mechanics, but not both. A few reported revising their writing to make it more sensible. Others revise to improve mechanical aspects.

Fifth graders were more articulate about stories they revised and why they did so. They focused more on revising for meaning.

 To make the sentences complete and to make them sound better and to make the story more creative.



Teacher Activities	Mean	SD
written feedback	3.13	.641
mini-lessons	2.88	.641
conferences	2.75	.463
holistic scoring	2.50	.535
analytic scoring	2.13	.720

Table 4. Teaching Strategies Reported by Teachers

Rating Scale: 1 = never; 2 = sometimes; 3 = usually; and 4 = always.

- So the words weren't spelled wrong and all that, and I make sure it made sense and stuff.
- We were supposed to write a paper on the Greek god, and I wrote it, and when I went back over it, I was writing about stuff that happened to his family and not actually him, so I had to change that and focus on him more than his family.
- I usually do that when I see something that didn't make sense or I think of something that could be better, like an idea, and then I change it.

Fifth graders were also more metacognitive in their responses.

- I try to revise my writing because that's one of the things I really don't do well. I can revise and make sure everything sounds right, but then my spelling and punctuation I can't do very well.
- I like to revise a lot though because I am not a great speller, and so I need to go back and check my spelling. So I go back and when

I'm checking my spelling, I'll find something like this word that I really didn't like. So I'll go to the thesaurus and make some changes.

- Things didn't make sense to me or anything, so
 I didn't know how the reader was gonna, how
 it was gonna make sense to them, so I just
 corrected that.
- So it'd be easier to understand for little people.
 Or if it's too like a baby story and I have to read it to grown ups. I'd make sure I could change the baby words. I would make them like bigger words and stuff.
- We had to make up our own story. I didn't do very well on it because I didn't have a lot of information on it.

On the survey, teachers reported making frequent use of mini-lessons and written feedback. They reported more holistic than analytic scoring of writing. All teachers reported conducting individual conferences with students at least sometimes. Table 4 presents teachers' ratings of the frequency

ERIC

with which they use these activities. A minilesson and conferences were observed in one classroom. No scoring or other feedback on writing was observed.

Teachers provided instructional support in different ways. For example, some teachers simply reminded students of previous lessons ("Remember to include a good topic sentence and two or three supporting details"). Other teachers explicitly modeled an assignment before circulating to provide individual feedback as students wrote themselves.

Discussion

This study, while beginning to provide evidence about writing motivation, supports prior research on general motivation. That is, children's motivation to write is a complex issue, affected by many factors. For example, the teacher's attitude and actions, the type of text students read and write, and the context in which writing occurs are all factors that may have an impact on a child's motivation to write.

It is well established that in order to be motivated to engage in any activity, an individual must feel competent at accomplishing it. The teacher is in a position to provide the instruction support and scaffolding that is essential to move young writers forward in their development, thereby ensuring their competence.

Perhaps even more important may be the teacher's attitude toward writing. Teachers who believe writing to be important and interesting, and convey that attitude, encourage students to value writing as a worthwhile task.

The text students encounter in their reading has a strong influence on their writing. When children are exposed to a wide variety of reading materials, they are provided with sources for their own writing. Experience with high quality, engaging expository text early in the school years may be an important vehicle for improving children's negative feelings related to writing information text.

Creating a motivating context for students writing is an important and challenging task for teachers. This study indicates that an important component of this kind of environment is social interaction. Children frequently commented that they share their writing with, and get ideas for writing from, friends, family members, and the teacher. Of particular interest was that students' perceptions of their own writing competence was often a reflection of how others reacted to their writing, suggesting that giving and receiving feedback should not be taken lightly. Rather, it should be carefully discussed and receive attention from an instructional standpoint.

The students in this study expressed a high level of interest when they were allowed to write about self-chosen topics. Other recent research also supports the notion that choice manifests control which is an essential ingredient in intrinsic motivation (Deci et al., 1991; Turner & Paris, 1995). Creating a context in which children will be motivated means providing them with choices and opportunities to write for sustained periods of time.

Cooper (1993) maintains that motivation involves a complex set of ongoing activities and attitudes that occur in the classroom environment. These activities and attitudes help to



build a community of learners who are excited about reading and writing and want to learn. The results of this study demonstrate that within these classroom communities, writing knowledge was socially constructed, and selfperceptions of writing ability were socially constructed as well. For these students, knowledge of writing was socially constructed through peer revision, comments during sharing, teacher editing and feedback, and certain types of instruction. Self-perceptions of writing ability appeared to be socially constructed through successful experiences, comments of others, and knowledge itself. The finding that social interaction played such a critical role in knowledge acquisition and self-perception of writing ability, was an important one in this study. This study demonstrated that children come to value writing and to feel good about themselves as writers when they are given opportunities to engage in various kinds of writing in an environment in which social interaction is encouraged and instructional support is provided.

References

- Ames, C. (1984). Competitive, cooperative, and individualized goal structures: A cognitive-motivational analysis. In R. E. Ames & C. Ames (Eds.), *Motivation in education: Volume 1* (pp. 177-207). San Francisco: Academic Press.
- Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80, 260-267.
- Applebee, A. N., Langer, J. A., Mullis, I. V. S., Latham, A. S., & Gentile, C. A. (1994). *NAEP*

- 1992 Writing report card. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist*, 44, 1175-1184.
- Bissex, G. L. (1980). Gnys at wrk: A child learns to write and read. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cairney, T. (1990). Intertextuality: Infectious echoes from the past. *Reading Teacher*, 43, 478-484.
- Calkins, L. (1986). The art of teaching writing. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cooper, J. D. (1993). Literacy: Helping children construct meaning (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Covington, M. V. (1985). The motive for self-worth. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), Research on motivation in education: The classroom milieu (pp. 77-113). New York: Academic Press.
- Deci, E. L, Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, 26, 325-346.
- Durkin, D. (1966). *Children who read early*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist*, 41, 1040-1048.
- Dweck, C., & Elliott, E. (1983). Achievement motivation. In E. M. Heatherington (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4, Socialization, personality, and social development (pp. 643-691). New York: Wiley.
- Dyson, A. H. (1989). Multiple worlds of child writers. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (1994). Interviewing: The art of science. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 361-376). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.



- Ford, M. E. (1992). *Motivating humans*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Forman, E. A., & Cazden, C. B. (1994). Exploring Vygotskian perspectives in education: The cognitive value of peer interaction. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (4th ed., pp. 155-178). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Freedman, S. W., Dyson, A. H. Flower, L., & Chafe, W. (1987). Research in writing: Past, present, and future (Technical Report No. 1). Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Writing.
- Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. New York: Academic Press.
- Graves, D. H. (1995). A fresh look at writing. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hall, M. A., Moretz, S. A., & Statom, J. (1976). Writing before grade one—A study of early writers. *Language Arts*, 53, 582-585.
- Hamilton, S. F. (1983). The social side of schooling: Ecological studies of classrooms and schools. *Elementary School Journal*, 83, 313–334.
- Harste, J., Woodward, V., & Burke, C. (1984).
 Language stories and literacy lessons. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Holdaway, D. (1979). *The foundations of literacy*. New York: Ashton Scholastic.
- McCombs, B. L. (1991). Unraveling motivation: New perspectives from research and practice. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 60, 3-88.
- Moss, P. A. (1994). Can there be validity without reliability? *Educational Researcher*, 23(2), 5-12.
- Nolen, S. B. (1988). Reasons for studying: Motivational orientations and study strategies. *Cognition & Instruction*, 5, 269-287.
- Oldfather, P. (1993). What students say about motivating experiences in a whole language classroom. *Reading Teacher*, 46, 672-681.

- Paris, S. G., & Oka, E. R. (1986). Self-regulated learning among exceptional children. *Exceptional Children*, 53, 103-108.
- Seidman, I. (1991). *Interviewing as qualitative research*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Silverman, D. (1993). Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text, and interaction. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Spaulding, C. L. (1992). The motivation to read and write. In J. W. Irwin & M. A. Doyle (Eds.), Reading/writing connections: Learning from research (pp. 177-201). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Strickland, D. S., & Morrow, L. M. (1989).
 Emerging literacy: Young children learn to read and write. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Turner, J., & Paris, S. G. (1995). How literacy tasks influence children's motivation for literacy. *Reading Teacher*, 48, 662-673.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Weiner, B. (1990). History of motivational research in education. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 616-622.



Appendix A

Classroom Observation Form



Classroom Observation Form

A. General Information	
School	Date
Grade level	Observer
Class size: boys girls	
Classroom characteristics (check all that apply):	
homogeneous group	
heterogenous group	
mainstreamed special education students	
Chapter 1	



(1) Room Arrangem	ent	
•		
		•
	•	
) Interest areas/spec	ial centers	
) Interest areas/spec	ial centers Description/Materials	Comments
		Comments



C. Instructional Activities

eraction	2 3											group ual
1 - Social Interaction2 - Materials3 - Grouping	1			3—Grouping	S = Small group I = Individual							
	Comments										3—	W = Whole group P = Pairs
										_		W = Who P = Pairs
	Student is										rials	CL/NE = Children's Lit/Narrative-Exp. CT = Content Texts
							•			2—Mate	2-Materials	CL/NE = Children's CT = Content Texts
	Teacher is				-					_		B = Basals R = Reference
	Topic/ Subject										1—Social Interaction	TS = Teacher-Student SS = Student-Student
	Time										1—Soc	TS = T $SS = S$

3—Grouping	S = Small group I = Individual
3—6	W = Whole group P = Pairs
2—Materials	CL/NE = Children's Lit/Narrative-Exp. CT = Content Texts VCT = Variety of Content Texts
	B = BasalsR = ReferenceW = Worksheets
1—Social Interaction	TS = Teacher-Student SS = Student-Student



Appendix B

Motivation to Write Scale Part A—Value of Writing



Name		

WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT WRITING?

San	nple	#1:	I am in	
			O 3rd grade O 5th grade	
San	nple	#2:	I am a	
			O boy O girl	
1.	I w	ould l	like for my teacher to let us write STORIES	·
	0000	almo	ry day ost every day e in a while er	
2.	I w	ould l	like for my teacher to let us write REPORTS	
	0000	almo	ry day ost every day e in a while er	
3.	I sh	are w	what I write with my classmates.	,
		I aln I do	ver do this. nost never do this. this some of the time. this a lot.	



4.	Wri	iting STORIES is something I like to do
	0	often sometimes not very often
	0	never
5.	Wri	iting REPORTS is something I like to do
	0	often
		sometimes
		not very often
	0	never
6.	Kno	owing how to write well is
	0	not important
		kind of important
		important
	0	very important
7.	Peo	ple who write a lot are
	0	very interesting
		interesting
	_	not very interesting
	0	boring
8.	I sh	are what I write with my family.
	0	I never do this.
	0	I almost never do this.
	0	I do this some of the time.
	0	I do this a lot.



9. Other people in my house			
	0000	spend a lot of time writing spend some of the time writing almost never write never write	
10.	Who	en I grow up I think I will spend	
	0000	none of my time writing very little of my time writing some of my time writing a lot of my time writing	
11.	I sa	ve the things I write.	
	0000	Always Usually Sometimes Never	
12.	I th	ink writing STORIES is	
	0000	a boring way to spend time an OK way to spend time an interesting way to spend time a great way to spend time	
13.	I thi	ink writing REPORTS is	
	0000	a boring way to spend time an OK way to spend time an interesting way to spend time a great way to spend time	



14. I w	rite something		
0 0 0	everyday almost every day once in a while hardly ever	-	



15. If your to minutes,	eacher said that you could choose to do one of the following in the next 20 which <i>one</i> would you choose? Check only <i>one</i> thing below.
-	write a letter
	_ write a poem
	_ write a list
	write in your journal
	_ write a message or a note
	_ write in your diary
	_ write a story
	_ write a report
	_ write a paragraph
	_ write a play
	_ write study notes



Appendix C

Motivation to Write Scale
Part B—Self-Concept as a Reader



Name		_	

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT YOUR WRITING?

Sar	nple i	#1:	I am in	·			
			O 3rd grade O 5th grade				
San	nple i	# 2:	I am a	·			
			O boy O girl				
1.	Му	frien	ds think I am				
	0 :	a goo an Ol	y good writer d writer ζ writer r writer				
2.	Whe	n I w	rite STORIES, I feel		··		
	0 1	please okay	pleased about what I write				·
3.	Whe	n I w	rite REPORTS, I feel				 _
	0 0	olease okay	pleased about what I write				



4.	I like to read what I write to others.
	O Almost never O Sometimes O Almost always O Always
5.	When I write STORIES, I think I am
	O a poor author O an OK author O a good author O a very good author
6.	When I write REPORTS, I think I am
	O a poor author O an OK author O a good author O a very good author
7.	When I don't know what to write about, I
	O almost always get an idea on my own O sometimes get an idea on my own O almost never get an idea on my own O never get an idea on my own
8.	The STORIES I write are usually
	O very good O good O okay O poor



9.	The REPORTS I write are usually
	O very interesting O interesting
	O okay
	O boring
10.	What others think about my writing is important to me.
	O Always
	O Almost always
	O Sometimes
	O Almost never
11.	Writing STORIES is
	O very easy for me
	O kind of easy for me
	O kind of hard for me
	O very hard for me
12.	Writing REPORTS is
	O very easy for me
	O kind of easy for me
	O kind of hard for me
	O very hard for me
	o very mare for the



13.	Check all the	iten	ns below that you did this week.
		1.	Wrote a story
		2.	Wrote a report
		3.	Wrote a play
		4.	Wrote notes
		5.	Wrote a poem
		6.	Wrote messages
		7.	Wrote a letter
		8.	Wrote a list
		9.	Wrote for fun
		10	Wrote in my journal or diary



Appendix D

Motivation to Write Interview



Student Interview

Specific Writing Experience

I'd like to talk about something you've written recently. Can you tell me about something you've written recently?		
·		
What was it?		
Why did you write it?		
Where did you get your idea for this story?		
Why did you choose to tell me about this?		
Did you share your writing with anyone? Tell me about it.		
Did you write this on a computer? Yes No—If No:		
 Do you ever write stories or reports on a computer? Yes No Where is the computer? 		
• Do you go to the computer lab at school? Why/Why not?		
Do you go to the computer lab at school: why why hot:		
• Do you own a computer?		
Tell me about something that you've written recently that you thought wasn't very good.		
What makes you say that it's not very good?		
General Writing Experiences		
Did you write anything at home yesterday? Tell me about it. Why did you write it? If No: Do you ever write anything at home?		
Do you ever talk to anyone at home about what you write? Tell me about that.		
Do you ever talk to anyone at school about what you write? Tell me about that.		



•	smates ever tell you how to improve your writing? How do you feel about that?
	hey give you suggestions?
	t kind of suggestions do they give you?
• Do y	ou have a particular friend or group of friends that you share your writing with?
Why do you	think people write? What are important reasons for writing?
Who gets you	u interested and excited about writing? Tell me about it.
• Is the	ere anything else that gets you excited about writing?
Have you eve	er felt really good about something that you've written?
•	t was it?
• Tell	me why you felt good about it.
-	any writing plans right now something you've been thinking about writing? If No: When will you write again?
Intertextuali	ty
Do vou ever	think of stories you've read when you are writing a story? Yes No
If Yes:	• Give me an example.
	• What was the name of the story you thought about?
	 How was your story like the story you read?
	How was your story different from the story you read?
Is there anyt	hing else that you can think of that gives you ideas for writing?



Writing Process

Do you think about what you are going to write <i>before</i> you write it? Tell me about it. • Do you do anything in particular? Tell me about it.
 Do you revise your writing and sometimes make changes? Tell me about something you wrote that you revised or changed. What were some of the changes you made? Why did you revise it?
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Writer Competence
What kind of writer do you think you are? (Show cards: Terrific Good Fair Crummy) • Why do you think you are a writer?
What do you think you have to learn to be a better writer? • Anything else that you think would make you a better writer?
What do you think makes someone a good writer?
What does your teacher do that helps you to be a good writer?
How does your teacher decide which students are good writers?
Does your teacher grade your writing? (Ask for details.)
Does your teacher sit down and talk with you about your writing? Tell me about that.
Does your teacher ever teach lessons about how to be a better writer? Tell me about that. • Can you give me an example?



Appendix E

Teacher Survey



Teacher Survey

Grade How long have you been teaching?
Do you encourage your students to write in their free time? Give some of your favorite examples.
What percentage of your class writing topics are teacher assisted?
0-20% 20-40% 40-60% 60-80% 80-100%
Check any formal training you have had in the writing process. Undergraduate course(s) County Workshops Graduate course(s) Other (please specify)
How would you rate your knowledge of teaching writing (or writing instruction)?
Excellent Good Satisfactory Need Improvement
Do you share the writing YOU do with your students? What have YOU shared lately?
How often do your students write at a computer?
Never 1 or 2 days a week 3 or 4 days a week Every Day

Please turn over to the other side to complete the survey.



How often does your writing program include the following *student* activities? Circle your answer.

		<u>Never</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Always</u>
•	Brainstorm Ideas	1	2	3	4
•	Persuasive Writing	1	2	3	4
•	Report Writing	1	2	3	4
•	Creative Writing	1	2	3	4
•	Portfolios	1	2	3	4
•	Response Journals	1	2	3	4
•	Dialogue Journals	1	2	3	4
•	Peer Conferences	1	2	3	4
•	Revision	1	2	3	4
•	. Read their writing aloud to others	1	2	3	4

How often does your writing program include the following *teacher* activities? Circle your answer.

		<u>Never</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Usually</u>	<u>Always</u>
•	Mini-Lessons	1	2	3	4
•	Written Feedback About Students' Work	1	2	3	4
•	Holistic Scoring of Students' Writing	1	2	3	4
•	Analytical Scoring of Students' Writing	1	2	3	4
•	Teacher/Student Conferences	s 1	2	3	4

Thank you for your time and cooperation.



Appendix F

Motivation to Write Scale:
Percentage of Students
Responding to Each Item



Name	<u>_</u>			
------	----------	--	--	--

WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT WRITING?

Sam	ple	#1: I am in		
		O 3rd grade O 5th grade		
Sam	ple	#2: I am a		
		O boy O girl	Grade 3	Grade 5
1.	I w	ould like for my teacher to let us write STORIES _		·
	0000	every day almost every day once in a while never	28% 29% 39% 4%	26% 36% 36% 3%
2.	I wo	ould like for my teacher to let us write REPORTS		
	0000	every day almost every day once in a while never	15% 22% 39% 24%	1% 11% 62% 26%
3.	I sh	are what I write with my classmates.		
	0000	I never do this. I almost never do this. I do this some of the time. I do this a lot.	4% 21% 49% 26%	3% 8% 71% 18%



		Grade 3	Grade 5
4.	Writing STORIES is something I like to do		
	O often	40%	51%
	O sometimes	43%	37%
	O not very often	14%	12%
	O never	3%	0%
5.	Writing REPORTS is something I like to do		
	O often	26%	7%
	O sometimes	33%	36%
	O not very often	21%	34%
	O never	19%	23%
6.	Knowing how to write well is		
	O not important	1%	1%
	O kind of important	7%	7%
	O important	24%	25%
	O very important	68%	67%
7.	People who write a lot are		
	O very interesting	42%	33%
	O interesting	44%	56%
	O not very interesting	4%	8%
	O boring	10%	3%
8.	I share what I write with my family		-
	O I never do this.	1%	8%
	O I almost never do this.	8%	11%
	O I do this some of the time.	24%	33%
	O I do this a lot.	67%	48%



	į.	Grade 3	Grade 5
9. Ot	her people in my house		
0	spend a lot of time writing	28%	27%
0	<u>-</u>	49%	47%
0	almost never write	18%	22%
0	never write	6%	4%
10. W	hen I grow up I think I will spend	·	
0		1%	3%
0	, //	13%	15%
0	,	54%	50%
0	a lot of my time writing	32%	32%
11. I s	ave the things I write.		
0	Always	33%	37%
0	Usually	40%	43%
0	Sometimes	22%	15%
0	Never	4%	6%
12. I t	hink writing STORIES is		
0	a boring way to spend time	6%	7%
0	an OK way to spend time	21%	23 %
0	an interesting way to spend time	35%	29%
0	a great way to spend time	39%	41%
13. I tl	hink writing REPORTS is		
0	a boring way to spend time	26%	27%
0	an OK way to spend time	18%	48%
0	an interesting way to spend time	28%	19%
0	a great way to spend time	28%	6%



	Grade 3	Grade 5
14. I write something		
O everyday	47%	38%
O almost every day	18%	38%
O once in a while	28%	22%
O hardly ever	7%	1%



15. Writing preferences of students (percentage of students responding)

If your teacher said that you could choose to do one of the following in the next 20 minutes, which *one* would you choose?

Grade 3		Grade 5	
write a story	33%	write a story	32%
write a play	13%	write a letter	15%
write in a journal	8%	write a poem	12%
write in a diary	8%	write a message	11%
write a report	8%	write a play	10%
write a poem	7%	write in a diary	7%
write a paragraph	7%	write a paragraph	4%
write a message	6%	write in a journal	4%
write a letter	6%	write study notes	3%
write a list	3%	write a list	3%
write study notes	1%	write a report	0%



Name		_		

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT YOUR WRITING?

san	npie #1: 1 am iii			
	O 3rd grade O 5th grade			
San	nple #2: I am a			
	O boy O girl			
		Grade 3	Grade 5	
1.	My friends think I am			
	O a very good writer	36%	21%	
	O a good writer	42%	59%	
	O an OK writer	19%	19%	
	O a poor writer	3%	1 %	
2.	When I write STORIES, I feel			
	O very pleased about what I write	71%	45%	
	O pleased about what I write	18%	38%	
	O okay about what I write	11%	15%	
	O unhappy about what I write	0%	1 % 	
3.	When I write REPORTS, I feel			
	O very pleased about what I write	47%	27%	
	O pleased about what I write	26%	44%	
	O okay about what I write	22%	27%	
	O unhappy about what I write	4%	1 %	



		Grade 3	Grade 5
4.	I like to read what I write to others.		
	O Almost never	7%	6%
	O Sometimes	43%	51%
	O Almost always	18%	23 %
	O Always	32%	21 %
5.	When I write STORIES, I think I am	·	
	O a poor author	1%	3%
	O an OK author	13%	26%
	O a good author	36%	52 %
	O a very good author	50%	19%
6.	When I write REPORTS, I think I am	·	
	O a poor author	4%	4%
	O an OK author	17%	34 %
	O a good author	39%	44%
	O a very good author	40%	18%
7.	When I don't know what to write about, I	·	
	O almost always get an idea on my own	51%	63%
	O sometimes get an idea on my own	43%	33%
	O almost never get an idea on my own	6%	1 %
	O never get an idea on my own	0%	3%
8.	The STORIES I write are usually		
	O very good	61%	26%
	O good	31%	59%
	O okay	8%	15%
	O poor	0%	0%
		U <i>7</i> 0	



		Grade 3	Grade 5
9.	The REPORTS I write are usually	·	
	O very interesting	38%	11%
	O interesting	35%	52%
	O okay	18%	29%
	O boring	10%	8%
10.	What others think about my writing is important to me		
	O always	58%	38%
	O almost always	19%	33%
	O sometimes	13%	21%
	O almost never	10%	8%
11.	Writing STORIES is		
	O very easy for me	54%	49%
	O kind of easy for me	38%	36%
	O kind of hard for me	4%	14%
	O very hard for me	4%	1 %
12.	Writing REPORTS is		
	O very easy for me	32%	19%
	O kind of easy for me	45%	34%
	O kind of hard for me	19%	38%
	O very hard for me	4%	8%



13. Typical writing activities reported by students (percentage of students responding)

Grade 3		Grade 5		
writing for "fun"	68%	journal writing	75%	
notes	65%	notes	66%	
journal writing	61%	writing for "fun"	64%	
report writing	54%	letters	60%	
letters	47%	lists	53%	
stories	46%	stories	49%	
lists	43%	messages	41%	
messages	39%	poems	37%	
plays	21%	report writing	12%	
poems	19%	plays	11%	



Appendix G

Scoring Rubric for *Motivation to Write* Interviews



NATIONAL READING RESEARCH CENTER, READING RESEARCH REPORT NO. 59

Scoring Rubric for Motivation to Write Interviews

Subjects

vvriting Experiences	 	
specific titles of original writing		
elaborated information on original writing		
vague description of original writing		
chosen		
assigned	<u> </u>	
sharing of original work		
with teacher		
with classmates/friends		
with family		
participation in Writer's Workshop	l	
type of writing they chose to tell about		
story		
letter		_
poem	 	
informational		
Where did you get your idea? (for writing) curriculum content		
TV		
book		
<u> </u>		
Why choose to tell me about this? most recent		
best work		
		-
		
	l	



Computer			
lab in school			
attend lab once/week			
attend lab > once/week			
own a computer			
enjoy using a computer			_
reasons for using the computer			
it's fun			
games			
writing			
drawing			
math			
Tell about writing that wasn't good			
Why writing wasn't good		ŀ	
too few details included (information)			
not enough descriptive language			
length			
	<u>-</u>	 	
	<u> </u>	—	<u> </u>
Write at home yesterday?			
Ever write at home?			
Kind of writing done at home			İ
homework		<u> </u>	
stories	ļ	ļ	ļ
journal		ļ	
		<u> </u>	
Talk with anyone about writing?			
parents			
siblings			
teacher			
classmates/friends			
	ļ	└	<u> </u>
	!	1	



Classmates give ideas to improve writing?			
handwriting (penmanship)			
mechanics (grammar/punc/caps)			
making sense			
elaborating			
use the dictionary		<u> </u>	
sentence-related			
word-related			
	 	ļ	<u> </u>
Why do people write?			
express themselves/communicate		<u> </u>	
to learn			
future/job related			
for fun			
to improve writing skills			
	 _		
	 	 	<u> </u>
Who/what gets you interested in writing? parents			
siblings	+	 	
teacher	 		
classmates/friends	+	 	
Oldobiliateo/ Illolido	+	 	
	+		
sports	+	 	
TV ——————			
movies —			
movies —	\top		
Ever felt very good about something written?	T		
specific title of original writing			
elaborated description	T		
vague description of original writing			
Why did you feel good about it?	1		
simply describes story			
people wanted to read it —			
best work —————————			
	<u> </u>		
Do you have writing plans now?	Ţ		
Specific plans (topic/title/plot/idea)	1		



Intertextuality

Do you ever think of stories you read when you are writing a story? books _____ classmates' stories ______ siblings _____ teacher _____ drawing ______ content journals/notebooks/learning logs_____ **Writing Process** Plan your writing? Revise writing? Why revise? make it better ______ make it more interesting _____ check spelling _____ make it sensible _____ **Writer Competence** What kind of writer are you? terrific _____ good ______ fair ______ poor ______ Why? think of ideas easily _____ make too many mistakes _____ don't finish stories ______ stories are too short _____ stories don't make sense ____ How can you become a better writer spell better _____ type better _____ improve handwriting _____ work beyond initial draft _____ learn to make it more interesting _____ make it more sensible ______ read more _____ write more _____



What m	akes someone a good writer?			
j	magination	_		
1	good ideas			
1	good spelling			
9	someone who reads/likes to read			
9	someone who writes/likes to write			
j	nstruction			
_				
_				
_			ļ	
_				<u> </u>
Teacher	r Influence			
	bes the teacher do to help you			
	a better writer?		l	
	conferences		•	
	edits	_		
(offers suggestions		<u> </u>	
	add details			
	word-related			
	sentence/paragraph-related			
	ideas to write about			
	says "write more"			
			<u> </u>	
1	reads aloud			
	eaches strategies (FAT-P)			
_				
_				
_				
_				
-				
Teacher	grade stories?			
Teacher grade other writing?				
1	etter grades		<u> </u>	
(comments			
	teach lessons on becoming a			
better w	riter?			
]	Directed Oral Language (DOL)			
(capitalization/punctuation ————————————————————————————————————			
-				
		ı		ŧ



	_	
	_	
۰		
		٠

National Reading Research Center

> 318 Aderhold, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602-7125 3216 J. M. Patterson Building, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742





U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").

