

UTILIZING THE NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT'S ANALYTIC WRITING
CONTINUUM AS A TEACHING TOOL TO INCREASE STUDENT
WRITING PERFORMANCE IN THE SECONDARY
LANGUAGE ARTS WRITING WORKSHOP

Presented to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University-San Marcos
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of ARTS

by

Cynthia I. Vetter, B.S.

San Marcos, Texas
August 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My heartfelt appreciation is extended to Dr. Liz Stephens for her patience, guidance, and mentoring through out this process. I am grateful for her editorial feedback and, most importantly, her friendship. She was the voice of reason and calm throughout the storm of writing this thesis.

I would like to thank the other members of my Thesis Committee, Dr. Gene Martin and Dr. Sharon O'Neal. I appreciate Dr. Martin's intelligence, vast APA knowledge, and I greatly respect him as a professional educator. Dr. O'Neal's passion regarding writing and education mirrors my own and her support of my research is invaluable.

Members of the Senior Research Team of the National Writing Project made this research possible through their support and access to the vast resources of the National Writing Project. It is my sincere hope I have maintained the level of educational excellence expected of all who are associated with the National Writing Project.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the two most important people in my life: Robert and Rick. I could not have been a professional student without your love and understanding. Thank you for putting up with me. This is not the end, but only the beginning.

This manuscript was submitted to the committee for review on July 9, 2007.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTER 1	1
Introduction.....	1
Statement of Need.....	3
Statement of the Research Question	6
Statement of Terminology	7
CHAPTER 2	9
Literature Review.....	9
Reform	9
Formative and Summative Assessment.....	10
Using a Rubric to Encourage Revision and Improve Writing Performance	14
Summary.....	15
CHAPTER 3	17
Methodology	17
Research Design	17
Collection of Quantitative Data.....	17
Collection of Qualitative Data.....	18
Sampling Procedures for the Experimental Group.....	19
Sampling Procedure for the Control Group.....	20
Experimental Treatments and Other Procedures	20
Quantitative Measures	23
Qualitative Analysis	23
Summary.....	23
CHAPTER 4.....	25
Results.....	25

Quantitative Results.....	26
Qualitative Results.....	28
CHAPTER 5	58
Discussion and Conclusion	58
Interpretations of Results for the Guiding Questions	59
Implications of Results	63
Limitations of Study	63
Recommendations for Further Research	64
REFERENCES	66

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Summary of Student Writing Performance.....	27
2. The Use of Writing in Teachers' Classrooms.....	32
3. Types of Writing.....	33
4. Teachers' Writing Instruction Strategy.....	34
5. Amount of Time Devoted to Writing Process Activities.....	35

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

More than 20 years after the National Commission on Excellence in Education determined the United States a nation “at risk,” the College Board’s Center for Innovative Thought, which was established in 2005 to identify and address critical issues in education, deemed America still “at risk.” In the preface to the Center’s publication, *Teachers and the Uncertain American Future*, Gaston Caperton, president of the College Board, emphasized the risk facing our nation extends beyond the classroom walls to encompass a lack of “American vision and leadership” regarding education (p. 5). In addition to identifying America as still “at risk,” the Center also identified teaching as a profession in crisis. New teachers leave the profession at an alarming rate. The *Harvard Education Letter* reported 20% of new public school teachers leave their positions within three years, almost 10% quit before finishing their first year, and almost 50% will leave the profession within five years (Makkonen, 2004). In the next decade, school districts will have to hire an estimated two million new teachers (The Center for Innovative Thought, 2006).

The 2002 legislation of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act demanded improvements to the American educational system so that students are prepared to enter a global economy and teachers are highly qualified to teach in their subject areas. According to Linda Darling-Hammond (2005), “a new knowledge based economy”

(p. 22) has underscored the need for intensive educational reforms including better teacher preparation and ongoing professional development to improve the quality of America's schools. Among many requirements designed to improve the teaching profession, the NCLB included standards-based reform regarding writing instruction and assessment (Caperton, 2006). In a 2005 publication of the National Writing Project, 69% of Americans polled "believe writing should be taught across all subjects and all grade levels" (p. 2) and that the teaching of writing should be an educational priority. The National Writing Project also described writing as "the currency of the new workplace and global economy" (p. 3).

In spite of being a nation "at risk" and teaching being a profession in crisis, the American public, policy makers, and educational researchers have made great strides in improving the quality of our educational system and writing instruction. According to Carroll and Wilson (1993), writing instruction prior to the early 1980's mirrored a factory or industrial model of a product-centered paradigm (p. 3). Just as factory workers of the Industrial Age were required to repeat relatively simple tasks, students were expected to master writing by repeatedly practicing the linear process of handwriting, spelling, and correct punctuation. Mastery of the parts constituted mastery of the whole. Caine and Caine (1991) noted "public education has always been tied to economic and social trends" (p. 12). As the American economy shifted from the Industrial Age to the Information Age in the 1980's, a paradigm shift in American education also began to occur. The age of information demands a work force that is flexible, takes risks, and works independently as well as collaboratively. These social and economic trends emerged in the writing research of Emig (1971), Murray (1982), Graves (1983), Calkins

(1986), and Atwell (1987). Commonly referred to as process writing, these researchers began advocating writing instruction that focused on modeling, pre-writing, drafting, student choice, sharing of writing, social interaction, conferencing, editing, mini-lessons regarding grammar, convention, structure and voice, revising, and publishing. Process writing or writing workshop is defined in a variety of ways, but one shared aspect of all definitions is that writing is a recursive and social process (Lipson, Mosenthal, Daniels & Woodside-Jiron, 2000). The National Writing Project (2005), the national leading proponent of the writing workshop approach to teaching writing, ascribes gains in student writing performance when the writing instruction is delivered using the writing workshop model. Writing assessment, particularly formative assessment, is one way to increase the recursive and social aspects of the writing workshop process. Through assessment, student writers can also learn to assess their own writing which is a critical skill for a workforce that demands independent thinking and flexibility. The writing workshop model has been utilized in America's classrooms for more than 20 years with documented success, but America's schools and their students are still failing. The documented influx of new educators combined with the massive exodus of experienced teachers has created a need to examine the implementation of the writing workshop and to reflect on these practices as one way to help teachers with the problems existing in today's educational landscape.

Statement of Need

Although many teachers claim to be process writing teachers, their assessment practices often focus on surface elements of language use, a product approach with an emphasis on error correction, often to the exclusion of content/voice. This type of

assessment fails at achieving the type of revision expected from a recursive writing process (Van DeWeghe, 2005). A study by Patthey-Chavez, Matsumura, and Valdes showed that on most student writing assignments, teachers provided no feedback regarding the writing. Researchers found that “surface level feedback” was given regarding “all edits and comments that pertained to grammar, punctuation, spelling, or format,” 58% of the time. Content-level feedback regarding “comments to delete, add information, as well as questions intended to challenge students’ thinking” combined with surface level feedback was given 34% of the time (2004, p. 467). Students who received surface level feedback improved somewhat in the area of writing conventions and students who received content level feedback improved in fluency but not elaboration or voice. A documented paradigm shift in writing instruction from repeating simple tasks to a dynamic social process has occurred. Even though writing instruction has changed from a product-oriented paradigm to a process-oriented paradigm, research indicates that changes in writing assessment have not shifted and that writing assessment primarily focuses on surface-level feedback.

Blasingame and Bushman (2005) described a multitude of struggles teachers face regarding writing assessment. A great deal of pressure comes from parents and school officials overemphasizing the importance of numerical grades. High stakes testing is another example of external pressure. State education agencies, administrators, and members of the public and private sector call for “high stakes testing as a means of demanding accountability” (p. 95) because informal or formative assessments do not provide sufficient enough proof of learning. Despite America’s paradigm shift from product to process learning, efforts for high stakes, summative testing and assessment

have continued. These summative assessments are usually externally imposed and are designed to compare schools, teachers, and students (Paris, 1998). Crone-Blevins (2002) showed that in this atmosphere, students often become concerned only about a passing grade and do not learn from the writing experience. Students perform for grades and have a lack of personal involvement and responsibility in their own education. Results from high stakes tests have little relevance to most students because no immediate opportunity exists to alter the outcome of the grade. Teachers' internal struggle between the tangible results of grades and the desire for a successful writing workshop atmosphere are often mutually exclusive. The writing workshop calls for an atmosphere of low anxiety where an emphasis is placed on personal progress, discovery, experimentation, and creativity, where as high stakes testing creates an atmosphere that "displaces more thoughtful and creative curriculum, [and] diminishes the emotional well being educators and children" (National Council of Teachers of English, p.1).

Historically, assessment has been a tool for teachers. Hunter, Mayenga, and Gambell (2006) discussed a lack of research regarding assessment. They criticized teachers' methods for writing evaluation as not reliable and valid because affective goals like initiative are amplified. They state this type of evaluation is not pedagogically or psychometrically sound. A call for more research is demanded because many types of writing assessments are "feedback" and not "feed forward" meaning that assessment is a tool for teachers, administrators, and state boards of education and not a tool for students to improve their writing. Crone-Blevins (2002) noted it is often challenging for students to separate constructive criticism regarding writing from a personal attack. Assessment

should help students become “better writers, make them want to write again, and teach them how to use writing as a learning and thinking tool” (p. 95).

Social interaction is also an essential part of the writing process, but such interaction has not typically been a part of writing assessment. Vygotsky’s (1978) social constructivist theory states that for writers to learn, they need to be engaged in social interactions that focus on writing tasks the writer cannot do alone, but can accomplish with some guidance. Vygotsky also described “psychological tools” that enable the user to manipulate or better understand the medium in which they are working. Such a tool for writing could help the writer cognitively reformulate her writing and work/write more efficiently to alter outcomes. Spandel (2006) described a carefully designed rubric as one of “the most useful instructional tools” that teachers have to guide revision (p. 19). Spandel also emphasized that rubrics can choreograph conversations about writing and provide students insight into what is good writing.

Even though sound theory-based pedagogy supports writing workshop practices, institutional implementation has been difficult, especially in regards to writing assessment. Implementation of high-stakes testing combined with the large numbers of new teachers leaving the classroom, experienced teachers retiring, and experienced teachers who were taught and trained in the product paradigm have contributed to the challenge of institutional implementation of writing workshop.

Statement of the Research Question

The purpose of this study was to determine if utilizing the National Writing Project’s Analytic Writing Continuum as a teaching tool will increase student writing

performance in the secondary Language Arts writing workshop. Two questions guided this study:

1. How do experienced classroom teachers use a rubric to guide students through the writing process?
2. What impact does using a rubric to guide students through the writing process have on student writing performance?

Statement of Terminology

The following terms were identified to clarify their use in the context of this study:

1. Formative assessments provide ongoing, diagnostic information regarding students learning and classroom curriculum. Formative assessments may be in the form of peer conferencing, teacher conferencing, and observations. This type of assessment is designed to monitor work in progress so that instructional methods can be adjusted accordingly. Feedback from formative assessment should motivate the student to revise and improve their writing (Paris, p. 189).
2. Summative assessments are usually reported as a numerical grade and are externally imposed when the work is viewed as fixed and finished (Blasingame & Bushman, p. 95).
3. A rubric is a rating scale or an “instrument to evaluate student learning that has taken place over time” (Blasingame & Bushman, p. 108). Rubrics are generally considered performance assessments made up of “. . . specific pre-established performance criteria, used in evaluating student work” (Mertler, 2001). Rubrics can be either holistic or analytic. A holistic rubric is used to evaluate the overall product as a whole and not the constituent parts. An analytic rubric is utilized

to score “. . . separate, individual parts of the product or performance first, then sums the individual scores to obtain a total score” (Mertler, 2001).

4. The 6 Trait rubric was originally developed by the Analytic Writing Assessment Committee in 1984. It included the universal writing standards of ideas, organization, voice, word choice, sentence fluency, and conventions (Spandel, 2005, p. 2). The 6 + 1 Trait rubric is an expanded version of the original rubric and includes publishing.
5. The National Writing Project’s Analytic Writing Continuum is an expanded 6 + 1 Trait rubric. The development of the expanded rubric was a National Writing Project response to the needs of local National Writing Project sites to have field-tested measures for evaluating student writing performance. Senior researchers from the National Writing Project and a panel of writing assessment authorities modified the 6 + 1 Trait rubric to meet the rigorous standards set by the National Writing Project for use in research studies.
6. Writing workshop or process writing is writing instruction that focuses on modeling, pre-writing, drafting, student choice, sharing of writing, social interaction, conferencing, editing, mini-lessons regarding grammar, convention, structure and voice, revising, and publishing. Process writing or writing workshop is defined in a variety of ways, but one shared aspect of all definitions is that writing is a recursive and social process (Lipson, Mosenthal, Daniels, & Woodside-Jiron, 2000).

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature reviewed in this study examined current research regarding writing assessment. The areas are (a) reform in writing assessment, (b) formative and summative assessment, and (c) rubric usage to encourage revision and improve writing performance. It is important to note that the studies reviewed in this chapter are qualitative in nature and there is a lack of quantitative data regarding the use of assessment as a teaching strategy to teach writing.

Reform

In a case study of four California schools, Wolf and Davinroy (1998) described writing assessment as a negative and critical experience that did little to foster revision or learning. They called for reform in writing assessment that included an emphasis on what real writers look for in their writing. This included “the role of vibrant language-the work and play of words-in children’s writing” (p. 419). They discovered when professional writers discussed their writing, they focused more on language and less on structure. Wolf and Davinroy questioned why “...we have so neglected language in our rubrics, standards, and other systems of measurement” (p. 420). They supported a fundamental change in writing rubrics from rigid, over generalized assessments to a form that celebrates student’s voice.

Atwell described “interventionist pedagogy” and a “post-process” view of writing instruction in her 1998 book *In the Middle: New Understandings About Writing, Reading, and Learning*. Her second edition book regarding the writing process and writing workshop, focused on qualities that were missing in her first book. Atwell discussed a need for a “redefinition of student responsibilities (expectations) and an emphasis on expert demonstration (apprenticeship)” (Taylor, 2000). Her new emphasis on intervention during the student’s writing process called for a more direct approach to teaching revision. This approach re-centered the teacher in the classroom as the writing expert. Similar to Vygotsky’s “tool” theory, Atwell cites Jerome Bruner in her “handover” theory of “knowledge-based teaching” where the teacher intercedes in the students writing process and the progressively provides less assistance to the student writer (p. 20).

Spandel (2005) described writing assessment as “looking within” (p. 4). Graves stated “We teach students how to read book, but not how to read their own writing. Unless we show children how to read their own writing, their work will not improve” (1994, p. xvi). Spandel elaborated on Graves’ thoughts to articulate once students are taught to how read their own writing, they can be taught to assess their writing and consequently to revise and improve their writing. She also described rubrics as a manual to writing revision (2006). Spandel’s 6-Trait writing rubric provided a common language for students and teachers to discuss writing and has been identified as a way to merge modes of authentic assessment and demands of high stakes testing (Shanley, 2004).

Formative and Summative Assessment

Writing assessment was originally described as a technology for evaluating student knowledge. One of the most widely accepted forms of student writing assessment

is the assignment of a numerical or letter grade. LaFontana (1996) described a fear of not being able to affect any learning or improvement in student writing through summative writing assessments and letter grades and that writing assessment needed improvement for both students and teachers. To more effectively engage students in their writing revision and assume more responsibility for their learning, LaFontana incorporated more formative assessments of student writing including not identifying all errors in a student draft, but merely checking on a grid the type of error the students should look for in their writing. LaFontana reported her students became more engaged in the writing process because they assumed the responsibility for identifying errors in their writing.

Hillocks (1986) discovered the primary mode teachers used to evaluate writing, summative comments, did not have much impact on student writing and revision. He also established “that students are unaware of or fail to understand evaluative criteria” (p. 168). In response to the fact that students did not respond to summative comments regarding their writing, Soles (2001) supported grading as a teaching strategy with the hope that students will “do better the next time they are given a writing assignment” (p. 122). To motivate students to revise, Soles discussed that students were more motivated to write when previous teacher comments were focused on what they wrote well. Soles also suggested a variety of ways for students to respond to the teacher’s carefully crafted, positive, and overall summative comments. However, none of the suggestions regarding summative comments included re-drafting the piece of writing. Soles did also maintain that teachers should respond to work in progress, but did not elaborate on the most effective way for teachers to provide formative assessment.

Horvath (1984) recommended that teachers should always evaluate as if they are looking at a work in progress. This encouraged formative feedback as opposed to summative feedback. Summative comments “treat a text as a finished product and the author’s writing ability as at least momentarily fixed” (p. 244). Unlike summative comments, formative feedback “treats a text as a part of an ongoing process of skills acquisition and improvement, recognizing what is being responded to is not a fixed but developing entity” (p. 244). Formative feedback measures individual growth and progress while summative evaluations measure against an ideal.

Huot (2002) suggested a quantitative score exerts more influence over students than what [teachers] can suggest about revision. He also asserted that by diminishing the negative influence of grades on the desire for students to revise their writing, more positive effects of writing evaluation, such as student learning, can be highlighted. One way Huot advocated that student learning through writing evaluation can be improved is through formative assessments instead of summative assessments. Students viewed a summative assessment or grade as fixed and their writing complete. Huot describes this type of evaluation as having “. . . no value for teaching and learning” (p. 65). To increase the opportunity for learning through assessment, Huot also suggested “. . . teaching students about the process of assessment and this means teaching them how to read and describe what they have read” (p. 78). Formative assessments are intended to help improve the learning process. This type of assessment attends to what is occurring during the writing process. Student writers then have the opportunity to address shortcomings and expand on strengths.

Stern and Solomon (2006) agreed with Huot and suggested more formative assessment and feedback is necessary for students to effectively revise their writing. Stern and Solomon conducted a comparison study of summative written comments regarding student writing made by English teachers and non-English teachers. They discovered that both groups universally addressed technical information only and ignored more global issues of organization and idea development. Stern and Solomon also noted that students were often perplexed by the feedback they did receive. They advocated an open dialogue regarding students' writing and that feedback, whether oral or written, should include “. . . compliments on inventive ideas, questions to inspire further inquiries, and evaluation on how and to what extent the goals of the assignment were achieved” (p. 26). Stern and Solomon also suggested using a carefully constructed rubric to help students identify patterns of weaknesses, errors, and strengths. By practicing selective marking, students are held responsible for finding and correcting grammatical, structural and contextual ideas themselves. Rubrics also help communicate expectations of written assignments and provide a tool for teachers when evaluating writing. Another feedback method suggested included multi-draft assignments that required students to revise draft to draft. Although Stern and Solomon supported the use of a rubric, they did not elaborate on the contents of the rubric.

The intent of writing assessment was originally to assist the teacher. Researchers discovered summative assessments held little meaning for students and did not encourage revision and the negative influence of numerical grades stunted students' desire to revise because the grade was viewed as an unchangeable entity. Formative assessments engaged the student writer and encouraged revision. Students were more likely to revise their

writing when the positive aspects of their writing were emphasized. Students also need to be taught how to evaluate their own writing to strengthen weaknesses and expand on the positive aspects of their writing. However, the research did not give examples of the best way to provide formative feed back nor did it address the most effective means of revising or re-writing a draft.

Using a Rubric to Encourage Revision and Improve Writing Performance

The rationale in Burke's 2003 *Writing Reminders*, for providing student writers with rubrics was that "Assessment should improve performance. Grades are irrelevant if students do not learn to write better" (p. 88). Burke described how rubrics provided a guideline of writing expectations for the student and teacher. He stated "Such information gives students what they need to perform well and to improve; they know for example, what questions to ask when they get stuck or must begin to write."

Wilhelm (2002) advocated the use of rubrics so that an assessment tool became a teaching tool. He suggested a rubric to help students self-monitor change in their writing and to assist the teacher in meeting the developmental needs of their students. Several other researchers have also concluded using a rubric effectively communicates desired writing outcomes for students by describing and providing examples of poor through excellent writing. Students must be carefully trained in how to use and interpret the rubric. Students used the rubric as a tool to move back and forth from the analytic scale of examples to their own writing (Wynyard & Gehrke, 1996, Stoddard & MacArthur, 1993).

Saddler and Andrade (2004) used rubrics not only to evaluate student's work, but to help students with "self-directed planning and goal setting, revising, and editing" (p. 49). Well crafted rubrics helped students identify strengths and weaknesses in their

writing and clearly articulated for students what good writing looks like. Rubrics not only help with self-assessment of writing, but with peer assessment as well. A variety of feedback including peer assessment and self-regulation regarding writing helped students consider multiple perspectives. However this research did not specify what good writing looked like.

While rubrics help guide the teacher, rubrics should also help the student to write better. A high-quality rubric should articulate for the student what good writing looks like and foster dialogue about writing between the student and teacher and the student with other students.

Summary

The Statement of Need and the Review of Literature describe how writing instruction has changed, but writing assessment has not as readily adapted to process oriented instruction. Teachers face many struggles regarding assessment, mainly the advent of high stakes testing and assessment that is often contrary to the student centered writing workshop. Researchers advocating writing assessment reform called for a change in writing rubrics from over generalized assessments to a form that celebrates student voice and what real writers look for in their work. Researchers also discussed a need for students to assume more responsibility for their writing and revision. Students must also be taught how to read and assess their own writing before they can revise it. However, researchers noted a lack of research regarding writing assessment, the most appropriate means of providing formative feedback to increase student writing performance, and how to teach students to evaluate and self monitor their writing. Teachers should minimize editorial remarks regarding surface level revision to increase student responsibility while

providing positive, content level feedback. Studies confirm the necessity for using a rubric as part of a teaching strategy, but more research is necessary to discover how to use a rubric as a tool to improve student writing performance. One possibility to address the need for formative assessment in the writing workshop setting, is the use of a rubric specifically designed to measure the prominent features of writing. Teachers who use this type of rubric as a tool for instruction to increase student writing performance could be further supported in an atmosphere of social constructivism by following protocols, participating in on-line communication, and receiving feedback from classroom observations.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Studies indicate a need for more research regarding writing assessment, the most appropriate means of providing formative feedback to increase student writing performance, and effective methods of teaching students to evaluate and self monitor their writing. Using the National Writing Project's Analytic Writing Continuum, a guided/mentored model for the rubric's use to improve student writing performance could be developed. This chapter will present (a) research design, (b) collection of quantitative data, (c) collection of qualitative data, (d) sampling procedures for the experimental group, (e) sampling procedures for the control group, (f) experimental treatment and other procedures, (g) quantitative measures, and (h) qualitative analysis.

Research Design

This was a mixed method study with quasi-experimental design and non-equivalent control groups.

Collection of Quantitative Data

Quantitative data were generated through independent scoring of pre-test and post-test student writing samples of the control and experimental groups. The pre-test and post-test student writing samples of the control and experimental groups were evaluated

at the National Writing Project's Scoring Conference in Denver, June, 2007. The discrete traits of ideas, organization, voice, sentence fluency, word choice, conventions, and a holistic score were evaluated using the National Writing Project's Analytic Writing Continuum.

Collection of Qualitative Data

Qualitative data were obtained from the teachers of the experimental group through a structured survey and Likert scale questionnaire regarding writing instruction and socio-demographic background information. The teachers were e-mailed the Writing Instruction and Background Information Survey. The purpose of this survey was to investigate how process writing occurred in their classrooms as well as how formative and summative assessment shaped revision and student writing performance. Socio-demographic information regarding the educational, work, and professional development histories of the teachers was also gathered. The experimental group teachers were also independently interviewed using a semi-structured interview process adapted from the Mississippi Writing/Thinking Institute's Teacher Interview Guide regarding instructional delivery of the Analytic Writing Continuum, how the Continuum was used to encourage revision, and about writing processes and instructional strategies in general. The researcher also conducted classroom observations of the experimental group classes using The Mississippi Writing/Thinking Institute Classroom Audit Guide to document the teachers' instructional methods regarding the Analytic Writing Continuum and the classroom procedures that produced revision in the students' writing. The experimental group teachers contributed to an online Teaching, Research, and Collaboration System [TRACS] discussion that reflected on the initial classroom audits and as a follow up to

the initial interview. The teachers participated in a Descriptive Consultancy Protocol (McDonald, Mohr, Dichter, & McDonald, 2003) to debrief regarding their experience using the Analytic Writing Continuum and discuss continued use of the Continuum beyond this study.

Sampling Procedures for the Experimental Group

The two teachers of the experimental group students have attended a Summer Institute of the Central Texas Writing Project and are Teacher Consultants for the National Writing Project. They attended the December Scoring Conference at Texas State University-San Marcos, Texas, where they learned how to use the Analytic Writing Continuum, and agreed to participate in additional treatment. The December Scoring Conference training regarding the use of the National Writing Project's Analytic Writing Continuum was only available to Teacher Consultants of the National Writing Project.

Teacher A taught 159 12th grade students, 61 of which were in English IV Dual Credit, and 98 were in regular academic English IV. Most of the 98 students in academic English IV were designated "at risk" based on district criteria. Teacher B taught 98 students all of whom were designated "at risk". Teacher B taught a combination of English I, English II, and English III in the alternative high school of choice at the same school district as teacher A. There were 22 English I students, 29 English II students, and 47 English III students. The total number of students in the entire experimental group was 257. The district served a rural and suburban population and had an enrollment of 11,881 students. The district's student population was 54% Hispanic, 42% Anglo, and 4% African American.

Sampling Procedures for the Control Group

The three teachers of the control group students were from the same school district as the teachers in the experimental group and taught at the same school as Teacher A. They taught similar grade and subject level classes and had a beginning sample size of 269 students. There were 55 Dual Credit seniors, 110 English IV students, 58 English III students, 32 English II students, and 14 English I students. All of the students from the control and experimental groups who submitted signed informed consent letters from their parents participated in the study. The Texas State Internal Review Board deemed this research project exempt from full review and only required informed consent.

Experimental Treatments and Other Procedures

December Scoring Conference

On December 7-9, 2006, 30 National Writing Project Teacher Consultants from Texas attended a Scoring Conference held at Texas State University-San Marcos, Texas. Sherry Swain, Ph.D., Senior Research Associate, National Writing Project, and Paul LeMahieu, Ph.D., Director of Research and Evaluation, National Writing Project, trained attendees in the use of the National Writing Project's Analytic Writing Continuum. The Continuum is an expanded 6+1 Trait rubric. The development of the expanded rubric was a National Writing Project response to the needs of local National Writing Project sites to have field-tested measures for evaluating student writing performance. Senior researchers from the National Writing Project and a panel of writing assessment authorities modified the 6 + 1 Trait rubric to meet the rigorous standards set by the National Writing Project for use in research studies.

Pre-test and post-test writing samples

The experimental and control group students' pre-test writing prompts were administered December 6 through December 8, 2006, and samples were collected on December 8, 2006. The pre-test and post-test writing prompts were selected by Paul LeMahieu, Ph.D., Director of Research and Evaluation, National Writing Project, from the National Writing Project's archive of prompts approved for the standards of research. Two prompts were used. The pre-test for the experimental group was the post-test for the control group; the pre-test for the control group was the post test for the experimental group. The post-test was administered on April 2 through April 6, 2007, and collected on April 11, 2007.

December, 2006

Participation approval for the school district involved in the study was received at the beginning of December, 2006, and students returned signed consent forms on December 5, 2006. Pre-test writing samples were administered to the control and experimental groups December 6, 2006, through December 8, 2006, and collected on December 8, 2006. The Scoring Conference was held at Texas State on December 8-10. Teacher B implemented the Analytic Writing Continuum upon returning to school after the Scoring Conference.

January, 2007

Teacher A introduced the Analytic Writing Continuum as a rubric to formatively evaluate students' writing.. Both experimental group teachers were emailed the Writing Instruction and Background Information Survey.

February, 2007

Teacher A was interviewed on February 1, by the researcher using the semi-structured Mississippi Writing/Thinking Institute's Teacher Interview Guide. On February 2, Teacher B was interviewed by the same process. A 90 minute classroom observation of Teacher B's classes was also conducted using The Mississippi Writing/Thinking Institute Classroom Audit Guide. On February 5, a 50 minute observation of Teacher A's classroom was conducted using the same Classroom Audit Guide. On February 16 through February 23, both teachers completed an online TRACS discussion regarding the initial interview and initial observation.

March, 2007

March 7, a 50 minute classroom observation using the Classroom Audit Guide was completed of Teacher B's classes. March 8, a 90 minute classroom observation was completed of Teacher A's classes. On March 14, both teachers participated in a Descriptive Consultancy Protocol (McDonald, Mohr, Dichter, & McDonald, 2003) to debrief regarding their experience using the Analytic Writing Continuum and discussed continued use of the Continuum past the conclusion of this study. The intent of the Descriptive Consultancy Protocol is to assist participants in thinking through a problem by analyzing it themselves and then listening to how others analyze the same problem.

April, 2007

Post-test writing prompts were administered to the control and experimental groups April 2, 2007, through April 6, 2007, and the samples collected on April 11, 2007.

Quantitative Measures

A t value was calculated for the pre/post test writing samples of the discrete traits of ideas, organization, voice, sentence fluency, word choice, conventions, and the holistic score. The differences between the experimental and control group were compared as well as the differences between the classes of the experimental group teachers.

Qualitative Analysis

The qualitative analysis identified recurring themes in the teachers' responses to the survey, interview, protocol, and classroom observations. The classroom observations, the interviews, and the discussions during the protocol were transcribed and analyzed to discover themes and patterns.

Summary

This was a mixed method study with quasi-experimental design and non-equivalent control groups. Quantitative data were generated through independent scoring of pre-test and post-test student writing samples of the control and experimental groups and a t was calculated for the pre/post writing samples. Qualitative data were obtained from the teachers of the experimental group through a structured survey and Likert scale questionnaire regarding writing instruction and socio-demographic background information. Classroom observations, an online discussion, and a protocol were also conducted. The two teachers of the experimental group students have attended a Summer Institute of the Central Texas Writing Project and are Teacher Consultants for the National Writing Project. They also attended the December Scoring Conference at Texas State University-San Marcos, Texas, where they learned how to use the Analytic Writing Continuum, and agreed to participate in additional treatment. The teachers from the

control group were from the same school district as the teachers in the experimental group. The information gathered from this study can hopefully be used to develop a guided/mentored model for using the National Writing Project's Analytic Writing Continuum.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine if utilizing the National Writing Project's Analytic Writing Continuum as a teaching tool will increase student writing performance in the secondary Language Arts writing workshop. Two questions guided this study:

1. How do experienced classroom teachers use a rubric to guide students through the writing process?
2. What impact does using a rubric to guide students through the writing process have on student writing performance?

This chapter will report the quantitative and qualitative results of this study as well as a description of the methodology.

Both quantitative and qualitative results were used in this study. Quantitative results are reported as a summary of student writing performance based on the calculation of a t value at a 90% confidence interval for the pre/post test student writing samples for the discrete writing traits of ideas, organization, voice, sentence fluency, word choice, conventions, and a holistic score. Qualitative results regarding the content analysis of the transcribed survey, interviews, observations, and protocol are reported as descriptions of the problems investigated in chronological order.

Quantitative Results

Summary of Student Writing Performance

At the beginning of this study, there were 159 students in Teacher A's classes, 98 students in Teacher B's classes for a total of 257 students in the experimental group, and 256 students in the control group. All three groups had writing samples removed from the study because the signed parental consent form was missing or part of the pre/post-test writing sample pair was missing. Coding errors and data entry errors further eliminated writing samples from the data analysis. The overall experimental group included 95 pre/post writing sample pairs from Teacher A's classes; 45 of the sample pairs were from English IV Dual Credit students, and 50 were from English IV students. There were 18 pre/post-writing sample pairs from Teacher B's classes that included 7 English I samples, 6 English II samples, and 5 English III samples. There were 110 sample pairs of writing from the control group classes that included 6 English I samples, 10 English II samples, 5 English III samples, 49 English IV samples, and 43 Dual Credit samples.

Control Group.

The control group students exhibited an increase in writing performance from the pre-test writing sample to the post-test writing sample in the areas of structure and stance, but not at a statistically significant level. The control group students demonstrated a decrease in writing performance from the pre-test writing sample to the post-test writing sample regarding the discrete traits of content, sentence fluency, diction, conventions, and the holistic score (see Table 1).

Experimental Group Teacher A.

Teacher A's students showed improvement for everyone of the measured attributes. Statistically significant differences occurred in the areas of content, structure, stance, sentence fluency, and the holistic score (see Table 1).

Experimental Group Teacher B.

Teacher B's students improved writing performance in the attributes of content, structure, stance, sentence fluency, diction, and the holistic score, but not at a statistically significant level. Teacher B's students had unfavorable results in the discrete trait of conventions, but not at a statistically significant level (see Table 1).

Combined Experimental Group

The combined experimental group showed improvement across all measured traits, with the performance increase in the areas of structure, stance, and the holistic score being at a statistically significant level (see Table 1).

Table 1 Summary of Student Writing Performance

	Content	Structure	Stance	Sentence Fluency	Diction	Conventions	Holistic
Control Group	▼	▲	▲	▼	▼	▼	▼
Experimental Group A	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
Experimental Group B	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▼	▲
Combined Experimental Group	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

Symbols

Favorable Results- Significant	▲
Favorable Results- Not Significant	▲
No Difference	O
Unfavorable Results- Not Significant	▼
Unfavorable Results- Significant	▼

The control group students showed improvement in their writing from the pre-test to the post test in the areas of structure and stance, but not at a statistically significant level. The control group students showed a decrease in performance in the areas of content, sentence fluency, diction, conventions, and the holistic score, but not at a statistically significant level. The combined experimental group students had an increase across all measured traits, with the performance increase in the areas of structure, stance, and the holistic score being at a statistically significant level.

Qualitative Results

Writing Instruction Survey and Background Information

Experimental Group Teacher A.

The survey revealed that Teacher A received a Bachelor of Art in English with a minor in Mass Communication from the University of Texas Pan American, and a Master of Arts in English from Southwest Texas State University. Teacher A has taught for a total of 24 years, the last seven in the current district. Teacher A is certified to teach Secondary English, Reading, and Journalism with provisional lifetime teaching certificates. Teacher A is not National Board Certified.

Teacher A listed the Central Texas Writing Project Summer Institute, Central Texas Writing Project school in-service, Jane Schaefer Writing Program, and TAKS training as professional development experiences. Teacher A described the Central Texas Writing Project Summer Institute as “the most comprehensive professional development I have been through,” where “strategies already perfected by classroom teachers” were presented.

Teacher A described her goal for teaching writing as “. . . helping students find ways they can demonstrate their competencies rather than measuring students against a predetermined set of skills.” Teacher A perceived their students as creative and was impressed by the ability of academically low performing students who could demonstrate understanding of a concept with less traditional assignments such as writing a play or a song.

Teacher A described herself as a writer.

In reference to receiving professional development, Teacher A cited the lack of money as one of the biggest road blocks to attending professional development. Teacher A also wrote that school administration only supports professional development when it is possible higher standardized test scores will be achieved.

When students developed a major writing assignment, Teacher A discussed the assignment in class, provided choice within the assignment, allowed the students to work on the assignment over time, gave opportunities to write in class, conferenced with individual students, provided opportunities for revision, used examples of finished products as models, discussed and analyzed those models, gave students opportunities for feedback on drafts, provided some instruction how to respond to those drafts, and allotted time for editing and proofreading of those drafts before they were submitted.

When Teacher A responded to drafts of student writing, she said that she wrote comments in the margins or at the end, offered students specific written suggestions for revision, provided comments and a grade, used editing symbols and abbreviations, and conferenced with individual students. In a final piece of student writing, Teacher A wrote

comments in the margins or at the end, provided comments and a grade, and used editing symbols and abbreviations.

When Teacher A informally addressed student errors in writing, she did mini-lessons on common errors, conferenced with individual students, used sample student papers to address errors, taught grammar, and/or used a grammar book, and used a student checklist. During formal evaluation of student writing, Teacher A identified every error, did mini-lessons on common errors, and used sample student papers to address errors.

Teacher A shared student writing through published pieces, conducted read arounds, displayed writing, and scheduled author's chair time. Teacher A did not use websites or online conference boards.

Experimental Group Teacher B.

Teacher B has a Bachelor of fine Arts in Drama Education with a Minor in English from the University of Texas. Teacher B has taught for 17 years with the last five years taught in the current district. Teacher B is not Nationally Board Certified.

Teacher B listed the Central Texas Writing Project Summer Institute, Region 13 training, and the Writer's League of Texas as professional development experience. As a result of professional development, Teacher B views writing as "a craft to be developed, honed and polished rather than a multifaceted activity that some students just seem to be able to do better than others because of some innate ability." Teacher B described all of their students as writers and referred to the December Scoring Conference at Texas State as an experience that "made me feel more positive about teaching to the different writing

needs of my students because of the specificity the Analytic Writing Continuum provides.”

Teacher B described herself as a writer.

Teacher B wrote “money is always a problem” when trying to attend professional development even though administration supports any effort that might improve students writing.

When students developed a major writing assignment, Teacher B discussed the assignment in class, provided choice within the assignment, allowed the students to work on the assignment over time, gave opportunities to write in class, conferenced with individual students, provided opportunities for revision, used examples of finished products as models, discussed and analyzed those models, gave students opportunities for feedback on drafts, provided some instruction how to respond to those drafts, and allotted time for editing and proofreading of those drafts before they were submitted.

When Teacher B responded to drafts of student writing, she wrote comments in the margins or at the end, offered students specific written suggestions for revision, provided comments and a grade, used editing symbols and abbreviations, put comments on a response form, and conferenced with individual students. In a final piece of student writing, Teacher B wrote comments in the margins or at the end, offered students specific written suggestions for revision, provided comments and a grade, used editing symbols and abbreviations, and conferenced with individual students.

When Teacher B informally addressed student errors in writing, she identified every error, did mini-lessons on common errors, conferenced with individual students, used sample student papers to address errors, taught grammar, and/or used a grammar

book, and used a student checklist. During formal evaluation of student writing, Teacher B conferenced with individual students.

Teacher B shared student writing through published pieces, conducted read arounds, displayed writing, and scheduled author's chair time. Teacher A did not use websites or online conference boards.

To measure differences in teacher practices when teaching writing, a Likert scale was used. The following results were found regarding the use of writing in the teachers' classroom (see Table 2):

Table 2 The Use of Writing in Teachers' Classrooms

	No Confidence 1	2	3	4	Very Confident 5
How confident do you feel about using writing in your grade/subject area?					Teacher A Teacher B

	Never 1	2	3	4	Daily 5
How often do you use writing in class? (This does not include copying or taking notes.)					Teacher A Teacher B

The following results were found regarding the types of writing students did in class (see Table 3):

Table 3 Types of Writing

	Never 1	2	3	4	Very Frequently 5
Quick writes/ Free writes					Teacher A Teacher B
Constructed Responses					Teacher A Teacher B
Point of View Writing			Teacher B	Teacher A	
Dialogues/Plays		Teacher A	Teacher B		
Poetry				Teacher A	Teacher B
Personal Narratives			Teacher A	Teacher B	
Stories		Teacher A		Teacher B	
Essays				Teacher A Teacher B	
Book Reports		Teacher B	Teacher A		
Research Papers/Projects				Teacher A Teacher B	
Reading Response Journals			Teacher A		Teacher B
Learning Logs/Classroom Notes			Teacher B	Teacher A	
Personal Journals		Teacher A			Teacher B
Letters		Teacher A	Teacher B		
Editorials		Teacher A Teacher B			
Summaries			Teacher A		Teacher B
Interviews		Teacher A Teacher B			
Magazine Ads/ Cartoons	Teacher A		Teacher B		

The following results were found regarding the teachers' writing instruction strategies (see Table 4):

Table 4 Teachers' Writing Instruction Strategy

	Never 1	2	3	4	Very Frequently 5
Graphic Organizers			Teacher A		Teacher B
Writer's Notebooks		Teacher A	Teacher B		
Word Walls/Word Banks	Teacher B		Teacher A		
Word Building Activities				Teacher A Teacher B	
Sentence Combining/ Sentence Building					Teacher A Teacher B
Mini-lessons				Teacher A	Teacher B
Modeling				Teacher A	Teacher B
Student-Teacher Conferences			Teacher A	Teacher B	
Scoring Guides				Teacher A	Teacher B
Portfolios		Teacher A	Teacher B		
Daily Oral Language				Teacher B	Teacher A
Literature Circles			Teacher A Teacher B		

The following results were found regarding the amount of time devoted to writing process activities (see Table 5):

Table 5 Amount of Time Devoted to Writing Process Activities

	Never 1	2	3	4	Very Frequently 5
Prewriting					Teacher A Teacher B
Drafting					Teacher A Teacher B
Peer Responding			Teacher A	Teacher B	
Revision				Teacher B	Teacher A
Editing					Teacher A Teacher B
Publishing				Teacher A Teacher B	

Teacher Interview Guide

Experimental Group Teacher A.

During the Teacher Interview, Teacher A discussed how she typically taught a piece of writing from beginning to end. Teacher A mentioned showing their students previous student examples, brainstorming, using a timeline, drafting, peer editing, turning in a draft for teacher comments, and a final draft. When Teacher A was asked what decisions she made during a writing assignment, she responded “Helping them correct run-on sentences, fragments, splices, and strengthening introductions and conclusions. They knew what they wanted to say, but were having a hard time. They struggled with completions across the board, mechanics were poor.” At the time of this interview, Teacher A had not introduced the Analytic Writing Continuum to her classes; therefore, writing instruction had not changed as a result of the Analytic Writing Continuum.

At the beginning of the school year, Teacher A's students might take up to three weeks to complete a writing assignment, but at the end of the year it would take 1 week. When asked what were the different reasons students write, Teacher A responded "They write the college application because they are motivated to get into a certain university. They sometimes write to express themselves in an emotional situation, like if they are mad at somebody. Or if they are frustrated by something. And quite a few high school students write poetry and a few write fiction because they like to write, but they rarely share it. For them there is a big difference between what they write for school and what they write for pleasure."

When asked about giving students feedback regarding their writing during the writing process, Teacher A stated "Early in the year, I correct a lot of mistakes for them. And I make comments in the margins. If I see a major need, I'll set up a student conference. As the year progresses, I try to get them to recognize their own mistakes and correct them themselves. So instead of marking the mistake, I just mark the line and they have to figure it out themselves. That puts more of the responsibility on them, but they can't do that at the beginning of the year."

When discussing summative feedback on a completed writing assignment, Teacher A mentioned placing the grade at the end of the paper with the hope that their students read the written comments throughout the paper before viewing the grade.

Teacher A provided grammar instruction through Daily Oral Language every day that included one grammar sentence, one vocabulary sentence, a short writing prompt, and a quiz every Friday. Teacher A described her students' progression in grammar as "amazing" and that the Daily Oral Language "... is one of the best, if not the best things,

I have done in my classroom.” Teacher A attributes this success to teaching grammar in small segments and not big units, but admits “But I’m sure I was guilty of that in my early teaching years.” Teacher A also described progress in Daily Oral Language as she knew her students are improving as writers “. . . because at the beginning of the year when I put a sentence on the board it takes much longer to find three mistakes. In May, I can put a sentence on the board with 7 or 10 mistakes, they can correct it easier and quicker. I can watch that progression. It’s very obvious. In their writing, it’s harder to track improvement in content than mechanics. In mechanics you can literally see the improvement.”

Teacher A stated that 25-49 % of class time each week was dedicated to writing process activities, and that time is equally divided between large group, small group, and individual activities.

Student writing deficiencies dictated grammar instruction in Teacher A’s classroom. When a set of essays are turned in, Teacher A tabulates 3 or 4 errors common to all papers. When the essays are handed back, Teacher A reminds the students of ways to avoid those mistakes in future writing assignments.

To make connections between reading and writing, Teacher A had the students relate classical literature to modern day life through writing assignments where parallels are made between the novel and current events.

Experimental Group Teacher B.

During the Teacher Interview, Teacher B discussed how she typically teaches a piece of writing from beginning to end. Teacher B mentioned showing her students previous student examples, using graphic organizers like Venn Diagrams, brainstorming,

pre-writing, showing more examples, drafting, peer editing, conferencing, revision, peer editing, and writing a final draft. When Teacher B was asked what decisions she made during a writing assignment, she responded that she works with students individually concerning phrasing, word choice, and specifically diction and connotation. Teacher B emphasized that word choice was one of the key factors in writers clearly expressing themselves. At the time of this interview, Teacher B had introduced the Analytic Writing Continuum to her classes, and believed writing instruction had changed as a result of the Analytic Writing Continuum. Teacher B introduced the discreet traits of the Analytic Writing Continuum by having the students practice scoring and used individual conferencing to discuss the traits as they applied to individual student's writing. Teacher B had used this same process prior to the Analytic Writing Continuum using the 6 + 1 Trait rubric as a guideline. Teacher B stated their goal was to get students to identify where they would score on the Continuum and identify the strengths and weaknesses of their writing. Teacher B noted her writing instruction had changed due to incorporating the Analytic Writing Continuum in her instruction. When asked how the instruction had changed, Teacher B stated "I don't have to bore them. They can write a sentence. I think it gives you more freedom to teach to a multiple level class which is what I've got. It allows me to teach the students at the level they are at. I don't have to drag some of them down. I think it helps me differentiate my instruction and teach appropriate mini-lessons." Teacher B also mentioned that it would take a long time for the students to fully internalize the Analytic Writing Continuum and hopes the students "...see it's a process and that it all goes together." Teacher B also intended to make a wall reference chart of the Analytic Writing Continuum. Teacher B articulated that the Analytic Writing

Continuum helped students move through the writing process because “It’s so specific and makes it so much easier to give them feedback about what they are doing. It’s really kind of freeing...It just makes it a lot easier to sort things out in my own head so that I can be real specific when I give feedback to that student. I’m a lot less general than I used to be and that’s good.”

Throughout the entire school year, Teacher B’s students usually take 6 weeks to finish a writing assignment. When asked what were the different reasons students write, Teacher B responded “They generally write because they have to. They know they have to have a grade. I try to get them to understand that writing is a life skill; it’s not something you just do for class. It’s something you’ll do for the rest of your lives. I try to put it on a practical level and then I tell them it is extremely emotionally healthy.”

Teacher B also wanted their students to participate in a variety of creative writing assignment including interviews and recipe writing as a way to describe people. When referring to these creative writing assignments, Teacher B emphasized the jargon associated with different types of writing genres.

When Teacher B was asked about strategies used to help students improve writing, she answered, “I sit with them one on one and ask them what they think what they need to do with it. I try not to be too negative; I think in the past I was more focused on the negative aspects of student writing.....I did more of the thinking for them. I would tell them what to do and now I try not to do that. I try to allow them to think on their own and fix the problem the way they think it can be fixed.” Teacher B also used this conferencing strategy when giving students feedback during the writing process. Teacher B also made

use of checklists, peer editing, and self evaluation as ways to provide students with feedback during the writing process.

When discussing summative feedback on a completed writing assignment, Teacher B stated “I do that usually on Fridays and I’ll have music on. I use music a lot. And then I will take students to my desk and take out the Analytic Writing Continuum and show them where I think they are in the process and I’ll show them things in their papers to explain why they got a certain grade. And we’ll talk about what maybe they could do next time. And if there is a problem that is re-occurring, I’ll make sure to point that out.”

Teacher B discussed providing grammar instruction through mini-lessons that related to the errors discovered through the various conferencing and editing activities. Teacher B also looked for grammar specific examples in literature the students were reading. Teacher B stated that grammar “. . . isn’t always fun, but they can’t always use a computer with grammar check [option].”

Teacher B stated that 50-74 % of class time each week was dedicated to writing process activities, and that time is equally divided between large group, small group, and individual activities.

When asked “How do you know your students are improving as writers?” Teacher B said “Because I can understand what they write. I’ll go ‘Yippee, I got that!’ They’ll put a little bit more energy into writing and begin to think in originality. It’s that coupled with the expansion of sentences, description, and voice.”

Teacher B used student writing to measure student thinking.

To make connections between reading and writing, Teacher B tried to find an emotional hook in the literature to engage the students in writing.

First Classroom Audit

Experimental Group Teacher A.

The researcher observed Teacher A's regular senior English IV class on February 5, 2007 from 9:45 to 10:35. Nineteen students were present which included 8 boys and 11 girls. Six people were absent from the class. The researcher arrived during the passing period and sat in the back of the classroom. The students' desks were arranged in straight rows facing the front of the classroom, the teacher's desk, and the overhead projector. There was a textbook and a dictionary in the basket under each student's desk. Student artwork was located on the bulletin board inside the classroom and included hand drawn depictions of the school's mascot intertwined with basketballs. Outside the classroom door were literary timelines of the students' lives composed of words and pictures cut out of magazines. The classroom was decorated with purchased Shakespeare and Chaucer posters, framed horse prints, framed tiger prints, a proof mark poster, scattered pots of sunflowers, and curtains made of material covered with sunflowers.

The students came into the class quietly and sat down and were permitted to sit where they wanted to. The teacher took roll and explained the class was being observed as part of the study regarding the Analytic Writing Continuum. The students began class by completing the Daily Oral Language assignment on the board which included correcting sentence punctuation and spelling. The students also defined the word "couplet." The teacher asked for volunteers to call out the sentence corrections and

vocabulary definitions. The Daily Oral Language activity was completed in about 7 minutes.

The teacher then reminded the students of the poetry project they were working on and reviewed the due dates of the project. The teacher then introduced the day's lesson. The teacher guided the students through writing a poem in the following format: line 1 was a prepositional phrase for the title, line 2 was a present participle, line 3 was a simile, line 4 was an allusion, line 5 was a present participle, line 6 was a simile, line 7 was a repetition of sound, line 8 was a juxtaposition, line 9 was a simile, and line 10 was an image. The teacher wrote on the overhead projector during the lesson.

The teacher gave a mini-lesson regarding prepositional phrases which included asking students for examples of and giving examples of prepositional phrases. The teacher gave an example of the prepositional phrase/title of the poem they were writing with the students. The students were called on to read the prepositional phrase from their poems. For each one of the different lines of the poem, the teacher wrote an example for the students and asked selected students to share what they had written. Some students volunteered. The teacher asked clarifying questions of the students when they read the lines of their poems out loud such as "What kind of blue?" and "To what degree was the sound?" All of the students listened to the instructions the teacher gave and all students were writing at the appropriate time. After all the lines of the poem had been worked through, the teacher read another poem they had written that followed the same format and pointed out the spacing and capitalization choices made for the poem. The teacher instructed the students to rewrite the drafts of their poems for homework and consider

their own spelling and capitalization choices. The bell rang that signaled the end of the class and the students left.

Experimental Group Teacher B.

The researcher observed Teacher B's class of junior English III at the alternative school from 1:20 to 2:40 on February 2, 2007. Fifteen students were present, 4 boys and 11 girls. The researcher arrived during the passing period prior to the beginning of class and sat in the back of the classroom. When the bell rang to begin class, many students were not sitting down and 3 students came to class from 1 minute to 5 minutes late.

The teacher's desk was near the back of the classroom, close to the door. The students' desks were in two perpendicular groups that faced the overhead projector. The classroom was decorated with purchased motivational posters about attending skills and body language, literature posters, a Buell motorcycle poster, framed Southwestern prints, Southwestern metal sculptures, silk plants and flowers, small lamps, native American bowls, African masks and carvings, book jackets, and one wall was painted a graduated blue. Bookshelves lined two walls, one with student text books, and one with the teacher's professional library. No student work was posted, but there were stacks of student posters to be graded. The posters were a combination of writing about personal independence and art exemplifying independence.

The class began by the teacher asking the students to recall the previous work they had done writing maxims. The teacher placed a student drawn cartoon with the theme of embarrassment on the overhead projector. The students then free wrote for about 5 minutes about an embarrassing moment in their lives. The teacher walked around

the classroom while the students were writing and if the students weren't writing, the teacher prompted them to write by asking questions.

At the conclusion of the free writing, the teacher led a discussion of what was occurring in the cartoon. The students volunteered to read what they had written. More students volunteered than were allowed to read. The teacher then lead a debriefing of the student's writing experience by asking the students to examine how many short sentences and how many long sentences they had written. The students then looked at the trait of sentence fluency on the Analytic Writing Continuum. The students took turns reading aloud the trait scores from their own copies of the Continuum. The teacher then discussed how short sentences sound one way and long sentences sound another.

The students then looked at a second cartoon about eating liver. The students then free wrote about something they didn't like, but they could only write using simple sentences. After about 5 minutes of writing, the students volunteered to read what they wrote. The teacher also asked them what the experience was like writing only simple sentences. The students responded with comments like "I had to leave a bunch of stuff out," "It sounds babyish," and "That was hard." The students also mentioned being conscious of their thoughts, but not conscious of their sentence structure.

For the students' next assignment, they worked in established groups of 3 on combining a set of simple sentences on the overhead projector into compound or complex sentences. Each group took turns reading the sentences out loud. The teacher then pointed out that the students could construct or deconstruct sentences in their own writing to increase sentence fluency.

The teacher then conducted a mini-lesson of how to expand sentences using correlative conjunctions such as either/or and not only/but also. The students continued to work in groups and expanded 8 simple sentences on the overhead projector using correlative conjunctions to create a story. The groups took turns reading their stories once they completed the assignment.

All the students listened when the teacher was talking and worked with their peers during the group work. During both group work activities, the teacher walked around and monitored the students' progress on the assignment. The bell rang and the students left.

TRACS Discussion

On February 16, 2007, the researcher posted online questions on the Texas State University's TRAC site for project use. The Experimental Group teachers were e-mailed instructions on how to log on to TRACS and participate in an online discussion. The following questions were asked:

1. How are you going to share the Analytic Writing Continuum with your students? Something similar to what we did at the scoring conference? (Sharing student writing examples at different scores and practicing evaluating writing using the Continuum?) Or something different? Maybe using age appropriate literature as examples of the traits? Make an extension of their prior knowledge?
2. Do you have a lesson or strategy you feel you teach exceptionally well regarding Content, Structure, Voice, Sentence Fluency, or Diction? What does the lesson entail?
3. In Teacher A's interview, she said "In their writing, it's harder to track improvement in content than mechanics." Teacher B—Do you agree with Teacher

A's statement? To both teachers: How can we show students ways to improve the content of their writing?

Experimental Group Teacher A.

Teacher A responded with the following answers:

1. The first thing I did with my advanced classes was have them create a quick continuum of their own. I asked them to list five to eight elements which they thought a writer has to consider in order to create a valid piece of writing. I was both surprised and impressed with how close their lists were to the NWP continuum categories. They understood the concepts quite well. I believe these upper-level students understand what effective writing samples should include even if they are not yet able to create them. Next, I gave them a copy of the positive side of the NWP continuum and asked them to compare it to their own list. We discussed the specifics under each category. Then I asked them to keep it in mind as they wrote their next essay. I plan to give them their own essays from the first semester to rate using the continuum and then their recent essays. One of my goals is for them to recognize the areas where they are improving and those where they are not. This will not only require them to become very familiar with the continuum but also analyze their own writing with specific elements in mind.
2. One of the things I have them do is create a variety of sentences based on graphic patterns which I provide. For example, I will tell them that a straight line represents an independent clause and a wavy line represents a subordinate clause. We discuss when punctuation is needed to separate the two. I will then instruct them to write a sentence to match a pattern I provide. One pattern might be a

wavy line followed by a straight line. When they write this sentence, a comma would be needed (as with this sentence) between the two different lines representing two different clauses. The patterns become more and more complicated. Then I will ask them to go back to one their own essays and put the lines under their own clauses. This will allow them to see if they are using the same type sentences repeatedly or if they are using a variety of sentence types. Obviously, students must be able to identify subjects, verbs, conjunctions (both coordinating and subordinating), and clauses to do this exercise. This should be simple review for high school students, but all too often it is not. This is a lesson that sometimes requires quite a bit of time and instruction before students are able to do it, but it does help them with sentence structure and variety.

3. I think the best way to show students how to improve content is by sharing many examples, both effective and not, on the same topic. It is very difficult to help students recognize the levels of content if the subject matter is too diverse. Students need the continuity of a single topic before they can make comparisons of discourse on that topic. This means that the more student samples I can use on one topic, the better. I like to have students track their own improvement in content over the course of the year, but this is sometimes difficult regarding content because one topic might generate a stronger response from an individual student than another topic. They tend to think it was the topic rather than their approach to it that made the writing effective or not. I also think that a good old-fashioned outline created both before and after they write is a good way to pinpoint weaknesses in content, specifically in organization. Unfortunately, most

of my senior students do not have much experience in outlining. I find myself having to teach the basics of outlining before they can create one.

Experimental Group Teacher B.

Teacher B responded with the following answers:

1. I think for my students giving them a chance to score student essays with the Continuum would be the best way for them to understand what each of the elements should look and sound like. After it they can score essays fairly consistently, I will introduce examples of literature for each of the traits and have them imitate the writing. I will also insert grammar lessons when appropriate. I plan to use *Image Grammar*, by Harry Noden, and use the painting images /brush strokes approach. There is also a companion book entitled, *Image Grammar Activity Book*, that is helpful. I have also thought of having the students take the essays they have scored with the Continuum and deconstruct them using the traits.
2. I like to teach connotation. One of my favorite activities is to first teach the difference between denotation and connotation, and then give the students a list of words with two synonyms to rate positive, negative and neutral. For example: official, statesman and politician. Next we look at a short article that relates the same story with each having different tone. I model the process of determining tone, thinking aloud as I read. I underline what I call the "tone words." I ask the students what they think the tone (positive, negative, neutral) of the article is based on the words I have underlined; they are always correct. The students do the next two versions by themselves and 90% of the time they are right. Using a tone sheet with categories of positive, negative, and neutral words, I give them a

writing prompt and ask them to respond with a positive, negative, or neutral tone. They must look at whatever category they choose and pick a word that describes more specifically the tone they wish to create. Once they pick the word, they respond to the prompt. The prompt, 'You are in a white room. You have no idea how you got there. There are no windows and no doors. You have no idea when or if you will get out. Write about what you would be thinking and feeling; write a minimum of one page. Be sure you keep your tone word in mind as we should be able to guess your tone word based on the word choices you make.' The students write for twenty minutes. As a student shares his/her writing, the rest of us are writing down every tone word we hear; I'm writing on the overhead. When the student finishes, we look at the tone words we wrote down and guess his tone word. The students really enjoy it and I've never had a student refuse to read what they wrote. I'm always surprised at what they write and so are they!

3. Yes, I agree it is harder to track improvement in content. I think that this may be due to the maturity of the students. It is hard to get them to think outside the box and write in new ways which would, in turn, require them to write the content in a different way. My juniors are doing a varied genre project and must use genres they have never used before to satisfy the requirements of the project and they are not happy. It should be interesting to see how the content changes and if it improves. I want them to see how the type of genre they choose impacts the writing. This is one way I attempt to get them to think about content and how they can use genre selection to help them develop more meaningful content in their writing by forcing them to think on deeper level.

*Second Classroom Audit**Experimental Group Teacher A.*

The researcher observed Teacher A's class of senior Dual Credit English on March 9, 2007 from 8:00 am to 9:20 am. 9 students were present for class; 5 students were tardy, with 1 student 15 minutes late.

The classroom was set up the same as the previous observation, but student poetry projects and "I am" poems had been put up on the inside walls and in the hallway outside the classroom. Assignments for Academic and Dual Credit Classes were written on the left side dry erase board.

The teacher handed out copies of the Analytic Writing Continuum and reviewed the trait of content, score 3, by reading the qualities to the students. The teacher assigned students to work in partners. The students had drafts of a paper they had written about the conflict and central idea in the novel *Frankenstein*. Each student had two copies of their papers; one they read aloud and the other they gave to their partners.

The students read their draft out loud while their partner read the second copy and marked on the Analytic Writing Continuum the score for each trait. Of the 5 groups, 2 followed the instructions and read their drafts out loud. The other 3 groups switched papers and read silently.

During part of this time, the teacher was not in the classroom. The teacher next door was absent and no substitute had been assigned to the class. Teacher A was with that class for about 5 minutes to take roll and wait for the appearance of the substitute teacher.

As the students read the drafts and marked the Continuum, their discussion revolved around the upcoming prom and spring break beginning the next day.

Teacher A expressed disappointment in the class because 5 students did not have completed drafts of their papers and the students expressed their dislike for the Analytic Writing Continuum stating that it was “too hard” and that they “needed more practice with it.” The teacher required 5 students who did not have completed drafts in class to bring them to the next day. With a few minutes remaining in class, Teacher A demonstrated for the researcher how they evaluated student papers by marking all the grammatical and punctuation errors in several of the student drafts that were turned in. The bell rang and the students left. One student remained to complain about the *Frankenstein* writing assignment. She stated the assignment was “not fair” and they had not been given enough time to work on it. The teacher told the student the draft was due the next day.

Experimental Group Teacher B.

The researcher observed Teacher B’s class of junior English III at the alternative school from 1:20 pm to 2:40 pm on March 7, 2007. Fifteen students were present, 4 boys and 11 girls. The researcher arrived during the passing period prior to the beginning of class and sat in the back of the classroom. When the bell rang to begin class, 5 students were tardy. Two students had head phones on and one student was text messaging on her cell phone. Four of the 5 students who were tardy sat together and giggled uncontrollably for about 10 minutes. Twelve minutes elapsed before all students were on task.

The set up of the classroom was the same as the previous observation. The teachers had the same art and personal belongings arranged around the classroom as well as the same purchased materials on the walls. Student illustrated posters with written

personal declarations of independence were added to the inside of the classroom and outside the classroom; illustrated Haiku poems had been posted on the walls.

The teacher placed a cartoon on the overhead projector. The cartoon was from the book *Snoopy's Guide to Writing*. The lesson of the cartoon was good writing is hard work. The teacher talked about cartoon; asked clarifying questions regarding the word "subtlety." The teacher made the point that it is difficult to please other people with your own writing, but that the Analytic Writing Continuum outlines good aspects of all writing. People will understand writing from the heart, especially if it incorporates the traits of the Analytic Writing Continuum. The teacher then read aloud Danielle Steele's comments on writing and related it to the Snoopy cartoon. The gist of Steele's essay on writing was that writing takes time and practice, and that as an author, Steel did not wait for artistic creativity to come to her. Rather, she sat at her computer every morning at 8:00 and forced herself to write even if she didn't want to. The teacher again referenced the Analytic Writing Continuum as a tool to help writers when it is a challenge to write and revise.

The teacher read aloud a released TAKS essay. The students arranged their desks into their writing groups. Each student had a copy of the essay and in their groups, they evaluated all the traits on the Analytic Writing Continuum. The teacher walked around and helped the students stay on task. The teacher talked the students through the traits starting with content and helped students decide if the essay was a 1 or a 2. The teacher asked students to give examples from the essay to support the score. The teacher asked guiding questions like "What ideas are given?" and "What examples relate to ideas?" Some students volunteered answers and some students were asked directly.

Regarding structure, the teacher asked “Does it have an opening?” and directed the students to “Look at the writing to find support.” The teacher attempted to have the students agree to a score within groups and between groups. Once the students could agree within one point of the other groups, they moved on to the next trait.

The teacher asked “What about style?” and “Does it need a larger vocabulary?” regarding voice. Some students gave answers like “It wasn’t that great.” The teacher asked for clarification and examples from the essay.

The teacher had students recall their prior knowledge of sentence structure and variety and asked if any sentences didn’t make sense. “Are any of the sentences choppy? Do they start the same? Do they have the same subject verb over and over? Does the author use prepositional phrases? Does the author use different words or the same ones over and over?” were the questions the teacher asked about sentence structure and variety. The teacher pointed out misspelled words, repeated words, and grammatical errors.

The teacher also asked “Does the author paint a picture with words?” Several students described the writing sample as using “baby” words. If a group wasn’t volunteering scores, teacher asked for score and example to support the score.

After students read second essay aloud in their groups, the teacher asked, “Judging by the length, would you place it at a 1 or a 3?” Each group was on their own to evaluate the traits of the second essay. The teacher walked around classroom and asked the students what stuck out to them about the paper. The teacher helped individual groups by asking questions like “Somebody tell me where you placed that on the continuum? A 3? Look at continuum and tell me why.”

The students talk back and forth when discussion was required. Most students readily volunteered to read/share work.

When the students read the second essay aloud, there was off topic discussion and laughing, but each group gave an example for one of the traits. At the end of class, the teacher took up the packets of TAKS essays with the plan of giving out the scores during the next class period. The students wanted to know scores immediately, not during the next class period.

Descriptive Consultancy Protocol

During the Descriptive Consultancy Protocol, the experimental group teachers participated in a guided discussion lead by the researcher. The following is a summary of that protocol:

Experimental Group Teacher A.

Teacher A introduced their students to the Analytic Writing Continuum in the middle of January. The students' initial response was that the Continuum would be more of a hindrance than a help. At the end of March, 2007, that attitude had not changed much. Teacher A's students had no experience with 6 + 1 Trait writing, the forerunner of the Analytic Writing Continuum. As a way of introducing the students to the Continuum, Teacher A and the students "...looked at a couple of examples that had strong points and weak points," but they did not practice scoring any sample essays. The students were given the Continuum and told to strive for a score of 6 in each trait when drafting their *Frankenstein* essay. Teacher A affirmed that "[I] made a lot of assumptions that since they were seniors that they would already know a lot of concepts in the Analytic Writing Continuum and that I wouldn't have to teach them." Teacher A also stated that in

retrospect “I would have been more successful in asking the students to peer edit their own work had they seen more examples and had more practice scoring.” For future work with the Analytic Writing Continuum, Teacher A acknowledged “I would lay down more groundwork. Even though I knew I wasn’t giving them enough at the time, it’s going to take more than I initially thought.”

Teacher A believed the Analytic Writing Continuum allowed for an increase in formative feedback by assisting the students “. . . to see that a paper can be very strong in one area and very weak in another area. I think sometimes they want to lump everything together as either only good or only bad.” Teacher A also stated they were trying to write fewer comments on the student’s drafts and only circle the trait score so that the students could begin to recognize the strengths and weakness of their writing without the teacher identifying every mistake. Teacher A could not definitively state whether that had been an increase in student writing performance as a result of formative feedback via the Continuum. However, Teacher A recognized that some students applied the concepts of the Continuum much more rigorously than others and that they had increased their self-monitoring of their writing. Teacher A also stated the potential existed for students to take more personal initiative with their writing using the Analytic Writing Continuum.

Experimental Group Teacher B.

Teacher B introduced their students to the Analytic Writing Continuum in December, 2006. Teacher B’s students had been using a 6 + 1 Trait rubric to peer edit and “. . . they didn’t seem put off by [the Analytic Writing Continuum]. They just saw it as another rubric similar to one they had already used.” Teacher B explained the Analytic Writing Continuum, looked at two examples for each trait, and then had the students

practice scoring with released TAKS samples. Teacher B stated that the “. . . students were really proud of themselves when they scored correctly. They treated it like a game and it generated a lot of discussion” because the students wanted to justify to the rest of the class that they were right. Even though Teacher B indicated success with the Analytic Writing Continuum, they still believed that in the future, the students needed more practice scoring before applying the Continuum to their own writing.

Teacher B believed the Continuum forced the students to “focus on aspects of writing they wouldn’t ordinarily have thought about. So they can at least say, ‘I think the content is OK, but I need to work on structure.’ They are at least learning how to articulate information about their writing instead of just saying ‘It’s boring.’” Teacher B also stated that instead of marking every error on the student’s drafts, that they found themselves saying things like “Consider your content.” Teacher B remarked that this was a more positive experience for the students and allowed the student and the teacher to be more specific when conferencing.

When asked if there was an increase in student writing performance as a result of using the Continuum, Teacher B stated that students were better able to describe their writing by saying things like “I didn’t vary my sentence length,” and “I don’t think my voice comes through.” Teacher B believed the students were just beginning to understand how to analyze and discuss language and that it would take more time to apply all the concepts to their writing; however, Teacher B also believed the students were beginning to use a common terminology to discuss their writing. Although Teacher B believed it would take more time for the students to definitively increase their self-monitoring of

their writing and to take more personal initiative, but that “the potential is definitely there.”

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to determine if utilizing the National Writing Project's Analytic Writing Continuum as a teaching tool will increase student writing performance in the Secondary Language Arts writing workshop. Two questions guided this study:

1. How do experienced classroom teachers use a rubric to guide students through the writing process?
2. What impact does using a rubric to guide students through the writing process have on student writing performance?

This was a mixed method study with quasi-experimental design and non-equivalent control groups. Quantitative data were generated through independent scoring of pre-test and post-test student writing samples of the control and experimental groups. Quantitative results were reported as a summary of student writing performance based on the calculation of a t value at a 90% confidence interval for the pre/post-test student writing samples. The change in the discrete writing traits of ideas, organization, voice, sentence fluency, diction, conventions, and a holistic score were measured. Qualitative data were obtained through a survey and Likert scale questionnaire of the experimental group teachers, interviews, classroom observations, an online discussion, and a group interview in the form of a Descriptive Consultancy Protocol.

The Statement of Need and the Review of Literature described how writing instruction has shifted to process oriented instruction, but writing assessment has not adapted to a process oriented paradigm. Researchers advocated writing assessment reform by changing writing rubrics from over generalized assessments to a form that celebrates student voice and what real writers look for in their work. The National Writing Project's Analytic Writing Continuum is a writing rubric designed to address both of these shortcomings in student writing assessment. Studies also indicated a need for developing the most appropriate means of providing formative feedback to increase student writing performance, and effective methods of teaching students to evaluate and self-monitor their writing. This chapter will examine (a) the interpretation of results for the guiding questions, (b) implications of those results, (c) limitations of the study, and (d) recommendations for further research.

Interpretations of Results for the Guiding Questions

Experienced Classroom Teachers Use of a Rubric to Guide Students Through the Writing Process

Teacher A.

Teacher A first exposed their students to the Analytic Writing Continuum in mid-January, 2007. Both the classroom observations and the teacher interview indicated that Teacher A did not provide any opportunity for their students to practice scoring sample writing or their own writing prior to being asked to peer edit using the Continuum. Teacher A's students initially believed that the Analytic Writing Continuum would be of little help to them and complained to the teacher in front of the researcher that the Continuum was "too hard" and that they "needed more practice." Teacher A admitted to

not providing enough scoring practice with the Continuum before the students were asked to internalize the rubric and apply it to their own writing.

Teacher A and Teacher B appear to be philosophically similar in their writing instruction; both teachers indicated on their Background Information and Survey nearly identical perceived use of writing workshop strategies. Both teachers have extensive teaching experience, possess multiple teaching certificates and broad, liberal arts educations. However, the qualitative data gathered regarding Teacher A suggest a lack of instruction and assessment activities expected in a recursive writing process. Teacher A's remarks and observed actions revealed a type of linear writing instruction and assessment that focused on punctuation and grammar correction and had little emphasis on the other traits listed on the Analytic Writing Continuum. Formative feedback during the writing process was provided for the students, but mostly regarding surface level revisions focusing on grammar. With the lack of practice and instruction regarding the Analytic Writing Continuum, the students in Teacher A's classes did not experience the social constructivist aspects of the writing workshop classroom.

Teacher B.

Teacher B's students had multiple opportunities to practice scoring sample writing using the Analytic Writing Continuum. Teacher B's classroom observations, survey, and interview revealed a writing workshop atmosphere where the students experienced writing as a recursive and social process. In addition to a variety of formative feedback techniques, Teacher B's students had the experience of moving back and forth from the analytic scale of the Continuum, to examples, to their own writing. Appropriate mini-lessons regarding all aspects of the Continuum and group activities

were interspersed in between student writing and scoring practice. The Analytic Writing Continuum provided a common language to describe writing and fostered a dialogue between the students and the teacher.

Impact of Using a Rubric Throughout the Writing Process on Student Writing

Performance

Teacher A.

Teacher A's students showed improvement for every one of the measured attributes included in the Analytic Writing Continuum. Statistically significant differences in the pre/post-test writing samples occurred in the areas of content, structure, stance, sentence fluency, and the holistic score. There was an increase in improvement in the areas of conventions, but not at a statistically significant level.

The qualitative data gathered about Teacher A's writing instruction indicated an emphasis on punctuation and grammar correction. This emphasis did not translate into a statistically significant improvement in the area of conventions. Based on the researcher's observations, the students in Teacher A's classes did not fully experience the constructivist aspects of the writing workshop classroom. However, their writing performance improved at a statistically significant level regarding most of the attributes measured on the Analytic Writing Continuum. This performance increase could be due to instruction using the Analytic Writing Continuum that was not observed by the researcher or instruction that occurred prior to the study. The majority of Teacher A's students were seniors and about half of Teacher A's students were in Dual Credit English.

Teacher B.

Teacher B's students improved writing performance in the attributes of content, structure, stance, sentence fluency, diction, and the holistic score, but not at a statistically significant level. Teacher B's students had unfavorable results in the discrete trait of conventions, but not at a statistically significant level.

The qualitative data regarding Teacher B's instruction revealed a writing workshop atmosphere where student's experienced writing as a recursive process and received formative feedback regarding their writing in a variety of ways. Even though their writing performance improved, it was not at a statistically significant level. This may be in part due a loss of data that may have weakened the statistical analysis for this group. The loss of data may also account for the decrease in performance in the area of writing conventions, but there was also an observed lack of instruction regarding conventions. Students in Teacher B's classes were mostly sophomore and junior level students at the alternative school of choice for the district. All of these students were designated "at risk" by district criteria.

Combined Experimental Group

When Teacher A's students and Teacher B's students are considered as one experimental group, the experimental group and the control group had approximately the same number of sophomores, juniors, seniors, Advanced Placement, and "at risk" students. The combined experimental group showed improvement across all measured traits, with the performance increase in the areas of structure, stance, and the holistic score being at a statistically significant level. The control students showed improvement in their writing from the pre-test to the post-test in the areas of structure and stance, but

not at a statistically significant level. Their writing performance decreased in the areas of content, sentence fluency, diction, conventions, and the holistic score.

Implications of Results

Even though Teacher A and Teacher B incorporated the Analytic Writing Continuum in their classes in different ways, the combined experimental group increased their writing performance in the six discrete writing traits measured and a holistic score from the pre-test writing sample to the post-test writing sample. The control group's performance decreased in four of the six measured traits and in the holistic score. Even though the performance decrease was not at a statistically significant level, the decrease in performance is a concern at a practical level. The experimental group students' writing performance increased for all of the traits and the holistic score. The control group students' performance decreased across four of the six traits and the holistic score. The implication is that using a rubric to guide students through the writing process improves student writing performance.

Limitations of Study

This study had several limitations. The number of teachers in the experimental group in this study was limited to teachers who taught secondary level Language Arts, and had participated in the Central Texas Writing Project Summer Institute and the National Writing Project's December Scoring Conference at Texas State. The number of the control group teachers was limited to teachers in the same district where the experimental group teachers and taught similar classes.

The number of both control and experimental group student participants was limited to those who returned signed release forms from their parents. The number of

student participants was further limited due to attrition of students transferring out of the school or district, and those who had schedule changes from the Fall to the Spring semesters, or due to some other reason, took only the pre- or post-test. Teacher B's experimental group suffered a loss of data due to the fluctuation of students at the alternative school.

Teacher A had extenuating family circumstances that may have prevented her from fully incorporating the Analytic Writing Continuum into their class instruction. Teacher A also mentioned that the students were not motivated to take either the pre-test or the post-test because there was no motivation or reward offered for their performance.

Increase in the proficiency of any of the discreet traits of writing may not be fully attributed to the use of the Analytic Writing Continuum. Increase in student writing performance could be partially attributed to student maturation or pedagogical practices independent of the Continuum.

Recommendations for Further Research

The quantitative data imply that using a rubric to guide students through the writing process improves student writing performance. However, the two experimental group teachers incorporated the Analytic Writing Continuum into their instruction in different ways. The following questions are recommended for further research:

1. Further research is needed to discover the best method for presenting the Analytic Writing Continuum to students.
2. Additional studies regarding the efficacy of the Analytical Writing Continuum at elementary and middle school levels need to be conducted.

3. Studies pertaining to the role of self-regulated writing and self-assessment in regards to instructional rubrics need to be conducted to more clearly define the students' role in formative writing assessment.

REFERENCES

- Atwell, N. (1987). *In the middle*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Atwell, N. (1998). *In the middle: New understandings about writing, reading, and Learning*. 2nd ed. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Blasingame, J., & Bushman, J. (2005). *Teaching writing in middle and secondary schools*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Burke, J. (2003). *Writing reminders: Tools, tips, and techniques*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Caine, R., & Caine, G. (1991). *Making connections: Teaching and the human brain*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Calkins, L. (1986). *Lessons from a child*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Caperton, G. (2006, July). [Preface] *Teachers and the uncertain American future*. College Board.
- Carroll, J., & Wilson, E. (1993). *Acts of teaching: How to teach writing*. Englewood, CO: Teacher Ideas Press.
- Center for Innovative Thought. (2006, July). *Teachers and the uncertain American future*. College Board.
- Crone-Blevins, D. (2002). The art of response. *English Journal*. 91(6), 93-98.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2005). Prepping our teachers for teaching as a profession. *The Education Digest*. 71(4), 22-27.
- Emig, J. (1971). *The composing process of twelfth graders*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Graves, D. (1993). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Graves, D. (1994). *A fresh look at writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Hillocks, G. (1986). *Research in written composition: New directions for teaching*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Horvath, B. (1984). The components of written response: A practical synthesis of current views. *Rhetoric Review*. 2, 136-56.
- Hunter, D., Mayenga, C., & Gambell, T. (2006). Classroom assessment tools and uses: Canadian English teachers' practices for writing. *Assessing Writing*. 11(1), 42-65.
- Huot, B. (2002). *(Re)articulating writing assessment for teaching and learning*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- LaFontana, V. (1996). Throw away that correcting pen. *English Journal*. 85(6), 71-73.
- Lipson, M., Mosenthal, J., & Woodside-Jiron, H. (2000). Process writing in the classrooms of eleven fifth-grade teachers with different orientations to teaching and learning. *The Elementary School Journal*, 101(2), 209-231.
- Makkonen, R. (2004, Summer). Taking care of novice teachers. *Harvard Education Letter*, 20, 1-4.
- McDonald, J., Mohr, N., Dichter, A., & McDonald, E. (2003). *The power of protocols: An educators guide to best practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Mertler, C. (2001). Designing scoring rubrics for your classroom. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 7(25), Retrieved June 23, 2007, from <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=25>.
- Murray, R. (1982). *Learning by teaching: Selected articles on writing and teaching*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- National Council of Teachers of English. (2000). *Position statement concerning the use of high stakes testing*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- National Writing Project. (2005). *The American public wants more attention paid to writing*. [Brochure]. Berkley, CA.
- Paris, S. (1998). *How students learn: Reforming schools through learner centered education*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Patthey-Chavez, G., Matsumura, L., and Valdes, R. (2004). Investigating the process approach to writing instruction in urban middle schools. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*. 47(6), 462-477.
- Saddler, B., & Andrade, H. (2004). The writing rubric. *Educational Leadership*. 62(2), 48-52.

- Shanley, R. (2004). Reforming writing instruction. *English Journal*. 94(1), 13-15.
- Soles, D. (2001). Grading as a teaching strategy. *Teaching English in the Two Year College*. 29(2), 122-134.
- Spandel, V. (2005). *Creating writers through 6-trait writing assessment and instruction*. New York, NY: Pearson.
- Spandel, V. (2006). In defense of rubrics. *English Journal*. 96(1), 19-22.
- Stern, L., & Solomon, A. (2006). Effective faculty feedback. *Assessing Writing*. 11(1), 22-41.
- Stoddard, B., & MacArthur, C. (1993). A peer editing strategy: Guiding learning disabled students in response and revision. *Research in the Teaching of English*. 27, 76-103.
- Taylor, M. (2000). Nancie Atwell's "In the Middle" and the ongoing transformation of the writing workshop. *The English Journal*. 90(1), 46-52.
- Van DeWeghe, R. (2005). Process teaching and content feedback on students' drafts. *English Journal*. 95(1), 109-112.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wilhelm, J. (2003). Assessment: The alpha and omega of achievement. *Voices From the Middle*. 11(2), 109-113.
- Wolf, S., & Davinroy, K. (1998). The clay that makes the pot. *Written Communication*. 15(4), 419-448.
- Wynyard, S., & Gehrke, R. (1996). Responding to audience: Using rubrics to teach and assess writing. *English Journal*. 85(6), 67-70.

VITA

Cynthia Inez Vetter was born in Austin, Texas, on November 5, 1971, the daughter of Carrie Mueller Amsden and David Allen Amsden. After completing her work at Calallen High School, Corpus Christi, Texas, in 1990, she entered Southwest Texas State University-San Marcos. She received the degree of Bachelor of Science from Southwest Texas State University in May, 2005. During the following years she was employed as a teacher at Gary Job Corps, San Marcos, Texas, Comal Independent School District, and San Marcos Consolidated Independent School District. She is also a Teacher Consultant for the National Writing Project. In June of 2005, she entered the Graduate College of Texas State University-San Marcos.

Permanent Address: 271 Grandview Avenue

New Braunfels, Texas 78130

This Thesis was typed by Cynthia I. Vetter.