



## **Workshop Writers vs. Prompt Writing: The Effect on Preschool Writing Ability and Attitude towards Writing.**

**Hassan Mohammad Taofik**

*Early Childhood Care Education Department, Federal College of  
Education Katsina, Katsina State Nigeria*

### ***Abstract***

*Children in schools are measured for nine weeks on the basis of a writing prompt using a provided rubric. This action research attempted to determine whether the Writer's use of writer's workshops and prompts differed in ability and attitudes. Eighteen children (N=18) were randomly split into two classes in a preschool class, and each group was taught writing in a separate form over a five-week span. One group received a persuasive paper using a prompt, and another was instructed to write a persuasive paper with a topic of free choice. A series of t-tests and item analysis were carried out to compare the ability and attitude of the two groups to the writing. The results showed that in the course of the study, both Group A (prompted) and Group B (free choice) experienced a decline in overall attitude regarding writing. Nonetheless, Group A (prompted), suffered a downturn greater than Group B (free choice). It seems that children get a bit more pleasure from picking their subject than being asked what to write during the workshop with the artist. The cumulative grades on the final persuasive writing revealed that children instructed with a guide performed lower than those using free-choice ( $11.56 > 9.78$ ) The only subcategory where group B (free choice) performed higher than group A (prompted) was in conventions. (Ideas:  $4.89 > 3.56$ ;  $2.56 > 2.11$ ;  $2.22 >$*

2.00; Conventions: 1.89 < 2.11). This indicates even that children who write more appreciate the learning phase more. Overall, those kids getting a prompt got higher grades on the Writing Test. When it allows children the ability to compose anything they want, they get a more constructive approach to learning. This study suggests that the writing of free choice and inspired writing have also a role in the classroom. Kids require guidance and specific directions in order to teach a certain style of writing (i.e. persuasive, narration, informational). Nonetheless, if we want to cultivate a lifelong enjoyment of learning, teachers in the classroom ought to set aside opportunities for pre-school children to compose and talk with us on what they want to compose on.

**Key words:** *writers' workshop, prompt writing, children attitude towards writing, early childhood education.*

## Introduction

"The Writers Workshop is an immersive approach to writing instructions for children to know about and practice the importance of training, writing / revising and editing their work (Jasmine, J., & Weiner, W., 2007) by writing mini-lessons or sharing. Children learn to be creative in the Writers Workshop.

Children do not need to write instructions in the curriculum for the Writer Workshop, but instead choose their own subject which is important to them. They plan, build and revise their personal work. The Writer's Workshop teacher also meets children individually to assist them in their work. Writing mechanics focused on

what every student now wants.

Jasmine & Weiner (2007) research showed that the Writers' Workshop strengthened the enjoyment of pre-school learning. "The model of a writing workshop has demonstrated an effective approach to teaching that encourages children in their preschool to learn the process by choosing a subject, review and edit drafts, and sharing their work" (Jasmine, J., & Weiner, W., 2007).

Public schools in that region often have to carry out written assessments in conjunction with the Writer's Workshop. Prompts can be so vague as "My first day ....." or something like " "If I had been invisible for a

day, I'd have ..... " County scripting tests and State written assessments both require students to do so. Write to me promptly. "When interacting with young children in writing, teachers are also interacting; using the written directions to make learning easy for children to write (Hudson, H.B. & Mercer 2006)." These methods are usually separate and used to measure comprehension from the Writers' workshop. "To help people understand this issue, writing is the first way to get students to demonstrate their skills at school (Hudson, H.B., & Mercer, 2015).

The question therefore arises as to the effect on the attitude of preschool children to writing by using Free Choice/ Writers Workshop or writing from a prompt? The purpose of this research was to determine whether children perform better on a prompt assessment.

### **Literature review**

Writer's Workshop has become a well-respected and highly acclaimed method of teaching writing to all age groups. It includes not only the freedom to choose what you write, but also the length of time that students need to get ideas on paper (Eitelgeorge, J.S., & Barrett, R. 2014).

In a study conducted by Jasmine and Weiner (2007), it was determined that the Writer's Workshop program promotes independence and confidence in elementary students. The study, similar in sample size to the present research, focused on one classroom of 12 boys and 9 girls. "The study was difficult to accomplish due to the complexity of the sample because the researcher was a teacher and the sample was limited to 19 children" (Jasmine and Weiner, 2007). Rowe, Fitch and Bass (2015) underlined the importance of children in the Writer's workshop in a year-long ethnographic study. They decided that when students had the opportunity to write and read what they had chosen they would find a voice and influence. "Children and teachers take part in what is known as 'Official Classroom Culture' (O.C.C), an event set that is organized and accepted by teachers for the purposes of 'do-school' by drawing on resources from their various affiliations (e.g., family, faith, professional identities, gender and age groups). To make a student's letters meaningful, they must determine what they want to express in their life, their association, both in their community.

Hudson, Lane, and Mercer (2015) found that written directions have little effect on fluency of writing. However, there were major limitations in their work. "It

was unclear if the improvements in the written fluency of the event were due to the incentive they wrote or to the graduation students associated with this story" (Hudson, Lane, and Mercer, 2015). Prompts can be useful only if the subject appeals to students who have to write.

However, with children with learning disabilities, McMaster, Xiaoqing and Petursdottir (2019) have taken a rapid step. They also gave pictures and pictures to see if pupils fighting could benefit from those visual aids. In addition to the story prompt. Some of the disabled students felt that the new time had been easier to produce.

Numerous studies on use of the workshops for both authors and writing of instructions have been done, but the comparison of the two studies is minimal. This study aimed to determine whether one type of writing is superior to the next and whether the child's pleasure in writing is affected.

## **Research Method**

### **Overview of the Project**

This was a research project primarily implemented by a classroom pre-school teacher. In pre-school general education, all nineteen children were asked to evaluate their attitudes toward writing. The Likert scale of the survey was the same scale as that used for the evaluation of reading attitudes in the Likert research (McKenna, M.C. D.J. & Kear, 1990).

The children were first grouped randomly into two groups. The selection was made to randomly pick two classrooms for kids who were interested in early-response (E.I.P) services and others who were enrolled in special education. Then the remaining students were randomly put in the two different classes. After being randomized, the groupings were separated, ensuring that the number of students in each group was equal to the number of students that were usually forming. The aim of this research was to determine whether writing directions or free choice would impact writing skills or attitudes to writing differently.

It was instructed to all children to write a persuasive word. The initial prompt was given to teach children to write a persuasive document. The short was, "You want to really come ..."

Group A has used the method of traditional learning, learning training, graphic organisation, and the conventional cycle of writing: pre-writing, writing, analysis, editing, assessment and printing. Every single party had the same

amount of time or written time for a conference with the instructor. After the research was completed, children were asked to conduct another survey to evaluate whether their written attitudes had improved.

For Group B, as shown in Figure 1, the Writer's Formal Workshop took place. Figure 1 shows Wagner, L., Nott, J.G. Agnew, A.T. proposed regular schedule for a Writers' Workshop. (2001). (2001).

Figure 1.

Typical time allotted	Activity	Teacher Responsibility	Student Responsibility
<b>5-15 Minutes</b>	Mini lesson	Direct instructions in whole group about strategies and skills.	Children participate in whole group instruction.
<b>5 Minutes</b>	Group rehearsal for writing	Brainstorming and topic discussion	Children suggest writing topics.
<b>10 Minutes</b>	Individual rehearsal for writing	Teacher models brainstorming her/his selected topic	Children draw a picture of selected topic.
<b>15-45 Minutes</b>	Individual writing and informal peer discussion	Teacher writes and then circulates as children write	Children begin new writings or continue with past work.
<b>5-15 Minutes</b>	Sharing of writing by one fifth of the students	Students are allowed to share.	Children share in a predetermined rotation.

### Research Questions

1. Do the Writer's Workshop and writing from a prompt have different effect on preschool children attitude towards writing?
2. Do the Writer's Workshop and writing from a prompt have different effect on preschool children?

### Hypotheses

1. Writing from a prompt will have a more positive effect on preschool children writing ability.
2. The Writer's Workshop will have a more positive effect on preschool children attitude towards writing.

### Description of the Sample

A general education, pre-school classroom is part of the participants There are 8 girls and 10 boys (n=18) in the school. The children choose a government

institution from the public pre-school. The children are usually economically low-income and have similar characteristics.

### **Data Collection**

Throughout the beginning and end of the implementation of the program data on attitudes towards participants' writing and writing skills were collected. During two months of February 9, 2018 to March 25, 2018, the analysis was performed. The children were referred to the 9 February 2018 Simple Writing attitude Survey. This was done to pilot the survey and to check validity , reliability and usability. Students obtained the survey 9. The pre-school teacher read them the survey questions as they answered them. They were asked not to examine each other's papers, and they provided generic cover sheets.

The Likert scale is the same as the one used by McKenna, M.C. And Kear, D.J. for collecting data on student attitudes towards writing (1990). Children were asked to respond to questions about their written attitude. The answers were graded from Wonderful (4) to Poor (1). Children were encouraged to associate their feelings with a specific aspect of writing.

Responses from Excellent (4 points) to Poor (1 point) were levelled. Children were asked to encircle their emotions on a certain aspect of writing. The children returned to the survey on March 25 , 2018 to find out if their attitudes have changed altogether.

Wonderful 4



Good 3



Okay 2



Bad 1



Using the Carroll County Persuasive Writing Rubric for Pre-schoolers a word of persuasive writing from each child was measured at the end of the analysis.

### **Data Analysis and Results**

There were 18 children in the preschool. Data on children's composition, Likert scale survey, similar to McKenna, MC. And Kear, DJ. The study was carried out at the beginning and at the end of 2018. In 2018, children were evaluated. The children were asked to answer questions about their writing approach.

Responses are graded from Excellent to Negative (at 4 points). Children were asked to circle their feelings regarding a writing topic.

### Attitudes

A pair t-test was carried out comparing the Group A attitudes pre- and post-test, which produced the written prompt. The value of a double-tailed P is 0.4230. By traditional definitions, the disparity is not considered statistically significant. The mean of the pre-study attitude of Group A, minus the post-study attitude of Group A, is 1.67. This gap has a 95 % confidence interval: 2.63 to 5.96. The value used in the calculations is 0.8223 of the intermediate values. Grade of liberty (df) = 16. The rating rating was 2.027.

Group A (prompted) was not important, but during this study there was a decrease in attitude (16.44>14.78). That might be because the children did not like writings. The attitude of the pupils will be determined at the start of the school year and by the end of the year to achieve more accurate results. Therefore, the research reveals how children usually feel about learning. Persuasive writing is usually the hardest job for school children to learn. The ego of the child is still very self-centered at this point. Kids of this era find it challenging to consider another person's point of view as a key aspect in persuasive writing. It could be stressful for an infant that could influence the attitude of the preschool children.

**Table 1: Group A Writing Attitude**

<u>Group A</u>	<u>Attitude Pre-Study</u>	<u>Attitude Post Study</u>
<b>Mean</b>	16.44	14.78
<b>SD</b>	4.33	4.27
<b>SEM</b>	1.44	1.42
<b>N</b>	9	9

A pair of t- tests were carried out in order to compare the attitudes of Group B, a group with free choice of subject, before and after research. The value of the two-tailed P is 0.7499. By traditional criteria, this difference is not considered statistically significant. The average value for the pre-study at Group B minus the post-study attitude at Group B is 0.67. This difference is about 95 percent confidence interval: 3.99 to 5.33. The t value is = 0.3299 of the intermediate

values used in calculations. Grade of freedom (df) = 8. The default marginal error was 2.021.

A very small decrease was shown by Group B's pre-and post-study approach (free choice). The children can't respond well to a compelling style of writing as with Group A (prompted). Group B was able to choose who they wanted to convince and demand for what they wanted relative to Group A. It may explain why they were able to personalize their subjects, while their attitudes deteriorated due to the difficulty of assignment.

**Table 2: Group B Writing Attitude**

<u>Group B</u>	Attitude Pre-Study		Attitude Post Study	
<b>Mean</b>		17.89		17.22
<b>SD</b>		3.41		3.60
<b>SEM</b>		1.14		1.20
<b><u>N</u></b>			9	
				9

There was an unpaired t-test comparing the pre-school attitude of the group A, the group to which this was prompted, and Group B, which were the children who had the freedom of choice. The value of the two-tailed P is 0.4433. By conventional criteria, this disparity is not considered statistically significant. The mean of the pre-study attitude of Group A minus the pre-study attitude of Group B is -1.44. This difference's 95 percent confidence interval: -5.34 to 2.45. T value = 0.7861 of the intermediate values of the estimates. Grade of liberty (df) = 16. The maximum difference error = 1.838.

While not substantial, the Attitude Test pre-study showed that the sample started with a more positive written attitude ( $16.44 < 17.89$ ). Group B could have been more successful in writing and therefore more confident and interesting to write before the study began. In reality, the results of the post-study attitude survey will have an influence.

**Table 3: Comparison of Pre-Study Writing Attitude**

<u>Group</u>	<u>Group A's Attitude</u>	<u>Group B's Attitude</u>
<b>Mean</b>	16.44	
<b>SD</b>	4.33	3.41
<b>SEM</b>	1.44	1.14
<b>N</b>	9	9

An unpaired t-test compared Group A, the prompt group, and Group B, which allowed children to choose free subjects was conducted. The post-study attitude was compared by The P value of two tails is 0.2073. By conventional criteria, this disparity is not considered statistically significant. The significance of post-study group A minus post-study group B is 2.44. 95 percent confidence interval: 6.39 to 1.50 from -6.39. The t value is 1,3142 for the intermediate values used in the equations. This is the degree of freedom (df) = 16. The standard error was 1,860.

The study has shown that overall writing behavior during the study has decreased in both Group A (prompted) and Group B (free choice) (14,78 < 17,22). However, Group A (prompted), rather than group B (free choice), experienced a decline. There can be some suggestion that children might choose their subject a little more interesting than what they were told to write. Hypothesis that so many things would have to be done in a free-choice writing classroom.

The positive impact on pre-school children's written attitude was supported, but only if the general decrease in group A and group B was opposed to prompt written.

**Table 4: Comparison of Post Study Writing Attitude**

<u>Group</u>	Group A Attitude Post Study	Group B Attitude Post Study
<b>Mean</b>	14.78	17.22
<b>SD</b>	4.27	3.60
<b>SEM</b>	1.42	1.20
<b>N</b>	9	9

Group B (free choice) had a more positive attitude to writing before the study, according to the results. All classes were less favourable to learning during the study. Group A has provided written prompt, while the topic of Group B is free to choose. The findings indicate a less favourable attitude towards writing to children than group A. Once they are allowed to choose their subject, they have a more favourable attitude towards writing. Nevertheless, the attitudes of both groups have reduced.

Group A 's average attitude from 16.44 before experiments was changed to 14.78 after the analysis. Around 17.89 before the study to 17.22 after the experiments, class B, a free choice category, went. While Group B has had the freedom to choose a subject, they have yet to write a persuasive text. The deterioration in the student's overall conduct may be the pupil's attitude toward the writing of a persuasive report. However, it is important to note that children who had free choice had a lower drop than students who had to write. This means that children want to select their own subjects instead of having to write what is told.

### **Overall Writing Results**

Samples have been obtained at the end of the test. Using the Persuasive Writing Rubric of the County for pre-school students, the final written samples were assessed. Every child was (prompted) to "convince your parents if you want to go to bed."

The t-test was carried out unpaired, in which the written sample of Group A, the prompt group and Group B was compared, and the participants had free choice of the subject. The P value of two dimensions is 0.3578. By traditional criteria, this difference is not considered statistically significant. Score for Group A and score for Group B is equivalent to 1.78. 95 percent gap confidence interval: between -2.20 and 5.76. The t value in the estimation is 0.9469 among the intermediate values. Freedom (df) = 16. Degree. The default error was 1,877.

Group A (presumed) was more competitive in the mean ranking than group B (free choice), based on the persuasive writing rubric of Carroll County Schools. Although not significant, the hypotheses that the ability of pre-schoolers to write should be strengthened in early writing. The study indicates that children from pre-school schools need to be encouraged to perform well on assessments of a specified type of writing. Group A (prompted) sought quality advice which was more based on persuasive paper. Children, for instance, were told to persuade the principal to send them to learn. Another reason was to ask the teacher to let them in the classroom to chew their gum. For through point of view, there are essential explanations. The work has come quicker. Nonetheless, children who wanted their own topics had to waste a lot of time trying to argue. For instance, one girl tried to convince her mom to allow her to lunch. The pupil did not realize that she should not have to persuade her mother

to encourage her to eat lunch because there were no compelling reasons. Group A (prompted) was definitely willing to spend more time formulating a decision while group B (free choice) sought to resolve the issue.

<u>Group</u>	<u>Group A (Prompted) Overall Writing Score</u>	<u>Group B (Free choice) Overall Writing Score</u>
<b>Mean</b>	11.56	9.78
<b>SD</b>	4.03	3.93
<b>SEM</b>	1.34	1.31
<b>N</b>	9	9

### **Writing Subcategory –(Ideas)**

In accordance with each section of the student samples, the unpaired t-test was performed. The two-size P-value of the Ideas subcategory is 0.1736. By conventional criteria, this disparity is not considered statistically significant. The mean of the ideas of Group A, the group receiving the incentives during the study, and the ideas of Group B, the group with free choice, equal 1,33. This difference is 95 percent trust interval: from-0.65 to 3.32. In the equations for the intermediate t values  $t = 1.4241$ . Independence standard (df) = 16. The error was 0.936. The error was average.

The Ideas Group focuses on the critical role and sponsorship of the persuasive writing rubriques of the Carroll County. In this area, Group A has been better (prompted) than Group B. As previously stated, this may be because Group A had spent more time constructing an argument than attempting to arrive at a conclusion. Group A students have spent more time formulating ideas to support their position.

**Table 6: Comparison of Writing Scores in Ideas**

<u>Group</u>	<u>Group A (Prompted) Ideas</u>	<u>Group B (Free choice) Ideas</u>
<b>Mean</b>	4.89	3.56
<b>SD</b>	2.03	1.94
<b>SEM</b>	0.68	0.65
<b>N</b>	9	9

### **Writing Subcategory –Organization**

In relation to each part of the pupil writing samples, unpaired t-tests were carried out. The value of two-tailed P is equivalent to 0.3464 in the organization subcategory. By traditional standards, this difference is not recognized as

statistically significant. The mean of the group A, the group which received the inspirations during the analysis and the free-choice group B is 0.44. This difference is 95% trust interval: from -0.53 to 1.42. T value= 0.9701 of the intermediate values used in the calculation. Independence standard (df) = 16. The standard difference was 0.458.

Organization means that the sentences of the student are in a logical order and support a position. The difference between Groups A and B is very slight. The basic part of the rubric focuses on absolute and incomplete expressions. This ability is unrelated to this argument. The only explanation for Group B to score less than Group A may be one element, in support of a situation.

**Table 7: Comparison of Writing Scores in Organization**

<u>Group</u>	<u>Group A (prompted)</u>	<u>Group B (free choice)</u>
	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Organization</u>
<b>Mean</b>	2.56	2.11
<b>SD</b>	1.01	0.93
<b>SEM</b>	0.34	0.31
<b>N</b>	9	9

### **Writing Subcategory –(Style)**

Compared to each segment of the student's writing samples the unpaid T-test was conducted. In the design subcategory the two-tailed P value equals 0.5025. By conventional standards, this difference is not statistically significant. The mean of group A, the group receiving the instructions during the study and group B, the group of freedom of choice, are equal to 0.22. This difference is 95 percent confidence between 0.46% and 0.91%. The intermediate values for the t value = 0.6860, respectively. The freedom degree (df) = 16. The default error was equal to 0.324.

The paper's style means how well in States the point of view, the good use of transitions and the use of conclusions lead. One of two classes was in this particular subcategory the nearest (2.22 > 2.00), respectively. The reason they were so close was that this area focuses less on convincing words as a particular style of writing, and more on how a paragraph could be written. Group A children were taught at the start of this study how to make a paragraph exactly

the same as in Group B. Before that study began, children in Group A were taught to compose a text exactly as in Group B.

**Table 8: Comparison of Writing Scores in Style**

<u>Group</u>	<u>Group A (Style)</u>	<u>Group B (Style)</u>
<b>Mean</b>	2.22	2.00
<b>SD</b>	0.83	0.50
<b>SEM</b>	0.28	0.17
<b>N</b>	9	9

### **Writing Subcategory –(Conventions)**

In accordance with each segment of the students' writing samples, the unpaired t-test was carried out. The two-tailed P value is equal to 0.5086 in the subcategory of agreements. By traditional criteria, this difference is not considered statistically significant. The mean of the Group A conventions, the group invited during the review and the Group B conventions, the free choice group, are equal to 2.22. This difference is 95 % confidence interval: from 0.92 to 3.52.  $T = 0.6761$  for the mean values used for the equations. Grade of liberty (df) = 16. The default divergence was 0.329.

The only subcategory that has been greater than Group A in Group B (free choice). The Conventions were (Prompted). (Ideas:  $4.89 > 3.56$ ; company  $2.56 > 2.11$ , concept  $2.22 > 2.00$ ). The conference focuses on orthography and punctuation in pupils' writing. The mini-lessons and conferences did not focus primarily.

Such criteria were dealt with as required. Group B's reputation in convention areas indicates that before the study started they were more active authors. This could also be the reason for their more positive attitudes. We were better writers, and we enjoyed the process more.

**Table 9: Comparison of Writing Scores in Conventions**

<u>Group</u>	<u>Group A (prompted) Conventions</u>	<u>Group B (free choice) Conventions</u>
<b>Mean</b>	1.89	2.11
<b>SD</b>	0.60	0.78

<b>SEM</b>	0.20	0.26
<b>N</b>	9	9

## Discussion

The first assumption was that writing could make pre-school children more prepared, though by a slight margin, to write as quickly as possible. The p value was 0.3578, so these findings could occur incidentally. While not significant, assumptions have been verified that earlier writing would have a more beneficial impact on the ability of pre-school children to write. The study shows that preschool children must be encouraged to evaluate a specific type of writing (i.e. persuasive writing) correctly. Group A (prompted) was given qualitative guidance which would be more persuasive. Pre-schoolers who chose their own topics had to waste a lot of time trying to argue. Group A (prompted), while group B (free choice) was busy with deciding a questionable subject, has spent more time formulating its position. Such findings cannot be generalized to other writing situations because of the small number of students, the duration of study and the restricted form of writing.

The second theory was that the Writer's Workshop would impact children's attitude towards writing more positively. The free choice group decreased significantly less than the incited group (Group A 16.44>14.78 compared with Group B 17.89>17.22), although the attitudes of both groups were declined after the research. Group B (free choice) had a more optimistic approach to writing before the study, according to the results. All groups had a less written mindset during the study. The study shows that students have a more favourable attitude towards writing when it is permitted to determine their own subject. The study shows that they can choose to write more easily. Group B (free choice) had a more optimistic approach to writing before the study, according to the results. All groups had a less written attitude during the study. The study shows that students have a more favourable attitude towards writing when it is permitted to determine their own subject. The study shows that they can choose to write more easily. The worsening of students ' overall attitude probably reflects the students ' attitude to the writing of a convincing article. However, I must remember that the subjects that were given free choice were less likely than those requested to do so. It is important to remember. It means, instead of having to write what they are told, students like to pick their own themes. In the field of conventions, Group B, the Free Choice Group, was therefore more successful. This particular field, concentrating on ideology, subject / verb agreement and punctuation, has little to do with students being encouraged or

not to become involved. This area indicates that Group B, the free option party, was most likely to be more active before the study began in the field of conventions. Group B's success in the convention area indicates that before the study began, they had become more successful authors. This might have also been the reason why they have been more positive. We have always been better writers, and we enjoy the process more than anyone.

## **Conclusion**

The results of the written assessment were significantly higher than the students who received a prompt. It is difficult to see whether students in Group A have achieved more because they have been educated on prompts or because Group B did not love the frequencies they checked (Hudson, Lane and Mercer, 2005) because of a slow progress. It is clear, however, that children have a better attitude to writing when they have the freedom to write what they want.

In order for them to be successful, it is important to be positive about writing. Children always believe we're ready for the assessment but don't know we need to prepare them for life. This study shows that writing openly and writing quickly have a place in the classroom. Students need prompt and explicit guidance in order to teach a certain style of writing (e.g. persuasive, narrative and informative). But to promote a lifelong love for writing, teachers in the classroom have to spend time writing about what they want to write and share with other people.

It was difficult to draw conclusions given the small number of children involved in the research. The research was also carried out in a relatively short period of time. If more data were collected throughout the school year, the results could have produced more successful results. The study is also underpinning because the preschool teacher carrying out the research was also a teacher in the classroom. It says that the study is vulnerable to bias. The young age participants often face a challenge. Their lack of knowledge about confidentiality makes it difficult to accurately read the mindset. The children are likely to classify what the researcher starts to feel the study needs to know. It is evident from the few surveys all labelled "brilliant." The survey itself, though, was carried out by a school teacher who also was a researcher. Although the survey was piloted, it was not fully tested before it was used in this study.

## **References:**

- Asaro, K., & Saddler, B. (2009). Effects of Planning Instruction on a Young Writer with Asperger Syndrome. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 44(5), 268-275. Retrieved October 13, 2009, from Research Library. (Document ID: 1683529571).
- Carroll County Persuasive Writing Rubric Grade 1. (2009). Retrieved November 9, 2009, from [www.carrollcountyschools.com: http://www.carrollcountyschools.com/Portals/0/docs/CC%201st%20Grade%20Persua](http://www.carrollcountyschools.com/Portals/0/docs/CC%201st%20Grade%20Persua)

- sive %20Writing%20Rubric.pdf
- Eitelgeorge, J.S., & Barrett, R. (2004). Multiple Continua of Writing Development in a First Grade Classroom. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 43(2), 17-64. Retrieved September 19, 2009, from Research Library. (Document ID: 771893021).
- Hudson, R. F., Lane, H. B., & Mercer, C. D. (2005). Writing prompts: The role of various priming conditions on the compositional fluency of developing writers. *Reading and Writing*, 18(6), 473-495. Retrieved from PDF: <http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com/hww/jumpstart.jhtml?recid=0bc05f7a67b1790ebc54cbffa611b2554dcf87ccd74e7d4f4deda691ffc5710c8fb6fcb4b2edb4db&fmt=P>
- Jasmine, J., & Weiner, W. (2007). The effects of writing workshop on abilities of first grade students to become confident and independent writers. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 35(2), 131-139. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ775798&site=ehost-live>; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10643-007-0186-3>
- Lin, S. C., Monroe, B. W., & Troia, G. A. (2007). Development of writing knowledge in grades 2-8: A comparison of typically developing writers and their struggling peers. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 23(3), 207-230. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ763802&site=ehost-live>; <http://www.informaworld.com/openurl?genre=article&id=doi:10.1080/10573560701277542>
- Martin, L. E., Segraves, R., Thacker, S., & Young, L. (2005). The writing process: Three first grade teachers and their students reflect on what was learned. *Reading Psychology an International Quarterly*, 26(3), 235-249. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ692262&site=ehost-live>; <http://taylorandfrancis.metapress.com/link.asp?target=contribution&id=U02084J66073N173>
- McKenna, M.C. & Kear, D.J. (1990). Measuring attitude toward reading: A new tool for teachers. *The Reading Teacher*, 43 (9), 626-639.
- McMaster, K., Xiaoqing Du, & Petursdottir, A. (2009). Technical Features of Curriculum-Based Measures for Beginning Writers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 42(1), 41-60. Retrieved October 13, 2009, from Research Library. (Document ID: 1670971901).
- Nolen, S. B. (2007). Young children's motivation to read and write: Development in social contexts. *Cognition and Instruction*, 25, 219-270. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ772157&site=ehost-live>; <http://www.leaonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07370000701301174>
- Rasinski, T., & Padak, N. (2009). Write Soon! *Reading Teacher*, 62(7), 618-620. <http://search.ebscohost.com>.
- Rowe, D. W., Fitch, J. M., & Bass, A. S. (2001). Power, identity, and instructional stance in writers' workshop. *Language Arts*, 78(5), 426. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=tfh&AN=4433952&site=ehost-live>
- Short, R. (2008). Through Their Eyes: Children's Perspectives on Writing. *Journal of Reading Education*, 33(3), 15-20. Retrieved September 19, 2009, from Education Full Text Database.
- Wagner, L., Nott J.G., & Agnew, A. T. (2001). Teaching ideas: The nuts and bolts of teaching first-grade writing through a journal workshop. *The Reading Teacher*, 55(2), 120-125. Retrieved September 19, 2009, from Research Library. (Document ID: 84069562)