AN INQUIRY INTO THE EFFECTS OF INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIATION ON STUDENT METACOGNITIVE AWARENESS DURING STORY GRAMMAR INSTRUCTION

by
Cayla Cohen

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

Faculty of Education
(Curriculum: Humanities and Social Sciences)
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba
August, 1992

ISBN 0-315-81750-X

Name _____

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

SOCIAL SCIENCES — SUBJECT TERM

0534 — SUBJECT CODE

U·M·I

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS
Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION
General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523
Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS
Language
- General 0679
- Ancient 0289
- Linguistics 0290
- Modern 0291

Literature
- General 0401
- Classical 0294
- Comparative 0295
- Medieval 0297
- Modern 0298
- African 0316
- American 0591
- Asian 0305
- Canadian (English) 0352
- Canadian (French) 0355
- English 0593
- Germanic 0311
- Latin American 0312
- Middle Eastern 0315
- Romance 0313
- Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY
Philosophy 0422
Religion
- General 0318
- Biblical Studies 0321
- Clergy 0319
- History of 0320
- Philosophy of 0322

Theology 0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES
American Studies 0323
Anthropology
- Archaeology 0324
- Cultural 0326
- Physical 0327

Business Administration
- General 0310
- Accounting 0272
- Banking 0770
- Management 0454
- Marketing 0338

Canadian Studies 0385
Economics
- General 0501
- Agricultural 0503
- Commerce-Business 0505
- Finance 0508
- History 0509
- Labor 0510
- Theory 0511

Folklore 0358
Geography 0366
Gerontology 0351
History
- General 0578
- Ancient 0579
- Medieval 0581
- Modern 0582
- Black 0328
- African 0331
- Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
- Canadian 0334
- European 0335
- Latin American 0336
- Middle Eastern 0333
- United States 0337

History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science
- General 0615
- International Law and Relations 0616
- Public Administration 0617

Recreation 0814
Social Work 0452
Sociology
- General 0626
- Criminology and Penology 0627
- Demography 0938
- Ethnic and Racial Studies 0631
- Individual and Family Studies 0628
- Industrial and Labor Relations 0629
- Public and Social Welfare 0630
- Social Structure and Development 0700
- Theory and Methods 0344

Transportation 0709
Urban and Regional Planning 0999
Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
Agriculture
- General 0473
- Agronomy 0285
- Animal Culture and Nutrition 0475
- Animal Pathology 0476
- Food Science and Technology 0359
- Forestry and Wildlife 0478
- Plant Culture 0479
- Plant Pathology 0480
- Plant Physiology 0817
- Range Management 0777
- Wood Technology 0746

Biology
- General 0306
- Anatomy 0287
- Biostatistics 0308
- Botany 0309
- Cell 0379
- Ecology 0329
- Entomology 0353
- Genetics 0369
- Limnology 0793
- Microbiology 0410
- Molecular 0307
- Neuroscience 0317
- Oceanography 0416
- Physiology 0433
- Radiation 0821
- Veterinary Science 0778
- Zoology 0472

Biophysics
- General 0786
- Medical 0760

EARTH SCIENCES
Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0996
Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Palynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences
- General 0566
- Audiology 0300
- Chemotherapy 0992
- Dentistry 0567
- Education 0350
- Hospital Management 0769
- Human Development 0758
- Immunology 0982
- Medicine and Surgery 0564
- Mental Health 0347
- Nursing 0569
- Nutrition 0570
- Obstetrics and Gynecology 0380
- Occupational Health and Therapy 0354
- Ophthalmology 0381
- Pathology 0571
- Pharmacology 0419
- Pharmacy 0572
- Physical Therapy 0382
- Public Health 0573
- Radiology 0574
- Recreation 0575
- Speech Pathology 0460
- Toxicology 0383

Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences
Chemistry
- General 0485
- Agricultural 0749
- Analytical 0486
- Biochemistry 0487
- Inorganic 0488
- Nuclear 0738
- Organic 0490
- Pharmaceutical 0491
- Physical 0494
- Polymer 0495
- Radiation 0754

Mathematics 0405
Physics
- General 0605
- Acoustics 0986
- Astronomy and Astrophysics 0606
- Atmospheric Science 0608
- Atomic 0748
- Electronics and Electricity 0607
- Elementary Particles and High Energy 0798
- Fluid and Plasma 0759
- Molecular 0609
- Nuclear 0610
- Optics 0752
- Radiation 0756
- Solid State 0611

Statistics 0463

Applied Sciences
Applied Mechanics 0346
Computer Science 0984
Engineering
- General 0537
- Aerospace 0538
- Agricultural 0539
- Automotive 0540
- Biomedical 0541
- Chemical 0542
- Civil 0543
- Electronics and Electrical 0544
- Heat and Thermodynamics 0348
- Hydraulic 0545
- Industrial 0546
- Marine 0547
- Materials Science 0794
- Mechanical 0548
- Metallurgy 0743
- Mining 0551
- Nuclear 0552
- Packaging 0549
- Petroleum 0765
- Sanitary and Municipal 0554
- System Science 0790

Geotechnology 0428
Operations Research 0796
Plastics Technology 0795
Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY
General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

AN INQUIRY INTO THE EFFECTS OF INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIATION ON STUDENT METACOGNITIVE AWARENESS DURING STORY GRAMMAR INSTRUCTION

BY

CAYLA COHEN

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

Acknowledgements

This writer would like to extend appreciation to the members of her thesis committee for their advice and recommendations: Dr. B. Zakaluk, Dr. O. Trosky, and Dr. R. Bruno-Jofre. Appreciation is also extended to the staff and students of Carpathia School who were involved in the study.

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to explore whether narrative instruction, a story grammar acronym, and think sheets for planning and editing stories enhanced the story recall and composition performance of two grade three students of poor reading ability. The next goal was to determine if the students knew how to apply their newly acquired story knowledge during subsequent reading and composing. The last purpose of this study was to document the interactions that occurred between the researcher and the students during the instructional process. A suburban Winnipeg school provided the context for the research. Children's picture books served as the source for both the instructional and testing material. Over a time period of two weeks, students participated individually in eight reading comprehension and eight written composition lessons. All sessions were audiotaped. Post test findings confirmed that the instructional strategies enhanced students' ability to both recall and compose a story. Interviews with the students revealed that metacognitive knowledge of story grammar increased story recall and writing performance. Qualitative and quantitative assessment of the data support the notion that poor readers benefit from mediated instruction that increases their participation and collaboration in the learning context.

This study expands our knowledge concerning the degree of instructional mediation required for poor grade three readers to acquire and benefit from a sense of story.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Leaf left blank to correct page numbering

CHAPTER I

Nature of the Study

In the elementary grades, teachers expect students to know the characteristics of stories. Some metacognitively-aware students learn these characteristics intuitively either from listening to stories or from responding to teacher questions. Others may need a more mediated instructional approach. One technique that teachers use to promote a sense of story is story grammar instruction. Story grammar refers to a set of linguistic rules for textual organization that apply if a selection is to be considered a story (Gordon & Braun, 1983). In the most basic form, a story's grammar represents the setting, the main character's goal or problem, the chain of events that occur as the character tries to solve the problem, the resolution of the problem, the responses or reactions of the story characters, and the lesson or moral of the story.

Story grammar is sometimes confused with story schema. A story schema is an abstract construct that represents a person's accumulated knowledge about characters, actions, and the sequence of events associated with a story (Idoll & Croll, 1987). Prior knowledge and maturation influence the availability of story schema (Anderson and

Pearson, 1984). Nonetheless, Applebee (1978) demonstrated that young children have rudimentary story schema. Story schema acts as a structural framework to either organize and integrate the comprehension of narrative information or guide the story writing process.

Metacognitive knowledge regarding the structure of narrative text helps students enhance both their story reading comprehension and the quality of their written compositions (Gordon & Braun, 1983). Metacognition refers to a conscious knowledge and control of one's own cognitive processes (Brown, 1980). In other words, metacognition means 'thinking about one's own thinking.' Tierney and Pearson (1983) suggest that knowledge and control of one's own cognition may constitute a link between the reading and writing processes. In this case, metacognition refers to awareness of story structure and application of that knowledge to increase not only one's comprehension and recall of stories, but also one's ability to construct well-formed stories.

To enhance the comprehension and story writing success of students who lack a sense of story, the use of instructional mediation is in order (Duffy, Roehler, Sivan, Ratliff, Book, Meloth, Vavrus, Wesselman, Putnam, and Bassiri, 1987). This type of instruction occurs

when an adult interacts and assists with developing a student's knowledge of narrative structure. Conceptually, mediated literacy instruction is synonymous with Pearson's (1981) gradual release of responsibility model of instruction in which the teacher begins the instruction by modeling the application of a strategy and then gradually releases task responsibility to the students. Instituting mediated literacy instruction allows students to perform both reading and writing tasks at a level slightly beyond their independent competence (Boyle and Peregoy, 1990; Beed, Hawkins and Roller, 1991; Duffy, Roehler et al., 1987; Pearson, 1981).

One essential feature of explicit instruction is that the teacher verbalizes his/her thinking processes and therefore models problem-solving attempts (Gersten & Dimino, 1989). Varying levels of adult feedback and prompting occur to help the student overcome difficulties either in comprehension and recall or in story composition. At this point, there is much dialogue and interaction between the teacher and student using story grammar as a heuristic to enhance the sense of story. Another important characteristic of mediated instruction is the use of whole texts that contain predictable story grammars (Boyle & Peregoy,

1990). Such texts facilitate the communication and prediction processes. The last feature associated with mediated literacy instruction is the gradual withdrawal of adult support. As the student's competence in comprehending and composing develops, the teacher encourages the student to assume more responsibility for completing the tasks independently. The mediated learning process is withdrawn once the student has internalized story grammar knowledge and can verbalize the related thinking process on his/her own (Boyle & Peregoy, 1990; Beed, Hawkins, & Roller, 1991; Duffy, Roehler et al., 1987).

While some students seem to learn story grammar on their own, others require more mediated instruction. For those students who lack story grammar knowledge, the explicit instructional model advocated by Duffy, Roehler and their colleagues (1987) and Pearson (1981) provides a general framework for planning instruction. While a number of studies attest to the efficacy of story grammar instruction for improving reading comprehension and written composition performance (Buss, Rattliff, and Irion, 1983; Carnine and Kinder, 1985; Fitzgerald and Spiegel, 1983; Fitzgerald and Teasley, 1987; Fitzgerald, Spiegel, and Teasley, 1987; Gordon and Braun, 1982 and 1986; Gordon, 1988; Griffey, Zigmond, and

Leinhardt, 1988; Idoll and Croll, 1987), a review of related literature suggests that there is not enough detailed information regarding how teachers can both interact and respond instructionally to students who lack story grammar knowledge. To meet individual student needs therefore, more specific research concerning story grammar instructional techniques is required.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to: a) investigate if a story grammar acronym, and think sheets for planning and revising stories improves the students' ability to recall a silently read story and compose a story independently; b) determine if narrative instruction enhances the student's ability to articulate knowledge of their reading and writing strategies by documenting the interactions that occur between a teacher-researcher and each student during story grammar instruction. In order to determine the effects of both the mediated instruction and the use of a story grammar acronym on the student's reading comprehension performance, the following procedures were adapted and then applied using a direct instruction format: a) teacher modeling of think-aloud comprehension strategies (Davey, 1983); b) directed reading-thinking

activities (Hennings, 1991); c) student self-questioning strategies (Gordon, 1983): and d) story frame activities (Cudd and Roberts, 1987). During the story writing component, the mediating process was extended through adaptations of the following activities: a) dictated stories (Allen, 1976); b) think-sheets for planning and editing stories (Raphael, Englert, & Kirschner, 1988); c) teacher-student writing conferences (Calkins, 1976); d) the listing of story elements from books read (Graves, 1989); and e) plot completion experiences (Stewig, 1990).

Significance of the Study

Considering the depth of story grammar research currently available, why was another study necessary? Upon closer examination of the research completed in the past decade, several limitations became apparent. First, it was determined that most studies were experimental in nature. Only four studies were descriptive (Kinney & Schmidt, 1986; Fitzgerald, Spiegel, & Teasley, 1987; Gordon, 1988; Cunningham & Foster, 1978). The problem with the experimental studies was that students, randomly assigned to the control group, were given dictionary related tasks (Fitzgerald & Spiegel, 1983; Fitzgerald & Teasley, 1983). Completing dictionary work does not relate to story grammar, therefore,

results from these types of studies need to be interpreted cautiously.

While analyzing the instructional materials used in the studies, it was discovered that researchers either borrowed stories from the original story grammar studies (Turetzky, 1982; Fitzgerald & Spiegel, 1983; Montague, 1988), wrote their own specific narratives (Fitzgerald & Spiegel, 1983), used basal reader stories (Idoll & Croll, 1987; Idoll, 1987; Carnine & Kinder, 1985; Griffey, Zigmond & Leinhardt, 1988), or failed to describe the specific nature of their narrative materials (Dreher & Singer, 1980; Gordon & Braun, 1982; Fitzgerald & Teasley, 1983; Fitzgerald, Spiegel, & Teasley, 1987). In general, the failure to use whole, naturally occurring texts during instruction was most apparent. Of the studies involving elementary students, only Kinney and Schmidt (1986) and Cunningham and Foster (1978) used trade novels.

Further limitations were found in the measurement procedures employed. With the exception of Carnine and Kinder (1985) and Gordon and Braun (1986), all of the other reviewed studies did not include delayed post testing. Data describing students' ability to retain learned strategies over an extended period of time is, therefore, non-existent. Although some researchers included student interviews in the post test

analysis, pre-test interviews were not carried out (Kinney & Schmidt, 1986; Gordon & Braun, 1986; Gordon, 1988). This lack of pre-test interview information prevented researchers from documenting growth in metacognitive awareness of narrative text structure.

Similarly, limitations were found in the instructional processes implemented. Two studies did not include important story components. Idoll and Croll (1987) for example, omitted 'theme' and 'response' categories from their story grammar map, while Griffey, Zigmond, and Leinhardt (1988) excluded 'time', 'setting', 'response', and 'theme' categories from their acronym. In these studies therefore, comprehension of these aspects of story grammar was not analyzed in the pre- and post-test measures. Lastly, none of the studies included a detailed 'think-sheet' as an instructional procedure to facilitate students' story organization and editing.

More important than the limitations described above, the critical recommendations of previous investigators need to be addressed. Based on evidence that story grammar instruction enhances the comprehension, recall, and composition process of intermediate level students, Fitzgerald and Spiegel (1983) and Laughton and Morris (1989)

suggested that instructional possibilities be explored with children of other ages. Similarly, Laughton and Morris (1989) recommended that future investigations concerning the effects of narrative instruction should be conducted with younger subjects who not only lack story grammar knowledge, but also experience specific difficulties in reading and writing.

In addition, Idoll and Croll (1987) recommended that future research with students experiencing learning problems should be designed to enhance the transfer and generalization of story grammar knowledge. To this end, Idoll and Croll suggested that during the instructional process students should: a) read a wide selection of stories; b) respond in a variety of ways such as giving story retellings or completing story grammar maps; and c) talk about and identify the general schema of a story.

Idoll and Croll (1987) further recommended that future studies be descriptive in nature. Specifically, they suggested that there is a need for qualitative investigations of literacy learning because such in-depth studies have the potential to enhance our understanding of the instructional process. Carnine and Kinder (1985) stated that the teacher modeling and corrective feedback provided by the teacher may be

critically important. "Qualitative analysis of teacher feedback would be particularly useful...The teacher models are rich in information since they take on a different form in every selection" (p.28).

In summary, there appears to be no story grammar research from a qualitative or interpretive perspective. Also, none of the studies have chronicled teacher/student interaction during the mediating process. Future story grammar research is warranted in view of the current interest in qualitative or interpretive inquiries, the limited amount of research related to the mediated literacy process, and the knowledge that instruction in the processing of narrative text represents a common and important aspect of teaching at elementary grade levels. Also, more research involving younger students and low-achieving students is required. The subjects in this study, therefore, will be low-achieving, primary grade students.

Statement of the Problem

In order to investigate teacher-student interaction during the process of story grammar instruction, six questions were considered. The first questions relate to the comprehension and recall of narrative text, while the subsequent set of questions relate to writing story

compositions. The next set concerns the notion of metacognitive awareness. The final question considers the salient features of the instructional mediation process. In all cases, the questions refer to grade three students of poor reading ability.

Story Comprehension and Recall

1. Will narrative instruction improve students' recall of a silently read story?
2. Will a story grammar acronym improve the students' ability to recall a silently read story?

Story Writing

3. Will narrative instruction improve the students' ability to compose a story independently?
4. Will think-sheets improve the students' ability to organize and edit written compositions?

Metacognitive Awareness

5. Can students: a) demonstrate knowledge of strategy application in story recalls and compositions; and b) articulate how they used the story grammar strategy in either comprehending or composing?

Instructional Mediation

6. In terms of facilitating learning, what is salient about the interactions between a researcher and students during the instructional mediation process?

Research Hypotheses

Hypotheses 1 - Narrative instruction will improve both the quality and quantity of ideas expressed in the post test recall for grade three students of poor reading ability.

Hypotheses 2 - A story grammar acronym will improve the students' ability to recall a silently read story.

Hypotheses 3 - Narrative instruction will improve the students' ability to write a story independently.

Hypotheses 4 - Think Sheets will improve the students' ability to organize and edit their written compositions.

Hypotheses 5 - Poor grade three readers will be able to: a) demonstrate knowledge of strategy application in story recalls and compositions; and b) articulate how they used the story grammar strategy in both comprehending and composing stories.

Hypotheses 6 - The following teacher-student interactions will be

observed during story grammar instruction: a) teacher modeling; b) teacher modeling with student participation; c) cueing of specific strategies, and d) providing general cues.

Theoretical Foundations of the Study

Story Grammar Theory

Story Grammar Research can be divided into the following main areas: a) Primary Research on Story Grammar; b) The Relationship of Story Grammar with Reading Comprehension and Written Composition; c) Story Grammar and Exceptional Learners; and d) Story Grammar and Metacognition. During the mid to later 1970's, there were four main story grammar researchers: Rumelhart (1975), Thorndyke (1977), Mandler and Johnson (1977), and Stein and Glenn (1975). Each researcher or investigate team designed a grammar as a tool for either analyzing stories or researching why children differ from adults in their story comprehension and recall. The story grammars developed by these researchers were all remarkably similar; they all basically defined a story as a series of problem episodes. After several unsuccessful attempts, the problem was either resolved or unresolved. More importantly, these researchers suggested that if students read or listened to enough stories,

to enough stories, they would internalize the story grammar. The structure would then be available as tacit knowledge for students both to predict, understand or remember similarly structured stories, and to write their own compositions.

Beginning in the late 1970's, investigators began to examine whether explicit story grammar instruction would improve students' story comprehension and story composition. The instructional procedures used in this research were similar to Brown, Campione and Day's (1981) process of informed training. Turetzky (1982), Fitzgerald and Spiegel (1983), Buss, Ratliff and Irion (1985), and Kinney and Schmidt (1986) all made a significant contribution to the field of reading by substantiating that story grammar related instruction improved students' comprehension and recall abilities. Similarly, studies completed by Gordon and Braun (1982), Fitzgerald and Teasley (1983), and Fitzgerald, Spiegel and Teasley (1987) all suggested that story grammar instruction provided students with a powerful tool to organize and improve the overall quality of their compositions. An important conclusion from these studies was that reading comprehension and written composition could be directly taught within a relatively short period of time. Also, many instructional

techniques, that are still used in today's research, were validated in these studies.

During the late 1980's, Idol and Croll (1987) shifted the research emphasis using exceptional learners such as the mildly handicapped and learning disabled as subjects. Noted for the use of a visual story map to facilitate learning, their study demonstrated that it was possible to increase the comprehension and composition abilities of exceptional learners' significantly through story grammar instruction. Additional research involving story grammar instruction and exceptional learners is very limited. The available research focuses on the qualitative and quantitative differences between the performance of learning disabled and average ability students. Investigations conducted by Montague (1988) and Laughton and Morris (1989), for example, suggest that learning disabled students lag behind their peers in recalling story grammar components and using story structure to enhance their compositions.

Until the 1980's, it was assumed that story schema operated tacitly (Gordon & Braun, 1986). Researchers believed that story schema guided comprehension and composing, but individuals were not

metacognitively aware of the process. Using a procedure similar to Brown, Campoine and Day's (1981) theory of "Self Control Training", researchers began to help students interact more with text. Singer and Donlan (1982), Camine and Kinder (1985) and Griffey, Zigmond and Leinhardt (1988) all successfully used either a self-questioning strategy or a combined self-questioning and story structure training strategy to enhance students' comprehension and metacognitive awareness. Studies carried out by Gordon and Braun (1986) and Gordon (1988) extended this research by incorporating student self-reports. These self-reports indicated the extent to which students were metacognitively aware of their story reading comprehension and writing processes.

Theory for the Design of the Data Analysis

The design of data analysis for this study was based on Erickson's (1986) theory of "interpretive research". Action, observation, and interpretation are 'at the heart' of this paradigm. Erickson used the term interpretive research in reference to the similarities among the following research methods: a) ethnographic; b) qualitative; c) participant/ observations; d) case study; and e) naturalistic. In his view, "Interpretive" is more inclusive than the other terms because it avoids the connotation

of being nonstatistical which is implied by the terms qualitative or naturalistic.

Interpretive research is appropriate to determine what is happening in a particular place rather than across a number of places. It involves intense participation in an educational setting followed by careful documentation and reflection upon what was observed (Erickson, 1986). Documentation is in the form of audiotapes, records of student's work, direct quotes from interviews, narrative vignettes, analytic charts, summary tables and descriptive statistics. Separately and together, these forms of documentation allow the researcher to triangulate the data gathered. Potential readers are also able to experience the educational context described.

Related Research

Documented research regarding teacher/student dialogue during a mediated process is very limited (Yager, Johnson, & Johnson, 1985). Wood, Wood and Middleton (1978) described varying teacher-student interactions in conjunction with the gradual withdrawal of teacher support during an instructional process. These researchers noted that according to the students' performance, teachers' responses varied in degree of

abstractness. Palinscar and Brown (1984) recorded reciprocal teacher-student dialogues that were in reference to specific text features. They observed that adult modeling helped remedial Junior High students interact more with text, and improved and maintained comprehension performance. On the other hand, they did not analyze the transcripts to determine the salient features of instructional interaction.

In 1986, Palinscar repeated her reciprocal teaching research with 'at-risk' grade one students. Applying an ethnographic approach in analyzing the transcripts, certain dialogue categories emerged. General instructional techniques included: a) direct modeling; b) elaborating or refining student responses; c) offering choices; and d) engaging student responses at the idea level. Similarly, Beed, Hawkins, and Roller (1991), adapted the research of Wood and her colleagues (1978) to describe five kinds of responses that teachers used to gradually withdraw support and encourage student independence. Although their research focused on instruction regarding a word recognition procedure and activating background knowledge as a pre-reading technique, their broad levels of teacher responses can easily be applied to narrative structure instruction. Their categories included: a) direct teacher modeling; b) inviting student

performance; c) cueing specific elements or strategies; and d) providing general cues.

In 1991, Eeds and Peterson analyzed teacher-student interactions during literature study groups. Although their research did not extend over a period of time to determine recurring patterns of interaction, their study revealed instances of teachers engaged in the following behaviours: a) modeling how to talk about literature; b) corroborating feelings and opinions expressed by students; c) discussing the essential meaning of a story in a collaborative way; d) extending students' responses to the events and tension in the stories; and e) expressing personal responses in relation to the story. They also provided evidence to show that students modeled their responses to stories after the strategies teachers used in talking about literature.

Also in 1991, Clay's research concerning book introductions with young readers revealed teachers engaged in the following instructional interactions: a) introducing the plot of the story; b) probing to discover related knowledge the children possess about the topic; c) accepting partially correct answers; d) making the criteria for an acceptable answer more explicit; and e) modeling the verbalization of anticipated story

outcomes. All of these investigators have extended our knowledge of appropriate reading instruction procedures by documenting teachers and students operating within the context of mediated learning.

Assumptions

The conclusions of this study must be considered in light of the following assumptions:

1. Subjects had the verbal ability to report their perceptions accurately.
2. The time allotted for the treatment was adequate to produce the desired effects.

Definition of Terms

Theoretical Foundations of the Study

1. Mediated Literacy Process - A temporary framework, characterized by adult modeling and feedback, that supports students in comprehending and composing. The framework allows students to successfully perform tasks at a level that would be slightly beyond their independent competence. Other important features include the use of whole texts and gradual withdrawal of adult support. Therefore, mediation is temporary and is removed when students can perform the

task on their own (Duffy, Roehler et. al., 1987). As applied in this study, the term mediated learning is synonymous with the concept of direct, explicit instruction and the Pearson (1981) model that highlights the gradual release of teacher responsibility during instruction.

2. Metacognition - A reader/writer's ability to monitor, talk about, or give some indication of his/her personal intellectual functioning in a specific learning situation (Gordon & Braun, 1986).

3. Story Grammar - A set of rules that describe how stories are typically organized. Story grammar represents the setting, the main character's problem, the character's attempts and responses to solving the problem, the resolution of the problem, and the story's theme (Gordon & Braun, 1983).

4. Story Schema - A 'cognitive blueprint' that represents how a story is typically organized. Schema acts as a structural framework to help people organize and integrate story information (McConaughy, 1980).

Theory for the Design of the Data Analysis

1. Interpretive Research - An 'umbrella' term that encompasses resemblance among the following paradigms; ethnographic, qualitative, descriptive, case study, and naturalistic (Erickson, 1986).

2. Narrative Vignette - A literacy form used to document, describe, and interpret an event. Exact transcriptions of what is being said in a particular context are described in a natural sequence (Erickson, 1986).

Description of the Sample

1. Good Reader - A student whose reading score falls at or beyond five months of his/her grade placement.

2. Poor Reader - A student whose reading score falls at or below five months of his/her grade placement.

Research Evaluation Procedures

1. Focused Holistic Scoring - A scale for considering the 'whole piece' of a written composition. Marking criteria consists of numerous pre-defined features. These features correspond to a set of scores that range on a scale from 1-4 (Greenhaugh & Townsend, 1981). See Appendix #6 for the scale used in this study.

2. Quantification of Retelling Profile - An evaluation form for oral

recalls of stories. The scoring is dependent across a number of pre-defined story grammar features. The story grammar features accompany a set of score points (Morrow, as cited by Glaser & Searfross, 1988). See Appendix #2 for the profile used in this study.

3. Qualitative Retelling Profile - A descriptive evaluation form for oral recalls of stories. The scoring is dependent across a number of pre-defined oral recall features (Irwin & Mitchell, as cited in Glaser & Searfross, 1988). See Appendix #4 for the profile used in this study.

Instructional Procedures

1. Story Frame - A term used to describe a modified cloze procedure. Phrases are omitted from a paragraph in which important structural aspects of a story have been highlighted (Cudd & Roberts, 1987).

2. Headlining - A mediated form of instruction used to present a narrative structure. Both the title and skeletal structure of the story are stated. Specific story details are omitted in order to allow for: a) student predictions; b) enjoyment of the story to be read; and c) adult modeling of comprehension strategies should later need arise (Clay, 1991; Cohen, 1992).

Overview of the Study

This study was designed to determine the effects of narrative instruction on the oral recall and written composition abilities of two poor grade three readers as well as investigate the researcher/student interactions during the instructional mediation process. Related literature is reviewed in Chapter 2 followed by a discussion of the research design, testing and experimental procedures in Chapter 3. A description of the data analysis and relationships to previous research findings is discussed in Chapter 4. Last, Chapter 5 summarizes the conclusions and presents implications for further research and development.

CHAPTER II

Review of the Related Literature

A review of the related literature for this study can be divided into the following seven main areas: a) theoretical foundations of the study; b) the relationship of story grammar to reading comprehension and written composition; c) story grammar and exceptional learners; and d) general research on metacognition; e) metacognition and instructional mediation; and f) story grammar and metacognition. First, primary studies which provided the original source for story schema research are reviewed. Next, studies that used story grammar instruction to enhance students' reading comprehension, written composition, and knowledge of story schema are discussed. Also, studies that employed story grammar instruction with exceptional learners are described. Then, general research on metacognition is presented and linked to the process of instructional mediation. Research that focused on developing students' metacognitive awareness of story grammar during the reading and writing processes is then explored. A summary of study findings concludes this review. With the exception of a few classical studies, the focus of this literature review is limited to research concerning elementary school-aged

children.

Theoretical Background

The abstract construct representing the accumulated knowledge that one uses in various types of mental processing is referred to as schema. A story schema therefore represents an idealized framework for both the elements of a typical story and knowledge concerning the relationship among the elements (Mandler and Johnson, 1977). Bartlett, a pioneer investigator of narrative comprehension in children and adults, wrote his classic book Remembering in 1932. Based on his research in which British subjects read and recalled familiar stories and stories of the Indians of the Northwest Coast, Bartlett suggested that the recall of narrative text is highly organized. Bartlett believed that people develop a schema for narratives and use the schema to comprehend and facilitate their recall of stories. Furthermore, Bartlett believed that people get a feel for a 'whole story' and then reconstruct details at the point of recall, based on what might logically have happened in their own experience. Especially when unfamiliar stories are being retold, recall often undergoes a series of blends, omissions, inventions and distortions when a particular story part cannot be retrieved. Bartlett (1932) theorized that

people use their schema, or topic familiarity, as well as their knowledge of the relationships among story elements to reconstruct the parts of the story that they have difficulty remembering.

Thorndyke (1977), designed some of the first studies that supported the notion of story schema. The purpose for one of his first studies was to determine the effects of varied plot structure on one's memory for a story. The subjects selected for the study read stories of similar content, but the passages represented one of the following four structures: a) story; b) narrative-after theme; c) narrative-no theme; and d) description. After the passages were read, the subjects were asked to complete the following three tasks: a) summarize the narrative; b) recall the passage in written form; and c) complete a recognition test. The results attained in the Thorndyke study suggest that as the structure of the passage became less explicit, the ability to both recall and summarize the passage also decreased. Thorndyke (1977) therefore inferred that passages without structure are more difficult to both recall and summarize as there is no schema to help distinguish which story elements are more important than others.

Researchers from the fields of cognitive psychology, anthropology,

and linguistics captured the essence of story schema by developing grammars, or sets of rules, that describe the underlying structure of most narratives. During the mid to late 1970's, there were four main story grammar researchers: Rummelhart (1975), Mandler and Johnson (1977), Thorndyke (1977), and Stein and Glenn (1975). The story grammars postulated by them are all similar in structure. According to McConaughy (1980, p. 185) each of these models "defines a story as a series of problem solving episodes centering on the main character's efforts to achieve a major goal." After several unsuccessful attempts, the story problem is either resolved or unresolved.

Beginning in 1975, Rummelhart proposed a story grammar to represent the internal organization of story material. Using two identical paragraphs, one coherent and the other obviously scrambled, he demonstrated that the structure of stories differs from a random string of sentences. 'A string' becomes a story when related events lead to a reaction. Story grammar is similar to the grammar of a sentence. Rather than using the terms nouns and adjectives, important elements are referred to as episodes and events. Unfortunately, Rummelhart's grammar for narrative text could only be applied to simple stories that

contained a definite beginning, middle and ending. It should also be noted that Rummelhart's rules were not as easily applied to stories with more than one setting.

Thorndyke (1977) and Mandler and Johnson (1977) also suggested that stories have an overall grammar or predictable plot. Along with Thorndyke, they stressed the importance of identifying the structural elements common to simple stories. However, Thorndyke described a story as consisting of the following elements: a) setting; b) theme; c) plot; and d) resolution while Mandler and Johnson devised six major story elements and referred to them as nodes. The nodes are:

1. Setting - includes introduction of characters, time and location.
2. Beginning - there is a statement of a basic problem which motivates the main character to act.
3. Development - there are internal and external reactions of the protagonist and other characters that lead to a climax or formations of a goal.
   - external refers to visible actions of characters
   - internal refers to thoughts, plans and perceptions

4. Attempt - the character's plan to reach the goal.

5. Outcome - the success or failure of the character's attempt(s).

6. Ending - the results usually emphasize a moral (Mandler and Johnson, 1977, pg. 110-11).

Mandler and Johnson (1977) used their grammar as a basis for analyzing the unaided story recall of subjects of various ages. Results from their study indicated that grade one students were able to recall endings, attempts and internal reactions. Grade four students recalled similar information but they were also able to recall more attempts and outcomes. University students were able to recall attempts, settings, beginnings and outcomes. Interestingly, recalling reactions and endings proved difficult for the adults to remember.

Stein and Glenn (1975) added categories to Rummelhart's original grammar for narrative text so the grammar could be applied to a wider range of stories. In addition, they investigated immediate and delayed recall in a manner similar to Thorndyke (1977) and Mandler and Johnson (1977). The only difference in the Stein and Glenn research was that they used subjects in grades one and five. Results indicated

that few students recalled the stories exactly as presented. Certain transformations, such as word substitutions and deletions regularly occurred. Grade one students had difficultly recalling main characters. Similar to the previous studies, students best remembered major settings. Initiating events, direct consequences, and problem-solving attempts were not as well remembered. Internal responses caused the most recall difficultly. Students from both grades changed internal responses to concrete actions on the part of the character.

In summary, the studies seemed to suggest that if students read or listen to enough stories, they will internalize the story grammar. This schema for the structure of stories will then be available to guide both the encoding and retrieval of story information. Readers and listeners seem to expect a particular story structure and use that schema to interpret and remember stories. The more a story conforms to an idealized story structure, the better the story is recalled. The length of a story is not a factor, but chronological age of the students does influence the amount of story information recalled.

Summary

Story grammar and schema theory research findings, when

combined, support the notion that two variables influence one's ability to both recall and comprehend narrative text. The first variable is the schema one has for the story being read and the second is the underlying structure of the text itself (Bartlett, 1932; Mandler and Johnson, 1977). The schema one has for the text being read focuses attention on important aspects of incoming information. In addition, the schema provides a framework to help the reader summarize both the key actions and events within a story. The interaction between the reader's schema of both text structure and story content influences the reader's ability to reconstruct the text (Anderson, Reynolds, Schallert and Goetz, 1977). The more defined the schema one possesses about a subject, the greater the degree of success one experiences in comprehending new information related to that same topic (Anderson and Pearson, 1984).

The Relationship of Story Grammar to Reading Comprehension

In the late 1970's, researchers began to examine whether explicit story grammar instruction would enhance both students' comprehension and schema for narrative text (Buss, Ratliff and Irion, 1985; Dreher and Singer, 1980; Fitzgerald and Speigal, 1983; Turetzky, 1981). These

investigators believed that story schema structures could be developed by enhancing students' awareness of the relationship between their existing story schema and the structure of the reading material being used. Combining explicit instructional techniques with the use of either story grammar questions, story structure charts, or other reinforcement activities, a basic knowledge framework was provided to help students realize the relationship between their existing story schema and the structure of the text being read.

Guthrie (1977) was the first person to begin adapting story grammar research for general classroom use. Basing his work on Thorndyke's (1977) story grammar rules, he modified the terms so that they could be understood more easily by children. Applying Guthrie's terms in a grade six classroom, Cunningham and Foster (1978) reported that story grammar instruction enhanced both students' reading comprehension and oral retelling of stories. However, their research was based on informal observations, therefore empirical evidence concerning the effectiveness of story grammar instruction was needed. The following is a detailed review of empirical studies linking story grammar with successful comprehension instruction.

In 1980, Dreher and Singer collected data to substantiate Cunningham and Foster's informal study. They randomly assigned twenty-eight grade five students to one of three treatment groups. The first group received story grammar instruction through a three-step strategy. First, components of the story structure were explained to the students. Second, with the assistance of the classroom teacher, students completed a story structure chart and explained the underlying reasons for their categorizations. Then, working in small groups, students cooperatively completed the charts. Last, students completed charts independently. The second group read and drew pictures of the same stories, but did not receive story grammar instruction. The third group received social studies instruction. At the conclusion of Dreher and Singer's study, the teacher read a story while all students followed with their own copy of the narrative. Students then recorded their story recall. Because there were no significant differences between the groups concerning the number of recalled ideas, the authors did not feel that teaching story grammar was a useful technique. Since their research indicated that grade six students already have a story schema, they therefore concluded that specific story grammar instruction was

unnecessary (Dreher and Singer, 1980).

In 1981, Whaley investigated readers' expectations of structures in stories and the nature of these expectations. She hypothesized that if readers expect certain structures, their responses should conform to the story categories identified by Mandler and Johnson (1977). Furthermore, all readers would use a similar schema as a set of expectations for story structure. However, older students would expect particular structures more than younger readers. The responses of older students would also contain more story grammar categories than those of younger students.

Fifty grade three and fifty-one grade six students were randomly selected for this study. Another group of fifty-two grade eleven students also volunteered. All students were classified as being either average or above-average readers. Students first read a set of narratives that had missing elements, and then verbalized what would happen next in the story. Then, students read a second set of stories that had missing elements, but this time information that would fit into the omitted part was supplied orally. Folk tales and stories specifically written by the researchers were used. No attempt was made to control for story length.

Results indicated that depending on the type of story being used,

readers expect certain structures. A high proportion of student responses matched categories predicted by the grammar. When categories predicted by the rules were not given, the students' alternative responses did not tend to be identifiable story categories except for characters 'reactions' which were identified as 'attempts'. Students in grade three gave responses that matched the story grammar to a lesser extent than students in grades six and eleven. There were, however, no significant differences in grade six and eleven students. On the other hand, older students were more likely to produce flashbacks not easily addressed by the grammar (Whaley, 1981).

Overall, the Whaley study supported the story grammar research of the 1970's in that there were age-related differences in the extent to which readers expect stories to have particular structures. As such, younger students are not as easily able to predict story grammar components because they have less book knowledge and less general sense of social situations. This latter factor is important as it is often embedded into the structural content of a story. Whaley also found that good readers are more sensitive to discourse structure. Her research then set the stage for other investigators to begin examining the

relationship between reading ability and expectation for story structure (Whaley, 1981).

In 1981, Turetzky addressed the following question: Do the teaching of story grammar and the use of general story schema questions improve reading comprehension with grade five students of Spanish/Hispanic background? Over approximately a month, students learned to identify narrative elements by analyzing short stories. They also completed story structure charts and answered story grammar related questions. Results indicated that the instructional program benefited the high achieving students more than the low achievers. On the other hand, the appropriate use of charts and questions appeared to influence the direction of learning and facilitate comprehension for both high and low achieving groups.

In 1983, similar results were obtained when Fitzgerald and Spiegel used a slightly younger student population and a more complex design for their study. They selected twenty average and twenty below average students that had been identified as lacking a sense of narrative structure and assigned them to one of two treatment groups. All students were from a grade four classroom. One group received instruction in using

story structure while the other group's instruction focused on dictionary usage.

Both groups were administered similar pre- and post tests. Students were given a production task whereby they read a story setting and were encouraged to write an appropriate ending. Invented spelling was encouraged. Stories were scored on a five point scale developed by Stein and Glenn (1977). A scrambled story task was then administered. Students read and recalled stories that contained 'mixed up' elements. Recall was scored by the extent to which students were able to reorder the story. Lastly, students read a story silently and wrote answers to literal and inferential questions without referring to the story.

The actual study was divided into two phases. Each lesson of phase one focused on one story element and its temporal relation to other story parts. The instructor told about the story element through the following steps: a) describing it; b) pointing out the element in a story on a wall chart; c) giving 2-3 other examples that would be appropriate for that particular story; d) eliciting 2-3 oral examples from the children; and e) giving non-examples and discussing why the examples were not appropriate. Students completed each lesson with an individual activity.

These activities included reading story segments and predicting what might logically happen next, or completing macro-cloze exercises whereby students read/listened to a story and then filled in missing chunks of information.

During phase two, students participated in individual and group activities in order to receive continued reinforcement. These activities included: a) scrambling and reordering jumbled stories; b) sorting sentence strips into story grammar categories and re-ordering the sentences; c) recalling stories read or heard; d) reading stories and identifying story parts; and e) answering story grammar related questions.

Post test results indicated that students in the experimental group were more aware of temporal relations among story elements, made more additions in the story recall, recalled more statements accurately in the scrambled stories task, and answered more literal and inferential comprehension questions. The effects of instruction were particularly noticeable during phase one. The authors concluded that long term instruction may not be necessary to enhance story knowledge and improve reading comprehension of average and below average grade four students (Fitzgerald and Spiegel, 1983).

The results must be concluded within two limitations: First, basal reader stories were used rather than authentic children's literature selections. Second, the control group completed dictionary related skills. Completing dictionary work does not relate to story grammar. Thus the two treatment groups cannot be compared.

In 1985, Buss, Ratliff and Irion also examined the influence of instruction in story structure using less skilled students as subjects. They obtained similar results to studies conducted by Turetzky (1982) and Fitzgerald and Spiegel (1983). In addition to using a two-phase type of instruction, they used delayed post tests in addition to pre- and post-instructional tests. Multiple measures involving oral story production, story arrangement, picture arrangement and probed and unprobed recall were also employed and the students were involved in puppet reenactments of the stories they were reading. The control group received regular instruction through the basal reading series. Results indicated that probed recall for students in the treatment group increased over the three test times. Increases in other areas were also observed with the treatment group, but were not statistically significant.

Kinney and Schmidt (1986) extended Fitzgerald and Spiegel's

(1983) research by using Mandler and Johnson's (1977) story grammar framework to teach plot development in a novel. Eight above-average grade three students were selected for the study. The rationale behind this investigation was that students are often good at understanding individual chapters within a novel, but have difficultly relating the action of each chapter to the novel's overall structure. Students tend to focus on each chapter as a separate unit. The researchers believed that a novel, although a highly complex form of narrative, can be viewed as a series of smaller grammars which contribute to the overall structure of the story (Kinney and Schmidt, 1986).

Using the novel Bunnicula (1979) by Deborah and James Howe, the study was divided into three stages. The first stage made the students familiar with the parts of the grammar. The novel was introduced in stage two. A large wall chart was constructed with the chapter numbers on the horizontal axis and story grammar elements on the vertical axis. This chart was used as a basis for large group review, prediction and summarization. Through reviewing, predicting and summarizing, students began to see how the chapters interrelated. In stage three, students examined the plot development of the novel by

focusing on how and where parts of the story grammar were used. At the conclusion of the novel story, students were asked if the story grammar helped them understand the novel better. Students reported that the story grammar provided a purpose for reading and helped them organize what they were learning.

Although Kinney and Schmidt's (1986) study was descriptively designed, several important details were omitted. The researchers did not adequately describe their process of student selection. Pre- and post-comprehension tests were not administered. Students were interviewed at the conclusion of the study, but a pre-treatment interview was not conducted. Comprehension tests and story writing were not included making it difficult to determine what learning occurred.

Summary

Turetzky (1982), Fitzgerald and Spiegel (1983), Buss, Ratliff and Irion (1985) and Kinney and Schmidt (1986) all used similar reading comprehension instruction procedures. Students were given story grammar text structure rules, information concerning the significance of the grammar, varied concrete practice and some feedback concerning their performance. Fitzgerald and Spiegel (1983) can be credited for

innovating story grammar reinforcement activities into instruction. Buss, Ratliff and Irion (1985) deserve recognition for incorporating the use of puppets to practice a story grammar component. Kinney and Schmidt (1986) also need to be commended for incorporating the use of a contemporary novel, devising a wall chart that helped students visualize plot development in a novel, and including self-reports to determine students' metacognitive awareness of story structure.

The Relationship of Story Grammar to Reading Comprehension and Written Composition

There is an abundance of research detailing the use of story grammar to improve reading comprehension. On the other hand, using story grammar as a vehicle for improving students written composition has not been widely researched. Gordon and Braun (1982), Fitzgerald and Teasley (1983) and Fitzgerald, Spiegel and Teasley (1987) suggested that story grammar instruction provides students with a powerful tool to organize their compositions, and Flower and Hayes (1981) stated that story schema provides students with an adaptable framework for both planning and guiding ideas during writing. The notion of story schema acting as an abstract planning device for the composing

process found support in Crafton (1982) and Squire (1983) when they suggested that reading comprehension and written composition processes share the same cognitive variables.

In 1982, Gordon and Braun investigated the effects of story schema training on reading comprehension and composition. They randomly assigned fifty-seven grade five students to either the experimental or control group. Over a five week period, both groups were exposed to fifteen instructional sessions. The experimental group used the techniques of: a) learning about simplified narrative structures through macrocloze procedures; b) posing their own questions prior to reading; c) writing their own narratives with and without the teacher's guidance; and d) discussing their writing in terms of story grammar components. Students in the control group were exposed to teacher-directed discussions and activities related to drama or literature appreciation. Post-instructional tests indicated that the experimental group outperformed the control group on total number of text structure categories recalled. The experimental group also answered more questions correctly then the control group. Lastly, the experimental group outperformed the control group in the total number of story grammar

categories included in their creative writing.

One year later, Fitzgerald and Teasley (1983) completed a similar study, but employed a more complex design. Using grade four students, they explored the effects of direct story grammar instruction on creativity, cohesion, syntactic complexity, and length of students' written compositions. Nineteen students, identified as lacking in story structure knowledge through their performance on story telling and the recall of scrambled stories were assigned to either an experimental or a control group. The experimental group received two phases of direct instruction in story structure which were identical to the ones used in the 1983 study conducted by Fitzgerald and Spiegel. Students in the experimental group wrote two stories before the instruction began and two stories after each instructional phase. A detailed analysis of these stories was based on a five point scale within: a) uniqueness; b) idea production; and c) language usage. Sentence length was analyzed by counting the number of words in a sentence and determining the number of T-units. Results indicated that direct instruction in story grammar increases the organization, coherence, and creativity of students' writing. Stories completed by students in the experimental group more closely resembled

abbreviated story episodes. No effects were noticed for the use of more elaborate syntax or increased sentence length as a result of story grammar instruction.

Although Fitzgerald and Teasley reported positive results, there were two limitations associated with their study. First, the experimental group filled in missing 'chunks' of story information, sequenced and recalled ideas, and wrote test stories after the instructional phases; they never wrote 'whole' stories during instruction. The control group, on the other hand, seemed to write more 'whole' stories during treatment than the actual experimental group. For example, students in the control group wrote stories that incorporated the dictionary words they were learning. Second, even though the control group was involved in some story writing, completing dictionary work does not directly relate to story grammar. Therefore, performance of the two groups cannot be compared.

In 1987, Fitzgerald, Spiegel and Teasley updated their previous study by adding new writing activities. During phase one and two, students wrote cumulative tales, story templates, group experience stories, story expansions and macrocloze exercises. Pre- and post-

instruction writing samples were provided. Although reinforcement activities were updated, the writing sample was of questionable standard. For example: a) the actions lacked detail; b) elements of time and setting were not included; and c) the characters did not converse with one another. Futhermore, there were no statistical data to document improvements described.

In spite of the above limitations, the authors reported that story grammar instruction and reinforcement activities had a strong impact on the organizational quality of the students' writing. They suggested that the quality of writing had been enhanced, but not story coherence or creativity. Given the lack of statistical data and weaknesses within the writing samples, the validity of the study's findings are limited.

Summary

There is very limited research linking the effects of story grammar instruction on written composition. The work of Fitzgerald and Teasley (1983) and Fitzgerald, Spiegel and Teasley (1987) can be commended for developing a two-phase instructional format and providing reinforcement writing activities. These researchers should also be credited for demonstrating that instructional influences become noticeable

after phase one. However, due to design and statistical limitations, the results of their studies must be interpreted cautiously.

Story Grammar and Exceptional Learners

During the late 1980's, the emphasis in story grammar research shifted towards instructing exceptional learners such as either the mildly handicapped or the learning disabled. Unfortunately, there is limited data available concerning exceptional learners' use of story schema in either comprehending, recalling, or composing stories. Spiro (1980) postulated that during the comprehension process, poor readers may not be able to: a) activate their prior knowledge or schema; b) apply their schema to the text being read; and c) infer a relationship between their schema and the information being presented in the text. Recognizing therefore that low achieving students may need a more concrete framework to recognize the relationship between their schema for narrative text and the structure of the text being used, Idoll and Croll (1987) designed a visual story map. The results from the Idoll and Croll study indicated that a story mapping technique enhances low achieving students' ability to both acquire and apply story schema. Subsequent research by Idoll (1987) indicated that students of all abilities learn effectively in one classroom with one

instructional strategy. This study is particularly relevant considering the current emphasis on mainstreaming exceptional learners within the regular classroom.

In 1988, Montague conducted a correlational study in which she investigated the qualitative and quantitative performance differences between low and high achieving students on listening and composing tasks that required active processing of story grammar. Twelve low achievers and twelve high achievers were randomly selected from intermediate, junior and senior high placements. Students gave oral retellings after listening to a narrative and wrote stories when provided with a brief story starter. Significant differences were found between the two achievement groups in the amount as well as the type of information included in the retellings and written stories. Across the grade levels, low achieving students recalled fewer total units of information, fewer direct consequences or major settings, and significantly fewer internal responses of characters. Similar results were observed in their story writing. The stories written by the low achieving students were disorganized and often incomplete.

Similar results were attained in the correlational research

conducted by Laughton and Morris (1989). After analyzing story writing samples from one hundred and ninety-two students in grades three, four, five and six, they concluded that low achieiving students give much poorer performances at the grades three, four and five level. However, at the grade six level, no significant differences were found between the responses of low and high achieving students.

Idoll and Croll (1987) were the first investigators to attempt story map training as a form of improving reading comprehension with low achieving students. Recognizing that less competent readers need precise teacher presentation, constant feedback, and much opportunity to practice newly acquired skills, they followed a model-lead-test paradigm with five students: teachers modeled appropriate responses, responded with the students, and then encouraged the students to respond independently. Also, teachers immediately corrected comprehension and word recognition miscues.

Five intermediate students were randomly assigned to alternate days of baseline data collection. During the baseline phase, students orally read a story at their own grade level for twenty minutes, retold the story in as much detail as possible, and then responded to

comprehension questions asked by the teacher. During the intervention phase, students read stories in a similar fashion. In addition, students were familiarized with a story map. When information pertaining to a particular story component was read, the students or the teacher recorded the information on the map. The story map procedures were eliminated when the students completed the maps with eighty percent accuracy.

At the end of the study, oral story recall was measured by the number of words, clauses, sentences, and story components included by the student. Students were then given comprehension subtests of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test (1976) and the Nelson Reading Skills test (1977). They also orally read an unfamiliar basal story and responded to related comprehension questions. Lastly, listening comprehension was assessed.

All five students improved on the listening comprehension test and at least one standardized reading test. Three students showed an overall gain in the number of words, clauses, sentences and story components used to retell the story orally. All students increased their ability to answer 'where' types of questions and included this category

in their recall. In addition, students increased their ability to identify the main character both in their recall and responses to probed questions. All students improved in their ability to answer action- related questions, while three students improved their retelling. Four students became more adept at identifying the main story problem. Two students increased in the ability to generalize the comprehension skills when presented with a new basal story, while two other students demonstrated a decrease in this area, and one student maintained his abilities.

Although Idoll and Croll's (1987) research clearly demonstrated that students exhibiting reading comprehension problems are capable of learning narrative structure, three limitations are associated with their study. First, 'theme' and 'response' components were not included in the story map thus not examined. Second, basal readers were used extensively throughout this study, rather than authentic children's literature. Spontaneous story writing was not included in the study.

Idoll (1987) continued this research using a heterogeneous group of grade three and four students as subjects. In a large instructional setting, low and high achieving students were taught story mapping techniques to improve their reading comprehension. Idoll hypothesized

that if low achievers were integrated with average and above average students, the low achievers would respond similarly to the skilled readers.

Results from her study indicated that ability grouping is not necessary if teachers want to advance reading comprehension with their students (Idoll, 1987). All students showed improvement in a number of general areas such as listening comprehension, performance on criterion referenced tests and journal writing. The low achieiving students made more significant gains on the reading and listening tests than students from the other ability groups. Low achieving students maintained their improvement in spite of being instructed in a group situation and reading stories that were more difficult than usual. Comprehension scores were maintained by all students even after the use of story maps was discontinued.

The Idoll (1987) study demonstrated that narrative text comprehension can be improved for both good and poor readers through direct instruction in story grammar. The progress of normal children is not impeded by mainstreaming exceptional learners into the classroom when teachers model appropriate strategies and communicate to the students that they are expected to adopt similar techniques to enhance

their comprehension and recall.

Summary

Results from the Montague (1988) and Laughton and Morris studies indicate that teaching story grammar earlier than the grade six level improves the reading comprehension and written expression of younger students exhibiting learning problems. Judging by Idoll (1987) and Idoll and Croll (1987) all the studies showed that if instruction focuses on character responses, then the low achieving students' oral recalls can be similar to that of average students in terms of both quantity and quality of ideas. Students identified as having reading problems are not only capable of learning about narrative structure, but can learn it in a regular classroom.

General Research on Metacognition

During the 1970's and 1980's, there was extensive research on students' metacognitive awareness of both text-processing and strategic reading behaviour. Also, many researchers studied and determined the correlations between metacognitive awareness of reading comprehension strategies and students' reading performance. The results of these research areas indicated that both young and poor readers do not

monitor their understanding of their reading and do not employ effective reading strategies as often as skilled readers. Baker and Brown (1984) suggested that poor text processing strategies may be traced to students' lack of awareness concerning either effective reading behaviour or knowledge of text structure. Since success in reading comprehension depends upon one's ability to both detect and correct the possible errors or difficulties encountered, good readers monitor their reading behavior and then engage in an alternate plan when comprehension fails (Brown, 1980; Paris, Wasik, and Westhuizen, 1989).

Clay (1973) studied the strategic reading behaviour demonstrated by grade one students. Based on her observations, Clay suggested that the beginning readers who performed within the top half of their class were able to correct more oral reading errors spontaneously then beginning readers whose performance was in the lower half of their class. Myers and Paris (1978) interviewed twenty grade two and twenty grade six students in order to determine students' knowledge of strategic reading behaviour. The responses to the interview questions suggested that younger students have less knowledge of cognitive elements related to reading behaviour and therefore lack flexibility in using reading

strategies in different learning contexts. For example, younger students had less knowledge of re-reading and skimming strategies to remedy text processing difficulties.

Paris and Myers (1981) designed comparative study of metacognitive differences between fourth grade good and poor readers. The results from this comparative study indicated that poor readers corrected fewer oral reading errors and employed less strategic study behaviour than that demonstrated by good readers. A design flaw, however, was that students' awareness of reading strategies was inferred from their performance on the testing tasks. Therefore, Paris and Myers could not be certain that poor readers' performance on the testing tasks indicated a lack of metacognitive knowledge; poor reading performance does not explicitly imply poor metacognition.

Garner and Kraus (1981, 1982) correlated measures of metacognitive reading comprehension with measures of reading performance. Interviews were conducted with good and poor seventh grade readers. Subjects were asked questions about their metacognitive knowledge of effective reading comprehension strategies. Two weeks later, subjects were given an error detection task to assess their

metacognitive reading comprehension knowledge. The results attained in this study indicated that there was a significant correlation between knowledge of reading comprehension strategies and performance on the reading task. For example, good readers focused on acquiring meaning as a goal and they described effective strategies they employed to ensure that their reading comprehension goal was obtained. On the other hand, poor readers did not focus on attaining meaning; many of the responses of the poor readers suggested that they were intent on calling words correctly.

One of the most notable correlational studies was conducted by Forrest-Pressley and Waller (1984). They administered a wide battery of reading comprehension and cognitive tasks to seventy-two grade three and seventy-two grade six students of high, average, and low ability. The results suggested that students' ability to report verbally on their thinking and to use strategic reading behaviour increased with both age and reading comprehension ability.

Summary

The results from the Baker and Brown (1984), Brown (1980), Clay (1973), Forrest-Pressley and Waller (1984), Garner and Kraus (1981,

1982), Myers and Paris (1978), Paris and Myers (1981), and Paris, Wasik and Westhuizen (1988) studies have made important contributions to our knowledge regarding metacognition. These studies have: a) provided developmental descriptions of childrens' metacognitive awareness; b) addressed differences in the metacognitive abilities of good and poor readers; and c) stressed the importance of self-monitoring for proficient reading comprehension behavior.

Metacognition and Instructional Mediation

The body of research that linked metacognition and proficient reading influenced investigators to design instructional studies to teach students how to use effective metacognitive strategies. The effect of having teachers provide explicit instruction regarding either a single reading strategy or multiple strategic reading behaviors was studied. Many of the studies emphasized the use of informed instruction. Although there are several studies that trained students to employ strategic reading comprehension behavior, many of the studies did not administer appropriate pre-, post-, and delayed-post tests to assess transfer and long term training effects on students' metacognitive knowledge and subsequent learning achievement (Baker and Brown,

1984; Paris, Lipson and Wixon, 1983; Paris, Wasik and Westhuizen, 1989; Pearson and Gallagher, 1983).

Brown, Campoine and Day (1981) identified two levels of instruction for the enhancement of students' learning. The first level of instruction, informed training, involved the use of the following procedures: a) giving students explicit information about the use of a particular strategy being learned and b) training students to use the strategy in different learning contexts so that the utility of the strategy would become apparent. The second level of instruction, self-control training, involved not only instructing students in the varied use of a particular strategy but also showing the students how to both self-monitor and evaluate their use of the strategy. The use of the self-control training appeared more successful than the informed training in both enhancing student school performance and transferring application of the strategy to other appropriate learning contexts.

Paris, Lipson, and Wixon (1983) identified three levels of metacognitive knowledge: a) declarative knowledge or the understanding for both the characteristics of a task and one's ability to perform the task; b) procedural knowledge or the understanding of how to perform the

actions of a strategy; and c) conditional knowledge or knowing both when and why one should perform a particular strategy. Paris, Cross, and Lipson (1984) then trained grade three and five students to use these three levels of metacognitive knowledge. Through the use of both teacher modeling and group discussions, the students were given explicit information concerning the procedural, declarative, and contextual knowledge associated with fourteen modules of different reading strategies. Pre- and post- metacognitive measures were administered to determine the impact of the intervention. Analyses indicated that students in both grade three and five made significant improvements not only in their metacognitive knowledge of reading strategies, but also in their ability to detect errors in a text and complete cloze reading comprehension exercises.

In a subsequent study, Paris and Oka (1986) trained fifty volunteer teachers to instruct grade three and grade five students to use twenty different strategic reading behaviors. The teachers were given workshops concerning the reading strategies, but were not supervised while they implemented the instruction with their students. After six months of intervention, the results suggested that the instructional

reading strategies benefitted students from a wide variety of ages and reading skills. The researchers therefore concluded that a metacognitive intervention program promotes effective reading behavior for both good and poor readers.

Miller (1985) taught comprehension strategies to fourth grade students of average ability. The students learned to employ the following techniques: a) define the given task; b) select an appropriate strategy to complete the task; and c) evaluate the strategy selected. The students were taught self-verbalization routines to evaluate the strategies they selected. In addition, the classroom teacher gave the students both guided practice in using the strategy and feedback concerning their performance. Results indicated that grade four students of average ability increased their comprehension monitoring during oral reading and recalled more of the training instructions during a post test interview.

Using a reciprocal teaching procedure, Palinscar and Brown (1984) trained grade seven students of poor reading ability to activate multiple strategic reading behaviors in order to enhance their reading comprehension abilities. The students were shown how to ask appropriate comprehension questions, make story predictions, and orally

summarize the text being read. Initially, the classroom teachers explicitly modeled the strategic reading behavior. Results indicated that the students gradually assumed more control in asking the comprehension questions, making predictions, and orally summarizing the text. Increases were also noted in the students' reading comprehension performance, but information regarding the students' metacognitive knowledge both before and after the instructional intervention was not reported.

Using existing classroom reading materials, Duffy, Roehler, and their colleagues (1987) trained grade three teachers to provide more explicit reading instruction to their low reading achievement students. The twenty teachers and their students that participated in the study were randomly assigned to either an experimental or a control group. The teachers that were assigned to the experimental group received training concerning the cognitive skills an expert reader uses when encountering text difficulties. In addition, the teachers used explicit modeling of the mental processes that both the basal skill exercises and drills emphasized. The format for these lessons consisted of: a) an introduction to the strategic reading behavior; b) explicit teacher modeling

of the strategy; c) interaction between the teacher and students concerning the use of the strategy with the basal reader-activity; and d) closure of the lesson. The teachers assigned to the control group followed the usual instructional routines associated with the use of their basal reading program.

The results attained from the Duffy, Roehler, et. al. study (1987) indicated that low achieving students are capable of learning and applying strategic reading behaviors. However, explicit instruction did not result in immediate changes in their reading behavior. Over the course of the school year, these students gradually became more aware of the declarative, procedural, and contextual knowledge associated with proficient reading behavior. They became more aware of both the lesson content being presented and the need to be strategic when reading.

Positive changes were also observed in the instructional behavior of the experimental teachers. The teachers became more explicit in explaining the mental processing in which a strategic student engages when reading. Duffy, Roehler, et. al. (1987) therefore concluded that classroom teachers can be taught to explain a complex task such as strategic reading behavior. Unfortunately, pretest awareness of the

students' metacognitive knowledge was not determined, therefore, information regarding the development of metacognitive processing is not controllable.

Summary

There is a lack of research concerning how explicit comprehension training affects students' understanding of metacognitive knowledge as many of the studies did not administer measures of the students' metacognition either before or after treatment procedures (Duffy, Roehler, et. al., 1987; Miller, 1985; Palinscar and Brown, 1984). All of the studies, on the other hand, emphasized that because poor readers either do not possess strategic reading behaviors or do not know when or how to use the strategies effectively, there is a need for more effective instruction that includes explicit explanations regarding the mental processing associated with reading related tasks. Particularly, there is a need to provide low-achieving students with the declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge pertaining to both single and multiple reading strategy lessons.

Story Grammar and Metacognition

Until the 1980's, it was assumed that schema functioned at an

unconscious level. Researchers believed that individuals were not metacognitively aware of using story schema in comprehension or composing. Singer and Donlan (1982), the first researchers to design a successful instructional intervention based on story grammar, were also the first people to use a strategy similar to Brown, Campione, and Day's (1981) 'self control training' in a story grammar study. In their study, students learned to generate story specific questions from schema general questions. This strategy proved to be an effective way to interact and learn from a text. Similar self-control training through self-questioning and story grammar strategy training was used with equally positive results in the Carnine and Kinder (1985) and Griffey, Zigmond and Leinhardt (1985) studies of learning disabled students.

Students' self-reports used as a metacognitive awareness measure by Gordon and Braun (1986) and Gordon (1988) demonstrated that awareness of the reading and writing process can be brought to a conscious or metacognitive level. Furthermore, their findings suggest that this awareness does not necessarily lag behind students' actions. The Gordon and Braun (1986) studies clearly illustrate that performance in reading and writing may be enhanced through the use of

metacognitive strategies common to both activities. The students' self reports further established the inter-relatedness of the reading/writing process.

Singer and Donlan (1982) were the first researchers to use story grammar as a vehicle for helping students acquire a process for 'learning how to learn' from text. They randomly assigned fifteen grade eleven students to one of two treatment groups. The format for both groups was similar. Each of the lessons focused on a short story and students in both groups were provided with background information and vocabulary instruction. Students in the experimental group were introduced to one story element per day and were also shown how to generate specific questions about the stories they were reading. Both groups then listened to an audio tape while following along with a copy of the story. At a given point, the audio tape stopped. The control group was then asked teacher-derived questions while the experimental group was shown how to generate content specific questions from general story schema questions. At the end of the story, the control group wrote essays in response to the teacher posed questions. The experimental group wrote additional questions. Each day, both groups also answered

a ten item multiple-choice test that was based on the story.

There were no statistical differences between the two groups during the first two instructional sessions. However, the experimental group scored higher on the multiple choice tests for the remaining sessions. Overall, results from this study indicated that self-questioning improves the reading comprehension of short stories and encourages more efficient reader-based processing of text. 'Theme' was the only component that still gave students difficultly. The limitations associated with this study were the omission of testing for comprehension through oral or written recalls and the lack of a delayed post test.

Camine and Kinder (1985) conducted a more extensive investigation. They assessed the relative effectiveness of teaching low performing students to either ask and answer schema-based story questions or generate story images and summary statements. Twenty-seven intermediate level students, from either regular classrooms, remedial reading programs, or special education programs, were randomly assigned to either a schema-based or generative instructional group.

Students involved in the schema-based intervention were exposed

to teacher instruction concerning basic story grammar. Initially, the teacher asked the story grammar questions, but the students later generated their own questions. Students were then given the opportunity to read silently and practice this schema strategy on their own. Teachers responded to any errors by modeling the correct answer.

For the generative instruction condition, teachers divided stories into chunks. At the end of each chunk, students closed their eyes, made a picture in their head and made a statement about the picture. This process was repeated at each generative chunk. At the end of the story, students gave summary statements. Results from this study indicated that low performing students in both the generative and schema based learning strategies group demonstrated comprehension gains. For example, pre- to post test improvements on retelling scores were well over one standard deviation.

In 1988, Griffey, Zigmond and Leinhardt continued to investigate the effects of self-questioning and story structure training on reading comprehension. They randomly assigned twenty-seven less competent students to one of three treatment groups. The reading ability level of subjects ranged from grade three to five. During the pre-test phase, all

students read a narrative and completed a four item multiple-choice test. They then read another story and answered four questions concerning story grammar elements. After a third narrative was read, students gave verbal story retellings.

During the intervention phase, students assigned to a self questioning and story grammar group were instructed how to ask themselves questions pertaining to story structure elements using a CAPS acronym (character, aim, problem, solution). Students that were assigned to a 'CAPS only' group were taught story grammar parts, but were not given instruction concerning self-questioning techniques. The training sessions for these first two groups included an introduction to the lesson, teacher modeling of the strategy, guided practice, and corrective feedback. The third treatment group was exposed to teacher-generated questions that related to the story structure. During the post testing phase, students read five stories, answered multiple-choice tests, and were alternately prompted or not prompted to use the strategies they had been taught.

Results from the study were similar to those obtained by Carmine and Kinder (1985). Self-questioning and story grammar instruction

enhanced comprehension for less competent readers. Students in the CAPS/self questioning group improved their comprehension more than students assigned to the teacher questioning group. The CAPS only group did not score better than the teacher questioning group. Furthermore, when students were not prompted to self-question and use their story grammar strategies, they did not answer more questions. It would seem that students may need cueing to use their questioning and metacognitive strategies to increase comprehension performance. This study could have been further enhanced by administering a delayed test, incorporating process writing into the instructional procedures, including the use of children's literature to facilitate the transfer of learning, and extending the acronym to include the following story components: a) time; b) theme; c) response; and d) setting.

Gordon and Braun (1986) designed a study in which story structure awareness was taught. Self-reports were then used to indicate the extent to which students used similar metacognitive strategies during the reading and writing process. Fifty-four grade five students were randomly assigned to either an experimental or control group. The control group received instruction in poetry writing with an emphasis on

structures for different types of poems. The experimental group was exposed to instruction that developed an awareness of general story structure. Emphasis for both groups was placed on teacher modeling, student self-questioning concerning story grammar elements, and writing both group and individual stories.

Extensive results were obtained from this study. There were no significant differences found between the two groups on: a) total number of text structure categories produced in the written recalls that followed the reading of an unfamiliar narrative; b) total number of story structure categories produced in independent compositions; and c) answering literal or inferential comprehension questions. Teacher modeling, discussions, macrocloze exercises, and collaborative writing improved the reading comprehension and written composition of both groups. For the experimental group, a significant difference was found from pre- to post-test on the comprehension section of the Gates-McGinite Reading Test. Both groups increased the total number of story structure elements produced in their recall and independent compositions, yet these figures dropped in number on delayed post tests.

Data from the self reports indicated that both groups considered

affective, judgemental or personal responses while reading (Gordon and Braun, 1986). They also considered ways to access their prior knowledge and used predicting or self questioning strategies. When writing recalls of stories, 10 students in the experimental group made reference to thinking about specific story elements. While none of the students in the control group made this type of reference. When the students were asked about the kinds of things they do to help them remember and understand a story, many gave responses similar to those identified above.

This study also revealed that more students in the experimental group employed story grammar as an organizational framework for planning their stories. While actually writing a story, students in the experimental group thought about internal monologing, story details and story elements. While the control group thought about story details but made more references to writing mechanics such as sentence structure, the experimental group indicated that story grammar, self-questioning and self-monologuing were the most helpful strategies to use while they were writing. Many students in the control group were not aware of their cognitive processes as some were only able to indicate that their mind

helped them to write a story.

Since some students mentioned the use of narrative structure in their self-report but they did not necessarily apply this knowledge in their stories, self-reporting did not distinguish between schema availability and schema utilization (Gordon and Braun, 1986). Therefore, the authors, felt that case studies geared to monitor individual performance would be necessary in order to observe the entire learning process more closely. Overall, the self-reports provided insight into whether the use of story grammar was an automatic or conscious process for students, however, caution is needed when interpreting self-reports. Responses may be reflective of inadequate verbalization skills or indicate students' perceived expectations of what they should report.

Gordon and Braun continued to study the link between metacognition and story grammar. In 1988, they used introspective self-reports of sixth grade students to determine the context in which students use knowledge about narrative text structure. Over a nine-month period, they taught and observed in a grade six classroom that was located in a middle class socioeconomic neighborhood. Approximately thirty students were enrolled. Students were given guidance in analyzing narrative text

through direct, explicit instruction in story grammar. Also, students were involved in process writing. They collaboratively wrote and edited stories, chose their own topics, and peer conferenced. After nine months, students were tested by recalling a story that they had read and writing an individual composition from a given story starter. When students had completed these tests, they were interviewed with a series of five questions that examined their metacognitive awareness of story grammar during the reading and writing process.

Results from this study were insightful. A large percentage of the students used story grammar in their reading and writing but did not use the structure consistently. Many students thought that the story grammar was more useful when they were composing their own make-believe stories rather than when they were reading and recalling a story. Some students indicated that they used the grammar if it was imposed by the teacher either through a discussion, story diagram, or when given an assignment to summarize a story. Others self-imposed the use of story grammar. For example, they used the structure when their comprehension broke down or they wanted to focus particular attention on a certain part of a story. Similarly, some of the students used the

grammar because of the text itself. The structure was used if the students were reading a story familiar in content or structure and if the text was either appealing or too difficult. Students also claimed that they used the grammar to remember the text for the written recall.

Within the writing context, some of the students used story grammar when composing their own stories. Story grammar knowledge was evident in the use of settings, initiating events, plot, resolutions, outcomes and reactions. Students stated that when they were cued by their teacher, they were more apt to use story grammar. Similarly, story grammar was considered when the students wanted to borrow elements from a book they had read or movie they had seen. A few students used the grammar for revision purposes or activated the grammar if they were not given a specific story topic. Story grammar was not used when students wrote about their own experiences. Content based on the students' life experiences seemed to overrule the use of grammar for stories. Some of the students stated that they used story grammar as an organizational aid before the process of writing. Only one student activated the structure as a checking device within the revision process.

Students who did not use story grammar either were not able to

bring the strategy to a conscious level or had minimal control over the textual structures. Five students appeared to lack the ability to be metacognitive and cognitive at the same time. These students experienced difficulty consciously applying story structure knowledge while actually reading and writing. Rich prior reading and life experiences influenced the degree to which story grammar was used. A positive self-concept was equally influential. One of the best readers/writers in the classroom made no mention of using story grammar strategies (Gordon, 1988).

Summary

Camine and Kinder (1985), Gordon and Braun (1986 and 1988), Griffey, Zigmond and Leinhardt (1985), and Singer and Donlan (1982) all used similar instructional procedures. Students were taught metacognitive strategies common to both reading comprehension and written composition activities. Students' self-reports used as a metacognitive awareness measure by Gordon and Braun (1986 and 1988) demonstrated that awareness of the reading and writing process can be brought to a conscious or metacognitive level. However, had Gordon and Braun pretested the students with interview questions and

asked the questions at regular intervals throughout the study, more information regarding the development of metacognitive processing may have been obtained.

Summary of the Literature Review

Researchers trace the early use of the term story schema to Bartlett (1932). Rumelhart (1975), Stein and Glenn (1975), Thorndyke (1977) and Mandler and Johnson (1977) all demonstrated that stories have a predictable structure or grammar. There were only subtle differences between the grammars developed. Generally, major elements include: a) setting; b) plot; c) internal and external reaction; and e) resolution. Results of these studies indicated that story schema may be used to guide predicting, recalling, understanding and remembering stories. Though knowledge of story schema is developmental, it has been shown that young children expect certain structures from stories.

From the late 1970's until the present time, story grammar researchers have branched off in different directions. The major areas discussed in this review included: a) reading comprehension; b) reading comprehension and written composition; c) exceptional learners; and c) metacognitive awareness. The studies that link story grammar and

metacognitive awareness share a base with Brown, Campione and Day's (1981) notion of 'self control training'. The most salient points from these studies indicate that through direct story grammar instruction, self-questioning and self-monologues, students were able to articulate the contexts in which they used their knowledge of story grammar. They were also able to explain how their knowledge of story grammar was used to enhance their reading comprehension and story writing abilities.

Studies that were completed in the areas of comprehension, composition and exceptional learners all shared a design based on Brown, Campione and Day's (1981), 'informed training'. There were two outstanding features. First, comprehension was directly taught within a relatively short period of time. Second, many instructional techniques that are still used in today's research had their basis in these former studies. Techniques included: a) providing an overview of story grammar through an ideal story; b) using teacher and student posed questions; c) writing group and individual stories; d) analyzing class produced and individual stories; e) diagramming, analyzing and parsing stories; f) using macrocloze techniques; and g) scrambling and sorting sentence strips into grammar categories.

Key studies in the general research on metacognition suggest that proficient reading comprehension depends upon the ability to both monitor one's understanding of the reading selection and correct errors or difficulties encountered (Baker and Brown, 1984; Brown, 1980; Paris and Myers, 1981; Paris, Wasik, and Westhuizen, 1989). The study completed by Duffy, Roehler and their colleagues (1987) linked the concepts of metacognition and instructional mediation. The results of their study indicate that three variables are necessary in order for students to both attain conceptual understanding of the reading process and demonstrate proficient strategic reading behavior. The first variable is teacher talk. The degree to which students interpret tasks is influenced by the teacher's instructional dialogue. The students of teachers who consistently talk about reading as a strategic behavior eventually understand that they also must be strategic. The second variable is interactive instruction. During the instructional process, both the teacher and student actively exchange information. This exchange continues until the students can demonstrate proficiency in the use of the targeted strategic reading behavior. The last variable is the element of time. The understandings one must develop in becoming a strategic

reader are gradual and occur over a passage of time.

The instructional principles developed from the Duffy, Roehler et.al. (1987), Gordon (1988), Gordon and Braun (1988), Idoll and Croll (1987) and Kinney and Schmidt (1986) studies form the basis for the instructional procedures used in this study and are described in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III

Procedures and Design

Overview

The purposes of this study were to: a) investigate the effects of narrative instruction, a story grammar acronym, and think sheets for planning and revising stories upon students' ability to recall a silently read story and compose a story independently; b) determine if narrative instruction facilitated students' ability to articulate knowledge of their reading and writing strategies after a time delay; and c) document the interactions that occurred between a teacher-researcher and each student during story grammar instruction. Each student received sixteen training sessions individually. Of these sessions, eight pertained to reading comprehension and the oral retelling of stories, and the remaining eight related to developing story writing abilities. The goals and instructional strategies emerged from the studies reviewed in Chapter 2. Evidence for the transfer of strategic learning behavior from the teacher to the students was found within metacognitive protocols provided by students who participated in studies by Gordon and Braun (1986 and 1988). Support to investigate the role of instructional

mediation in making students more metacognitively aware was also attained by results of a pilot project (Cohen, 1991) conducted in February of 1991. Six general questions guided the study:

Story Comprehension and Recall

1. Will narrative instruction improve students' recall of a silently read story?
2. Will a story grammar acronym improve the students' ability to recall a silently read story?

Story Writing

3. Will narrative instruction improve the students' ability to compose a story independently?
4. Will think-sheets improve the students' ability to organize and edit written compositions?

Metacognitive Awareness

5. Can students: a) demonstrate knowledge of strategy application in story recalls and compositions; and b) articulate how they used the story grammar strategy in either comprehending and composing?

Instructional Mediation

6. In terms of facilitating learning, what is salient about the interactions between a researcher and students during the instructional mediation process?

The questions were the focus of: a) the pilot study c) the student sample; c) testing and scoring procedures; and d) instructional procedures.

Pilot Study

The purposes of the pilot study were threefold:

1. to determine if story grammar instruction improved the recall and composition writing abilities of one unique grade three student;

2. to develop and refine testing instruments and interview questions;

3. to determine the instructional effectiveness of the use of a story frame and think sheets for composing and editing.

The pilot study included one student who was placed in a Special Education classroom in the Winnipeg School Division. The student could orally read at grade level and sight read isolated lists of words that were above grade level, but had difficulty comprehending and recalling silently

read material. Silent comprehension scores were more than 1 year below grade level. While he was able to write coherent sentences and his spelling was above grade level, his independently written stories lacked focus and detail. Furthermore, the student had difficulty sustaining attention during most instructional aspects of the school day.

Immediate post testing results indicated that the instructional strategies were effective. However, delayed post testing indicated regressions in story writing ability. While the intervening spring break may have influenced the results, the need to re-instate instruction became apparent. The acronym did not reflect the natural sequence of the story componets, therefore the need to create a new acronym was also noticed.

A few changes were made with the testing instruments. The scoring of the qualitative retelling profile was re-defined and therefore became less 'vulnerable' to misinterpretation. The story frame and sequencing component of the quantification scheme were changed to reflect the sequence of components presented in the acronym. Lastly, one interview question was reworded to allow subjects an opportunity to reflect more concretely on their thought processes.

Subjects

Based on recommendations of Idoll and Croll (1987), Gordon and Braun (1988), and the pilot study, a case study approach was adopted. Two grade three subjects, an eight year old girl and a nine year old boy, were selected as the subjects of this study. Both students demonstrated poor reading abilities, but possessed average or above average verbal skills and adequate decoding proficiency. The students attended an elementary school in a greater Winnipeg school division. The school services a diverse population including families from a nearby military base, a low-income housing project, and the surrounding middle-class neighborhood.

Recruitment Procedures

A request for permission to conduct this study accompanied by an abstract of the thesis proposal was submitted to the research department of the school division. Based on both the pilot study and the advice of the school division's Early Years Consultant one grade three classroom was selected for the purpose of data collection. A letter was sent to parents which notified them of the study and gave them the opportunity to exclude their child from participating. (See Appendix A for a copy of

the letter.)

Selection Procedures

The following procedures were employed to obtain the appropriate students:

1. The classroom teacher was given a class list and asked to eliminate the names of students: (a) whose parents had provided written notification to exclude their child; (b) who exhibited decoding problems which might interfere with reading comprehension; (c) who demonstrated low verbal ability or were receiving language therapy; (d) who were functioning more than two grade levels below expected reading and writing performance.

2. The teacher was then asked to judge the remaining students according to their level of reading performance. Employing the following criteria, the number 1, 2 or 3 was placed beside each name: 1 - good reading abilities; 2 - average reading abilities; 3 - poor reading abilities.

3. The investigator then administered the reading comprehension subtest of the Gates-MacGinite Reading Test (Primary C1, 1965) to each potential student. The grade equivalent scores were ordered from highest to lowest and compared with the teacher's judgements regarding

reading performance.

4. To confirm that students had adequate decoding skills, a grade three passage from the Ekwall Reading Inventory (1986) was individually administered. Students who scored below 95 percent word recognition accuracy were eliminated.

5. Students who scored at grade placement were eliminated from the study.

6. Pre-training measures were then individually administered to the remaining potential subjects. Reading comprehension, recall and a story writing sample from each student were analyzed. One experienced teacher also independently scored these pre-training measures (See Appendix B-1 to B-6.) Students whose comprehension, recall and story writing scores exceeded 65 percent were eliminated from the sample selection.

7. From the remaining potential sample, two students who obtained the lowest scores on both the recall and writing tasks were selected as the subjects for the study.

Testing and Scoring Procedures

Reading Pretest Procedures

Franklin in the Dark (Bourgeois, 1986) was used for the pretest story (See Appendix B-7 to B-9 for a description of the stories used in this study.) Individually, students silently read the book, rehearsed his/her recall, and then orally retold the story. The following directions were used:

The title of the story is Franklin in the Dark. Read the story to yourself. When you are finished reading, I am going to ask you to tell me everything that you remember about the story. I will help you with any words that you do not know. Now that you are finished the story, take a minute and think about everything that you have read. Now, please tell me everything that you remember about the story.

If the student seemed reluctant, the following prompts were to be used:

- Please retell the story as if you were explaining the story to a friend who has never heard the story before.

- What else do you remember about the story?

- Do you remember anything else about the story?

- What happened next?

- Once upon a time there was... (adapted from Morrow and cited by Glaser & Searfross, 1988).

After the student recalled the story, ten story grammar related questions were asked. If the student had included the correct answer to

the question during his/her recall, the question was scored as correct and not posed. The following comprehension questions were asked:

1. Who is the main character?
2. Where does the story take place?
3. When does the story take place?
4. What is the problem in the story?
5. What did Franklin do to try and solve the problem?
6. Was it hard to solve the problem? Why or why not?
7. How does Franklin feel about his problem?
8. How does the problem get solved?
9. How does the story end?
10. Was there a lesson that you learned from the story? Explain.

(Adapted from Gersten & Dimino, 1989, p. 54; Idoll & Croll, 1987, p. 218; McConaughy, 1982, p. 586; Singer & Donlan, 1987, p. 173).

Composition Pretest Procedures

Individually, students were asked to write a make-believe story. A story starter was not given unless the student seemed reluctant to begin writing. There was no time limit. The following directions were given:

I'd like you to write a make-believe story. Take a minute and think about all the things you want to include in your story. If you want, you

can jot down and organize some of your ideas before you begin. Try to write as much as you can about your story. Do not worry if you do not know how to spell a word. Try to spell the word the best that you can or ask me for the correct spelling. Tell me when you are ready to begin writing your story.

The following sample story starters were used when prompts were necessary:

1. Once upon a time there was a wicked old witch named Hazel. _____

_____ 2. Once upon a time there was a brave young prince/princess that lived in a far off castle._____

_____ 3. Once upon a time there was a brave young dragon that lived in an enchanted forest. _____

Pretest Metacognitive Questions

1. When you were reading the story, what were some of the things you were thinking about? Tell me about them.

2. When I asked you to tell me about the story, what were some of the things you were thinking about? Tell me about them.

3. While you were writing your story, what were some of the things

that you were thinking about? Tell me about them.

4. What are the parts of a story that you know?

(Taken from Gordon & Braun, 1986, pp. 296-298; Gordon, 1988, p. 150).

Post Test Procedures

In order to obtain post-test measures, the students were again assessed individually. They re-read the pre-test story, orally recalled the story, and answered comprehension questions. The students then wrote another composition and responded to interview questions. In addition, students read an unfamiliar story to allow further comparisons of pre- and post-test data. Annie and the Wild Animals (Brett, 1985) was used with one student, and an alternate book, Peace At Last (Murphy, 1980), was used with the other student. (See Appendix B for descriptions of these stories). The alternate book was selected for one student as the readability of the book more closely matched the student's instructional reading level. One experienced teacher independently scored the post-test recalls and written compositions. The following interview questions were asked to assess metacognitive awareness:

1. When we began reading together you were able to recall __ sentences about the story. Now you are able to remember __

sentences. Why are you now able to remember more sentences? (This question will be discussed futher in relation to the recall graph.)

or

2. Did you think about story parts when you were reading Franklin in the Dark? Tell me about them.

3. Did you think about story parts when you were writing your story? Tell me about them.

4. What story parts do you know? (Questions 2-4 were taken from Gordon & Braun, 1986, pp. 296-298; Gordon, 1988, p. 150.)

Delayed Post Test Procedures

Delayed post testing was conducted four weeks after the administration of the immediate post-tests. The students re-read the immediate post-test story. Then as before, they recalled the story, answered comprehension questions, wrote a composition, and responded to interview questions. In addition, an unfamiliar story was read to further compare testing data and to determine both the retention and application of the students' story grammar knowledge. No More Baths (Cole, 1980) was used with one student while an alternate story, Why Can't I Fly? (Gelman, 1976), was selected for the other because the readability of

the book more closely matched the student's instructional reading level. One experienced teacher independently scored the delayed post test recalls and written compositions. The questions that were used for the pretest interview were again asked for delayed post testing purposes.

Instruction was briefly reinstated after the delayed tests if students scored below 80 percent accuracy on the comprehension recall and written composition. This instructional review occurred for four sessions or until the student again reached his/her post test levels on the recall and composition tasks. This procedure was based on the recommendations for designing educational research described by Borg and Gall (1989).

Analysis of the Oral Recalls and Written Compositions

All data analysis was completed by the investigator and to determine reliability, re-scored by an experienced teacher who received previous training concerning the scoring procedures for the oral retellings and written compositions. The Pearson product-moment correlational formula was used to determine the relationship between the investigator's and the second rater's scores. Training sessions as well as pre-, post- and delayed tests were transcribed from tape-recordings for data

analysis. A portfolio containing think sheets, dictated and independently written stories was also kept. Finally, student interviews were collected.

Six vignettes were created from the previously described sources of data. These vignettes are actual segments lifted from the verbation transcripts to illustrate specific interactions and statements of learning. In addition, they include event description as well as the researcher's interpretive analysis concerning the researcher/student interactions during the mediation process. A classification system was then developed to examine the interactions. A posteriori classification, adapted from prior research, allowed the investigator to devise a system that served the needs of the students involved in the study (Beed, Hawkins and Roller, 1991; Clay, 1991; Cohen, 1991; Eeds and Peterson, 1991; Eeds and Wells, 1989; Palinscar, 1986; and Palinscar and Brown, 1989).

Descriptive statistics document the interactions during the training sessions, as well as the results of the pre-, post- and delayed post-tests. All statistics were summarized in a table or graph format to provide the most informative presentation of results. Growth in oral story retellings was documented quantitatively through the development of a profile (adapted from Morrow and cited in Glaser & Searfross, 1988) and

qualitatively through a description using an adaptation of Irwin and Mitchell's qualitative retelling profile (as cited in Glaser & Searfross, 1988). Both profiles were extended to provide a more definitive scoring system. Furthermore, for each story that the students read, the percentage of story grammar components recalled was calculated. A comparison of whether the story grammar components were stated in the oral recall or whether probed comprehension questions were necessary was also documented for each student. The number of words and sentences that the students used in their recalls was tabulated as well as the number of adult prompts required to stimulate each recall.

Growth in written compositions was documented through the use of a focused holistic marking scale (adapted from Greenhalgh & Townsend, 1981; Manitoba Assessment as cited in Evans, 1985). A numerical value system was assigned to the following scoreable units: a) topic focus; b) topic development; c) organization; d) word choice; e) sentence structure; f) punctuation and capitalization; g) spelling; h) and use of story grammar components. The number of words and sentences that the students used in their compositions was recorded as well as the percentage of story grammar components included.

The rational for using a quantification of retelling profile was based on advice given by Morrow (in Glaser & Searfross, 1988). She stated that the system provided numerical values when teachers were interested in recall stories as a means of charting student growth. Similarly, the rationale for using a focused holistic marking scale was based on suggestions given by Greenhalgh and Townsend (1981) and Evans (1985) in which these authors stated that this scoring system considered the total piece of writing. Furthermore, the scale evaluated the student's writing in terms of pre-defined criteria.

Instructional Procedures

Within ten days, eight reading comprehension and eight written compositions sessions were undertaken. Each student received individual instructional sessions. Each session was approximately 60-75 minutes. The reading events usually occurred between 9:00 and 10:25 a.m. or between 10:45 and 11:55 a.m. Writing events usually occurred between 1:00 and 2:05 p.m. or between 2:25 and 3:25 p.m. All sessions were audiotaped with the tape recorder in full sight when the story reading and writing occurred.

Overview of the Training Format for the Reading Comprehension

The first session was designed to provide an overview of story grammar. During sessions #2, 3, and 4, an adaption of the Directed Reading Thinking Activity (Hennings, 1991) was used to help students learn the story grammar components and formulate main idea statements. In addition, the researcher also modeled reading comprehension strategies. The students were shown how to ask their own questions in sessions #5, 6, and 7. For the last training session, students brainstormed questions independently and then read to verify their predictions. Metacognitive awareness of the learning strategies was explicitly reinforced by the researcher providing for transfer within the instructional setting. The following acronym was designed to help the students learn the story grammar components, frame appropriate questions, and recall stories read:

S - setting

M - main idea

A - action

R - response

T - theme

E - ending

These instructional techniques were derived from research reviewed in Chapter 2. The storybooks that were selected for instructional reading materials ranged from a grade one to a grade three reading level and each book could be completely read and discussed with the students within one training session.

Lesson #1. The students were introduced to the story elements by: a) using familiar stories as examples; b) prompting the use of student background knowledge; and c) providing concrete explanations for unknown story elements. The students were then given a more detailed explanation of the narrative elements. Examples were provided for all of these components. After the story components were reviewed, the students chose a story to read. The researcher and students formulated pre-reading predictions and then read the story to verify the responses. The predictions and answers were recorded by the researcher on a prediction think sheet (See Appendix C-1 for a sample of the prediction think sheet.) After the story was read, the students completed a story frame and then recalled the story (See Appendix C-2 for a sample story frame.) Students kept a graph representing the number of sentences they recalled about each story. Lastly, students made verbal responses

to the story by choosing sections they enjoyed or wanted to discuss further.

Lesson #2. Story components were reviewed using similar procedures presented in Lesson #1. Response related words from the story read during the first lesson were recorded in a journal. Students then chose another story to read. The adaptation of the directed reading thinking activity (Hennings, 1991) was again applied as students predicted story content and then silently read to confirm their predictions. The researcher recorded these predictions. Students completed another story frame, recalled and then responded to the story. The researcher modeled comprehension and prediction strategies as needed.

Lesson #3. Response related words were found in story #2 and added to the journal listing. 'Setting' words were found in story #2 and the researcher recorded them in the journal. Students chose another story, recorded their own predictions, and then read to confirm these predictions. The researcher recorded the corresponding information that was found from having read the story. Students completed a story frame, recalled and then responded to the story. Again, the researcher modeled comprehension or prediction strategies as needed.

Lesson #4. Similar procedures were used from lesson #3. In addition to setting and response words, the researcher also began a list of story problem phrases. Also, the students recorded the predictions and answers on the think sheet.

Lesson #5. More words were added to the listings for setting, response and story problem related words. Students brainstormed questions for the book they selected and then read to find the correct answers. The researchers recorded the questions on the think sheet, but the students wrote the answers. Lastly, the story was recalled and students responded to the book they read.

Lessons #6 and #7. These lessons were identical to lesson #5, except that the students recorded the questions and answers on the think sheet.

Lesson #8. The students brainstormed questions, silently read their selected book, recorded answers to their questions and then recalled the story. The researcher did not assist in these procedures, thus this lesson was not audiotaped.

Overview for the Training Format for the Written Composition

The first two training sessions for the written composition

instruction were designed to introduce the story planner think sheet as well as have the students dictate their own stories. A similar procedure was used for session #3, except only the beginning portion of the story was dictated. The students then completed the story independently. During session #4, students were shown how to revise their stories. Sessions #5, 6, and 7 included having the students dictate their ideas for a story organizer, write and then revise the story independently. For the last session, students conferenced with the researcher regarding content, sentence structure and use of story grammar components in the previously written story.

Summary of the Design and Procedures

Results from the pilot study indicated the need for changes in the story grammar acronym, scoring the retelling profiles and the organization of the story frame. Two grade three students were then selected for the sample in this study. Both students demonstrated poor silent reading comprehension, but possessed average verbal skills and decoding proficiency. Pre-training measures included having students read a story silently, orally recall the story, and answer related comprehension questions. Students then wrote a composition and

responded to a metacognitive awareness interview. Eight reading comprehension and eight written composition sessions were provided. Each student received individual lessons. A story grammar acronym served as the basis of these sessions. Post test procedures were similar to the pretest condition except the students also read and recalled an unfamiliar story. Delayed testing was conducted four weeks later. Data was analyzed through a quantification of retelling, a qualitative retelling profile, and a focused holistic marking scale. Six vignettes were then created to illustrate the teacher/student interactions during the instructional process.

The statistical analysis of the data and findings are presented in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER IV

Analysis and Findings

This chapter provides qualitative and quantitative analysis of the reading comprehension and written composition data. The research questions will be restated in this chapter along with a description of the methods used for their analysis. A discussion of findings in relation to testing times will then follow. To maintain anonymity, pseudo names have been substituted for real names in the analysis.

Story Comprehension and Recall

Questions 1 and 2

Will narrative instruction improve the student's recall of a silently read story?

Will a story grammar acronym improve the students' ability to recall a silently read story?

The quantification of retelling (Morrow, as cited in Glaser and Searfross, 1988) and qualitative retelling profile (Irwin and Mitchell, as cited in Glaser and Searfross, 1988) were used to answer questions 1 and 2.

Preliminary Screening Results

As scores from a recently administered standardized reading test were unavailable, the reading comprehension subtest of the Gates MacGinite Reading Test (Primary C1, 1965) was administered. Hillary's grade score was 2.7 and Greg's was 1.5. Therefore, Hillary's reading performance was seven months below her grade placement level and Greg's was one year and seven months below. In order to determine if the decoding skills of the subjects were adequate, the students orally read passages from the Ekwall Reading Inventory (1986). Hillary did not make any word recognition errors for the grade two or grade three level passages. Greg's word recognition accuracy was 98 percent for the grade three passage and 96 percent for the grade two passage. These results were also commensurate with the judgement of the classroom teacher that the subjects' word recognition skills were adequate.

Pretest Analysis

The quantified and qualitative retelling profiles indicated that initially both students had a low degree of story grammar understanding. According to the quantification of retellings, Hillary was only able to recall 39 percent of the possible story grammar components after silently

reading a story. Greg recalled 27 percent of these components. All supporting data related to Hillary's story comprehension and recall is reported in Appendix D-1 to D-19 and Greg's data is provided in Appendix E-1 to E-19. The following provides a more detailed description of the information that the students recalled in regards to: a) setting; b) main idea; c) plot; d) resolution; e) theme; and f) sequence of elements.

Although both students mentioned the main character's name several times throughout their recalls, they did not explicitly state that Franklin was the main character of the pretest story. When specifically asked about this aspect, both students recognized that Franklin was indeed the main character. Hillary was able to recall all supporting characters, whereas Greg was only able to recall Franklin's mother. Neither student was able to recall information pertaining to the major or minor setting. Similarly, when the researcher specifically asked probing questions about the setting, Hillary stated that the story took place "outside" and Greg thought that the story happened "in a forest or something". They gave partially correct responses concerning the time element: Hillary said that the story was during the "day and part of it is at

night"; Greg thought that the story occurred during the "summer".

Neither student recalled a main idea statement. When specifically asked about the main idea, both students expressed difficulty in being able to respond. Heather stated, "Its hard". Hillary and Greg stated information pertaining to the problem within the first sentences of their recall. Details of the action, however, were lacking. For example, Greg stated,

> He went to ask everybody if they were afraid of dark places and stuff and all of them were afraid of different other stuff not um - dark stuff

When asked to remember more information, Greg started describing the ending of the story; he did not notice the vagueness of his plot description. Hillary recalled the animals that Franklin approached to help solve the problem, but lacked specificity in describing the results of these attempts:

> He met a duck and the duck was afraid of deep water so he had to wear water wings. Then he met a lion...

Neither student stated Franklin's responses concerning failed attempts to solve the problem. There were no details concerning the resolution of the story: Greg simply said that "He was not scared to go into his shell" but did not state how Franklin resolved his problem. When

asked a specific question about the ending of the story, Greg only said that "It was a very happy ending". Hillary recalled that "When no one was looking he turned on his nightlight", but did not exactly state that Franklin had discovered a strategy to cope with his fear of the dark. Neither student recalled a lesson that Franklin learned in the story. However, when asked directly about this story element, responses were more forthcoming. Greg said, "There's nothing to be afraid of in his shell, its just your imagination". Hillary gave a similar response, "You don't have to be afraid of the dark".

Both students' ability to state story elements sequentially was inadequate. They were only able to recall the problem, attempt, and resolution elements in correct order. Three sequence words, 'when', 'then', and 'the end', were stated in Hillary's recall. 'At the end' was the only sequence type of phrase that Greg used. He had particular difficulty controlling the mechanics of speaking. He seemed to lack the appropriate words to express himself as he stated the word 'stuff' five times. In total, Greg stated 113 words and seven sentences in his recall. Hillary stated, 180 words which made up approximately thirteen sentences.

According to the qualitative retelling profile, the students did not state any personal responses in their retellings. There were no apparent attempts to connect background knowledge to the story, except when the researcher asked a direct question concerning the theme. Similarly, there were no creative statements or personal reactions to the text.

Summary of the Pretest Analysis. Both subjects' retellings indicated a low degree of comprehension for the pre-test story. Recalling the story problem independently triggered the recall of additional story information for both students. As this information lacked detail, it appeared that neither student had a strong sense of story schema or purpose for reading and retelling a story. In addition, neither student responded to the text in such a way that demonstrated personal involvement with the story. This data is based on scoring by the researcher and an experienced teacher. The Pearson product-moment correlation for one student was r=.97 and r=1.0 for the other.

Post Test Analysis

Students were required to read two stories for the post test analysis. The familiar pretest story Franklin In The Dark, was re-read. Students then read an unfamiliar story. Hillary read Annie and the Wild

Animals (readability level 3 - Fry, 1977) while Greg read Peace At Last (readability level 2 - Fry, 1977).

The quantification of retellings and the qualitative retelling profiles, indicated that learning basic story grammar components improved students' recall of a silently read story. The quantification of retelling scheme demonstrated that Hillary and Greg's recall of the pretest story improved 40 percent. Hillary's recall of information from an unfamiliar story improved 41 percent, while Greg's improved 34 percent. Therefore, the number of words and sentences increased for both students' retellings. Hillary used 188 more words to retell the familiar pretest story. Greg used 125 more words to retell the story. When retelling an unfamiliar story, Hillary stated 66 more words and Greg stated 83. In addition, a decline in the number of adult prompts needed to retell a story was noted for both students. Greg needed one prompt to retell each story. Hillary required two prompts. The following provides a more detailed description of quantitative and qualitative information regarding the students' recall of a) setting; b) main idea; c) plot; d) resolution; e) theme; and f) sequence of ideas.

In the post test recall of the familiar and unfamiliar story, neither

student explicitly identified the main character element. Both students recalled all possible minor story characters. In comparison to pretest data, both students recalled more detailed information pertaining to the setting and action components. Hillary's use of the acronym to guide her retelling of these aspects was particularly evident.

> "First you talk about the setting. The setting is where, when, and who. The story was outside. And Franklin and his mother were in the story. And a polar bear, and a bird, and a lion, and a duck were in the story...It was happening in day and in night.

Unless prompted by the researcher, Greg was not consciously able to use all elements of the story grammar acronym to guide his retelling of a story. He only used the setting, problem, action and ending elements. However, he was able to recall more accurate information concerning the minor setting and time element for both the familiar and unfamiliar story. For example, in the unfamiliar story, he used location words such as baby's room, living room and kitchen. He also used words indicating time such as 'morning', 'the sun came out', and 'night'.

Both students improved their ability to formulate main idea statements. Hillary used the acronym as a cue for stating information regarding the main idea. She specifically used the words 'most

important idea' in her retellings. In her retelling of the unfamiliar story, she stated "The most important idea in the story is about finding a friend". Greg used the words 'main idea' in his retelling of the unfamiliar story, but not in the retelling of the familiar pretest story. He formulated an accurate statement concerning the main idea for the familiar story, but even with the cue phrases he had difficulty stating a coherent thought for the unfamiliar story. "Now I have to tell you the main idea is Mr. Bear can't sleep because all the racket coming from the family - tick tock the clock, and the sink and the sun".

Improvements were noted, particularly in Greg's retellings, concerning a description of the problem and actions in the post test stories. Outcomes of attempts to solve the problem were specifically described by both students. For example, Greg stated,

> But, Franklin was the only one who was afraid of dark, dark places. He went to lots of other people to see if they're afraid of dark places. He asked if they could help them. Um- but they were afraid of all different other stuff. The duck was afraid of swimming and deep, deep water. When no one was looking he put on his water wings. And - um - the lion was afraid of really loud noises. When no one was looking ... .

Furthermore, in the post test retellings, both students stated response words concerning attempts, failed actions, and resolutions. Greg stated

words such as: 'afraid', 'scared', 'not sure', 'wasn't afraid', 'wasn't comfortable', and 'tired'. Hillary stated similar types of feeling words.

The students recalled more information concerning resolutions to the problems in the post test retellings. They stated the detailed action that resolved the problem as well as the character's responses to the ending of the story. Hillary summarized the resolution in one or two sentences, whereas Greg's retelling was more elaborate. For example, in recalling the unfamiliar test story, Hillary stated, "And the ending was happy cause the animals went back to the woods and the cat came back with three soft kittens. And Annie wasn't lonely anymore." Hillary also stated themes for both post test stories. Greg only stated a theme for the familiar story. Both students gave concrete examples of themes. They were not able to extend the themes into universal truths. For example, both students stated that a night-light could be turned on if someone was afraid of the dark. Neither student elaborated that 'crutches' were acceptable in dealing with a variety of fears.

Hillary was able to recall all story elements in correct sequence. The use of the acronym was evident with both test stories. Stating names of story grammar components seemed to guide her retelling

process.

> "First you talk about the setting. The setting is where, when and who. The story was...And then the most important idea in the story is that...and the action is the middle of the story...And the problem is that Franklin won't go in his shell. And he goes around asking people if they can help him...The responses are the characters feelings. Franklin felt sad and scared and didn't want to go in his shell...And the lesson that Franklin learned is that...And the ending was that Franklin he went to sleep...

Greg did not apply the story grammar acronym to guide his retelling. He repeated elaborate story information several times. For example, when memory failed he would return to the beginning of the story and recall all the information again. Greg also had difficulty sequencing the exact events making the details very confusing. He did not seem to know where to stop recalling story information or how to discriminate important from non-important story details. For example, in his recall of the familiar story, he stated the following non-important detail, "[Franklin] was sliding down in the water and this frog was on a lily pad." He 'made up' information in order to end his recall: "Franklin wasn't afraid of going into his shell. He was sound asleep until the next morning." An important aspect to note is that when told to use the acronym strategy, Greg's recall significantly improved. The acronym guided the recall of important

story information as he used the names of the story elements in his recall.

> "Setting means, where, when, and who. The people in the story were...The most important idea is that Mr. Bear couldn't get to sleep. The problem in the story was that....O.K., I told you about the action - Response now - Mr. Bear felt angry...Now I have to tell about the lesson. I think the bear learned ...At the end of the story Mr. Bear finally got to go to sleep...

However, even with the acronym he was not always monitoring his retelling. He stated that the setting included who, where, and when, but only recalled the characters in the story. Last, the following sequence type words were stated by both students: 'first', 'at the beginning', 'then', 'when', 'but', and 'at the end'.

Both students made improvements in their ability to respond to text. According to the qualitative retelling profile, Hillary moderately responded to the familiar post test story. She stated a personal example related to the theme.

> Well, I marked this page because when my lights off I don't like to go to sleep. So when everybody is downstairs - My mom and dad are downstairs - I just turn on my night-light and go to sleep, too.

Her response to the unfamiliar story indicated a higher degree of involvement with the text. She indicated that she was making story

predictions in conjunction with the clues in the illustrations.

> I just marked one page. It sort of gives you a hint what's going to happen in the story. This (points to text) gave me a hint because I thought a cat was going to come and then it did come...And then it looked like a bear was going to come and it did...

Greg did not respond personally when retelling the familiar story, but gave responses to the unfamiliar story at a lower level of comprehension. For example, he picked an illustration he thought was humorous.

Delayed Post Test Analysis

The delayed test was administered four weeks after the post test. Students re-read the familiar post test story. In addition, an unfamiliar story was selected for them to read. Hillary read No More Baths (readability level 3 - Fry, 1977) and Greg read Why Can't I Fly (readability level 1 - Fry, 1977).

The quantified and qualitative profiles suggested that Hillary retained all gains made during the study. She scored 16 percent higher on the retelling of the familiar story and 8 percent higher on the retelling of the unfamiliar story. She was able to retrieve and use the story grammar acronym for guiding her retelling process, although she did not state the names of specific narrative components in the recalls. Also,

when the retellings of the unfamiliar and the familar story were compared, there were more words and sentences in the unfamiliar story. Hillary stated 162 more words and 26 more sentences. While reading the unfamiliar delayed post test story, Hillary indicated that she was thinking about a related personal experience which perhaps influenced the increase in the number of words and sentences.

> It reminded me that I had to take a bath before supper. I didn't like it, either. Once I take a bath, I can't go outside to play.

A few changes were noted in Greg's ability to recall a story. Compared to the pretest analysis, he scored 8 percent higher on the retelling of the familiar and 10 percent lower on the unfamiliar story. Although a regression seemed to occur in his ability to recall story details relating to setting, time, and action, he was able to recall the story problem and resolution.

As regressions were observed in Greg's retellings, reading comprehension instruction was reinstated for four lessons. The researcher explicitly modeled reading comprehension strategies and how to use the acronym for recalling a story. More positive results were noted during this delayed process than during the actual study. With the

exception of one story, all quantification of retellings were in the 80 percent range and understanding of story grammar improved: he was more adept in applying and verbalizing researcher modeled strategies without being prompted. A trend towards gaining control over the mechanics of talking about a story was also emerging.

> SMARTE - S setting. O.K., where, when and who. The characters in the story were...The story took place on a Thursday and Friday...Where - The story took place at Imogene's...O.K. S-M- The main idea is - I gotta think back and make a picture about the action...S-M-A- The problem was...The first action was when...The second action was...S-M-A-R-T The lesson is that...S-M-A-R-T-I the interesting parts was I didn't know she was going to get peacock feathers...S-M-A-R-T-I-E The end was when Imogene...

As evidenced by the above recall, Greg seemed to become much more involved in the delayed teaching and learning situation. He suggested an improvement in the acronym so that it reflected the actual spelling of the word 'smartie'. He included the 'i' to cue discussing the interesting parts of the story.

Summary of the Post and Delayed Post Test Analysis. The narrative instruction improved both students' ability to recall a silently read story. Hillary recalled a high degree of explicit textual information. The use of the story grammar acronym guided her recall of important

story information and facilitated her control over the mechanics of talking about a story. A moderate degree of inferred information was stated in her recalls as only concrete examples of themes were given. Moderate improvements were made in her responses and involvement with text. Greg recalled a moderate degree of explicit and inferred textual information. His inability to activate the story grammar acronym resulted in disorganized story retellings, few responses to the text, and poor control over the mechanics of talking about a story. However, it was noted that when prompted to use the acronym strategy, his recall and response improved substantially. Hillary was able to retain the instructional strategies over a four week delay, but regressions occurred in Greg's ability to recall an unfamiliar story. With four additional comprehension lessons, growth was then noted in Greg's ability to retell stories.

Few small differences occurred between the researcher's and the second rater's scores for all of Hillary's recalls. The correlation was r=.95 for the familiar post test story and r=.98 for the unfamiliar story. Correlations for the delayed test stories were r=1.0. Similar high correlations were obtained for all of Greg's recalls.

Story Writing

Question 3 and 4

Will narrative instruction improve the students' ability to compose a story independently:

Will think-sheets improve the student's ability to organize and edit written compositions?

A focused holistic marking scale (adapted from Greenhalgh and Townsend, 1981) was used to analyze the written compositions for these questions.

Pretest Analysis

According to the focused holisitc marking scale, Greg scored 48 percent and Hillary scored 62 percent. The following section provides an analysis of the students' written compositions in comparison to: a) topic focus; b) facility with written language; c) understanding of sentence mechanics; d) spelling; and e) use of story grammar components. Further supporting data related to the students' written compositions are reported in Appendix F and G.

The ideas expressed in both students' stories related to the assigned topic of writing a make-believe story. A restricted choice of

words was used to convey these ideas. Hillary's story was organized according to setting, problem, resolution and theme. However, these elements were only connected by the work 'and' which was used twenty-two times, but the originality of Hillary's ideas was quite impressive. Greg had difficulty beginning his story and required the use of a story starter. Even with this help, his story only included an event and an ending; there was an insufficient number of ideas to develop the story.

The use of appropriate sentence structure, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling was inadequate for both students. There were 181 words and approximately eleven sentences in Hillary's story. As only six periods were used, there were many 'run-on' types of sentences. Spelling errors detracted from the general readability of both stories. Hillary misspelled common expressions such as 'once upon a time'. She also omitted a letter from her name. Greg used 71 words or approximately six sentences. There were no periods other than the one provided in the story starter.

Hillary's setting was adequately described. There were sentences indicating 'who', 'where', and 'when'. The sentence indicating

'where' was more detailed than the other aspects of the setting.

> Once a pund a time there was a pecful forst and
> lots of animels lived there Twhere was a deer and
> ribits and brids and baers and some camprs came
> to the forst...

Other than the story starter, there was no description of setting in Greg's story. Several characters were mentioned in both students' stories. The characters completed actions within their respective plot, but still appeared relatively 'flat' as they did not converse or demonstrate responses to the actions.

The idea of a problem was conveyed in Hillary's story. However, as the problem was immediately resolved, there was no suspense to her story.

> And some camprs came to the forst and the
> camprs made a fire to keep them warm then they
> went to sleep and they forgot to put the fire our
> and it was vaery windy and the wind blo so hard
> that some sparls flo out and the fire was geting
> bigre and the forstranger so it and he called the
> flare deprmite and they put the fire out.

The problem element was not well stated in Greg's story. There was an insufficient elaboration of ideas related to the action element to permit evaluative judgement by either the researcher or experienced teacher.

> That made snak soup And different kinds of souP
> And tries to on People...And tells them to do Any

> thing she wan'ts Them to do was choce peoPle
> And try to eat PeoPle

Hillary's problem statement was well resolved and in considerable detail:

> and rescued the Aniamels. And they took them to the Aniamel Hopidel and chaeked to see if ayne of the animels were heart and if they were then they would beandch it up and the campers had to plat new trees and grees and were all the new trees tro back...They let all of the aniamel go to the forste and it was peceful oenc a gen.

In addition, the beginning of a theme was included in Hillary's story, but detail was omitted concerning the relevance of the statement to the central problem of the story.

> And if people wanted to go capming they slapt in capins

In Greg's story, there was insufficient evidence for any data analysis regarding either the story resolution or theme elements.

Summary of the Pretest Analysis. The scores from the focused holistic writing assessment indicated that in order to enhance their story writing performance, both students needed further instruction applying story grammar knowledge. Both students also required further instruction regarding the use of appropriate sentence structure and basic capitalization and punctuation principles.

Only a few differences occurred between the researcher's and experienced teacher's ratings of the compositions. The Pearson product-moment correlation was r=.80 for Hillary's story and r=.91 for Greg's.

Post Test Analysis

After the training, Hillary's story writing ability improved 18 percent, while Greg's improved 26 percent, suggesting that the instruction was effective and the think sheets for composing and revising stories were influential factors in bringing this improvement about. Although gains were mainly observed in the quality of the compositions, some slight increases were noted in the number of words and sentences the students used. Hillary included 23 more words but formulated l0 more coherent sentences than were written in the pretest story. Similarly, Greg included only 27 more words in his post test composition, but growth in terms of organization was readily apparent. The following provides a more detailed analysis of the students' written compositions in comparison to: a) topic focus; b) facility with written language; c) understanding of sentence mechanics; d) spelling; and e) use of story grammar components.

As in the pretest composition, the ideas expressed by Hillary and

Greg related to the assigned topic of writing a make-believe story. Both students continued to use a restricted choice of words to convey their ideas. Similar to her pretest composition, the originality of ideas in Hillary's post test story created a positive impact upon both the researcher and second rater. Using The Three Bears as characters, she developed an unusual problem and wrote a humorous and coherent story. Although the ideas and actions expressed in Greg's story were ordinary and functional, he clearly improved in his ability to develop a topic. He did not require the use of a story starter. He was able to select his own topic and write a simplistic story that included an organized beginning, middle and end.

Both students improved their ability to compose a sentence and adhere to writing conventions. For example, a variety of connective words were incorporated to replace the word 'and'. The students used words such as: 'one nice morning', 'last night', 'now', 'then', 'when', 'but', and 'so'. Hillary included 15 more capital letters to begin her sentences and used appropriate punctuation to end these sentences. There were 7 more complete sentences in Greg's composition. Neither student improved in the area of spelling. Greg's spelling errors were not

distractable whereas Hillary's errors were; her title and lead sentence contained noticeable spelling errors as well as characters' names and common words.

The effects of story grammar instruction and think sheets for planning and editing were most noticeable in the students' descriptions of story grammar components. More specifically, Hillary demonstrated improvement in her ability to manipulate characters, specify a problem, create action, and resolve the story plot. Greg improved in these areas, as well as in being able to state a story setting. Both students named their characters and included character responses in their stories. Greg's description of a character response was quite detailed.

> Jim felt so angry he stamped his foot so hard his face went red.

Hillary was able to extend the character element by including general physical descriptions:

> Mamma bear was brown and had a black nose. Papa bear was brown and had a black nose and wore glasses. Baby bear had a black nose and he was brown.

Her story characters became more dynamic as she also incorporated dialogue into the action component whereas Greg did not include

dialogue and his characters remained relatively flat.

Both students wrote problem statements. Hillary's statement was particularly well described. She included a time and place aspect as well as the effect of the problem:

> One nice morning Momma bear went down to the kitchen. Last night she left her recipe on the table it wasn't there that ment that someone stol itIII Now Momma bear culodn't make porige. That made Momma bear sad.

Greg's problem statement was more coherent but details, that would have made the overall story more interesting to read, were still lacking:

> Jim made a fort but the wind was to strong and blow the snow fort to pieces.

Since there was insufficient evidence for analyses in both the students' pretest story, the post test compositions indicated that the instructional strategies completed during this study positively influenced Greg and Hillary's ability to incorporate the action element. There was one action sequence in Greg's post test composition. He stated the attempt and an outcome:

> Pete got a shovel and threw snow at the fort. But the wind blew snow off the shovel.

Through dialogue, Hillary included two characters' attempts at solving the problem. If she had written more detailed outcomes, the humor in her composition would have become more apparent:

> Then baby bear came in the kitchen. Baby bear said "I thike that I now what to put in it." "What" said Momma bear. "flower" saide baby bear. But it didn't wrok becauss he was thikeing of brad. Then Papa bear came in. "I now what to put in." "What" said Momma bear. "Colteitcips." saide Papa bear. When Momma bear hred that she was sad.

Greg demonstrated the most improvement in his ability to resolve a problem and end a story. He stated an action that resolved the problem and provided an implicit ending for the story:

> Macky made an igloo but when the wind blow it didn't move it. So Jm and Pete made an igloo. They made a really strong igloo.

Delayed Post Test Analysis

The delayed test was administered four weeks after the composition post test. The focused holistic marking scale indicated that Hillary retained all gains made during the study. She obtained an identical score to her post test composition. Regressions occurred in Greg's composition as his holistic score was 14 percent lower than that of his post test. His story reflected a skeletal problem-centred plot

organization, but a basic elaboration of story elements was omitted. There were three characters and an implicit indication of time, but there was no indication of setting. The problem was vague and resolved immediately; actions were noticeably lacking in the story. The ending was the most detailed aspect of the story with the response of two characters. Thus four more lessons were provided in story writing instruction for Greg. The instruction focused on paralleling the plot structure of the stories read and recording explicit details on the story organizer think sheet. More positive results were noted during this delayed process than during the actual study. Scores from the focused holistic marking scale were above the 80 percent range.

Summary of the Post and Delayed Post Test Analysis. The narrative instruction and think sheets for planning and revising stories facilitated the improvement of both students' ability to compose a story independently. These instructional strategies guided their composition process. The effects of the narrative instruction and think sheets for planning stories were reflected in the organizational framework of the students' stories. Specific evidence supporting the use of think sheets as a pre-writing activity was also demonstrated in character description,

creation of a problem and action, and resolution of story plot. The effects of the think sheet for revising stories were reflected in improved sentence structure, more appropriate use of capitalization and punctuation, as well as more explicit inclusion of story grammar components. Hillary was able to retain the instructional strategies over a four week delay. Regressions occurred with Greg's composing abilities, but his performance was brought to an acceptable standard with four additional lessons.

A few differences occurred between the researcher's and the second rater's scores for all of Hillary's test compositions. The Pearson product-moment correlation was $r = .96$ for the post test and $r = 1.0$ for the delayed test. Similarly, only a few differences occurred between the researcher's and experienced teacher's scores for Greg's compositions. The Pearson product-moment correlation was $r = .91$ for the post test and $r = .96$ for the delayed test.

Metacognitive Awareness

Question 5

Can students: a) demonstrate knowledge of strategy application in story recalls and compositions; and b) articulate how they used the story

grammar strategy in either comprehending or composing?

Students were interviewed in order to answer these questions. This procedure provided information regarding their megacognitive awareness in relation to reading and writing processes.

Pretest Metacognitive Interview Analysis

According to the pretest student interviews, metacognitive awareness of reading and writing processes was underdeveloped with both students. Hillary was not able to respond to the question asking her what she was thinking about while reading the story. Greg's response, however, indicated that he was possibly thinking about the problem. He said that he was thinking about, "Franklin didn't want to go into his shell".

When asked what was being thought about while recalling the story, Greg indicated that he was thinking about his own feelings of being in a dark place. He stated "If I went into this dark place - um - I wouldn't be afraid cause I know there's nothing in there that's going to be scary". It was difficult to substantiate whether Greg was actually thinking about his own feelings because this type of statement was not made during his actual recall of the story. Similar ambiguity was found in Hillary's case; she indicated that she was thinking about "How Franklin solved his

problem". At the beginning of her recall, she stated that "He met lots of animals that were afraid of stuff, too", but did not elaborate on this aspect of the story unless specifically asked by the researcher. Therefore, although both students responded positively to the question, their response was not substantiated in a perusal of their story recall protocols.

The last pretest interview question asked the students to describe familiar parts of a story. Hillary said that she was familiar with events in a story, characters, and a time element. She mentioned that there was usually a problem and a solution to a story, but she had difficulty explaining these terms. When combined with the quantification of retelling, the results of her metacognitive interview indicated that Hillary was aware of basic story grammar components, but did not know when or how to use them effectively. Greg had more difficulty replying when asked about the parts of a story. He was not able to state that stories have a beginning, middle, and end. Even when the researcher rephrased the question, his response indicated an initial lack of story knowledge and misunderstanding of the question being asked:

> "Like spiders and stuff? I don't know".

Summary of the Pretest Metacognitive Interview Analysis. Neither student was metacognitively aware of reading and writing processes. Hillary was unaware of what she was thinking about while silently reading a story. Greg possibly thought about the problem element. While recalling a story, references were made to thinking about the problem element and background experience, but it was difficult to find evidence of these thoughts in the students' recalls. Hillary was aware of several story grammar components but had difficulty explaining their function. Greg severely lacked story grammar knowledge as he was unable to name basic narrative elements.

Post- and Delayed Post Test Metacognitive Interview Analysis

Hillary made progress as she became more metacognitively aware of the reading and writing processes; she was able to describe when and how she used the story grammar strategy. Greg, on the other hand, was not able to consciously use the story grammar acronym without prompting by the researcher. However, he did use the problem, action, and ending components in contrast to his responses during the pretest interview.

The post- and delayed test interviews revealed that Hillary used the acronym to guide her silent reading, oral recalling and composing of

a story. Hillary explained that she would 'spell the acronym in her head' in order to guide the retelling and composing process and she stated the names of the story grammar components in sequence in her post test recall:

> I was thinking about the word Smarte. I was thinking about the beginning of the story and who were the characters and where the story was. In the middle of the story, I was thinking about the action. I was thinking about the chicken and the cat and the pig and what happened when Jesse went to live with them. I was thinking she went home at the end of the story.

The interview suggested that the acronym triggered the prediction process while Hillary silently read an unfamiliar story. She indicated that she was making predictions about the settings, characters, action, and ending:

> The setting is kind of like the Annie book. They're both outside ... I was thinking of some animals that she might meet. I was thinking she might meet a dog or a bird. I was thinking it might keep going on ... I was thinking that she would still have a problem at the end of the story. I was thinking she wouldn't take a bath when she went home. And I was thinking that her parents should let her take a bath at the end of the day so she can still go out and play.

The acronym also triggered an outline of ideas for Hillary to

elaborate upon while composing a story:

> I was thinking about the word Smarte. I was thinking about the setting, the bears and what colour they are and what they looked like. The problem was someone stole mamma bear's recipe and baby bear and pappa bear were trying to find the recipe. Baby bear and Pappa bear were trying to help but they couldn't. It made momma bear sad. At the end mamma bear went looking for the recipe.

Thus, the acronym provided a basic organizational framework to guide Hillary in both story recall and story writing. Specific details, such as the porridge recipe being left on the kitchen table, were 'filled in' as needed. She seemed to rely on 'letting one idea lead to the next'. When questioned what she was thinking about while writing her delayed-test composition, Hillary outlined the basic plot and indicated "I was thinking about what went with the story".

Greg's use of the story grammar acronym was inconsistent. While reading and recalling the post test stories, Greg indicated that he was thinking about the setting problem, action and resolution components. For example, he stated that "Mr. Bear couldn't get to sleep because of the noise". But predictions about how Mr. Bear might solve his problem were not made. However, the delayed test interview suggested that

Greg was making predictions about the problem, action and ending while silently reading the unfamiliar story. He indicated that he was wondering about the components, but specific ideas were not predicted:

> I was wondering about what different ways he would try to fly ... I was wondering how he would solve his problems. I was thinking he would do the things the animals told him and he would fly.

He expressed more about the story grammar strategy during the post test writing interview. He described thinking about a beginning, middle, and end for his story. He did not use the names of the known story grammar components in his description, but a setting, problem, and ending were implied:

> The beginning - I put their names down and it happened at Jim's house. The middle - I thought Jim worked so hard on the fort and the wind broke the fort. The end of the story - Mickey had a really good idea - like making an igloo.

Summary of the Post and Delayed Post Test Metacognitive Interview Analysis. When combined with the quantification of retelling and qualitative retelling profiles, the results of the interviews suggested that Hillary learned when and how to use her knowledge of story grammar effectively. Greg became more aware of story grammar components, but

did not use this knowledge consistently. Results of all student interviews are presented in more detail in Appendix H.

Instructional Mediation

Question 6

1. In terms of facilitating learning, what is salient about the interactions between a researcher and students during the instructional mediation process?

A posteriori classification system, adapted from prior research, was designed to present the patterns of researcher/student interactions (Cohen, 1991). The researcher randomly selected five reading instruction and five writing instruction sessions that had been completed with each student. Utterances made by the researcher and students during these story reading and writing sessions were then grouped into appropriate categories.

Overview of the Instructional Mediation Analysis

Five general categories were created to illustrate the researcher/student dialogue. These five categories corresponded to the following stages of the mediated literacy process: a) pre-reading; b) during reading; c) responding to the story; d) recalling the story, and e)

planning a composition. Numerous subcategories were also developed in order to permit more detailed descriptions concerning the function of the five general categories. The categories and subcategories were labelled as follows:

Category 1 - Providing a Mediated Framework to Present Novel Story Features:

a) Headlining a Story

b) Making Story Elements Public

c) Making Story Elements Relevant

d) Modeling New Concept Features

e) Modeling Reading Comprehension Strategies

f) Modeling Story Prediction Strategies

g) Modeling the Telling of a Related Experience

h) Encouraging the Student to Activate Background Knowledge

i) Mediating Student Responses to Build Story Meaning

j) Encouraging the Use of New Story Knowledge

k) Shifting Ownership to the Reader as Problem-Solver

The first four subcategories reflected how the narrative structure was presented within a meaningful context. Subcategories (e) and (f)

represented demonstration of pre-reading comprehension processes. Student background knowledge was activated through subcategories (g) and (h). The last two subcategories encouraged the students not only to apply story knowledge in new contexts but also assume active ownership of the learning process.

In addition to the teaching categories, five student-centered subcategories were also created:

a) Modeling Teacher Responses

b) Responding to Prompted Cues

c) Using New Story Knowledge

d) Linking Personal Knowledge

e) Establishing Evidence of Learning

The first subcategory indicated the students' ability to join in, follow, or extend the investigator's responses. The second subcategory reflected the students' closure or response to the researcher's request to complete an idea. Although more structured, this second subcategory still encouraged participation by prompting students to apply information or give supporting details. Subcategory (c) demonstrated the students' ability to apply their knowledge of story grammar to new stories being

read. The fourth subcategory showed the students activating background knowledge that was related to either the content or concepts being discussed. The last category helped classify responses that revealed how the students voluntarily provided related information or verbalized either a strategy, a prediction, or independent insight.

Vignette 1. The first vignette was created from Greg's fourth story reading session. The researcher and Greg were preparing to read the story What's That Noise?, (Lemieux, 1984).

Head-lining a Story

(1) T. The story that we're going to read today is called What's That Noise? Its about a bear that has been hibernating for a long time. He wakes up when he hears a noise. He doesn't know what the noise is and he doesn't know how long he's been sleeping. He searches through the forest to find the noise.

The researcher began the mediated literary experience by headlining the story to be read (Line #1). The title was stated and basic information regarding the main character, setting, time, and problem was given. The headline provided the student with a skeletal structure of the story. Specific details were omitted in order to allow for student prediction of story elements, enjoyment of the book to be read, and researcher modeling of reading comprehension strategies should later need arise.

Having headlined the story, the researcher then modeled when and how to talk about a life experience that related to the problem in the story. In Line #2, the researcher stated that story titles trigger memory of prior experiences and then provided a personal story as an example. When this behaviour did not cue the student to share a personal story, the researcher then asked a specific question that encouraged the student to activate his related background knowledge (line #3). In Line 3-7, the researcher probed for specific details and then summarized the conversation when the student had difficulty expressing himself clearly.

Modeling the Telling of a Related Story

(2) Sometimes, story titles remind us of an event that has happened in our life.
T. I live near a parking lot. At night, I always hear lots of strange noises. I think they might be engine noises.

Encouraging the Student to Activate Related Knowledge

(3) T. Have you ever heard a noise and couldn't figure out what was making the noise?
(4) S. Sometimes, when I'm in bed.
(5) T. What kind of noises do you hear?
(6) S. A really loud noise - a jet I think - or a plane cause I think all planes are different.
(7) T. So, you hear loud noises in bed at night and you think its a plane, but you don't know what type of plane.

The researcher demonstrated a pre-reading process in Lines #8-

11. When and how to activate a strategy was explicitly stated. The researcher not only modeled a prediction for the story, but also shared the reasoning "behind the prediction" (line #9). The student modeled the reasoning process and the researcher then elaborated the response in line #11.

Modeling Reading Comprehension Strategies

(8) T. Before you begin reading a story, its always a good idea to look at the title, and the pictures on the front cover and the back cover. All of these give us really big clues of what the story is going to be about.

Modeling Story Prediction

(9) T. I can tell from the picture on the back cover that the bear probably hears a soft noise. His nose is right up beside the bird's nest. He's doing something with his paws to show he hears a soft noise.
(10) S. His paws are near his ears.
(11) T. Right, when people hear a soft noise, they put their hands beside their ears to show that they are listening really hard.

The researcher encouraged application of the story grammar knowledge being learned and fostered independence by having students makes predictions of narrative elements within new stories read. In lines #13-18, the student was prompted to consider a range of possibilities for the story elements prior to actually reading the story. The student accepted ownership of the learning process in line #19 by stating a

prediction without being prompted. The researcher explained how to confirm the prediction and the student then modeled the researcher's strategy (line #21). In line #22, the researcher acknowledged the student's prediction by demonstrating other confirmation clues.

Encouraging the Use of New Story Knowledge

(12) T. Let's make some predictions about the setting.
(13) S. There's going to be a bird, butterfly and fox.
(14) T. Ok, so you think some of the characters in the story will be animals. There's other animals that live in the forest.
(15) S. A squirrel
(16) T. or a deer
(17) S. a frog?
(18) T. Usually there are ponds in a forest and frogs do live near ponds.
(19) S. I think it's spring.
(20) T. The bear has just woken up. Let's look on the front cover and see if there's other ways we can tell it's spring.
(21) S. There's flowers and butterflies.
(22) T. Look at how tiny the birds are. Birds are born in the spring. So, the time probably is Spring.

Using language the student understood (line #23), the researcher explained where the action component of a story was found and what the reader should expect. In line #25, a previous composition served as a catalyst to make the discussion relevant and link the element back to the reading process.

Making Story Elements Public

(23) T. Now the action. The action is the middle of the story. The bear is going to try and solve his problem, but he's not going to

be able to solve it right away.

(24) S. The bear can't tell what it is.

Making Story Elements Relevant

(25) T. In the story that we wrote about Animals That Share, Mrs. Polar Bear didn't solve her problem immediately either. Do you remember what we wrote?

(26) S. The other animals like tried to help but the bears ate Mrs. Polar Bear's food.

In addition to preparing the student for the structure of the narrative, the investigator also modeled repetitive language features within the story to be read (line #29). Once the language feature was firmly learned, the researcher shifted ownership to the student to make further story predictions (line #34-37).

Modeling New Concept Features

(27) T. Let's pick out some animals that he might ask if they have heard his noise.

(28) S. Birds

(29) T. So, he'll go to the birds and say "Do you hear my noise?" What sounds do birds make?

(30) S. A cheep

(31) T. The bird is going to say "I hear a cheep-cheep." So, the bear will say "That's not the noise –"

(32) S. the bear hears.

(33) T. The bear says "That's not the noise I hear".

Shifting Ownership to the Reader as Problem-Solver

(34) T. Let's pick out another animal.

(35) S. his mom

(36) T. What might happen?
(37) S. The bear says, "Do you hear my noise?" Momma bear snores. The bear says "That's not the noise I hear."

The researcher again modeled a reading comprehension strategy to help the student predict an end for the story. In line #38, the actions were summarized in order for the researcher to demonstrate the thinking "behind" her inference. In line #40, 'internal dialoguing" was explicitly verbalized to cue the student. The student modeled the teacher's thinking process in line #41. The researcher then prompted the student to make the statement more explicit so that when the concept was encountered in the actual text, the student would more easily be able to confirm his prediction. (lines #42 and 43).

Modeling Reading Comprehension Strategies

(38) T. Ok. Let's think about the ending. The other animals are only hearing sounds that they make. The birds hear a chirp. The frog hears a ribbit. So the noise that the bear hears has to be coming from him.
(39) S. He's making the noise.
(40) T. That's right. I think to myself, "What are the noises inside a bear's body that would wake the bear?"
(41) S. his heart
(42) T. What kind of noise does the heart make?
(43) S. boom. boom.

The researcher mediated interactions with the student by acknowledging partially correct responses, but at the same time,

supported the student to communicate more effectively orally and risk making his statements more explicit. Lines #44-55 demonstrate this process. The researcher also used another conversation technique to prompt student completion of ideas. This behaviour, as noted in Lines #48 and #54, resembled a cloze activity. The researcher verbalized a thought process but omitted key words to elicit the student to 'fill in the gaps' and prompt more active participation in the learning process. This latter technique provided a bridge between explicit researcher modeling and the shifting of ownership to the reader as problem-solver.

Mediating Student Responses to Build Story Meaning

(44) T. Let's make a prediction about the theme.
(45) S. um
(46) T. When we talk about the theme, we can start the sentence with the word "if".
(47) S. If you hear a noise, look around and you might find out what it is.
(48) T. At the beginning of the story, a noise will wake a bear up. He won't know what time it is. We predicted that at the end of the story, the bear would find out that the noise was his heart. What do you think the bear learned? If a bear –
(49) S. If a bear hears a noise, he knows it's his heart.
(50) T. and he also knows what time it is.
(51) S. and he knows that it's uh - spring.
(52) T. What does he do in spring?
(53) S. Wake up and eat.
(54) T. So, if a bear is hibernating and hears a noise –
(55) S. He knows the noise is his heart. It's spring and it's time to get up.

Category 2 - Providing a Mediated Framework to Encourage Active Learning

Two subcategories were created from researcher interactions during the actual reading of a story:

a) Tracking Significant Ideas

b) Encouraging Active Learning

Tracking significant ideas reflected cases wherein the researcher provided the students with a purpose for reading; the students were prompted to keep a particular prediction in mind and then actively search for the answer while reading. The second subcategory was necessary because the students had to be helped with the prediction/confirmation process. They were encouraged to find proof within the story for either confirming or discovering an error in their predictions as well as make questions and generalizations. Further analysis revealed that there had to be four new student subcategories:

a) Confirming Predictions

b) Discovering an Error in Predictions

c) Acquiring Information

d) Making Further Predictions

Subcategories (a) and (b) were both used to document cases when students confirmed or discovered an error in their predictions by finding supporting evidence within the text or illustrations. Subcategory (c) reflected the student acquiring additional information from having read a story or answering literal and inferential questions posed by the researcher. The last subcategory showed when students made additional hypotheses as they read a story.

Vignette 2. The second vignette was created from Hillary's sixth reading session which used Sadie and the Snowman (Morgan, 1985).

Modeling Reading Comprehension Strategies

(1) T. Let's read over our setting questions so that we will know what to look for when we are reading.
(2) S. (reads questions)
(3) T. (reads text) One cold winter day (I think ok I was right about the time prediction because the author used the words one cold winter day), Sadie (uh-huh, I know that character's name now) made a snowman in her backyard (I was kind of right about the place. I thought it would be at her house. Now I know it's in the backyard).
(4) T. (reads next page) She used cookies for the eyes, an apple for the nose, and great big banana for the smile. (This page is telling me what Sadie used for the snowman. It didn't tell me anything about where, when, and who. I'm going to keep reading. I don't need to write any of that information down).

In order to encourage active learning, the researcher modeled comprehension strategies during the actual reading of the story. In line

#1, the researcher demonstrated how the student generated questions provided a purpose for reading. As the researcher read the story, she then shared her thinking processes with the student. The researcher verbalized the 'internal dialoguing' she wanted the student to engage in for confirming prediction questions. In line #4, the researcher demonstrated sorting relevant from irrelevant information.

(5) S. She looks really sad.
(6) T. The author is giving us a clue that he will be describing the problem soon. So, I think to myself, "I better read over our question about the problem so that we can find out if we are right or not".
(7) S. (reads prediction) Is the problem that the snowman keeps melting?

In line #5-7, the researcher took advantage of the student's reaction to an illustration to further model active reading comprehension strategies.

Tracking Significant Ideas

(8) T. Why don't you read that page and find out for sure if that is the problem?

Shifting Ownership to the Reader as Problem Solver

(9) S. (read text silently) But some birds at the cookies, a squirrel ate the apple, and a large raccoon stole the banana. (It didn't say that the snowman melted so I just keep reading) The sun came out and the snowman began to melt (I was right about my prediction).
(10) T. So, what did you find out?

(11) S. Well, I was right that the snowman was melting, but the animals ate the snowman too.
(12) T. Now which question should we be reading to find an answer for?
(13) S. Will Sadie try to find a shady spot?
(14) T. Right, we know the problem. Now we're trying to find the answers to our questions about the action.
(15) S. (looks at page) She's putting it under a tent.
(16) T. You're smiling.
(17) S. (reads text) She did find kind of a shady spot, but the wind blew the tent away. We were kind of right.

Tracking of significant ideas, as demonstrated in line #8, provided the student with a specific purpose for reading. The student kept a particular prediction in mind and then searched for the answer while reading. In lines #9-17, the ownership for the learning process shifted to the student. Line #9 indicated that the student was modeling the internal dialoguing process. In line #13, the student verbalized the next prediction to track while reading. The researcher acknowledged and elaborated the response in line #14 by stating the reason for making a prediction about the action. Although the text did not explicitly state that Sadie found a shady spot, the student was able to confirm her prediction independently.

Modeling Story Prediction Strategies

(18) T. So, we don't have any more predictions left. Now we have to look at the pictures really carefully, and make up questions in our

head and read to see if we are right. Let's look at the next picture. She's protecting the snowman.

(19) S. She's going to hide the snowman under the deck.

(20) T. So, as you're reading that page, you should be saying to yourself,"Is this telling me that Sadie hides the snowman under the deck?"

(21) S. Well, its like a deck. She put the snowman under the porch.

The researcher then stated a strategy to use once the pre-reading story predictions had been confirmed. In line #19, the student modeled the teacher's cue. Line #20 reflects the internal dialoguing the researcher wanted the student to engage in while silently reading to confirm the prediction. The student then verified the prediction in line #20.

Encouraging Active Learning

(22) S. Well, she does build it every winter. She dumps the water into a plastic bag and puts it in her freezer. In the winter, she dumps the bag and does the same thing again. We were kind of right.

(23) T. We just didn't know that she was going to stick the water in the freezer.

(24) S. She'll probably keep on saving the water and keep on building snowmen with it. Its kind of like a circle story.

(25) T. Absolutely. Have you read other circle stories?

(26) S. Well - Give the Mouse a Cookie - when he finishes drawing a picture, he asks for another cookie and it repeats again.

(27) T. We have a couple of questions that we didn't answer. We thought that she was going to feel sad. Were we right?

(28) S. Well, first she was sad and then she was happy because she knew what she would do.

(29) T. The author has shown us many ways that let us know Sadie is sad.

(30) S. She's lying on her tire swing. When I'm sad I don't feel like doing anything either. I just lay on my bed.

The above dialogue reveals how the student accepted ownership in the learning process. She voluntarily confirmed and formulated predictions in line #22 and 24. Furthermore, a relation was drawn to the structure of a previous story that had been read. In lines #27 and 29, the researcher prompted the student to find proof within the story to confirm her opinion about Sadie's responses. After finding acceptable proof, the student then voluntarily related a personal example (line #30).

Category 3 - Facilitating the Recall of a Story

Four subcategories were created for recalling a story:

a) Providing General Recall Cues

b) Cueing Specific Elements

c) Modeling the SMARTE Strategy

d) Providing Other Recall Strategies

The first subcategory was the case in which the investigator provided the least amount of instructional support to the students. Without being specific, the students were prompted to choose and apply a strategy. The second subcategory cued the students to use a specific element of the SMARTE strategy. The last subcategories were used to classify

instances in which the greatest amount of researcher assistance was provided. The researcher explicitly demonstrated how to facilitate story recall by using the story grammar acronym. As Greg had difficulty recalling a story, subcategory 4 was mainly developed for him. He was shown how to use other recall strategies such as tallies, visualization and association in conjunction with the story grammar acronym.

Student subcategories were not created for this category as this information was accounted for in the analyses.

Vignette 3.

The third vignette was taken from Greg's sixth story reading session. Greg was recalling the story The Sandman, (Shepperson, 1989).

Providing General Recall Cues

(1) T. When you're telling me about a story, how do you remember what to talk about?
(2) S. Spell SMARTE

Cueing a Specific Element of the Strategy

(3) T. Yes, think of the first letter and what it reminds you to talk about.
(4) S. The characters in the story was The Sandman and that kid - Jay. The story happened at night.
(5) T. Good
(6) S. And the story - And it happened in Jay's room.

Prompting Completion of Ideas

(7) T. Can you describe the characters and the time and the place? Jay is –

(8) S. Jay is a little boy and the sandman is huge. You could just see his legs in that picture. The time was at night cause it was dark and Jay was reading the comics with a flashlight.

The student was encouraged to assume ownership for the recall process. The student was reminded that it was appropriate to use the Smarte acronym and prompted him to verbalize his knowledge about the recall process by asking a general "How do you remember question?" (lines #1 and 2). The researcher then provided more explicit support by explaining how to use the first letter of the acronym (line #3). The student responded by providing general details in lines #4 and 6. The researcher then prompted the student to complete his recall of the setting. By providing an incomplete sentence in line #7, the researcher signalled the student to 'fill in the gaps'.

Modeling the SMARTE Strategy

(9) S. O.K. - I did all three. O.K the most important idea is that Jay stayed up all night. The problem - no wait - um - but the - but Jay?

(10) T. If you can't remember what to talk about, what can you do?

(11) S. I spell the word Smarte.

(12) T. I spell the letters in my head. I see an S, an M, now I see an A. Now I can talk about the action.

(13) S. The problem in the story was that the Sandman couldn't get him to sleep.

The researcher intervened in line #12 when the student expressed confusion and again stated but did not apply the SMARTE acronym (line #9). Recognizing the need to adjust her level of response, the researcher modeled spelling the word and explained the cue provided (line #12). The student then participated by stating knowledge about the story problem (line #13).

Providing Other Recall Strategies

(14) S. He tried to see if the boy would count sheep. When he counted sheep, he didn't go to sleep. And he brung in sand. The Sandman brung in a whole barrel of sand and dumped it on the bed. Then the boy made a big, big castle. Let's see. Um- And-

(15) T. You've told me about the sheep and sand. That's two things. When we counted the actions on the Think sheet, how many were there?

(16) S. six.

(17) T. How many more actions are there?

(18) S. four.

(19) T. First he brought in the sand. Last he tried the sheep. Let's think of the second, third and fourth action.

(20) S. The Sandman sung him a lullaby, but Jay sang along– Let's see, I forget.

(21) T. Let's think of the things we talked about before we read the book. A mother does many things if a baby can't fall asleep.

(22) S. The Sandman rocked the boy like a baby. Jay didn't fall asleep. He was still awake. Oh, The Sandman brought lots and lots of cookies and - um that didn't make Jay go to sleep. He was still awake.

(23) T. Good

(24) S. One more what was it? um-

(25) T. Let's talk about the Sandman rocking Jay and singing a lullaby and bringing in cookies. Then maybe you'll remember the last action.
(26) S. The Sandman rocked the boy's bed over.
(27) T. What about the lullaby and the cookies.
(28) S. The Sandman played a guitar and the teddy bear ate too many cookies. I know - he read him a pop-up story, but he didn't go to sleep.

In lines #14-28, the researcher adjusted intervention strategies to match the memory difficulties demonstrated by the student. One more action was recalled after the researcher summarized, tallied, and sequenced the previously recalled facts (lines #15-20). As the student was still unable to participate in recalling the story, the researcher provided more support by referring back to the pre-reading discussion (line #21). The student then contributed two more actions (line #22). By discussing the actions in more detail, associations were triggered and the student then recalled the last action (lines #25-26).

Providing General Recall Cues

(24) T. Let's keep going. What do you remember that happened next?
(25) S. OK S-M-A-R-Response-the feelings. The Sandman felt happy and worried. He was happy when they were playing in the sand together and the Sandman felt worried because someone was coming...S-M-A-R-T-E The end - from all the excitement, the boy finally fell asleep. Then The Sandman picked up all the sheep and took them away. Then the boy got right back under his covers and went to sleep. And in the

morning he woke up.

Even though difficulty was encountered in recalling the actions, the researcher encouraged the student to assume responsibility for recalling the parts of the story that he could remember (line #29). The student responded and verbalized the organizational process in line #30. He then recalled a few general details concerning the character's responses and his understanding of the story resolution.

Category #4 - Providing a Mediated Framework to Adapt and Parallel Story Structure During the Composition Process

From this fourth general category, five subcategories were created:

a) Changing the Characters

b) Changing the Time

c) Adapting or Paralleling Story Plot

d) Changing the Character's Responses

e) Completing the Plot

In combination with the discussion of stories read, these subcategories provided evidence of an organizational thread in which students created their own stories. The first two subcategories reflected attempts on the

part of both the researcher and student to adapt the aspects of setting to create a new story. Either the characters were re-named, and the number or type of characters were altered, or the nature of the character was entirely changed. The student was encouraged to give characters a first name, an indication of either gender or age, and a physical description. The basic structure of the stories remained the same, but the number, sequence or type of events reflected the change in setting, time, and character.

Stories were adapted by being organized around the basic story grammar. Often students paralleled their written compositions after the plot structure of a particular story they had read. They were given the choice of creating either type of story, original or book patterns. The last subcategory reflected the students experimenting with having main characters solve their own problem, or allowing other characters to resolve the conflict.

Vignette 4. This next vignette was taken from one of Greg's story writing sessions during the delayed instructional procedures.

Changing the Characters

(1) T. Who should the character be in this story? the bear family, your family, another family?

(2) S. My family - um - Pat, Jim, Gary and Sharon.

(3) T. Let's describe all the people in your family.
(4) S. Pat's my mom. She has grey hair. She always wear earrings.
(5) T. Now Gary.
(6) S. He's nine. He has freckles on his nose. He always smiles.
(7) T. Now Jim. Does he have grey hair, too?
(8) S. No black. Jim's my dad. And Sharon is eleven. She has freckles, too. She's bigger than I am.

Changing the Time

(9) T. Now the time, the story we read happened early in the morning. How can we change the time?
(10) S. It can be early in the afternoon.
(11) T. In the story we read, we could tell it was morning because the bears were in their pyjamas. How will we be able to tell the time in our story?
(12) S. Everyone's in the kitchen. Everybody is just finishing their lunch.
(13) T. What was for lunch?
(14) S. Macaroni and cheese. It was cheesy and good.

The researcher and student began planning the composition by brainstorming changes to the characters, setting, and time. The researcher's role, as demonstrated in lines #1, 3, 5 and 7 was to interact with the student to elaborate his descriptions of the story characters. Physical descriptions of the characters were encouraged. Lines #2, 4, 6, and 8 reflect that the student responded to the researcher's prompts by naming the characters and describing the character's hair color, age, facial features and height. In line #9, the researcher used a previously read story as a 'springboard' to begin negotiating a change in the time

element. The researcher again referred to the story in line #11 in order to provide the student with a model of how authors indicate the time component. In line #12, the student modeled the researcher's example. Further details were encouraged in lines #13 and 14.

Adapting Story Plot

(15) T. In the story that we read, Baby Bear wanted to watch TV, but the TV was broken. If you're just finishing lunch, what would be a good thing to break and need to get fixed.
(16) S. the dishwasher.
(17) T. We could make this into a funny story. If we make the dishwasher do really weird things, the problem could be the interesting part of the story. Do you remember the story about The Sandman? The Sandman was funny because of all the different ways he tried to get Jay to go to sleep. So, the dishwasher won't work. Let's describe what happened. Usually there's lots of soap and water all over the floor.
(18) S. It would jiggle or something.
(19) T. Ya - usually they vibrate if they're broken.
(20) S. Lots and lots of bubbles are coming out and the dishwasher is going to move a bit.
(21) T. Where is it moving?
(22) S. It probably hits the fridge. It makes lots of noise.
(23) T. What kind of noise would you hear?
(24) S. brrr - sprrr -
(25) T. Let's think of the first action someone in your family can do to solve the problem.
(26) S. Pat will try to push the dishwasher back to its place - but problems don't get solved right away.
(27) T. That's right, they don't. So, let's think of something funny the dishwasher will do.
(28) S. The dishwasher is going to push her instead. Pat's not that strong.
(29) T. This is an out of control dishwasher.

In writing, the student's plot followed the same path as a previously read story, but the type of events reflected the change in setting, time and character (lines #15 and 16). In line #16, the student suggested an original idea to parallel the basic plot structure. The researcher extended the idea by explaining and providing a familiar example of how a humorous problem influences excitement in a story. In line #17, the researcher provided a model of a humorous effect relating to the broken dishwasher. The student modeled the researcher's plot suggestions in lines #18 and 20. Elaboration of ideas was encouraged in lines #21 and 23. The student demonstrated knowledge by stating that problems do not get solved right away, but did not state how to reflect the idea in the story (line #26). When the researcher prompted the student, however, he was able to respond with a humorous idea (line #28).

Changing the Character's Responses

(30) T. In the story that we read, Mr. and Mrs. Bear felt sorry for Baby Bear. They showed how they felt by reading to the baby and blowing up a balloon. How does your family feel about the dishwasher?
(31) S. Angry.
(32) T. There's lots of way's people show that they are angry.
(33) S. Our face goes dark red.

(34) T. Usually characters do something with their hands to show how they feel. Mrs. Blair put her hand on her chest to show how surprised she was to see a bear in her house.
(35) S. You can like shake your hands.
(36) T. If people are angry they usually say something, "We need another dishwasher".
(37) S. "You dirty rat."

The researcher began the discussion of character responses by providing an example from the story that had been read. The example included how the characters felt and reacted to events in the story. When the student gave a vague response (line #31), the researcher stated how characters demonstrate feelings through body movements and dialogue (lines #32, 34, 36). The student responded in lines #33, 35 and 37.

Completing the Plot

(38) T. OK. Let's think of an ending. In the story we read, father bear plugged in the T.V. How should we end this story?
(39) S. Sharon can take out all the dishes. Let's see. Oh, pull the plug.
(40) T. Its a good idea. What will happen to the machine?
(41) S. It will turn off. The bubbles will pop. The noises stop.
(42) T. Let's thing about how else the story will end. At the end of Fix It, Baby Bear changed. She didn't want to watch T.V. She decided to read a book instead. How can we show that your family has changed?
(43) S. Um?
(44) T. At the beginning of the story the Mason's had just finished lunch. What were they doing with the dishes?
(45) S. putting them in the dishwasher.

(46) T. What might they decide to do with the dishes at the end of the story? Instead of using the dishwasher -
(47) S. they would wash the dishes themselves.
(48) T. Right. The dishwasher doesn't work, so they have to change and do the dishes themselves.

Although the student self-corrected when an error in judgement was noticed, the ending he suggested was vague (line # 39); he did not connect or mention that the machine would stop causing problems. When the researcher directly asked about the machine, the student stated three possibilities (line # 41). In lines #42 - 48, the researcher guided the student in making the connection between the cause and effect nature of the problem and the change in character action. The student had difficulty in understanding the concept. With the student's help, the beginning of the story was summarized (lines #44, 45). The researcher then prompted the student's active participation in completing the idea by verbalizing only part of the thought process (lines #46 and 47).

Mediating Student Responses to Build Story Meaning

(49) T. Let's think of the main idea.
(50) S. a machine shakes and makes bubbles.
(51) T. How do we find the main idea when we are reading?
(52) S. We can look though the actions.
(53) T. We can ask ourselves a question, too. We do the same thing to find the main idea when we read as when we write.

(54) S. What are the characters doing? Um - trying to push the machine - No - They're trying to stop the dishwasher from making bubbles and shaking and making noise.

(55) T. Right. We can get an idea about the main idea by zeroing in on the things we picked for the most interesting part of the story - the bubbles, the shaking, the noise. Its all about a machine that goes crazy.

(56) T. How do authors show they're most important idea?

(57) S. On the title.

In lines #49 - 57, the researcher and student established the essential meaning of the story. After the student gave an approximate response in line #50, the researcher asked for procedural knowledge of how to find a main idea in reading (lines # 52, 52, 53). The researcher then explained that reading and writing techniques were interchangeable (line # 53). The student applied the self-dialoguing procedure in line #54. He began formulating another main idea statement, but noticed and self-corrected his mistake. Although the student stated a basic main idea in line #54, the researcher extended the concept. While brainstorming ideas for the story, the student chose to focus on the actions of the dishwasher as the most interesting aspect of his story. The researcher related the main idea to those interesting details (line #55). Last, the student demonstrated his insight into author craft by stating how main ideas are showcased in a story (line #57).

Category 5 - Providing Insight into Author Craft

After students read and recalled a book, they responded to the story by choosing pages they wanted to discuss further. The researcher's interactions focused on three subcategories:

a) Revelation of Character

b) Revelation of Tone

c) Revelation of Plot

Both students often chose to talk more about the characters and the funny parts of the stories. When the responses were combined with the other general category areas, students were given explicit insight into 'how the author does it' or the craft of writing a story.

In addition to revelation of character, tone, and plot, students also responded to the stories by discussing illustration techniques and linking personal knowledge and experiences.

Vignette 5. This last vignette was taken from a cross-section of the students' responses to the books that they read. The discussion of character development was created from Hillary's response to Princess Frownsalot (Bianchi, 1987). The discussion of story tone was from Greg's response to I Want A Cat (Ross, 1989). The discussion of plot

was from Hillary's response to Jim and the Beanstalk (Briggs, 1970).

Revelation of Character

(1) T. Tell me about the pages that you marked.
(2) S. Well, I marked this page because I wouldn't frown monsters out of my closet before I went to bed. I'd be too scared.
(3) T. The princess is very different in this story than in other fairy tales.
(4) S. She frowns alot.
(5) T. Right - usually princesses smile and they are very pretty. They are usually very nice, too.
(6) S. She's wearing a short dress.
(7) T. and knee high socks.
(8) S. She isn't pretty. She doesn't look very nice.
(9) T. At the beginning of the story, the author is describing what kind of a person that the princess is. The author is telling us about the princess through the princess' actions. She's frowning and standing with her hands on her hips. She's miserable.
(10) S. She likes being mean. Her and her cat always laugh. She frowned her brother away from the T.V. She frowned the King away from the chocolate chip cookies.
(11) T. The author showed how mean the princess was by what she says. She said, "Get off me". Look at how black the words are.
(12) S. She's angry. She calls her car stupid.
(13) T. I like when she called the servants airheads. Do you remember the funny words she called the doctors?
(14) S. Ketchup bottles?
(15) T. Why did she call them that?
(16) S. um?
(17) T. Ketchup is slow at coming out of a bottle She felt the doctors were slow at getting her to smile back.
(18) S. She wasn't very nice.
(19) T. We can tell by looking at the illustration how other people in the Kingdom feel about her.
(20) S. They don't like her. They're covering their heads.
(21) T. They're looking away from her. She frowns too much.
(22) S. She's crossing her arms, too.
(23) T. So, we can tell alot about the princess at the beginning of the

story. When the author describes a character, it makes us fell a certain way about the character.

(24) S. I don't like her at the beginning of the story. She kind of looks like a witch with her chin.

(25) T. The illustrator drew a funny picture. When the cat was pulling on her to unfrown her face, the princess' chin looked like a witch's chin. Why did the illustrator do that?

(26) S. To make her be really mean.

(27) T. I like the way the illustrator made the picture really big.

(28) S. The better you can see it.

(29) T. It wouldn't have been so funny if it was a small picture. Did you like the princess at the end of the story?

(30) S. I liked her at the end cause she felt good about helping her cat.

(31) T. So, the character changed at the end of the story.

(32) S. She changed her name to Princess Frownsalittle. She felt good. She gave the cat the smile.

(33) T. It was the first time she'd ever given anything to anybody. When you help somebody, you feel good about yourself.

(34) S. Sometimes we help Kindergarten kids read. I like reading with them.

(35) S. I like the Princess the best. Sometimes I do things that she does. Sometimes I yell at my brother. I do this (shakes finger). I tell him to get away from the T.V. - all he does is play Nintendo.

The student began responding to the book by indicating knowledge of the main character's personality (line #2). Although the researcher did not label Princess Frownsalot as a fully 'round' or 'dynamic' character, she explicitly revealed the craft of character development. The researcher then stated how an author creates a character and where the development occurs in a story (lines #9, 11, 19, and 23). In lines #3 - 8, the researcher and student discussed how a

character's inner personality influences physical appearance and in line #9, the researcher explained that a character's actions revealed personality. After the researcher provided an example, the student modeled the researcher's structure in talking about the character element. The student described the Princess and found evidence from within the story to verify the description (line #10). In line #11, the researcher stated and provided an example of how character development emerges through the author's written langauge. The student sensed the Princess' anger when the researcher pointed to the author's use of bolded print (line #12). Although the researcher explained the Princess' pun in line #17, the student understood that the language reflected an undesirable type of person.

The student demonstrated her own knowledge of character by recognizing subtle imagery in one of the illustrations (line #24). The researcher extended the conversation by explaining the humorous effects of the exaggerated illustration. In line #19, the researcher pointed out how other characters' comments and actions indicated the main character's personality. The student provided additional evidence from the story (lines #20,22). By asking the student how she felt about

Princess Frownsalot, the researcher initiated a discussion of character change (line #23). Lines #30 and 32 indicate the student recognized that story actions affect character change. The researcher's response prompted the student to relate a personal example (lines #33 and 34). This collaborative discussion concerning craft of character development influenced the student's last response. The actions, language, physical descriptions, comments of other characters, and change in personality, brought Princess Frownsalot to life. The student identified with this real type of character (line #35).

Revelation of Tone

(1) T. Tell me about some of the pages that you picked out.
(2) S. Well this one is funny. She's dressed up in a cat suit and doesn't want to get out of it until she gets a cat. Jesse's shadow looks like a real cat.
(3) T. Her mom and dad said some interesting things to let Jesse know she couldn't have a cat.
(4) S. They always said "No".
(5) T. Look at how big and black the letters are.
(6) S. They don't want a cat.
(7) T. They used some unusual words to describe a cat.
(8) S. Crawly.
(9) T. Creepy yawly things. All those words kind of sound alike.
(10) S. They sound funny if you say them really fast.
(11) T. They gave Jesse something funny instead.
(12) S. Ohya - toy cats (laugh).
(13) T. I like what Jesse did, too. I thought it was funny that she got into a cat costume and refused to get out of the costume until she got a cat. That was an unusual way to get her parents to do something.
(14) S. I liked this one. She's in the tub with her costume one.

(15) T. Do you remember what she did instead of sleeping on the bed?
(16) S. Ohya. She slept on the floor.
(17) T. It was pretty funny in the restaurant, too.
(18) S. She ate under the table.
(19) T. Look at her dad. He has a clothespin on his nose.
(20) S. Peuuww!
(21) T. Jesse said something funny to the waiter.
(22) S. Um?
(23) T. She told the waiter don't cook the trout. She wanted to eat raw fish like a cat.
(24) S. Oh ya. I marked this one cause she's howling at night.
(25) T. The author used some interesting words to describe what she sounded like.
(26) S. A million pigs downstairs. Its funny.
(27) T. It wouldn't have been as funny if the author said she howled really loud. I thought that when Jesse howled like a cat was most exciting. That's what woke up the neighbors.
(28) S. They said, "Give her a cat, give her a cat, give her a cat."
(29) T. Her mom said it too. Do you notice something interesting about the neighbor's names?
(30) S. Big Fig - they rhyme.
(31) T. Why did the author do that?
(32) S. Make us laugh. I marked this one, too. He says that he has a surprise for Jesse.
(33) T. The father gets a real surprise when he opens up the door and so do we. I wasn't expecting Jesse to be in a cat costume.
(34) S. The author tricked us.
(35) T. We had to read right to the very last page to find out the ending. Its fun to read stories that keep you guessing right to the end.
(36) S. I didn't know she wanted a dog.
(37) T. We could write a new story about all the funny things Jesse does to get a dog.
(38) S. The story keeps going on and on.

The student immediately recognized that the main character's actions produced a funny story (line #2). The researcher did not use the word 'tone', but extended the student's knowledge of the concept by

explicitly stating how the author created a humorous story. The craft was first explored by revealing the effects of language and character dialogue with the student. In lines #3, 7 and 9, the researcher demonstrated talking about how the style of the author's language conveys tone. Modeling how to talk about verbal humor was again made explicit in lines #21, 23, 25, 27 and 29. The student modeled his comments after the teacher's by locating and describing how Jesse's howling sounded like a million pigs (line #2). The student also recognized the humor in the neighbor's names and the repetition of "Give her a cat" (lines #28, 30 and 32). The researcher elaborated the discussion of tone by collaboratively discussing how the combination of situation and action produced humor (line #13, 17 and 23). The student responded by laughing at Jesse's antics in the bathroom, bedroom and restaurant (lines #14, 16, 18 and 20). Last, the student demonstrated his own knowledge of tone by finding humor in the surprise ending of the story (lines #32, 34, and 36). The researcher corroborated the student's response by expressing delight in reading and suggesting he could possibly write a continuation of the story (lines #33, 35, 37). The discussion of tone, supported Greg's retelling of the story.

Revelation of Plot

(1) T. Which story do you like better. Jack or Jim and the Beanstalk?

(2) S. I like Jim and the Beanstalk. Jack isn't very nice. He steals stuff from the giant. The giant's not very happy.

(3) T. In Jack and the Beanstalk, I liked the way the giant kept saying Fe, Fi, Fo, Fum. The giant didn't have a rhyme in this story.

(4) S. He was just unhappy. But the author took some ideas from Jack and the Beanstalk.

(5) T. What are some of the ideas that the author took?

(6) S. Jack stole the gold and that's why the giant is unhappy.

(7) T. Authors take ideas from an old story and use them for a problem in a new story. There's nothing wrong in borrowing ideas to make new and interesting stories.

(8) S. Jim and the Beanstalk - like it doesn't have - like there's nobody that lives with the giant. There's a lady that lives with the giant in Jack and the Beanstalk.

(9) T. Right. Why did the author need to have the wife in the old story?

(10) S. Let him in and give him something to eat?

(11) T. The author for Jim and the Giant didn't need the wife because he changed the giant in the story. The giant really wasn't mean.

(12) S. He's nice. He gave Jim a gold coin and wrote him a letter.

(13) T. Right. He let Jack into the castle. So when an author changes a story, sometimes he has to take out or add new characters to make the action interesting. Who were the new characters added to the story?

(14) S. the eyeglass maker and the dentist and the hatmaker.

(15) T. Don't forget Jim. There are other ideas that the author took from Jack and the Beanstalk. In Jack and the Beanstalk, the author kept repeating Fe, Fi, Fo, Fum. The author for this story kept repeating things, too.

(16) S. Jim kept buying large things for the giant.

(17) T. Before he bought the things he always had to do something for the giant.

(18) S. measure him.

(19) T. When Jim walked down the street, the people always felt the same way.

(20) S. They were surprised.
(21) T. Their hat or glasses would fall off. When the giant wanted Jim to get something, he always said the same words.
(22) S. He always said 'Get em'. He always banged his fist.
(23) T. So, some authors repeat words or actions in a story. When authors repeat words or actions it helps us make predictions about the story, but it also makes the story exciting because you aren't sure how its going to end. If you want to change an old story and make up your own, you can change the words or actions that were repeated.
(24) S. The best part was the end.
(25) T. How come.
(26) S. Because the giant didn't eat Jim. Jim got a letter and he got to keep a gold coin. I think he was surprised and excited that he got one from the giant.
(27) T. So you liked the happy ending.
(28) S. Ya.

The student indicated a general awareness of how the plot was created. In line #4, she stated that the author took some ideas from the original story. By explaining that the previously stolen gold made the new giant unhappy, she demonstrated awareness that events from the original story created the problem element for the new story. The researcher responded by probing for further details (line #5), summarizing the student's statement (line #7), and explaining that the "borrowing of ideas" was an acceptable procedure in the craft of plot manipulation (line #7).

The student sensed that plot development affected the number and nature of characters (lines #4 and 8). The researcher and student

then collaboratively elaborated upon that idea in lines # 9 - 15. The student's knowledge of plot creation was extended when the researcher initiated a discussion of how the author manipulated repetition in the story (lines #15, 17 and 19). The student 'picked up' on the researcher's idea and verified the use of repetition by providing evidence from the story (lines #16, 18, 20, 22). By explaining why authors use repetition (line #23), the researcher presented the craft of plot development. The student indicated she followed the researcher's 'line of thought' when she chose the ending as her favorite part of the story. The feeling of suspense was relieved as the student discovered the giant wouldn't eat Jim (lines #24, 26 and 28). The discussion influenced Hillary's recall of the story.

Analysis of the Researcher/Student Interactions

Results of the tabulation for researcher/student interactions are reported in Appendix I. Counting and labelling interactions for the first general category, Providing a Mediated Framework to Present Novel Story Features, indicated the highest percentage of researcher interactions involved the following subcategories a) modeling new concept features; b) modeling story prediction strategies; c) mediating

student responses to build story meaning and d) encouraging the use of new story knowledge. The lowest percentage of researcher interactions concerned headlining a story and modeling the telling of a related experience. Both students interacted quite differently within this first broad category. The highest percentage of Hillary's interactions related to using new story knowledge and linking personal related knowledge indicating that she was able to assume more responsibility for her learning. In contrast, most of Greg's interactions focused on modeling researcher responses and responding to prompted cues. When the researcher provided more explicit instructional support, Greg participated within the collaborative learning context.

Analysis of the second general category, Providing a Mediated Framework to Encourage Active Learning, revealed that most researcher interactions included the following area: a) tracking significant ideas; b) encouraging active learning; c) modeling reading comprehension strategies; and d) mediating student responses to build story meaning. The highest percentage of the researcher's interactions with Hillary focused on encouraging active learning. The highest percentage of the researcher's interactions with Greg related to mediating student

responses to build story meaning. Many of Hillary and Greg's interactions within this second broad category involved confirming predictions, discovering errors in their predictions, and acquiring information. However, the highest percentage of Hillary's interactions were confirming predictions while Greg's were modeling researcher responses. Analysis of this broad category indicated that although both students were active participants during the actual reading of the stories, Greg required more concrete researcher support in order to participate.

Student interactions were not tabulated for the general categories Providing a Mediated Framework to Adapt and Parallel Plot Structure and Facilitating the recall of a story. For both students, most of the researcher's interactions during the composing process related to adapting or paralleling plot, completing the plot, and mediating student responses to build story meaning. The highest percentage of researcher interactions for story retellings were providing general recall cues and modeling the SMARTE strategy; the essence of the researcher's role was meaning and process oriented.

Analysis of the last general category, Providing Insight into Author Craft, revealed the researcher's interactions for both students' responses

to text were fairly equally distributed among revelation of character, tone and plot. The highest percentage of Hillary's responses were related to revelation of plot while Greg's were related to story tone. In addition, a number of both students' interactions centered on the illustrator's techniques.

Summary of the Instructional Mediation. There is evidence of the researcher a) providing explicit modeling; b) modeling with student participation; c) cueing specific strategies; and d) providing general cues during the comprehension and written composition lessons. The five general researcher/student dialogue categories illustrated these varying levels of interactions but overall, the hypothesized interactions were too general for discussion purposes. In addition to the investigator categories, ten student interaction categories were also observed.

Overall Summary of the Analysis and Findings

Analysis of the pretest story retellings revealed that neither Hillary nor Greg had a developed sense of story schema; both students' responses to the pretest story indicated a lack of personal involvement with the story as well as a vague purpose for reading and retelling. In addition, both students needed further instruction regarding the

application of story knowledge to the writing process. Neither student was metacognitively aware of reading and writing processes.

The post- and delayed post test analysis indicated that the use of a) narrative instruction; b) the story grammar acronym; c) think sheets for planning and revising stories improved both Hillary and Greg's ability to recall and compose a story independently. Both students' ability to recall a familiar story improved 40 percent. Hillary's ability to recall an unfamiliar story improved 41 percent, while Greg improved 34 percent. Similarly, Hillary's ability to write a story independently improved 18 percent, while Greg's improved 26 percent. After a time delay, Hillary retained the gains made in her ability to both recall and compose a story independently. Compared to the pretest analysis, only a few changes were noted in Greg's performance; the reading comprehension and written composition lessons were reinstated and more positive results were noted.

The post- and delayed post test interviews suggested that Hillary learned when and how to use her knowledge of story grammar. Greg became more aware of story grammar components, but did not use this knowledge consistently. Numerous investigator and student categories

were created from the instructional mediation transcripts. The vignettes illustrated sample investigator/student dialogue that was observed during the instructional process, but the hypothesized interaction categories were too general for analysis purposes.

A detailed summary of the conclusions as well as implications for further research and development are presented in Chapter 5.

Chapter V

Summary, Conclusions, and Implications

The intent of this study was to determine if narrative instruction, a story grammar acronym, and think sheets for planning and editing stories facilitated the improvement of both students' ability to recall and compose a story independently, and enhanced metacognitive awareness regarding the role of story grammar knowledge in comprehending and composing. These purposes were derived from the evidence that story grammar instruction enhanced the comprehension, recall, and composition abilities of older students, and that there was educational merit in exploring instructional procedures for teaching story grammar to younger students (Fitzgerald and Spiegel, 1983; Laughton and Morris, 1989).

Another intent of this study was to document the investigator/student interactions that occurred during a mediated literacy process. This goal was especially important because, to date, no such story grammar research has been written. Also, none of the studies have chronicled investigator/student interaction patterns during story grammar instruction.

This study sought to find answers for the following six questions:

Story Comprehension and Recall

1. Will narrative instruction improve the students' recall of a silently read story?

2. Will a story grammar acronym improve the students' ability to recall a silently read story?

Story Writing

3. Will narrative instruction improve the students' ability to compose a story independently?

4. Will Think-Sheets improve the students' ability to organize and edit compositions?

Metacognitive Awareness

5. Can students: a) demonstrate knowledge of strategy application in story recalls and compositions; and b) articulate how they used the story grammar strategy in either comprehending or composing?

Instructional Mediation

6. In terms of facilitating learning, what is salient about the interactions between a researcher and students during the instructional mediation process?

The purpose of this last chapter, therefore, is to summarize the findings and conclusions based upon the study. Implications for classroom practice are then offered followed by suggestions for further research.

Summary of the Design

Hillary and Greg, the subjects selected for this study, were grade three students attending a suburban Winnipeg school. Hillary was eight and Greg was nine years of age. The classroom teacher identified both students as having adequate decoding and verbal communication skills, but poor silent reading comprehension. Their story writing skills were also below grade level expectation. Neither student received in-school resource support.

Pretests were administered during the first week of December, 1991. Reading ability was determined by using the reading comprehension subtest of the Gates MacGinite Reading Test (1965). Story grammar knowledge was assessed by having students read a book silently, and then provide recalls of all the information that they could remember. Comprehension questions related to story grammar components followed if students did not recall other specific story

grammar information. The students were then asked to write a make-believe story. Following the pretests, Hillary and Greg were interviewed and asked questions concerning their metacognitive awareness of their reading and writing processes.

The study was an examination of an instructional method: to learn the story grammar components, students received eight reading comprehension and eight written composition lessons. All sessions were audiotaped and conducted individually. The strategies/procedures were: a) a reading activity; b) teacher modeling of comprehension and composition strategies; c) a student self-questioning strategy; d) think-sheets for planning and editing stories; e) Story Frames; f) dictating stories; g) listing story elements from books read; h) plot completion experiences; i) an acronym to trigger memory of story components and j) a teacher-student writing conference. At the completion of the training sessions, the pretests and interviews were re-administered. An unfamiliar story was also read and recalled to determine transfer of training effects.

Delayed tests were completed four weeks later. Students re-read the post test story in addition to reading silently a new story. Both stories

were orally recalled by the student, related story grammar questions answered, and then the students were briefly interviewed. To examine transfer of training to writing, another composition was also written. When regressions occurred in Greg's recalls and compositions, instruction was reinstated for four sessions. A second rater scored all recalls and compositions for the pre, post and delayed post tests. The researcher and experienced teacher then met and negotiated any differences in scores.

Summary of the Findings and Conclusions

Story Comprehension and Recall

Hypothesis 1. Narrative instruction will improve both the quality and quantity of ideas expressed in the post-test recall for grade three students of poor reading abilities.

The verbatim transcripts document the acceptance of this hypothesis. Significant improvement was demonstrated by both students on the retellings.

Hypothesis 2. A story grammar acronym will improve the students' ability to recall a silently read story.

Again, the verbatim transcripts show that this hypothesis can be

accepted. Improvement was demonstrated by both students on the quantification of retellings and qualitative retelling profile. However, a conditional acceptance should be noted as one student did not always use the acronym without prompting.

1. Hillary became aware of and used story elements in the reading and recalling process. Her recall of story information became more sequenced. Use of the narrative acronym facilitated remembering details in sequential story grammar order. Greg became aware of story elements, but did not use them consistently. Wihtout a reminder to use the acronym, Greg's recalls were repetitious and disorganized.

2. Since pretesting analysis showed weak story knowledge, there is now evidence both students used their new learning in their recalls of: a) characters; b) time; c) setting; d) problem; e) attempts; f) outcomes; g) themes; and h) endings. With the narrative instruction and story grammar acronym, Hillary also recalled main idea statements. On the other hand, neither student was able to extend themes into universal truths. The most easily recalled elements were: a) supporting characters; b) minor settings; c) time; d) problem; and e) ending. Character responses were most difficult to remember.

4. Both students increased the number of words and sentences used to recall information for familiar and unfamiliar stories. More words and sentences were used for recalling familiar rather than unfamiliar stories.

5. A decrease in the number of adult prompts needed to retell a story was noted for both students.

6. Both the adapted directed reading-thinking activity and the self-questioning strategy were effective procedures for improving students' recall of story information. The self-questioning strategy produced slightly higher scores on the quantification of retelling scheme than the adapted directed reading-thinking activity. When using either the predicting and the self-questioning strategy, Greg required explicit modeling of what to do with the predictions and questions.

7. The story grammar acronym helped students control the mechanics of talking about a story. More sequence type words were stated when students used the acronym strategy for retelling. Hillary learned the language and concepts needed not only to talk about narrative structure, but also to talk about her own 'inner' thinking regarding this matter.

8. The instructional mediation helped both Hillary and Greg respond more readily to text. Responses were related to: a) character development, b)

story tone; c) plot development; d) illustration techniques; and e) related background experiences.

9. After a four week delay, Hillary retained and made efficient use of the comprehension strategies she learned during the study. She used the acronym not only as a guide for her retelling process, but also as an aide to activate background knowledge and make predictions while reading the delayed test story. After a four week delay, Greg retained retelling gains when the story was familiar, but regressions were evident in his ability to recall an unfamiliar story. The reading comprehension instruction was repeated for four lessons. After the reinstated instruction, Greg was able to apply and verbalize researcher modeled strategies. He became more active in the learning process and suggested an extension of the acronym. He then used the acronym as a framework to help recall the stories read in the delayed post testing.

Story Writing

Hypothesis 3. Narrative instruction will improve the students' ability to write a story independently.

This hypothesis is accepted in view of the significant improvements demonstrated by both students on the post test findings.

Conditional acceptance should be noted because after a four week delay, regressions occurred in one student's composition which required four additional lessons before improvement was noted.

Hypothesis 4. Think Sheets will improve the student's ability to organize and edit their written compositions.

This hypothesis is accepted in view of the significant improvements produced by both students in their stories. Conditional acceptance should be noted as after a four week delay, regressions occurred in one students' composition and required four additional lessons before improvement was noted.

1. The total number of words and sentences that the students used in their compositions did not increase noticeably, but the overall quality of the stories improved.

2. The students' compositions became organized as more information was presented in story grammar order.

3. The think sheet for planning stories was an effective strategy for helping students include story grammar components in their written compositions.

4. Both students named their story characters and incorporated character

responses into their compositions. Hillary described her story characters in physical terms, included character dialogue, and correctly used quotation marks.

5. Hillary used the acronym as an organizational framework during the writing process. Greg mainly used the problem, action and resolution components to organize his writing. Evidence that both students used what they knew was demonstrated in more explicit information being written about the problem, action, resolution, setting and ending. Hillary incorporated several action sequences while Greg included one segment.

6. The checklist for editing stories facilitated the improvement of both students' basic sentence structure, and the appropriate use of punctuation and capitalization.

7. Students used more connective words when linking one idea with the next.

8. The narrative instruction and think sheets did not influence either students' spelling abilities. Hillary's spelling errors attracted reader attention while Greg's errors were not as noticeable.

9. Ideas expressed in Hillary's stories were original and humorous. When Greg paralleled the plot structure of stories read, his stories

became more interesting to read. The ideas and actions in Greg's self-chosen topics were ordinary and functional. Story grammar knowledge did not influence elaboration of ideas.

10. After a delay of four weeks, Hillary retained all writing performance gains made during the instructional study. Regressions occurred in Greg's ability to compose a story. While a problem centered plot was still evident, he failed to elaborate on basic ideas. The written composition instruction was then repeated for four sessions with positive results.

Metacognitive Awareness

Hypothesis 5. The students will be able to: a) demonstrate knowledge of strategy application in story recalls and compositions; and b) articulate how they used the story grammar strategy in both comprehending and composing.

This hypothesis is accepted. After the reading comprehension and written composition instruction, both students were able to express how they used their level of story grammar knowledge.

1. Hillary and Greg were both able to list orally and explain story grammar components that were taught during the instructional study.

2. Hillary was able to describe when and how she used her knowledge of the story grammar strategy. The strategy was used to trigger the prediction process while silently reading a story. She spelled the acronym in 'her head' to facilitate her recall of a story and also used the acronym as an organizational thread for planning a composition.

3. Hillary internalized the story grammar strategy as metacognitive behaviours were still apparent after a delay of four weeks.

4. Greg's use of the story grammar strategy was inconsistent. Unless prompted by the researcher, he did not consciously use all elements of the acronym to read or recall the post test stories, only the setting, problem, action and ending elements. Some knowledge, however, was internalized as he indicated thinking about the problem, action and resolution components for the delayed recall procedures. The delayed interview also indicated that Greg made general predictions about these elements and used them as an organizational framework for his retelling.

5. Greg was most cognizant after writing in the immediate post test condition. He expressed thinking about a beginning, middle and end for his story.

Instructional Mediation

Hypothesis 6. The following interactions will be observed: a) teacher modeling; b) teacher modeling with student participation; c) cueing of specific strategies; and d) providing general cues.

Although examples of the above categories were extensively documented in the audiotapes of the reading comprehension and written composition instruction, the categories were insufficient to describe the complex interactions that occurred. This hypothesis is accepted with the following caveat: Five general categories were developed to encompass the broad range of investigator/student interactions. Numerous investigator and student subcategories were then developed to further delineate these five general areas.

Investigator Interactions. 1. Analysis of the researcher interactions shows the essentials of: a) making story elements public; b) making story elements relevant; c) modeling new concept features; d) headlining a story; e) modeling reading comprehension strategies; f) modeling story prediction strategies; g) modeling the telling of a related experience; h) encouraging students to activate background knowledge; i) mediating student responses to build story meaning; j) encouraging the use of new

story knowledge; and k) shifting ownership to the reader as problem-solver.

2. The researcher adjusted her instructional support to ensure both students were able to participate in the learning context. When text difficulty threatened students' comprehension, the researcher shared the task by modeling strategies and withdrew help as students' gradually made connections and demonstrated evidence of their learning. Therefore, this mediated form of learning always remained meaning and process oriented.

3. The students' recall of stories they read was facilitated by: a) providing general recall cues; b) cueing specific elements; c) modeling the SMARTE strategy; and d) providing other recall strategies.

4. The written composition process was mediated by: a) changing the characters b) changing the time; c) adapting or paralleling story plot; d) changing the characters' responses; and e) completing the plot.

5. Across the five general categories, the highest percentage of researcher interaction with Hillary involved: a) encouraging the use of new story knowledge ; b) encouraging use of background knowledge; c) encouraging active learning; d) adapting or paralleling Plot; e) modeling

the SMARTE strategy; f) providing general recall cues; g) discussing revelation of story characters.

6. The highest percentage of interactions with Greg involved: a) mediating to build story meaning; b) modeling new concept features; c) modeling prediction strategies; d) encouraging active learning; e) modeling reading comprehension strategies; f) adapting or paralleling plot; g) modeling the SMARTE strategy; h) providing general recall cues; and i) discussing revelation of story tone.

7. The lowest percentage of researcher interactions with both students involved headlining a story.

Student Centered Interactions. 1. The interactions of the students were: a) modeling teacher responses; b) responding to prompted cues; c) using new story knowledge; d) linking personal knowledge; e) establishing evidence of learning; f) confirming predictions; g) discovering an error in predictions; h) acquiring information; i) making further predictions; j) indicating knowledge of character; k) indicating knowledge of tone; l) indicating knowledge of plot; and m) responding to story illustrations.

2. The highest percentage of Hillary's responses to the researcher

interactions included: a) using new story knowledge; b) linking background knowledge; c) confirming predictions; d) discussing revelation of story characters.

3. The highest percentage of Greg's interactions included: a) modeling researcher responses; b) responding to prompted cues; c) confirming predictions; d) acquiring information; e) discussing revelations of story characters; and f) discussing revelation of story tone.

4. The lowest percentage of Hillary's interactions involved: a) responding to prompted cues and b) modeling researcher responses.

5. The lowest percentage of Greg's interactions involved: a) using new story knowledge and b) making further predictions.

6. Hillary's increased participation in subcategories that required the researcher to provide less structured support indicated that she had internalized more active approaches for comprehending, recalling, composing, and responding to a story.

7. Greg's participation in subcategories that required more concrete researcher support indicated that he was able to participate in the learning situation when more structure was provided. When he began internalizing more active ways of participating it indicated that we can

reach such low-achievers if we are willing to expand the effort.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations need to be acknowledged when considering the findings of this study:

1. This investigation was limited to analyzing data produced and observed from two poor grade three readers. The findings cannot be generalized beyond the context and students used in the study.

2. Exact replication of the study may not be possible due to the open-ended nature of the procedures being used. Although the format of the training procedures was identical for the students, individual student responses required different mediation for each subject.

3. Each session was 60-75 minutes. The students continued with their regular academic program during the remainder of the school day. The effects of what occurred in the students' classrooms, as related to reading and writing instruction, may have influenced post-and/or delayed-test performances.

4. As Hillary was approximately seven months behind her grade placement in terms of reading performance and Greg was approximately one year and seven months behind, the analysis of researcher/student

interactions would therefore indicate an important point. The more severe the reading comprehension problem, the more explicit mediated forms of learning and longer instructional periods are required in order for students to interact within a collaborative learning context. Therefore eight reading comprehension and eight written composition lessons cannot be stated as a recommended practice for all students.

5. The use of an audio-tape recorder may have been obtrusive and inhibited the students' natural communicative style.

6. Experimental bias cannot be ruled out as the study was under the direct control of the investigator.

7. The reading comprehension subtest from the Gates-McGinite Reading Test was not re-administered for the post-test or delayed post-test analysis. Therefore, learning gains were not documented in this area.

8. Delayed post testing was not re-instituted after Greg's four additional comprehension and composition lessons. Therefore, his ability to retain the reinstated instruction after a second delay was not determined.

Assumptions

The conclusions of this study must be considered in light of the following assumptions:

1. Subjects had the verbal ability to report their perceptions accurately.
2. The time allotted for the treatment was adequate to produce the desired effects.

Discussion of Findings

The results of this study must be interpreted in terms of previous theory and research which was examined in Chapter Two.

Story Comprehension and Recall

This study supports the primary research on story grammar. Mandler and Johnson's (1977) study indicated that grade four students were able to recall attempts, outcomes, and endings. Internal reactions were more difficult to remember. In analyzing the quantification of retelling schemes and narrative vignettes, it was evident that Greg and Hillary were able to recall attempts and endings in addition to recalling the following elements: a) characters; b) time; c) setting; and d) problem. With instruction, Hillary was also able to recall theme and main idea statements. Consistent with Mandler and Johnson's study (1977), both students were less likely to recall the response category. However, when specifically questioned about this category, both students were able to

provide appropriate responses.

Research conducted by Fitzgerald and Spiegel (1983), Buss, Ratliff and Irion (1985); Gordon and Braun (1982); and Idoll and Croll (1987), suggested that story grammar related instruction improved the quality and quantity of ideas expressed in students' recalls of stories read. When instruction included having students: a) predict story grammar components; b) sequence sentence strips into appropriate story grammar categories; c) complete story grammar maps; and d) ask their own story related questions, the amount of information and total number of story grammar components increased in the recalls. This study verifies and extends the previously mentioned research findings. The quality and quantity of ideas expressed in both students' recalls improved significantly when the following strategies were adapted and applied: a) story grammar acronym b) researcher modeling of comprehension strategies; c) a directed reading - thinking activity; and d) student self-questioning activities. The number of words and sentences increased for both students' retellings of familiar and unfamiliar post-test stories. Both students were able to recall more accurate information about the narrative components and stated more of these details in correct story

grammar sequence.

Story Writing

Studies conducted by Gordon and Braun (1982), Fitzgerald and Teasley (1983), Fitzgerald, Spiegel and Teasley (1987), Idoll (1987), and Gordon and Braun (1986), demonstrated that story grammar instruction positively influenced students' written compositions. Through individual and group stories, cumulative tales, and story expansions, two major improvements occurred. First, there was an increase in the total number of story grammar categories included in the students' writing. Second, the organization, coherence, and creativity of the stories became more apparent. This study supports previous story grammar research, but adds the following strategies: a) think sheets for planning and editing stories; b) dictated stories; c) listing story grammar related words from books read; and d) providing a mediated framework to adapt and parallel plot structure for the students' individual stories. The think sheets and listed words support Graves' (1989) story writing recommendations. Although the total number of words and sentences did not significantly increase, both students' post-test compositions became noticeably more organized and coherent. Specifically, the students became more adept

at: a) developing a story topic; b) including characters, a problem and attempts at resolving the problem; c) ending a story. Both students' use of appropriate sentence structure, punctation and capitalization also improved.

Grade five students in Gordon and Braun's study (1986) were not able to retain their retelling and story composing improvements over a delayed period of six weeks. Hillary was able to retain the gains after four weeks in recalling a familiar and unfamiliar story as well as composing a story independently. After a delay, Greg was able to retain gains made for retelling a familiar story, however, regressions occurred in his ability to retell an unfamiliar story and compose a story independently. With four additional comprehension and composition lessons, higher scores on the quantification of retelling and focused holistic marking scale were achieved than retelling and composing scores during the actual study.

Metacognitive Awareness

During the 1980's, researchers focused on linking story comprehension with metacognitive theory. Results of research completed by Singer and Donlan (1982), Carnine and Kinder (1985), and

Gordon and Braun (1986) showed that student self-questioning improved comprehension and encouraged more reader-based processing of text. Griffey, Zigmond and Leinhardt (1988) demonstrated that elementary learning disabled students' ability to answer comprehension questions improved when the self-questioning strategy was combined with a story grammar acronym. The percentage of story grammar components recalled was slightly higher when Greg and Hillary applied the SMARTE acronym together with brainstorming their own questions than when the directed reading thinking activity was used with the acronym. In this situation, both students recalled more action and time components. Greg also recalled more setting and main idea statements, while the acronym and self-questioning facilitated improvement in sequencing Hillary's retellings and recalling the theme.

The interviews conducted in Gordon and Braun's (1986) research indicated that after narrative structure had been taught, many grade five and six students activated prior knowledge, made story predictions and engaged in self-questioning while reading and recalling a story. During the composing process, students explained that they thought about story components, important ideas, sequence, and the 'five W' questions.

Gordon's (1988) study suggested that following nine months of narrative instruction, many grade six students were able to verbally state contextual and procedural knowledge of story grammar. These students reported that story grammar was more useful for organizing a make-believe composition than for reading and recalling a story or writing about a real experience. A few students were not able to 'bring' the narrative strategy to a conscious level. Although in this study a shorter instructional period and younger students were used, findings support the notion that narrative instruction facilitates students' ability to become more metacognitively aware of the reading and writing process. Through a mediated literacy procedure, Hillary developed and maintained a sense of story schema. She was then able to effectively use her knowledge of story grammar during the reading, recalling and composing process. Greg became more aware of the story grammar components, but did not use the knowledge consistently. He seemed to use only the problem, action and resolution components consciously.

Instructional Mediation

One of the main purposes of this study was to document the interactions that occurred between a researcher and grade three students

of poor reading ability during instruction. Research documenting teacher/student interactions during a mediated literacy process has been limited (Clay, 1991; Eeds and Peterson, 1991; Beed, Hawkins and Roller, 1991; Palinscar and Brown, 1989; and Palinscar, 1986). Many teacher responses identified by Clay (1991) and Palinscar (1986) were similar. They included: a) linking students' background knowledge to new ideas; b) elaborating and refining students' responses; c) making the point of instruction explicit through story introductions and direct modeling of strategies; and d) collaboratively building story meaning. Eeds and Peterson's (1991) research of literature study groups documented teachers engaged in modeling how to talk about a story and expressing personal responses in relation to the book being discussed. Beed, Hawkins and Roller (1991) identified four types of interactions that reflected either an increase or decrease in teacher support depending on task demands.

None of the previously mentioned researchers quantitatively documented the different categories of teacher/student interactions. This study validates and extends their findings. In addition to Clay's (1991) book introductions, other pre-reading mediation categories documented in

this study include: a) making story elements public; b) making story elements relevant; c) modeling reading comprehension strategies; d) modeling story prediction strategies; and e) encouraging students to use new story knowledge. Analysis of researcher interactions, while students actually read stories during this study, confirmed Palinscar's (1986) documentation of adult support in the form of elaborating student responses and collaboratively building story meaning. Depending on the difficulty of the text, a range of researcher interactions were evident in helping students gain meaning. When the text was difficult, the researcher assumed more responsibility for the task by modeling reading comprehension strategies or prompting completion of students' ideas. However, the researcher also assumed student competence by encouraging the tracking of significant ideas and when appropriate, shifted ownership to the reader as a problem solver. This mediated form of instruction was similar to the four levels of teacher behaviour observed by Beed, Hawkins and Roller (1991).

When Greg and Hillary responded to the stories, the researcher's interactions were noted as being similar to the teacher dialogue recorded by Eeds and Peterson (1991). There was explicit modeling of how to

talk about literature. Specifically in this study, the researcher demonstrated how to talk about character development, story tone, and plot creation. As also observed by Eeds and Peterson (1991), Hillary and Greg modeled the researcher talking about literature. An interesting finding, although not documented by Eeds and Peterson (1991), was that a significant percentage of Hillary and Greg's responses were related to the author's illustrations.

Student gains were noted in Clay's research by observing how students demonstrated evidence of their learning. Comments, related to either background experiences or similar books that had been read, were considered signals that learning was occurring. Palinscar and Brown's (1984) earlier research on the effects of reciprocal dialogue between a teacher and Junior High students noted gains in the students' comprehension scores and interactions with text. Although 'payoffs' related to teacher/student dialogue were not the focus of her 1986 research, Palinscar noticed that the reciprocal nature of instruction helped grade one students function more independently on the final days of the research. Besides these types of examples, students in this study demonstrated further evidence of learning through the following

behaviours: a) voluntarily talking about related content or strategy information; b) verbalizing either a strategy prediction or insight without researcher prompting; c) improving and maintaining their ability to recall and compose a story independently; and d) reflecting and talking about strategies used while reading, recalling and composing a story. The overall gains made by Hillary and Greg therefore support the notion that story grammar instruction, provided through a mediated framework, is of benefit to some grade three students who experience difficulty with their reading comprehension and written composition.

Implications for the Classroom

A number of results from this study have implications for instructional practice:

Story Comprehension and Recall

1. Teachers need to be aware that narrative material contains a structure which may be difficult for some students to comprehend. It would also seem that a lack of story schema causes comprehension problems in the reading and composing processes. Further, since students with both poor reading comprehension and an underdeveloped sense of story schema may not understand or appreciate the authors' use of literary

elements in everyday texts, they may then be unable to apply such literary devices in their own compositions. Consequently, arranging for acquisition of story grammar knowledge by simply 'surrounding' poor readers with good literature may be insufficient. This study suggests that some students require a more mediated form of instruction in order to comprehend, recall or compose a story. In other words, teachers need to explicitly introduce narrative elements and develop students' relevant background knowledge.

2. Some children may be able to formulate pre-reading predictions or questions but, for some reason, are unable to transfer that knowledge to guide the reading process. Thus, teachers need to verbally model the 'internal dialogue' in which a reflective reader engages when using these strategies.

3. Students need the opportunity to make generalizations based on the instruction they have received. Generalizations and applications of story grammar knowledge can be made by allowing students to self-select books from a well chosen collection and providing opportunities to give comprehension responses through a variety of mediated techniques.

4. Since metacognitive awareness is an important educational goal, it is

essential that all learners regardless of reading and writing ability should be taught how to exhibit the reading and writing behaviours of more reflective children. Through mediated discussions, students should have the opportunity to talk about both the schema of a story as well as their own responses to the text they are reading.

The following specific instructional directives are organized according to before, during, and after reading acitivites.

Pre-Reading Activities - Provide a Mediated Framework to Present Story Features. 1. Using language students understand, make story elements public by explicitly telling: a) what they are; b) where they are found in a story; c) signals author use to indicate an element; and d) what the reader can possibly expect from reading that particular section of the story.

2. Make the story elements relevant by linking the discussion to either previous books read, stories students have written or the students' background experiences.

3. Provide students with a 'headline' to the story. Explain skeletal information regarding the main character, setting and problem. The amount of information given to the students depends on the difficulty

level of the text.

4. Encourage students to discuss background knowledge related to the head-lined concepts. Model the telling of a related story if necessary.

5. Model pre-reading comprehension strategies. Show and explicitly tell students how authors high-light important information related to the story elements. Demonstrate how to glean information from the title, illustrations presented on the front or back cover, and the title page.

6. Based on the headline, title, cover page illustration, related knowledge, and a quick glance through the book, encourage students to use their story knowledge and predict information relating to all narrative components.

7. Model story prediction strategies. Share your thought process in how and why you made the particular prediction.

8. Model new language or concept features that are related to the story elements.

9. Acknowledge partially correct student responses, but at the same time, mediate students' responses to build story meaning. The explicit modeling of strategies and prompting students to complete their ideas, supports students in making their oral communication more effective.

<u>During Reading - Providing a Mediated Framework to Encourage Active Learning</u>. 1. Model reading comprehension strategies. Demonstrate how to use the predictions to 'self dialogue' while reading the story.

2. When appropriate, shift ownership for the learning. Encourage students to track significant ideas by keeping a particular prediction in mind and then searching to confirm the answer while reading. Prompt for more active learning by having students find explicit and implicit proof within the text and illustrations that either confirms or disconfirms their predictions.

3. List story grammar related words in a journal: a) physical descriptions of characters; b) types of personalities; c) ways characters change; d) indicators of place and time; e) ideas about plot; f) internal and external character responses; g) figurative language, and h) themes learned. These lists of words provide students with a framework for making story predictions and creating their own stories.

<u>Post Reading - Facilitate the Recall of the Story</u>. 1. Model the SMARTE acronym to guide students' retellings of stories. Describe how to visually spell SMARTE. Demonstrate how to talk about story

information that is cued by each letter in the acronym. Model use of appropriate sequence and connective words.

2. When appropriate, provide less structured adult support by cueing students to use a specific component of the acronym strategy.

3. When necessary, demonstrate other recall techniques such as look-backs, visualization, tallies, and associations.

Story Writing

Teachers must recognize that it is not enough to provide story grammar instruction only through reading comprehension lessons. Explicit story grammar instruction must also be linked to the writing process. Poor grade three readers still benefit from group story writing experiences as well as paralleling plot structure of good quality literature. The following tenets for mediated story grammar learning provides teachers with a flexible framework for developing instructional strategies based on their students' literacy needs.

Pre-Writing: Provide a Mediated Framework to Adapt and Parallel Plot Structure. 1. Use the literature being read in the classroom as a guide for students to develop characters for their own stories: a) create new character names; b) change the number or type of characters when

adapting or paralleling plot; c) describe height, weight, hairstyle, clothes and how the character moves or talks; d) describe how the character reacts internally and externally to problems and actions within the story; e) change the personality of the character; and f) explain how the change occurred and the thematic effects of the change.

2. Use literature being read as a model to guide students in developing the aspects of setting and time: a) detail tangible elements of the setting; b) describe the smells, sounds, and tactile images of the setting; and c) describe the time through words and illustrations.

3. Paralleling plot structure is not a technique that is only limited for use with young children. Students who demonstrate poor reading comprehension and composing skills, as well as other students in the classroom, gain valuable insight into author craft by experimenting with basic plot line. Students need experience creating their own stories from the basic story grammar structure as well as patterning the plots of stories that have been read.

4. Encourage students to formulate a main idea statement about their compositions. Relate how their main idea statement was formulated back to how they might identify main idea statements in a similar way

when they are reading.

5. Use the story planner think sheet to record ideas about potential compositions. There is a genre structure to planning a story. Explicitly model recording ideas in point form as opposed to writing complete sentences.

6. After students have completed their compositions, encourage a checking process using an editing think sheet. Model how to edit each component on the think sheet by sharing your thought processes with the students. Conference with students about the changes they make in their own compositions.

7. Allow for the element of time. The understandings one must develop in becoming both a writer and a strategic reader are gradual and occur over the long term.

Implications for Research and Development

This study provided qualitative and quantitative data regarding the effects of narrative instruction, think sheets for planning and editing stories, and a story grammar acronym, on the students' ability to recall and write a story independently. Additionally, it provided information concerning students' knowledge of the reading and writing processes and

investigator/student interactions during a mediated literacy learning process. As a result of this study's findings, a number of suggested areas for future research and development are offered:

Story Comprehension and Recall

1. It would be useful to conduct research involving other genre structures, such as scientific or business related genres, at various age levels and across reading abilities. Specifically, there is a need to examine the most effective ways to help students internalize the genre structures of other types of text so that effective learning can be facilitated for all students.

2. Since other case studies do not exist to support the effectiveness of the story grammar acronym used in this study, additional studies should be completed.

3. As students were able to generate main idea statements from the story grammar instruction, further research relating story grammar instruction to main idea identification would be useful.

4. The quantification of retelling profile and focused holistic marking scale need to be used with other student populations to determine their validity as measures of students' ability to recall and compose a story

independently.

5. The use of think aloud protocols or a more concrete interview format would be useful to determine the effects of mediated instruction on students' metacognitive knowledge concerning their own reading and writing processes.

6. Since more precise categories to measure students' responses to text would be useful for classroom teachers, future researchers could build upon the categories uncoverd in this study.

Instructional Mediation

1. There is a need for further documentation of the mediation process when students are internalizing the story grammar structure and exhibiting reflective reading behaviours. As limited qualitative evidence exists to support the interactions observed in this study, it would be useful to conduct other interpretive research across various age levels, and reading and writing abilities.

2. There is a need to verify specific elements in teacher interactions which increase students' ability to recall and compose a story independently and those which enhance students' more elaborate responses to text.

3. The correlation between the amount or type of adult dialogue and the quality of students' reading, writing, or responding would be most useful for educational practice.

4. Changes that occur in adult/student interactions with repeated readings or discussions of the same story would also be helpful for classroom teachers.

5. Rather than attempting to teach all story grammar components within one story, it would be beneficial if future research examined teacher/student interactions and documented the kinds of instructional strategies that help students to internalize one story element at a time such as identifying theme, creating a setting, or developing characterization or plot.

6. Future studies should investigate the correlation between explicit story grammar instruction and students' responses to text or participation within a collaborative learning situation such as a literature study group.

REFERENCES

Allen, R.V. (1976). Language experiences in communication. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Anderson, R.C. and Pearson, P.D. (1984). A schema - theoretic view of basic processes in reading comprehension. In P.D. Pearson, R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, and P. Mosenthal (Eds.), Handbook of Research on Reading. New York: Longman.

Applebee, A.N. (1978). Frameworks for comprehending discourse. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press.

Baker, L. and Brown A.L. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In P.D. Pearson, R. Bar, M. Kamil, and P. Mosenthal (Eds)., Framework of Research on Reading. New York: Longman.

Bartlett, F.C. (1932). Remembering. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beck, I. and McKeown, M. (1981). Developing questions that promote comprehension: The story map. Language Arts, 58, 913-918.

Beed, P.L., Hawkins, E.M. and Roller, C. (1991). Moving learners toward independence: The power of scaffolded instruction. The Reading Teacher, 44, 648-655.

Borg, R.W. and Gall, M.D. (1989). Educational research: An introduction. New York: Longman.

Boyle, O.F. and Peregoy, S.F. (1990). Literacy scaffolds: Strategies for first and second language readers and writers. The Reading Teacher, 44, 194-200.

Brown, A.L., Campione, J.C. and Day, J.D. (1981). Learning to learn: On training students to learn from texts. Educational Researcher, 10, 14-21.

Brown, A.L. (1980). Metacognitive development and reading. In R.J. Spiro, B.C. Bruce, and W.F. Brewer (Eds), Theoretical issues in reading.

Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.

Broudy, H.S. (1977). Types of knowledge and purposes of education. In R.C. Anderson, R.J. Spiro, and W.E. Montague (Eds.), Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge. Hilsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Buss, R.R., Ratliff, J.L. and Irion, J.C. (1985). Effects of instruction on the used story structure in comprehension of narrative discourse. In J.A. Niles and R.V. Lalik (Eds.), Issues of literacy: A research perspective. Rochester, N.Y.: National Reading Conference, MF0608713.

Camine, P. and Kinder, D. (1985). Teaching low performance students to apply generative and schema strategies to narrative and expository material. Remedial and Special Education. 6, 20-30.

Clay, M. (1983). Reading: The patterning of complex behavior. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann.

Clay, M. (1991). Introducing a storybook to young readers. The Reading Teacher, 45, 264-273.

Cudd, E.T. and Roberts, L.L. (1987). Using frames to develop reading comprehension in a first grade classroom. The Reading Teacher, 41, 74-79.

Cunningham, J. and Foster, E. (1978). The ivory tower connection: A case study. The Reading Teacher, 31, 365-369.

Davey, B. (1983). Think-aloud-modeling the cognitive processes of reading comprehension. Journal of Reading, 27, 44-47.

Davis, Z.D. and McPherson, M.D. (1989). Story map instruction: A road map for reading comprehension. The Reading Teacher, 43, 232-240.

Dreher, M.J. and Singer, H. (1980). Story grammar instruction unnecessary for intermediate grade students. The Reading Teacher, 34, 261-269.

Duffy, G.G. and Roehler, L.R. (1986). The subtleties of instructional mediation. Educational Leadership. 43, 23-27.

Duffy, G.G. and Roehler, L.R. et. al. (1987). Effects of explaining the reasoning associated with using reading strategies. Reading Research Quarterly, 22, 347-368.

Eeds, M. and Peterson, R. (1991). Teacher as curator: Learning to talk about literature. The Reading Teacher, 45, 118-126.

Erickson, B. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Evans, P. (1985). Canadian activity in large scale assessment of writing. English Quarterly 18, 23-27.

Fitzgerald, J. and Spiegel, D. (1983). Enhancing children's reading comprehensi on through instruction in narrative structure. Journal of Reading Behaviour, 25,1-17.

Fitzgerald, J., Spiegel O. and Teasley, A. (1987). Story structure and writing. Academic Therapy, 22, 255-262.

Fitzgerald, J. and Teasley, A. (1983). Effects of instruction in narrative structure on children's writing. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference, Austin, Texas, ED 243076.

Forrest-Pressley, D.L. and Waller, T.G. (1984). Metacognition, cognition and reading. New York: Springer Verlag.

Fry, E. (1977). Fry's readability graph: clarification, validity, and extension to level 17. Journal of Reading, 21, 242-252.

Garner, R. and Kraus, C. (1981-1982). Good and poor comprehenders differences in knowing and regulating reading behaviors. Educational Research Quarterly, 6, 5-12.

Gates, A.L. and MacGinite, W.H. (1965). Gates MacGinite reading test Primary CI. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gersten, R. and Dimino, J. (1989). Teaching literature for at risk students. Educational Leadership, 46, 53-57.

Glaser, S.M. and Searfross, L.W. (Eds.). (1988). Reading diagnosis and instruction: A c-a-l-m approach. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Gordon, C. and Braun, C. (1982). Story schema: Metatextual aid to reading and writing. New inquiries in reading research and instruction. New York: National Reading Conference, MF 05388.

Gordon, C. and Braun, C. (1983). Using story schema as an aid to reading and writing. The Reading Teacher, 37, 116-121.

Gordon, C. and Braun, C. (1986). Mental processes in reading and writing: A critical look at self-reports as supportive data. Journal of Educational Research, 79, 292-301.

Gordon, C.J. and Braun, C. (1988). Contexts for narrative text structure use: What do the kids say. English Quarterly, 21, 148-163.

Gordon, C. J. (1983). Improving reading comprehension and writing: The story grammar approach. Alberta: Braun and Braun Education Enterprises Ltd.

Graves, D. (1989). Experiment with fiction. Canada: Irwin Publishing.

Greenhalgh, C. and Townsend, D. (1981). Evaluating students writing holistically: An alternative approach. Language Arts, 58, 811-822.

Griffey, Q.L., Zigmond, N and Leinhardt, G. (1988). The effects of self-questioning and story structure training on the reading comprehension of poor students. Learning Disabilities Research. 4, 45-51.

Guthrie, J. (1977). Research views: Story comprehension. The Reading Teacher, 30, 575-577.

Hennings, D. (1991). Essential reading: Targeting, tracking, and thinking about main ideas. Journal of Reading, 34, 346-353.

Idoll, L. (1987). Group story mapping: A comprehension strategy for both skilled and unskilled readers. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 20, 196-205.

Idoll, L. and Croll, V. (1987). Story mapping training as a means of improving reading comprehension. Learning Disability Quarterly, IV, 214-229.

Irwin, P.A. and Mitchell, J.N. (1988). The reader retelling profile: Using retellings to make instructional decisions. In S. M. Glaser and L.W. Searfross (Eds.) Reading diagnosis and instruction: A c-a-l-m approach. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Kinney, M.A., and Schmidt, J. (1986). Relating the parts of the whole in novel reading: Using story grammars to teach plot development in novels. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the IRA, Philadelphia, ED 276990.

Laughton, J. and Morris, N. (1989). Story grammar knowledge of learning disabled students. Learning Disabilities Research, 4, 87-95.

McConaughy, S.H. (198). Using story structure in the classroom. Language Arts, 57,157-165.

McConaughy, S.H. (1982). Developmental changes in story comprehension and levels of questioning. Langauge Arts, 59, 580-589.

McCormick Calkins, Lucy. (1986). The art of teaching writing. New Hampshire: Heinemann.

Mandler, J. and Johnson, N. (1977). Remembrance of things parsed: story structure and recall. Cognitive Psychology, 9, 111-151.

Miller, G.E. (1985). The effects of general and specific self-instruction training on children's comprehension monitoring performances during reading."Reading Research Quarterly, 20, 616-628.

Montague, M. (1988). Story grammar and learning disabled students comprehension and production of narrative prose. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Florida Reading Assoc., Orlando, Florida, ED302819.

Morrow, L.M. (in press). Retelling stories as a diagnostic tool. In S. Glaser, L. Searfross, and L. Gentile (Eds.), Re-examining Diagnosis in reading: New trends and procedures for classrooms and clinics. Englewood Cliffs, New Hersey: Prentice-Hall.

Myers, M. (1980). A procedure for writing assessment and holistic scoring. Urbana Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, ED 193676.

Myers, M. and Paris, S.G. (1978). Children's metacognitive knowledge about reading. Journal of Educational Psychology, 70, 680-690.

Paris, S.G., Cross, P.R., and Lipson, M.Y. (1981). Informed strategies for learning: A program to improve children's reading awareness and comprehension. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 1239-1252.

Paris, S.G. and Myers, M. (1981). Comprehension monitoring and study strategies of good and poor reader. Journal of Reading Behavior, 13, 5-22.

Paris, S.G. and Oka, E.R. (1986). Children's reading strategies, metacognition, and motivation. Developmental Review, 6, 25-56.

Paris, S.G., Wasik, B.A., and Van Der Westhuizen, G. (1989). Metacognition: A review of rResearch on metacognition and reading. In J. Readence and S. Baldwin (Eds.), Thirty-Seventh Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. N.Y.:National Reading Conference.

Palinscar, A.S. (1986). The role of dialogue in providing scaffolded instruction. Education Psychologist, 21, 73-98.

Palinscar, A.S. and Brown, A.L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension: Fostering and comprehension monitoring activities, Cognition and Instruction, 1, 17-75.

Pearson P.D. and Gallagher, M.C (1983). The instruction of reading comprehension. Contemporary Psychology, 8, 317-344.

Rand, M.K. (1984). Story schema: Theory, research and practice. The Reading Teacher, 37, 377-382.

Raphael, T.E., Kirschner, B.W and Englert, C.S. (1986). Expository writing program: making connections between reading and writing. The Reading Teacher, 41, 790-795.

Rumelhart, D. (1975). Notes on a schema for stories. I D.G. Bobron (Eds.), Representing and Understanding: Studies cognitive science. New York: Academic Press.

Singer, H. Donlan, D. (1982). Active comprehension: Problem solving schema with question generation for comprehension of complex short stories. Reading Research Quarterly, 17, 166-185.

Smith, Carl B. (1990). Story map: Setting, plot, mood, theme. The Reading Teacher, 44, 178,179.

Spiro, R.J. (1980). Constructive processes in prose comprehension and recall. In R.J. Spiro, B.C. Bruce, and W.F. Brewer (Eds.) Theoretical issues in comprehension and recall. New Jersey: Brewer.

Stauffer, R.G. and Harrel, M.M. (1990). Individualized reading thinking activities. The Reading Teacher, 44, 178,179.

Stein, N. and Glenn, C. (1975). An analysis of story comprehension in elementary school children: A test of a schema. Washington University, ED 121474.

Stewig, J. (1990) Read to write, New York: Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

Thorndyke, P. (1977). Cognitive structures in comprehension and memory of narrative discourse. Cognitive Psychology, 9, 77-111.

Tierney, R.J. and Pearson, P.D. (1983). Toward a composing model of reading. Language Arts, 60, 568-580.

Turetzky, L.G. (1982). Does the teaching of story schema and the use of schema related questioning improve reading comprehension? (MED Thesis, William Paterson College), 237943.

Whaley, J.F. (1981). Story grammars and reading instruction". The Reading Teacher, 34, 762-777.

Whaley, J. (1981). Reader's expectations for story structures. Reading Research Quarterly, 17, 90-114.

Widomski, C. (1983). Building foundations for reading comprehension. Reading World, 22, 306-313.

Wood, D., Wood, H. and Middleton, D. (1978). An experimental evaluation of four face to face teaching strategies. International Journal of Behavioural Development 1, 131-47.

Wood, K.D. (1984). Probable passages: A writing strategy. The Reading Teacher, 37, 496-99.

Appendices

Appendix A - Recruitment Procedures

Dear Parents:

Research is needed in order to learn the best way to teach students to understand and write their own stories.

I plan to conduct a study to find out if teaching students the different parts of a story will help to improve not only their ability to remember stories but also to write their own stories.

In my study, there will be 10 reading sessions. Students will be reading stories, recalling information about the stories and answering questions. They will be shown a simple way to remember story parts and ask questions about the stories they are reading. Following story reading sessions, there will be 10 story writing sessions in which students will be telling and writing their own stories. They will be shown a way to organize and edit their stories.

Each session will last one class period. Your child's classroom teacher will be consulted to ensure that your child will not miss important classroom activities.

Your child's participation in this study is voluntary. You may withdraw your child at any time. Any information about your child's participation in this study will be kept confidential. At the end of the study, you will be offered a chance to meet with me and discuss your child's progress and be given samples of your child's work.

In order to do this study, I am 'on leave' from my regular teaching position in Winnipeg S.D. #1. I have taught regular and Special Education classrooms for the past 9 years. I am doing this study to complete the requirements for my Master's degree.

If you would like your child to participate in this teaching study, please sign the attached form and have your child bring the form to school. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me or my supervisor at the telephone numbers listed below.

Yours sincerely,

Cayla Cohen (489-5574)
Prof. B. Zakaluk (474-9022)

<u>Permission Form</u>

Name of Student _____

I do consent to let my child participate in the study.

_____

I do <u>not</u> consent to let my child participate in the study.

_____

Appendix B - Retelling and Writing Measures

Appendix B
#1

Directions for Scoring Quantification of Retelling

1. Setting (13 points)

A. Main Characters	2	- 2 pts. for stating character as being the main or most important character - 1 pt. for including character many times in recall but not specifically stating character as being most important - 0 no inclusion of main character in recall.
B. Supporting Characters	3	- 1 pt. for each additional character mentioned to a maximum total of 3 pts. for this category. If there is only 1 or 2 other characters in the story, give maximum points (3) for student recall. - 0 no inclusion of other supporting characters.
C. Major setting	2	- 2 pts. for stating setting as being the major setting or recalling where whole story takes place. - 1 pt. for partial statement of major settings. - 0 no inclusion of major setting.
D. Minor Setting	2	- 1 pt. for each additional setting mentioned to a maximum total of 2 pts. for this category. If there is only 0 or 1 other setting in the story, give maximum points (2) for student recall.

- 0 no inclusion of other minor settings.

E. Time

2

- 1 pt. for a general statement of time. 1 pt. for each additional time element mentioned to maximum of 2 pts. for this category. If there is only 0, or 1 other time elements in the story, give maximum points (2) for student recall.
- 0 no inclusion of a time element.

F. Main Idea

2

- 2 pts. for general statement of main idea.
- 1 pt. for partial statement of main idea.
- 0 pts. for no inclusion of main idea.

2. Plot (12 points)

A. Goal or Problem (2 pts.)

- 2 pts. for clearly stated goal or problem.
- 1 pt. for a partially stated goal or problem.
  Some information is missing from recall.
- 0 pts. no inclusion of a problem.

B. Actions/Episodes (10. pts.)

- 3 pts. for clear statement of what the character(s) did, the outcome of the action, and how the character(s) felt, if explicit. (1 pt. for each action, outcome, response).
- 2 pts. for partial statement. One aspect has been left out - what the character did, the outcome or the response.
- 1 pt. for vague statement. Two aspects have been left out.
- 0 pts. no inclusion of the action.

	- Adjust number of events named by the student to equal the percentage of the 10 pt. maximum.
3. Resolution (3 pts.)	- 3 pts. for clearly stated solution to problem or how goal is reached. Recall must include action of character(s), outcome of action, and how the character(s) felt. - 2 pts. for partial statement. One of the following pieces of information is missing: action of character(s), outcome of action, and character(s) feelings. - 1 pt. for marginal statement. Two of the following are missing: action, outcome, feeling. - 0 pts. no inclusion of a resolution.
4. Theme (2 pts.)	- 2 pts. for clearly stated lesson or moral to the story. - 1 pt. for partial statement of lesson or moral to the story. - 0 pts. no inclusion of a theme.
5. Sequence (10 pts.)	- 10 pts. for recall told using all four story structure elements as follows: Setting, Main Idea, Action, Response, Theme, Ending.
Adapted from: Morrow, as cited by Glaser and Searfross, 1988	- 6.6 pts. for 3 elements in order. - 3.3 pts. for 2 elements in order. - 1 pt. for 1 element in order. - 0 pts. none of the elements are in order.

Appendix B
#2

Score Sheet for Oral Recalls

Record the number of points scored for each element.

1. Setting (13 points)

Main Character (2)		_____
Supporting Characters (3)		_____
Major Setting (2)		_____
Minor Setting (2)		_____
Time (2)		_____
Main Idea (2)		_____
	Subtotal	_____

2. Plot (12 points)

Goal or Problem (2)		_____
Action #1 (3)		_____
Action #2 (3)		_____
Action #3 (3)	10% maximum	_____
Action #4 (3)		_____
Action #5 (3)		_____
	Subtotal	_____

Total Score Received for Action X 10 _____

Possible Total for Story Used

Subtotal _____

(goal ÷ possible score from 10 pt. maximum)

3. Resolution (3 points) _____

Subtotal _____

4. Theme (2 points) _____

Subtotal _____

5. Sequence (10 points) _____

Subtotal _____

6. Total Score _____

Adapted from:
Morrow, as cited by Glaser and Searfross, 1988.

Appendix B
#3

Directions of Scoring the Qualitative Retelling Profile

1. Understanding of Story Read

A. Comprehension of textual information.	High - retelling includes information directly from text. Moderate - retelling includes information directly from text. Some information has been omitted, added or substituted. Low - most of the retelling does not include information directly stated in text. Distortions are obvious. None - retelling does not include any textual information.
B. Comprehension of inferred information.	High - retelling includes several statements accurately inferred from the text. Moderate - retelling includes a few statements accurately inferred from the text. Low - retelling includes inaccurate statements inferred from the text. None - retelling does not include any inferred information.
C. Importance of information included in the retelling.	High - retelling accurately includes all story grammar components. Moderate - retelling includes most story components. 1-2 components may be omitted. Low - retelling omits most story

	grammar components. None - important information is not provided.
D. Generalizations based on the text.	High - recall includes a summary statement which can be applied to the real world - e.g. accurate statement of a theme. Moderate - recall includes partial statements applied to real world. Low - recall indicates obvious difficulty forming a statement applied to real world. None - generalizations have not been made.
2. Reader's Response	
A. Responses to text.	High - recall includes several individual or creative statements about the text. Moderate - recall includes a few individual or creative statements. Low - recall indicates obvious lack of creative statements. None - no apparent responses to text.
B. Involvement with text.	High - recall includes several affective statements or indications about the text. Moderate - recall includes a few affective statements or indications about the text. Low - recall indicates lack of affective involvement. None - no apparent responses to

text.

3. Facility with Language

A. Control over the mechanics of speaking.	High - recall demonstrates appropriate language fluency (vocabulary, sentence structure, language conventions, organization of retellings). Moderate - 1-2 aspects of language fluency are omitted. Low - most aspects of language fluency are weak. None - no apparent control over the mechanics of speaking.

Adapted from: Irwin and Mitchell, as cited by Glaser and Searfross, 1988

Appendix B
#4

Score Sheet for the Qualitative Retelling Profile

Directions: Record high, moderate, low or none beside each category.

1. Understanding of Story Read

A. Comprehension of textual information _____

B. Comprehension of inferred information _____

C. Importance of information included in the retelling _____

D. Generalizations based on the text _____

2. Reader's Response

A. Response to text _____

B. Involvement with text _____

3. Facility with Langauge

A. Control over the mechanics of speaking _____

Adapted from: Irwin and Mitchell,
as cited by Glaser and Searfross, 1988.

Appendix B
#5

Directions for Scoring the Written Composition

1. Topic Focus	4 = ideas relate to assigned topic 3 = focus on assigned topic with some fluctuation 2 = doesn't write an assigned topic 1 = insufficient evidence to permit judgement
2. Topic Development	4 = originality of ideas creates impact 3 = ideas ordinary and functional 2 = insufficient number of ideas - nothing seems to happen 1 = insufficient evidence to permit judgement
3. Organization	4 = well organized,coherent story grammar components - setting, plot, action, resolution. - paragraphs are evident 3 = conveys ideas, but coherence and unity of story grammar components fluctuates 2 = lacks coherence, unity 1 = insufficient evidence to permit judgement
4. Word Choice	4 = word choice correct and appropriate, uses descriptive words 3 = word choice ordinary but functional 2 = restricted word choice 1 = insufficient evidence to permit judgement
5. Sentence Structure	4 = sentences are complete and well constructed - varied sentence patterns 3 = sentences are mainly complete

- a few (2-3) awkward sentences
- some variety in sentence patterns

2 = sentences are incomplete, fragmented

1 = insufficient evidence to permit judgement

6. Punctuation and Capitalization

4 = punctuation and capitalization attract no attention

- good use of a variety of sentence mechanics

3 = a few errors which do not detract from attention

- occasionally misspells common words

2 = errors detract from readability

- misspells common words

1 = insufficient evidence to permit judgement

7. Spelling

4 = spelling attracts no attention

3 = a few errors which do not detract from attention

- occasionally misspells common words

2 = errors detract from readability

- misspells common words

1 = insufficient evidence to permit judgement

8. Major Setting

4 = well organized and described introduction to setting and time

3 = ideas are conveyed, but some information is omitted.

2 = noticeably lacks information

1 = insufficient evidence to permit judgement

9. Characters

4 = characters have names, converse with one another, demonstrate responses to problem /action. The responses are either illustrated or

		stated in the story.
	3 =	one of the above features is omitted - either name, conversation, or response
	2 =	two features are omitted
	1 =	insufficient evidence to permit judgement
10. Problem	4 =	well described problem
	3 =	idea of a problem conveyed, but some information is omitted
	2 =	problem is noticeably not well stated
	1 =	insufficient evidence to permit judgement
11. Actions	4 =	well described actions - includes what character did and the outcomes of the actions
	3 =	ideas relating to action conveyed, but some information is omitted
	2 =	actions are noticeably not well described
	1 =	insufficient evidence to permit judgement
12. Resolution	4 =	story is well resolved - action and outcome are well described.
	3 =	ideas relating to story resolution are conveyed, but some information is missing
	2 =	noticeably lacks information, coherence
	1 =	insufficient evidence to permit judgement
13. Theme	2 =	a lesson is explicitly stated or inferred from the story
	1 =	insufficient evidence to permit judgement

Interpretation - Item 1 refers to student's understanding of the test directions; Items 2-4 refer to student's facility with written language; Items 5 and 6 refer to student's understanding of sentence mechanics; item 7 is self explanatory; items 9-13 refer to students's understanding of story grammar components.

Adapted from: Greenhaugh and Townsend, 1981.

Appendix B
#6

Score Sheet for the Written Compositions

A total of 4 points is allowed for each writing category.

1. Topic Focus _____
2. Topic Development _____
3. Organization _____
4. Word Choice _____
5. Sentence Structure _____
6. Punctuation and Capitalization _____
7. Spelling _____
8. Major Setting _____
9. Characters _____
10. Problem _____
11. Actions _____
12. Resolution _____
13. Theme (2) _____

Adapted from: Greenhaugh and Townsend, 1981.

/50

Appendix B
#7

Story Grammar of Franklin in The Dark

Author - Paulette Bourgeois
Illustrator - Brenda Clark
Publisher - Kids Can Press Ltd. Toronto 1986
Readability - Grade 3

Major Setting - Imaginary Meadow
Problem - Franklin was afraid of the dark. He thought that creepy, slippery, monsters lived inside his shell.
Plot - Franklin went looking for help
Obstacles -

Episode 1
Time -
Setting - Pond (home)
Action - Franklin asked Duck for help
Duck expressed fear of water.
Duck said he wears wings when no one looks.
Duck offered wings.
Outcome - Franklin kept looking for help. He is not afraid of water.
Reaction -

Episode 2
Time -
Setting - Field
Characters - Franklin, Lion
Action - Franklin asked him for help.
Lion expressed fear of noises.
Lion said he wore muffs when no one looks.
Lion offered muffs.
Outcome - Franklin kept looking for help.
He is not afraid of noise.
Reaction -

Episode 3
Setting -
Place - In the country

Characters - Franklin, Bird
Action - Franklin asked Bird for help.
Bird expressed fear of flying.
Bird said he uses parachute when no one looking.
Outcome - Franklin kept looking for help.
He is not afraid of flying.
Reaction -

Episode 4
Time -
Setting - North Pole (imaginary)
Characters - Franklin, Polar Bear
Action - Franklin asked Bear for help.
Bear expressed fear of cold.
Bear said he wears snowsuit when no one is looking.
Outcome - Franklin kept looking for help.
He is not afraid of cold.
Reaction - Tired, hungry

Episode 5 - Resolution
Time - Getting late
Setting - Pond (home)
Characters - Mom, Franklin
Action - Franklin discovered Moms could be afraid.
Franklin told Mom about walk.
Mom hugged Franklin.
Franklin was brave and crawled inside his shell.
He turned on the light when no one looked.

Lesson - Its alright to be scared of the dark.
Its alright to have fears. Develop a
coping strategy to deal with your fear.

Appendix B
#8

Annie and the Wild Animals

- written and illustrated by Jan Brett
- Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1985
- Readability - Grade 3

Characters - Annie house, at the edge of the woods
Time - Winter, Spring
Plot - Annie tries to find a new friend.
Problem - Annie needs a new friend. Taffy, her cat, ran away.

Action #1
Time - Winter
Character - Annie
Action - She placed a corncake at the edge of the woods.
Outcome - A moose ate the cake.
Reaction - She thought he would be too big to tame.

Action #2
Time - That night
Character - Annie
Action - She left another cake.
Outcome - A moose and wildcat ate the cake.
Reaction - She thought the wildcat was too mean to tame.

Action #3
Time - That morning, the next morning
Character - Annie
Action - She placed more corncakes outside.
Outcome - A bear, moose, wildcat ate the cakes.
Reaction - frustrated
The bear is too grump for a pet.

Action #4
Time - Next day
Character - Annie
Action - Annie left many corncakes at the edge of the woods.

Outcome - A moose, wildcat, bear, deer family, and wolf ate the cakes.
Reaction - She thought none were soft like Taffy.

Action #5
Time - Next day
Character - Annie
Action - She made more cakes and left them outside.
Outcome - The animals ate the cakes.
Reaction - Upset.

Appendix B
#9

Story Grammar of No More Baths

Author - Brock Cole
Illustrator - Brock Cole
Publisher - Collins Publishers, Toronto 1980.
Readability - Grade 3

Major Setting - along the river, Jessie's home
Problem - Jessie runs away because she does not want to take a bath in the
middle of the day.
Plot - Jessie tries to live with her animal friends.

Episode 1

Time - middle of the day
Setting - sandy place along the river
Characters - Mrs. Chicken, Jessie
Action - Jessie tries frazzling like a chicken but can't get the sand out.
Outcome - Jessie went to look for another friend.
Response - itchy, fretful

Episode 2

Time - middle of the day
Setting - deserted mill
Characters - Mrs. Cat, Jessie
Action - Jessie tried to lick her hands like a cat, but she didn't look clean and
shiny like Mrs. Cat.
Outcome - Jessie went to look for another friend.
Response - disappointed.

Episode 3

Time - middle of the day
Setting - Mrs. Pig's home
Characters - Mrs. Pig, Jessie
Action - Jessie sits in a mud puddle like a pig, but she began to think about
home.
Outcome - Jessie returns home.
Response - homesick

Episode 4

Time - middle of the day
Setting - Jessie's home
Characters - Jessie's family
Action - Jessie takes a bath. Mom hugs Jessie.
Lesson - There's nothing worse than taking a bath.

Appendix B
#10

Suggest Book List

Suggested Book List (Grade 2-3)

Title	Author
Amigo	Byrd Baylor
The Accident	Carol Carrick
Annie and the Wild Animals	Jan Brett
Badger's Parting Gifts	Susan Varley
Bear's Toothache	David McPhail
Big Sarah's Little Boots	Paulette Bourgeois
Big Sister Little Sister	Charlotte Zolotow
The Cat Who Wore a Pot on Her Head	Jan Slepian, Ann Seidler
Cloudy with a Chance of Meatballs	Judi Barrett
Crafty Chameleon	Mwenye Hadithi
Cream of Creature from the School Cafeteria	Mike Thaler
Cross Country Cat	Mary Calhoun
The Cut-Ups	James Marshall
A Difficult Day	Eugenie Fernandes
Dream Eater	Christian Garrison
The Foundling Fox	Irina Korschunow
The Founding	Carol Carrick
A Hippopotomus Ate the Teacher	Mike Thaler
Imogene's Antler's	David Small
It Wasn't My Fault	Helen Lester
Ira Sleeps Over	Bernard Waber
Jim and the Beanstalk	Raymond Briggs
Jumanji	Chris Van Allsburg
King Bidgood's in the Bathtub	Audrey, Don Wood
Lost in the Storm	Carol Carrick
The Most Wonderful Egg	Helme Heine
The Mystery of the Missing Red Mitten	Steven Kellog
Miss Fanshame and the Great Adventure	Sue Scullard
No More Baths	Broth Cole
No in Here Dad	Cheryl Dutton
Peace at Last	Jim Murphy
Piggy Book	Anthony Browne
Poinsetta and the Firefighters	Felicia Bond

A Porcupine Named Fluffy	Helen Lester
Prince Anders	Babette Cole
Princes Smartypants	Babette Cole
Roger's Umbrella	Honest Dan'l Pinkwater
Sadie and the Snowman	Allen Morgan
What's that Noise	Michelle Lemieux
Who's that Knocking at my Door	Reinhard Michl

Appendix C - Story Comprehension and Written Composition Procedures

Appendix C
#1

SMARTE THINK SHEET

I Predict	I Know
Setting Where - Will the story be in the bear's house?	Where - house - living room
When - Is the time at night?	When - one morning
Who - Will the bear and his family be in the story	Who - Emma, Mom, Dad, Repairman
Main Idea Mom and Dad try to fix the TV	Mom and Dad try to fix the TV but the TV is broken
Action Problem - Is the problem that the bear can't watch TV because it is broken.	Problem - TV won't work its unplugged
Mom and Dad will look at the wires - can't fix it.	1) Emma asked Mom - Mom couldn't - turned switch
Phone Repair man - can't fix it.	2) Asked Father - couldn't - antenna
TV Repair - won't fix it.	3) Repairman - did't fix it - screwdriver
Response Baby Bear - Sad	Baby - sad - cheer her up
Mom, Dad - sorry	
Theme If you want to watch TV, don't pull the plug	If the TV doesn't work and your parents are tyring to fix it go do something else while you are waiting - read, play, snack, clean.
Ending Interesting Ending. Plug the TV in.	Dad plugged TV in.
	Emma read.

Adapted From: Raphael, Englert, and Kirschner, 1986.

Appendix C
#2

Sample Story Frame

_____

The main character is _____. The other characters are _____ . The major setting is _____. The time is _____. The most important idea is _____.

The problem is that _____. _____ tries to solve the problem by _____. But, it doesn't work because ___ _____. _____ felt_____. I know because _____.

Then, _____ tries to solve the problem by _____ _____. But, it doesn't work because _____ _____ . _____ felt _____ . I know because _____.

Then, _____ tries to solve the problem by _____ _____. But, it doesn't work because _____ _____.

_____ felt _____ . I know because _____

_____.

The resolution is _____

_____. _____felt_____. I know because _____

_____. _____. The theme is _____

_____ . _____. The story

ends _____.

Adapted from: Cudd and Roberts, 1987.

Appendix C
#3

Sample Story Planning Think Sheet

1. Setting

Characters
Time
Place

2. Most Important Idea

3. Problem

4. Action

5. Response

6. Theme

7. Ending

Adapted from: Raphael, Kirschner, and Englert, 1986.

Appendix C
#4

Sample Editing Think Sheet

Does each sentence make sense	___	___	___	___
Have I used capitals correctly	___	___	___	___
Have I used. ? !	___	___	___	___
Do my characters talk ""	___	___	___	___
Did I check my spelling	___	___	___	___
Did I indent each paragraph	___	___	___	___
Do I have all the S	___	___	___	___
M	___	___	___	___
A	___	___	___	___
R	___	___	___	___
T	___	___	___	___
E	___	___	___	___
Does my story have a title	___	___	___	___
Did I illustrate my story	___	___	___	___

Adapted from: Raphael, Englert, and Kirscher, 1986.

Appendix D - Story Comprehension and Recall Data for Hillary

Appendix D
#1

Transcript of Hillary's Pretest Story Recall

S. Well Franklin is scared of the dark. He met lots of animals that were afraid of stuff, too. There was slippery things and other things in his shell.
T. What else do you remember about the story?
S. At the end he went into his shell. When no one was looking he turned on his nightlite.
T. What else do you remember about the story?
S. Well - uh - His mother was looking all over for him and she asked him if he found anyone to help him but all the other animals were afraid of stuff.
T. Can you tell me something else about the story?
S. That Franklin could slide by himself in the water.
T. Do you remember anything else?
S. He met a duck and the duck was afraid of deep water so he had to wear water wings. Then he met a lion and he had to wear earmuffs because he was scared of loud noises. He met a bird that was afraid of flying so high he would get dizzy and he would fall down into the ground so he put on his parachute and then he met a Polar Bear that was afraid he would freeze so he put on a - when no on was looking he put on his snowsuit. Then he turned on the light and went to bed.

Appendix D
#2

Transcript of Hillary's Post Test Recall of the Familiar Story

S. First you talk about the setting. The setting is where, when and who. The story was outside. And Franklin and his mother were in the story. And a polar bear, and a bird, and a lion, and a duck were in the story. And - um - and it was outside, but I didn't know when it was happening - in the day and night. And then the most important idea in the story is that Franklin is scared of his shell. He won't go in it because its dark. And the action is the middle of the story. And the problem is that Franklin won't go in his shell because there's monsters in it and slippery things. And he goes around asking people if they can help him but they couldn't because they were all afraid of things, too.

T. Tell me about that.

S. Well the duck was afraid of deep water and when no one was looking, she would put on her water wings. And then Franklin met a lion. And the lion was afraid of great loud noises. And then Franklin met a bird. The bird was afraid of flying, so when no one was looking, she put on his parachute. And Franklin met a polar bear that was afraid of freezing on icy cold nights so when no one was looking, he would put on his snow suit and he would go to bed.

And then Franklin found nobody to help him. So, he walked back home - um - and went back home to his mom. The responses are the characters feelings. And Franklin - looks like on the front cover that he felt sad and scared and didn't want to go in his shell. And the lesson that Franklin learned is that if you are ever scared of a dark place, then just turn on your night light. And the ending was that Franklin he went to sleep in his shell with his night light on. That's all I can remember.

T. Is there anything else you can tell me about the story?

S. Well, I marked this page because when my lights off I don't like to go to sleep. So when everybody is downstairs - my mom and dad are downstairs - I just turn on my night light and go to sleep, too.

Appendix D
#3

Transcript of Hillary's Post Test Recall for the Unfamiliar Story

S. It was outside and it was in winter time. And Annie and a moose and a bear and a cat and a wolf and a deer, and all kinds of animals were in the story and Annie's cat and there were three kittens. The most important idea in the story is about finding a friend. The action is the middle of the story.. The problem in this story is that Annie had a cat and the cat stopped playing and she slept all day. And she went away. And then she wanted to make a new friend. And she was trying to and she couldn't because she said something about each animal.

T. Tell be about that.

S. Well first she fed corncakes to the moose and put them at the edge of the woods, but the moose was too big to be her friend. And she made another cake and the moose came back with a wild cat. And the wild cat was too growly. And then a bear came with the other animals but the bear is too big and he growls alot. Annie was sad cause she wanted a pet to train. When Annie woke up, she wanted a pet to train. When Annie woke up, there was a big moose in the window. The animals came back with a deer and they shook the house.

T. What else can you tell me about the story?

S. The lesson that Annie learned is that if your cat goes away, don't worry cause she'll come back. And the ending was happy cause the animals went back to the woods and the cat came back with three soft kittens. And Annie wasn't lonely anymore.

T. Tell me about the pages you marked.

S. Well-um-all the pages have it - I just marked one page. It sort of gives you a hint what's going to happen in the story. So, it gives you all sorts of hints what's going to happen.

T. So, when you saw the hints, what sorts of things were you thinking about.

S. That her cat would come back and she would bring some kittens cause I saw three kittens and a cat.

T. Were you thinking about story parts when you were reading this book. You said that you looked at the pictures and it gave you clues what would happen next. Were you thinking about story parts when you looked at the pictures?

S. Well, I saw a moose. I thought there would be a whole bunch of mooses

coming to get the corncakes. This (points to the text) gave me a hint because I thought a cat was going to come and then it did come and the moose stayed. And then it looked like a bear was going to come and it did. And then it looked like a deer was going to come and it finally came.

Appendix D
#4

Transcript of Hillary's Delayed Post Test

Recall for the Familiar Story

It was winter. Annie's cat went away from home. She wanted to find a pet. So, she baked corncakes. All these different wild animals came to eat them. There was a moose, a wild cat, a bear, a wolf, and a deer. Each of them came everyday and ate a corncake. The first one would stay and then the next one would come and eat. They weren't good pets. She put a corncake at the edge of the wood. A moose came. He was too big. She left another corncake. The next morning, the moose was back with a snarling cat. The cat was too mean. She put out more corncakes. The next morning, a big, growling bear was there with the moose and cat. The bear was too grumpy for a pet. Annie left more corncakes. The animals came back with a deer and a large wolf. They weren't soft. The animals were too big and not friendly and fluffy like Annie's cat. The moose stuck his nose through the window and wanted more corncakes. When Annie went to bake more corncakes, there was none left. Her house shook cause the families of animals came. They roared and growled. Annie went to sleep. The next morning they were all gone. They could find their own food cause it was spring. One day, her cat came back. She looked back where she was walking and there were three little kittens. Now Annie won't be lonely anymore. They'll all be there. She learned you don't have to worry if your pet goes away because it will come back.

Appendix D
#5

Transcript of Hillary's Delayed Post Test Recall for the Unfamiliar Story

There was a little girl named Jesse. She didn't like to take baths. She was playing outside and she got all dirty. She went inside. Her mom said she had to take a bath. Jesse didn't want to take a bath in the middle of the day. So she said she was going to run away. So, she ran away. She met Mrs. Chicken. Mrs. Chicken asked Jesse if she wanted to live with her and be a chicken. Jesse said she'd try and she did. Mrs. Chicken said that Jesse had to learn to frizzle. Mrs. Chicken put sand on her hair. She couldn't get the sand out. It scratched. She said good-bye to Mrs. Chicken.

She walked along the path. She saw a cat. She said "Hello, Mrs. Cat". Mrs. Cat said, "Hello Jesse." Mrs. Cat said, "Where are you off to?" Jesse said, "I'm running away from home because I have to take a bath in the middle of the day." Mrs. Cat said that cats don't take baths. Mrs. Cat said, "Would you like to live with me and be a cat?" Jesse said, "I'll try". She showed Jesse how to lick her paws and rub behind her ears because that's what cats do to clean themselves. Jesse tried but her hair was sticky. It wasn't like Mrs. Cat's fur. She said good-bye to Mrs. Cat.

She walked along the path. She met Mrs. Pig. Mrs. Pig said, "Hello". Jesse said, "Hello". Mrs. Pig said, "Where are you off to?" Jesse said, "I'm running away from home cause you have to take a bath in the middle of the day." Mrs. Pig said, "What's a bath?" Jesse said you have to fill a tub with hot water. She asked Jesse to live with her. Soon they came to puddles of mud. Mrs. Pig said that you have to live in a puddle of mud. It will cool you down. Jesse tried to sit down in a puddle of mud. Jesse felt cold and hungry. Jesse decided to go home. She couldn't be any of those animals. She said "Good-bye". She went home and her dad was bringing the cows in. He said, "You decided to come home." Jesse just kept on walking and didn't say a word. She walked upstairs and turned on the water. She got into the water and washed herself. Her mom got a fluffy yellow towel and gave Jesse a hug. She learned she still didn't like taking a bath.

Appendix D
#6

Number of Words, Sentences, and Adult Prompts in Hillary's Recall's

Stories	No. of Words	No. of Sent.	No. of Prompts	Date
Franklin in the Dark*	180	13	4	Dec. 2/91
Mystery of Missing Mitten	168	10	4	Jan. 13/92
Imogene's Antlers	244	27	16	Jan. 14/92
I Want A Cat	319	23	12	Jan. 15/92
Big Al	367	31	20	Jan. 16/92
Show and Tell	311	23	14	Jan. 17/92
Sadie and Snowman	289	22	9	Jan. 20/92
Jim and the Beanstalk	396	30	6	Jan. 21/92
Princess Frownsalot	343	32	6	Jan. 22/92
Franklin in the Dark**	368	26	2	Jan. 23/92
Annie and the Wild Animals**	246	18	2	Jan. 24/92
Annie and the Wild Animals***	246	25	1	Feb. 24/92
No More Baths***	408	51	2	Feb. 24/92

* = Pretest
** = Post-Test
*** = Delayed-Test

Appendix D
#7

Quantification of Hillary's Retellings

Stories	Main Char	Sup Char	Maj Set	Min Set	Time	Main Idea	Prob	Action	Resol	Theme	Seq	Total	%
Franklin in the Dark *	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	6.6	16.6	41%
Mystery of the Red Mitten	1	2	1	2	0	1	2	5	2	0	6.6	22.6	57.1%
Imogene's Antlers	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	7	2	1	6.6	28.6	72%
I Want a Cat	1	3	1	2	2	2	2	4	3	2	10	32	80%
Big Al	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	7.5	2	1	10	34.5	86%
Show & Tell	1	3	1	2	2	0	1	7.5	3	1	10	31.5	79%
Sadie and Snowman	1	3	1	2	2	1	2	6	2	1	6.6	27.6	70%
Jim and the Beanstalk	1	3	1	2	1	2	1	9	1	2	10	33	83%
Princess Frownsalot	1	3	2	1	2	1	2	5.5	2	2	10	31.5	79%
Franklin in the Dark**	1	3	1	1	2	2	2	6.6	2	1	10	31.6	79%
Annie and the Wild Animals**	1	3	1	2	1	2	2	6	3	1	10	32	80%
Annie and the Wild Animals***	1	3	1	2	2	2	2	10	3	2	10	38	95%
No More Baths***	1	3	1	2	1	2	2	10	3	1	10	36	90%

* = Pretest
** = Post Test
*** = Delayed Test

Appendix D
#8

Summary of Hillary's Qualitative Retelling Profile

Stories	A Text Info.	B Infer Info.	C Imp of Info.	D General	E Resp.	F Involv	G Spkg
Franklin in the Dark*	M	M	M	M	N	N	M
Mystery of Red Mitten	M	N	L	N	N	N	M
Imogene	H	H	H	H	H	H	M
I Want a Cat	M	M	M	M	H	H	L
Big Al	H	M	M	M	M	M	M
Show and Tell	H	L	L	L	L	L	M
Sadie and the Snowman	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Jim & Beanstalk	H	M	H	M	H	H	M
Princess Frownsalot	M	L	M	L	H	H	M
Franklin in the Dark**	H	M	H	M	M	M	H
Annie and the Wild Animals**	H	M	H	M	M	H	H
Annie and the Wild Animals***	H	H	H	H	N	N	H
No More Baths***	H	H	H	H	H	H	H

A = Comprehension of Text Information
B = Comprehension of Inferred Information
C = Importance of Information Recalled
D = Generalizations of Text

E = Responses to Text
F = Involvement with Text
G = Control of Speaking Mechanics

Scoring
H = High indication
M = Moderate indication
L = Low indication
N = No indication

Appendix D
#9

Comparison of How Story Grammar Components were Stated in Hillary's Recalls

Stories		Main Char	Char	Time	Setting	Prob	Action	Resp	Ending	Theme	Main Idea
Franklin in the Dark*		Q	R	Q	PQ	R	P	Q	PQ	N	N
Mystery of Red Mitten		Q	P	Q	P	R	P	Q	P	Q	P
Imogene's Antlers		R	R	R	P	R	R	P	P	R	R
I Want a Cat		Q	R	R	PR	PR	P	Q	R	R	R
Big Al		Q	R	R	PR	PR	R	PR	R	P	P
Show and Tell		Q	R	R	P	P	P	PR	R	R	P
Sadie and the Snowman		Q	R	R	PR	R	P	P	P	R	P
Jim and the Beanstalk		Q	R	P	P	R	R	R	R	R	R
Princess Frownsalot		Q	R	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	P
Franklin in the Dark**		Q	R	R	P	R	R	P	P	R	R
Annie and the Wild Animals**		Q	R	P	P	R	P	P	R	R	R
Annie and the Wild Animals***		Q	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	Q
No More Baths***		Q	R	Q	R	R	R	Q	R	Q	R
Total	R	1	12	8	2	10	6	3	7	9	6
	Q	12	0	3	0	0	0	4	0	2	1

R = stated in recall
PR = prompted recall
P = partially stated in recall
I = incorrect answer

Appendix D
#10

Summary of Information Stated in Hillary's Recall

	Pretest	Famil Post Test	Unfamil Post Test	Famil Delayed Test	Unfamil Delayed Test
Setting	-a shell	-First you talk about the setting. The setting is where, when, and who. The story was outside...	-house -edge of woods -woods -outside	-house -edge of woods	-outside, inside, home
Characters	-Franklin, duck, lion, bird, polar bear	-And Franklin and his mom were in the story. And a polar bear, and a bird, and a lion, and a duck were in the story.	-Annie and a moose and a bear and a car and a wolf and a deer and all kinds of animals were in the story.	-Annie -wild animals - there was a moose, wildcat, bear, wolf, deer	-Jesse, mom, dad, Mrs. Chicken, Mrs. Cat, Mrs. Pig
Time	went to bed	-It was happening in day and in night	-It was in winter time -When Annie woke up...	-reference to winter -one day -next morning	-middle of day
Main Idea	Franklin is scared of the dark	Franklin is scared of his shell and he won't go in it.	-The most important idea in the story is about finding a friend.	-Annie wanted a pet.	-Jesse didn't like to take baths
Problem	There were slippery things and other things in his shell.	The problem is that Franklin won't go in his shell because there's monsters in it and slippery things.	The problem is that Annie had a cat and the cat stopped playing...And she went away...She wanted to make a new friend and she couldn't because...	Annie's cat went away from home. She wanted to find a pet.	-She didn't want to take a bath in the middle of the day.

Summary of Information Stated in Hillary's Recalls con't

Action	He met lots of animals that were afraid of stuff too.	The duck was afraid of water and when no one was looking...And then Franklin met a lion...The lion was afraid of...Then Franklin met a bird...	-First she fed corncakes to the moose but the moose was too big to be her friend...The moose came back with a wildcat. The wildcat was too...Then a bear came...	Each animal came everyday and ate a corncake. The first one would stay and then the next one would come. They weren't good pets. A moose came...	She ran away. She met Mrs. Chicken...Mrs. Chicken said she had to learn to frizzle...She met Mrs. Cat...She showed Jesse how to lick her paws...She met Mrs. Pig...Mrs. Pig showed her how to live in a puddle.
Response	-scared	The responses are the character's feelings. Franklin felt sad and scared and didn't want to go in his shell.	-Annie felt sad cause she wanted a pet to train. -The ending was happy... -lonely	-Now Annie won't be lonely anymore	-sand scratched -tried to lick herself but she was sticky -she felt cold, hungry
Theme	-no statement	The lesson that Franklin learned is that if you are ever scared of a dark place, then just turn on your night light.	The lesson that Annie learned is that if your cat goes away, don't worry cause she'll come back.	Don't worry if you're pet goes away because it will come back.	-Jesse couldn't be one of the animals -She still didn't like taking a bath
Ending	Then he turned on the light and went to bed	-The ending was that Franklin went to sleep in his shell with his night light on.	The animals went back to the woods and the cat come back with three soft kittens. And Annie wasn't lonely anymore.	One day her cat came back. There were three little kittens. They'll all be there.	She went home...She didn't say a word. She turned on the water. She got into the water and washed. Her mom gave Jesse a hug...

Appendix D
#11

Summary of Correlation Coefficients Calculated for Hillary's Retellings of Stories Read

Story	Correlation Coefficient
*Franklin in the Dark	.97
Mystery of the Red Mitten	1.0
Imogene's Antlers	.82
I Want a Cat	1.0
Big Al	.98
Show and Tell	1.0
Sadie and the Snowman	.97
Jim and the Beanstalk	.99
Princess Frownsalot	.98
**Franklin in the Dark	.95
**Annie and Wild Animals	.98
***Annie and Wild Animals	1.0
***No More Baths	1.0
	Average .97

* = Pretest
** = Post-Test

Appendix D
#12

Transcript Hillary's Recall for Story #1

Recall of The Mystery of the Missing Red Mitten

T. Tell me everything that you can remember about the story.

S. She lost her mit and she looked everywhere that she was, but she couldn't find her mit there and she went into the woods and looked but her mit wasn't there and she went to her neighbour's and ask her neighbour if she saw her mit and her neighbour said, "No". Her neighbour said to look by the snow angels, but her mit wasn't there. Then her neighbour asked her to have some hot chocolate because she made some for Anne and her neighbour saw this red dot on the snowman and then Annie ran out the door and her mitten was the heart of the snowman and she got her mit back.

T. What else do you remember about the story?

S. She was going to plant the other mit to see if a mitten tree will grow.

T. What else to you remember about the story?

S. She asked if a bird took it and then she thought a hawk took it to keep its babies head warm, but it didn't take it?

T. What else do you remember about the story?

S. She thought her dog found her mit, but it was just a bird.

Appendix D
#13

*Transcript of Hillary's Recall for Story #2

Recall of Imogene's Antlers

T. Tell me everything that you can remember. Make a picture in your head and begin with the setting. I'll help you out, as you tell me about the story. The setting tells us where the story happened. The setting was -
S. It was at Imogene's house, the kitchen.
T. What else do you remember?
S. It was outside.
T. When we talk about the setting, we also talk about the most important setting. What was the most important setting in the book.
S. Imogene got antlers.
T. That's the problem. The most important place in the story was -
S. the living room
T. That's right. That's where most of the story happened. When we talk about the setting, we also talk about the time and the characters.
S. It was in summer, on Thursday and Friday. There was Imogene's mother and father and her grandfather, and the cook and the maid and her brother.
T. When we talk about the setting we also talk about the most important character.
S. Imogene was the most important.
T. You've told me about the setting, now what are you going to tell me about?
S. The most important idea.
T. Make a picture in your head. The author gives us clues to the main idea in the title and the cover story.
S. The most important idea is that Imogene got animal parts.
T. If you can't remember, think of the next letter that will help us remember.
S. A - action - the middle of the book. Imogene was happy about the antlers.
T. When you talk about the action, you tell about the problem.
S. The problem was that Imogene got antlers and she couldn't get rid of them. They tried all sorts of things but they didn't work.

T. Can you be more specific?
S. They called the doctor, but the doctor couldn't find anything wrong. Then they called the principal, but the principal had no advice.
S. Then her brother looked in the book and said that she turned into a elk. Then they called the hat maker, but the hat was too big for Imogene.
T. Now what are you going to tell me about?
S. Response. Imogene didn't feel upset that she had antlers. She felt happy. Her family felt surprised. They had a funny face. Her mother fainted.
T. When we talk about response, we talk about the character's responses, but we also talk about how we felt.
S. I felt happy because the author made Imogene do funny things. She was riding on the railway of the stairs and she was swinging on the chandelier and she had a difficult time getting dressed because her clothes got stuck on her antlers. She couldn't get through the door.
T. The author wanted us to really laugh about Imogene's problems.
S. The theme.
T. Imogene learned that if -
S. If you are having problems, don't be upset.
T. One more thing to tell me about.
S. The ending. Imogene woke up in the morning and she didn't have her antlers. she had peacock feathers.

Appendix D
#14

Transcript of Hillary's Recall of Story #3

Recall of I Want A Cat

T. Let's see if we can remember as many sentences as we did yesterday. What can we do so that we'll remember all the things that happened in the story?
S. Think of the word Smarte.
T. Why don't you start telling me about the story?
S. First she's asking her mom and dad for a pet.
T. OK. When I tell about a story, I think about the word Smarte. I spell the word Smarte in my head. The first letter is -
S. S
T. And what does the S stand for?
S. setting
T. And when we talk about the setting, what do we talk about?
S. Where, when, who
T. OK, so why don't you tell me about where, when and who is in the story.
S. It happened in Spring on Monday and Tuesday.
T. Good what else can you tell me?
S. It happened at her house, in school.
T. Tell me a sentence.
S. Part of the story took place in school and um - part of the story took place in her room. Part of the story took place in the bathroom and part of the story took place outside and part of the story took place in the living room. People in the story are Jesse, her mom and her dad and her pet and her teacher was in the story and the pet shop owner.
T. OK, you've told me about the setting. Keep spelling Smarte in your head. What letter comes next?
S. The most important idea?
T. OK, well tell me about that.
S. The most important idea in the story is that she wants a pet.
T. Keep going. Now what can you tell me about?
S. The action. First she tried - First she makes a cat suit and she buries her clothes. Then she goes to school and wears her cat suit. Then she goes to a restaurant on Tuesday and she eats on the floor. She goes to bed

and sleeps on the floor. She goes outside and howls.

T. When we talk about the action, we talk about the problem in the story. You've told me all the things that she did, but not the problem.

S. Her mom and dad kept saying no that she couldn't get a pet.

T. Now what can you tell me about?

S. Response. Well, she feels happy at the end and then she's upset because she can't get one and then she makes a noise and all the neighbours come and say to get her a cat. Her mom and dad do. Then her dad knocks on the door -

T. What are you telling me about?

S. The ending - that he has a surprise for her. Then Jesse wants a dog, so she makes a dog costume. So, I don't think her parents will get her a dog if she already got a cat.

T. Something got left out. You told me about the setting -

S. The theme.

T. You're smiling. You knew that.

S. If you - well, in the story, this is her lesson - If you want a pet, make lots of noise. My idea was, if you ever want a pet, do what you're mom and dad say.

T. Is there anything else you remember?

S. Her mom asked what she was doing with a cat costume on. She sucked her thumb when she went to bed.

Appendix D
#15

Transcript of Hillary's Recall for Story #4

Recall of Big Al

T. Tell me about the story.
S. Big Al learned a lesson.
T. How do we start talking about a story?
S. Setting
T. Tell me about that.
S. Uh
T. The setting tells us three things.
S. Where and when and who.
T. Why don't you start telling me about where, when and who.
S. It happened in the summer, in the ocean.
T. Great, wonderful. Keep going.
S. Big Al and some other fish and some fishermen were in the story.
T. How can you remember what to tell me about next?
S. The most important idea.
T. The most -
S. The most important idea is that - I forget.
T. Big Al -
S. Big Al makes friends.
T. What can you tell me about next?
S. The action is the middle of the story - um
T. Tell me what happened.
S. The fish got caught in the net.
T. The action begins with a problem.
S. Big Al's problem was that he was big and ugly and he had big teeth and big eyes and he looked scary and the other fish were frightened of him.
T. Good, keep going. Tell me what happened.
S. First, he tries to hide himself under some seaweed but it doesn't work because his eyes and his big teeth show. Then next, he tries to puff himself up and make the other fish laugh and see how silly he was. That didn't work because all the fish were scared. And then he tried to make himself smaller by hiding under the sand, but a little piece of sand gets stuck in his gills. He sneezes and he looks like he was before and all the

fish swam away. Then he changes his color and tries to blend into the school of fish but the other fish went left and right. Al kept on going straight and then they went off in a different direction. Al was big and they could tell he was big. If he was a tiny fish he wouldn't just go straight.

T. What can you do so that you will remember what comes next?

S. Think of the word SMARTE.

T. Alright spell the word SMARTE to yourself. Which letters have you already told me about? What letters can you tell me about next?

S. Now the response - well, its how the character feels and we feel. Well, Big Al felt very lonely and sad and upset and he was crying because no other fish would be his friend. He was all be himself. He had no one to play with.

T. You marked some pages. Why don't you tell me about how you felt about those pages?

S. I marked this one because it reminds me of what I did in school. Well, we drew these leaves and we painted them in with water color and it was all different colors.

T. So this artist has used water color to make the illustration just like an activity you have done in art before. Tell me about another page you marked?

S. I think he looks silly.

T. Why did you think the illustrator did that?

S. So, the other fish would swim away. I marked another one cause he looks so silly. He doesn't look normal cause he puffs himself all up.

T. I think the author did that to make us see how hard Big Al was trying to make a friend.

S. This page reminds me of my toy fish. Its exactly the same.

T. The color of Big Al made you think of a favorite toy. Neat! What else can you tell me about the story.

S. The theme is the lesson the character learns. Big Al learns that if you help someone they will be your friend. Then there is the ending. Big Al saves the other fish and they become good friends and then they all crowd around him and they are friends now.

Appendix D
#16

Transcript of Hillary's Recall for Story #5

Recall of Show and Tell

T. Tell me everything you can remember about the story.
S. That Benjamin brings his baby sister to school in his knapsack.
T. How do we start talking about a story?
S. Say the setting first?
T. Alright.
S. The setting is where, when, and who is in the story. It was at school and at Benjamin's house. It - um- and it was during school.
T. You're doing great. Keep going.
S. And Benjamin and his baby sister and his class and his teacher and the doctor and the principal were in the story.
T. Excellent. Keep going.
S. And the most important idea is that don't bring things for show and tell if they're wrong to bring.
T. Keep going.
S. And the action is the middle of the story. And the problem was Benjanim brought his baby sister to school in his knapsack. And the teacher tried to rock the baby, and she rocked the baby too hard and fast.
S. And then the principal came in and yelled at the baby. And then the principal called the doctor.
T. What happened when the principal called the doctor?
S. The baby started to cry even harder.
T. When you tell me about the action, tell me about what happened when the character tries to solve the problem.
S. And then the doctor - the principal called the doctor. The doctor opened her big black kit and she took out lots of needles and she said, "That one's too small." Then she took out this enormous one and when Benjamin's baby sister saw it she started to cry louder than ever.
T. You're doing wonderful. Keep going.
S. And then Benjamin called his mom and the mom got Benjamin's baby sister and Benjamin's mom rocked Benjamin's baby sister and the baby sister went to sleep and then when the baby sister and her mom and Benjamin went home, Benjamin's mom put Benjamin in the knapsack.

T. What else do you remember?
S. And the next day, Benjamin brought some funny things and his class did.
T. What else can you tell?
S. no response
T. How can you remember what to tell?
S. Think of the word Smarte.
T. Which letters have you told me about?
S. S,M and the A and E.
T. What do you still need to tell me about?
S. The response and the theme. The response is what the character feels in the story. Benjamin's mom felt happy and Benjamin's teacher felt surprised. And the theme is that if you ever have show and tell, um - my idea was ask your mom if you can bring it. In the story he learned if you have show and tell, never bring a baby.

Appendix D
#17

Transcript of Hillary's Recall for Story #6

Recall of Sadie and the Snowman

T. Tell me everything you can remember about the story.

S. That one cold winter day, Sadie built a snowman. Then, the sun comes out and the animals start to eat all the food on it. Then the snowman melts from the sun. Then she builds another snowman and she keeps on building snowmen because the animals are eating it and the sun keeps on melting it. The first thing she does is hide it under her porch and then she tried to make a tent, but it didn't work because of the wind. She made a smaller snowman and put it under her porch. The animals kept eating the food off it. The sun kept melting it. So, Sadie got all the water from the bowl, put it in a bag and then she put it in her freezer until next winter and she built snowmen all over again. Then it would probably keep on happening again. That's all I can remember?

T. How can you remember all the things we talk about in a story?

S. Think of the word Smarte. The setting is where, when and who. It was in winter and summer and spring. It was outside Sadie's house in her backyard. Sadie was in the story. One day -

T. How do we know what to tell about next?

S. Think of the word Smarte.

T. Spell the word in your head. The first letter is -

S. S

T. Now what letter are you going to spell in your head?

S. M - the most important idea - The most important idea in the story is that Sadie keeps on building snowmen, but it keeps on melting. The action. The problem is that Sadie's snowmen keeps on melting. She tries lots of different ways but it doesn't help because the animals keep on eating it and the sun keeps on melting it.

T. Can you tell me some of the ways?

S. First she tries to put it under her porch, but the animals eat it. The sun melts its.

T. What else?

S. She makes another snowman and then she does the same thing. She puts it under a tent, but the wind blows it away and the sun melts it again.

Sadie made a smaller snowman and puts it in a bowl and put it under her porch, but animals kept eating it. And-they-and the sun kept melting it. Sadie saved up all the water -

T. What do you tell me about next?

S. The response. First Sadie felt sad. Then she felt happy because Sadie knows what to do. First she builds a snowman all over again. Then her smaller snowman melts completely. Then she saves all the water up and puts it in a plastic bag and puts it in her freezer and waits until next winter.

T. What else can you tell me?

S. If you ever build a snowman and it starts to melt, then save up the water and wait until next winter and use it again and keep on doing it and you'll keep on building a snowman.

T. What else do you remember?

S. Sadie would never miss her snowman cause its in the freezer all the time. Then she was happy when she kept on doing it all winter.

Appendix D
#18

Transcript of Hillary's Recall for Story #7

Recall of Jim and the Beanstalk

T. Tell me everything you can remember about the story.

S. First its the setting and where, when and who is in the story. And-um-and it was at the giant's castle and Jim's house. And - it was one morning when Jim woke up. And Jim and the giant and Jim's mom was in the story. And the most important idea is that Jim helps the giant be happy. And the action is the middle of the story and its the problem. The problem is that Jack is unhappy cause the giant stole some stuff from him. And so and the giant couldn't read well. So, Jim went and got the giant a pair of glasses. And the giant was happy that he got the glasses but he was still unhappy cause he didn't have any teeth. And then Jim went and bought the giant some teeth and the giant was happy that he had some teeth but he was still unhappy that he didn't have any hair. Jim went out and got the giant a wig. The responses were that the giant was angry, but he banged his fist on the table. And you can tell he was angry because he had a frown on his face. And you could tell he was happy cause he had fun getting all that big stuff. And the theme is - this is what Jim learned. If someone asks you to help them, then help them because you will get a surprise. And the giant learned that if you ask somebody to help them, they'll do it. And the ending was happy because the giant wrote a letter to Jim and the giant gived Jim a big gold coin.

T. What else do you remember about the story?

S. And there's some other characters.

T. Tell me about it.

S. Well there's a dentist. Well the dentist and the person was shocked because they had never seen a big giant coin like that. The dentist made a tooth for the giant.

T. Who else did you notice?

S. The person that made glasses.

T. Tell me about it.

S. He was shocked too because he'd never seen any big coin like that before. He made the giant a pair of glasses and Jim took them back to the giant.

T. Is there anyone else that he met?

S. And then there was a person that makes wigs - a wig maker and he was shocked but he did it anyway. And he gave the wig to Jim and the giant was very happy that he got it.

Appendix D
#19

Transcript of Hillary's Recall for Story #8

Recall of Princess Frownsalot

T. Tell me everything you can remember about the story.
S. First I'll tell you about the setting, where, when and who's in the story. It was in a castle. And-um-and the princess and her brother and the king and queen were in the story and the artist and the doctor. It was a modern story. The most important idea was getting a smile. The action was the middle of the story. The problem is that the princess frowns alot. She gets a frown. She has a frown and it gets stuck on her face. It stays there. And then they try to unfrown her face, but it won't work.
T. Tell me about that.
S. They asked the great minds of the kingdom to come in but the princess called them airheads. Then they asked the doctor if he could do something. He said that Princess Frownsalot should get a transplant. They were looking for somebody with the right kind of smile. The princess' cat, he was the right one. And he was scared because that he had to go in the transplant. So they switched smiles and then the princess got a smile. And then she undid the smile cause she didn't want her cat to frown. She took the smile off of her face and put it back on the cat's face. And she felt good. And then she got a smile-and-um-The response was that she felt mad in the story.
T. Tell me about the feeling mad.
S. Um-she would frown everybody away from stuff. She would do bad things and so she felt bad. She felt good -
T. Tell me about that -
S. When she put the smile on the cat's face the cat felt happy and scared.
T. Tell me about that.
S. Well the cat felt happy throughout the story and it felt scared when they were chasing him. The king and queen were worried and they were wondering what was going on.
T. What else can you tell me?
S. The theme that the princess learned - if you can ever help somebody, then you'll feel good and happy. The ending was that she got a smile and she got a new name. Well, before her name was Princess Frownsalot. Now

her name was Princess Frownsalittle because she changed the name because she only frowned a little.

Appendix E - Story Comprehension and Recall Data for Greg

Appendix E
#1

Transcript for Greg's Pretest Story Recall

S. It was about Franklin. He was scared to go into his shell because he saw - um - creepy things and monsters and stuff and he was afraid to go into his shell because there was monsters and stuff and slippery things.
T. What else do you remember about the story?
S. That he went to ask everybody if they were afraid of dark places and stuff and all of them were afraid of different other stuff not um - dark stuff.
T. What else do you remember about the story?
S. That - that - when he finished his walk. He was on his way home and he walked and walked until he found his mother coming to look for him. Then Franklin was hungry and then at the end he was not scared to go into his shell. That's all I can think.
T. Is there anything else you can remember about the story?

Appendix E
#2

Transcript of Greg's Post Test Recall for the Familiar Story

S. OK, The first part of the story, Franklin was scared to go into his shell and then he went to places but they're afraid of all different other stuff-flying and swimming and loud noises and nobody helped Franklin like - nobody was afraid of dark, dark places. But, Franklin was the only one who was afraid of dark, dark places. He went to lots of other people to see if they're afraid of dark places. He asked if they could help them. Um - but they were afraid of all different other stuff.

T. Tell me about them.

S. The duck was afraid of swimming and deep, deep water. When no one was looking, he put on his water wings. And-um-The lion was afraid of really, really loud noises. When no one was looking he would put on his really loud - not really loud - earmuffs. The big bear was afraid of icy water. When no one was looking he would wear his snow suit to bed. This bird was afraid of flying because-um-cause he's afraid of falling. And Franklin was on his way home. And his mom was looking for him and she didn't know where he was. When they got home, Franklin's mother gave him a really big hug and said "Goodnight". And then Franklin wasn't afraid to go in his shell. He had a night light with him. And when nobody was looking, he got into his shell and wasn't afraid anymore - cause it was just his imagination.

And um - let's see here. At the beginning of the story, he was sliding down this stream. He was jumping up and down in the water and this frog was on a lily pad. Franklin's mom took a flashlight and shined it into the shell. And then she said "See, there's nothing to be afraid of. Its just your imagination." Franklin wasn't really sure. So he went to the other places to see if they knew if they were afraid of really dark places. They were only afraid of flying, ice, and loud noise and deep water. But Franklin wasn't afraid of all the stuff. He didn't want to go into his shell, but he was carrying it with his rope and then at the end he went to his shell because he was sure he wasn't afraid. He didn't know he had a night light. It was so dark he didn't know he had a night light when he got home, his mother gave him a huge warm hug. He went into his room. He climbed into his shell and then turned on his night light. There was nothing to be afraid of

but Franklin wasn't really sure. He thought that his mom was lying, but at the end of the story, Franklin wasn't afraid of going into his shell. He was sound asleep until the next morning. He knew there was nothing to be afraid of.

Appendix E
#3

Transcript of Greg's Post Test Recall for the Unfamiliar Story

S. There's this bear, he was trying to get to sleep, but his mom was snoring out loud. Then-um-Mr. Bear went to the baby's room but he was pretending he was on an airplane flying. And then-um-he went into the living room, but the clock went tick-tock-tick-tock. And then he went to the kitchen. Then the leaky faucet was dripping water. Um- and then he went into the car. He said it wasn't comfortable. And then in the morning when the sun came out it went right through the window and Mr. Bear couldn't get to sleep. And then he got up and went right back up into his bedroom and then-um-Mrs. Bear was laying on her side and Mr.-um-Bear got to sleep. And then the alarm clock rang. And-um-Mrs. Bear got up and made tea for Mr. Bear. Baby Bear comes up and jumps right on the bed with a letter. And-um-I've told you about where, when and who - OK. I think the story took place in the summer-um-on a hot day. And-um-part of the story took place at night and some of it took place in the morning. Now I have to tell you the main idea - is Mr. Bear can't sleep because all the racket coming from the family - tick tock, the clock and the sink and the sun. Mr. Bear was so tired, he went back upstairs and fell right back asleep. In the morning he woke up because of the -um- the alarm-the bell. Then Mrs. Bear said she'll make Mr. Bear some tea. The baby bear came in and jumped on the bed with a letter.

Prompted Recall of Peace At Last

T. Tell me about the story using the word Smarte.
S. Setting means where, when, who. The people in the story were Mr. and Mrs. Bear and the little tiny bear. The most important idea is Mr. Bear couldn't get to sleep because of all the racket. Response - I mean A - the problem in the story. The problem was that Mr. Bear couldn't get to sleep because of all of the noise. The problem doesn't get solved right away.
T. Tell me about that.
S. Mr. Bear couldn't get to sleep. When he went to the living room, the clock was ticking too loud. When he went to the kitchen the faucet was dripping. When he went to the car, the sun was shining in his eyes and the birds were singing. Baby Bear was pretending he was an airplane.

Then he went back up to his room, then he finally fell asleep. OK I told - you about the action - response now - Mr. Bear felt angry in the story because he couldn't get to sleep and the other things were making so much noise he couldn't get to sleep. Now I have to tell you about the lesson. I think the bear learned - if somebody is making lots and lots of noises, go to all different places until it stops. The ending - At the end of the story, Mr. Bear finally got to go to sleep and then he fell asleep, but he didn't know that he fell asleep and then in the morning the bell rang. Mr. Bear woke up and Mrs. Bear said she will make him some tea. And um- Baby Bear comes jumping up on the bed with a letter. He gets it from the mailbox.

Appendix E
#4

Transcript of Greg's Delayed Test Recall for the Familiar Story

The family of bears was getting tired and they planned to go to bed. And um-when Mr. Bear and Mrs. Bear were in bed, Mrs. Bear started to snore. Mr. Bear couldn't stand it. He went to sleep in baby bear's room. But baby bear was pretending he was an airplane. He couldn't stand it. He went to sleep in the living room, but he heard the clock ticking. He couldn't stand it so he went to sleep in the kitchen. The leaky faucet was dripping. He went to sleep in the garden and there was a big owl making lots of noise. He went into the car, when he got in it was cold and uncomfortable. The sun was shining and the birds were singing. Mr. Bear went back to his room. When he got into the house Mrs. Bear was turned over and she was not snoring anymore. Mr. Bear fell asleep, but the alarm clock rang. Then Mrs. Bear woke up and said she'd get Mr. Bear some breakfast and a cup of tea. This is the funny part. Baby Bear jumped up on the bed with the mail.

Appendix E
#5

Transcript of Greg's Delayed Post Test Recall for the Unfamiliar Story

Minnie wanted to fly like a bird. He climbed up a tree and started to flap his hands. He said, "I can fly, I can fly, I can fly." Flop. The bird said that is not right - that is wrong. I think the bird put feathers on Minnie. Minnie climbed up a tree and jumped. I said, "I can fly, I can fly, I can fly." Flop. He met this ladybug. She put glue on his body and made the feathers stick. When he went to the top of the tree, he said, "I can fly, I can fly, I can fly." Flop. He landed in a duck pond. I think the duck put glue on him. I'm getting mixed up. Then he met a butterfly. The butterfly told him he had to have wings. So Minnie made wings. The butterfly helped him put on the wings. He went to the top of the tree. He went up to the top and jumped. He said, "I can fly, I can fly, I can fly." Flop. He gave up and didn't want to fly. The animals said to try it once more. They took this big blanket. I think it was a blanket. Minnie jumped. She landed in the blanket. She said, "I can fly." Good-bye.

Appendix E
#6

Number of Words, Sentences, and Adult Prompts in Greg's Recall's

Stories	No. of Words	No. of Sent.	No. of Prompts	Date
Franklin in the Dark*	113	7	2	
The Bear's Toothache	182	10	3	Jan. 13/92
Mystery of Missing Red Mitten	207	19	20	Jan. 14/92
Big Sarah's Little Boots	221	20	21	Jan. 15/92
What's That Noise	254	20	19	Jan. 1692
Leo the Late Bloomer	197	18	20	Jan. 20/92
The Sandman	202	19	20	Jan. 21/92
Piggybook	336	23	8	Jan. 22/92
I Want A Cat	288	24	14	Jan. 23/92
Franklin in the Dark**	238	18	1	Jan. 23/92
Peace At Last**	196(279)	12	1	Jan. 24/92
Peace At Last***	191	17	1	Feb. 24/92
Why Can't I Fly***	216	22	1	Feb. 24/92
Sombody and Three Blairs	287	27	4	Feb. 25/92
Fix-It	239	19	3	Feb. 26/92
Someday Rider	188	14	3	Feb. 27/92

* = Pretest ** = Post-Test *** = Delayed-Test

Appendix E
#7

Quantification of Greg's Retellings

Stories	Main Char	Sup Char	Maj Set	Min Set	Time	Main Idea	Prob	Action	Resol	Theme	Seq	Total	%
Franklin in the Dark*	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	6.6	10.6	27%
Bear's Toothache	1	3	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	0	6.6	18.6	47%
Mystery of Red Mitten	1	3	1	2	2	2	2	6	3	2	6.6	30.6	76.5%
Big Sarah's Little Boots	1	3	1	2	2	1	1	7	1	1	6.6	26.6	67%
What's That Noise	1	3	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	6.6	24.6	61%
Leo Late Bloomer	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	3	2	1	6.6	21.6	58%
The Sandman	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	8	2	0	6.6	30.6	78%
Piggybook	1	3	2	1	2	1	2	5	2	1	6.6	26.6	67%
I Want a Cat	1	3	1	2	2	2	2	4	3	1	6.6	27.6	70%
Franklin in the Dark**	1	3	0	1	1	2	2	6	3	1	6.6	24.6	67%
Peace At Last**	1	3	0	2	2	1	2	5	2	0	6.6	24.6	61%
Peace At Last ***	1	3	0	2	1	1	1	9	2	0	10	30	75%
Why Can't I Fly	1	3	0	1	0	1	1	3	3	0	6.6	19.6	50%
Somebody & Blair's	1	3	1	2	2	1	2	8	2	1	10	33	83%
Fix It	1	3	2	0	2	1	1	10	3	1	10	34	85%
Someday Rider	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	10	2	1	10	33	93%
Imogene	1	3	1	2	2	0	1	5	2	1	10	29	73%

* = Pretest ** = Post Test *** = Delayed Test

Appendix E
#8

Summary of Greg's Qualitative Retelling Profile

Stories	A Text Info.	B Infer Info.	C Imp of Info.	D General	E Resp.	F Involv	G Spkg
Franklin in the Dark *	L	L	L	L	N	N	L
Bear's Toothache	M	N	L	N	N	N	L
Mystery of Red Mitten	M	M	M	M	H	H	L
Big Sarah's Little Boots	M	L	M	L	N	N	L
What's That Noise	M	L	L	L	N	N	L
Leo Late Bloomer	M	M	M	M	M	M	L
The Sandman	M	H	M	H	M	M	L
Piggybook	M	M	M	M	H	H	L
I Want a Cat	M	M	M	M	M	L	L
Franklin in the Dark**	M	M	M	M	N	N	L
Peace At Last**	M	M	M	M	L	L	L
Peace At Last***	H	N	H	N	L	L	M
Why Can't I Fly	L	N	L	N	N	N	M
Somebody & Blair's	H	L	H	L	M	M	M
Fix It	H	H	H	M	M	M	H
Someday Rider	M	M	M	M	M	M	H
Imogene	M	L	M	L	H	H	H

A = Comprehension of Text Information
B = Comprehension of Infermed Information
C = Importance of Information Recalled
D = Generalizations of Text

E = Responses to Text
F = Involvement with Text
G = Control of Speaking Mechanics

Scoring
H = High indication
M = Moderate indication
L = Low indication
N = No indication

Appendix E
#9

Comparison of How Greg Stated Story Grammar Components

Stories		Main Char	Char	Time	Setting	Prob	Action	Resp	Ending	Theme	Main Idea
Franklin in the Dark*		Q	N	R	N	R	P	R	P	R	N
Bear's Toothache		P	R	Q	Q	R	PR	Q	R	Q	Q
Mystery of Red Mitten		Q	R	P	P	R	P	P	R	PR	PR
Big Sarah's Little Boots		Q	R	R	PR	PR	PR	PR	P	P	P
What's That Noise		Q	P	PR	PR	R	P	PR	P	P	P
Leo Late Bloomer		Q	P	PR	PR	PR	Q	R	P	R	P
The Sandman		Q	R	R	R	R	PR	R	R	P	R
Piggybook		Q	R	P	R	PR	P	QR	R	P	P
I Want a Cat		Q	R	PR	R	R	P	R	P	P	R
Franklin in the Dark**		Q	R	R	R	R	R	Q	P	Q	Q
Peace At Last**		Q	R	R	R	R	R	Q	R	P	R
Peace At Last ***		Q	Q	R	R	R	R	Q	R	N	Q
Why Can't I Fly ***		Q	Q	R	R	P	R	Q	R	N	Q
Total	R	0	9	6	7	9	4	4	7	2	3
	Q	12	2	1	1	0	1	6	0	1	4

R = stated in recall I = incorrect answer
N = no statement Q = stated in probed question
PR = prompted recall
P = partially stated in recall
P = partially stated in probed question

Appendix E
#10
Summary of Information Stated in Greg's Recalls

	Pretest	Famil Post Test	Unfamil Post Test	Famil Delayed Test	Unfamil Delayed Test
Setting	-a shell, home	-home, shell, bedroom, water, other places	-baby's room, living room, kitchen, car, bedroom	-baby's room -kitchen -living room -garden -house -bedroom	-reference to a tree
Characters	It was about Franklin -his mother	-Franklin, duck,lion, big bear, bird, mother	-The people in the story were Mr. and Mrs. Bear and the little tiny bear	-Mr. Bear, -Mrs. Bear, -Baby Bear	-Minnie -duck -butterfly -ladybug
Time	no statement	-He said "Good night" -night-light -He was sound asleep until next morning	-sun was shining -birds were singing -he finally fell asleep -In the morning the bell rang -In the morning when the sun came out -Part of the story took place at night and some of it took place in the morning	-planned to go to bed -sun was shining -alarm rang	-no statement
Main Idea	He was afraid to go into his shell because there was monsters and stuff and slippery things	Franklin was the only one who was afraid of dark places.	The main idea is Mr. Bear can't sleep because of all the racket coming from the family.	Mrs. Bear started to snore. Mr. Bear couldn't stand it.	Minnie wanted to fly like a bird.

Summary of Information Stated in Greg's Recalls con't

Problem	He was scared to go into his shell because he saw-um-creepy, things and monsters and stuff	Franklin was scared to go into his shell	Mr. Bear couldn't get to sleep.	-reference to Mr. Bear couldn't stand noise	Minnie wanted to fly like a bird.
Action	That he went to ask everybody if they were afraid of dark places and stuff and all of them were afraid of different other stuff-not-um dark stuff	The duck was afraid of swimming in the deep deep water. When no one was looking, he put on his water wings...The lion was afraid of...When no one was looking...The bear was afraid of...When no one was looking...	Mr. Bear went to the baby's room, but he was pretending...And then he went into the living room but....Then we went to the kitchen. The faucet...Then he went into the car...	He went to sleep in....but baby bear was...He couldn't stand it. He went...He heard...He couldn't stand it...	I'm, getting mixed up.
Response	-scared, afraid, not scared, hungry	-scared, afraid, wasn't afraid, wasn't really sure, he knew there was nothing to be afraid of	-so tired -Mr. Bear felt angry in the story because he couldn't get to sleep	-he couldn't stand it	-he gave up -he didn't want to fly
Theme	-no statement	He climbed into his shell then turned on his night light. There was nothing to be afraid of it was just his imagination.	I think the bear learned if somebody is making lots and lots of noises, go to all different places until it stops.	no statement	no statement
Ending	He found his mother coming to look for him. Then Franklin was hungry and then at the end he was not scared.	When they got home, Franklin's mom gave him a hug...Franklin wasn't afraid...He had a nightlight...When no one was looking...	Mr. Bear was so tired he went back upstairs and fell asleep. The alarm rang. Mrs. Bear said she'll make tea. Baby Bear jumped on the bed with a letter.	Mr. Bear feel asleep but the alarm rang...Mrs. Bear said...Baby Bear jumped...	The animals said try once again. They took the blanket...Minnie jumped...She said, "I can fly."

Appendix E
#11

Summary of Correlation Coefficients Calculated for Greg's Retellings of Stories Read

Story	Correlation Coefficient	
*Franklin in the Dark	1.0	
Bear's Toothache	.98	
Mystery of Red Mitten	.96	
Big Sarah	.90	
What's That Noise	1.0	
Leo the Late Bloomer	.96	
The Sandman	.98	
Piggybook	.90	
I Want A Cat	.97	
**Franklin in the Dark	.99	*Pretest
**Peace At Last	.90	**Post Test
***Why Can't I Fly?	.96	***Delay-Test
Somebody and Three Blairs	.99	
Fix-It	1.0	
Someday Rider	.99	
Imogene	.98	
Average	.97	

Appendix E
#12

Transcript for Greg's Recall of Story #1

Recall of the Bear's Toothache

T. Tell me everything that you can remember about the story.
S. The boy was sleeping and then he heard this sound and he didn't look and he didn't know what it was and he looked out the window and there was a bear with a toothache. He invited the bear in and he examined his teeth and that didn't work and -
T. Make a picture in your head of what happened next.
S. He took a steak from the kitchen. The bear tried to eat it but it made his tooth sore and then he took this pillow and tried to um hit him on the head, but he ducked and then the father came. The boy didn't answer and they looked up and went back to bed. Then um the, I think, the boy tied a rope to the bear's tooth to the bear's - to the bedroom post and then told him to walk out the door and he was holding on to the house - or whatever. The boy pushed him out and then his tooth popped out.
T. What happened at the very end of the story?
S. The bear gave the tooth to the little boy cause he helped him - the bear get rid of his toothache.

Appendix E
#13

Transcript of Greg's Recall for Story #2

Recall of The Mystery of the Missing Red Mitten

T. As you are telling me about the story, think about the different parts of the story. We've counted the parts. We know that there are 6 parts. We remember the parts -
S. by the word SMARTE
T. OK. So, the first letter is an S. The S stands for -
S. Setting
T. And that's what you start telling me about. Tell me a sentence.
S. It was outside in the winter and this girl lost a mit.
T. Tell me what the girl's name was.
S. The girl's name was Annie and she lost a mit.
T. OK. You are starting to tell me about the setting. You told me that she was outside. But, when we talk about the setting, we talk about where the story was taking place - all the places where the story happened.
S. The story happened outside and -
T. Make a picture in your head of the first place that she was.
S. She's at a hill, a castle, a tree
T. Tell me a sentence.
S. She went to a castle, a hill and a tree, Miss Seltzer's.
T. We also talk about the most important place. The most important place -
S. She was searching all over the place.
T. The most important place that the story happened was near the snowman because that's where she found -
S. Where her mit was.
T. After we talk about where, we talk about when and who. Tell me when the story happened.
S. In the winter and she lost her mits and she couldn't find them.
T. Oh, just wait a second.
T. Now, tell me who was in the story.
S. The characters in the story are Anne and Miss Seltzer.
T. You've told me about the setting. Now what are you going to tell me about next?
S. Most important idea.

T. That's right. Think of the "M" standing for most important idea. Tell me a sentence.

S. The most important idea was Annie lost her mit and she couldn't find it and she looked at lots of other places a tree, Miss Seltzer's, a hill. Then she went to Miss Seltzer's for hot chocolate and she saw the heart on the snowman.

T. OK, you've told me about the setting, most important idea, now what do we talk about next?

S. Response. She felt upset, then every place she goes she felt even more upsetter than before. Then the last thing she looked. She saw a snowman and she remembered that she used the mitten for the heart of the snowman.

T. So, we're talking about responses. How did she feel there?

S. She's jumping up and down like a rabbit. Then she was so surprised that she couldn't stop jumping.

T. OK, You've told me about response. Spell the word SMARTE. What word do you tell be about next?

S. Theme.

T. What does the theme tell you.

T. The theme tells us the lesson in the story.

S. If you loose a mit, then think back to wherever you were and it might be there.

T. You've told me about setting, most important idea, action, response, theme -

S. The ending. The ending was that she found her mit and then she will never take her mit off again.

Appendix E
#14

Transcript of Greg's Recall for Story #3

Recall of Big Sarah

T. When you tell me everything you can remember about the story, you start by talking about the -
S. Setting - who, when, and where.
T. OK, so tell me about those three things.
S. It happened in the summer - I mean the Spring. Let's see.
T. You told me the setting is about who, where, and when. You told me about when. Now tell me about who and where.
S. Sarah was in the story. His brother was in the story - um - his mom was in the story and the storekeeper was in the story.
T. Good. Keep going.
S. Where - It happened in a puddle - um -
T. Some of the story took place in a puddle. Other parts of the story took place -
S. in a shop and in the house and outside the house.
T. OK. You've told me about the setting. Let's spell the word SMARTE - S-M- Now we talk about the most important idea. Tell me a sentence.
S. The most important idea - um-
T. If you can't remember, the author gives us a clue in the story title. Let's look at the title. What's the most important thing in the title?
S. Sarah
T. Yes, she is the most important character. What was something important that happened to her?
S. The most important idea about Sarah is that she got new boots.
T. There was a problem with the old boots.
S. The most important idea about Sarah is that she got new boots because she grew.
T. Good. Now what do you tell me about?
S. The action?
T. Right. When we spell SMARTE, we spell S-M-A-. The A stands for action. What can you tell me about the action?
S. The problem - Sarah thought her boots were shrinking, but um - but she didn't want to get new boots - cause she liked those boots really, really

much. They are as yellow as a bathtub. She tried everything that she could do to put on the boot.

T. Tell me some of the things that she did to put her boots on.

S. pulling it with a dog.

T. Tell me in a sentence.

S. Sarah pulled the boot with the dog. Sarah tried planting the boot. I think she tried pulling on it.

T. Let's make a movie in our head. Make a picture of all the things that Sarah did to get her boot on.

S. She tried stretching it. She tried pulling it with a bike. She tried planting it. She tried blowing it. She tried taking off her sock.

T. Something always happened when she tried doing all those things.

S. the boot didn't fit.

T. OK, We've spelled S-M-A- now we talk about?

S. Response -

T. When we talk about response, we talk about the characters feelings.

S. Sarah felt really angry because she didn't want to get new boots. She felt sad because she couldn't stretch the boot. She felt upset cause she had to get new boots.

T. Now, we talk about -

S. Theme - If you have a little brother or sister and you've grown out of the boots, give the boots to them.,

T. Now we talk about -

S. the ending - Let's see - I can't think.

T. Sarah did something at the end of the story. Let's made a movie in our head about what she did. She got new boots and -

S. Mathew and Sarah were jumping around in the puddles and they were so happy jumping in the puddles and Sarah was glad about her new boots.

T. There was something special about the new boots. They did something that her old boots couldn't do -

S. make noises.

Appendix E
#15

Transcript of Greg's Recall for Story #4

Recall of What's That Noise?

T. How do you remember to tell me everything about a story?
S. Setting.
T. How are you going to remember? What word is going to help you remember?
S. SMARTE
T. as you tell me about the story, spell SMARTE in your head. When you see the letter, think of the word you have to tell me about. Take you time and tell me about the story.
S. Setting
T. Tell me a sentence. The story was -
S. in the -
T. Tell me a sentence.
S. The story was taking place in the woods. The story was happening outside, on a farm, and at a beehive, at his home, and in the forest.
T. OK, you've told me about where. Now tell me a sentence about when.
S. The story happened in the spring.
T. Good. Tell me all the other times.
S. The story happened in spring, fall and winter.
T. Keep going. You've told me where, when.
S. Now who. The people in the story was the bear, the farmer, the bee, frog, the birds and did I say frog - fox.
T. Now what are you going to tell me about.
S. The most important idea.
T. Tell me a sentence.
S. The most important idea is - It just goes out of my head - just like that. He kept on looking to see what the sound was, but it was his heart the whole time.
T. Now what are you going to tell be about?
S. The action.
T. Tell me a sentence.
S. The problem was, the bear woke up, heard a sound and he didn't know what it was and he looked all over the forest. The bear went to a beehive.

T. When we talk about the action, we tell what happened when the bear went to solve his problem.

S. He got stung. He went to the farm and he got into big trouble. The bear dropped a tomato down to the pond then he snuck the tomatoes out of a big basket and started eating them. He went to the frog and he didn't hear his noise.

T. Tell me about that.

S. The owl.

T. Tell me a sentence.

S. He went to the owl, but the owl didn't know what his noise was.

T. How can you figure out what to tell me next.

S. Response - feeling.

T. Tell me about it.

S. The bear felt worried because he couldn't find the sound. He went to all these places, but he couldn't figure out what the sound was.

T. How else did he feel?

S. Happy cause it was his heart the whole time and when he went to sleep and woke up he danced around for joy.

T. Next.

S. Theme - I know what it means. If a bear hears a noise it was his heart the whole time. At the end, he found out it was his heart the whole time and he went to those other places for nothing. It was in his body the whole time.

Appendix E
#16

Transcript of Greg's Recall for Story #5

Recall of Leo the Late Bloomer

T. Take your time and tell me everything you can remember about the story.
S. S - the setting - where, when and who. Leo's mom was in the story. His dad was in the story and Leo was in the story. It happened in the spring time and summer and winter.
T. So it happened over a whole -
S. month
T. Year, A whole year has gone by.
S. The most important idea.
T. Who -
S. I've told you about where, when and who.
T. You told me who's in the story and when. You told me it happened in spring. You told me that Leo was in the story.
S. Where. It happened in a jungle. Um - in the garden.
T. Now what do you tell me about?
S. The most important idea - Leo wanted to grow up so he could read, write and draw.
T. Now what do you tell me about?
S. The R.
T. If you don't know, spell the word in your head. Start spelling.
S. S.
T. next letter
S. M
T. next letter
S. A
T. So what do you know what to tell me about next?
S. Action. The problem was that Leo wanted to grow up. Everyone tried, but he didn't grow.
T. Tell me about it.
S. The people tried to see if he could eat?
T. Make a picture in your head. Think back to the first thing that dad did.
S. Leo's dad watched him all the time to see if he would grow.
T. Tell me about it.

S. He watched him in a chair, when he was in a hole -
T. What are you talking about?
S. in the ice hole.
T. Let's make a sentence. Leo's dad -
S. watching him in the ice hole.
T. What were the other animals doing.
S. making stuff.
T. What?
S. Making snowmen. Leo was chasing a rabbit.
T. What was the next thing dad did? Remember, there were 5 things.
S. in the jungle.
T. Tell me a sentence.
S. Everybody was playing around.
T. Everyone was making flowers. What was Leo doing?
S. playing around.
T. When everyone was making snow sculptures, what was Leo doing?
S. Chasing rabbits.
T. So, what was he doing when everyone was making flowers?
S. Chasing a rabbits.
T. What else can you tell me about?
S. Leo's dad watched him when he was watching TV. OK, response - the feelings - Leo felt upset and sad because he couldn't grow up.
T. Tell me about that.
S. Leo's eyebrows were bumpy and he was lying on the ground.
T. What else do you know?
S. His mom and dad felt sorry for Leo. They tried but Leo couldn't do it.
T. What else?
S. The T was the theme.
T. Good you're spelling the word in your head.
S. Theme is the lesson learned. If Leo can't read, wait until he grows up. At the end of the story, Leo bloomed.
T. Tell me about it.
S. He could draw, he could write his own name, he could say a whole sentence.

Appendix E
#17

Transcript of Greg's Recall for Story #6

Recall of The Sandman

T. Take your time and tell me everything you can remember about the story. When you're telling me about a story, how do you remember what to talk about?
S. Spell SMARTE.
T. Yes, think of the first letter and what it reminds you to talk about.
S. Setting - where, when, and who.
T. Tell me a sentence.
S. The characters in the story was the sandman and that kid - Jay and - The story happened at night.
T. Good sentence.
S. And the story - and it happened in Jay's room.
T. Good. Can you describe the characters and the time and place.
S. Jay is a little boy and the sandman is huge. You could just see his legs in the picture.
S. OK - I did all three. OK, the most important idea is that the sandman tried everything to get the boy to sleep and the problem - no wait - um - but the - but Jay -
T. If you can't remember what to tell me, what can you do?
S. Spell the word SMARTE.
T. OK. Spell the letters in your head. I see an S, an M, now on A. Now I talk about the action.
S. S-M-A
T. Now what do you tell me -
S. The problem in the story was that he couldn't get to sleep. And the sandman tried everything.
T. Tell me about that.
S. He tried to see if they boy would count sheep and see if that would work.
T. Tell me about that.
S. When he counted sheep he didn't go to sleep. And he brung in sand - The sandman brung in a whole barrel of sand and dumped it on the bed.
T. Good.
S. Then the boy made a big, big castle. Let's see - And -

T. Let's count the actions. You've told me about the sheep and sand. That's two things. Let's use our fingers to keep count. How many action were there?
T. We've told 2. How many more do we need?
S. Four.
T. Tell me about them. First he brought in sand. Last he tried the sheep. Think of the second, third, fourth.
S. The sandman sang him a lullaby. Jay sang along. And - um - let's see - I forget.
T. If counting doesn't help, think of the things you do when you fall asleep.
S. The sandman rocked the boy like a baby.
T. Tell me about that.
S. Jay still didn't fall asleep. He was still awake.

S. One more, what was it? Um -
T. Let's keep going and maybe you'll remember it later. Let's talk about the Sandman rocking Jay and singing a lullaby.
S. The Sandman rocked the boy like a baby. Jay didn't fall asleep. Oh, the Sandman brought lots of cookies and -um that didn't make Jay go to sleep. The Sandman rocked Jay's bed over. The Sandman played a guitar and the teddy bear ate too many cookies. I know - he read him a pop-up story.
S. Response, the feelings. The sandman felt happy and worried. He was happy because they were playing in the sand together and the sandman felt worried because Jay made huge castles.
T. If you can't remember, what are you going to do?
S. spell SMARTE.
T. OK, then, do it.
S. S-M-A-R- Response the feelings. The Sandman felt happy and worried. Alright now -T- then theme is, that from all the excitment, the boy finally fell asleep. Then the sandman picked up all the sheep and took it away. Then the boy got right back under his covers and went to sleep. And in the morning he woke up.

Appendix E
#18

Transcript of Greg's Recall for Story #7

Recall of Piggybook

T. Tell me everything you can remember about the story. Take your time.
S. The characters in the story were Mrs. Piggot, Simon, and Patrick and Mr.Piggott. The mom left because she had to do all the work for the other people. She had -um-it took place at Mr. Piggot's house and it happened at night and in the day and the mom only left for a couple of days and um-the pigs tried to take care of themselves.
T. When you are telling me about a story, what word is going to remind you of all the things to tell me?
S. Smarte
T. Let's spell Smarte. What's the first letter?
S. S.
T. You've told me about the setting. You told me who, where and when. Spell the next letter.
S. M.
T. What do you tell me?
S. The most important idea was that the mom had to do all the work for the family and she had to-and-um vacuum, make the beds and do the dishes and then she had to go to work.
T. Now what do you tell me?
S. the R.
T. Let's spell the word.
S. S-M-now the A. The problem in the story was that the mother had to do all the work. The other part of the family didn't want to do the work and them - um - Mr. Piggot had to go to important work. His kids had to go to important school. When they got home, the mom wasn't there to greet them-and then they wanted their meal but nobody answered. Then they turned into pigs. They tried to cook the food but the food was horrible.
T. What else did they do?
S. They tried to make breakfast, lunch and supper, but it tasted horrible. Then they tried to look for scraps, but they couldn't find any. Then Mrs. Piggot came home and found them -the pigs begging her to come back. And-um-then she came back and they helped with the cooking - um - and

then - they thought that the food was really, really nice. They helped make food every meal time. And - um- when she came home she was happy cause she saw the pigs begging her. Then they helped her make the supper. Then she was really happy. She got to do whatever she wanted - like fix the car and stuff. The theme is the lesson learned. If your mom leaves, uh - clean up the house and she might come back. The ending - when - um - her - mom - they're mom came home and - um - she found Mr. Piggott and Simon and Patrick looking for scraps of paper. And um - they couldn't find any and they begged her to stay.

Appendix E
#19

Transcript of Greg's Recall of Story #8

Recall for I Want a Cat

T. Tell me everything you can remember about the story.
S. This story took place at Jesse's house.
T. Good start. Keep going.
S. Jesse wanted a cat, but every time she asked her parents, her parents said, "No". Then, she put on this cat suit.
T. When you are telling me about a story, what are you thinking about.
S. Word Smarte.
T. What letter does the word start with?
S. S
T. What does the S mean?
S. Setting
T. Tell me about the setting. You started out with a wonderful sentence. You told me the story took place at Jesse's house.
S. The people in the story were Jesse's neighbors, her family, and Jesse and - um - on a Wednesday she went to his restaurant and ate fish.
T. The story happened on -
S. Wednesday.
T. Tell me more about the time. Did it just happen on Wednesday? The story
S. The story happened on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday.
T. What have you told me about?
S. Where, when, and who.
T. Now what do you tell me about?
S. The M. The most important idea is that Jesse wants a cat but her mom and dad - her parents - keep on saying "No". But, then she dresses up into a cat suit. And then when she dresses up into the tub, her dad said to take off the cat suit, Jesse said "No, I won't take this off until I get a pet." The action - the problem was that Jesse wanted a cat, but her parents said "No". She put on her cat suit.
T. Hold up your thumb so you know that's the first thing. Every time you tell an action, hold up a finger so you will know how many more actions to tell about.

S. Jesses put on a cat suit. Then um - every time she wanted a cat, her dad always gave her toys. Then-um-she asked her parents if she could get a cat, but her parents said, "No". Then she-um-got into the tub, but her dad said "Take off the cat suit". But Jesse said, "No. I'll never take it off until you give me a cat." Then she went outside, then she started howling. Then her neighbors came to the door and told the family to get Jesse a pet. On Wednesday, Jesse's dad went to the store and got Jesse a cat.

T. What are you telling me about now?

S. the response

T. When Jesse's dad went to the store, was it at the beginning, middle or end of the story?

S. End.

T. So, what can you tell me about next?

S. Spell the word Smarte. S-M-A-now R. Jesse felt sad because she couldn't get a pet. And-um-then she went outside and walked around and went by a road. Two cats came up to her and tried to cheer her up. I told you the response - um -the theme - Jesse learned if you want to get a cat, dress up into a cat suit and your mom and dad might get you a cat. OK, now I just need one more. The end - the ending was that on Wednesday - her dad went to the pet store to get her a cat but then when he came to the door, she wanted a dog instead. And-um-then she got out of her cat costume and then she went into a dog costume. When the dad came to the door, Jesse put on her dog suite and said, "Woof, woof". Jesse was really, really happy to get a cat, so was the family.

Appendix F - Story Writing Data for Hillary

Appendix F
#1

Hillary's Pretest Composition

Oence a pund a time there was a pecful forst and lots of animels lived there. There was a deer and ribits and brids and baers. And some camprs came to the forst and the camprs made a fire to keep them warm then they went to sleep and they forgot to put the fire out and it was vaery windy and the wind blo so hard that some sparis flo out and the fire was geting bigre and the forst rangr so it and he called the fiare deprmite and they put the fiare out and rsecued the Aniamels. And they took them to the Aniamel Hopidel and chaecked to see if ayne of the aniamels were heart and if they were then they would beand it up and the campers had to plat new trees and grees and wene all the new trees gro back and the new grass gro back. They let all of the aniamel go to the forste and it was pecaful oenc a gen. And if people wanted to go capming they slapt in capins and that is the end.

Appendix F
#2

Hillary's Post Test Composition

The lost reicpe.

Oenc a poud a time ther lived a baer fimley. Ther was a Momma baer Papa baer and baby baer. Momma baer was brown and had a black nose. Papa baer was brown and had a black nose and wor glasse. Baby baer had a black nose and he was brown. One nice morning Momma baer went down to the kichen. Last nigt she laft her reicpe on the table it wasn't there that ment that someone sotel it!!! now Momma baer culodn't make porige. That made Momma baer sad. Then baby baer came in the kichen baby baer said I thike that I now what to put in it. "What" said Momma baer. "flower" saide baby baer but it didn't wrok becuass he was thikeing of brad. Then Papa baer came in. "I now what to put in" "What" said Momma baer. "Colteitcips" saide Papa baer. when Momma baer hred that she was sad. Then Momma baer whent to Mrs. + Mrs. Fox house. Momma baer saide have you seen my reicape "yes" saide Mrs. Fox "it's" right hear said Mrs. Fox. That porige was so good "can" I coppy it down saide Mrs. Fox "Yes" said Momma baer. So they all had porig togather.

Appendix F
#3

Hillary's Delayed Post Test Composition

The Big Mistory

Oen winter day Heather and Marie said to eah other that there books were truning withe. Heather siad this is a big mistory to slve. Marie thoght of an idae. Her idae was that we could stay up late. We fell asleep the nxet day wen they wer going to school Heather had a idae. Her idae was that after school they could look for cules. So they looked in ther closits and under there beds. They foud nothing. it was time for Heather Marie Michael and Rob to go to bed. The nxte day Heather + Marie were frstrated. They both made an idae. The idae was that they would make faceis and mass up there beds and wat for the people ho were doing it. They saw to people come into the room. They sone a flaslight at them. They saw ho the pepole were. They wer Michael and Rob. they told thre mom there moms said that Michael and Rob were gronded for a moth. Heather and Marie said "how did you ter our books withe?" They said that they painted our books with with paint. Heather and Marie said that Michael and Rob had to paint the books the same couler they were befor.

Appendix F
#4

Number of Words and Sentences Used in Hillary's Written Compositions

Story Title	No. of Words	No. of Prompts
* Untitled	181	11
When Baby Raccoon Got Lost (dictated)	260	27
The Big Adventure (dictated)	313	30
Getting A New Home (partially dictated)	288	26
Snow White and The Two Dwarfs	250	27
**The Lost Recipe	204	21
***The Big Mystery	216	20

* = Pretest
** = Post-test
*** = Delayed - Test

Appendix F
#5

Scores From the Focused Holistic Marking of Hillary's Written Compositions

Story Title	Topic Focus	Topic Dev.	Org.	Word Choice	Sent Struct	Punct Captl	Spell	Maj Set	Char	Prob	Action	Resol	Theme	Total	%
Untitled*	4	4	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	1	2	1	31	62%
Snow White and the Two Dwarfs	4	4	4	2	3	3	2	3	4	3	3	3	1	39	78%
The Lost Recipe**	4	4	4	2	3	3	2	3	4	4	3	3	1	40	80%
The Big Mystery***	4	4	4	3	3	4	3	2	3	3	3	3	1	40	80%

Appendix F
#6

Summary of Story Components Stated in Hillary's Compositions

	Pretest	Post-Test	Delayed Test
Main Idea	no statement	-The lost recipe	-The Big Mystery
Characters	-reference to a forest ranger, campers, and a fire department	-Oenc a pond a time there lived a baer famley. Ther was a Momma baer, Papa baer and baby baer. Poppa baer was brown and had a black nose and wore glasse...	-Marie, Heather, Michael, Rob, mom
Setting	-Oence a pund a time there was a pecful furst and lots of animels lived there. There was a deer and ribits and brids and baers.	-reference to a kitchen, Mrs. Fox's house.	-school, bedroom
Time	-Oence a pund a time -Wene all the new trees gro back and the new grass gro back	-Oenc a pund a time -One nice morning Momma went down to the kitchen -Last night she left her reicpe on the table it wasn't there... -Then Momma Baer went to...	-One winter day -time to go to bed -the next day -grounded for a month

Summary of Story Components Stated in Hillary's Compositions con't

Problem	-it was vaery windy and the wind blo so hard that some sparis flo out and the fire was geting bigre	-Last night she left her recipe on the table it wasn't there that ment that someone sutel it!!!Now momma baer culodn't make purige.	-One winter day Heather and Marie said to each other that there books were truning withe. Heather siad this is a big mistory to slve.
Action	-and the fire was geting bigre and the firstrangr so it and he called the fiare deprmite and they put the fire out and rescued the Animels.	-Then baer came in the kitchen baby baer said "I thike that I know what to put in it." "What" said Momma Baer "Flower" saide baby bear but it didn't wrok becuass he was thikeing of brad. Then Puppa baer came in "I know what to put in..."	-Marie thoght of an idae...Her idae was that after school they could look for clues...They fond nothing...They saw to people come into the room. They sone a flashlight at them...
Response	-reference to animals being hunt	When Momma baer hred that she was sad.	They were both frustrated.
Resolution	-And they took them to the Animel Hopidel and chaeked to see if ayne of the animels were hurt... and the campers had to plant new trees...	-The Momma baer went to Mrs. and Mr. Fox's house..."Have you seen my recipe". "Its right here. that purig was so good. Can I copy it down?" They all had purig together.	-They told their mom...Michael and Rob had to paint the books the same color as before.
Theme	If people want to camp they sleep in cabins.	No statement	Michael and Rob were grounded for one month.

Appendix F
#7

Summary of Correlation Coefficients Calculated for Hillary's Story Writing

Story	Correlation Coefficient
*Untitled	.80
Snow White and Two Dwarfs	.95
**The Lost Recipe	.96
***The Big Mystery	1.0
	Average .93

* = Pretest
** = Post-test
*** = Delayed - Test

Appendix F
#8

Hillary's Dictated Story #1

When Baby Raccoon Got Lost

Once upon a time, there were lots of animals that were friends! Their names were Mr. Deer, Mrs. Bear, Baby Raccoon and all the rabbits. It was getting to be winter. All the leaves had frost on them. All the water was turning to ice. It started to snow.

One day Baby Raccoon and his friends were playing near a cabin. They were playing tag and taking food from the garden. The hunter, who lives in the cabin, comes home, and decides to go hunting. He gets his gun. The rabbits run away because they are afraid they might get killed. Baby Raccoon finds a hollow tree with a hole in it and decides to hide in there. The hunter goes away. Baby Raccoon crawls out of the hole and goes to the rabbits den because its close by.

Baby Raccoon said, "I can't find my way home. I need help."

The rabbits said, "Look for your own footprints." Baby Raccoon looked for his footprints, but he couldn't find his because there were so many of them. He asked the rabbits again.

The rabbits said, "We have no more ideas, so go look for Mr. Deer."

Baby Raccoon finds Mr. Deer collecting food for the winter, but Mr. Deer didn't know the way home.

Then Baby Raccoon starts to cry abit. Then he goes and asks Mrs. Bear.

Mrs. Bear said, "I'll walk you home. When you get big you'll be able to find your way home."

Baby Raccoon got home. His family was happy to see him. They smiled, hugged and kissed him.

Appendix F
#9

Hillary's Dictated Story #2

The Big Adventure

Once upon a time, there lived these three friends. Their names were Baby Monkey, Baby Parrot, and Baby Giraffe. It was a very hot summer day in the jungle. There were green vines. The sun was shining. The leaves and grass are green. There was brown dirt. There was lots of water. There was a big banana tree.

The three friends planned an adventure before, but today they are going to do it. They knew what kinds of animals would try to get them, so they planned a way to escape. They knew the lion would try to get them first.

They started on their adventure and they saw a lion. The lion tried to eat them. The lion had a scary look on his face. The babies tried to run away, but there was a big lake in front of them. The giraffe swam a little ways into the lake. The parrot flew onto the giraffe's back. The monkey swam with the giraffe and climbed on top. When the lion was gone, they swam out of the water.

When they walked a little ways away from the lake, a tiger came. The tiger wanted them for dinner so he walked around them in a circle. The babies held their breath and they were shaking. The babies try to run away from the tiger, but a herd of elephants stop them. They dug a hole under the dirt, but it didn't work because the giraffe's head stuck out.

So they climbed out of the hole. A big Ape sees them and swings on the branches and vines and scares. He screams and scares the elephants away. The tiger disappeared into the jungle.

The babies went home and planned a new adventure about going across the lake and escaping ferocious animals. This time they'll build something so the giraffe doesn't have to swim.

Appendix F
#10

Hillary's Partially Dictated Story

Geting a new home

Once upon a time there lived these three animals in a pet store. There was Charlie The Bird, Loony The Snake, and Eric The Fish. The pet store was open and there was a big open sign in the window of the pet store. The lights were on and lots of people were in the pet store looking at all the different animals.

The three pets were waiting for someone to buy them, but they bought the other animals instead. Charlie The Bird was in his cage and he was singing and he was trying to get the other people's attention. He sang Mary Had A Little Lamb. He was singing really loud. But, the people were too far away so they couldn't hear him. Charlie The Bird felt sad and he was starting to cry. He covered his face with his wings.

.....

Loony the snake was doing tricks in his cage. He was burying himself he curled himself up. But, the people were looking at the others. Eric the fish, was doing triks like swimming in a circle. He was leaping in the water but the people wer looking at the others. So Charlie the brid covered his hade with his weigs. And Loony the snake went into a coner. Loony the Snake put a sad face on. Eric the fish frowed. He was unhappy. But then a grl named Sophie and her mom and Dad came into the pet store. Sophie saw that the animals wer unhappy. So she aked her mom and dad if she cuold get all of the animals. Sophie priomst to take care of the animals. They side "yes" and then Sophie and her mom + dad went home. The anamils wer naver unhappy agin.

Appendix F
#11

Hillary's Independently Written Story

Snow White and the 2 Dawrs

Oenc apnuod a time there lived a prity girl named Snow White. She had long Darke brown hire. She liked to were a white srite and a bule srit. Her smile was so nice that you could see her white teeth. She had to littel frisds named Happy and Grupy. Happy wor glasse and smiled like Snow White. They both wre cordaroys and t-shrits.

Snow White lived in a woodin house with a woodin rofe. Her address is 194 Ubique. Her house was panited white and bule. She had a mother and she was very sike. She had a very bad cold and had truble brething. Soon she died. Snow Whit wanted to cry. But her smile was on her face. Her simle was still on her face that mant that her smiel was sike on. So Grumpy tryed to read her a sory. So she would cry. It was called I Love you forever. It didn't wrke because Snow Whites smile was on her face. Then Happy made Snow Whites wich Rode to Avenlee. because some of it was sad. It didn't work becuass her sime was on her face. The next day Snow White whent to her motheres funarle. But Snow White was still simleing. Snow White said "I" won't this simle off my face but when Snow White saw her mother she srted to cry. Snow White rembored when they planted a gradn together. The plated roses and daisies together. They smelled wonderful. So Snow White finally got her smile off her face.

Appendix G - Story Writing Data for Greg

Appendix G
#1

Greg's Pretest Composition

Once upon a time there was a wicked old witch named Hazel. That made snak soup and different kinds of soup And tries it on people and tomds them into stegosurses And tells them to do any thing she wan'ts them to do was chace people and try to eat people and try to keep them away from the castle and the stoped caming so she stoped toming people into dinosours.

Appendix G
#2

Greg's Post Test Composition

Making snow forts

There was a boy named Jim and a nother boy named Pete and a girl named micky. Pete and Micky where at Jims house. Jim made a fort but the wind was to strong and blow the snow fort to pieces. Jim felt so angry he stamped his foot so hard his face wen't red. Pete got a shovel and threw snow at the fort. But the wind bloow the snow off the shovel. Macky made an igloo but when the wind blow it didn't move it. So Jim a Pete made an igloo. Th made a really strong igloo.

Appendix G
#3

Greg's Delayed Post Test Composition

Playing a Soccer game

Once upon a time their lived a boy named Kevin. He was playing a game of soccer by himself but then the 3 muskateers came. And started to tease him Kevin was so angry he scared them off. And Kevin was happy he could scream. When he got home he told his mom what he did his mom was happy to hear what Kevin did.

Appendix G
#4

Number of Words and Sentences Used in Greg's Written Compositions

Story Title	No. of Words	No. of Sentences
* Untitled	71	6
Going to Bed (dictated)	200	24
Animals That Share (dictated)	233	21
Share With Other People (partially dictated)	185	19
Being Locked Out	164	18
** Making Snow Forts	100	8
*** Playing a Soccer Game	66	5
Somebody Tries to Break into the Mayson's	220	22
The Mayson's Try to Stop the Dishwasher	200	24
Shawn Learns How to Skate	166	16
Imogene Keeps Changing	160	14

* = Pretest
** = Post-test
*** = Delayed - Test

Appendix G
#5

Scores From the Focused Holistic Marking of Greg's Written Compositions

Story Title	Topic Focus	Topic Dev.	Org.	Word Choice	Sent Struct	Punct Captl	Spell	Maj Set	Char	Prob	Action	Resol	Theme	Total	%
Untitled*	4	2	2	3	2	2	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	25	50%
Being Lock Out	4	3	4	2	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	2	1	39	78%
Making Snow Forts**	4	3	4	2	4	4	4	2	2	3	2	3	1	38	76%
Playing Soccer***	4	2	3	2	3	3	4	2	2	2	2	2	1	32	64%
Somebody Breaks into Mayson's	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	1	41	82%
Mayson's Stop the Dishwasher	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	1	45	90%
Shawn Learns to Skate	4	4	4	3	2	4	4	2	3	3	3	3	2	41	82%
Imogene	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	2	3	2	3	3	1	39	78%

Summary of Story Components Stated in Greg's Compositions (Appendix G #6)

	Pretest	Post-Test	Delayed Test	Delayed Instruc.
Main Idea	-no statement	-Making Snow Forts	Playing a Soccer Game	Mayson's Stop Dishwasher
Characters	-Used story starter	-There was a boy named Jim and another boy named Pete and a girl named Micky	-Once upon a time their lived a boy named Kevin. He was playing a game of soccer by himself but then the 3 muskateers came.	-Their lived a boy named Gary. He is nine years old and he gots freckles on his nose. Their was a man named Jim. He is my dad and he gots black hair...
Setting	-possible reference to a castle	-Pete and Micky where at Jims house.	-reference to home	-They were in the kitchen putting the dishes into the dishwasher.
Time	-no statement	-reference to winter-wind,snowfort, shovel, igloo	-Once upon a time	-Once upon a time -It was in the afternoon just after 1:00. They were just finishing lunch.
Problem	[witch] That made snnk Soup And different Kinds of souP And tries it on PeoPle	-Jim made a fort but the wind was to strong and bloaw the snowfort to pieces	-Muskateers started to tease Kevin	-The dishwasher started to shake. Bubbles were going all over the house. The dishwasher was going rrrr.
Action	And tells them to do was chace peoPle and try to eat peoPle and try to keep them away from the castle and the stuped coming	-Pete got a shovel and threw snow at the fort. But the wind blow the snow off the shovel.	-Kevin was so angry he scared them off.	-Pat tried to push the dishwasher But she wasn't that strong. The dishwasher pushed her. Gary tried to open the door. But more bubbles came out. Jim tried to turn it off...
Response	-no statement	-Jim felt so angry he stamped his foot So hard his face went red.	-Kevin was so happy he could scream.	-Jim and Pat felt angry their face went red. Jim kicked the machine.
Resolution	-and they stopped caming So She Stopped turning People into dinosaurs.	-Micky made a igloo but when the wind blouew it didn't move it. So jim and Pete made an igloo. The made a really strong igloo.	-When he got home he told his mom what he did his mom was happy to hear what Kevin did.	-Sharon hated the noise and she pulled the plug. The bubbles poped and the machine turned off. And the family was happy.

Appendix G
#7

Summary of Correlation Coefficients Calculated for Greg's Story Writing

Story	Correlation Coefficient
*Untitled	.91
Being Locked Out	.91
**Making Snow Forts	.91
***Playing a Soccer Game	.96
Somebody Tries to Break Into the Mayson's	1.0
The Mayson's Try to Stop the Dishwasher	.95
Shawn Learns How to Skate	1.0
Imogene Keeps Changing	.86

* = Pretest
** = Post-test
*** = Delayed - Test

Appendix G
#8

Greg's Dictated Story #1

Animals That Share

Once upon a time, there was a mother named Mrs. Polar Bear. Another animal was named Mrs. Peacock. Another animal was named Mr. Monkey. He was a really, really funny guy. It was in the summer time at the zoo. It was really hot. People were wearing sun lotion, short-sleeved shirts, and short pants. The animals had to go into the water because the sun was shining.

Mrs. Polar was really hungry because the other polar bears wouldn't share with Mrs. Polar Bear. Mrs. Peacock chased the other bears so Mrs. Polar Bear could have something to eat. You could tell she was running because all her feathers were sticking up. Mrs. Peacock was running, but it didn't work because the bears turned around and started running after Mrs. Peacock. Her feathers were spread really wide. Mrs. Peacock was really angry. The bears growled and showed their teeth and opened their claws. The bears went back to the food.

Then Mr. Monkey was up in the tree. Then Mr. Monkey tried to hook up the bears so that Mrs. Polar Bear could have something to eat. The money used his tail to pick up the bears. He dropped his tail to the ground. He started to lift the bears. But, the bears bit the monkey's tail. The bears fell down and started eating the food.

The other bears finally decided to share with Mrs. Polar Bear. The other bears decided that they will eat some and leave the rest for Mrs. Polar Bear. They will only eat what the zookeeper leaves for them. Now Mrs. Polar Bear will not be hungry. She still gets to eat lots of good food.

Appendix G
#9

Greg's Dictated Story #2

Going to Bed

Once upon a time, there was a girl named Sarah and a boy named Keith. Sarah was 8 years old. Keith was 10. It was night-time. It was 9 o'clock. It was dark outside. There was a full moon.

It was time for Sarah to go to bed. She went upstairs and when it was quiet, she snuck a book that was on a shelf out in the hall. She started reading. The book was about dinosaurs.

Her mom said, "Put that book back and go to bed."

Sarah put the book on the bookshelf and then went back to bed. When her mom went back downstairs Sarah turned on the radio. She listened to a hockey game. The Jets were winning 3-0.

Her mom got so upset and made a fist with her hand. She said, "Turn off that radio and go to bed."

Sarah turned off the radio and went back to bed. Her brother, Keith, came up to read her a story. He read her an ABC book. As he was reading, she fell asleep right in the middle of the book. She didn't get up anymore because she was sound asleep. She didn't wake up until morning.

Appendix G
#10

Greg's Partially Dictated Story

Share with other people

Once upon a time, there were three people playing outside at Johnathan's house. Johnathan made a fort out in the front yard. He was playing with Kevin and Maria. It was fall. The colored leaves were on the ground. Johnathan, Kevin and Maria were playing nicely in the leaves.

Johnathan showed Kevin and Maria his fort. Kevin and Maria said, "Can we try out the fort?" Johnathan said, "No', you're just going to break it."

Kevin asked Johnathan nice, "Please can I try out the fort?" Johnathan said, "No". Kevin felt upset. He shook his fist at Johnathan. Maria asked Johnathan but Johnathan said "no". Maria felt angry her mouth was close. Johnathan changed his mind He decided to share the fort. They all made a bedrrom with leavs and a blanket and a pillow. A and A tea room with a snack chairs and a dining room with candle sticks and a tv

They made a tearoom with table and chairs. Tthey got the snack from the house and ate it in the tearoom. A and then they got a tv for the dining room.

Appendix G
#11

Greg's Independently Written Story #1

Being locked out

Once upon a time there was a boy named Kyle and a girl named linda and another girl named Sharon. It was spring time. There were pudles on the ground. The butter flies where flying around the flowers. Then it started to rain. The children cam home from the park. The went to Sharons house. They tried to open the door but it wouldn't budge. Sharon nocked on the door but nobody answered. Kyle went to the neighbour but nobody answered. Linda went home to tell her mom to phone the key store. Lindas mom siad "do you have a key". The store keeper said "I don't think we have a key. The felt so angry there face went red and they made a fist with there hand. Finally Sharon mom came home and unlocked the door. Sharons mom said "I'm late because the tire pops". They finally got to go inside. When they went inside they were so happy they jumped up and down.

Appendix G
#12

Greg's Independently Written Story #2

Somebody tries to break into the Maysons house

The Maysons live in a house with a white roof. The mail box is right by the door where the mail man can see it. Around the house you would see red bricks with a medium size chimne. smoke was coming out of the chimne. Their were 2 windows in the fort and 3 in the bake. I was happening on saturday Gary family were Just finishing their lunch. They were packing their bags to go camping. The Mayons just left before the 3rd pig came. He brock in. He went to the parents room and stold some jewelery. He took Pat's best wedding ring. He took Jim's faverite watch. He took Sharons best ereing. He went to the basmint and stold supper mareo 3. Then he want to the living room and took a plant that made in fell a sleep under the piano. And the very next day the Mayons came home. They went to the parents room and faound the jewelery box empty. They went to the basement and found some nintendo games were stolin. They went to the living room and found the 3rd pig. The were so angry the put their hands on their hips. The pig played rock songs on the piano. Then he jumped out the big window. Gary wants the pig back to play with.

Appendix G
#13

Greg's Independently Written Story #3

Shawn learns how to Skate.

Once upon a time their lived a boy named Kyle. He had a Birthday Party today at Saints Rorller Rrink. Kyle was a good skater. Kyle invited Shawn Kevin and Johnny. They went Roller skating in the afternoon at 1 25. Shawn did'n no haw to skate. Kevin held Shawns hand. But Shawn fell down. Kyle skated behind him to make sure he dowsn't fall down. But Shawn fell down John shows Shawn how to do cros over. Johnny skated and lifted his foot over the other. Shawn tried that but he got a big bruise. Shawn felt sad that he count skate. Lots and lots of tears were coming down. Shwan rubed his eyes to get the tears out. Kevin and Johnny and Kyle held Shawns hand finlly Shawn hew how to skate. Shawn skated in a circle when the lights wen't on. Shawn did do scros over while he was skating backwards Kevin Kyle John learned a lesson that if you no how to skat help other people.

Appendix G
#14

Greg's Independently Written Story #4

The Maysons try to stop the dishwasher

Once upon a time their lived the Mayson family. Their lived a boy named Gary. He is nine years old and He gots freckles on his nose. Their was a man named Jim. He is my dad and he got black hair. My sister is eleven years old and she gots a couple of freckles. I have a mom named Pat. She has grey hair and she has earrings. It was in the afternoon just after 1:00. The were just finishing lunch. They had macaroni + chees. They were in the kitchen putting the dishes into the dishwasher when the dishwasher started to shake Bubbles were going all over the house. The dishwasher was going Brrrrrrr. It crashed into the refridgerator. Pat tried to push the dishwasher. But she wasn't that strong. The dishwasher pushed her Gary tried to open the door. But more bubbles came out. Jim tried to turn it of. But it goes on again. Jim and Pat felt angry their face went red. Jim kicked the machine why you little rat. Sharon hated the noise and she pull the plug. The bubbles poped and the machine turnd of. And the family was happy. The family washed the dishes themselves.

Appendix G
#15

Greg's Independently Written Story

Imogene Keeps Changing

Once upon a time their was a girl named Imogene She is 9 years old. Her mom is 49 years old and she has brown hair. Her dad has dark black hair he is 50 years old. Norman is Imogenes brother. It is Friday. Imogene was at her house. she woke up with feathers on her back Mom tried to kut the feathers but the nife wousn't sharp anoth. Dad phone the shirt repar to cover the feathers but the shirt was to small. Norman phone the zoo to come over and check the feathers but they can't get help. Mom and dad felt sad because they can't get rid of the feathers. they were rubing their eyes. Imogene felt angry she clenches her hands. It was time for Imogene to go to bed. In the morning she didn't know that she had an elephants trunk. The trunk was Grey long and fat. She wen't to the kitchen and scard her mom and dad.

Appendix H - Metacognitive Awareness Data for Hillary and Greg

A Comparison of How Hillary Responded to the Interview Questions (Appendix H #1)

Questions	Pretest	Post Test	Delayed Test
The student's thinking while reading a story	I forget	1. It (points to text) sort of gives you a hint what's going to happen in the story...This (points to illustration) gave me a hint because I thought a cat was going to come and then it did...And then it looked like a bear was going to come and it did.	1. It reminded me that I had to take a bath before supper. I didn't like it. Once I take a bath, I can't go outside to play... 2. The setting is kind of like the Annie book. She meets animals and they are both outside... 3. I was thinking of some animals that she might meet. I was thinking she might meet a dog or a bird. 4. I was thinking it might keep going...I was thinking she would still have a problem at the end of the story. 5.And I was thinking that her parents should let her take a bath at the end of the day so she can still go out and play.
The student's thinking while recalling a story	How Franklin solved his problem.	1. Well, you think of the setting, the most important idea, and the action and the responses and the theme and the ending. 2. I was thinking about them when I was telling the story and I was spelling the word in my head.	1. I was thinking about the word SMARTE. 2. I was thinking about the beginning of the story and who were the characters and where the story was. 3. In the middle of the story I was thinking about the action. I was thinking about the chicken and the cat and the pig and what happened when Jesse went to live with them. 4. I was thinking she went home at the end of the story.

A Comparison of How Hillary Responded to the Interview Questions con't

The student's thinking while writing a story	I was thinking there was a forest fire and they saved all the animals.	1. I was thinking about the setting-the bears and what color they are and what they look like. 2. I was thinking the problem was someone stole mamma bear's recipe and baby bear and pappa bear were trying to find the recipe...It made mamma bear sad. The ending-mamma bear went looking for her recipe.	1. At the beginning, I was thinking about where, when and who. I was thinking that the story was at Heather and Marie's house. I was thinking that Heather and Marie and Michael and Rob would be in the story. 2. In the middle of the story, I was thinking they had a mystery to solve. They didn't know who was painting the books. 3. At the end I was thinking they would find out who was doing it. I was thinking about what went with the story.
The student's knowledge of a story	1. problem-what happens in a story 2. ending 3. when it takes place 4. who's in a story - people and animals 5. solution - I don't know what it is.	1. Setting-the characters, where the story takes place like a house and when the story happens like in the winter or spring. 2. The Most Important Idea is what the whole story is about. 3. The action is the problem. The character has a problem and he tries to solve it but it doesn't get solved right away. 4. The responses are the feelings like sad and happy. 5. Theme is the lesson learned. 6. Ending is the end of the story.	1. SMARTE - Setting is who, where, and when. 2. The most important idea is what the whole story is about - Jesse didn't what to take a bath. 3. The action is the middle. The character has a problem but the character can't solve the problem and tries different ways to solve the problem, 4. The responses are the character's feelings 5. Theme is the lesson. 6. The end of the story.

Appendix H
#2

A Comparison of How Greg Responded to the Interview Questions

	Pretest	Post Test	Delayed Test
The student's thinking while reading a story	Franklin didn't want to go in his shell	1. The problem that Mr. Bear couldn't get to sleep because of the noise. 2. Where, when and who. 3. The ending-Mr. Bear finally got to sleep cause Mother Bear wasn't snoring.	1. I was thinking what different ways he would try to fly. 2. I was wondering how he would solve his problem 3. I was thinking he would do the things the animals told him and he would fly.
The student's thinking while recalling a story	If I went into this dark place-um-I wouldn't be afraid cause I know there's nothing in there that's going to be scary.	1. Thinking back it comes into my head. 2. I think of all the things that Franklin did. 3. Franklin and all the other people. I was thinking about Franklin being scared to go into his shell. The other animals were afraid of something else. 4. I was thinking about if I could get more than I done before.	1. I was thinking that Minnie had a problem. 2. I was thinking about how Minnie was going to solve his problem and at the end he did.

A Comparison of How Greg Responded to the Interview Questions con't

The student's thinking while writing a story	I don't know.	1. Beginning I was thinking about lots of details. I put their name down and it happened at Jim's house. 2. In the middle I thought Jim worked so hard on the fort and the wind broke the fort. 3. I was thinking about how they would feel. 4. At the end of the story, Micky had a really good idea like making an igloo.	1. The muskateers bugged Kevin and Kevin told his mom.
The student's knowledge of a story	1. Like spiders and stuff? I don't know. 2. People are scared to do something and at the end they aren't that afraid.	1. The S means the setting-where, when and who-like a place and a time like winter and the characters. 2. M means the main idea-its about the most important character. 3. A means the action, The problem doesn't get solved right away. 4. The R stands for response-the feelings like mad. 5. The T stand's for the theme-the lesson. 6. The E stands for the ending of the story.	1. The S means who, where and when. 2. The M is the main idea like - I don't remember. 3. The A is the action. Problems don't get solved right away. 4. The R is response like feeling happy. 5. The T. is the lesson like Franklin learned. 6. The end of the story - its a happy ending.

Appendix I - Instructional Mediation Data

Appendix I
#1

Providing a Mediated Framework to Present Novel Story Features: Number and Percentage of Researcher Categories

	Students			
	Hillary		Greg	
Subcategories	No.	%	No.	%
Headlining a Story	8	.4	8	3.2
Making Elements Public	15	7.3	13	5.2
Making Elements Relevant	8	.4	16	6.3
Model Concept Features	15	7.3	28	11.1
Model Reading Comp. Strategies	13	6.3	10	4.0
Model Prediction Strategies	20	6.3	28	11.1
Telling Related Experience	5	2.4	8	3.2
Activate Student Knowledge	35	17.1	21	8.3
Mediating to Build Meaning	15	7.3	42	16.7
Using New Story Knowledge	40	19.5	23	9.1
Shift to Reader as Problem Solver	14	6.8	18	7.1

Appendix I
#2

Providing a Mediated Framework to Present Novel Story Features: Number and Percentage of Student Categories

	Students			
	Hillary		Greg	
Subcategories	No.	%	No.	%
Model Researcher Responses	23	18.5	49	41.5
Responding to Prompted Cues	6	4.8	39	31.4
Using New Story Knowledge	40	32.3	24	20.3
Linking Personal Knowledge	39	31.5	24	20.3
Establish Evidence of Learning	16	12.9	8	.7

Appendix I
#3

Sample Protocols from Providing a Mediated Framework to Present Novel Story Features-Researcher Categories

Headlining a Story

- Its about a little boy that stays awake all night...
- Sarah is like you. She has...
- The bear has been hibernating for a long time. Suddenly...
- This is the story of the Three Blairs. Its like Goldilocks and the Three Bears...
- This is a story about a bear family. The TV is broken. So baby bear can't watch TV...
- This is about...
- This story is about a big, ugly fish...
- The character does unusual things to get...
- Its a funny story...
- This story is about a mom that wants...
- Its about a little tiger that is slow at...

Making Story Elements Public

- The major setting is where the whole story takes place...
- Usually stories happen at a certain time...
- Sometimes the character learns a lesson about how to deal with a problem...
- The first part of the story is the setting. It tells us...
- The action is the middle...
- Let's list all the time words...
- Let's list where words...
- The theme is the lesson...
- Characters try to solve the problem, but it usually doesn't work...
- The most important person is...
- Whatever the character couldn't do at the beginning, he can usually do at the end of the story.

Making Story Elements Relevant

- A Story is like...
- Characters have feelings when they have problems just like we do...

- In the story that you wrote, the main character was...
- The character in the story is like you. She really wants a...
- How could we tell the time in your story?...
- Story characters that we know are Goldilocks, Snow White...
- You're teacher has already talked to you about some of these story parts...
- In the story that we wrote, the problem was...
- It's like in your story...
- Story characters learn lessons just like we do when we solve a big problem...
- Story characters are like actors in a play...

Modeling New Concept Features

- As you read near the end of the story something will change...
- Maybe the author will use really big letters to show us...
- The giant got killed at the end of the old story. We'll have to see what happens at the end of this story...
- When children learn to do new things, parents say they have bloomed. Its like a flower...
- Patience means that...
- In Jack and the Beanstalk, the giant said "Fe-fi-fo-fum..." As we read, we'll have to see what this giant says...
- The Sandman is a make-believe person that helps children fall asleep at night...

Modeling Reading Comprehension Strategies

- Before we read, we look at the title...
- Stories remind us of things we've done. This story reminds me of...
- I can tell from reading this page that...
- Sometimes we can tell the most important idea by looking at the title and picture on the front cover...
- We can remember the parts of a story by spelling SMARTE in our head...
- The author hasn't given many clues, so I think to myself...
- By looking at the front cover, I can tell the setting will be...
- We thought the most important idea was...So, the lesson has to be about what to do when...
- Its hard to talk about the most important idea until you talk about the problem, action...
- We can tell how characters feel by looking at what they are doing with their hands...

Modeling Story Prediction Strategies

- I think the author is going to make Imogene do funny things because...
- We could ask, "Will the boy..."
- Maybe this story will remind us of...
- I think the setting will be...because...
- I think this will be a sad story...
- I think the boy might try putting a string around the tooth because when people have a toothache...
- Now the main idea. Let's read through our list of actions to get some ideas...So, we could ask, "Will the most important idea be...?"
- I think she looks worried...
- I wonder how Sarah feels about her problem...
- The bear must hear a soft noise. He's cupping his paw over his ear...
- I wonder if...

Modeling the Telling of a Related Experience

- When I was young...
- One time...
- Last year...
- When I had a headache, I got it to go away by...
- My mom was upset when...
- When I was your age, I use to help my mom by...
- When I can't fall asleep, I...
- When I was little, my mom use to...
- I hear noises like...
- This story kind of reminds me of...

Encouraging the Student to Activate Related Knowledge

- Do you remember...?
- What are some things you like to do in winter...?
- What story parts do you know...?
- What might be some ways you could...?
- Have you ever...?
- What is...?
- How do you help your mom...?
- Who helps you when you have a problem...?
- What kind of stories put you to sleep...?
- What is your favorite snack...?

- Has that ever happened to you...?
- Do you know...?
- Have you ever...?
- Do you remember the story of...?
- Has your TV ever been broken...?

Encouraging the Use of New Story Knowledge

- Who do you think the main character will be...?
- What might be some of the things she does to solve the problem...?
- What happens after the problem...?
- What do you think the problem might be...?
- What might be the setting for this story...?
- What's the next thing they might do...?
- What lesson might the characters learn...?
- What might be the main idea...?
- What will probably happen at the end of this story...?
- What will happen when they try to solve the problem...?

Sample Protocols from Providing a Mediated
Framework to Present Novel Story Features
Student Categories

Linking Personal Knowledge

- [I help my mom] make my bed...
- [If someone is having trouble at school] you can help them if they're mixed up on a word...
- [I had to be patient] when I was helping a kindergarten kid read...
- [I brought] a trophy and a calendar for show and tell...
- Sometimes I have ice-cream (as a bed-time snack]...
- I practice soccer to get good at it...

Evidence of Accepting Ownership in the Learning Process

- This story that I read was about a mitten, too...
- When I was looking at the book, I saw that...
- I peeked at the end...
- The character is going to be in trouble...
- We make predictions about...next
- I can tell the time of the story is summer because...

- Ya, I like that because...
- [Before you read a book] look at the cover and look at the title...
- The problem won't get solved right away..
- I think...

Appendix I
#4

Providing a Mediated Framework to Encourage Active Learning: Number and Percentage of Researcher Categories

	Students			
	Hillary		Greg	
	No.	%	No.	%
Subcategories				
Track Significant Ideas	20	13.5	26	11.9
Encourage Active Learning	47	31.8	50	22.9
Model Reading Comp. Strategies	21	14.2	35	16.1
Model Prediction Strategies	14	.9	13	6.0
Mediating to Build Meaning	26	17.6	58	26.6
Prompt Completing of Ideas	7	9.7	17	7.8
Shift to Reader as Problem Solver	13	8.8	19	8.5

Appendix I
#5

Providing a Mediated Framework to Encourage Active Learning: Number and Percentage of Student Categories

	Students			
	Hillary		Greg	
	No.	%	No.	%
Subcategories				
Confirming Predictions	34	31.2	28	22.0
Discovering Errors	21	19.3	16	12.6
Acquiring Information	20	18.3	21	16.5
Responding to Prompted Cues	7	6.4	13	10.2
Making Further Predictions	8	7.3	13	10.2
Modeling Researcher Responses	10	.9	31	24.4
Establish Evidence of Learning	9	8.3	5	3.9

Appendix I
#6

Sample Protocols From
Providing a Mediated Framework to Encourage
Active Learning - Researcher Categories

Tracking Significant Ideas

- Let's keep reading to find out more about the problem...
- Let's read to the end of the story and see if you are right...
- Let's keep reading to the end and see if...
- Read the next couple of pages and see if we are right...
- We're still trying to find out if...
- Turn over the page and see...
- Read and see if Big Al does make himself look small...
- Let's read our questions about...Now let's read the next page and see if we can find any of our answers...
- Why don't you keep reading and find out what he plays with...
- Read and see if he messes up the beds...

Encouraging Active Learning

- Were we right about our prediction...?
- We said the first thing she was going to do was...were we right...? How can we tell?
- At the end of the story, we said that...Are we right...?
- We thought the time was going to be summer. Did the story tell us that...?
- We thought the first action was going to be...Were we right...?
- Are we still right...?
- What did you find out...? How do you know...?
- We thought that... Are we still right...?
- We thought the setting was...

Shifting Ownership to the Reader as Problem-Solver

- What does that information tell us...?
- So, on the next page, what questions do we want answers for...?
- Does that answer any of our questions...?
- What are we reading to find out next...?
- What are we looking for...?

- What words did the author use so that you know for sure...?
- We were right about something what was it...?
- You're smiling - What did you find out...?
- Can you find...
- Which question does that answer...?
- How do you know...?

Modeling Comprehension Strategies

- On the first few pages, the author will introduce us to the setting...
- When the author doesn't tell us in words, we study the pictures...
- If you aren't sure, read it again to find out...
- If I don't know, I say to myself, "How does this sound..." That doesn't sound right...
- We have no more predictions left. Let's look at the next page and take a guess about what might happen next...
- We thought that...Does that look like what he's doing? I guess we have to change our prediction...
- (reads text) One morning (Oh, so my prediction was right), Emma (on the author is telling me the character's name)...
- As I'm reading, I say "OK - I've found out about the setting. Now I'm going to read the prediction about the action."
- (reads text) But (If an author says but I know he will probably tell about the problem next) the TV didn't work (so my prediction was right)
- OK, we found out part of the ending. We still want to find out...So as I'm reading I'm saying to myself. Is this telling me that...?

Sample Protocols From
Providing a Mediated Framework to Encourage
Active Learning - Student Categories

Confirming Predictions

- Ya, Jim was in the castle - that's where most of the story was - We were kind of right...
- Ya, we were right and it happened on a Monday and Tuesday...
- It was Jesse, mom, dad and the owner of the pet store.
- Yup, she's smiling.
- No - the living room cause she was mostly there
- No - she was making lots of noise and the neighbors heard and they said to get her a cat...

- You can tell because she's happy...
- Ya - he learned that if you are unhappy, ask someone to help you...
- No - he tried to hide in the seaweed...
- No - the mom rocked the baby...
- [The boy was the main character] cause he got the tooth out...
- Is Leo too small to eat? Yes, we're right...
- I was right. He could read. He could write...
- No, she went sledding first.
- I think so - She can't get her boots on cause they are too small - right here...
- Sarah's mom says she needs to get new boots - We were right...
- Ya - right here - The bees stung the bear on the nose...
- It doesn't look like he was eating the porridge...
- He didn't break the chair. He just tried them out...
- Ya - he was in the living room...
- He did go out the window...
- I guess we were right. Emma's mom couldn't...
- I think we're gonna be right...
- It is his mom. It says...
- I was right. It says...

Evidence of Accepting Ownership in the Learning Process

- And then when she wakes up, she's not going to have any feathers and she'll probably have something else...
- Usually, when I'm upset, I don't do anything...
- It answers that the setting is going to be at the castle...
- Its kind of like a circle story...
- Oh, oh, it looks like he's not...
- How could that...
- This didn't answer the prediction...
- OK, it tells me his father was in the story so my prediction was right.
- The cowboys are in the story, too. So, my prediction was right.
- I don't think this answers my prediction. I'll keep on reading.
- I don't know if he fell off...I better keep on reading...

Appendix I
#7

Providing a Mediated Framework to Adapt and Parallel Plot Structure: Number and Percentage of Researcher Categories

	Students			
	Hillary		Greg	
	No.	%	No.	%
Subcategories				
Changing Characters	8	6.7	13	.6
Changing Time	11	9.2	22	10.7
Adapt or Parallel Plot	58	48.3	80	39
Change Chararacter Responses	15	12.5	30	14.6
Completing Plot	15	12.5	35	17
Mediating to Build Meaning	13	10.8	25	12.2

Appendix I
#8

Sample Protocols From
Providing a Mediated Framework to Adapt
and Parallel Plot Structure

Restructuring the Setting

- We've read stories that had settings in the main character's homes...Let's think of a new setting...
- In the story about The Red Mit, the little girl was Annie. Can you think of names for the animals...
- What would be a good time for our story...?
- How will readers know its during the day...?
- In the story that we read, the characters were a girl, her mom and dad. What kind of characters do you want...?
- What characters are in jungle stories...?
- Let's see if we can think of some words that describe a jungle...
- We can have people as the characters or we can have animals...
- Usually story characters have names...
- We can make our story happen in winter, too... Or, we can change the season...
- What are some ways of describing 'almost winter'...?
- In the story we read this morning, Annie played at... Let's try and describe where baby raccoon and his friends were playing...
- We read a bear story today. Do you want to write another bear story or change the type of animals...?
- Let's name the monkey...
- The story of Annie was in winter. Let's think of a good time for a zoo story...
- Let's look at our list of characters in our journal...
- There's lots of ways we can tell its fall...
- OK, we can use Sarah again. Will she have a brother like in the story we read...?
- What will Sarah be like in our story...?
- In the story we read, the house was...Describe the house for your story...

Adapting or Paralleling Story Plot

- What would be a problem for pet store animals...?
- Why won't people buy the pets...?

- What will Charlie Bird do to get noticed...?
- How can we tell other readers that the song didn't help Charlie find an owner...?
- We could tell Imogene wasn't worried because...
- How will readers know Charlie feels like crying...
- Oh, oh - another problem...What's your character's plan...?
- What might happen when they try to run away from the tiger...?
- The story that we read was about a mitten that got lost. Should something get lost in our story...?
- How did the baby raccoon get lost...?
- When Annie went to the toboggan hill, she found Ralph's boots, but she didn't find her mit. What can happen when Baby Raccoon asks the rabbits for help...?
- What will happen when he asks Mr. Deer...?
- Let's try and change the problem for the bear...
- In the Bear's Toothache, the boy tried different ways to help the bear get rid of his toothache. Let's try and think of something that Kevin and Maria would do...
- In the story we read, Sarah tried lots of different ways to get her boot to fit. What are all the sneaky things she will do to stay up late in our story...?
- The problem in The Three Blairs was...What kind of interesting problem should we have in our story...?
- The bear caused lots of problems. What should the pig do in our story to cause problems...?

Completing the Plot

- At the beginning of the story, the animals were unhappy, so at the end of the story...
- How will this adventure ever end...?
- In the story about The Mit, Miss Seltzer helped Annie solve her problem...Who will help Baby Raccoon solve his problem...?
- Miss Seltzer talked to Annie and that helped her solve the problem...What might Mrs. Bear talk to Baby Raccoon about...?
- Annie was excited about finding her mit...How will Baby Raccoon feel at the end of this story...?
- How can you think of the title...?
- How can we end our story? At the end of The Three Blairs the bear went out the window. How can we make an interesting ending...?
- In the story we read, father got the machine to work by plugging it in...How can we end this story and get the machine to stop...?

Appendix I
#9

Facilitating the Recall of a Story: Number and Percentage of Researcher Categories

	Students			
	Hillary		Greg	
	No.	%	No.	%
Subcategories				
Providing General Recall Cues	22	51.2	29	39.7
Cueing Specific Elements	9	20.9	10	13.7
Modeling SMARTE Strategy	10	23.3	21	28.8
Other Cues	2	4.7	13	17.8

Appendix I
#10

Sample Protocols From
Facilitating the Recall of a Story

Modeling the SMARTE Strategy

- Spell Smarte in your head...Each letter will trigger a story part for you to tell me about...
- Let's spell the word - S-M-A... Now I'm going to start talking about the action...
- The first letter is S - it means setting. The story took place in...
- S-M-the most important idea - I think about the actions the character did - Oh ya - the most important idea is...
- S-M-A-R-the R means responses or how the characters felt. Imogene felt...in the story...
- I keep spelling the word over and over so I know what to talk about next. S-M-A- the action. The problem in the story was...

Modeling Other Recall Strategies

- Let's count the action...
- If you can't remember what the Sandman did, think of the things you do to fall asleep...
- Let's keep talking...Maybe you'll remember it later...
- Make a movie in your head of the first place that she was...
- Think back to the first action...
- I can make a picture in my head of all the different rooms the bear went - the kitchen...
- I can talk about the most important idea by thinking what the actions were about...
- Now the ending. I remember cause its like the story...

Providing General Recall Clues

Recalling a Story

- You've told me about...Now what are you going to tell me about?
- How do you remember to tell me about a story...?
- If you can't remember what to tell me about, what can you do...?

- You're smiling...You know what is next...
- What parts of a story have you talked about...?
- What word will help you remember...?
- Keep spelling Smarte in your head - What letter comes next...?
- How do we start talking about a story...?
- Think of the next letter...

Appendix I
#11

Providing Insight into Author Craft: Number and Percentage of Research Categories

	Students			
	Hillary		Greg	
	No.	%	No.	%
Subcategories				
Revelation of Character	23	31.1	15	27.3
Revelation of Tone	28	37.8	19	34.5
Revelation of Plot	23	31.1	21	38.2

Appendix I
#12

Providing Insight into Author Craft: Number and Percentage of Student Categories

	Students			
	Hillary		Greg	
	No.	%	No.	%
Subcategories				
Revelation of Character	42	33.1	17	23.6
Revelation of Tone	27	21.3	19	26.4
Revelation of Plot	28	22.0	14	19.4
Illustration Techniques	11	8.7	7	9.7
Linking Personal Knowledge	14	11.0	15	20.8

Appendix I
#13

Sample Transcript for Greg Reading Fix-It

T. Has your TV ever been broken?
S. No - the VCR has.
T. What do you do when you can't watch movies?
S. We have another VCR downstairs.
T. This is a story about a bear family. The TV is broken. So the baby bear has to think of some other things to do while the TV is being fixed. What are some other things the bear could do?
S. Go outside and play, phone a friend, play by himself with his toys, watch his dad fix-it.
T. So, there's lots of activities he could do while the TV is being fixed. Let's start to make some predictions about the story. What do we predict first?
S. setting - Where the story happens - in the bear's house and when the story takes place - I think at morning or night cause it looks like he has pyjamas on. Now - who - the bear and his family.
T. Let's leave the main idea until later. Let's go in to the problem.
S. The baby bear wants to watch TV and the TV is broken.
T. Right. That's why the title is Fix-It.
T. Let's think of all the actions they'll do to fix the TV.
S. They'll take it to a TV repair.
T. What might Baby do before they take it to the repair shop.
S. Um-
T. Wouldn't baby tell somebody first?
S. his mom or dad - They'll look at the wires or something and they can't fix the wires. They could phone the repair shop and tell the repair man to come over. The repair man will look at it, but he can't fix it.
T. Baby Bear can't watch TV. How might the baby feel?
S. Sad.
T. What about mom and dad?
S. They might feel sorry for the little bear.
T. Let's think about how the story might end.
S. They might have left the power off.
T. Possibly, what would be another reason the power is off?
S. unplugged - or - maybe they'll plug it in.
T. Let's predict the lesson.
S. If you want to watch TV, don't pull the plug.
T. Let's talk about the main idea. If we want to know the main idea, we look

at the actions. It will give us clues. Now we ask ourselves, "What are the characters trying to do?"

S. Mom and dad try to fix the TV.

T. Right. That's the important idea and that's why the author used it for his title. Let's look at these first pictures.

S. The cat is chasing the mouse. He's gonna unplug the TV.

T. Right. It didn't show the cat actually unplugging the TV, but we can see that he's running across the floor. (reads text) one morning (Oh, so my prediction was right) Emma (Oh, the author is telling me the character's name) got up early to watch TV.

T. Just by looking at the picture I can tell some more things about the setting, too. I can tell the story is probably taking place in a living room or den. That's usually where people put their TV. So, were we right about our prediction?

S. Ya, its in their living room.

T. As I'm reading, I say "OK, I've found out about the setting. Now I'm going to read the prediction about the actions." Let's read them.

T. As I'm reading, I'm going to see if I'm right.
But (If an author says but, I know he will probably tell about the problem next) the TV didn't work (so I think my prediction was right)

T. Before we read the first page, what prediction should we look at? Read and see if you are right?

S. Emma asked her mom - we don't know if the man fixed the TV.

T. What should you do?

S. Keep on reading. I guess we were right. Emma's mom couldn't fix the TV.

T. What did mom do to fix the TV?

S. turn on the switch.

T. Now where do we look.

S. The second action. (reads)

T. Read and see if you are right.

S. Emma's father tried to fix it, but he couldn't. He looked at the antenna.

T. Now where do we look.

S. I think we're gonna be right.

T. How can you tell?

S. He's on the phone. We were right. Emma's father phoned the repairman. (keeps reading) This didn't answer the prediction. Emma's father is blowing up a balloon to cheer Emma up. Keep on reading. It doesn't answer the prediction. The balloon popped.

T. What did you find out.

S. Emma's father pretended he was a horse. Emma's mom read her a story.

T. The author is telling us about the responses. How does the baby feel?
S. Sad.
T. How do you know?
S. The mom and dad are trying to cheer the baby up.
T. Do you think Emma still wants to watch TV.
S. No.
T. She's kind of learning something. If the TV is broke -
S. read a book.
T. Let's keep reading and see if we are right.
S. He solved the problem. He plugged the TV in.
T. Were we right about are prediction for the theme?
S. No - If your TV doesn't work and people are trying to fix it, just go do something else while you wait.
T. Like what?
S. read a book, play with her toys, um - get something to eat.