

THE INFLUENCE OF STORY SCHEMA
ON READING RESPONSE AND WRITING PROCESS

By

KATHERINE C. PUHARICH

B.A., The University of British Columbia, 1982

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
(Department of Language Education)

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

March 1989

© Katherine Cynthia Puharich, 1989

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of English Education

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date April 5, 1989

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to investigate the influence of story schema on reading response and the writing process. Although a small number of researchers suggest that cognitive structures (schemata) influence reading and writing, the various schemata that affect both processes have not been characterized. The current study: 1) identified the components of story schema; and 2) described the influence that this schema had on students' reading responses and their writing processes.

Using a case-study approach with five honour-roll, eighth-grade students, subjects participated in five one-hour sessions requiring them to: 1) read William Saroyan's short story "The Great Leapfrog Contest" in 12 segments; 2) write a conclusion to Saroyan's story; 3) discuss the short story genre; 4) write a short story using think-aloud procedures; 5) revise their stories using think-aloud procedures; and 6) agree or disagree with the investigator's proposed changes to their stories.

Forty pieces of datum (25 hours of transcription and 15 written products) were analyzed using six traditional elements of story: plot, character, setting, theme, point of view, tone and mood. Three general findings emerged: 1) bright, grade-eight students' overall story schema was comprised of four constituent schemata: concepts of plot, character, setting and theme; point of view, tone and mood were not accounted for; 2) the variables which characterized each schemata were similar for

both reading and writing; and 3) these schemata, in addition to helping students construct meaningful representations of print, interfered with students' reading and writing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
ABSTRACT.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	viii
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY.....	1
A. The Problem.....	1
B. Background to the Problem.....	1
C. Overview of the Problem.....	2
D. Definition of Terms.....	3
E. Limitations.....	6
F. Significance of the Study.....	7
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	8
A. Correlational Studies.....	9
1. Reading Ability and Writing Ability.....	9
2. Reading Environmental Factors and Writing Skill.....	11
3. Reading Ability and Syntactic Maturity.....	13
4. The Reading Process and the Writing Process.....	15
B. Influence of Writing on Reading.....	17
1. The Effects of Sentence-Combining on Reading and Writing	18
2. The Effect of Writing Instruction on Reading and Writing	19
3. The Influence of Writing Practice on Reading and Writing	22

Chapter	Page
C. Influence of Reading on Writing.....	24
1. The Effect of Reading Practice on Writing Ability.....	24
2. The Effects of Reading Instruction on Writing Ability.....	26
D. Reading, Writing and Schema Theory.....	31
E. Summary.....	36
III. RESEARCH DESIGN.....	39
A. The Pilot Study.....	40
B. The Sample.....	41
C. Data Collection Procedures.....	42
1. Session One.....	42
2. Session Two.....	44
3. Session Three.....	45
4. Session Four.....	45
5. Session Five.....	45
D. Analysis of the Data.....	47
IV. ANALYSES AND RESULTS OF THE DATA.....	52
A. Plot.....	53
B. Character.....	60
C. Setting.....	73
D. Theme.....	77
E. Point of View.....	84
F. Tone and Mood.....	91
G. Summary.....	99

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.....	103
A. Summary.....	103
1. Plot.....	104
2. Character.....	106
3. Setting.....	108
4. Theme.....	109
5. Point of View.....	111
6. Tone and Mood.....	112
B. Conclusions.....	114
C. Implications for Further Research.....	118
D. Implications for Teaching.....	119
REFERENCES.....	125
APPENDIX A.....	140
APPENDIX B.....	147
APPENDIX C.....	150
APPENDIX D.....	152
APPENDIX E.....	154
APPENDIX F.....	162

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Character Description.....	60
2	Character Conflict (Reading).....	68
3	Character Conflict (Writing).....	69
4	Character Change.....	72

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation and gratitude are extended to Dr. Joseph Belanger, a mentor and friend, whose high regard for his students inspires them to express the best in themselves. His guidance and continued encouragement were greatly appreciated and will be long remembered.

I would also like to thank Dr. Roy Bentley and Dr. Kenneth Slade for their helpful suggestions on both the original proposal and the final drafts of the report.

Sincere thanks are expressed also to Bob Hodgins for protocol transcriptions, editorial suggestions and word processing services. His patience, his understanding and his calm assurances throughout the course of the masters' program will not be forgotten.

I would also like to thank the following for their cooperation: the Surrey School District; Doug Pearson, the school principal; David Carter and Elaine Bisbey, teachers; and Jacob, Brent, Jennifer, Pat and Melissa, the five students whose participation enabled the study to be conducted.

Thanks are extended to my friends Rosa Audia and Sally Audia, who in times of crisis helped me meet deadlines by not tempting me with social invitations.

Final and special thanks are extended to my mother and father, Marija and Srecko Puharich, who taught me that no labour, however arduous, is insurmountable; and that no labour, however humble, is dishonouring.

CHAPTER I

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

A. The Problem

The problem addressed by the current study is the degree of influence of students' story schema on their reading responses and writing processes.

B. Background to the Problem

For decades theorists have contended that the mind processes sensory and symbolic experiences through personal associations and cognitive schemata (Rosenblatt, 1938; Vygotsky, 1962). They have argued that individuals compose meaning, whether they are reading or writing; that reading and writing are inter-related; and that readers and writers create meaningful wholes from experiences, memories and data that are structured and stored in memory. Despite long-standing support for this association, however, only recently have significant efforts been made to study reading-writing relationships. Current investigators are suggesting with greater frequency that comprehending and composing are complementary processes.

Although theorists posit relationships between reading and writing, the nature of these relationships has yet to be determined. While a large body of research reports correlations between reading and writing ability (e.g., Loban, 1976), between reading proficiency and syntactic maturity (e.g., Hartman,

1984), and between reading, writing and environmental factors (e.g., Weathermon, 1984), very few empirical studies have demonstrated a causative relationship between reading and writing. A small number of studies suggest that various schemata (cognitive structures) influence both reading and writing (Kelley, 1984; Taylor & Beach, 1984), but no studies describe the specific schemata that affect the reading and writing processes.

The current study examines one of the many schemata which underlie knowledge of concepts, that of story schema. More specifically, the current investigation uses six elements of a story to: 1) identify and characterize the distinct components of students' story schema; and 2) determine the influence that this knowledge of story has on both their comprehension and production of stories.

C. Overview of the Procedures

To investigate the relationship between students' reading and writing and their concept of story, the study examined five honour-roll, eighth-grade students as they participated in five, one-hour sessions which actively engaged them in reading and writing. In the first session, subjects read William Saroyan's short story "The Great Leapfrog Contest" in twelve parts; subjects responded after each segment by orally predicting upcoming events. In the second session, subjects discussed the short story genre and then began writing a story of their own using think-aloud procedures. Students finished writing the

first drafts of their stories during the third session, and at this point began to revise their drafts. During the fourth session, subjects finished revising their drafts and produced a final document. During the fifth and final session, students responded to appropriate, neutral and inappropriate changes which had been made to their stories by the investigator; in addition to agreeing or disagreeing with these changes, subjects provided rationales on which their decisions were based.

Twenty-five hours of transcribed reading, writing and discussion--made up of students' reading responses, think-aloud protocols which accompanied the writing and rewriting of their stories, and their responses to the investigator's proposed revisions--were analyzed for traditional short story elements: plot, character, setting, theme, point of view, tone and mood.

D. Definition of Terms

Throughout the study various central terms will be used as defined below.

1. Schema

Schema refers to knowledge that is packaged into a unit. Stored in memory are schemata representing knowledge about all concepts. According to Rumelhart (1977), schemata are

'the building blocks of cognition.' They are the fundamental elements upon which all information processing depends. Schemata are employed in the process of interpreting sensory data (both linguistic and nonlinguistic), in retrieving information from memory, in organizing actions, in determining goals and subgoals, in allocating resources, and, generally, in guiding the flow of processing in the system. [p. 34]

2. Story Schema

Story schema refers to a generalized knowledge of stories. Embedded within a story schema are constituent subschemata which define and describe the concept of story. Combined, these subschemata are an idealized representation of the parts of a typical story.

3. Making Meaning

This phrase is used to describe one aspect of the composing and comprehending processes, whereby both readers and writers make meaning of the print they encounter. The metaphor can be traced to Louise Rosenblatt (1938, 1976), who discusses reading in terms of a two-way transaction--as meaning that happens between reader and text. The reader--drawing from past encounters with language, people and the world--makes meaning by meshing this experiential matrix with the written word. When literature is read aesthetically, the reader does not respond to the story written by the author, but rather to the story he or she evokes during the transaction with the text. Rosenblatt (1982) states,

...the aesthetic stance, in shaping what is understood, produces a meaning in which cognitive and affective, referential and emotive, denotational and connotational, are intermingled.
[p.273]

This response is the meaning that is made by the reader; and, it is this response that becomes shaped into what the reader sees as the literary work, or in Rosenblatt's (1985) terms, the evocation corresponding to the text.

4. Plot

Plot is defined as the plan, design, scheme or pattern of events in a work of fiction.

5. Character

Simply stated, character refers to the major and minor individuals presented in a story.

6. Setting

As defined by Stein and Glenn (1979), setting includes the introduction of a specific protagonist and contains information that refers to the physical, temporal and social context in which a story occurs.

7. Theme

This term refers to either the direct or indirect statement of a story's central idea. As stated by Perrine (1966), it is a "unifying generalization about life." [p. 117]

8. Point of View

The point from which a story is seen or told is known as its point of view. Although many variations are possible, two points of view are referred to in the current investigation: 1) Omniscient point of view, where the story is told by the author, using the third person; and 2) first person point of view, where the story is told in the first person by one of the characters in the story.

9. Tone

The attitude an author has towards his or her material and/or audience constitutes or determines the tone in a piece of fiction.

10. Mood

The atmosphere established by the totality of a piece of literary work is defined as its mood.

E. Limitations

The generalizability of the results of this study must be interpreted in light of limitations of: 1) the sample; 2) the environment; 3) the procedures; and 4) the variables chosen for examination.

The two major sampling limitations are the intelligence of the subjects (honour-roll students) and their grade-level. These students appear to be representative of honour-roll, grade eight students in British Columbia. Formal generalization, however, must be limited to the population sampled; that is, a suburban, middle-class school district.

The standard limitations ascribed to the process approach are applicable here. For example, logically, it would appear that students who articulate what they do as they are doing it, might find this articulation to interfere with their writing processes and products. Hayes and Flower (1983), on the other hand, do note that interference merely slows down the process, rather than alters it significantly.

A final limitation is imposed by the variables chosen to examine story schema. It is possible that a researcher using different categories of story schema might come up with different results.

F. The Significance of the Study

The major contribution of the study is the light it sheds on the interrelationships between reading and writing, a question which has intrigued researchers and theorists for at least two thousand years. This study will investigate the ways in which reading response and writing process are both influenced by the subject's schema, findings which will supplement recent work showing the importance of knowledge of the structure of prose on students' abilities to read and write. The study should also help to explain the well-known but poorly understood correlations between reading and writing processes.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The behavioural nature of reading and writing suggests sharp differences between the two acts. If writing is viewed as the process of "putting meaning on paper" and reading as the process of "getting meaning from paper," the behavioural discrepancy is apparent. Yet in terms of cognitive activity, this is not the case, for reading and writing are regarded as closely related skills. Relationships between the two have been noted for over 2000 years (Belanger & Martin, 1984). The majority of studies attempting to demonstrate that a relationship does exist, however, has emerged within the past 25 years, since Braddock, Lloyd-Jones and Schoer (1963) called upon researchers to explore the interrelation.

Unfortunately, these studies have not led to definitive results or consensus. Investigators' differences in background, curricular emphasis, and theoretical stance have produced a body of research which, although supplying us with a great deal of knowledge, suggests that much has yet to be learned. Despite these differences though, research examining the relationship between reading and writing can generally be categorized into one of four areas: 1) correlational studies; 2) studies which examine the influence of writing on reading; 3) studies which examine the influence of reading on writing; and 4) studies

which speculate on the nature of the reading-writing relationship.

A. Correlational Studies

Correlational, descriptive and ethnographic research on the reading-writing relationship generally deals with four areas of investigation. Similar to categories outlined by Stotsky (1983), these studies examine the relationship between reading ability and writing ability, reading-environmental factors and writing skill, reading ability and syntactic maturity, and the reading and writing processes.

1. Reading Ability and Writing Ability

The fact that a correlation does exist between reading achievement and writing ability has been found by Loban (1963, 1966, 1967), Leone (1980), Bippus (1978), D'Angelo (1977), and Thomas (1977). As documented by Belanger (1978), Loban (1963, 1966, 1967) investigated the reading-writing relationship in greatest depth. Monitoring students over a 13-year period, from kindergarten through grade 12, Loban commented on students' reading and writing abilities at various grade levels: for students above the grade two level, he found high correlations between reading scores and ratings of writing quality; of sixth-grade students he stated, "those who read well also write well; those who read poorly also write poorly"; and of the same students at the ninth-grade level, he said that "Relationships between reading and writing become more pronounced as the years pass" (Belanger, 1978, p.56-57). Significant correlations have

also been reported by Leone (1980) with kindergarten students, by Bippus (1978) with fourth- and sixth-grade students, by D'Angelo (1977) with ninth grade-students, and by Thomas (1977) with college students. Hammill and McNutt (1980), conducting a meta-analysis of 89 studies which correlated reading, writing, listening and speaking, reported correlations between 37 measures of reading and writing.

Other studies have been more specific and have concluded that reading has correlated positively with learning to write (Shanahan, 1980), writing ability (Schewe & Froese, 1986), spelling errors (Pitts, 1985) and final grades in a college composition course (Taylor, 1981). Shanahan (1980) examined the relationship of learning to read and learning to write with over 500 students in grade two and five and suggested that the relationship is different for different grade levels. The relationship for students reading at a second grade level was described as a word recognition-word production relationship; whereas the relationship for students reading at the fifth-grade level and above was described as a reading comprehension-prose production relationship. In a non-experimental study on the grade four level, Schewe and Froese (1986) found that reading comprehension and writing ability were related, but that students' concept of story grammar in their reading was not reflected in their writing. Pitts (1984) sought to determine the relationship between the reading scores and spelling production of 71 under-prepared, college freshmen and found that

capable readers make significantly fewer orthographic errors and phonological errors than did adequate or disabled readers. Taylor (1981) examined the relationship between listening and reading comprehension with final course grades of 78 college students enrolled in a composition course. He found that reading alone correlated significantly with final grades.

Readability formulae have also been employed to investigate the reading-writing relationship. Lozdowski (1976), examining 338 students in grades seven through fourteen, correlated students' reading scores with scores obtained from the application of eight readability formulae to samples of students' writing. He concluded that reading level could reliably be predicted within one grade level from the grade a student received on a piece of written work. Barnes (1984), on the other hand, found a greater difference between reading level and grade level. He gathered writing samples in the expository, argumentative, and descriptive modes from 292 third-, fifth- and seventh-grade students. Barnes concluded that although individual third graders write at a level similar to that which they read, fifth- and seventh-grade students write approximately three and four grade levels below their reading level.

2. Reading Environmental Factors and Writing Skill

Within the last ten years very few researchers have investigated the relationship between writing skill and reading-environmental factors. Weathermon (1984), McConnell (1983) and Felland (1980) have more recently examined writing

achievement and its relation to home background, literature exposure and number of books read by students, but as seen in reports by Belanger (1978) the number of earlier studies examining such relationships surpasses those of recent years.

Weathermon (1984) administered a questionnaire to the parents of 160 grade six and seven students who were evaluated by their teachers as "more effective" or "less effective" writers. The investigator concluded that the better writers were from home environments that placed emphasis and value on reading and writing. McConnell (1983) categorized 144 second-grade children into four groups based on amount of literature exposure and writing practice. Narrative writing samples were collected and analyzed for vocabulary, story structure elements, and holistic ratings. Although no differences were noted for the first two measures, significantly higher holistic ratings were received by students with high literature exposure and frequent writing practice. Felland (1980), randomly selecting 950 high schools, distributed a questionnaire to English department-heads. Based on the data gathered on 456 superior and average writers, he concluded that in comparison to the average students, superior writers read more books. Belanger (1978) documented earlier studies (Donelson, 1967; Monk, 1958; Maloney, 1967; Bargig, 1968; Hyndman, 1969; Woodward & Phillips, 1967; Wyatt, 1960; and Lacampagne, 1968) which examined populations of different grade levels and arrived at similar conclusions: good writers were likely to read more frequently,

have more books in their homes and have parents who read extensively.

3. Reading Ability and Syntactic Maturity

Another large group of correlational studies has shown that statistically significant correlations exist between reading ability and various measures of syntactic maturity. Sentence type, T-unit length, clause length, total number of words written, mechanics, and adjective and adverb use have all been found to correlate with various reading measures (Kuntz, 1975; Hartman, 1984; Hill, 1982; Ledford, 1984; Zeman 1969; Perron, 1976; Johnson, 1981; Bushner, 1980; Simon, 1980; Wade, 1982; Heller, 1980).

Kuntz (1975) reported significant correlations between reading achievement and syntactic complexity at the .001 level of confidence. Hartman (1984) analyzed 116 ninth-grade students' written retellings of a short narrative selection and concluded that of the five qualitative and five quantitative writing variables measured, seven correlated with reading comprehension at the .05 level of confidence. Hill (1982) examined seventh- and eighth-grade students' compositions for writing mechanics factors, writing quality factors and nominal modifying phrase factors. She also concluded that reading was related to "specific factors in writing performance."

Ledford (1984), examining fifth-grade students' stories, reported statistically significant (.05 level of confidence) correlations between reading achievement and students' use of

mechanics, adjectives, adverbs, comparative references, other conjunctions, lexical cohesion, and total number of words. Zeman (1969), using grade two and three students as subjects, found that below average readers used significantly more simple sentences and above average readers more compound and complex sentences. Perron (1976) and Johnson (1981) found that T-unit and clause length correlated with the reading comprehension of students at the third-, fourth- and fifth-grade levels. In an investigation of the relationship between university freshmen's reading comprehension and syntactic elements of their expository writing, Heller (1980) concluded that whereas poor readers wrote shorter T-units that were usually expanded by adding subordinate clauses, good readers wrote longer T-units expanded through such non-clausal structures as prepositional phrases. Also included among the good readers' writing characteristics were intra-T-unit coordination of detail and passive verb phrases.

Bushner (1980) examined 120 students at the seventh- and eighth-grade levels. Her data indicated that statistically significant differences exist among very good, average, and poor readers in total reading, literal reading, inferential reading, words written, words per T-unit, and words per clause. Simon (1980) used the number of words per T-unit as the sole index of syntactic maturity; however, rather than examine this in relation to reading comprehension, she related it to reading response. Simon concluded that there is an association between specific types of reading response and syntactic writing

maturity when response is defined in four categories of engagement: involvement, perception, interpretation and evaluation. Using pictures to elicit oral and written response, Wade (1982) investigated the relationship between children's oral and written language and their reading comprehension scores. He found that better readers used fewer T-units in their oral language and more words per clause in their oral and written language. Based on his data, Wade concluded that "The number of words per written clause is the best single predictor of reading comprehension."

4. The Reading Process and the Writing Process

Investigations of the eighties have been process oriented. This research has enabled Birnbaum (1981) and Ryan (1984) to draw parallels between the reading and writing processes, and among various other findings has led Atwell (1981), Scott (1985), Lowe (1986) and Dahl (1985) to conclude that reading is an important component of the writing process.

Birnbaum (1981), using a case study approach, examined the reading and writing behaviours of fourth- and eighth-grade students during the reading and writing process. Ratings of proficiency in one process were related to ratings of proficiency in the other process. Atwell (1981), examining the role of reading in the composition of text, videotaped 20 average undergraduates while they were writing a narrative essay under visible and blind writing conditions. Analysis of the products revealed little. Analysis of the process, however,

revealed that with their texts visible, better writers read what they wrote more than did less able writers. When students' written texts were not in view, the better writers, because of their ability to plan mentally, were still capable of producing more coherent text.

Scott (1985), examining 60 fifth-grade students' reading processes as they revised a transactional writing task, found reading to be an important component of the revision process. Since better readers were capable of detecting more errors than poor readers, they corrected more and thus produced work of superior quality. In a study investigating the reading-writing relationships as revealed in the composing processes of four college freshmen, Lowe (1986) examined students as they read and reacted to four essays and as they composed aloud in the development of four essays. Pre-writing played a very small role in the planning of their papers. Participants' revision mainly consisted of correcting surface features. They did not re-read their written text to insure that all parts connected and formed a cohesive whole. Based on the data, Lowe concluded that "Performance in reading and writing is adversely affected by failure to determine and use purpose to construct meaning."

Using ethnographic methodology, Dahl (1985) observed college students for one semester as they participated in a course which combined reading and writing. Students read different selections about similar topics, drew a schema map and then summarized the information in a written essay. Dahl noted

that students reread extensively while composing, but she also noted that students wanted their summaries to sound like the passage read, and that they often used the author's structure of text in their own compositions. The investigator concluded that "Writing performance was shaped by reading experiences". Ryan (1984) observed and interviewed eight fifth-grade students to investigate the cognitive and linguistic strategies used by these students as they wrote and read expository and narrative text. Six strategies--defined by the investigator as reporting, conjecturing, contextualizing, structuring, monitoring, and repairing--were identified in both reading and writing processes.

B. Influence of Writing on Reading

Studies examining the influence of writing on reading can be divided into three different areas: those examining the influence of sentence-combining on reading and writing performance (Menendez, 1979; Callaghan, 1978; Sullivan, 1978; Howie 1979; Phelps, 1979; Levine, 1977; Mackie, 1982; Trivelli, 1983; McAfee, 1981; Evans, 1986); those concerned with the effects of writing instruction or writing activities on reading and writing ability (Taylor & Berkowitz, 1980; Wolfe, 1975; Glover, Flake, Roberts, Zimmer & Palmere, 1981; McCarthy, 1989; Bravick, 1986; Nagle, 1972; Reed, 1967; Lee, 1986; Oehlkers, 1972; Calhoun, 1971; Walker-Lewis, 1981; Obenchain, 1971; Yasuf, 1982; Hinton, 1982; Kelley, 1984; Raphael, 1986); and those investigating the effects of writing practice on reading and

writing skill (Collins, 1980; Marshall, 1987; Decker, 1989; De La Rosa, 1979; Arthur, 1981). Unlike correlational studies, which have generally been consistent in their findings, significant and consistent results have not been obtained as regularly with these experimental studies.

1. The Effects of Sentence-Combining on Reading and Writing

Sentence-combining and its effects on reading and writing performance remain inconclusive. Crowhurst (1983), in an attempt to synthesize 20 years of research and assess what teachers may realistically expect from sentence-combining, asserts that sentence-combining practice leads to the development of students' syntactic resources. That is, the relationship between sentence-combining and writing generally appears to be positive and significant; yet as previously stated, the relationship between sentence-combining and reading and writing remains unclear. Menendez (1979), Callaghan (1978), Sullivan (1978), Howie (1979) and Phelps (1979) found no significant gains in reading ability or writing quality; whereas Levine (1977), Mackie (1982), Trivelli (1983), McAfee (1981) and Evans (1986) found that sentence-combining contributed to gains in reading comprehension.

Levine (1977), exposing a third-grade experimental group to 96 sessions of sentence-combining treatment, concluded that transformational sentence-combining had positive effects upon written composition and reading comprehension when measured by a standardized test. Mackie (1982) exposed fourth-grade

subjects to sentence-combining instruction for 20 weeks and found an increase in overall quality as well as reading comprehension and syntactic maturity. Evans (1986), examining the effect of sentence combining on 30 college juniors, 71 twelfth-grade students and 30 sixth-grade students, found that sentence-combining instruction most influenced the reading and writing development of students with low abilities in these areas.

Callaghan (1978) and Sullivan (1978) did not find similar results with ninth- and eleventh-grade subjects. Callaghan (1978) had 580 ninth graders work on oral and written sentence-combining exercises for the course of one school year. Results indicated that although the experimental group demonstrated gains in syntactic maturity, there was no evidence of an increase in reading or writing quality. Paralleling this study, Sullivan (1978) found that whether subjects did 15 or 30 lessons, sentence combining did not contribute to gains in reading ability or writing quality.

2. The Effect of Writing Instruction on Reading and Writing

Studies examining the influence of writing instruction on reading and writing ability tend to be somewhat more consistent. Taylor & Berkowitz (1980), Wolfe (1975), Glover, Flake, Roberts, Zimmer, & Palmere (1981), and McCarthy (1989) found that writing activities contributed to significant gains in reading retention, recall and achievement. Bravick (1986), Nagle (1972) and Reed (1967) found that writing activities and instruction

led to improvement in reading comprehension, but Lee (1986), Oehlkers (1972) and Calhoun (1971) that it did not. The influence of writing instruction on both reading and writing has been investigated by Walker-Lewis (1981), who found that writing instruction led to improvement in reading comprehension; by Obenchain (1971), who found that it lead to gains in written composition but not reading; by Yasuf (1982), Hinton (1982) and Kelley (1984), who claim that writing instruction contributed to growth in both reading comprehension and writing achievement; and by Raphael (1986), who found that writing instruction helped increase students ability to summarize expository passages.

Taylor and Berkowitz (1980), examining the effect of summary writing on reading, found that sixth-grade students who wrote single-sentence summaries after reading recalled significantly more than those who did not. Wolfe (1975) reported that college students in a remedial reading course remembered difficult vocabulary better when writing the new words in sentences rather than when reading them as part of a sentence. Glover, Plake, Roberts, Zimmer & Palmere (1981) instructed groups of college students either to read and paraphrase an essay or to write key words while reading the essay. Results indicated that significantly more ideas were recalled by students who paraphrased the essay.

In a study attempting to improve the reading comprehension of 81 students, Bravick (1986) randomly assigned subjects to one of three groups: a reading only group, a group writing opinion

responses, or a group writing structural responses. At the end of 15 weeks, results indicated significant differences between groups in total comprehension and in inferential comprehension on a standardized test. The investigator concluded that the Structural-Response Instructional Model helped students increase their understanding of written discourse.

A recent study has demonstrated that computer-assisted writing positively influences reading as well. McCarthy (1989) instructed two groups in writing using the process approach. The experimental group used the word processor for writing, and the control group used traditional tools. Results indicated that there was a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence in the reading achievement of the experimental group.

Investigators have also examined the influence of writing instruction on both writing ability and reading performance. Walker-Lewis (1981), attempting to improve the reading comprehension and writing ability of under-prepared college students through integrated reading-writing strategies, found significant differences between control and experimental groups in reading comprehension, but not in writing ability when measured by holistic evaluation. Obenchain (1971), on the other hand, found significant gains in writing measures at the .001 level of confidence, but not in reading comprehension.

Yasuf (1982) and Hinton (1982), examining the impact of a writing program on 1024 ninth-graders and 703 tenth-graders respectively, detected gains in both reading and writing.

Kelley (1984) found gains in both reading and writing also. Two treatment groups were exposed to writing instruction using the Sentence/Paragraph Structure Approach and the Six-Step Writing Approach. After twenty-three 40-minute periods, Kelley concluded that both methods of composition contributed to growth in reading comprehension and writing achievement, with mean scores being significantly higher ($p > .01$) than mean scores of students who spent an equivalent amount of time in sustained silent reading. Raphael (1986) examined the impact of text structure instruction on students' comprehension and production of text also. Data gathered from 159 grade five and six students indicated that a writing environment emphasizing peer editing and publication and/or instruction in text structure significantly increased students' ability to compose and summarize expository text.

3. The Influence of Writing Practice on Reading and Writing

Investigators have examined the influence of writing practice, as opposed to a structured continuous writing program, on reading and writing achievement. Collins (1980) and Marshall (1987) found that practice in writing improved reading comprehension, Decker (1989) and De La Rosa (1979) that it did not, and Arthur (1981) that it neither influenced reading nor writing.

Collins (1980) found that reading instruction combined with expressive writing practice improved college freshmen's reading comprehension significantly more than did reading instruction

alone. The experimental group, consisting of 35 students with grade-point averages below that required for continued matriculation, displayed significant mean differences for comprehension and total score as measured by a standardized test. Marshall (1987) examined the effect of three writing tasks on students' understanding of short stories. Results indicated that writing in the personal analytic and formal analytic modes was associated with significantly higher post test scores than restricted writing in the form of short answer questions.

Decker (1989), on the other hand, did not report significant findings. For 16 weeks, a 10-minute daily writing component was added to the remedial reading instruction of tenth, eleventh and twelfth grade experimental subjects. There was no evidence to conclude significant differences between the average performance of experimental subjects and control subjects. De La Rosa (1979) found no differences between control and experimental groups as well. When reading scores were considered, gains produced by a group engaged in creative writing sessions were not significantly better than gains produced by a group in sustained silent reading. Arthur (1981), including writing as well as reading performance as her measures, found similar results. After a six-week treatment period in which subjects in the two experimental groups participated in daily sustained writing (writing about whatever they wished) or reactive writing (writing stimulated through

lesson plans), Arthur concluded that without feedback or instruction, writing practice alone did not influence reading or writing.

C. Influence of Reading on Writing

A third area of investigation, research examining the influence of reading on writing ability, is divided into two subcategories: studies concerned with the effect of reading practice on writing ability and studies concerned with the effect of reading instruction on writing ability. A number of studies in the first subcategory suggest that reading practice influences one's writing, but another group suggests that it does not. The second sub-category of studies, those attempting to improve composition skill through reading instruction, have generally been unsuccessful in reporting measurable writing growth.

1. The Effect of Reading Practice on Writing Ability

In an attempt to investigate the influence of free reading and writing practice on composition quality, Heys (1962) examined students from grades nine through twelve over a one year period. Experimental groups wrote one theme each week for the academic year, while the control groups read for the same amount of time. Although Heys did not report the statistical significance of his results, he concluded that in comparison to the writing group, the reading group made twice as many gains. DeVries (1970), employing similar methodology with fifth grade students in a nine-week experiment, found that students assigned

additional reading and no written work improved their writing to a greater extent than did students who wrote two themes a week. It should be noted, however, that this difference was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. A study by Glazer (1973) demonstrated that oral literature study contributed significantly to better written work.

To explore the possible effects of children's reading on their writing, Eckhoff (1983) analyzed reading texts and writing samples from two second-grade classes. One of the texts, referred to as Basal A, closely matched the style and complexity of literary prose; whereas the other text, referred to as Basal B, employed the use of a very simplified style. The findings of the study showed that the writing of the 37 children studied contained features of their reading texts. Basal A children wrote linguistically complex sentences, using complex verb forms, subordinate clauses, and infinitive and participial phrases. Basal B children usually copied the format of their texts. In other words, they wrote one-line-sentences.

Contrary to claims made by the above studies, Elley, Barham, Lamb, and Wyllie (1976) did not re-affirm results claiming that free reading and literature study led to improved composition. Examining the effects of three different English programs on high school students in New Zealand over a three year period, the investigators found that after one year, students who had additional reading instead of traditional or transformational grammar study wrote slightly (but not

significantly) better compositions. At the end of the third year, the reading group did not make gains superior to those made by the two grammar groups. Rather, they displayed equal competence.

Nielsen (1980) examined the effects of reading literature on children's narrative writing over ten treatment sessions and found that although students believed they were writing better stories, as well as enjoying the composing act to a greater extent, there was no significant difference in the literary quality of students' writing when they read silently or were read to. Louque (1984) was also interested in the effects of reading on overall quality, but rather than literature acting as a stimulus, the newspaper served as the source of students' reading material. The treatments of newspaper reading, free writing followed by newspaper reading, and newspaper reading combined with guided writing did not account for differences in overall writing quality--reading ability, reading attitude and gender, however, did. The effects of reading children's literature for 15 minutes every day for a 12 week period was investigated by Michener (1985). Using 47 randomly selected fourth grade children, she found that the reading aloud treatment had no significant main effects on semantic maturity, syntactic maturity and writing style.

2. The Effects of Reading Instruction on Writing Ability

Belanger (1978) documents early attempts to improve writing proficiency through reading instruction (Eurich, 1931; Mathews,

Larsen, & Butler, 1945) and concludes that in these studies instruction in reading skill did not have a significant effect on writing ability. Similar results were obtained in later studies by Schneider (1971), O'Donnell (1974), Miller (1974), Campbell (1976) and Perry (1980). Maat (1978), questioning whether or not improvement in the comprehension of expository and argumentative prose would result in the improvement of composition in these modes, concluded that there was a significant difference in gain on subjects' total writing scores, but that this improvement was small.

Belanger (1978) examined the influence of a reading treatment, called the SOS Reading Technique, on students at the grade-nine and grade-ten levels over a six month period. Four experimental classes were initially administered a standardized reading test and assigned topics which elicited writing samples. Experimental groups were then exposed to the reading treatment, which was followed by post-testing identical to the pre-testing mentioned above at three and six month intervals. Writing samples were analyzed for overall quality, syntactic density, T-unit length and total number of words. Although the combined reading samples showed significant change between control and experimental groups, this change did not produce statistically significant change on any of the four writing measures. Belanger concluded his study by stating that "these results suggest that one should not expect to teach writing by indirect

methods: if writing is to improve, it should be taught" [p. 223].

Three recent studies examined the effect of the IBM Writing to Read program (which teaches students 42 phonetic sounds in the context of words which they then use in their own writing). Stevenson (1988), based on test scores obtained from 241 kindergarten and 282 first-grade students, reported significant reading gains but not writing gains. Whitmer and Miller (1987) obtained similar results with kindergarten and first-grade students. Scores indicated that subjects in the IBM group received significantly higher scores in reading comprehension than did subjects in the control group. Misenheimer (1989) concluded that significant differences were found in vocabulary, word recognition and total reading achievement test scores of students completing Writing to Read. Significant claims were not made with regard to writing achievement.

The twelve studies described above do not demonstrate a relationship between reading skill and writing skill. A small number of recent studies, however, have obtained results that are contrary to these findings (Belanger & Martin, 1989; Crowhurst, 1987; Hart, 1980; Austin, 1984; Mavragones & Padak, 1982; Reagan, 1985).

Belanger and Martin (1989), replicating an earlier study conducted with students in grades nine and ten (Belanger and Martin, 1984), examined the effect of a reading treatment on the reading and writing ability of 164 grade eleven students.

Following the administration of a phonic-based reading treatment, the investigators found that after four months the experimental group showed statistically significant gain in reading achievement and writing proficiency. The investigators concluded that these gains resulted "from the students' improved ability to decode written words automatically and fluently" and from an environment in which "writing was taught systematically and evaluated as part of students' regular classroom work in English"--thus, supporting their earlier claim that improved reading ability provided a foundation on which writing could be taught.

Crowhurst (1987) also obtained significant writing results in her examination of the effect of reading instruction and writing instruction on reading and writing persuasion. One hundred sixth-grade subjects were exposed to one of two treatments: 1) instruction in a persuasion schema combined with writing practice; or 2) instruction in a persuasion schema combined with reading practice. The control group received one lesson in a persuasion schema. Crowhurst concluded that although there were no significant differences in reading, both treatment groups improved significantly in writing when judged qualitatively.

Hart (1980), interested in determining whether a direct method of teaching selected reading skills was effective in helping students improve reading and writing skills, tested a population of 177 tenth-grade subjects. Students in the

experimental group wrote one composition a week for ten weeks and studied selected reading skills. Significant improvement in reading comprehension, vocabulary and writing skill was evidenced among students who had practice in selected reading skills. Hart's definition of what encompasses writing skill, however, appears somewhat limited, for only if students incorporated the taught skills into the organization of their essays were they considered to have shown improvement in composition skill. Austin (1984) was concerned with students' ability to use selected rhetorical techniques in their own writing. She exposed the experimental group to a series of lessons requiring the reading of essays and a thorough analysis and discussion of the composition techniques used in these essays. The control group received no instruction in the analysis of essays. Although post-test scores suggest that experimental students were writing more mature essays at the end of the study, so were students in the control group. Gains in the composition scale for the control were significant at the .05 level.

Mavragones and Padak (1982) were not solely concerned with reading instruction, but rather with the effects of a program which included both a reading treatment and syntactic manipulation on students' levels of syntactic maturity and reading achievement levels. Fifty-five ninth-grade disabled readers served as subjects for three experimental groups and one control group. None of the groups differed on post reading

measure. Among the syntax measures, however, significant differences in favour of the experimental groups were found. Those groups receiving total treatment (reading while listening and daily exercises in syntactic manipulation for 55 minutes per day for 24 weeks) or variations of this treatment used significantly more T-units, as well as more words per T-unit. A study by Reagan (1985) differed in that she attempted to describe the effects of combined reading-writing instruction on the composing processes of 13 freshman basic writers. Gathering data through direct observation, interviews, writing samples, and audio and video-tapes of composing, she detected positive change in writing proficiency, as well as attitude toward writing, self, and the composing process. Yet with regards to her statistical analysis suggesting that combined reading-writing instruction helped improve students' compositions, Reagan felt that a number of other factors--course content, attendance, motivation, attitude toward self and literacy, educational and environmental background, the instructor's role and attitude toward students and subject--were also highly influential.

D. Reading, Writing and Schema Theory

With empirical and correlational data supporting the assumption that reading and writing are interrelated skills, educators have naturally speculated on the nature of this relationship. How these language skills are learned, what their functions are, and what instructional bearing they have on the

classroom are questions addressed by many. Researchers are attempting to define and characterize the relationship between reading and writing, and in doing so, are suggesting that schemata (knowledge that is organized and stored as units or cognitive frameworks) guide both processes.

Based on the view that oral language is learned through exposure to language, many believe that reading and writing, like oral language, cannot be taught in the traditional sense. Rather, they must be learned through the tacit internalization of patterns and principles that are acquired through extensive exposure to and practical experience with the use of language in actual situations.

Smith (1983) asserts that writers learn all they know through reading. His argument is that in order to learn how to write like a writer, one must learn how to read like a writer. In other words, the reader must engage with the author in what the author is writing. In describing this event Smith states,

Bit by bit, one thing at a time, but enormous numbers of things over the passage of time, the learner learns through "reading" like a writer to "write" like a writer. [p. 564]

Goodman and Goodman (1983) share this view of learning by doing. Speaking of children, they claim that what students observe in reading, they use in writing. Through engaging in a large amount of varied reading and writing, children develop a sense of control over them and find a personal significance for becoming literate. Development in reading and writing occurs

only if students actively participate in reading and writing experiences which have significant and personal meaning for them.

Reading and writing are also discussed in terms of a transactional process in which communication between a language producer and receiver takes place. Bazerman (1980) presents the relationship between reading and writing in terms of a "conversational model," stressing that writing occurs within the context of previous writing. In this view, student writing is seen as a response to what others have written. This response first begins with an accurate understanding of "prior statements" of "written conversation." Students then react to the reading, evaluate it, define those issues they wish to pursue, and finally develop these in written form. Bazerman considers students' writing a "contribution to an on-going conversation." Holt and Vacca (1981) also speak of the reading-writing relationship as an alliance based on communication. They express that through reading and writing we communicate to a variety of people for a variety of purposes. This action and interaction with people and things is the source from which knowledge is acquired. Moffett (1983), on the other hand, regards reading and writing as forms of "meditation," as ways of modifying "inner speech" or our stream of consciousness. Both language acts control inner speech by allowing a text to structure it, or by structuring it to create a text. Other theorists refer to reading and writing as processes of

meaning construction. Tierney and Pearson (1983) discuss the reading-writing relationship in their presentation of a "composing model of reading." From a reader's perspective, meaning is created as a reader uses his background of experience together with the author's cues to arrive at what the writer wants him to think or do and with what the reader decides and creates for himself. From a writer's perspective, he uses his own background of experience to generate ideas, and in producing a text, considers what he wants to say, what he wants the reader to do or think, and makes judgments about what he considers his reader's background will be. Essentially, these acts of composing are seen as involving continuous, recurring, and recursive "transactions" among readers and writers, their receptive inner selves, and their perceptions of each other's goals and desires. Petrosky (1982) referring to this notion as a schema-theoretic approach, also asserts that the connection between reading and writing is rooted in the fundamental act of making meaning. His explanation is that schemata (plans, frames and scripts) control our perceptions of both format and content in our reading and writing. Hennings (1982) expresses a similar view, stating that schemata organize contextual and relational content, which in turn help students produce written texts and comprehend materials they read.

Recently, psychologists have been interested in how knowledge of stories--or story schema--contributes to the comprehension and production of stories. Much of this research

has generated definitions of story which outline prototypical story forms. One of the main components of these definitions is the inclusion of a protagonist who is motivated to carry out some type of goal-directed action, with the intention of attaining a goal (Rumelhart, 1975; Mandler and Johnson, 1977; Stein and Glenn, 1979; Johnson and Mandler, 1980; Stein and Trabasso, 1981; Stein and Policastro, 1984). Although there are variations in these definitions, the basic structural properties are described in highly similar terms.

According to Stein and Glenn (1979), the prototypical story has six major constituents: 1) the setting; 2) the initiating event which contains information about a change in the protagonist's environment; 3) the internal response which includes the protagonist's emotional response; 4) the attempt, or the protagonist's plan to attain a goal; 5) the consequences, signifying whether or not the protagonist succeeded in attaining the goal; and 6) the reaction, information that can be classified into one of three areas--the protagonist's emotional and cognitive responses to the goal attainment, future or long term consequences that occur as a direct result of goal attainment, or the moral, summarizing what the character learned.

Mandler and Johnson (1977) and Johnson and Mandler (1980) define a goal-directed story in similar terms. However, they also propose a definition of a nongoal-directed story. The description of their nongoal-based story allows for the

occurrence of unplanned actions. This type of story includes the following components: (1) a setting, introducing the protagonists; (2) a beginning, similar to Stein and Glenn's initiating event; (3) the protagonist's emotional response to the beginning; (4) an automatic unplanned action resulting from the protagonist's emotions; and (5) an ending.

Researchers argue that these prototypical definitions of story, embedded within an individual's mind, represent an idealized schema of story. The surface structure of a particular story, however, may not necessarily contain all elements of the prototypical story. It is therefore assumed that readers and writers use their knowledge about the prototypical structure of a story to make sense of what they read and of what they write.

E. Summary

Investigations concerned with the reading-writing relationship are of four types: 1) correlational studies which attempt to demonstrate that a relationship between reading and writing does exist; 2) studies which seek to determine whether or not writing activities influence reading and writing skill; 3) studies which examine the influence of reading practice and instruction on writing skill; and 4) studies interested in how readers and writers make sense of text--how their knowledge of stories, their schema, contributes to their comprehension and production of stories.

The 41 correlational studies discussed demonstrate that a relationship between reading and writing exists. We can confidently assert that good readers tend to be good writers, that good writers tend to have more reading experience than poor writers, and that good readers tend to write longer, more complex sentences.

Unlike correlational research, experimental studies examining the influence of writing on reading have not produced conclusive results. Sentence-combining, for example, generally agreed to be a positive influence on syntactic maturity, does not necessarily appear to produce significant gain in reading comprehension at the elementary, secondary or college levels. Although five of the studies reviewed found that it did, five other studies found that sentence combining had no effect on reading achievement. Writing instruction on the other hand, appears to be more beneficial. Twelve of the 15 studies outlined demonstrate that writing activities and/or writing instruction lead to either improved reading comprehension, retention or recall. Free writing does not serve as a substitute; only students receiving instruction and guidance demonstrate significant growth in reading achievement.

Experimental studies examining the influence of reading on writing yield results which differ from those examining the influence of writing on reading. Generally, the results are not as positive. Six studies conclude that practice in reading influences writing and four conclude that it does not. A ruling

majority cannot be established here, for three of the six studies were unable to claim with statistical significance that reading practice or literature study led to improvement in writing skill. Further support regarding the ineffectiveness of reading on writing is found in 12 studies which sought to improve writing through reading instruction. None claim that their reading treatments improved students' composition skills. Five recent studies, on the other hand, report contrary results. Through the study of various schemata and text-structure treatments, these studies claim that reading instruction does improve writing skill.

The final category of literature views reading and writing as processes of meaning construction, whereby both readers and writers rely on their background of knowledge and experience to make sense of what they read and write. Many of these theorists believe that schemata--knowledge that is stored as cognitive frameworks--determine students' comprehension and composition of prose. Recently, investigators have been interested in how knowledge of stories contribute to the understanding and production of stories. This research has generated definitions of story which outline prototypical story forms. It is believed that these story schemata include definitive conceptions of story structure, and consequently determine the comprehension and composition of a particular story.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Using a case-study approach, the current investigation examined the reading and writing processes of junior high-school students. To describe relationships between reading and writing, the study explored how students' overt and tacit knowledge of story structure influenced their comprehension and composition of short stories. On the basis of research which suggests that students have internalized a story schema that aids them in comprehending basic narratives (Rumelhart, 1975; Mandler & Johnson, 1977; Stein & Glenn, 1979; Stein & Trabasso, 1981; Stein & PolICASTRO, 1984), the present study attempted to: 1) identify the students' components of story schema; and 2) investigate whether or not these components, or schemata, affected not only students' comprehension of narratives but their written composition as well.

Methodology designed to examine the reading process was based on the work of David Jackson (1982) in Continuity in Secondary English. In developing English curricula that focuses on students and teachers as active meaning makers through language, Jackson proposes a model which moves students through four significant phases of growth: from trusting their own voice in a school context, to expanding perspectives, to reflecting on experience, and finally to thinking aloud in public. The

present study adopted Jackson's "predicting" strategy. Jackson asked his students to read a passage silently and then, based on clues contained within the passage, to predict what they thought might happen next. Because this activity would force students to rely on their interpretive systems, and thereby enable the investigator to determine students' methods of making meaning from story, the present study replicated Jackson's procedure.

Examination of the writing process relied on methodology employed by many researchers who have attempted to gain insights into the composing act (Emig, 1971; Perl, 1979; Bridwell, 1980; Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1983; Hayes and Flower, 1983). Using this procedure, these researchers asked relatively small samples of students to think aloud while they composed. Generally, students wrote alone in the presence of an observer while their responses were audiotaped or videotaped. Similar procedures were followed in the present study: subjects reported to a classroom in their school where they wrote aloud in the investigator's presence while their verbalizations were audiotaped.

A. The Pilot Study

To assess potential problems with the design, a pilot study was conducted with one student. Using a schedule similar to that outlined in Section C below, the pilot provided the investigator with insights relating to methodology and student response. More specifically, it allowed the examiner to conclude that: 1) David Jackson's procedure was feasible on the

grade-eight level; 2) although composing aloud is initially somewhat unusual for students, they adapt quickly and are capable of producing prose using this method; and 3) to complete the investigation's designated tasks, each subject must devote a total of five hours to the project at hand.

As a result of the pilot, one change was made to the study's original design. For the first session to remain within the designated one-hour time-frame, subjects could not complete the final task required of them during this first hour. Therefore, since the product of this assignment was being used solely as a springboard for discussion in the second session, subjects were asked to complete this task for homework.

B. The Sample

Five, eighth-grade, honour-roll students from a metropolitan school district volunteered to participate in the study. In selecting subjects the examiner relied on two sources: 1) students' overall academic record; and 2) confirmation from their English teachers that these students were capable readers and writers. Only those students receiving a grade-point average of at least 6.625 (from a possible score of 7.0) on their first and second progress reports of the year were considered. With the English teachers' endorsements that these potential candidates were "good" students, subjects were approached regarding their voluntary participation in the study. Parental consent was requested of all subjects prior to their involvement. Three females and two males were granted

permission to participate. These subjects, knowing that their identity would remain concealed, adopted pseudonyms: Pat, Jennifer, Melissa, Brent and Jacob.

To verify students' long-term, high academic standing, the investigator examined each individual's student file. As measured by the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test, all students were reading at least one and one-half years above grade level in the seventh grade, one year prior to their participation in the study. Subjects' academic progress reports disclosed that from the fourth to the eighth grade, these students consistently received either A's or B's in all core subject areas--math, science, social studies and language arts/English. Teachers' written comments further verified subjects' academic success. Generally, students were referred to as "conscientious", "dedicated", "cooperative" "outstanding" and "scholarly."

C. Data Collection Procedures

Each of the five subjects participated in five, one-hour sessions. Working with the investigator on an individual basis, each student was engaged in five hours of reading, writing and discussion. The procedures outlined below were applied to all participants.

1. Session One

- a) Subjects' first task was to read and respond to William Saroyan's short story "The Great Leapfrog Contest" in 12 segments (see Appendix A for a precise breakdown). The story, divided in this manner, was taken from David

Jackson's book Continuity in Secondary English. While being tape-recorded for approximately 45 minutes, students read each segment silently and, based on events contained within the passage, predicted upcoming events (see Appendix B for the schedule of questions directed at each student). Although subjects thought they had read Saroyan's tale in its entirety by the twelfth segment, they were not provided with the story's conclusion. Jackson's rationale for not including Saroyan's finale was to demonstrate that students would respond to this incompleteness because of their narrative expectations, which, when violated, provoked them to react with extreme dissatisfaction. Appendix C contains the story's original conclusion as written by Saroyan.

- b) Following this interrupted reading and prediction session, students wrote their own brief conclusion to Saroyan's story for approximately 15 minutes. With this, the investigator was attempting to determine whether subjects' conclusions would have a "sense of an ending," whether their versions would fulfill their narrative expectations.
- c) At the end of the session students were given a homework assignment in which they were verbally instructed to write a descriptive paragraph (see Appendix D). To establish continuity between their reading and this

writing assignment, students were asked to write on a topic similar to Saroyan's: unfairness and cruelty.

2. Session Two

- a) The second meeting started with a 10 to 15 minute tape-recorded discussion based on students' homework assignment. Initially, in an attempt to get at students' perception of the short story genre, the investigator asked, "What is a short story?" Once subjects determined those features which, in their minds, characterized the short story, they were asked, "Is this event you described for homework a short story?" Students' affirmative or negative responses to this question, were followed with the interrogative, "Why?" or "Why not?"
- b) For the remaining 45 to 50 minutes, students began to re-write their paragraphs in short story form. Subjects did not receive any instruction in writing the short story, but rather were told that based on their knowledge of what a short story is, to write a story dealing with the same incident their paragraph dealt with. While composing aloud into a tape recorder, students wrote the first drafts of their short stories in the presence of the investigator. During this period, although subjects were permitted to ask questions, they received no interruptions from the investigator. When this session ended, students were told that they would continue writing their stories in the upcoming session.

3. Session Three

During the third session, students continued writing their first drafts aloud while talking into the tape recorder. All finished their stories at various intervals within the hour, and upon completion, were verbally instructed to revise their stories. During this phase of revision, students continued to compose aloud while being tape-recorded.

4. Session Four

This session started with students being told that the final drafts of their stories must be submitted to the investigator by the end of the period. For the duration of the hour, students continued to revise aloud while their verbalizations were tape-recorded.

5. Session Five

- a) In the fifth session students were directed to read their stories aloud and, if necessary, to make final editorial changes. As in previously discussed sessions, students were tape-recorded while completing these tasks.
- b) Prior to this meeting, the investigator examined each student's story and made both weak and constructive changes that were to be discussed with the student. These changes included simple editorial changes as well as changes in plot, character, setting, theme, point of view, tone and mood. To explore students' tacit knowledge of story structure, the investigator asked them

to agree or disagree with these changes¹, and, besides expressing their decisions, to indicate why they would or would not go along with these recommendations.

The suggested changes listed below illustrate three types of changes proposed by the investigator: a stylistically appropriate change, a stylistically neutral change, and a stylistically inappropriate change.

i. Appropriate Change

An appropriate change was one which was deemed to enhance the story. For example, the investigator suggested to one student that she eliminate her first four paragraphs and instead begin with her fifth paragraph. By eliminating these first four paragraphs comprised of unnecessary material concerning a minor character, the story was more effective without the superfluous information.

ii. Neutral Change

A neutral change was one which was deemed to neither enhance nor mar the story. For example, in one case the investigator rewrote a sentence concerning the

¹ The investigator anticipated that subjects might expect teachers to make improvements to their writing; therefore, to avoid a situation where subjects viewed the investigator as an expert and thereby accepted all revisions, students were told that the investigator's proposed changes were not "corrections," but simply different methods of presentation--none of which were necessarily better than their own methods. The fact that students would say, as one did, that some changes were "kind of...dumb," suggests that they did not view the investigator as an authority figure.

description of a tree. It was suggested to a student that he change his sentence, "He grabbed a hold of Mark's head and swung it swiftly into the stump of a big tree." to "He grabbed a hold of Mark's head and swung it swiftly into the tree." As this change had no significant bearing on the main elements of story, it was deemed to be neutral.

iii. Inappropriate Change

An inappropriate change was one which was deemed to detract from the story. In the following example, a character description inconsistent with the student's was suggested: a charming character in contrast to a milque-toast. For example, the investigator wrote the following passage and suggested to the student that she include it in her seventh paragraph.

She was one of the most beautiful girls I had ever seen. Her greenish-hazel eyes and dark brown hair were a stunning combination. Her face was perfect. She had smooth, flawless skin that people wanted to touch, and her high cheek-bones...

Additional examples of appropriate, neutral and inappropriate changes can be found in Appendix E.

D. Analysis of the Data

The investigator examined eight pieces of data for each of the five subjects. Each student's participation in five hours of reading, writing and discussion produced: 1) reading responses to "The Great Leapfrog Contest"; 2) a written

conclusion to "The Great Leapfrog Contest"; 3) a discussion of the short story genre; 4) an original short story; 5) think-aloud protocols corresponding to the short story; 6) a revised version of the story; 7) think-aloud protocols corresponding to the revised short story; and 8) rationales of the subject's decisions to refuse or accept the investigator's suggested revisions for their short story. Therefore, in total, 40 pieces of datum were gathered from the five subjects: 15 written products and 25 hours of tape-recorded reading, writing and discussion.

Prior to analyzing the data, the investigator transcribed the verbal protocols mentioned above. The resulting transcriptions were extensive, the resulting data for one student alone running to 106 pages. This confirms Hayes and Flower's (1983) observation that one page of text may produce 20 pages of protocol.

Using traditional classifications of the short story--as defined by Brooks and Warren (1959), Perrine (1966), Aloian (1968), and Metcalf (1980)--each piece of datum was analyzed for evidence of plot, character, setting, theme, point of view, tone and mood. For setting, in conjunction with the definition established by the author's listed above, an additional

component, as defined by Stein and PolICASTRO (1984), was used to analyze the data.²

All 40 pieces of datum were independently examined for the six elements of story. Since the investigator focused on only one element per reading of each protocol, the number of combined readings constituted 240. The procedures followed in analyzing the data are as outlined below:

- 1) The eight pieces of datum gathered from one subject were analyzed as a unit for a single element of story (i.e., plot). Each sentence that was written or spoken by the student was read and closely examined for reference or connection to the element under observation--in this example, plot. If the statement made any reference which could possibly be construed as plot, this statement was colour-coded on the original document and rewritten and interpreted onto a data sheet with headings containing the subject's name, the element under examination, and the specific protocol in which it had been found (see Appendix F). If the statement made no reference to plot, the investigator proceeded to read on. Identical

² According to Stein and PolICASTRO (1984), a prototypical story has six major constituents: 1) the setting; 2) the initiating event; 3) the internal response; 4) the attempt; 5) the consequence; and 6) the reaction. The setting, they claim, "includes the introduction of a specific animate protagonist and normally contains information that refers to the physical, social, or temporal context in which the remainder of the story occurs."

procedures were followed for each statement made by the subject.

- 2) Once the investigator completed this observation and analysis of plot for one subject's unit of data, procedures identical to those described above were followed in analyzing the remaining four subjects' concept of plot.
- 3) With all five subjects' data analyzed for plot, for example, the investigator then classified the information on the various data sheets. These data sheets for each of the five subjects were laid side by side. The investigator compared responses across subjects looking for similarities and differences. Consistent patterns were classified as characteristic of subjects' concept of plot. These various constituent components were combined and further classified to comprise subjects' overall plot schemata.
- 4) For the remaining elements of story (character, setting, theme, point of view, tone and mood), the steps outlined in subsections 1, 2 and 3 were repeated.

The major components of the design, then, were: 1) a pilot study which assessed problems with the data collection procedures; 2) a sample of five high-ability, grade eight students, two males and three females; 3) data collection procedures which included having the students read a story in segments, respond to each segment, and write a conclusion for

the story; discuss their concept of story; write their own short story using think-aloud procedures; revise their story using think-aloud procedures; and comment on the investigator's proposed revisions; and 4) a data analysis which categorized students' responses in writing and reading using six elements of story schema.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSES AND RESULTS OF DATA

Analyses of the five case studies revealed moderate relationships between reading and writing on the eight variables analyzed: 1) twelve transcribed reading-response segments to "The Great Leapfrog Contest"; 2) the subject's written conclusion to "The Great Leapfrog Contest"; 3) a transcribed discussion of the short story genre; 4) the subject's first draft of his or her short story; 5) the subject's revised draft of his or her story; 6) a transcribed think-aloud protocol that accompanied the first draft; 7) a transcribed think-aloud protocol that accompanied the revised draft; and 8) the subject's reaction to revisions proposed by the investigator. To identify the characteristics of these high-ability students' story schema and determine the influence that this schema has on reading and writing, each of the above variables was analyzed for traditional story elements: plot, character, setting, theme, point of view, tone and mood.

The students' overall story schema was made up of schemata corresponding to these story elements. Furthermore, these schemata consisted of a configuration of variables which served to guide students in both their reading and writing. For example, with respect to plot schemata, students made meaning of their reading and writing by relying on subschemata comprised of

conflict, conflict resolution and happiness binding. In reading and writing about character, students' constituent subschemata included character description, character presentation, character conflict and character change. In terms of setting, subjects constructed meaningful representations of the text they read and wrote by focusing on the protagonist and his social environment; whereas in terms of theme, their schemata generated variables which identified theme as a didactic cliché that generally referred to conflict. Regarding plot, character, setting and theme, then, the current investigation established that students relied on their conceptual knowledge of story to create meaning when reading and writing. However, students' overall story schema did not appear to include distinguishable knowledge frameworks for either point of view, tone or mood.

A. Plot

Analysis of the data revealed that relationships between reading and writing were found in academically-able, grade eight students' schemata for plot. The most distinct elements found in students' reading and writing were their notion of conflict, conflict resolution and happiness binding. The current investigation also found that, in addition to helping students, these schemata often interfered with both their reading and writing.

Reading for plot was strongly characterized by the notion of conflict in students' responses to "The Great Leapfrog Contest." After reading the story's first segment, eleven

sentences that introduced the character Rosie, all students revealed their anticipation of conflict--conflict of the man-versus-man type. All students immediately predicted Rosie's contact with an opposing force. Three students correctly guessed that her opponent would be male: Subject 1, Jacob,¹ asserted that "Rosie will get into a fight with a boy or something like that"; Subject 2, Melissa, assumed that "she gets frogs and has a contest between her and another boy"; and Subject 3, Jennifer, stated that "she wins the great leapfrog contest and beats a guy." Subjects 4 and 5, Brent and Pat, initially felt that Rosie's opposition would be female, but quickly corrected themselves after reading the second segment: the introduction of Rex. At this point, the story's fourth paragraph, all students accurately assessed the collision between Rosie and Rex.

Anticipating conflict that pits man against man in the story they read was similar to the conflict in the stories they wrote. That this external, physical conflict was foremost on their minds could be inferred from their stories' introductory sentences. Three students implied in both their initial and final drafts that their text would deal with conflict of this exact nature. In their opening lines, Pat, Melissa and Brent respectively wrote:

¹Subjects in the study chose the pseudonyms Jacob, Melissa, Jennifer, Brent and Pat. In the text subjects will be referred to by their pseudonyms.

One day when Mark was sitting on a swing at school Jordy came up to Mark and said, "Get off that swing or I'll push you off!";

The South African population is suffering the unjust takeover of their country's government by White officials;

Today all through school there was talk about the big fight.

All three examples demonstrated the importance that conflict had on students' plots. This significance was seen also in Jacob's and Jennifer's written work; however, rather than make an immediate statement, they followed a traditional pattern in which they introduced their characters and setting, and then followed this with statements that made the tension between characters obvious. Jacob wrote, "He and my dad had been mad at each other for quite awhile," and Jennifer wrote that "Everyone in the class thought Tanis was weird and always bugged her." Despite the decision to wait before introducing conflict, the inclusion of it confirmed that conflict was an essential component of plot schemata, a component which not only influenced students' reading, but their writing as well.

Conflict resolution, in conjunction with students' sense of an ending, was also found to be an important component of plot schemata in both reading and writing. Students' responses to "The Great Leapfrog Contest," combined with their own short stories, indicated that along with the anticipation of conflict, they also anticipated resolution of conflict. However, subjects equated resolution of conflict with a "happy ending." Students'

early reading responses indicated their expectation of a solution to the Rex-and-Rosie situation. Naturally, they assumed a winner would emerge; however, upon discovering that Rosie was victorious, their disappointment and displeasure became evident. In recognizing Rosie's ruthlessness, they began to expect her downfall, but when these expectations were not fulfilled, to them justice had not been served. Four of the five students demonstrated that the conflict could have been resolved had the author included a happy ending. Melissa, Jennifer and Pat made statements very similar to the following comment made by Jacob when asked, "What do you think of this ending?":

I think it sort of left it hanging a bit. Like, they could've let Rex get up after awhile and sort of let us see what he's like after that.

Clearly, to the student the story lacked a sense of ending, but Jacob, as with the other students also felt that a harmonious ending would have been preferable to Saroyan's. Jacob continued: "Rex and Rosie should've gone up and probably just been more normal and...sort of become friends," as did Pat who said, "They should've become friends and not fight anymore." Jennifer, on the other hand, thought "they should both fall and both become leaders," and Melissa reported that "they respect each other for what they are." These four students, when given the opportunity to rewrite Saroyan's ending, fulfilled their expectations with happiness binding. In their written conclusions to the story, all had the characters "make up."

Subjects' writing revealed complimentary schemata. In their own short stories, all students appeared to feel that resolution of conflict and the happy ending were synonymous. Conflict between characters was not necessarily resolved; but nonetheless, all students created a sense of completion through their happy endings. Outcomes and methods varied, but in all cases happiness prevailed. For example, Jacob's characters, after they "...apologized and were no longer enemies...went to dinner and became friends"; Pat's protagonist died, but as a result, the antagonist "...was a lot nicer and he began getting more friends"; Jennifer's little waif "...finally found a true friend"; and Melissa, who wrote an essay rather than a short story, indicated in her final session of the study that she would

change [her] story so it had people in it. A white person would make a difference for those South African people who did lose hope in all white people. It would prove to be that white people can be good.

Brent, the only student who did not demand a happy ending, was, nonetheless, consistent in his reading and writing. Rather than look for a happy ending in his reading, Brent felt that a "twist" would have been more appropriate. Looking puzzled and disappointed he said,

It seems to carry on like Rosie's going to win, and I was just thinking that maybe they'll change it for a twist in the end. But they didn't. They just [...PAUSE...] they just did what looked like would happen...If they did it right, it would have been a little more exciting if he changed it around.

When given the opportunity to write his conclusion to "The Great Leapfrog Contest," Brent created this twist by not having anyone declared a winner. A "twist" was also found in Brent's own short story, for after losing a fight, his protagonist was unexpectedly declared the winner "because he fought fair and honest." The antagonist, on the other hand, "had no friends." In terms of Brent's narrative logic, justice had been served.

Thus far, discussion has revealed that students' schemata for plot is generally composed of conflict, conflict resolution and a happy ending. This schemata, however, in addition to positively influencing students' comprehension and composition of stories, often interfered with both reading and writing. Although students' sense of plot enhanced their literal comprehension, these narrative expectations also prevented them from extending their conscious understanding of the print. All students agreed that there would be early collision between Rosie and Rex, and all used their story sense to predict a harmonious ending. But, when their expectations of narrative logic were unfulfilled, students reacted to this violation. All subjects focused on their sense of unfulfilled expectations, rather than attempt to understand why Rosie behaved as she did or why the "gang" in the story felt that Rex was getting what he had coming to him. In real life, students accept that good men die and scoundrels flourish, but in the world of make-believe, they can not relinquish the stock conventions of the popular tale.

Similar patterns emerged in students' written work. Their unwillingness to deviate from "the expected" was seen in their reactions to revisions proposed by the investigator. When it was suggested to Jacob that his story end tragically he said, "It's got to have a happy ending. Every story has that." Likewise, Jennifer felt that the investigator's suggestion to conclude with suicide was "kind of a dumb ending." She continued to say, "I don't want it to be ironic. I want a good ending, a happy ending. Don't you think Tanis deserves to be happy?" Brent, who indicated in his reading that happy endings were not mandatory, also demonstrated that in a world of his making, he preferred to order events aright. Rejecting the investigator's recommendation that the conclusion be altered to include the protagonist's death, he said:

I like the idea of having it a little bit different. But, um, the only thing is, I think it's maybe a little bit unrealistic. One kick in the head and the guy's dead?...Like maybe he could be severely hurt, but, ah, I don't think he'd die.

As with the other academically talented grade eight students in the study, Brent's notion of plot--his concept of conflict, conflict resolution and the happy ending associated with these--not only prevented him from taking his readers and himself into the deeper structures of feeling and thought, but also prevented him from selecting events that would enhance the significance and profundity of his own written work.

B. Character

Relationships between students' reading and writing were also found in their concept of character. Students' character schemata consisted of four constituent subschemata: character description, character presentation, character conflict and character change.

Examination of students' reading responses and written work revealed that characters were described as "good" or "bad", and that all characters, be they major or minor, were two-dimensional. As seen in Table 1, four of the five students viewed characters as either good or bad in the story they read, and all five students had good and bad characters in the stories they wrote.

TABLE 1
Character Description

	Reading	Writing
Jacob	Good/Bad	Good/Bad
Brent	Good/Bad	Good/Bad
Pat ²	-	Good/Bad
Jennifer	Good/Bad	Good/Bad
Melissa	Good/Bad	Good/Bad

² Since the student was not making judgments while reading, a blank space was left in the reading column.

While reading "The Great Leapfrog Contest," Jacob, Brent and Melissa made direct reference to the characters' being either good or bad. When asked by the investigator "Why do you think Rex is going to lose [the contest]?" Jacob answered, "He's sort of the bad guy in the story..." A similar exchange took place when Brent was questioned:

Investigator: So what do you think of him
for...(student interrupts)

Brent: For not saying anything about it? Well, that he's pretty good then. He's a good guy.

Investigator: And how about Rosie?

Brent: Well she's not very nice now. She's whacking his head against the ground.

Although Melissa did not initially describe the characters in good or bad terms, she directly stated who the villain was half way through her reading. As the story unfolded she insinuated that Rex was bad, whereas later she reported that Rosie was. When asked if she was reformulating her opinion about characters she said, "A little, because now Rosie seems like the bad person." Characters for this talented grade-eight student, then, had to be either good or bad.

Responding to what she had read, Jennifer did not directly identify the hero and villain; however, her comments clearly indicated that she either viewed the characters in favourable or unfavourable terms:

Jennifer: ...he has practically no feelings. It seems like he doesn't care about anything except for himself...He's really self-righteous, conceited. He thinks he's the best at everything, and if he gets

lowered at the best then he gets mad and wants to pull down the guy at the top and get there himself.

Investigator: And how about Rosie, how do you feel about her?

Jennifer: Well I don't think she'll do anything drastic to get to the top. She just wants to fit in. Like, if she's just a member of the gang that's fine, but if she can be the leader of the gang, that's fine too. But she won't do anything like hurt somebody.

Observations similar to those described above were also seen in students' written work. Brent's and Jennifer's character descriptions clearly indicated that their characters fell into the realm of good or bad. The following two paragraphs from Brent's short story demonstrate this point:

After school today everybody ran to the clearing in the woods where the fight was going to take place. Mark was one of the people fighting and he was quite well liked. He was a good fighter and when he won, it was always fair.

Dave his opponent had arrived and he was standing with his group. He was very mean and he wasn't really very nice to anyone. He was ruthless and he didn't care how he won a fight just as long as he won no matter what.

In addition to this, Brent's think-aloud protocols revealed that aside from planning this good-bad element, Mark's popularity and Dave's ruthlessness determined upcoming events in his story. After writing these paragraphs and thinking about what was going to happen next, he said to himself:

.....the.....the.....um.....let's see.....Davie was the mean one, and Mark was the nicer one so..... Mark will be the one that gets hurt.

Like Brent, Jennifer's responses to reading also had characters which were classified as good or bad. In the following passage she made this evident to her readers.

...Tanis was the kind of girl who put up with a lot. She is usually nice to everyone...She has a funny laugh which everyone imitates...She helps around our classroom when she finishes her work...

The next day we were all in the girl's changing room and Kim and Terri the class bullies started to make fun of Tanis' brown runners. Kim often pushed Tanis around and insulted her and her brother.

The remaining three students (Pat, Jacob and Melissa) also incorporated the good and the bad into their written work; however, rather than specifically state this, they made subtle implications. Pat, for example, did not tell her readers who the hero and villain were. She decided to have the actions of her characters speak for themselves. She wrote, "One day when Mark was sitting on a swing at school, Jordy came up to Mark and said, "'Get off that swing or I'll push you off!'"

Jacob also made indirect reference as to who was "good" and "not good." Writing his story in first person about two baseball coaches, one of whom was the narrator's father, enabled his readers to deduce that the narrator's father would be the good coach and the other figure the bad coach. This description of character was reinforced by the poor judgment calls made by the other coach and with the following character assessment made by the narrator's father: "What a goof!"

Unlike the others, Melissa--who wrote an expository essay rather than a short story--did not have any specific characters

in her writing sample. Yet despite the expository nature of her work, Melissa also distinguished between the good and the bad. Discussing the current Black-White situation in South Africa, she made clear who the villains were.

The white population has invaded this country, taken over its government and mistreated its people. It is also very discriminating because the S. Africans are, in a sense being punished for having a different colour of skin, a different religion, customs or because of a different language.

In addition to showing that students view characters in terms of opposite traits, data also revealed that in both students' reading and writing, character descriptions were two-dimensional. That is, besides thinking in terms of good and bad to describe characters, students provided little depth and detail. As a result, characters were flat and stereo-typed, rather than round and complex. This two-dimensional aspect of character description was seen in all five students' reading and writing.

After reading the first two introductory paragraphs to "The Great Leapfrog Contest," students were all asked: "What's your impression of Rosie?" The five subjects responded with the following remarks: "She's kind of a butch"; "Sort of bossy"; "She's not really a girl"; "She's mean"; "She's like really free going." As the story progressed, providing its readers with further insight into the characters, students were asked, "How do you feel about Rosie now?" Answers verified that students continued to view characters two-dimensionally: "She's still

kind of pushy"; "She's pretty though"; "She's playing a little unfairly"; "I think [she's] weird"; "She's smart. She's ...just witty and Rex is a big chunk of bone." Clearly, students were not thinking of characters as developing beings. All characters remained static and two dimensional. This was also the case in students' written work. Jacob provided his readers with very little detail about character. The following two sentences were his only character descriptors: "Brian Donnely was a Canadian Football League official and also a coach in the football league" and "My dad always had trouble controlling his temper." Brent provided the readers of his short story with terms that were very similar to the type used when students interpreted characters in the story they read: "nice," "mean," "ruthless" and "large." Pat provided her readers with only one descriptor: "wimp." Jennifer, who used the terms "silly" and "weird," also included physical description: "She had green eyes and dark brown hair."

In terms of the second subschemata, character presentation, the investigator also saw evidence of relationships between students' reading and writing. All five students relied on the author's direct presentation of character to make inferences while reading; likewise, all five students employed direct methods of character presentation in their written material.

Based on observable events in the story they read (e.g., Rosie hitting Rex's head against the pavement), Jacob, Brent, Jennifer and Pat concluded that Rosie was the "smarter" of the

two characters. Students made no reference to motive, consequences, or human behavior--largely, perhaps, because this would have required examination of the author's indirect presentation of character. Melissa, on the other hand, attempted to understand what motivated characters to behave as they did; nevertheless, when doing so, she based her decisions on the obvious. When answering the question "What do you think makes Rex act the way he does?", her answer revealed that, when she was not relying on given information, she was stereotyping.

Well seeing he's probably from Texas, he probably hasn't seen a girl act like Rosie has, like a tomboy, and he doesn't really like it. His parents probably taught him the place of a girl in society, and he's sort of confused about why Rosie is more like a boy than a girl...Texas sort of has girls like housewives, and boys like boys, and men like cowboys who go work on the land and ride horses.

Reading-writing interrelations became apparent when the above reading responses were juxtaposed with students' writing samples, for it became obvious that students relied completely on direct methods of character presentation not only when reading but when writing their own stories as well. While reading, students examined character in terms of what was specifically stated, and while writing, they revealed character by telling, rather than by showing or implying. Think-aloud protocols revealed that as writers they put importance on characters' names, physical attributes and the conflict confronting characters--all aspects which lend themselves well to direct presentation. Thus, in addition to telling their

readers that "Dave was ruthless" and that "Sally Stockwell was a girl," students demonstrated that these aspects of character were important when planning their stories. For example, before beginning to write, Pat said to herself,

Okay...this boy, his name is Mark, is in grade seven. He's small for his age and looks sort of wimpy. His clothes are a little out of style and he walks a little funny.

Brent's think-aloud protocols revealed that while mentally shaping his characters, he also put emphasis on what was directly observable. Dissatisfied with what he had written, he said, "Stop! That doesn't sound right" and then proceeded to think of different descriptors: "...he was too wild-like.....he was too hyper.....he was too into it.....he was over-doing it." One of the five students did not even feel that it was necessary to provide his readers with character detail. When the investigator suggested to Jacob that he revise his story and physically describe his characters, he stated:

There's no need for description. I could've put it, like where they were and everything...They're not making comments on what they look like or anything. There's just nothing that you need it for.

Despite Jacob's resistance to include more description, his think-aloud protocols revealed that when he was thinking of character he was also preoccupied with superficial detail; hence, the statement, "Brian Donnely is a baseball umpire, so I gotta write something about that."

Thus far, relationships between reading and writing have been examined with regard to character description and character

presentation. Strong reading-writing interrelations also surfaced in the area of character conflict, the third component of students' character schemata. As seen in Tables 2 and 3, examination of students' reading and writing revealed that: 1) conflict was always of the "man versus man" type; 2) the danger confronting characters was always physical; and 3) if conflict was resolved it was resolved by means of selecting a "winner."

TABLE 2
Character Conflict

Reading			
	Type	Danger	Resolution (Student version)
Jacob	Man vs Man	Physical	1 winner Resolved
Brent	Man vs Man	Physical	Tie Not Resolved
Pat	Man vs Man	Physical	1 winner Resolved
Jennifer	Man vs Man	Physical	1 winner Resolved
Melissa	Man vs Man	Physical	Tie Resolved

TABLE 3
Character Conflict

Writing			
	Type	Danger	Resolution
Jacob	Man vs Man	Physical	Tie Resolved
Brent	Man vs Man	Physical	1 Winner Not Resolved
Pat	Man vs Man	Physical	1 Winner Not Resolved
Jennifer	Man vs Man	Physical	1 Winner Not Resolved
Melissa	Man vs Man	Physical	- Not Resolved

Conflict between individual characters, traditionally referred to as "man versus man," was the element students predicted most consistently in the short story they read, and it was the only type of conflict found within the short stories they wrote. After reading the first three paragraphs of the story, those which introduced the character Rosie, three of the students predicted, before being introduced to any other person in the story, that this character would come into conflict within another character. The remaining two students also predicted conflict between characters; however, they did so after reading the story's fourth paragraph: that which

introduced the character Rex. All students made comments very similar to Jacob's: "Rosie will get into a fight with a boy, or something like that." Since students did not speculate on conflicts other than "man versus man" in the story they read, it was not surprising that they employed only the "man versus man" conflict in the stories they wrote. In their written work, Pat and Brent focused on conflict between boys; Jennifer on conflict between girls; Jacob on conflict between male adults; and Melissa on conflict between groups of people.

Furthermore, subjects always viewed opposition between people in physical terms. While reading, students saw only "the fight" or "the competition" between Rosie and Rex. Likewise, in their written work, the conflicts confronting characters were physically threatening. Brent wrote, "Today all through school there was talk about the big fight"; Pat wrote, "One day when Mark was sitting on a swing at school, Jordy came up to Mark and said, 'Get off that swing or I'll push you off.'" By introducing an element of threat, the remaining three students also made their readers aware of the physical dangers confronting their stories' characters. In both their reading and writing, conflict was resolved for six of the ten subjects by means of determining a winner(s) or loser(s) at the end of the story. Students did not feel that it was always necessary to resolve the conflict between characters; however, they generally felt that whether or not characters settled their differences, it was necessary for "winners" and/or "losers" to

emerge at the end of the stories they read and wrote. When students were given the opportunity to change the conclusion of the story they read, three students had "winners," and the remaining two had "ties," implying that both characters either won or lost, depending on one's interpretation of a tie.

In the stories students wrote, one student resolved the conflict between characters; three of the five students had single winners emerge, but they did not settle character differences. The one student who did resolve character differences did so by means of a tie. Even Brent, who had the antagonist win, decided that this character should be stripped of the honour of winning and a new winner crowned--the loser. Brent concluded his story with the statement: "Pretty well all the people there felt the fight was unfair so they favored Mark for the place of winning the fight because he fought fair and honest."

In addition to reading and writing relations in the areas of character description, character presentation and character conflict, strong reading and writing interrelations were also found in the area of character change, the fourth component of students' character schemata. Not all students felt that it was necessary for characters to change. As seen in Table 4, two did not. The remaining three, however, felt that it was necessary for them to see change in character when reading and writing a story.

TABLE 4
Character Change

	Reading	Writing
Jacob	Wanted Change	Change
Brent	Indifferent	No Change
Pat	Wanted Change	Change
Jennifer	Wanted Change	Change
Melissa	Indifferent	No Change

Although not all students felt that change in character was required, relationships between these students' reading and writing were, nonetheless, clearly evident. Brent and Melissa made no reference to the fact that the characters in Soroyan's story did not change, nor did they allow for character change or growth when writing their own conclusion to this story. This static element was also detected in their written stories. Neither Melissa nor Brent presented their characters as developing or changing beings. Just as they were content with a static and unchanging Rosie in the story they read, so were they content with static and unchanging characters in the stories they wrote.

Relationships between reading and writing character development were also found in the work of Jacob, Pat and Jennifer. None of these academically talented grade eight students was satisfied with the static characters of his or her

reading material; therefore, all of them changed the outcome of Soroyan's short story when writing their own conclusion. In students' versions, characters made changes for the better. For example, Pat wrote "Rosie came to her senses and realized that she didn't want to kill anymore people"; Jennifer wrote, "[Rex] promised he would try to be a better person"; and Jacob wrote, "Rosie and Rex were best of friends and neither of them ever fought each other, or anyone else again." Similar patterns were found in the short stories that students wrote. All three students indicated that characters changed as a result of the experience they had undergone in the story. For example, Jacob wrote, "Neither Dad nor I ever again did something to harm someone, but instead talked things over instead of yelling and fighting"; and Pat wrote, "After a while Jordy started to be a lot nicer. He knew he wouldn't be able to live with his old self so he changed to a different person." Clearly, then, as demonstrated in the work of these three students, their story schema helped them understand a basic, but important, aspect of story--that characters often undergo a change in personality or outlook.

C. Setting

Ordinarily, setting consists of "time" and "place" (Aloian, 1968; Metcalf, 1980). Recent attempts to describe the conceptual organization of story knowledge, however, have led to broader definitions of the concept of setting (Stein & Glenn, 1979; Stein & Policastro, 1984). Stein and Policastro (1984)

describe the prototypical story as one which consists of a setting and an episode. In defining the former they state,

The setting includes the introduction of a specific animate protagonist and normally contains information that refers to the physical, social, or temporal context in which the remainder of the story occurs.
[p. 118]

The current investigation, applying the above definition to analyze of the data, found two significant relationships between reading and writing: 1) grade-eight, honour-roll students' schemata for setting place considerable emphasis on protagonists and their social environment; and 2) these schemata place very little emphasis on physical and temporal aspects of setting.

In relation to Stein and Policastro's definition of setting, "The Great Leapfrog Contest" conforms to all variables previously outlined. Its setting includes the introduction of a protagonist: Rosie Mahoney; the physical context of the story: the slums of Fresno County; the temporal context: a past winter and summer; and the social context: girl/boy confrontation. In their efforts to understand Saroyan's material, students relied on a configuration of schemata that focused on the protagonist and her social encounters. After reading the story's first segment, all students commented on Rosie and the element of competition. As they read they refined their predictions about the situation she would find herself in. In terms of content and progression, the following comments, taken from Jacob's transcript, were similar to statements made by all students involved in the study:

Segment 1: I think she would fight anybody who comes along.

Segment 2: She'll get into a fight with that Rex Folger guy.

Segment 3: Rosie and Rex will both be in this game of leapfrog and they'll get into a fight somehow.

Segment 5: Maybe they won't fight. Instead, they'll have a leapfrog contest and the last person to drop out will win.

Segment 6: They'll keep on going for a long time and Rex will finally get tired and lose.

In segments one, two, three, five and six, those which students responded to in the quotes above, Saroyan not only provided his readers with information pertaining to the girl/boy confrontation, he also provided his readers with clues relating to time and place. Students' interpretations, however, were not fashioned by these factors. Four students entirely disregarded that Rosie and Rex lived in a "slum neighbourhood"--and hence that they were children of poverty. Likewise, these students overlooked Saroyan's temporal statements. Only one student, Jennifer, used this information to determine that which motivated Rosie. When asked why Rosie wanted to "play with the guys", Jennifer's answer reflected her sensitivity to the neighbourhood and the time of year:

Because winter's really drabby--you know draggy. You don't want to stay home. She probably wants to go out and have some fun. It's winter and she just wants to join in...It's the slum neighbourhood of town so if they play softball or whatever, like they can get it wrecked and nobody'll say anything.

The insignificance allotted to time and place in setting schemata by students, combined with the significance of human interaction, was not only evident in students' reading, but in their writing as well. Initially, this was observed in their written conclusions to "The Great Leapfrog Contest." While students made incidental reference to location, they elaborated on the social interaction within the story; however, rather than maintain an atmosphere of competition and animosity, as intended by Saroyan, four of the five students changed the social setting to one of harmony and camaraderie. Focusing on the characters and their behavioral changes, Jacob wrote:

Rosie...helped Rex up. Then we all walked to the corner store, and got in line with our cans of pop. When it was Rosie's time to pay for her pop, Rex stepped up and said "I'll buy it".

Jennifer expressed similar changes in social setting:

...she told Rex she would share the position with him...When Rosie came up to shake Rex's hand..Rex shook her hand cheerfully and thought their gang is going to be the best in the neighbourhood.

Like Jacob and Jennifer, Melissa and Pat also focussed upon a change in social atmosphere, but Brent, whose emphasis was also social, chose to maintain a level of competition and animosity.

Short stories students wrote revealed similar findings. All included physical and temporal setting: the "ballpark on Saturday"; the "clearing in the woods...after school"; "the playground at recess"; the "grade seven classroom"; and "South Africa today." Once physical and temporal setting were documented though, their function and relevance ceased. Setting

did not serve to develop plot, character, theme or mood. It did not suggest habits, income, temperament, eccentricity, cheerfulness or gloom. Rather, as with preceding evidence, priority was given to protagonists and social milieu: to the hatred between two baseball coaches; to the fight between Mark and Dave; to the threats Mark was receiving from Jordy; to the peer-pressure placed on Tanis; and to the injustice wrought upon Black South Africans. "What was happening" and "to whom it was happening" were primary, while "where" and "when" merely secondary.

D. Theme

Within theme schemata, relationships between reading and writing were evident. Examination of data--students' reading responses to "The Great Leapfrog Contest", their written conclusions to Saroyan's tale, their discussion of the short story genre, their own written stories, their think-aloud protocols, and their reactions to revisions proposed by the investigator--confirmed that honour-roll, grade-eight students' story schemata identified theme in terms of three constituent subschemata: a didactic pronouncement, a cliché, and a broad generalization that referred to conflict.

Analysis of the data revealed that theme was interpreted by all five subjects as a "lesson to be learned." Moral statements were found in their reading responses and writing samples. Student response to theme in "The Great Leapfrog Contest" was in the form of a didactic pronouncement. In

answering the investigator's question "What do you think this story is about?" three students openly declared and two students implied that readers were being taught a lesson. Brent felt that Saroyan was making two declarations: 1) "if you think things out...and have a technique...it will give you more advantage"; and 2) "not to show off and...fight everybody for friends." Pat also thought that "fighting" was the main subject and that the author was "telling you...that...it's not a very good way to settle an argument." Jacob, who also considered fighting to be an important component, felt that the author was saying,

Mind your own business. Try not to lead everyone...so that someone doesn't finally come along and beat you up.

Melissa, whose interpretation differed, felt that the story was about

...not judging a person on what they are, like...being a girl or a boy or any particular race...just judging them on being a person.

And Jennifer, reacting with disappointment to the story's outcome, felt that despite the little knowledge characters gained, readers learned that,

[Cheating] doesn't prove anything...It's like cheating on a test. You don't learn anything if you cheat on a test...Everything goes to waste, all the homework and everything.

Examination of students' writing samples confirmed that not only are theme and moral interchangeable when students read, but also when they write. Students' written texts and think-aloud

protocols revealed that, as authors of short stories, they perceived the writer's role as one of "teacher." All five stories written by the students had lessons in them--ones which dealt with such topics as friendship, honesty, racial prejudice, change and compromise. Furthermore, the think-aloud protocols revealed that three of the five students consciously planned to incorporate these lessons into their stories. While generating ideas, Jacob said emphatically:

Ah ha! I'll get suspended from school and my dad'll get suspended from the game. And then two wrongs don't make a right.

Likewise, Brent made similar plans as he was plotting the events of his story. In reference to the main character, he stated, "...he'll come in and teach the other guy a lesson by beating him fairly." Melissa, confirming the notion that moral and theme are synonymous, implied that her intentions were also to educate her reader. Looking back on her work she said to herself:

The moral is not to judge people on how they look, and judge them upon what they are...The theme is not to judge people on how they look, how they talk, how they dress, but on who they really are.

Aside from equating theme to a didactic message in their reading and writing, discussions with students revealed that this message was one of a story's key ingredients. In discussing the short story genre, one student made specific reference to didacticism. When asked what a short story was, Melissa replied,

A short story teaches a lesson, like a fairy tale would. In a way that it would be understandable to different types of people.

When discussing the possibility of changing their stories, three of the five students either agreed or disagreed because of the influence it had on the story's moral. Brent was not initially averse to including a death in his story because it would assist in demonstrating that "It doesn't pay off to fight dirty." He liked the idea because "it sounds more like you're trying to get a point across than trying just to tell a story." Melissa also agreed to the investigator's suggestion that her conclusion be substituted for one written by the investigator, but she also felt that this newly formed paragraph required some alterations. It did not fully explain that transfer of learning had taken place, and thus upon hearing the change she said, "Yea.... [PAUSE]....but simplify this paragraph...and sort of explain that he convinces the people." Unlike Brent and Melissa, Jennifer did not agree to the idea of changing her conclusion. Going along with the suggestion that her "good" character suddenly become "bad" would mean that "nobody would learn anything." Despite this reluctance, however, after much thought Jennifer decided to consider the possibility of change, but only under her conditions: that her main character "realize how bad she was and then apologize."

In addition to finding that students expressed theme in terms of a moral principle, the investigator also found that this statement was often in the form of a cliché, or if not

stated verbatim, then the idea was at least a familiar one. In predicting the outcome of "The Great Leapfrog Contest" all five students believed that at least one of the two main characters would come to some sort of realization. In stating what the characters would learn, those who focused on fighting, two males and one female, said the following familiar phrases: "Mind your own business," "Don't be a bully" and "Fighting isn't the answer to solving problems." The remaining two female students saw the boy/girl confrontation as the story's central issue. Uttering phrases often heard from children their age, the girls said that the story's male character would learn that "Girls can be better than boys" and that "Girls have guts too."

Familiar sayings and ready-made phrases were also found in students' written work. All five students made reference to a familiar phrase in their think-aloud protocols. Rather than leave this moral statement implicit, four of the five students explicitly stated their theme in the story's actual text. Jacob, whose think-aloud protocols revealed that he set out to teach that "Two wrongs don't make a right," explained this to his audience in the story's conclusion. The narrator, who had been punished by his father for fighting at school, did not understand why the elder could do the same at a baseball game and not be reprimanded for his actions. In response to his son's inquiry, the father replied,

...I think you're right, if you're grounded for what you did, I should be grounded for my incident.

For the next two days (Sunday and Monday) Dad and I had to stay home...We were very bored...and had learned our lessons. Dad and I made a promise;

1. Dad wouldn't swear at people and
2. I wouldn't punch people.

Brent's think-aloud protocols revealed that he planned to teach his readers that "It doesn't pay off to fight dirty." Consequently, as his story's main character was lying motionless on the ground after having been beaten by the resident bully, Brent directly informed his readers of the effects of fighting dirty.

As a result of the unfair fighting of Dave he had hardly any friends and Mark was hurt badly. Pretty well all the people there felt the fight was unfair so they favored Mark for the place of winning the fight because he fought fair and honest.

Just as Brent's message implied that "the good guy always wins," Pat's suggested that the bad guy could "mend his ways" or "correct what he was like." As seen in the following quotation, Pat made this explicitly clear:

Jordy changed because of what happened to him. He was a lot friendlier and didn't fight as much. Jordy realized what he had done and so he tried to correct what he was like.

Jennifer, who said during discussion that "You hafta help somebody when they need it," made her readers aware of the personal satisfactions gained when assisting those who need you. She concluded her story with the following two sentences:

So out of friendship and pity I lent my gym shoes, she was really thankful and told me she was glad to have a friend like me. I felt happy that I could help out my new friend.

Jacob, Brent, Pat and Jennifer explicitly stated the themes of their stories. Melissa, on the other hand, did not. Although her thoughts revealed that her message was "not to judge people on how they look," she implicitly conveyed this message by asking her audience a key question. In discussing the current Black-White situation in South Africa, she wrote:

It looks as though the white population would prefer it if everyone was the same. But if you walk into a rose garden would you want all the flowers to look alike?

Thus far, it has been demonstrated that whether students commented on their reading or writing, theme consisted of an explicit moral statement originating from a cliché. Further examination of these statements revealed that they were broad generalizations that referred to conflict. With reference to "The Great Leapfrog contest", three of the five students perceived that story dealt with fighting; the other two students were more specific and saw this conflict in terms of male and female roles. Students' written work further demonstrated that thematic statements emerged from the tension within a story. All five stories were different in terms of plot, but all of their themes were similar in their dealing with human conflict.

Included among these findings was the lack of specificity in statement of theme. All declarations made by students were broad generalizations that accounted for little of the specific story in question. Students did not focus narrowly on the story they were reading or writing. Rather than make statements which

accounted for all of a story's specific details, they made comments which applied to many stories--hence the statements "Mind your own business"; "Girls can be better than boys"; and "Two wrongs don't make a right." By solely relying on cliches to depict theme, students demonstrated that their schemata for theme inhibited their reading and writing by restricting their analysis to a general, predetermined statement.

E. Point of View

Students' reading responses and writing samples revealed that further weaknesses appeared in students' overt and tacit knowledge of point of view. These high-ability, grade-eight students did not appear to have schemata which allowed them to maintain consistency or effectiveness when either reading or writing. Examination of the data revealed that comments relating to point of view were sparse, immature and inconsistent.

Analysis of subjects' reading and writing disclosed little overt knowledge of point of view. As seen in students' reading responses to "The Great Leapfrog Contest," none of the subjects voiced cognizance of the story's point of view. One would not necessarily anticipate such revelations in students' initial responses, since the story appears to be written in third person and the reader more concerned with the characters and events relating to them. However, as the reader approaches the story's mid-point and is then abruptly introduced to the first person plural narrator, one might expect students to detect, in some

manner, this change in voice. Yet, as previously stated, none of the subjects took advantage of this opportunity to comment on the narrator's identity, credibility or consistency.

Verbal declarations and insinuations alluding to awareness-of-narrator were absent from students' general discussion of the short story genre. Explaining the elements of the genre, no student overtly included point of view as a component of his or her short story schema. Similarly, analysis of students' think-aloud protocols revealed that when writing their own short stories, students also failed to take into account the credibility and consistency of their narrator, suggesting that since point of view does not fit into their short story schema, it is only natural for them not to take point of view into account.

In addition to finding that students' overt knowledge of point of view was weak, the current study also found that students' tacit knowledge of point of view was weak. This became evident as inconsistencies appeared in both students' reading and writing.

Examination of responses to "The Great Leapfrog Contest" indicated that although some students were able to refer unconsciously to the narrator when reading, they were unable to identify him when questioned. Interestingly, two students included the first person plural narrator in their reading responses just as the narrator entered the story in segment six.

As seen in the following passage from "The Great Leapfrog Contest," the narrator's persona is evident:

They got to leaping over one another, quickly, too, until the first thing we knew the whole gang of us was out on the state highway...

Naturally, we were sure Rex would win the contest. But that was because we hadn't taken into account the fact that he was a simple person, whereas Rosie was crafty and shrewd...After a while, about three miles out of Fowler, we noticed that she was coming down on Rex's neck, instead of on his back.

Despite the narrator's obvious presence, no student articulated this. In addition, students appeared to be unaware of the effectiveness and appropriateness of the various points of view. That they did not comment on the advantages and limitations of the point of view chosen by Saroyan suggests that point of view is not a criterion by which these honour-roll, grade-eight students judge short stories as readers. Pat, for example, was aware of the narrator's presence in this passage; yet as seen in the following exchange, she was unaware of his identity, role or purpose. Clearly, she demonstrated that point of view was not a component of her short story schemata when reading.

Pat: Well, Rosie could win, because if she keeps jumping over Rex like she is, then it's making him weaker, so....[PAUSE]....so she could win. But then....[PAUSE]....they could disqualify Rosie.

Investigator: Who's "they"?

Pat: Um....[PAUSE]....the people who are following, like the gang who are watching them. Probably, Rex's big gang that he's in....[PAUSE]....cause he or just some people wanna watch them.

Jacob, like Pat, also began to make reference to "they"

immediately after the narrator was introduced; however, unlike Pat, Jacob identified "they" as the author of the story, rather than characters from the story. As seen in the following exchange, although Jacob referred to the narrator, his inability to assess the narrator's identity would appear to indicate that, like Pat, point of view was not included in his short story schema when he was reading.

Jacob: Rex will finally get tired and lose.

Investigator: Why do you think that?

Jacob: He's sort of the bad guy in the story. The way they say it. Him being simple and everything. They always do that... They talk about the good people. You know, they say she's smart, and then they say he's dumb.

Investigator: Who's "they"?

Jacob: Well, the author.

Students' inability to identify the narrator in Saroyan's story as a child, or one of the gang members, interfered with their understanding of the story. By not recognizing who was telling the story, they were unable to consider the credibility of a child-narrator, and it was because of this insensitivity to credibility that they misinterpreted events. The child-narrator reported what he saw in the leapfrog contest: Rosie Mahoney coming down on Rex Folger's neck like "a ton of bricks" for three miles so that his "head was bumping the ground every time Rosie leaped over him." The narrator recognized that "They were good loud bumps that...were painful," but he failed to recognize

the severity and danger of this action. Consequently, because subjects in the study did not assess the narrator, they, too, neglected to perceive the gravity and consequences associated with having one's head knocked on "hard cement" for miles. In the end, the narrator casually told his readers that Rex's "body straightened out, and his arms and legs twitched," but when questioned about the seriousness of Rex's injuries, none of the students made an accurate assessment. One student saw no danger at all: Jacob claimed that, "A bump on the head isn't going to kill someone." Three students declared the problem to be one of fatigue: Brent asserted that "he was just really exhausted, so he just lay down"; Melissa felt that "He just probably fainted, mostly from exhaustion"; and Pat thought that "it doesn't seem like he has very much energy left." The remaining student, Jennifer, commented at greater length, yet she too saw the injuries as merely superficial. She felt that

Rex probably has a big bruise on his head and he probably has a headache or something, cause when you go down the blood rushes and then you get a headache and a bump and everything, and you don't feel too good.

Analysis of students' writing indicated that, as with their reading, inconsistencies and uncertainties were found in students' tacit knowledge of point of view. Examination of students' first writing assignment revealed that maintaining a consistent point of view when writing was not an important consideration. Following their reading of "The Great Leapfrog Contest," all students were asked to write their own conclusion

to the story. In doing so, only one student maintained consistency by continuing to write in the first person plural. The remaining four students switched from first person plural to third person omniscient.

Although students maintained a consistent point of view when writing their own short stories, inconsistencies in point of view were seen during the phase of the investigation which required them to either agree or disagree with proposed revisions suggested by the investigator. The subtle discrepancies made by the investigator dealt with changes in students' point of view. Whether or not students allowed this change, none of them indicated that they were aware of the nature of the change. By introducing new phrases and sentences with the first person pronoun "I," the investigator indirectly implied to Pat and Brent that they change their stories from third person to first person point of view. Without hesitation, both agreed to revise their stories as suggested by the investigator. Neither student seemed concerned with the ineffectiveness of this change. Furthermore, when the students were asked "How have we changed your story by doing this?" neither stated the obvious--that a change in point of view had taken place. Brent replied, "It sounds more like, more like you're trying to make a point across, than trying just to tell a story." Unlike Brent, Pat was not specific in her attempts to explain the change, she simply said, "Now it's better."

Recommendations for revision were also made for the remaining three students; however, in their case, it was indirectly suggested that they change from first person to third person omniscient point of view. Melissa, like Pat and Brent, agreed to the change, and as with the others, was unable to articulate the exact nature of this change. After hearing a one-hundred word paragraph composed by the investigator, Melissa agreed to change her story, an essay written in first person, to one which introduced a fictitious character whose thoughts were revealed through an omniscient narrator. Her immediate response was,

Yeah, I like that...I think that's a really good introduction...Because it's sort of showing through the eyes of a young child how he feels about it, and it's more of a personal view to the problem...in any story it's important to feel...how the people feel in the story, and so you can sort of become a part of it so you really enjoy it.

Aside from not recognizing the change in point of view, Melissa did not appear to be concerned with maintaining consistency of the third person point of view. Shortly following the above change, rather than continue with the omniscient narrator, the investigator recommended that the original first person singular narrator be changed to a first person plural narrator. Melissa did not recognize that this change would be inconsistent with her decision to go along with a third person narrator. The following exchange took place:

Investigator: On the third page you say, "At this time I cannot state a solution..." I was wondering what you would think of changing the "I" to a "We".

Melissa:[PAUSE]....I suppose. Yea, because I do mention a country, and I guess me being part of a country. It wouldn't really be me stating a solution. It would be Canada I suppose. Yea, I would agree to that.

The remaining two subjects, Jennifer and Jacob, did not agree to changes in point of view as proposed by the experimenter; yet despite their refusals, neither student indicated that by disagreeing with the changes they were aware of the nature of the shift, or that in doing so they were maintaining consistency in point of view. The dialogue between Jennifer and the investigator was as follows:

Investigator: The person who's telling the story is called "I" throughout. I thought we could give that person a name, like Michelle.

Jennifer: Ohhh!

Investigator: Do you think that would be a good idea?

Jennifer: No. I don't think it's necessary cause it makes sense right now.

Jacob, responding in a similar manner, also indicated that his refusal was not based on awareness of point of view. When the investigator re-read his story with an obvious shift in the narrator's identity, Jacob replied, "It doesn't add to the story. Names aren't important. There's just nothing that you need them for."

F. Tone and Mood

As literary terms, "tone" and "mood" are distinct concepts. Yet, despite their differences, many authors recognize that these terms share congruent features (Duffy & Pettit, 1952;

Frye, Baker & Perkins, 1985). Both are similar in that they deal with attitude and feeling: tone is defined as the author's attitude toward his material and audience; and mood defined as the general pervasive feeling aroused by the various factors in a piece of fiction (i.e., plot, character, setting, theme). They are different, however, in terms of their emphasis: with tone relating to the author's voice, and mood relating to the story's atmosphere. Applying these definitions in the analysis of the raw data, the investigator found that in both their reading and writing, subjects' overall story schema did not include a distinguishable knowledge framework to suggest either clear and overt or tacit awareness of tone and mood. Analysis of students' reading responses revealed that they did not discern or respond to either the story's emotional atmosphere or the author's tone. Similarly, in their own written work, students did not firmly establish either an emotive mood or a distinctive voice to characterize their compositions.

Not having formulated a schemata for tone or mood prevented subjects from examining either of these elements in "The Great Leapfrog Contest". Students created meaningful representations of the text by relying on the narrator's literal statements, not by further establishing the emotive attitude conveyed by the story or by the author's attitude toward his subject. For example, in reading the following excerpt, students understood that Rosie devised a "crafty" method of winning the game; they did not closely examine Saroyan's language and realize that

despite its young speaker and simple nature, its complexity lies in its somewhat paradoxical characteristics.

Naturally, we were sure Rex would win the contest. But that was because we hadn't taken into account the fact that he was a simple person, whereas Rosie was crafty and shrewd. Rosie knew how to figure angles. She had discovered how to jump over Rex Folger in a way that weakened him.

For the child narrating, leapfrog was a game of fun, and the players, based on their strategic tactics, either "crafty" or "simple." For Saroyan, the contest was not an idle game, but a test of endurance and determination, which not only established a hierarchy among the children but also had implications for their future. Saroyan was attempting to convey the competitive nature of life for children from the slums. Subjects of the current study, however, were unable to perceive these implications. Instead, they interpreted what the narrator said at face value, and thus misconstrued the story's tone and mood. Consequently, four of the subjects, rather than feel empathy for Rex, reported only on the power struggle between characters--on Rosie's cleverness and Rex's feeble-mindedness: "She's smart. She's, she's just witty and Rex is just a big chunk of bone"; "Well I'd say Rosie's beginning to be sort of smarter about the whole thing"; "Rosie used more of her brain"; "She's a lot smarter than Rex. He's a simple person." Contrary to the narrator's remarks and the students' reports, Rosie was neither "crafty" nor "smart"; she was devious, cunning and unscrupulous, but since this was implied through an ironical tone which

students were unable to grasp, students could neither perceive these characteristics nor the story's oppressive mood that alluded to man's inhumanity to man.

The insensitivity to tone and mood detected in students' reading responses was also reflected in their written compositions. Students' conclusions to "The Great Leapfrog Contest" revealed their inability to detect and maintain a consistent tone and mood, as did the investigator's suggestions for revising their short stories. In addition to these inconsistencies, analysis of their stories revealed weaknesses in the process of generating distinguishable tone and mood. By merely reporting events, they added a neutral element to their compositions, which consequently imparted a high degree of indistinctiveness.

As previously stated, inconsistencies were initially observed in students' conclusions to "The Great Leapfrog Contest." Four subjects rewrote Saroyan's original outcome to conform to their notions of happiness binding, and thereby sharply altered the story's atmosphere of sadness and commiseration to one of merriment and content. Clearly, this change did not perpetuate the emotive attitude established by the author. Contrary to Saroyan's sequence of events, students' statements that "Rosie and Rex were best of friends," that "they both laughed and agreed to be friends," that "they shook hands," and that "neither of them ever fought each other or anyone else

again," provided a sudden turnabout, from a state of suffering and pain to one of camaraderie and mirth.

Additional evidence demonstrating students' lack of awareness of consistency in tone and mood appeared in their short stories and their reactions to revisions proposed by the investigator. Melissa, in reporting many "facts" about South Africa tried to evoke feelings of sympathy while simultaneously projecting an authoritative tone. With examples of bigotry, injustice and corruption, she appealed to her reader's emotions throughout her 500-word composition: "South Africans are being punished for having a different colour of skin"; "[Black] South African children are lacking a proper education"; "these people...are chased after, shot at (sometimes killed), physically abused and put in jail by the police." Her established sense of tragedy, coupled with her tone of expertise, however, were destroyed with a single concluding remark. Realizing that she might not be thoroughly informed, Melissa shifted her officious tone to one of contingency and doubt when finally stating that, "Some of this information could be false for there is a lacking in my knowledge of what the actual details are." All students demonstrated similar errors in judgment when agreeing to include the investigator's suggestions for revision in their short stories. Once again, Melissa, in addition to transmitting two incongruent tones of authority and doubt in expository form, included a third incompatible tone of helplessness in narrative form when

agreeing to include the following passage written by the investigator:

Kinta, with hidden body and tear-filled eyes, glared with horror and disbelief as he watched his mother and father being clubbed to death. He had been exposed to violence and death all of his thirteen years, but this was the first time it was affecting him so deeply. Pain and anguish tore through his body as he watched his parents receive their fatal blows.

Brent demonstrated his lack of awareness for consistency when deciding to follow two stale didactic sentences written by the investigator with an original frenzy-filled paragraph written by himself. The following exchange ensued:

Investigator: Brent, rather than start your story with this paragraph here, I thought that perhaps we could start off with these sentences that I'm about to read to you: "I think that fighting is one of the worst things you can do. Not just because you can get your face bashed in, but because it causes a lot of trouble."

Brent: Um....[LONG PAUSE (reads his introduction)].... Yeah, that's a good thing to start off with because after you say, "Fighting is one of the worst things you could do", you could say "I remember when..." and then put my paragraph and say "...when all through school there was talk about the big fight. 'Are you going to go?' 'Who's fighting?' 'Where's it going to be?'... 'He's going to kick his head' and 'Dead Meat.'"

Investigator: Which do you prefer--your original way or this way?

Brent: Probably this way because...it'd make it sound more like, more like you're trying to make a point across, than just trying to tell a story.

The remaining students, made similar errors in judgment. Because their schemata for tone and mood did not include variables which sensitized them to the subtle attitudes and

atmosphere communicated through written language, they willingly combined their written work with prose that differed in style and feeling from that of their own.

Further examination of students' short stories revealed that in addition to these inconsistencies, the tone and mood communicated by these young authors were not conveyed by such conventional means as word choice, phrasing, or selection of detail, but rather by means of direct statement. All attitudes were generally contained within a simple remark: "I felt happy that I could help out my new friend"; "In my opinion this situation is very unfair"; "...all the people there felt the fight was unfair"; "Jordy still felt bad"; and "My dad always had trouble controlling his temper." Students did not establish a sense of joy, injustice, remorse or restraint. They communicated their messages, but since these messages were not expressed through choice of language, style or imagery, they did not stimulate an emotional reaction in the reader. The following passage, for example, failed to establish a sense of tone and mood. Jacob, who was focusing on the animosity between two baseball coaches, tried to establish an atmosphere of suspense and fear:

While dad was at work, and mom and I were asleep Donnelly left a rude message on our answering machine. It was in some sort of a riddle form so, I spent the next two days trying to figure it out. When it was finally decoded it meant, that on Saturday we would lose and get hurt at the same time.

With mother and child alone at night, the villain intruding while they are asleep, the mysterious code that requires deciphering, and the impending threat to the protagonist's physical well-being, Jacob ensured that his passage contained events leading to fear and the unknown. His lack of detail and language suggestive of mystery and suspense, however, prevented the reader from experiencing these feelings. Therefore, although Jacob's intentions were apparent, he could not effectively relay his plans because his schemata for tone and mood did not contribute to a thorough, cognizant understanding of how voice and emotion are generated in literature.

Like Jacob, Pat's tone and mood were neither persuasive nor effective. By having a teacher reprimand a student for his behavior, Pat introduced a scenario suggestive of authority, but as seen in the following passage, the tone and aura associated with her authoritative figure were ineffectively conveyed.

[Jordy] pushed Mark to the ground and then him and his group ran off. A teacher came out to see what had happened. Mark told the teacher and the teacher went off to look for Jordy and his group. When the teacher found them he said, "If you don't leave Mark alone I'll have you all suspended."

Despite the authority a teacher stereotypically represents, the mere presence of this figure did not produce the sense of power intended by Pat. Similarly, the teacher's message did not project its expected threat and intimidation. Without the appropriate language, detail, emphasis and expression, Pat's reader could not experience the authority, the anger, the threat

and the intimidation this scene was designed to communicate. Similar to previously discussed reading and writing examples, weaknesses in Pat's schemata for tone and mood prevented her from effectively developing either of these concepts in her written work.

G. Summary

Analysis of the data revealed that subjects' overall story schema constituted subschemata corresponding to four traditional short story elements: plot, character, setting and theme. The investigation did not find distinguishable schemata corresponding to point of view, tone and mood.

To make sense of the stories they read and wrote, students employed similar plot schemata. All relied on their notion of conflict, conflict resolution and happiness binding. That is, in the story they read and the story they wrote, these elements were universal. Students' story schema told them that the plot of each story required conflict (more specifically, conflict of the man-versus-man type), that this conflict needed to be resolved, and furthermore, that this conflict was resolved, and the sense of an ending created, through happiness binding.

Character schemata incorporated four elements: character description, character conflict, character presentation and character change. In terms of character description, students described characters two dimensionally, as either "good" or "bad." Conflict between these characters was always physical, and generally resolved by means of selecting a "winner."

Furthermore, in terms of character presentation, all students relied on direct methods. While reading, they examined the narrator's direct statements of character to make inferences, and while writing, they developed character by stating the discernible. Finally, not all students felt that it was necessary for a character to change by the end of a story, but those students who expected characters to change in the story they read, had characters change in the story they wrote. Conversely, those students who did not expect characters to change in the story they read, did not have characters change in the story they wrote.

As with subjects' plot and character schemata, their schemata for setting was identical in both their reading and writing. Three constituent components made up this schemata:

the story's physical setting; the story's temporal setting; and the protagonist in his or her social environment. Not all, however, contributed equally to the way in which students constructed coherent representations of the text they read and wrote. Overall, students placed very little significance on setting of time and place, and a great deal of significance on the social interaction found within a story.

In terms of theme, subjects employed similar schemata in both their reading and writing as well. Three assumptions guided students in their thematic interpretation of stories: 1) that theme was a didactic pronouncement, or a lesson to be learned; 2) that the theme was always stated in the form of a

cliche; and 3) that this cliche was usually a broad generalization that referred to conflict. Examination of students' reading and writing revealed that in all cases theme was reduced to statements such as "Mind your own business", "Cheating doesn't prove anything", and the classic, "Don't judge a book by its cover."

Schemata for point of view, tone and mood did not characterize students' overall story schema. Examination of students' reading and writing revealed that point of view was not a criterion by which they judged prose. Subjects were unable to identify the narrator of a story or maintain a consistent point of view in their writing. Similar findings were observed in relation to students' concepts of tone and mood. Not having formulated a schemata for either of these elements prevented students from examining these concepts in the stories they read and wrote.

Students' overall story schema, then, appeared to both hinder and assist them in their reading and writing of short stories. Because students had concepts of plot, character, setting and theme, they approached their reading and writing tasks with cognitive frameworks which sensitized them to these elements in the stories they read and in the stories they wrote. Students' schemata for plot, for example, allowed them to recognize the important role that conflict plays within a story. Consequently, students understood that conflict was essential to a story's sequence of events, be it in a story they were reading

or writing. In another example, schemata for theme enhanced students' reading and writing by providing them with a general notion of the didactic component of story. Students sought theme in the material they read and included theme in the material they wrote. Furthermore, by generalizing their thematic statements, it appeared that students understood the necessity to look beyond the immediate events in a story and to attach global significance to these events. This very schemata, however, which positively influenced students' reading and writing, negatively influenced their comprehension and composition of stories as well. Because students stated their generalizations in the form of cliches, they reduced the complexity of these stories. Students did not bother to elaborate on the essential meaning of the work and therefore diminished the significance of the fiction they read and wrote. As suggested by Bransford and Johnson (1973), Baker and Brown (1980) and Rumelhart (1977), weakness of appropriate schemata contributed to weaknesses in the comprehension and production of stories. Other negative influences were found in the schema that students did not have. Because schemata for point of view, tone and mood had not yet developed in these talented, grade-eight students, they could not rely on these concepts to help them make meaning of their reading and writing.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

A. Summary

The current investigation examined the influence that story schema has on reading and writing. Using a case study approach with five eighth-grade, honour-roll students, five one-hour sessions were designed to engage subjects in reading, writing and discussion. The first session required subjects to read William Saroyan's short story "The Great Leapfrog Contest" in twelve segments, and following the reading of each excerpt, to predict upcoming events. In the second session, individual students discussed the short story genre and then wrote their own short story aloud. During the third and fourth sessions, subjects continued to write and rewrite their stories aloud. And in the fifth session, to explore student's tacit knowledge of story structure, each subject was requested to agree or disagree with changes made to his or her story by the investigator. Students were also asked to indicate why they would accept or reject the investigator's recommendations.

The final phase of the study involved close analysis of eight pieces of datum for each of the five subjects: 1) transcribed reading responses to "The Great Leapfrog Contest"; 2) a written conclusion to "The Great Leapfrog Contest"; 3) a

transcribed discussion of the short story genre; 4) the first draft of his or her short story; 5) the transcribed think-aloud protocols accompanying his or her first draft; 6) a revised draft; 7) the transcribed think-aloud protocols accompanying the revised draft; and 8) the transcribed responses to the investigator's proposed revisions. Each piece of datum was analyzed for plot, character, setting, theme, point of view, tone and mood.

1. Plot

The investigation found that eighth-grade, honour-roll students' schemata for plot consisted of three constituent subschemata: conflict, conflict resolution and happiness binding. Furthermore, confirming reports by Rumelhart (1977) that commitment to particular schema may have debilitating effects, the data revealed that in addition to aiding students, plot schemata interfered with their reading and writing as well.

Didactic discussions of the short story generally declare that plot consists of a sequence of events that arise from conflict (Brooks and Warren, 1959; Perrine, 1966; Aloian, 1968). All students participating in the study revealed that this declaration manifested itself in their own reading and writing. Moreover, the nature of this conflict was identical in all cases: man versus man. In reading "The Great Leapfrog Contest," after being introduced to a single character, all students predicted that the story would centre on the friction between this character and another. In their own short stories,

students incorporated conflict that was solely of the man-versus-man type. When it was suggested to them that they deviate from this, all refused the investigator's proposal.¹

As with the concept of conflict, the notion of conflict resolution was universal. The latter, however, appeared to be synonymous with happiness binding. That is, "a sense of an ending," as coined by Kermode (1967), was created with the inclusion of a "happy ending." In "The Great Leapfrog Contest" (with Rosie winning, Rex losing, and neither of them making up) students' narrative expectations of a happy ending were violated. This led four of the five students to simply declare that a harmonious conclusion would have resolved the conflict between the two characters. This narrative logic extended into the written work of these four students. In their conclusions to Saroyan's story and in their own short stories, a sense of completion was created through use of the happy ending.

Although plot schemata allowed students to view incidents in stories in relation to the stories as completed wholes, this schemata also generally appeared to handicap students' reading and writing. Rather than enhance their comprehension of "The Great Leapfrog Contest," all five students demonstrated that commitment to their narrative expectations prevented them from examining deeper structures of the text. Similarly, because

¹ As noted in Chapter III, the rejection of some of the proposed changes suggests that subjects' easy acceptance of some of the investigator's changes was not simply in response to an authoritative figure.

they could not relinquish these stock conventions, students' written work also lacked sufficient depth. When given the opportunity to alter this by concluding tragically, they still chose not to, for in a universe of their making, happiness prevails.

2. Character

Within the concept of character, four variables remained consistent in students' reading and writing: character description, character presentation, character conflict and character change.

With regard to character description, examination of students' reading and writing demonstrated that: 1) four of the five students perceived characters in terms of "good" or "bad"; and 2) all students described characters on a two-dimensional level. Analysis of the good-bad element revealed that students made either direct or indirect reference to this in both their reading and writing. Although this helped students in their understanding of protagonist and antagonist, it was limiting because students did not venture to examine characters beyond the level of hero and villain. Likewise, analysis of the two-dimensional element of character revealed that students' descriptions generally consisted of single-word adjectives which described physical aspects of characters in the stories students read, as well as in the stories they wrote.

Analysis of the data also revealed that students relied exclusively on direct methods of presentation in their reading

and writing. All five students utilized the author's direct presentation of character to make inferences while reading. Similarly, all employed direct methods of character presentation in their written material. Emphasis was placed on the observable. In reading for character, all students based their inferences on the narrator's direct statements of character and action. In their writing, these same students developed character by directly stating the discernible: characters' names, physical attributes and the conflict confronting characters. Consequently, all characters (major and minor) were flat and insufficiently developed.

Additional reading-writing relationships emerged in relation to character conflict. Examination of students' reading and writing disclosed that: 1) conflict was of the "man versus man" type; 2) the danger confronting characters was physical; and 3) conflict was resolved by means of selecting a winner. In all cases, students perceived only the physical conflict between different characters. For example, while reading, they were aware of the corporal nature of the conflict encountered by characters, but they failed to recognize that characters were contending with emotional conflict as well. Similarly, students' written work included a human protagonist and antagonist, who, by the end of a story, were labelled as either "winner" or "loser."

Finally, character change was not a necessary criterion for students in either their reading or writing. It is of interest,

however, that the three subjects who expected characters to change in the story they read, had characters change in the story they wrote, and the two subjects who did not expect characters to change in the story they read, did not have characters change in the story they wrote.

3. Setting

Gathered evidence suggested that total setting schemata constituted elements identical to those described by researchers questing to define the story concept (Stein & Glenn, 1979; Stein & Trabasso, 1982; Stein & PolICASTRO, 1984). More specifically, in both their reading and writing, these bright, eighth-grade students' schemata for setting contained reference to an animate protagonist with information pertaining to a story's physical, temporal and social context. In addition to this finding, the present study also found that in constructing a meaningful representation of the print, be it print they read or wrote, students relied on a configuration of schemata that placed little emphasis on physical and temporal variables and great emphasis on protagonists and their social environment.

In reading "The Great Leapfrog Contest" all subjects demonstrated a preoccupation with Rosie and "the fight." Who would win and how he or she would win were of primary concern; that the children were from the slums, and consequently impoverished outsiders, was not a consideration. Similar data were obtained in relation to students' written work. Initial observations, made in their written conclusions to Saroyan's

tale, revealed that all five subjects made incidental references to locale while elaborating on character and social atmosphere. Likewise, in their own short stories, students documented time and place and then proceeded by focusing on animate characters in association with "hatred," "fights," "threats," "peer-pressure" and "injustice"--thereby affirming that the constituent structure of their setting schemata consisted of a configuration of subschemata that recognized physical and temporal setting, but mainly relied on an animate character and social milieu to construct meaning when writing, as well as when reading.

4. Theme

The study revealed that students' schemata for theme embodied three basic assumptions: 1) that theme and moral were interchangeable; 2) that theme was best expressed in the form of a cliché; and 3) that thematic statements were broad generalizations that referred to the conflict within a story. As with all schemata discussed thus far, this configuration not only assisted students with their interpretation of stories, but also interfered with it.

Theme was interpreted by all five subjects as a "lesson to be learned." Furthermore, subjects generally relied on a cliché when making this didactic pronouncement. In response to Saroyan's story "The Great Leapfrog Contest," students felt that the story was telling its readers: "[Cheating] doesn't prove anything"; "Mind your own business"; and "Don't judge a book by

its cover." Students' short stories disclosed that, as writers, they perceived their role as one of "teacher." All five stories written by students had lessons directly stated within the stories' text. Furthermore, students' think-aloud protocols revealed that they consciously planned to incorporate these lessons into their stories. For example, one student said, "The moral of my story is going to be 'Two wrongs don't make a right'"; another said, "I better not forget my theme and say that people shouldn't judge people on how they look or dress, but on who they really are." Since these ready-made phrases captured the basic meaning of their stories, students did not search for a more thorough account of their stories central meaning; and in doing so, as demonstrated in their reading, they diminished the significance of their work.

In addition to the above findings, the investigation also found that students' thematic statements were generalizations that referred to conflict. With reference to their reading, the three students who perceived the conflict within Saroyan's tale as one dealing with the physical encounter between characters made statements of theme that specifically dealt with the issue of fighting; whereas the other two students, who saw the conflict as one of gender, made thematic statements that related to male and female roles. Students' written work further demonstrated that theme was directly linked to a story's conflict. All five stories written by subjects were different

in terms of their plot, but their themes were all similar in their dealing with human conflict.

5. Point of View

Analysis of the data disclosed that eighth-grade, honour-roll students' overt and tacit knowledge of point of view was weak in both their reading and writing. None of the five students made overt statements relating to point of view during a combined twenty-five hours of tape recorded reading, writing and discussion. Overt awareness of a narrator's identity, credibility and consistency was absent from all reading and writing responses made by students--be these responses provoked or unprovoked. Similar findings were made with regard to students' tacit knowledge of point of view. Close examination of twenty-five hours of transcripts further re-affirmed that there was no evidence to indicate that point of view was incorporated into students' short story schema.

Examination of students' reading revealed that although two students casually made reference to the narrator in "The Great Leapfrog Contest," these students, as well as the remaining three, were unable to identify Saroyan's child narrator. Furthermore, none of the subjects implied that they possessed tacit knowledge of the effectiveness and consistency in the point of view selected by Saroyan. This inability to comment on the child narrating the story interfered with students' interpretation of events. Because they did not identify and assess the credibility of the child-narrator, students did not

recognize that the narrator was failing to understand the seriousness and the consequences of the injuries received by one of the characters. Consequently, all five students failed to perceive the enormity of what happened in the story's end.

Insensitivity to effectiveness and consistency was also found in students' writing. Inconsistencies were initially observed in their written conclusions to "The Great Leapfrog Contest." Although one student successfully maintained consistency of point of view, four of the five students shifted from Saroyan's original, first-person plural point of view to a third-person omniscient narrator. Further evidence was found during the investigator's attempts to change point of view in the short stories students wrote. Without hesitation, two students allowed the investigator to change inappropriately their stories' point of view from third to first person; one agreed to change from first-person singular to a combination of first-person plural and third-person omniscient; two did not agree to any changes but despite their refusals, could not articulate rationales based on tacit knowledge of point of view.

6. Tone and Mood

Analysis of eighth-grade students' reading and writing revealed that these high-ability students' cognitive schemata for tone and mood was the weakest schemata in the study. Overt and tacit awareness of both concepts was absent from all reading and writing tasks performed during twenty-five hours of investigation.

Examination of reading responses to "The Great Leapfrog Contest" disclosed that no student interpretations of the text examined Saroyan's attitude. Hence, students did not account for the story's overall atmosphere, which implied that life's competitive nature had serious life-long consequences for children from the slums. Rather than base interpretations on messages communicated through tone and mood, all students based interpretations on the narrator's literal statements.

Similar weaknesses in schemata for tone and mood appeared in students' own compositions. In rewriting Saroyan's conclusion to "The Great Leapfrog Contest," four students demonstrated their inability to maintain consistency by adding an atmosphere of camaraderie to that of the tension and hostility already established by Saroyan. Similar examples were found in students' responses to revisions proposed by the investigator, whereby subjects combined their written work with the investigator's passages, passages that contained a tone and mood different from their own. In their own short stories, students did not establish an overall attitude that characterized their work. Rather than communicate their messages through word choice, phrasing or selection of detail, all five subjects conveyed attitudes and feelings through statements such as "I felt happy" or through events suggestive of the feeling that they were attempting to establish. For example, in trying to convey a sense of fear and suspense, one

student wrote that after spending two days decoding a "rude message...it meant that on Saturday we would...get hurt".

B. Conclusions

Evidence gathered in the present case study helps to account for the well-known correlations between reading and writing by showing how each depends on students' knowledge of story schema. Under the conditions described in the current investigation, three general findings emerged: 1) honour-roll, eighth-grade students' overall story schema encompassed four traditional story grammars: plot, character, setting and theme, and it lacked three others: point of view, tone and mood; 2) the variables which characterized each constituent schemata were similar for both reading and writing; and 3) these schemata, in addition to helping students construct meaningful representations of print, interfered with students' reading and writing.

On the positive side, a major finding of the investigation was that story schema facilitated students' reading responses and writing processes. Students' concept of plot, for example, allowed students to recognize conflict within the story they read, and it ensured that students include this element within the sequence of events they created in the stories they wrote. Students made meaning with greater ease because they understood that conflict was all but necessary to the plot of stories. Another example of how students' schema enhanced their reading and writing was revealed in their concept of theme. Even though

they had a limited understanding of theme as a broad generalization, knowledge of theme helped students to look beyond the immediate events in a story and thereby attach global significance to the material they read and wrote. Additional positive relationships were revealed in students' concept of character. Having incorporated into their schemata subschemata comprised of character description, character presentation and character change, students had sufficient tools to trace character development in the stories they read and to develop characters in the stories they wrote.

On the negative side, the investigation found that story schema had a limiting effect on students' reading and writing. These limitations were revealed both by the schemata they had (plot, character, setting and theme) and by those they did not have (point of view, tone and mood).

Examination of plot revealed that this schemata--embodied by conflict, conflict resolution and happiness binding--impaired, rather than strengthened, the effectiveness of students' reading and writing. Having formulated a schemata which alerted them to the shape and internal rhythm of all stories, students demonstrated that their narrative expectations informed them that plot was based on conflict that was resolved by means of a happy ending. This assumption coloured all they read and wrote. Students naturally anticipated a peaceful outcome in Saroyan's story, and likewise based their conclusions to their own short stories on similar expectations. Herein lay

the snare, however; for the very schemata which allowed them to make sense of what they read and wrote simultaneously contributed to their ineffectiveness as readers and writers. In students' interpretation of "The Great Leapfrog Contest," as well as their own short stories, plot dealt with a person to whom particular events happen, rather than a certain kind of person through whom particular insights into life are revealed. Not having incorporated into their story schema the notion that plot is a means by which revelations of character and life are presented, students were incapable of searching beyond the "happily-ever-after" concept.

Additional interference resulted from character schemata. In both students' reading and writing, characters were described in black-white terms: as good or bad, honest or dishonest, superior or inferior. As readers, they perceived characters as two dimensional; as writers, they created characters that were also two dimensional. Students had not yet incorporated into their schemata the notion that characters were more than paragons of virtue or monsters of evil. Their existing schemata did not alert them to examining character in terms of consistent behaviour, motivation and plausibility. They did not realize that character is not developed by simply telling what a person does, but rather by describing what a person is.

Students' existing concept of theme imposed limitations on their reading and writing as well. In all cases observed, whether students were seeking a moral in the story they read or

depicting a moral in the stories they wrote, they oversimplified and conventionalized the stories by relying on cliches. These ready-made phrases prevented them from further elaborating or speculating. Students forced new experiences into old formulas, and in doing so lost the chance of gaining a new or fresh outlook. Students' existing schemata for theme did not direct them towards investigating motive, purpose or behaviour.

Compilation of data pertaining to students' concept of point of view further reaffirmed that weakness in reading was paralleled by weakness in writing. Students' inability to identify Saroyan's narrator as a child and recognize the limitations of such a young narrator clearly interfered with their interpretation of events in the story they read. The child narrating did not fully comprehend the outcome of the events on which he was reporting. Students' failure to perceive the narrator's lack of awareness resulted in their own misunderstanding of these events. This weakness in students' reading was similar in nature to those found in students' writing. In their written work students demonstrated that little thought was given to the consistency, effectiveness and credibility of their narrators. Students' willingness to accept the investigator's proposed revisions in their story's point of view revealed that they were insensitive to the ineffectiveness and inconsistency these changes created in their written work. As a result, students' written products were ineffectual in their presentation of point of view. Not having formulated a

schemata which enabled them to consider a narrator's identity, limitations, effectiveness and consistency restricted students' reading responses and writing processes. Thorough interpretations of stories they read were thwarted by this insensitivity to the various aspects of point of view. Likewise, their writing suffered from this deficiency. As writers, they were neither aware of the scope that point of view permitted nor were they aware of the limitations it imposed. Consequently, students' written work did not achieve its potential breadth and depth.

C. Implications for Further Research

Based on the conclusion that academically talented, eighth-grade students display specific weaknesses in their overall story schema, it is in the opinion of the current investigator that further research be directed towards examining the developmental nature of the various traditional story grammars which comprise students' concept of story: the elements of plot, character, setting, theme, point of view, tone and mood. Grade eight students' insensitivity to many of these concepts may be directly attributable to low maturation of the cognitive processes required for thoroughly understanding these concepts. It is therefore recommended that, in addition to determining whether or not students of this grade level possess the necessary cognitive structures, a similar study be replicated with students at the grade nine, ten, eleven and twelve levels. If specific concepts develop with cognitive maturation, then it

becomes necessary to determine whether or not heading for a patterned, reflective response too early inhibits the students' way of coming to terms with their reading and writing experiences.

Further research might also be directed towards examining sample populations with differing ability levels. Since the current investigation focused on students with high ability, future investigations could examine students of average or low ability. First, it is necessary to determine whether or not the students with lower ability possess schemata identical to that outlined in the present study. If these students do not, it will be necessary for researchers to then describe the story schema that these students rely on to make sense of what they read and write. And finally, (in conjunction with this detailed descriptor), investigators need to determine the influence that this schemata has on students' reading and writing.

D. Implications for Teaching

Findings from the current investigation suggest that in terms of pedagogy, teachers' planning of secondary English curricula account for three specific variables: the strengths in students' existing story schema, the weaknesses found in this schema, and the similarities between the reading and writing processes.

Among the study's findings is the notion that within students' cognitive frameworks lie schemata which help them create meaningful representations of the stories they read and

write. Years of reading, watching, telling and hearing stories have shaped a set of narrative expectations which serve as an interpretive system for all that students read and write. Thus, the implication arises that teachers develop programs which build on this existing framework of interpretation. Making fuller use of the skills students have, rather than focusing on isolated word skills such as vocabulary exercises, bring us closer to James Moffett's statement that "...the structure of the subject must be meshed with the structure of the individual" (Moffett, 1968). In doing so, teachers encourage students to become active meaning makers through language. Students bring meaning to the classroom and what they do in it through their existing systems of language and thinking.

The finding that students' internalized story schema helps with the reading and writing of short stories leads the investigator to further suggest that students receive instruction in exposition. Much in the same way that Stein and Policastro (1984), Stein and Trabasso (1982) and Stein and Glenn (1979) believe that story patterns are helpful, Calfee and Curley (1983), Hennings (1982) and Meyer (1975) believe that grammars of exposition exist and that these patterns require internalization if students are to comprehend expository prose. Because students have little exposure to exposition in the elementary grades, they have little opportunity to develop an understanding of the structure of expository prose. Therefore, to help students comprehend and compose lengthy or complex

pieces of exposition, teachers must develop and refine a schemata which sensitizes students to the organization of conceptual and relational content.

Recognizing the intellectual context students work within is essential. Equally imperative, however, is to recognize the deficiencies within this framework. Therefore, in addition to suggesting that students be encouraged to use their story schema, it is also recommended that attempts be made to further develop this schema. Clearly, although students' schema assists with the comprehending and composing processes, these bright, grade eight students' existing schemata for plot, character, setting and theme also interfere with their reading and writing. Modification of this schemata might prove beneficial. Referring to this modification, or mode of learning, as "tuning", Rumelhart (1977) states that,

...tuning involves replacing a constant portion of a schema with a variable one--that is, adding a new variable to a schema. This sort of schema modification amounts to "concept generalization"--making a schema more generally applicable. Presumably, the occasion for such learning is the discovery, at some point in time, that a particular schema would offer a good account for a particular situation if only some presumably constant feature of the schema were allowed to vary. [p. 53]

For example, viewing plot in terms of three subschemata--conflict, conflict resolution and happiness binding--prevents students from relying on the scope required of mature readers and writers. In order for the quality of their thinking to become more thorough and searching, they must become acquainted

with various patterns of narration. Learning how to cope with tragedy and unhappiness in fiction, asking how this may contribute to the significance of story, thinking in terms of what revelations are made, and acquiring habits of selective attention would further expand students' schemata and likely lead to more effective reading and writing.

In addition to modifying existing schemata, it is also necessary to create new schemata. In light of the marked deficiencies in students' knowledge of point of view, tone and mood, the present investigator recommends that teachers account for schemata formation in their instructional plans. A review of available material for junior-high students in British Columbia reveals that little emphasis is placed on these three story elements in currently used text books. Many of those used at the grade eight, nine and ten level completely disregard point of view, tone and mood (Cline, Williams & Donlan, 1974; Plattor, 1973; Glatthorn, Kreidler & Heiman, 1971), while some merely address these terms incidentally in their glossaries (Lechelt, Brown, Brennan and Fleming, 1980; Lechelt, Brennan and Brown, 1980; Lechelt, Clark and Medd, 1980). Others have made point of view the teaching objective of designated chapters (Lawrence, 1973; Roe, 1973); however, despite activities requiring students to write in the first, second and third person, none of these books provide students with a schema which allows them to approach their reading and writing tasks critically. At the senior secondary level, Perrine (1966)

provides students with information that is pertinent to them as readers of short stories. For example, he suggests that to understand and evaluate a story the reader ask a series of questions: Who is interpreting the events of the story? Has the writer chosen his point of view for maximum revelation of his material? Has the author used his point of view fairly and consistently? Clearly, these questions are a beginning for both readers and writers, but the task of answering them requires that students have a fully developed schemata for point of view.

Assuming that eighth-grade students possess an appropriate level of cognitive maturation, an understanding of point of view, tone and mood requires, in Rumelhart and Norman's (1978) terms, "restructuring" and "tuning". First, new schemata must be created. This mode of learning, called restructuring, involves "patterned generation"--or learning by analogy. Initially, meaningful concepts of point of view, tone and mood should be generated by patterning them on existing schemata. Once new schemata are created, students should then be provided with experiences which allow them to make meaning of print they read and write through their newly formed conceptualizations of point of view, tone and mood. As students gain more experience with new exemplars, the process of tuning, responsible for the evolution of schemata, will upgrade this schemata, and in doing so, will allow students to approach their reading and writing tasks with additional frameworks of knowledge.

Final teaching implications are based on the investigation's conclusion that reading and writing are related cognitive processes. James Squire (1983) attributes ineffective reading and writing to the schools' failure to recognize this relationship. He states,

Our failure to teach composing and comprehending as process impedes our efforts not only to teach children to read and write, but our efforts to teach them how to think. [p. 23]

Learning to read and write cannot be accomplished by focusing on a series of isolated reading and writing skills. Important as these skills may be, they must be taught in a holistic context, a context which does not ignore the thinking process. Integrating reading and writing through such strategies as imagining, clustering, questioning, and anticipating enables learners to explore their own thinking processes at the emotional, cognitive and metacognitive levels. By encouraging them to wonder, predict, remember, support, connect, guess and play, teachers "actively" engage students in the reading, writing and thinking processes, a component which according to Hillocks (1986) is essential. Students begin to perceive themselves as "readers" as well as "writers"; as listeners as well as tellers; as editors as well as proud publishers. Teachers, on the other hand, relinquish their roles as authorities and relegate themselves to more effective roles as facilitators and elicitors of strategies that lead to more effective reading, writing and thinking.

REFERENCES

- Aloian, D. (1968). Stories and storytellers. Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Arthur, S.V. (1981). The effects of two writing treatments on the reading and writing of third graders (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 4278A-4279A.
- Atwell, M.A. (1981). The evolution of text: The inter-relationships of reading and writing in the composing process (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 116A.
- Austin, D.E. (1984). Reading to write: The effect of the analysis of essays on written skills in college composition classes (Doctoral dissertation, the University of Alabama, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 771A
- Barbig, E. (1968). An exploration of growth in written composition to determine the relationship of selected variables to poor writing in grades 9 and 12 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1968). Dissertation Abstracts International, 29, 2140A.
- Barnes, J.A. (1984). An analysis and comparison of reading and writing levels of third, fifth, and seventh grade students as measured by readability formulae Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 78A.
- Bazerman, C. (1980). A relationship between reading and writing: The conversational model. College English, 41, 656-661.
- Belanger, J.F. (1978). Reading skill as an influence on writing skill. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Belanger, J., & Martin, R.G. (1984). The influence of improved reading skill on writing skill. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 30, 194-212.
- Belanger, J., & Martin, R.G. (1989). The influence of a reading treatment on the written compositions of grade 11 students: A research update. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 35, 36-48.

- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1983). Levels of inquiry in writing research. In P. Mosenthal, L. Tamor, and S.A. Walmsley (eds.), Research on writing: Principles and methods. New York: Longman Inc.
- Bippus, A.C. (1978). The relationship of the quality of students' written language, productivity of writing and reading comprehension in grades four and six (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 3993A.
- Birnbaum, J.C. (1981). A study of reading and writing behaviors of selected fourth grade and seventh grade students (Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 153A.
- Braddock, R., Lloyd-Jones, R., & Shoer, L. (1963). Research in written composition. Champaign, Illinois: National council of teachers of English.
- Bransford, J.D., & Johnson, M.K. (1973). Consideration of some problems of comprehension. In W. Chase (Ed.), Visual information processing. New York: Academic Press.
- Bravick, J. (1986). The development, implementation, and evaluation of an instructional model to increase comprehension through written structural-response to text. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 281 178)
- Bridwell, L.S. (1980). Revising processes in twelfth grade students' transactional writing. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 5765-A.
- Brooks, C., & Warren, R.P. (1959). Understanding fiction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.
- Bushner, D.E. (1980). The relationship between the reading comprehension ability of seventh and eighth grade subjects and the syntactic complexity of their written language (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University School of Education, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 4878A.
- Calfee, R., & Curley, R. (1983). Structures of prose in the content area. In J. Flood (Ed.), Understanding reading comprehension: Cognition, languages and structures of prose, Newark, DE: International reading association.
- Calhoun, J.L. (1971). The effect of analysis of essays in college composition classes on reading and writing skills (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 1971A.

- Callaghan, T.F. (1978). The effects of sentence combining exercises on the syntactic maturity, quality of writing, reading ability, and attitudes of ninth grade students. (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 637A.
- Campbell, D.B. (1976). A study of two methods of teaching English in a community college setting (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnical Institute and State University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 4808A.
- Cline, J., Williams, K. & Donlan, D. (1974). Voices in literature, language and composition (3). Canada: Ginn and Company.
- Collins, C.D. (1980). The effect of writing experiences in the expressive mode upon the reading self-esteem, attitudes, and academic achievement of freshmen in a college reading course (Doctoral dissertation, The State University of New Jersey (New Brunswick), 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 3804A-3805A.
- Couture, B.A. (1981). Reading to write: An exploration of the uses of analytic reading to teach composition (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 4021A.
- Crowhurst, M. (1983). Sentence combining: Maintaining realistic expectations. College Composition and Communication, 34, 62-72.
- Crowhurst, M. (1987). The effect of reading instruction and writing instruction on reading and writing persuasion. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 281 148)
- Dahl, K.L. (1985). Reading and writing as transacting processes (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 111A.
- D'Angelo, J.L. (1977). Predicting reading achievement in a senior high school from intelligence, listening, and informative writing (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 2027A.

- Decker, N.C. (1989). The effects of writing in the expressive mode upon the reading achievement of remedial readers in the secondary school (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 1746A.
- De La Rosa, M.C. (1979). The effects on reading achievement of students engaged in creative writing and students engaged in sustained silent reading and creative writing (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 663A-664A.
- DeVries, T. (1970). Reading, writing frequency, and expository writing. Reading Improvement, 7, 14-15.
- Donelson, K.L. (1967). Variables distinguishing between effective and ineffective writers at the tenth grade. Journal of Experimental Education, 35, 37-41.
- Duffy, C., & Pettit, H. (1952). A dictionary of literary terms. University of Denver Press.
- Eckhoff, B. (1983). How reading affects children's writing. Language Arts, 60, 607-616.
- Elley, W.B., Barham, I.H., Lamb, H., & Wylie, M. (1976). The role of grammar in a secondary school English curriculum. Research in the Teaching of English, 10, 5-21.
- Emig, J. (1971). The composing process of twelfth graders (Research Report No. 13). Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Eurich, A.C. (1931). The reading abilities of college students: An experimental study. College program Series, Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Evans, R. (1986). The effects of sentence combining instruction on controlled and free writing and on scores for standardized tests of sentence structure and reading comprehension. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 269 739)
- Felland, N. (1981). A national survey of the level of composition achievement (superior/average) of twelfth grade composition students and selected personal characteristics/environmental factors (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 3037A.

- Frye, N., Baker, S., & Perkins, G. (1985). Harper handbook to literature: With a chronology of literature and world events by Barbara M. Perkins. New York: Harper and Row.
- Glazer, J.I. (1973). The effect of literature study on the ability of 4th and 5th grade pupils to create written stories. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 095 538)
- Glatthorn, A.A., Kreidler, C.W., & Heiman, E.J. (1971). The dynamics of language (1). Toronto: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Glover, J., Plake, B., Roberts, B., Zimmer, J., & Palmere, M. (1981). The effects of paraphrasing and drawing inferences on memory from prose. Journal of Educational Psychology, 73, 736-744.
- Goodman, K., & Goodman, Y. (1983). Reading and writing relationships: Pragmatic functions. Language Arts, 60, 590-599.
- Hamill, C. & McNutt, G. (1980). Language abilities and reading: A review of the literature of their relationship. Elementary School Journal, 80, 269-277.
- Hart, E.J. (1980). The effect of a knowledge of selected reading skills on the acquisition and retention of these skills in written composition (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 1510A.
- Hartman, D.M. (1984). An investigation into the predictive relationship of ten writing assessment variables to reading comprehension (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Connecticut, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 1353A.
- Hayes, J.R., & Flower, L.S.J. (1983). Uncovering cognitive processes in writing: An introduction to protocol analysis. In P. Mosenthal, L. Tamor, & S.A. Walmsley (Eds.), Research in writing: Principles and methods. New York: Longman Inc.
- Heller, M.F. (1980). The reading-writing connection: An analysis of the written language of university freshmen at two reading levels (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 4452A.

- Hennings, D.G. (1982). A writing approach to reading comprehension--schema theory in action. In J.M. Jensen (Ed.), Composing and comprehending, Urbana, Ill: ERIC clearinghouse on reading and communication skills, and The National Conference on Research in English, 1984.
- Heys, F. (1962). The theme-a-week assumption: A report of an experiment. English Journal, 51, 320-322.
- Hill, S.S. (1982). Relationships between reading and writing performance: A correlational study of metropolitan reading subscores and national assessment writing scores (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Florida, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 1862A-1863A.
- Hillocks, G., Jr. (1986). Research on written composition. Urbana, Il: ERIC Clearinghouse on reading and communication skills, and the National Conference on Research in English.
- Hinton, P.R. (1982). Basic skills: Reading performance test scores and the impact of a writing program (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 750A.
- Holt, S.L., & Vacca, J.L. (1981). Reading with a sense of writer: Writing with a sense of reader. Language Arts, 58, 937-941.
- Howie, S.M. (1979). The effects of sentence-combining practice on the writing ability and reading level of ninth grade students Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 1980A.
- Hyndman, R. (1969). Some factors related to writing performance of tenth-grade students (Doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 30, 1468A.
- Jackson, D. (1982). Continuity in Secondary English. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Johnson, N.R. (1981). A comparison of syntactic writing maturity with reading achievement (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 4346A.
- Johnson, N.S., & Mandler, J.M. (1980). A tale of two structures: Underlying and surface forms in stories. Poetics, 9, 87-89.

- Kelley, K.R. (1984). The effect of writing instruction on reading comprehension and story writing ability (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 1703A.
- Kermode, F. (1967). The sense of an ending: Studies in the theory of fiction. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kuntz, M.H. (1975). The relationship between syntactic attainment and reading ability in seventh grade (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 2159A.
- Lacampagne, R.J. (1968). A national study of selected attitudes and approaches to writing of twelfth-grade students with superior writing performance versus those with average writing performance (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1968). Dissertation Abstracts International, 30, 212A.
- Lawrence, E. (1973). Action English 2. Toronto: Gage Educational Publishing, Ltd.
- Lazdowske, W.P. (1976). Determining reading grade levels from analysis of written compositions (Doctoral dissertation, New Mexico state University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 1504A.
- Lechelt, D., Brown, H., Brennan, P., & Fleming, J. (1980). Telling the world (1). Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Lechelt, D., Brown, H., Brennan, P., & Fleming, J. (1980). Telling the world (2). Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Lechelt, D., Clark, D., & Medd, G. (1980). Telling the world (3). Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Ledford, S.Y. (1984). The relationships among selected sixth-grade students' reading schemata, reading achievement, and writing sophistication (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 797A.
- Lee, C. (1986). The effects of instruction in the organizational patterns of writing on comprehension. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 269 744)
- Leone, A.H. (1980). A study of the interrelationships of writing ability, writing interest, reading readiness and reading performance of a given kindergarten population

- (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Connecticut, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 525A.
- Levine, S.S. (1977). The effects of transformational sentence-combining exercises on the reading comprehension and written comprehension of third-grade children (Doctoral dissertation, Hofstra University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 6431A.
- Loban, W.D. (1963). The language of elementary school children (NCTE Research Report No 1). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Loban, W.D. (1966). Language ability: Grades seven, eight, and nine. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Loban, W.E. (1967). Language ability: Grades ten, eleven, and twelve. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Louque, M.P. (1984). Effects of newspaper reading, freewriting, and guided writing on overall writing quality of seventh grade students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 2698A.
- Lowe, W.G. (1986). Reading/writing relationships as revealed in the composing processes of beginning college freshmen (Doctoral dissertation, the University of Alabama, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 3333A.
- Maat, D.W. (1978). An inquiry into empirical relationship between the reading and writing of exposition and argument (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Albany, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 4631A.
- Mackie, B.C. (1982). The effects of a sentence-combining program on the reading comprehension and written composition of fourth-grade students (Doctoral dissertation, Hofstra University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 4779A.
- Maloney, H.B. (1967). An identification of excellence in expository composition performance in a selected 9a population with an analysis of reasons for superior performance (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1967). Dissertation Abstracts International, 29, 2432A.
- Mandler, J.M. & Johnson, N.S. (1977). Remembrance of things parsed: Story structure and recall. Cognitive psychology, 9, 111-151.

- Marshall, J.D. (1987). The effects of writing on students' understanding of literary texts. Research in the Teaching of English, 21, 30-63.
- Mathews, E.G., Larsen, R.P., & Butler, G. (1945). Experimental investigation of the relation between reading training and achievement in college composition classes. Journal of Educational Research, 38, 499-505.
- Mavrogenes, N.A., & Pakak, N.D. (1982). The reading road to writing. Journal of Educational Research, 75, 334-339.
- McAfee, D.C. (1981). Effect of sentence-combining instruction on the reading and writing achievement of fifth grade children in a suburban school district (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Woman's University, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 156A.
- McCarthy, I.D. (1989). The effect of technology on the teaching of writing in the middle school and its impact on achievement in reading and language arts (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 1775A.
- McConnell, M.A. (1983). The effect of literature exposure and writing practice on the original narrative writing of second-grade children (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio state University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 2619A.
- Menendez, S.D. (1979). The effect of sentence-combining practice on remedial college students' syntactic maturity, punctuation skills and reading ability (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 6599A.
- Metcalf, J. (1980). New worlds. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited.
- Meyer, B.J.F. (1975). The organization of prose and its effect on memory. The Hague: Mouton.
- Michener, D.M. (1985). A quasi-experimental study of the effects of reading aloud to third-grade students as reflected in their written composition skills (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 1545A.

- Miller, T.J.A. (1974). A qualitative study of the "free modifiers" in narrative-descriptive compositions written by Black college freshmen after leaving the influence of the Christensen Program and a study of their attitudes toward written composition (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 33, 3483A.
- Misenheimer, J.F. (1989). The effect of the IBM writing to read program on reading and spelling achievement test scores of primary students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 1722A.
- Moffett, J. (1968). Teaching the universe of discourse. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Moffett, J. (1983). Reading and writing as meditation. Language Arts, 60, 315-332.
- Monk, F.J. (1958). A study to determine the relationship between children's home environments and their school achievement in written English. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.
- Nagle, J. (1972). The effects of a directed writing activity in eighth-grade social studies instruction on general reading achievement and on social studies reading achievement (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 33, 1523A.
- Nielsen, B.F. (1980). Effects of reading on children's narrative writing (Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 99A.
- Obenchain, A. (1971). Effectiveness of the precise essay question in programming the sequential development of written composition skills and the simultaneous development of critical reading skills. Unpublished Master's thesis, George Washington University. (In Belanger, J.F. (1978). Reading skill as an influence on writing skill. Unpublished doctoral dissertation).
- O'Donnell, J.F. (1974). An experimental study of the effects of the supplemental use of a psycholinguistic remedial tutorial program on the reading-writing behaviors of Black high-risk college freshmen, and on their attitudes toward reading, writing and other college-related stimuli (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 1552A.

- Oehlkers, W. (1971). The contributions of creative writing to reading achievement in the language experience approach (Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 6689A.
- Perl, S. (1979). The composing processes of unskilled college writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 13, 317-336.
- Perrine, L. (1966). Story and structure. Toronto: Academic Press.
- Perron, J.D. (1976). The impact of mode on written syntactic complexity: Part 3 fifth grade report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 126 511 and 126 531)
- Perry, M.L. (1980). A study of the effects of a literary models approach to composition on writing and reading achievement (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University School of Education, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 6137A.
- Petrosky, A.R. (1982). From story to essay: Reading and writing. College Composition and Communication, 33, 19-36.
- Phelps, S.F. (1979). The effects of integrating sentence-combining activities and guided reading procedures on the reading and writing performance of eighth-grade students (Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 179A.
- Pitts, S.J.K. (1985). Spelling as a correlate of reading ability in under-prepared college freshmen: Measures and error types (Doctoral dissertation, The University of New Mexico, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 2358A.
- Plattor, E.E. (1973). Action English 1. Toronto: Gage Educational Publishing Ltd.
- Raphael, T. (1986). The impact of text structure instruction and social context on students' comprehension and production of expository text. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275 990)
- Reagan, S.B. (1985). Double exposure: combined reading-writing instruction (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 2863A.
- Reed, E. (1967). Improving comprehension through study of syntax and paragraph structure in seventh-grade classes. Forging ahead in reading, 12, 575-579.

- Roe, M. (1973). Action English 3. Toronto: Gage Educational Publishing, Ltd.
- Rosenblatt, L.M. (1938). Literature as exploration, New York: Noble and Noble.
- Rosenblatt, L.M. (1976). Literature as exploration, (3rd ed.). New York: Noble and Noble.
- Rosenblatt, L.M. (1982). The literary transaction: Evocation and response. Theory into Practice, 21, 268-277.
- Rosenblatt, L.M. (1985). Viewpoints: Transaction versus interaction--A terminological rescue operation. Research in the Teaching of English, 19, 96-107.
- Rumelhart, D.E. (1975). Notes on schema for stories. In D.G. Bobrow & A. Collins (Eds.), Representation and understanding. New York: Academic Press.
- Rumelhart, D.E. (1977). Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. In R.C. Anderson, R.J. Spiro & W.E. Montague (Eds.), Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge. Hillside, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rumelhart, D.E., & Norman, D.A. (1978). Accretion, tuning and restructuring: Three modes of learning. In J.W. Cotton & R.L. Klatsky (Eds.), Semantic factors in cognition. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ryan, S.N. (1984). An examination of reading and writing strategies of selected fifth-grade children (Doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University-College of Education, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 2105A.
- Schneider, V. (1971). A study of the effectiveness of emphasizing the teaching of reading skills to improve composition skills in remedial English classes at Kansas Community College (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 31, 6369A.
- Schewe, A., & Froese, V. (1986). Relating reading & writing via comprehension, quality and structure. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 281 141)
- Scott, K.F. (1985). Children's revision abilities: Reading and rewriting as component processes (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Albany, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 1237A.

- Shanahan, T.E. (1980). A canonical correlational analysis of the reading-writing relationship: An exploratory investigation (Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 1007A.
- Simon, P.E. (1980). An exploratory study of the relationship between reading response and syntactic writing maturity (Doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 2533A.
- Smith, F. (1983). Reading Like a Writer. Language Arts, 60, 558-567.
- Squire, J.R. (1983). Composing and comprehending: Two sides of the same basic process. In J.M. Jensen (Ed.), Composing and comprehending (pp. 23-31). Urbana, ILL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills.
- Stein, N.L., & Glenn, C.G. (1979). An analysis of story comprehension in elementary school children. In R.O. Freedle (Ed.), New directions in discourse processing, Volume 2 in the series, Advances in discourse processes. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Stein, N.L., & Policastro, M. (1984). The concept of story: A comparison between children's and teachers' viewpoints. In Mandl, H., Stein, N.L., & Trabasso, T. (Eds.), Learning and comprehension of text (pp. 113-55). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Stein, N.L., & Trabasso, T. (1982). What's in a story: An approach to comprehension and instruction. In R. Glaser (Ed.), Advances in instructional psychology (pp 213-67). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Sternglass, M.S. (1976). Composition teacher as reading teacher. College Composition and Communication, 27, 378-382.
- Stevenson, Z. (1988). Achievement in the writing to read program: A comparative evaluation study. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 293 147)
- Stotsky, S. (1983). Research on reading/writing relationships: A synthesis and suggested directions. Language Arts, 60, 627-642.

- Sullivan, M.A. (1978). The effects of sentence-combining exercises on syntactic maturity, quality of writing, reading ability, and attitudes of students in grade eleven (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 1197A.
- Taylor, B., & Beach, R. (1984). The effects of text structure instruction on middle-grade students' comprehension and production of expository text. Reading Research Quarterly, 19, 132-146.
- Taylor, H.W. (1981). Listening comprehension and reading comprehension as predictors of achievement in college comprehension (Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 66A-67A.
- Taylor, B., & Berkowitz, S. (1980). Facilitating children's comprehension on content material. In M. Kamil & E. Moe (Eds.), Perspectives on reading research and instruction, Twenty-ninth yearbook of the national reading conference. Washington, D.C.: National Reading Conference, Inc.
- Thomas, F.L. (1976). The extent of the relationship between reading achievement and writing achievement among college freshmen (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 6320A-6321A.
- Tierney, R.J., & Pearson, P.D. (1983). Toward a composing model of reading. Language Arts, 60, 568-580.
- Trivelli, E.A. (1983). A study of the effects of sentence combining on eighth-grade students' written syntactic ability and reading comprehension (Doctoral dissertation, the University of Akron, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 383A.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). Thought and Language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wade, W.A. (1982). Relationships of elicited oral and written language with reading comprehension scores among nine-to-twelve-year-old children (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 3434A.

- Walker Lewis, H.D. (1981). Using writing to improve the reading comprehension abilities of academically underprepared college students (Doctoral dissertation, Hofstra University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 2053A.
- Weathermon, C.J. (1984). The home backgrounds of writers. Unpublished masters' thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Whitmer, J.E., & Miller, M. (1987). The effects of writing on reading abilities: A comparison of first grade writing programs with and without computer technology. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 289 157)
- Wittrock, M.C. (1983). Writing and the teaching of reading. Language Arts, 60, 600-606.
- Wolfe, R.F. (1975). An examination of the effects of teaching a reading vocabulary upon writing vocabulary in student compositions (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 3337A-3338A.
- Woodward J.C., & Phillips, A.G. (1967). The relationship of selected characteristics to poor writing in college. Research in the Teaching of English, 1, 41-53.
- Wyatt, N. (1960). A study of the relationship of extensive reading to certain writing skills of a selected group of sixth-grade children (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, 1960). Dissertation Abstracts International, 21, 2643A.
- Yasuf, D.R. (1982). Reading performance test scores and the impact of a writing program (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 745A.
- Zeman, S.S. (1969). Reading comprehension and the writing of 2nd and 3rd graders. Reading Teacher, 23, 144-150.

APPENDIX A

"The Great Leapfrog Contest"

THE GREAT LEAPFROG CONTEST

By William Saroyan

Segment One¹

Rosie had little use for girls, and as far as possible avoided them. She had less use for boys, but found it undesirable to avoid them. That is to say, she made it a point to take part in everything the boys did. She was always on hand, and always the first to take up any daring or crazy idea.

If she didn't whip every boy she fought every fight was at least an honest draw, with a slight edge in Rosie's favour. She didn't fight girl-style or cry if hurt. She fought the regular style and took advantage of every opening. It was very humiliating to be hurt by Rosie, so after a while any boy who thought of trying to chase her away, decided not to.

She was just naturally the equal of any boy in the neighbourhood, and much the superior of many of them. Especially after she lived in the neighbourhood three years. It took her that long to make everybody understand that she had come to stay and that she was going to stay.

Segment Two

She did, too; even after the arrival of a boy named Rex Folger, who was from somewhere in the south of Texas. This boy was a natural-born leader. Two months after his arrival in the neighbourhood, it was understood by everyone that if Rex wasn't

¹ Each segment was typed on a separate sheet of paper and given to subjects one at a time.

the leader of the gang, he was very nearly the leader. He had fought and licked every boy in the neighbourhood who at one time or another had fancied himself leader. And he had done so without any noticeable ill-feeling, pride or ambition.

Segment Three

One winter, the whole neighbourhood took to playing a game that had become popular on the other side of the tracks, in another slum neighbourhood of the town: Leapfrog. The idea was for as many boys as cared to participate, to bend down and be leaped over by every other boy in the game, and then himself to get up and begin leaping over all the other boys, and then bend down again until all the other players had become exhausted. This didn't happen, sometimes, until the last two players had travelled a distance of three or four miles while the other players walked along, watching and making bets.

Segment Four

Rosie, of course, was always in on the game. She was always one of the last to drop out, too. And she was the only person in the neighbourhood Rex Folger hadn't fought and beaten.

He felt that was much too humiliating even to think about. But inasmuch as he seemed to be a member of the gang, he felt that in some way or another he ought to prove his superiority.

Segment Five

One summer day during vacation, an argument between Rex and Rosie developed and Rosie pulled off her turtle-neck sweater and challenged him to a fight. Rex told Rosie he wasn't in the

habit of hitting women--where he came from that amounted to boxing your mother. On the other hand, he said, if Rosie cared to compete with him in any other sport, he would be glad to oblige her.

Segment Six

So Rex and Rosie fought it out in this game Leapfrog. They got to leaping over one another, quickly, too, until the first thing we knew the whole gang of us was out on the State Highway going south towards Fowler. It was a very hot day. Rosie and Rex were in great shape, and it looked like one was tougher than the other and more stubborn. They had talked a good deal, especially Rosie, who insisted that she would have to fall down unconscious before she'd give up to a guy like Rex.

He said he was sorry his opponent was a girl. It grieved him deeply to have to make a girl exert herself to the point of death, but it was just too bad. He had to, so she had to. They leaped and squatted, leaped and squatted and we got out to Sam Day's vineyard. That was half-way to Fowler. It didn't seem like either Rosie or Rex were ever going to get tired. They hadn't even begun to show signs of growing tired, although each of them was sweating a great deal.

Segment Seven

Naturally, we were sure Rex would win the contest. But that was because we hadn't taken into account the fact that he was a simple person, whereas Rosie was crafty and shrewd. Rosie knew how to figure angles. She had discovered how to jump over

Rex Folger in a way that weakened him. And after a while, about three miles out of Fowler, we noticed that she was coming down on Rex's neck, instead of on his back. Naturally this was hurting him and making the blood rush to his head. Rosie herself squatted in such a way that it was impossible, almost, for Rex to get anywhere near her neck with his hands.

Segment Eight

Before long, we noticed that Rex was weakening. His head was getting closer and closer to the ground. About half a mile out of Fowler, we heard Rex's head bumping the ground every time Rosie leaped over him. They were good loud bumps that we knew were painful, but Rex wasn't complaining. He was too proud to complain.

Rosie on the other hand, knew her man, and she was giving him all she had. She was bumping his head on the ground as solidly as she could, because she knew she didn't have much more fight in her, and if she didn't lay him out cold, in the hot sun, in the next ten minutes or so, she would fall down exhausted herself and lose the contest.

Segment Nine

Suddenly Rosie bumped Rex's head a real powerful one. He got up very dazed and very angry. It was the first time we had ever seen him fuming. By God, the girl was taking advantage of him, if he wasn't mistaken and he didn't like it. Rosie was squatted in front of him. He came up groggy and paused a moment. Then he gave Rosie a very effective kick that sent her

sprawling. Rosie jumped up and smacked Rex in the mouth. The gang jumped in and tried to establish order.

It was agreed that the Leapfrog contest must not change to a fight. Not any more. Not with Fowler only five or ten minutes away. The gang ruled further that Rex had had no right to kick Rosie and that in smacking him in the mouth Rosie had squared the matter, and the contest was to continue.

Segment Ten

Rosie was very tired and sore; and so was Rex. They began leaping and squatting again; and again we saw Rosie coming down on Rex's neck so that his head was bumping the ground.

It looked pretty bad for the boy from Texas. We couldn't understand how he could take so much punishment. We all felt that Rex was getting what he had coming to him, but at the same time everybody seemed to feel badly about Rosie, a girl, doing the job instead of one of us. Of course, that was where we were wrong. Nobody but Rosie could have figured out that smart way of humiliating a very powerful and superior boy.

Segment Eleven

Less than a hundred yards from the heart of Fowler, Rosie, with great and admirable artistry, finished the job.

That was where the dirt of the highway siding ended, and the paved main street of Fowler began. This street was paved with cement, not asphalt. Asphalt, in the heat, would have been too soft to serve, but cement had exactly the right degree of brittleness. I think Rex when he squatted over the hard cement,

knew the game was up. But he was brave to the end. He squatted over the hard cement and waited for the worst. Behind him, Rosie Mahoney prepared to make the supreme effort. In this next leap, she intended to give her all, which she did.

Segment Twelve

She came down on Rex Folger's neck like a ton of bricks. His head banged against the cement, his body straightened out, and his arms and legs twitched.

He was out like a light.

Six paces in front of him, Rosie Mahoney squatted and waited. Jim Talesco counted twenty, which was the time allowed for each leap. Rex didn't get up during the count.

The contest was over. The winner of the contest was Rosie Mahoney.

APPENDIX B
Schedule of Questions for
"The Great Leapfrog Contest"

Segment One

Go on then. What's going to happen next?

What's your impression of Rosie?

How do you think a story like this might end?

Segment Two

What do you think is going to happen next?

What do you think of Rex?

Segment Three

Now what do you think might happen?

What made you decide that this would happen next?

Segment Four

Go on. What do you think is going to happen?

How do you feel about Rosie? Why?

How do you feel about Rex? Why?

Segment Five

What do you expect might happen now?

Segment Six

Now what do you think might happen out of all of this?

What makes you think that?

Segment Seven

Now what?

Segment Eight

What do you think is going to happen to both of them in the end?

Who's going to be the winner?

Segment Nine

What do you think will happen at the end of the story? Why?

Segment Ten

What are you thinking now?

Segment Eleven

What are your thoughts at this time?

Segment Twelve

So, what do you think of this?

Is this a good ending? Why/why not?

APPENDIX C

Conclusion to "The Great Leapfrog Contest"

Rex didn't get up by himself at all. He just stayed where he was until a half-dozen of us lifted him and carried him to a horse trough, where we splashed water on his face.

Rex was a confused young man all the way back. He was also a deeply humiliated one. He couldn't understand anything about anything. He just looked dazed and speechless. Every now and then we imagined he wanted to talk, and I guess he did, but after we'd all gotten ready to hear what he had to say, he couldn't speak. He made a gesture so tragic that tears came to the eyes of eleven members of the gang.

Rosie Mahoney, on the other hand, talked all the way home. She said everything.

I think it made a better man of Rex. More human. After that he was a gentler sort of soul. It may have been because he couldn't see very well for some time. At any rate, for weeks he seemed to be going around in a dream. His gaze would freeze on some insignificant object far away in the landscape, and half the time it seemed as if he didn't know where he was going, or why. He took little part in the activities of the gang, and the following winter he stayed away all together. He came to school one day wearing glasses. He looked broken and pathetic.

That winter Rosie Mahoney stopped hanging around with the gang, too. She had a flair for making an exit at the right time.

APPENDIX D

Verbal Homework Instructions

All subjects received identical verbal instructions. The following passage was read to each student:

For homework, I would like you to write about an event which you think is unfair or cruel. This event may be real or made-up. It may be based on something that has happened to you, to someone you know or to someone you don't know. If you don't want to write about something that is real, then by all means feel free to make something up.

Any questions about this assignment?

APPENDIX E

Examples of Appropriate, Neutral and Inappropriate Proposed Revisions

A. Appropriate Suggestions

Example One

Investigator: How about including some information about the characters. Maybe something on how they look. I don't know what Mr. Donnely looks like, and I don't know what the character Dad looks like.

Jacob: I don't think it really matters.

Investigator: No?

Jacob: Nothing's needed. You don't need to know what they look like. There's no need for description. I could've put it, like where they were and everything, but.....I didn't want to.

Investigator: So why don't you think you need some description?

Jacob: Just ah.....there's nothing that the story needs description for. The people aren't making comments on what they look like or anything. There's just nothing that you need it for.

Investigator: Mm huh. How about the character Mom, she was mentioned. Do you think that she needs to be described at all?

Jacob: No. Minor character. There's nothing..... nothing that you really need after that.

Example Two

Investigator: Melissa, in the second paragraph you said, "They were forced to live in very rural areas and restricted to these areas." Do you think we could add these two sentences to that: "Kinta's dirt-floored home consisted of four corrugated tin walls sheltering 56 square feet of space. His parents, unfortunately, went beyond the permitted boundaries, and as a result had paid the consequences.

Melissa: I'll agree to that because it, it's like.....one thing I didn't like about this was that there wasn't really any actual characters in [my story]. And with introducing Kinta in the beginning, right, I think it's a good idea to like carry on throughout the story.

Investigator: Mm huh. Any other reasons why?

Melissa: Also because it sort of shows, it gives an actual example of what is happening and it's more fully described.

Investigator: Is that important?

Melissa: Mm huh.

Investigator: Why?

Melissa: Because, like I said before, it's more personal, naming him and talking about how he feels, and you sort of begin to know the person and you feel for them.

Example Three

Investigator: One last suggestion that I have Brent relates to your ending. In your story, Mark loses the fight but is declared the winner because he fought fair and honest. Right?

Brent: Yeah.

Investigator: In the end you say, "With this, John, the large friend of Mark, ran over to Dave and beat wildly on him, so wildly Dave ran....[student interrupts]....

Brent:to get away.

Investigator: Yes, "to get away," but what would you think if we changed that and said, "With this, John, the large friend of Mark's ran over to Dave to beat him up, but he had no such luck. Dave gave him a quick, powerful kick in the face. John fell back and was out cold, or at least everyone thought he was. That was before they realized that Mark and John were dead."

Brent: Ahhh....Mark and John? Um, there was, Mark and John were, um how many times did he, did he just ki, punched him or did he kick him?

Investigator: He "gave him a quick, powerful kick in the face."

Brent: Um, I, I like the idea of, um, of having them fight.

Investigator: Ah ha.

Brent: I, I like the idea of having, maybe a little bit of a different fight, because if I describe Dave some more--like what his Dad was doing to him and that he was more mean--he wouldn't run away. So I think that's better that they fight. But the part about them dying, um.....I like the idea of having it a little bit different. But, um, the only thing is, I think it's maybe a little bit unrealistic. One kick in the head and the guy's dead?

Investigator: Ah ha.

Brent: Like maybe he could be severely hurt, but, ah, I don't think he'd die.

Investigator: Okay then, how about if we said, "He gave him a number of extremely powerful kicks--in the face, in the stomach and in the head."

Brent: Yeah, may maybe he picks something up and hits him too. But having them both die in the end, that's unrealistic. Maybe just one of them could die.

Investigator: Do you like the idea of having someone die in the end, or would you rather not?

Brent: It kind of finalizes it a little bit more, and I guess it's more dramatic.

Investigator: So would you include a death in your story then.

Brent: Ahh, no....[PAUSE]....because I've finalized it, you know concluded it, without having someone die.

B. Neutral Suggestions

Example One

Investigator: I noticed that you wrote "G'night" instead of "Good night." How about changing that to "good night?"

Jacob: I thought it was okay the way it was. Nobody really says, "good night" now. It's just "g'night." So I was just doing it like I would do it.

Investigator: Like you would write it?

Jacob: No, like if I was saying "good night" to my parents that's exactly what I would say.

Investigator: Mm huh.

Jacob: So that's the way I wrote it.

Example Two

Investigator: What do you think of combining paragraphs two and three? Would you go along with that idea?

Jennifer: Instead of having two separate paragraphs?

Investigator: Mm huh.

Jennifer: Yeah, I guess we could. It's just like two sentences.

Investigator: Mm huh. How about paragraphs six, seven and eight?

Jennifer:[PAUSE]....Um, well....[PAUSE]....in this one Sally is talking about volleyball, and in this one, it's all about Tanis, and this one it doesn't have nothing to do with Tanis. That's what I thought. You should have another paragraph for it. It is short, but this one's just all about Tanis and this one has nothing to do with Tanis. That's why I thought I should have another paragraph.

Investigator: So, should we keep it as it is? Or maybe make it longer?

Jennifer: No, I think we should just leave it because this has nothing to do with injustice, and we're just taking up room then. Cause I don't think it's necessary to explain all about volleyball and that.

Example Three

Investigator: I was looking through your story and I noticed that from this point on you abbreviated "south" by putting an "S." I was thinking that we could continue to write "south" instead of abbreviate it.

Melissa: Well, I guess. I just used it so I wouldn't have to write out the entire word, because it was getting a little tiring. So it was easier to

abbreviate it.

C. Inappropriate Suggestions

Example One

Investigator: Throughout your story Mark is being bugged by Jordy. Jordy isn't very nice to him because he's a bit of a wimp. Do you think we could change that so that something else gives Mark grief? Do you think that could be the main part of the story?

Pat: You mean like have another boy from school pick on him?

Investigator: No, I was thinking that he could encounter an animal in the woods, and then get into a fight with this animal.

Pat: Oh.

Investigator: Could we do that?

Pat: We could....[PAUSE]....but I don't think it would be very good. Because, like if he was to meet a bear or something like that everybody knows that the bear's gonna win. It's kinda weird having a person fight with an animal[PAUSE]....I like it better with Jordy bugging him.

Investigator: Why's that?

Pat: I don't know. It's easier.

Investigator: What's easier?

Pat: It's easier to write.

Example Two

Investigator: Another suggestion is to eliminate the first two full paragraphs and start with the second full paragraph on page two.

Jennifer: Mm huh.

Investigator: What do you think of that?

Jennifer:[PAUSE]....Yeah....[PAUSE]....That might look more professional. There are some stories that

I read, like they do all things that happened in the beginning, and then they say, "Well this all happened." It makes it sound more like a diary or something. So that might sound pretty good. Yeah. That's a good idea.

Investigator: Why do you like the idea?

Jennifer: Cause, like, I want everything to be perfect for the reader so that they get the idea right away.

Investigator: Mm huh.

Jennifer: So we can put the end first, and then I guess I start introducing in the back so that the reader gets the idea right away, and they wouldn't be so bored in the beginning. On the first page they'd have all the ideas that were happening...

Investigator: Mm huh. So do you think that would ruin your story? Would it confuse your readers?

Jennifer: No, no. Because this is just sort of all the introductory: about what she is; what I did; about all my friends and all that. And the back is all about Tanis and what happened, the real meat of the story. So I don't think it'll confuse them. They'll just think, "Oh! She's just doing the action first and she'll introduce later."

Example Three

Investigator: This story ends with the narrator's father, who I think is just called Dad, and Mr. Donnely making up. They have an argument in the beginning and then they make up in the end. Do you think that we could change that so that rather than have the two characters make up, become friends and go out for dinner, they get into a fist fight and hurt each other. And then end the story with Mr. Donnely hospitalized.

Jacob: But then we'd have to go on, and you have to end it somewhere. I don't think you could just end it with the guy lying in the hospital cause you'll wonder what's gonna happen, and just what they still think of each other.

Investigator: Well, what if Mr. Donnely died. Would that end things?

Jacob: Yeah....[PAUSE]....but I don't know how you could apologize for killing someone. I think it almost has to end like that.

Investigator: Like that? What do you mean "like that?"

Jacob: Well, with them both being friends. Like I don't think you could end with them just being enemies.

APPENDIX F

Example of Analysis Sheet

Subject's Discussion of the Short Story Genre

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

Text from Subject's Short Story

[illegible]

Think-Aloud Protocols from Subject's Short Story