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Abstract

This study investigated the impact of creative drama as a prewriting strategy, on both, the content and the process, of short story writing. Two grade 6/7 classes were involved in the study for a period of ten weeks, one receiving drama and the other one a lesson/discussion prewriting instruction. With regard to the scores the drama students received on their compositions in the nine categories measured (ideas, detail, audience awareness, sentence structure, language style, plot, setting, character, and narration/dialogue), they were slightly higher than those of the alternate group in the first of the two stories and highly significantly higher in the third story. The progressive increase in scores suggests that using creative drama as a prewriting activity is even more effective when used over a longer time span. The results also showed that students exposed to drama wrote longer stories, used more dialogue, and wrote more frequently in the first person. Other qualitative differences in the content of the stories between the two groups included students’ approach to plot development, characterization, and setting description. The study also demonstrated that the students who received drama were generally positive about the prewriting activities, they enjoyed the writing process, and most frequently referred to their experience as being “fun”.
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CREATIVE DRAMA IN THE WRITING PROCESS:  
THE IMPACT ON ELEMENTARY STUDENTS’ SHORT STORIES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

It all begins in play: Life, love, learning. Teaching, too, has its roots in play. One of the earliest records we have in instruction are the Socratic Dialogues – conversations that happen in play and imagining. In my world everything revolves around play, from driving my car through a mud puddle to teaching geometry to my students. Three students hold one piece of string. The one in the center becomes the vertex, the two holding the ends are the rays. They chant alternately: “I am the vertex.” “I am the ray”. “And together we are acute!” Through dramatic play the students reify an abstract idea.

In the past six years I have been enticed by drama in my life outside of school. Gradually, this interest has taken a position on the stage in my lesson planning. Increasingly I have taken opportunities to incorporate drama in all facets of classroom life. I found this practice to be beneficial in terms of creating a positive atmosphere in the class, and at a gut level, I felt that it helped students learn. When the staff in my school debated adopting a platoon model in which students from several classes are rotated through to different teachers for selected subjects, I readily endorsed the plan, volunteering to teach drama. The more experience I gained in using drama in the classroom, the more I felt sure that using drama as a medium for learning is a viable choice. It is this belief that led me to examine the application of drama to writer’s
workshop (specifically in prewriting) for my thesis topic. As a teacher working with grade six and seven students for the past six years, I've been searching for ways to assist my students to become more effective and engaged writers. I became curious to see what impact integrating drama in teaching short story writing would have on their compositions and writing experiences.

Writing is a complicated task. Many students experience difficulty and frustration when writing (Schultz & Fecho, 2000). Educators have recognized this fact and have looked for ways to assist students in this area for many years. To start with, it was important to acknowledge that students need to have a good grasp of the nature of writing. With this notion the focus was placed, by theorists and educators alike, on the process of writing rather than the product. This notion was born from research into writing composition which yielded the following conclusion: writing is a non-linear, recursive process composed of prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing experiences (Chiste & O'Shea, 1990). The conceptual shift in pedagogy to focusing on the process rather than the product when teaching writing took place concurrently with or, perhaps, as a result of, the rise of constructivist theory of learning in the 1970's which emphasized construction, rather than transmission of knowledge (Law & Murphy, 1997). Constructivism can be delineated into several strands, one of which is social constructivism. This perspective posits that learning occurs within a social context; that is, meaning is constructed through social interaction (Woolfolk, Winne, & Perry, 2000).

The new theory of learning permeated most areas in education, one of which was drama. As with writing, in the early 1970's it became popular to view drama as a process rather than a product (Shugert, 1992). Instead of primarily focusing on the presentation of
a scripted play, the preference was to emphasize the process of drama. One of the outcomes was the popularity of creative drama which came to be defined by the Children's Theatre Association of America as "an improvisational, non-exhibitionl, process centered form of drama in which participants are guided by a leader to imagine, enact, and reflect upon the human experience" (Conrad & Asher, 2000).

Creative drama and narrative writing, in spite of their clear difference in mode of expression, have many common features. They are both social, have an audience, and use imagination. Both are means of expressing points of view. Capitalizing on these commonalities by drawing the two together presents, I think, an attractive possibility. One way to unite them is to incorporate drama into the prewriting stage of the writing process. Drama activities engage students collaboratively and help them to access their own language and knowledge, and therefore may act as valuable precursors to writing. Through drama, I believe students can construct scenarios in a meaningful, participatory manner that provides them with material about which to write.

In the following chapters, I will discuss the theoretical framework within which drama and writing are placed. I will follow this with a description of recent theoretical changes in how learning is conceptualized, and explain how writing and drama have been influenced by these developments. The writing process will be outlined, and the use of creative drama as a prewriting strategy will be illustrated. I support this notion with a description of the different components of drama, and ways in which these can enhance the writing experience. A review of empirical studies in drama and their effect on learning will follow. In the review, I explain that there is a paucity of studies in this field and suggest that further investigation would not only assist our understanding in this area,
but also provide support for the argument that the use of drama is a viable instructional method when teaching writing to upper intermediate students.

My study, situated in an elementary school, examines the effect of drama as a prewriting strategy on the short story writing of grade six and seven students. The study involves two classes in which one class participates in drama activities during prewriting and one does not. In my discussion, I compare the content of the students' compositions in the two classes in terms of level of performance based on the results of BC Performance Standards, an assessment guide developed by the Ministry of Education, as well as in terms of the qualitative differences found in the compositions of the two groups. I also compare the two classes in terms of the students' attitudes about their drama and non-drama prewriting/writing experiences. The latter discussions are based on comments gathered from students' reflective journals, and on observations I made during the course of the study. In my concluding comments, I discuss the implications of this study for education. I suggest that the use of drama in prewriting motivates students to write and that it is effective in assisting students to develop their understandings of short story writing.
I begin the literature review for this study by introducing the theoretical framework, social constructivism, within which it is placed. In the next two sections, I will discuss first writing, then drama. In the writing section, I start with a brief overview of the changing approach to writing instruction as influenced by the rise of social constructivism. Next, I describe the writing process and discuss the significance of the prewriting stage in this process. In the drama section, I also begin with a brief historical overview. I then follow with a discussion of the value of creative drama in the prewriting stage of the writing process. Finally, I review empirical studies in creative drama and their effect on learning. In the concluding sections of this chapter, I discuss the rationale for this study.

Theoretical Framework

Both the writing process and creative drama can be placed in the framework of social constructivism, a strain of the broader constructivist theory. Constructivist theory is regarded by many as a metatheory in that it encompasses a number of cognitive theories of learning (Woolfolk, et al., 2000). Social constructivists stress the notion that knowledge is created, maintained, and altered through an individual’s interactions with others which take place within a specific socio-cultural context. This perspective focuses
on learning as sense-making, rather than on the acquisition of knowledge that exists somewhere outside the learner (Oldfather & Dahl, 1999).

**Constructivism**

The fundamental notion of constructivism is that learners actively construct their own knowledge and meaning from their experiences (Kearsley, 1996). They build understanding, make sense of information, and construct new ideas or concepts based upon their current and past knowledge. In an educational setting, this means that students are viewed as being active participants in constructing the meaning of the material presented within the classroom. This view of learning differs from the traditional stand where students are seen as "vessels" into which information is poured by their teachers.

John Dewey (1938), a philosopher and theorist who participated in the education scene for most of his years until his death at age ninety-three in 1952, speaks to this distinction in *Experience and Education*. He describes the premise of the traditional approach as follows:

The subject matter of education consists of bodies of information and of skills that have been worked out in the past; therefore the chief business of education is to transmit them to the new generation....

The traditional scheme is, in essence, one of impositions from above and from outside.... Learning here means acquisition of what already
is incorporated in books and in the heads of the elders....Moreover that which is taught is thought of as essentially static. It is taught as a finished product with little regard either to the ways in which it was originally built up or to changes that will surely occur in the future.

(pp.18-19)

In contrast to the traditional model where information is dispensed by the teacher, Dewey believed that students learn best by doing, and that they build understanding from their experiences. Instead of imposing knowledge on learners, the learners must be put into learning environments that permit them to generate their own understandings (Julyan & Duckworth, 1996). Although Dewey (1938) did not specifically speak of learners actively constructing meaning, this idea is implied in his view that there is an “intimate and necessary relation between processes of personal experience and education” (p.34), and in his idea that “there is no intellectual growth without some reconstruction, some remaking....through reflection” (p.36). Dewey was, however, explicit in describing the mind as a verb, as something to do rather than something to be filled like a sponge. In his central idea of intellectual integration, the mind is continuously seeking, using, organizing, and digesting information. In a continuous spiral, what is learned in one situation is applied to another (Greene, 1996).

Jean Piaget, a Swiss psychologist and Dewey’s contemporary, expanded on Dewey’s argument against traditional education by pointing out the inherent weakness in assuming that the teacher and the student (listener) have mutual communication frameworks (Marlowe & Page, 1998). He argued that this was not realistic; the student
hears what he/she perceives and that might not be the same thing as what the teacher is saying. What teachers taught, therefore, was not always what the students learned.

This argument is grounded in Piaget’s broad ideas on learning which he explains in terms of organization and adaptation. Using the term *schemata* which refers to knowledge structures/constructs and ways of perceiving and understanding the world, Piaget posited that learners organize and construct their own knowledge schemata in relation to previous and current experiences. These schemata, which represent our understandings, can be specific, such as eating using chopsticks, or more general, such as eating. Learners adapt to their environment by constructing, organizing, deconstructing, or reorganizing their schemata through two processes: assimilation and accommodation. When a learner assimilates information he/she is able to fit that new information into the already existing conceptual framework. When a learner accommodates to information however, he/she is required to modify the existing conceptual framework to account for new knowledge that does not fit. The processes of assimilation and accommodation result in cognitive growth. Learning requires assimilation and accommodation. This premise is foundational in the theory of cognitive construction of knowledge; that is, that learners actively construct understandings of their environment. Constructivist theorists also state that this can occur more readily through meaningful situations (Petraglia, 1998; Woofolk et al, 2000; Pressley & McCormick, 1995). In short, Piaget emphasized that children actively construct meaning through experience, and through this process they also develop their cognitive structures.
Social Constructivism

The social context for learning was important to Dewey and Piaget. Dewey (1938) believed that “all human experience is ultimately social: that it involves contact and communication.” In his view “education is based upon experience and educative experience is a social process” (p. 59). Piaget also acknowledged that meaning may be constructed through interaction with others, although his theory emphasized individual cognitive development, through meaning construction (Petraglia, 1998). It is Vygotsky, however, who is most associated with the social component of the social constructivist theory with his ideas on thought, language and learning (Wells, 2000).

Although Lev Vygotsky (1896-1917), a Russian psychologist, wrote profusely in his short life in the early part of the century, he did not become known to the Western world until the English translation of his books Thought and Language and Mind and Society in the late 1970s. Vygotsky posited that higher mental functions develop through participation in social activities and thus the social context of learning is essential. The development of knowledge, ideas, attitudes, and values comes about through interaction with others (Woolfolk et al., 2000).

In his book Thought and Language, which was first published in Russia in 1934, Vygotsky (1986) develops the argument for the necessity of social interaction by first outlining the interdependent relationship between language, in the forms of speech and thought:

The meaning of a word represents such a close amalgam of thought and language that it is hard to tell whether it is a phenomenon of speech or a phenomenon of thought. A word without meaning is an empty sound;
meaning, therefore, is a criterion of “word”, its indispensable component. …

Word meaning is a phenomenon of thought only insofar as thought is embodied in speech, and of speech only insofar as speech is connected with thought and illuminated by it. It is a phenomenon of verbal thought, or meaningful speech – a union of word and thought. (p. 212)

Vygotsky (1986) then states that from about the age of two the child uses talk to others, or to himself (egocentric speech, commonly seen in young children when they are involved in sole activities), as a way of tackling problems and facilitating activities. It is this talking out loud that allows the distinctively human ability to “comprehend a situation, find a solution, or to plan a nascent activity” (p. 30). In Mind and Society (1978) he states two important points:

1) A child’s speech is as important as the role of action in attaining the goal. Children not only speak out about what they are doing; their speech and action are part of one and the same complex psychological function, directed toward the solution of the problem at hand. 2) The more complex the action demanded by the situation and the less direct its solution, the greater the importance played by speech in the operation as a whole. (p. 25)

Eventually, according to Vygotsky (1986), this talking out loud “goes underground” and turns to inner speech, the purpose remaining intact:

The function of egocentric speech is similar to that of inner speech: It does not merely accompany the child’s activity; it serves mental orientation, conscious understanding; it helps in overcoming difficulties;
it is speech for oneself, intimately and usefully connected with the
child's thinking...In the end, it becomes inner speech. (p. 228)

This inter-weaving of language and thought, according to Vygotsky (1986) is a
social process. "The earliest speech of the child is essentially social; a communication
with the aim of contact with the parent." (p. 35). Through this social act, the child learns
to use language for different functions. Bullock (1983) summarizes these functions, as
being: reference (there's a bird), communication (I'm tired), semantics (identifying
category like 'dog') and planning (maybe I can get it with a stick). Eventually, these
functions become incorporated into inner speech. As the child gains more experience in
social interaction, these functions, and mental processes, also increase. In an often quoted
passage, Vygotsky (1978) explains this concept by stating that:

An interpersonal process is transformed into an intrapersonal one. Every
function in the child’s cultural development appears twice; first, on the
social level, and later, on the individual level; first, between people
(interpsychological), and then inside the child (intrapsychological).
This applies equally to voluntary attention, to logical memory, and to
the formation of concepts. All the higher functions originate as actual
relations between human individuals. (p. 57)

Vygotsky's view of the transfer of the interpsychological to the intrapsychological
can be further clarified. McCarthy (1994) states that Harre identifies four phases of the
internalization process that proceed cyclically from the social to the individual and back
to the social: a) appropriation, in which the individual participates in social practices,
b) transformation, in which the individual takes control over the social appropriation,
c) publication, in which the transformation again becomes public, and d) conventionalization, in which the transformation is reintegrated back into the social process.

To maximize this development of learning, Vygotsky (1986) argued that instruction should be directed slightly above the child’s present mental abilities in an area he termed as “zone of proximal development” which he describes as being “between a child’s actual mental age and the level he reaches in solving problems with assistance” (p.147). One essential factor in this instructional model is that it necessitates the presence of a more knowledgeable member, such as parent, teacher, or peer who will provide assistance in the learning process. In the classroom, this assistance in learning, often termed “scaffolding,” may take the form of providing information, prompts, reminders, or encouragement at the right time and in the right amounts, and then gradually allowing the student to do more and more on his own (Woolfolk et al., 2000). The premise of this concept, Vygotsky (1986) explains, is that “what the child can do in cooperation today he can do alone tomorrow” (p.188). The notion that guides scaffolding is that “the only good form of instruction is that which marches ahead of development and leads it” (p.188).

The other factor that this process requires is dialoguing. The dialogue itself becomes the means through which the external, social plane is internalized to guide the child’s own thinking, that is, the child’s inner speech (McCarthy, 1994).

Bakhtin’s (1986) theory of dialogue echoes Vygotsky’s notion of inner speech in that he views social activity as creating, rather than just representing reality. Bahktin emphasizes the need for dialogue and communication and the inevitable beliefs that are constructed and reconstructed in the process (Randic, 1991). Bahktin (1986) states:
The unique speech experience of each individual is shaped and developed
in continuous and constant interaction with others’ individual utterances....

These words of others carry with them their own expression, their own
evaluative tone, which we assimilate, rework, and reaccentuate. (p.89)

Barnes (1995) summarizes this notion by saying that “our ability to talk and think
is not simply our own invention but has arisen from taking part in all the shared projects,
collaborations, dialogues and disputes that have constituted our lives” (p. 6) and that we
build our ability to talk and think by participating in dialogue with others.

Vygotsky viewed written language as one of many forms of language. He saw
writing as a symbolic representation for the purpose of communication and construction
of meaning (Jilbert, 1992). As in the case of oral speech, Vygotsky (1986) believed that
“writing enhances the intellectuality of the child” (p.183). Unlike, oral speech, however,
Vygotsky saw written speech “as a separate function differing from oral speech in both
structure and mode of functioning” (p. 181). Vygotsky (1986) asked, “why does writing
come so hard to the schoolchild that at certain periods there is a lag of as much as six or
eight years between his ‘linguistic age’ in speaking and in writing?” (p. 180).

Vygotsky (1986) theorized that the answer is due to a number of factors. First,
writing requires a double abstraction: abstraction from the sound of speech: “[writing] is
speech in thought and image only, lacking the musical, expressive, intonational qualities
of oral speech” (p.181); and abstraction from the interlocutor: “[writing] is addressed to
an absent or an imaginary person or to no one in particular...written speech is
monologous, it is a conversation with a blank sheet of paper” (p. 181). Second, unlike
oral speech where every sentence is prompted by a motive of the interlocutor, “the child
has little motivation to learn writing when we begin to teach it...[it is] further removed from immediate needs” (p. 181). Third, as compared to speaking where the child is barely aware of the sounds he produces or the mental operations he performs, “writing requires deliberate analytical action....he must take cognizance of the sound structure of each word, dissect it, and reproduce it in alphabetical symbols” (p.182). Moreover, the syntax of inner speech (condensed, abbreviated) is the exact opposite of written speech, with oral speech standing in the middle. “Written speech must explain the situation fully in order to be intelligible” (p.182).

When describing the development of written language, Vygotsky frames his explanation in terms of a series of signs – gestures, scribbles/drawings, and finally the written word. Jilbert (1992) summarizes Vygotsky’s concept of written language development as progressing through four stages. In the two initial stages, gesture is primary. In the first, a transition occurs from broad gestures with the hands and body to indicatory gestures with the pencil on paper appearing as drawings and scribbles. In the second level of development, gestures are used to communicate the meaning of objects during play. “It is on the basis of these indicatory gestures that playthings themselves gradually acquire their meanings – just as drawing, while initially supported by gesture, becomes an independent sign” Vygotsky (1978) expands by saying, “Children’s symbolic play can be understood as a very complex system of ‘speech’ through gestures that communicate and indicate the meaning of playthings.” The third and fourth stages involve the child first writing the spoken symbols of words (second order symbolism) then finally the spoken word is eliminated as the direct link and written language becomes first order symbolism for thoughts.
Neelands, Booth, & Ziegler (1993) and Wagner (1999) use Vygotsky’s concept of gestures and play as early writing symbols in the first two stages which lead to actual writing in the second two stages to present an interesting argument. Because gesture and play are active symbolic processes important in the development of writing in the early years of a child’s life, they may continue, in the form of drama, to enhance the development of writing as students progress into adolescence. Yawkey (1983) defines play as “the cognitive capacities of youngsters to use “as if” thought structures to transform themselves into other people, objects, or situations as observed in their motor and/or verbal actions.” Play, he continues, is “developed in social interactional settings” (p. 2). Defined in this social constructivist manner, it is clear that play shares essential concepts with drama.

A field of drama that also fits well within the social constructivist framework is psychodrama. Psychodrama has its origins in Theatre of Spontaneity which was started in Vienna in 1921 by J. L. Moreno, the father of psychodrama (Kellerman, 1991). The group of actors, directed by Moreno, used no scripts but rather improvised current events or scenes that were suggested by the audience. Following the scenes, the audience and actors discussed their feelings and reactions, as well as ways in which roles could be played differently (Holmes, 1991).

Two interconnected concepts, spontaneity and creativity, are at the center of the theory of psychodrama, as well as being central to play. Moreno believed that creativity often emerges best not from careful, reasoned planning, but as surges of inspired actions, catalyzed by imagination, play, and above all, spontaneity. When allowing themselves to be spontaneous, people are more creative. Moreno observed that children are more able
to enter role play or fantasy situations and express their feelings freely; however, this willingness to be spontaneous subsides with age. It is necessary, therefore, to present people with situations for spontaneity to occur and/or to provide “spontaneity training” (Corey, 2000). Moreno also pointed out the value of drama in serving to provide a concrete expression for one’s imagination. Through drama, people can see, feel, and interact with that which may seem distant, abstract, or fantastic (Karp & Holmes, 1991). Finally, Moreno believed that the “as if” concept in psychodrama allowed people to experiment with different situations and understand different perspectives. As Yablonsky (1992) explains, participating in the dramatic process tends to “facilitate the expansion of a person’s role repertoire so everyone can learn more precisely in action what it is like to be another person in another role” (p. 25). Allen (1978) cites the following poem by Moreno that expresses this concept:

A meeting of two: eye to eye, face to face.
And when you are near I will tear your eyes out
And place them instead of mine,
And you will tear my eyes out
And place them instead of yours.
And I will look at you with your eyes
And you will look at me with mine. (p. 11)

Although Dewey, Piaget, Vygotsky and Moreno came from different theoretical and philosophical perspectives, a common theme in all of these theories is the power of play to enhance cognition such as creativity and intellectual development. At the grade six/seven level, students are less apt to play than in their younger years, so drama
becomes a legitimate and socially acceptable medium for play. Vygotsky saw play as critical to mental development and the development of higher level thinking skills (Petraglia, 1998). Effective writing requires these skills. Dewey viewed play as a central path of intellectual growth: the arena through which a child builds meaning through representation and organizes it into coherent sequences or narratives (Franklin, 1999). Piaget stated that the development of play, like thinking, evolves from birth and continues across the life span (Yawkey, 1983). Through play, children can “mentally digest” and better understand personal experiences and, therefore, make use of such developments to progress (Gitlin-Weiner, 1998). In play, Vygotsky (1978) states, a child “always behaves beyond his average age, above his behaviour.”

In summary, according to social constructivism, the learner constructs knowledge in a social context. The use of creative drama during writing instruction applies an approach to learning drawn from the theory of social constructivism because, characteristically, improvised activities demand dialogue. Participants of creative drama interact with one another, drawing on past/present experiences to build scenes where new understandings are mutually constructed, verbalized, and concretized in action. Scaffolding is an inherent part of this process as one individual prompts, guides, or suggests trains of thoughts to others that might not have come about without this mutual construction of meaning. The “as if” scenarios allow the participants to vocalize and experience the material, which might then assist in subsequent written composition processes. Improvised activities might help to remove the abstractness of writing. Also, improvisational drama might help ground the writing process by providing both a
purpose for writing, and some immediate language and images that can be transcribed to paper.

Writing

First I will discuss writing as it relates to social constructivism. Then I will describe the writing process. Finally, prewriting, one of the stages in the writing process, will be discussed in detail as it is most pertinent to this study.

Social Constructivism in Writing

The philosophical shift in views on learning from a traditional to constructivist slant is mirrored in the way educators have approached writing instruction (Applebee, 1993). Traditional approaches to writing instruction have treated writing as a body of knowledge about the structure of texts. Accordingly, traditional instruction focuses on the text at several different levels, including mechanics such as punctuation, spelling, rules of grammar, and paragraph structure. These lessons are accompanied by exercises designed to assist development of composition that follows these preparatory lessons. Given the definition of writing as a body of knowledge, traditional writing instruction focuses on the acquisition of that knowledge, via memorization of rules, analysis of models exemplifying those rules, memorization of valued texts, and drill and practice in the application of these rules (Applebee, 1993).

During the 1970's, with the advancement of social constructivist theories, there was a parallel paradigm shift from focusing on writing as a study of texts to an examination of the writing process employed by individuals as they composed (Law & Murphy, 1997). Schultz and Fecho (2000) state that this change occurred with the
groundbreaking work of Emig in 1971, who looked at writing development in ways that emphasized the process of writing rather than the end product. In line with social constructivist theory, the new body of research attended to the social context in which learning occurs and the role of language in developing literacy (McCarthy, 1994).

Research in writing changed to emphasize the process of writing, and to describe how writers go about constructing texts. With these new views, the product and parts of language came to be considered within the process (Pappas, Kieffer, & Levstik, 1999).

*The Writing Process*

The writing process is described as an active, constructive, social meaning-making enterprise (Pappas et al., 1999). Within the culture of the classroom, writers draw on their own schemata, based on past/current knowledge, to create texts. The social nature of learning is emphasized, and discourse is viewed as a key feature in instruction (Applebee, 1993). Commenting specifically on discourse in the writing process, McCarthy & McMahon (1992) reiterate Vygotsky’s views that knowledge is actively constructed through social interaction, that there is a movement from the interpsychological to the intrapsychological plane, and that learning occurs within the zone of proximal development:

Social constructivism incorporates discourse with learning; this learning is internalized. If an individual’s thoughts are internalized conversation, writing can be perceived as the reemergence of this internalized interaction. Further, to enhance one’s writing ability, one need to increase and vary the amounts and types of discourse [through] peer interaction. (p.18)
Creative Drama and Prewriting

Elements of the Writing Process

The writing process, as described by Bakunas (1996), consists of prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing. This model, unlike the early models where segments were taught in a linear fashion, is recursive, enabling the writing activities to be dynamic and interactive. Below are the stages and key features of this writing process model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Prewriting | - generating and exploring, recalling and rehearsing, and relating and probing ideas, as well as planning, thinking and deciding  
            | - an ongoing experience that can interact with the other writing experiences |
| Drafting   | - involves attempts to create a whole text by writing down ideas without a concern to "get things right"  
            | - can be interrupted by prewriting or occur concurrently with revising exercises |
| Revising   | - occasions to rethink, review, recreate the text  
            | - an ongoing activity that can happen during prewriting or drafting |
| Editing    | - intended to "clean up" the draft  
            | - changes are made to content and mechanics |
| Publishing | - consists of sharing  
            | - there is much variety in the form of publication |

Prewriting

Although writers utilize, to various degrees, each stage of the writing process, I will elaborate only on the prewriting stage here as my study primarily focuses on this element. LaRoche (1993) states that before moving efficiently through the writing
stages, students must feel skilled in the foundation level, the prewriting stage. According to Moore and Caldwell (1993), good writing is preceded by good thinking. They cite Moffett's notion that writing represents a distillation of thoughts that have surfaced during a time of focusing upon internal schema.

Research has shown that it is in the prewriting stage that students have the most difficulty with writing (Pressley & McCormick, 1999). For example, many students become blocked before they begin to write, or report that they cannot think of anything to write about. Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) analyzed the composing processes of strong and weak writers and found that competent writers spent more time on prewriting than did poor writers. In contrast, inexpert writers typically spent energy on local or superficial elements of a written text.

Prewriting, it is argued, assists students with their writing and should occupy a larger share of the classroom writing time (Annarella, 2000; Chiste & O'Shea, 1990; Moore & Caldwell, 1993). In prewriting, three subprocesses occur recursively. First, students generate information that might go into the composition. They do this by retrieving information from long-term memory or by seeking information in the environment. Second, students set writing goals. Third, students organize the retrieved information (Pressley & McCormick, 1999). LaRoche (1993) further argues that prewriting strategies help students learn to connect thoughts and feelings and enable them to form a loose structure of generated ideas from which writing will grow. Lastly, Hillcocks (1986) cites Emig's 1971 study which found that in the prewriting period most of the elements that will appear in the piece are present.
A critical factor in the “cycle of frustration” of unskilled writers rests in their notion of how to begin. One of the primary difficulties of these writers is generating ideas, that is, finding enough to say about the topic in terms of ideas and length. When faced with writing assignments, students frequently experience “writer’s block.” They approach writing tasks with confusion and frustration (LaRoche, 1993; Chiste & Shae, 1990).

In spite of the arguments supporting the notion that time spent on prewriting activity should be substantial, Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) report that, for the most part, writing assignments are given with little preparation. In fact, in his analysis of six studies done on writing composition, Hillocks (1986) found that students spent less than five minutes on prewriting.

There are many prewriting strategies commonly listed in writing composition teaching guides. Some of these are brainstorming: (random listing of ideas, words, or phrases), mindmapping (diagramming of ideas, for example on spokes radiating from a central word), ordering (using outlines, or numbered or diagrammed brainstorming), and freewriting (writing in complete sentences or paragraphs not recognizable as a draft of the essay) (Chiste & O’Shea, 1990). Furthermore, according to Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987), the best way to teach composition is to maximize the quality of what students write. This is achieved by ensuring that students write about what they know and want to express.
Drama

Creative drama as a prewriting strategy is well suited to achieve the goal of having students write about what they know. Several inherent factors exist within drama that potentially make this medium an effective tool in assisting students with composition. These factors will be presented as they relate to the theoretical framework and the functions of the prewriting process. First, I will provide a brief overview of the development of creative drama as a process. Then I will describe the relationships between creative drama and each of the following: experiential/kinesthetic learning, thought and language development, social construction of meaning, challenges of writing, spontaneity and creativity, role play, and motivation.

Social Constructivism and Drama as a Process

As in the case of writing, where the teaching focus moved from product to process, the teaching of drama has undergone a similar path. Drama as a process first made its appearance in schools during the 1930s when Winnifred Ward established a teacher training program in educational drama (Shuman, 1970). Ward acknowledged that her work was rooted in John Dewey’s progressive education philosophy of providing a relevant, humane, interactive and child-centered approach to schooling (Wagner, 1999). However, it was not until the 1966 Dartmouth Conference for British and American educators, where creative drama was a topic of much discussion (Ross, 1984), that this approach gained popularity through its effective promotion of key figures such as Dorothy Heathcote, Gavin Bolton, and Brian Way. These dramatists and educators were
involved in drama education in a number of ways: producing written material, lecturing, and directly teaching drama to students (Shugert, 1992).

In this approach, the overriding emphasis is placed on the process of developing original drama through improvisation as opposed to the product of such development, namely the presentation of a scripted drama before an audience (O’Farrell, 1998). Rather than focusing on passive reception (Henry, 2000), the goal is to promote cognitive learning and active imagination as the participants mentally slip from one identity — actor, playwright, director, audience — to another. At one moment, for example, they might be physicalizing a goat (acting) while watching another child portray a troll (audience), and at the same time thinking of what they would have said as the troll (playwrighting), or how they might have said it (directing) (Woodson, 1999).

The new, process-oriented view of drama is in line with the social constructivist philosophy of learning. It is interactive and child centered, encourages creativity, and engages the students in meaningful learning. This view of creative drama will be presented as it relates to prewriting and the role it can play in enhancing student writing.

Creative Drama and Experiential Learning / Kinesthetic Connection

First and foremost, improvisational drama is social in nature, a communal experience. It means that students must “leave their seats, get together with other students, discuss ideas, share thoughts, and display emotion,” all in the pursuit of taking an idea and improvising a moment (Kaplan, 1997).

Learning by doing, a popular concept in education often attributed to John Dewey, is accommodated in drama, as drama requires direct and active involvement to
construct meaning (Shugert, 1982). Smith (2000) argues that by being immersed in staged dramatic situations, students can “live” concepts through vicarious experiences rather than just “cover” them. Roper (2000) explains that in creative drama “a fictional world is a social construction of reality and this template is laid on the actual world” (p. 220). Byron (1986) adds that the fictional world is abstract but the participation in the drama is concrete. This concrete nature of drama, he argues, allows for instructional tasks to make human sense, as they are embedded in a context of human purposes and interactions. In short, the learning is real because “it is a shaping from life” (p.128). An authentic context for learning is provided.

Drama is unique in that it is multidimensional. It engages students on a physical, emotional, and cognitive level. These features, inherent in drama, are conducive to learning in general and, in this case, to assisting students with their composition activity.

Warren (1998), who has written on the value of drama-writing connections, points out that just as senses are used to create atmosphere within the drama, they are referred to again and again in the texts produced. She explains that, in drama, there is a “semiotic chain of events, enacted on and through bodies, in which meanings are made now in one media, now in another then superimposed upon and embedded within one another” (p.115). She claims that it is the drawing of attention to the senses inherent in the nature of drama that caused a subsequent marked increase in sensory references in the written compositions of the grade nine students with whom she was working.

Moffet and Wagner (1983) speak to the physical component. They assert that experience is coded first by muscles, then the senses, then memory, and finally reason. Sutton (1998) points out that students are often asked to use reason without ever
exercising their muscles beyond the physical act of picking up a pen and committing words to the page. If the experiences were first coded by the muscles through creative drama exercises, she argues, students would likely experience more pleasure and success in writing.

Wilkinson (1988) also argues that this bodily/kinesthetic connection as a prewriting activity supports oral and written language. She states that educators observed that the physicality of creative drama has freed students to use “imaginative, interactional, abstract language” (p. 13). In short, as Hillocks (1986) states in Research on Written Composition, experiential approaches to teaching writing are almost always more successful than any other approach.

_Creative Drama and Thought/Language Development_

Vygotsky’s view on thought and language is that language, in the form of speech, and thought are interdependent in a child’s mental development. It stands to reason that the more opportunities we provide our students to engage in meaningful dialogue, such as a creative drama activity during prewriting, the greater the potential for language and cognitive growth.

Creative drama often demands dialogue. Scenes are dependent on and built on the exchange of conversation between participants. In this forum students are engaged actively and collaboratively in language learning (Krogness, 1995). Byron (1986) agrees: “Drama is a valuable promoter of [students’] language development – they constantly create new language demands on themselves through their attempts to make sense of the situations they find themselves in” (p.127).
Heathcote (in Wagner, 1976) believes that when involved in drama, students are experiencing, thinking, feeling, and expressing real emotion with authentic words and yet stepping outside of themselves and understanding that they are in a fictional world. Studies show that the exchange of dialogue found in creative drama tends to be personal and can define the speaker. Wilkinson (1988) cites a grade 5/6 study by Shaffner (1983) which found that in drama there is a higher incidence of interactional and expressive talk, as compared to traditional classroom discussions in which there is a high incidence of informational talk. In this study, interactional talk was defined as focusing on exchanges with people and expressive talk as focusing on expression of thoughts and feelings, whereas informational talk was defined as focusing on concrete information. The researcher concluded that children are able to bring both their feeling and their thinking together in drama, and that this results in cognitively richer talk. Moreover, the expressive language produced in the drama experience offers children greater opportunities for abstract thinking than informational language, which is the most prevalent form in most classroom activities. Because oral language is viewed as a "seedbed" for the development of writing (Wagner, 1999), and because talk takes place in the preparatory creative drama exercise for the writing that follows, the cognitive and language growth presumably will be reflected in the students' writing as well.

Although the relationship between drama and cognitive growth per se has not been measured, numerous studies show that drama promotes oral language development. Studies summarized by Wagner (1999) include one by Stewig and McKee (1978), which showed a significant difference between pre and post test scores on variety-of-words measure of Grade 7s; a 1983 Snyder and Greco study showing a significant increase in
the number of words spoken by Grade 3s; and a study by Vitz (1984), showing a significant increase in the verbal output of students in Grades 1-3. In total, of the twenty-three studies listed by Wagner that examined the relationship between and oral language development, only four found no difference between the group who had the drama experience and the control group.

Creative Drama and Social Construction of Meaning

The purposes of prewriting are to generate and explore ideas and to plan ways in which to present them in composition. Paradoxically, the key conclusion of Bereiter and Scardamalia’s (1987) research is that students’ main problem in writing is accessing and giving order to what they know. It is apparent that, not only is more emphasis needed on prewriting, but also that we need more effective strategies for achieving these two aims within the prewriting activities. I suggest that the use of creative drama helps students to discover and shape their ideas. This line of thinking is directly associated with Vygotsky’s (1986) notion that knowledge is constructed in a social context. Theorists who advocate the use of creative drama (Courtney, 1989) stress students’ active construction of meaning and their affective engagement in making meaning. Creative drama, Courtney states, emphasizes development of personal responses to a context-specific social situation. Norris (2000) points out that in drama, unlike any other enterprise, several ways of making meaning are in place:

In education *word* is used in the teaching of all subjects focused on language arts; *number* in mathematics, science and music; *image* with the visual arts; *gesture* in dance; and *sound* in music. Drama integrates
He challenges teachers to expand their teaching repertoire to include more ways of knowing and representing in their classrooms.

When participating in creative drama activities, students engage collaboratively in developing scenes. They immerse themselves in different situations, and construct different realities. Using a character or situation as a base, they extend and expand by creating their own dialogue and events (Fumer, 2001). As scenes are developed, the students are challenged to make the situation believable; it must make sense. This collaborative and reflective process entails presenting, discussing, working on, and reworking of ideas.

It is during times of collaborative reflection that ideas have the potential to be embedded in the psyche. Information passes from the interpsychological plane to the intrapsychological. O'Neill (1984) states that in creative drama, one experiences the “as if” world, and at the same time creates the means of reflecting on existence. A conscious and reflective attitude, she says, is likely to develop in drama because of the dynamic relationship between reality and pretense. Through reflection and collective discussion about dramatic experiences, adds Verriour (1984), not only is meaning created and are ideas generated, but the language structures evoked through these close examinations of framed dramatic situations are reflected in the writing process.

Through these improvisations, students work together by sharing and building on each other’s ideas and impulses to create meaningful content. To use Vygotsky’s line of thinking, this information is shared and constructed within the social context, then internalized on the individual level and stored for retrieval when writing. Ample
opportunities to participate in improvisational activities in the prewriting process will help them to both generate and, later, express their ideas.

**Creative Drama and the Challenges of Writing**

Vygotsky (1986, 1987) provides three reasons for why children find writing difficult. First, written speech, unlike its oral counterpart, is abstract in nature. It is void of any sense of sound or movement, and it is an interaction between the writer and paper only, lacking an interlocutor. Second, it requires voluntary, conscious effort as compared to largely unconscious, effortless oral speech. And third, in that it is formal, conventional, and elaborated written language, it lies at the opposite end from inner speech which is the highly condensed, abbreviated internal language used by an individual for important functions such as solving problems, planning, and facilitating activities.

Using drama as a prewriting activity provides a way to bridge the gap between inner speech and written language, and thus ease the process of transmitting thought to paper. McMaster (1998) posits that drama is thinking out loud, where thoughts are articulated, expressed, and enacted in the context of improvised activities. Wilkinson (1993) says drama brings alive the written page. In the prewriting drama activity, students fill the void of voice, gesture and the absent respondent as they become immersed in collaborative construction and enactment of scenes. The intonation is heard and experienced; the movement is seen and felt. Their inner speech is converted, through a concrete experience, to full oral text, providing a stepping stone to a written one. Neelands (1993) adds, “if children are engaged in the expressive aspects of drama, the
writing that accompanies the drama -- writing that grows out of and...is engendered by
drama -- may possess the same characteristics and qualities of expression” (p.11).

Moore and Caldwell (1993) speak further on using drama to assist students with
the writing process by referring to Scardamalia and Bereiter’s (1987) problem-solving
model of composition planning. In this model, they distinguish between abstract
planning, inner speech, and rehearsal. In contrast with the first two, rehearsal takes place
at the concrete level and resembles the final product. Hence, they argue, narrative
rehearsal may be regarded as a type of first draft, and revised and edited in this form the
process of transcription to paper begins. Bolton (1984) adds that creative drama provides
an efficient and productive medium for students to elaborate and revise their ideas. It is
much simpler to rearrange composition through drama than to painstakingly insert,
delete, and rearrange ideas in writing. The subsequent first draft, therefore, may already
have the edits included that took place through the process of drama.

Creative Drama and Spontaneity, Creativity, and the Zone of Proximal Development

Moreno believed spontaneity and creativity are interconnected, and that one
fosters the growth of the other. Vygotsky (1978) believed that in play, a child “always
behaves beyond his average age, above his behaviour” (p.102). Both of these statements
suggest that creative drama, which is a form of spontaneous play, is a creative, problem-
solving activity which may assist students to “bootstrap” their own cognitive
development.

A close look at creative drama supports this view. Sawyer (2000) points out that
in creative drama, an ensemble of participants collaboratively create a scene without any
prearranged dialogue. Each created moment is open to endless plausible subsequent moments. The improvisation, states Sawyer, requires the participants “to create everything; the dramatic elements emerge from the dialogue, in a problem finding [and solving] process that is collaborative and emergent” (p.158). In addition, the participants are required to create a scene that is logical in terms of content, sequence, and timing (Rose et al., 2000). In order to do this, it is imperative that they “focus and concentrate in order to pick up on one another’s cues and prompts emitted in the play…that they extend each other’s actions” (Yawkey, 1983, p. 4). It is the challenge of these spontaneous, creative collaborations, explains Wagner (1999) that places the participants in the zone of proximal development.

Wagner (1999) cites Giffin’s study which shows that, during improvisation, children scaffold for each other by providing a framework on which others can stand as they build a new understanding. This is done in numerous ways: by posing leading questions, by repeating statements in alternate ways, or by making implicit suggestions for change in behaviour while in character. Teachers also scaffold students’ involvement in a scene, such as by side coaching and demonstration. One of the more innovative techniques to facilitate and guide the students is called “teacher-in-role,” a method introduced by Dorothy Heathcote (Tarlington, 1988). Using this method, the teacher works inside the drama that is being created, taking on roles that help the students to clarify and direct the work. “From this vantage point, s/he stimulates a dramatic response among participants, challenging them to extend the storyline and deepen their characterization” explains O’Farrell (1998, p.120).
The improvisational element in creative drama lends itself to mutual scaffolding by participants as they are continually challenged to respond and build on each other's statements and actions. Each gesture, movement, or feeling that occurs either from scaffolded prompts, or independent of them, is potentially another building block in the students' subsequent written narrative.

*Creative Drama, Moreno and Role Play*

Moreno believed that the "as if" concept in drama allows people to experiment with different situations and understand different perspectives. Dorothy Heathcote echoes his statement, saying: "thinking from within a situation forces a different type of thinking" (cited in Wagner, 1976, p. 17). Similarly, Lang (1999) remarks: "it allows people to walk a mile in someone else's moccasins and opens up a broad range of human experience for consideration and reflection" (p.54).

Mead defined role playing as putting oneself in the place of another -- understanding another's role attributes, thoughts, and feelings (cited in Yawkey, 1983). Creative drama offers limitless opportunities to construct different characters and to involve oneself, in both mind and body, in the lives of other people. Nixon (1988) portrays role play in drama as a creative and integrated teaching tool, useful in "opening up" themes and topics. Blatner (1997) suggests that role playing develops a capacity for metacognition as one shifts between the role one plays and oneself. Perhaps the most valued and mentioned feature, however, is that role play lends itself to fostering empathy (Blatner, 1988, Waterman, 1999; Courtney, 1989; Edmiston, 2000). By empathizing with a character, students think and feel other than they are and are led beyond the limits of
their everyday existence (Wright, 1984) and are prompted to consider the perspectives of others.

The understandings and the feelings that students gain about their character in role play can be transferred to their writing. By the time pen is put to paper, explains Neelands (1993), the students can really write their own stories. They have been “living” in their characters, and have looked at them from the inside out. In her experience with her students, Waterman (1999) finds that “students report back their experiences with honesty and sincerity and often express a depth of feeling of the characters and the situation with passion” (p. 49).

Creative Drama, Vygotsky, and Motivation to Write

Vygotsky (1978) says that “teaching should be organized in such a way that writing ... is meaningful for children, that an intrinsic need should be aroused in them” (p. 118). Hodgkins (1993) states that students want to become writers, not because they have mastered syntax, but because they are convinced they have something to say.

When students participate in creative drama activities they come away with both the material and the need for writing. The feelings and experiences are real in the drama and thus the writing generated from drama activities is rich (Waterman, 1999). Traditional motivations for writing in school deal with the completion of writing tasks; that is, doing assignments because they are a part of the course outline and the teacher requests them. Neelands (1993) argues that when the writing is embedded within a context that has personal meaning for the writer, the motivation for writing takes on a different form. From within a drama context, the writer works in a feeling/thought mode,
moving between the drama and pen, learning and exploring through them both. Exploration and learning become motivations for the writing; the writing is not simply a means to an end. Commenting on her experience incorporating creative drama into the classroom learning, Warren (1998) explains that writing is not a lifeless act, but essential for furthering future dramas. She provides a quote from a student’s journal, "When we make or create a situation ourselves, we want to write about it. It’s easier and more interesting because it happened and our imagination created it. It really seems easier to write" (p. 107). Similarly, Tarlington (1984), a lecturer of drama in education who works with middle-school children, declares,

Of the 3,500 children I can count on one hand those who had difficulty deciding what to write. They wrote easily because the dramatic context supplied them with something to say and a purpose for saying it. (p.199)

A social constructivist classroom may be described as a place where students interact with one another in activities that are meaningful and motivating. My own experience of using drama in the classroom has, for the most part, been positive. When I use drama, the students appear to be engaged in learning and seem to enjoy the activity. Clearly, though, dealing on a level guided solely by impressions is not sufficient to convince myself or other educators to implement such instructional strategies. Therefore, in the following section I describe empirical educational studies on the impact of creative drama on learning.
Empirical Studies of Creative Drama and its Effect on Learning

Researchers who have investigated the capacity of drama to enrich learning have found positive results across a variety of developmental domains. In her effort to collect evidence supporting the need for creative drama training for teachers, Hundert (1996) compiled the following list:

Drama has been associated with gains in language acquisition (Stewig, 1983; Wilkinson, 1988, Bidwell, 1990); problem solving (Pipkin & DiMennna, 1989; Meyers & Cantino, 1993); cooperative learning (Rosenberg, 1987; Tarlington & Verriour, 1991); empathy and values clarification (Bolton, 1984; Courtney, 1989); self-esteem and social development (Warger & Kernan, 1986; Buege, 1993).

(p. 202)

In addition, Hundert suggested that, as a methodology, drama has been found to be helpful in facilitating curriculum across many subject areas, including language arts, environmental studies, history, science, mathematics, and physical education.

In her review of research into drama as a strategy for language arts learning, however, Wagner (1999) found that empirical studies have been few in number. Furthermore, much of it is faulty in design, does not build on previous studies, and is not well grounded theoretically. To illustrate her first point, she points out that since 1989, a total of 34,232 dissertations have dealt with reading and writing, and only 71 with drama in education.

Although relatively few in number, dissertation research and other studies that have passed scholarly scrutiny have provided encouraging findings for the place of drama in education when used as an instructional method. Kardash and Wright's (1987) meta-
analysis of sixteen studies showed that instructional use of drama was related to a significant improvement in reading, oral language skills, self esteem, and moral reasoning. Conard’s (1999) more recent meta-analysis of twenty-one empirical studies of the outcome of drama instruction found improved performance in measurable academic and cognitive skills. An omission in this meta-analysis, however, is the detailed description of which academic or cognitive skills were the focus of each study.

Particularly useful to my study, however, was that both meta-analyses found larger positive effects at the elementary rather than the secondary level. Also, the majority of the studies were done with “normal students in regular classrooms” (p. 210).

When looking specifically at studies investigating the effect of creative drama on writing, Neelands (1993), in his review of literature, states that only five quasi-experimental studies have been conducted: Pellegrini (1984) (Kindergarten), Roubicek (1983) (Grade 5), Wagner (1986) (Grades 4 and 8), Ridel (1975) (Grade 9), and Troyka (1973) (College Freshmen). All of these claim that drama improves writing. Pellegrini found a positive correlation between the level of dramatic fantasy play and the writing fluency of sixty-five kindergartners. Roubicek found that acting out a story is significantly more effective than a structured discussion for improving subsequent writing among fifth graders. Wagner used one of three instructional conditions prior to a persuasive writing exercise -- role play, direct instruction, and no instruction-- with eighty-four comparable fourth graders and seventy comparable eighth graders, and found significant improvement when the role play activity was used. Ridel’s investigation found that creative writing ability and originality of twenty-five ninth graders improved when creative dramatics was used once a week for a full semester. Troyka’s study
showed a significant increase in the use of facts, reasons, and incidents in expository essays written by eighty-three experimental college students involved in role play activities as compared to sixty-eight control students in the control group.

Wagner's (1999) more recent review adds Moore and Caldwell's (1990, 1998) (Grades 2 and 3 respectively), Dunnagan's (1991) (Grade 7), and Neelands' (1993) (Grade 10) studies to this list. Moore and Caldwell found that for second and third graders, fifteen sessions of either drama or drawing were more effective forms of preparation for narrative writing than traditional planning using discussion. Dunnagan's study, which used a paired subset comparison of fifteen grade seven students, found that those involved in drama activities showed increased attention to imagery and increased insight into characters' feelings and empathy in their narrative writing. Neelands' qualitative study described the attitudes of tenth graders whose teacher used writing as an intrinsic element in drama work. He reported that the students' writing was personal, reflective, and showed an enhanced empathy and understanding of a broad range of people.

In my own research on the drama and writing connection in theatre, education, research journals, and the ERIC database, I found seven additional works, all of which speak favourably about the effect of creative drama on writing. Some of these are studies, some are projects, and some are simply informal reports of personal experiences: Beyersdorfer and Shauer (1993) (Grade 8); Smith (2001) (Grade 2/3); Blazuk, Chinn and McKay (1984) (Grade 4); Lang (1999) (Grades 4-9); Schneider and Jackson (2000) (Grades 2/3); Herbert (1982) (Grade 3); and Tritter (1981).
Beyersdorfer and Shauer (1993), two classroom teachers, reported on a short story unit they team-taught over a period of five eighty-minute lessons during which eighth graders collaborated on writing and dramatizing their work. Beyersdorfer and Shauver stated that the mutual critiques by the students groups during rehearsal of the developing stories led to meaningful revisions and expanded the students' knowledge of plot and characterization. Although Beyersdorfer and Shauer outlined the lesson plans and made a statement about their findings, the number of students involved in the project or the procedure for arriving at the findings was not mentioned.

Smith (2001) taught a drama class incorporating writing for eight days for 3 hours a day with eleven second and third graders. Smith involved the students in drama exercises that were based on narrative material such as a story and a talk show; and non-narrative, such as spider behaviour and an inanimate object coming to life. Smith found that when given the choice, students preferred to write about the drama experiences that were based on narrative rather than non-narrative material and that, in both situations, the social interaction during the drama activity helped inspire the students develop their writing. Smith's conclusions emerged from her detailed observation of the drama activities and close examination of the students' written work.

Blazuk, Hinn, and McKay's (1984) study involved 33 grade 4 students who were given six one-hour social studies/writing lessons by a drama specialist. The researchers found that the students were enthusiastic throughout the unit and the drama technique generated writing that showed evidence of meaningful, purposeful learning. The researchers did not elaborate on the manner in which they arrived at their conclusions,
hence, like Beyersdorfer and Shauer (1993) reported above, their results can only be interpreted as anecdotal.

Lang’s (1999) study involved two teachers, one a grade 8/9 English and Drama teacher, and the other a generalist teacher of grades 4/5/6, who conducted three two week units using drama to enhance students’ oral and written response to a variety of selections of literature. In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the drama experiences as they relate to the prescribed learning outcomes in the British Columbia’s Language Arts curriculum (BC Ministry of Education, 1996), which specifies that students will speak, listen, read, write, view and represent information, data were collected from the following: daily student responses in a drama note-book, student letters to the researcher, and student evaluative comments at the end of the drama/short story units. Based on these responses, Lang concluded that the drama experiences did in fact enable the students to meet the learning outcomes. The numerous excerpts of student reflections on both the process of the drama and the impact of the drama on their writing are useful for my study as they provide information on designing drama activities and the student responses these activities might generate.

Schneider and Jackson’s (2000) study examined emerging themes that related to the writing that occurred when drama was used as a teaching and learning medium in a grade 2/3 class of 25 students. The students were led through two drama units, each lasting two months. Data were collected from the students, classroom teacher, and researcher, using field notes, transcripts, and writing samples. The researchers concluded that, in spite of the fact that the context was imaginary, the students’ involvement in the drama enabled them to write for authentic reasons. Also, the various role play activities
served to increase the students’ ability to understand and write from multiple perspectives.

Tritter (1981) worked with a grade 5 class divided into two groups of twelve. Each group in the project received one 40 minute drama/story writing-lesson and one 40 minute non-drama/story-writing lesson. The objective of the lesson was to provide an alternative ending to a story. Tritter’s findings indicate that the Drama Group’s writing showed more personal involvement and imagination as demonstrated by greater divergence from the format and story line.

In summary, studies in creative drama and writing are relatively few in number. Although the investigations listed above dealt with narrative writing, only seven of them, Dunnagan (1991), Lang (1999), Roubicek (1983), Moore and Caldwell (1990, 1998), Neelands (1993), Ridel (1975), and Tritter (1981) included the writing of short stories. Of these, only one, Dunnagan, studied students at the grade 6/7 level in which I am interested. In general, I found the studies informative in terms of providing ideas for methodology and lesson design. Also, the teacher's and students’ reflective comments on the drama and writing activities were helpful in identifying practical considerations. The studies lacked detailed description of specific aspects of writing that may have been impacted by the drama experience. It is this gap that I intended to help fill by collecting data which examine not only the students’ level of performance (as indicated by scores based on the BC Performance Standards for Writing) on their compositions but also data which provide qualitative descriptors of their written compositions. Furthermore, I intend to shed more light on the compositions by collecting data which examine the students’ attitude of the drama/writing process.
Rationale

Writing is not an easy task. Writing is, in fact, a very complex process involving numerous functions and forms taking place simultaneously (Schultz & Fecho, 2000). Many students experience difficulty and frustration when writing. As a teacher, I feel continually challenged to find ways to enhance the writing ability of my students. I believe that incorporating creative drama when teaching writing can enable some of my students to feel more comfortable during writing, take control of their writing, and improve their writing quality.

In my experience, if a student does not have a clear idea for writing, the student cannot effectively engage in any of the other stages of the writing process. To make the greatest instructional impact on unengaged writers, it makes sense to focus on getting students started writing. Therefore I propose that the use of a creative drama strategy during the prewriting phase of writing may help students generate ideas, topics, and scenarios for writing. Prewriting is a preliminary phase of the writing process that encompasses all of the strategies a writer uses to plan out the subsequent composition (Chiste & O'Shea, 1990). In the prewriting context, I envision creative drama as involving students in creating scenarios based on given topics that they can later transcribe as narrative.

Given the links between play, drama, and intellectual and creative growth, I believe that the demands of writing can be addressed, in part, through drama instruction linked to subsequent writing because of the parallels that exist between creative drama and narrative writing. They both contain a cyclical process of: a) collecting data and trusting one’s own words, b) making choices, c) focusing and clarifying an image, d) becoming aware of senses and feelings, e) using appropriate diction, f) organizing and, g)
revising and editing (Wagner, 1984). Also, both creative drama and narrative writing may contain the same elements of fiction: a) character, b) environment (setting), c) playable action (plot and conflict) and, d) thought (theme), (Sutton, 1998). Wagner (1999) further points out that the criterion for determining whether it is a good drama is the same as the criterion for a good story – “does it create an imagined world that can be believed, that is true to our understanding of human experience” (p. 27). The parallels found in the process and content of creative drama and writing are helpful to students’ understanding of the elements their story should contain.

By the time students reach grade 6/7, typically writing is very decontextualized, or abstract. Students often are asked to write on an assigned topic without the benefit of contextualizing activities. Thus, they might struggle to generate ideas, to make links to their prior knowledge, and to organize and plan their narratives. Creative drama involves the participation in the construction and enactment of scenes using all of the human dimensions: cognitive, physical, emotional, spiritual. If we accept Dewey’s and other educators’ notion that one “learns by doing” then the learning that takes place when constructing scenes using the body in its entirety is significant because the learner, as a writer, gains experience about which he/she can write.

In addition, according to Vygotsky (1986), learning is mediated by language. He posits that “thought is not merely expressed in words; it comes to existence through them” (p. 218). Creative drama provides a structure and a context for dialogue that differs from the regular academic discourse in classrooms in that it includes the elements of fiction and imagination. Creative drama promotes students’ language development as students constantly create new language demands on themselves through their attempts to
make sense of the dramatic situations in which they find themselves. These novel words/thoughts generated in prewriting through a creative drama experience provide valuable material for students’ subsequent writing.

Learning by doing and learning through language as described above are part of the constructivist view. To add the social element of constructivism as Vygotsky intended means that learning by doing and learning through language must occur interactively in a social setting. Drama requires students to collaboratively interact with one another. Students plan, organize, execute, and reflect on improvised activities. Thus creative drama most aptly represents an environment where Vygotsky’s theory that meaning is constructed in a social context is realized.

Vygotsky identified a gap between a student’s thoughts and his/her written words. I suggest that creative drama may bridge this gap. Through creative drama, thoughts and ideas are realized, vocalized, gestured, and experienced with all senses, turning the highly-condensed, abbreviated inner speech into an expressive format which can then be more readily transposed into the students’ writing. In the same manner, creative drama provides a medium for abstract planning. Inner speech can be organized and concretized through the construction of “first drafts” in improvisation. These drafts can be “edited” and “revised” more readily than can be done in writing.

Moreno, the father of psychodrama, posits that spontaneity and creativity are interconnected and that one fosters the growth of the other (as cited in Yablonsky, 1992). The improvisation element of creative drama, therefore, works to develop students’ creativity. During this improvisational process the students and the teacher as side coach scaffold, or provide assistance to one another, by furnishing a framework on which each
can stand as they collaboratively build new understandings. They must “pick up” on one another’s cues and prompts and extend each other’s actions. Each gesture, movement, word, or feeling felt that occurs from scaffolded prompts potentially becomes another building block in the students’ subsequent written narrative.

The “as if” feature of creative drama allows students to experiment with different situations and understand different perspectives. Through role play, they put themselves in the place of others, and come to understand and empathize with their thoughts and feelings. After they have experienced “living” as others, the students have the understanding to write from different perspectives.

Finally, Vygotsky (1978) says that “teaching should be organized in such a way that writing ...is meaningful for children, that an intrinsic need should be aroused in them” (118). When students participate in creative drama, they come away with both the material and purpose, for writing. The writing is embedded within a context that has personal meaning for the writer, and thus a motivation for writing is created.

Although there are studies that have linked creative writing and creative drama, the body of literature is limited because the studies are few in number, especially with the middle school population. They are also limited because the findings tend to report general trends such as increased creativity in the student writing and personal involvement, but without providing detail about the qualitative differences one can expect. I would like to obtain more information in this area because a comprehensive description of the end results will make more clear to me and others what I should be teaching. The more I am aware of the impact of creative drama during the prewriting process in students’ writing, the better I will be able to provide effective scaffolding.
My final rationale for doing this study is the context in which it rests in current literature and educational practice. In my experience, drama is not a well established teaching technique in regular elementary school classrooms, even though the results suggest that students' creativity and motivation improve. The parallels between drama and writing, such as communicating to an audience, creating mutual understandings, the provision for individual voice, and the endless possibilities for creativity, lend to a natural integration of the two subjects. I believe that integrating drama with writing at the prewriting stage of the writing process can have a positive impact on the narrative writing experiences of grade 6/7 students.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Statement of the Purpose and Research Questions

Research literature on the use of creative drama as a teaching strategy is limited. Particularly limited is research investigating the use of creative drama in connection to writing when taught by a generalist teacher at the middle school level. The primary purpose of my research study is to examine what the effects the use of drama as a prewriting strategy has on students’ short story writing. As a teacher working with grade six/sevens for the past six years, I am continually searching for ways to assist my students to become more effective and engaged writers. Drama, an integral component of the language arts curriculum, has been a personal interest of mine for many years. I wanted to focus on one particular aspect of the language arts program, that is, the connections that exist between the use of creative drama activities and students’ writing. Specifically, if drama is used as a prewriting strategy in the writing process, how will it affect students’ short story writing process, as well as the content of the stories that they produce?

Pilot Study

Due to the paucity of studies that examine the creative drama/short story writing connection with students in the upper elementary school grades, in February, 2001, I conducted a pilot study to investigate whether there was a difference in short stories written by students who experienced creative drama in prewriting as compared to the stories of those who had taken part only in discussion. The participants of the study were
two grade 6/7 classes in my school. Both classes participated in writing two stories on the theme of “exclusion”. The lesson began with a brainstorming activity to generate ideas for the story. The students’ ideas were recorded on the blackboard. Class A (treatment group) was involved in dramatically improvising the generated material. Class B (control group) discussed the material in small groups. Following this exercise, the students were instructed to write a short story. For the second story, the strategies were reversed; that is, Class A was involved in the discussion prewriting activity and Class B in creative drama.

The results of the study showed that, in the stories written in the creative drama condition, students used more expressions connected to the theme of exclusion. Specifically, they more frequently referred to the feelings of the victim of exclusion, and they generated more dialogue and more action centered on the victim. Also, the treatment group appeared to employ greater character development, and more text was used. In a questionnaire following the writing of the two stories, the students indicated that they had enjoyed the creative drama process, and they felt that it had helped them to write their stories.

The study had many limitations. However, it was valuable in that it sparked my interest in investigating this subject further. It also alerted me to methodological issues in conducting studies such as this. Lastly, it gave me an indication as to what to expect, both in terms of strategy instruction and in the type of results I might find in a more rigorously designed and extended study.
Research Questions

I formed my research questions in two broad categories: content and attitudes. How did the drama activities impact the content of the participants’ short stories? What did the participants think about the process and the product? I focused on the product in addition to the students’ feelings of the experience because I felt a broader, more encompassing insight into this project would be more useful to both myself and my colleagues who may be interested in this area.

I used the BC Performance Standards short story writing guide, developed by the British Columbia Ministry of Education, as a basis to assess students’ level of performance on their compositions. I chose this tool for two reasons: a) it provides comprehensive descriptors for the various elements found in short story writing, and b) it is a well known, commonly used assessment tool in schools in British Columbia.

_content

1. Comparison between the short stories of students when drama is used in prewriting to the short stories of students who have not had drama when assessed according to the BC Performance Standards:
   1.1 What is the growth in the level of performance in ideas?
   1.2 What is the growth in the level of performance in detail?
   1.3 What is the growth in the level of performance in audience awareness?
   1.4 What is the growth in the level of performance in sentence structure?
   1.5 What is the growth in the level of performance in language style?
1.6 What is the growth in the level of performance in plot?

1.7 What is the growth in the level of performance in setting?

1.8 What is the growth in the level of performance in character?

1.9 What is the growth in the level of performance in narration/dialogue?

2. Quantitative differences in selected topics of interest between the short stories of students when drama is used in prewriting to the short stories of students who have not had drama:

   2.1 What is the difference in word count?

   2.2 What is the difference in the amount of dialogue use?

   2.3 What is the difference in the amount of first person narration?

3. Qualitative differences in selected topics of interest between the short stories of students when drama is used in prewriting to the short stories of students who have not had drama:

   3.1 What qualitative differences emerge in character description?

   3.2 What qualitative differences emerge in plot description?

   3.3 What qualitative differences emerge in setting description?

*Attitude*

4. How do students who had drama feel about the prewriting activities and the impact of these activities on their short story writing compared to students who have not had drama?
Process

5. How do I, as the teacher, perceive drama students’ participation in the prewriting activities and the writing of their stories compared to students who have not had drama?
CHAPTER FOUR

METHODS

Study Design

This study is quasi-experimental in design involving two intact classes in which one is given an experimental treatment and the other one is not (McMillan and Shumacher, 1997). Both quantitative and qualitative data are used. The quantitative data deals with the product, that is, the short story compositions. The qualitative data deals with the attitude, that is, the students' feelings towards the project as indicated in students' reflective journals, as well as process: my observations of the learning process, from the perspective of teacher-researcher throughout the course of the study.

Participants

The participants were 54 of 58 students enrolled in two grade 6/7 classes in the school in which I teach. The first class was my own regular class, out of which 27 of the 29 students took part in the study. This included 12 grade 6 students (4 female, 8 male), and 15 grade 7 students (9 female, 6 male). In the second class, 27 of the 29 students took part in the study; 13 grade 6 students (6 female, 7 male), and 14 grade 7 students (6 female, 8 male). I had been teaching writing to the second class for 80 minutes per week and drama for 40 minutes per week since the beginning of the school year. The drama lessons were a part of a class rotation model involving the four upper intermediate classes. All participants in the study were familiar with creative drama activities.
The Site

The K-7 elementary school of 412 students is located in central British Columbia in a rural area on the outskirts of a small city. The socio-economic status of the catchment area could be generalized as lower to middle class with a predominance of employment in the forest and pulp industry. The range of incomes is broad, from one-parent families on social assistance to two-parent income families who appear to live in relative financial comfort.

Ethical Considerations

Permission for this study was requested from the school principal, the school district, and the university Research Ethics Board (Appendices A-D). Parents of the students were given a letter explaining the study along with a voluntary consent form. The letter included the following information: disclosure of the purpose and procedures of the study, a guarantee of anonymity and confidentiality, a request to use the results for my Master's Thesis, an option to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty, and a statement explaining that possible risk to the participants is no greater than that of a normal school activity. This information was also explained verbally to the students in the two classes.

The study did not present an inconvenience to the students as the assignment was a part of the established Language Arts curriculum. Four students did not participate in the study. One student in my regular class has special learning needs and is following her own Individualized Educational Plan. Three students, one from my class and two from the other, chose not to be included. These students participated in the instructional program; however, the data were not reported in this research.
Teacher Responsibilities

In order to provide an environment conducive to learning, it was my responsibility as the teacher to not only organize the class, establish routines, and clarify expectations, but also to develop an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect. This is particularly important for drama, which works best when participants are able to commit to the activity (Haseman & O'Toole, 2000). Prior to beginning this study, I had introduced the students, in their biweekly drama classes, to numerous exercises designed to provide structure and form for individual and group work, as well as to also encourage the students to let go of inhibitions, to build trust, and to gain confidence.

Procedure

The two grade 6/7 classes were involved in a ten week project from March 25, 2002 to June 7, 2002. My class received drama as a part of prewriting instruction and is therefore referred to as the Drama Group. The second class did not, and is referred to as the Non-Drama Group. The rationale behind using two groups was to enable me to have a comparison group.

For both groups, the class time devoted to the instructional activities investigated in this study was two 45 minute blocks per week with additional time provided for reflective journal writing. In the first week, the students received instruction on how to complete a story outline including the following elements: an introduction, three events, a climax, a conclusion, main characters, and the setting. They then wrote a short story that was used as a baseline, which I have labeled the Pre-Treatment Story. In the following 9 weeks, the students were given additional instruction on short story writing and were
required to produce three short stories, based on different themes, one at the end of every three weeks. For each of these three stories, as well as for the Pre-Treatment Story, students were given the weekend to complete their stories as needed, and I accepted, without penalty, stories that were handed in late. In the following sections, I describe the planning of the unit and provide a brief summary of the lessons relating to the theme and format of the Pre-Treatment Story and the subsequent three stories.

Design of the Instructional Unit

When designing the unit for this study, my objectives were twofold. From the researcher’s perspective, I strove to design a unit that answers the research questions. Therefore I assigned four stories. The first one, a Pre-Treatment Story serving as a baseline, was assigned prior to prewriting instruction. The three subsequent stories were assigned with the onset of prewriting instruction at three week intervals over a period of nine weeks. The short story writing lessons for both groups followed a similar template including introduction, mini-lessons, prewriting activities, and time allotted for writing. From the teacher’s perspective, I strove to design a unit that addresses the learning outcomes for grade 6/7, is workable in a regular classroom, and is interesting to the students. With this in mind, the mini-lessons for each class included elements of short story writing (plot, character, setting, dialogue). Also, each class was requested to write one story using first person narration so that the students may get practice in writing from that perspective. Finally, I chose story topics that provided variety and that I believed the students would find engaging. The following provides a detailed description of the requirements, concepts covered, and methodology encompassed in the lessons.
Pre-Treatment Story: This story, which served as a baseline, was presented prior to introducing the two forms of prewriting activities. Because the students were not going to participate in a prewriting activity to generate ideas, I assigned a topic in which I believed, based on my discussions with them earlier in the year, students had an interest and knowledge – the terrorist events of September 11th. They were given choice in the perspective from which to write and how true they wanted to remain to what they knew to be facts. Students were instructed, however, to create a story outline (introduction, three events, climax, conclusion, characters, and setting) to help them when writing their story.

Story One: The prewriting activities were first introduced to the students, then implemented by them for each of the following three stories. For Story One, the topic assigned was “An Embarrassing Moment”. I settled on this topic because (a) I had received a positive reaction from the students when I had given it to them as an option and (b) it had a high likelihood of eliciting references to feelings. In my pilot study, I found that students who had been exposed to drama prewriting activities wrote more expressively about the feelings of characters that were being excluded from others than those students who were not exposed to drama. I wanted to see if another comparable topic that deals with feelings would produce similar results.

In lesson one, both the Drama and Non-Drama Groups generated ideas on situations illustrating an embarrassing moment through pair-share (exchange of ideas between two students), followed by a whole-class brainstorming session. These situations were discussed in detail and recorded in point form on the board. Then the students wrote a story outline. They were given the choice to use a situation we had
already discussed or to come up with an embarrassing moment of their own for the topic of their story.

Lessons two to five began with a 5-10 minute mini-lesson on various elements of short story writing, presented in an identical fashion, to both groups. Topics covered were the "grab" (introduction), rising action, ways in which information about a character may be communicated, and ways to appeal to different senses when describing setting.

The next 20 minutes of each of these four lessons differed for the two groups. The Non-Drama Group participated in prewriting activities in which the concept covered in the mini-lesson was extended through teacher-led whole-class, or small-group discussions, as well as various desk assignments. For example, following the mini-lesson on rising action, the Non-Drama Group worked in partners to assemble, in correct order, strips of paper containing parts of a given story. They then compared their work with another set of students and were required to justify their choices in terms of rising action. Lastly, they discussed, with their partner, the rising action of their own story. My role during the follow up activities was to circulate and provide individual assistance. The Drama Group's prewriting activities, on the other hand, did not involve extension via direct instruction or guided practice of the concept introduced in the mini-lesson. Rather, in self-selected groups, students took turns first verbally sharing their story outline with the group, then dramatically "fleshing out" a segment of their planned story with the assistance of the members of their group. This was done by the students assuming roles of characters within a given scenario and then developing the scene by playing it out through improvisation. Students were encouraged to discuss, reflect, and rework their improvisations as they saw fit. The improvisations took place in various parts of the
classroom, mudroom, and hallway. Because the activity was new, at the beginning of this part of the lesson, I took a few minutes to model the activity using myself and different members of the class to create scenes from a story outline that I had developed to use as an example. After this demonstration, the students proceeded independently and I circulated from one group to another providing assistance either as a teacher-in-role (taking part in the scene) or as an observer.

The last 15 to 20 minutes of the class were, once again, the same for both groups. During this time students worked individually, using their story outline as a guide, on drafting a portion of their story. The students were encouraged to draft one event per day and, if possible, to incorporate ideas generated in the prewriting sessions into their story. The objective of this approach was twofold: (a) to divide the story into manageable portions, and (b) to enable students to transfer the prewriting activities to their own writing immediately after the prewriting instruction.

Lesson six, the final lesson, was open ended. Students were given time, depending on their progress, to continue to discuss (Non-Drama Group) or to dramatize (Drama Group) their stories; or to complete their draft, proofread, edit, or write a good copy which was to be handed in for assessment.

*Story Two:* The assignment for this story was to rewrite the Pied Piper of Hamelin from the perspective of one of the characters in the story. I chose this assignment because (a) I wanted to give students practice in writing in the first person, and (b) a common story frame would allow me to more easily participate as teacher-in-role, a strategy I found to be helpful in enhancing the students' drama. Because I was aware that some
students might not enjoy this particular topic, I allowed students to make as many changes to the original version as they wished.

In lesson one, both the Drama and Non-Drama Groups were involved in reading and then discussing the story. As a class, we then brainstormed different characters that might inhabit the town of Hamelin. These were recorded on the board. Last, the students were asked to choose a character and develop a story outline from that person’s perspective.

As with Story One, lessons two to five began with a 5-10 minute mini-lesson on various elements of short story writing, presented in the identical fashion to both groups. Topics covered were character description, dialogue, use of detail in setting, and portrayal of emotion.

Again, the next 20 minutes differed for the two groups. The Non-Drama Group’s prewriting activity entailed a teacher-led whole class and/or small group discussions on the concepts covered in the mini-lessons. These were then connected to the story events: (a) villagers/occupations and their corresponding rat difficulties; (b) content and manner in which the different characters may voice their concerns at the townhall meeting; (c) details describing places in Hamelin and the surrounding area; (d) different characters’ reactions to the departure of the children.

The prewriting activities for the Drama Group entailed improvisation of the story events with myself as Teacher-in-Role, leading the students through the following scenes: a) fellow villagers lamenting about the rat difficulties; b) Mayor, councilors, villagers, and the Pied Piper at the townhall meeting; c) Pied Piper (teacher) luring the rats (students) out through town to the river; and d) villagers sharing their feelings and
experiences about the departure of the children. The last 15 to 20 minutes of the class were spent with students in both groups writing their stories, as was done Story One.

Again as in Story One, the sixth lesson was open-ended. Students were given time to continue to discuss or dramatize their stories, complete their draft, or work on a good copy.

*Story Three:* The topic assignment was open. I wanted to accommodate those students who look forward to writing about topics completely of their own choice. I also gave the students the option to work with a partner to brainstorm ideas on the same topic. However, they were to develop their stories individually.

In lesson one, both the Drama and Non-Drama Groups, worked in partners or individually brainstormed ideas for their topic. The latter portion of class time was devoted to developing their individual story outlines.

Lessons two to five were structured similarly to the format established in prior lessons. The first 5-10 minutes were spent on mini-lessons. These included foreshadowing, alternate ways to express the words “said” and “went,” and different types of endings. The following 20 minutes entailed class and group discussions, as well as related prewriting assignments for the Non-Drama Group, and improvisation of story outlines for the Drama Group. Lastly, both groups spent the final 15-20 minutes of the lesson writing their stories.

Once again lesson six was open ended. Students were given time, depending on their progress, to continue to discuss or dramatize their stories, complete their draft, proofread, edit, or write a good copy.
Student Reflective Journals

On five occasions (April 4, April 11, May 2, May 22, June 11), outside of the time provided for the prewriting and story writing activities, students recorded their impressions of the prewriting and story writing experiences in a reflective journal. The instruction I gave for this 10 – 15 minute exercise is as follows: *Please record your impressions and experiences on this writing unit. You may comment on whatever you wish. It could be about the activities we do during the class and how you feel about them, about your stories and how your story writing is going, or about anything else that comes to your mind when thinking about this unit. Please be honest and open with your comments.*

Data Collected

My data collection consisted of (1) a preliminary short story sample (Pre-Treatment Story) from each student in the Drama and the Non-Drama Group; (2) three stories (Story One, Story Two, Story Three) from each student in the Drama and the Non-Drama Group written after exposure to prewriting activities; (3) reflective journals by the Drama and the Non-Drama Groups; and (4) my teacher/research journal. Both quantitative and qualitative data was used; the former to analyze the content of the compositions, and the latter to analyze the students’ attitude and my observations of the project.
Data Analysis

Content: I examined the content in three distinct ways. First, the Pre-Treatment Story and Stories One, Two, and Three, for both groups, were evaluated and statistically compared for overall level of performance based on the BC Performance Standards. Second, the Pre-Treatment Story and Stories One, Two, and Three, for both groups, were analyzed and statistically compared along three dimensions: word count, first person narration, and use of dialogue. Third, Stories One, Two, and Three, for both groups, were analyzed and statistically compared according to prevalence of selected points of interest found specific to each one. In Story One, I tracked character development, specifically statements illustrating a character's feelings associated with an embarrassing moment as well as words/actions of other characters that contributed to that embarrassing moment. In Story Two, I tracked plot development, specifically the amount of diversion from the original story line. In Story Three, I tracked setting development, specifically the instances when description of setting was isolated and when setting description was infused with plot and/or character development.

Attitude: First, using a qualitative approach, student reflective journals for both groups were analyzed and compared for positive, negative, and neutral comments. Second, for both groups, the specific ideas expressed in these comments were analyzed and compared. Lastly, my research journal was examined for observations on student engagement in the study.
Content

I. Analysis Procedure for Level of Performance in the Pre-Treatment and Subsequent Three Stories

Prior to assessing the stories, I entered each one in my computer. I did this so that I could return the original to the students and also to enable me to read and code them more easily.

I assessed the stories using an adapted version of the BC Performance Standards rubric for grade 6/7 short story writing developed by the Ministry of Education (Appendix E). In the version used in this study, the spelling and punctuation components were ignored as changes in these areas were not expected. The nine components and their corresponding descriptors from the original version which were left intact and used in this study are: ideas, detail, audience awareness, sentence structure, language style, plot, setting, character, and narration/dialogue. In order to derive a score, a four point rating scale correlating with the four existing achievement levels was used: Level 1, Not Yet Within Expectations = 1 point; Level 2, Meets Expectations = 2 points; Level 3, Fully Meets Expectations = 3 points; Level 4, Exceeds Expectations = 4 points. Appendices F, G, H, and I provide examples of stories graded primarily at Level 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively. When using this rubric, the maximum total score that may be obtained for each story is 36.

I first assessed the compositions when they were handed in to me by the students so that they could be promptly returned. I then scored them all again at the end of the study. I chose to use only the second set of scored data because in this assessment I felt I was not tempted to make adjustments to scores in order to accommodate individual
student's needs. I also felt more competent in rating consistently and accurately when the compositions were scored in one time period rather than on four separate occasions in a space of ten weeks.

Prior to analyzing the results, reliability analysis was conducted on the scores. A random sample of 16 stories was re-scored by two independent raters. The sample consisted of two of each of the Pre-Treatment Story, Story One, Story Two, and Story Three, representing both groups. To provide a greater range of stories, once a student's name was drawn it was eliminated from the subsequent sets of stories.

The raters, an English teacher and an English teacher education candidate, both familiar with BC Performance Standards, were given the following instructions: (a) first, read the rating criteria carefully and examine the scores awarded to examples of writing samples provided by the BC Ministry of Education, (b) then read through the sixteen stories, (c) review the criteria again, (d) finally, award a score of 0 to 4 with 0.5 increments to each of the nine components for every story. To calculate reliability, the correlation coefficient was calculated where each rater's scores for each component in every composition were totaled and their means compared to the mean scores I had awarded for those same compositions (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997).

To establish that the Drama and the Non-Drama Groups' writing level before treatment was similar, I carried out an independent t-test for comparing two means and the F-variance ratio test to compare two variances on the total scores of the Pre-Treatment Stories.

Each of the 54 participants in the Drama and Non-Drama Groups wrote four stories, a total of 216. I recorded the raw data of the story scores on a spreadsheet. I used
ten columns, one for each of the nine components measured and an additional one for the total score. Microsoft Word Excel program was used to conduct the statistical analysis.

I first analyzed the stories by comparing scores of the nine components measured (ideas, detail, audience awareness, sentence structure, language style, plot, setting, character, and narration/dialogue) and the total score of these components that the students received in Story One, Story Two, and Story Three to their Pre-Treatment Story.

In analyzing these results, I repeated the following steps for each point of interest:

(1) I used each student's scores for the given criteria to calculate the mean and the corresponding standard deviation for the Drama and the Non-Drama Group. This was done for the Pre-Treatment Story, Story One, Story Two, and Story Three. (2) Next, to determine the level of significant differences in scores of Stories One, Two, and Three over the Pre-Treatment Story of students in each of the Drama and the Non-Drama Groups, I conducted a paired t-test. That is, for each component measured, I compared the mean scores of Story One against the mean score of the Pre-Treatment Story, and then the same for Story Two, and then for Story Three, for each of the two groups, Drama and Non-Drama, using p-values. (3) Finally, I conducted an independent t-test to compare the Drama and the Non-Drama Group mean scores in Stories One, Two, and Three respectively. (4) I also calculated the Gain score (e.g., Story One mean score – Pre-Treatment Story mean score = Mean Gain Score) for each of Stories One, Two, and Three, and then repeated the above three steps to analyze the gains in scores in each of the components as well as the total score. In my analysis, 5% level of significance
was used to evaluate the results of Stories One, Two, and Three when compared to the Pre-Treatment Story.

II. Analysis Procedure for Word Count, Dialogue Use, and First Person Narration

Word Count.

I used the Microsoft Word tool to derive word count from the stories I had typed in previously. In order to maintain consistency, I used the same analysis procedure to examine word count as I did when analyzing the level of performance described previously.

Dialogue. To measure usage of dialogue, I counted the words that characters speak in each of the Pre-Treatment Story, Story One, Story Two, and Story Three for both groups. For example, "Come to me," he said would count as 3 words. I then calculated the percent of dialogue text in each story and used this value in my analysis. Once again, to retain consistency, the same procedure was followed to analyze the amount of dialogue as when analyzing the previous data.

Perspective. To check for perspective, I coded the stories for first and third person narration only as none of the students wrote in second person narration. Because all students were requested to write Story Two in the first person, it was not included in the data. After obtaining the results for the number of students in the Drama and the Non-Drama Group using first person narration, I carried out a two proportions independent samples z-test to establish if the proportions of students in the Drama Group using first person narration in Story One and Story Three differs from the proportion in the Non-Drama Group.
III. Analysis Procedure for Selected Points of Interest Specific to Each Story

Each of the three short story assignments had its own topic and instructions, and therefore I analyzed each one according to the prevalence of a specific point of interest that was relevant to each assignment.

Point of Interest for Story One: Character. In my pilot study, for which the story topic was “the experience of exclusion”, I found the compositions of the Drama Group showed greater frequency of reporting of feelings felt by the victim as well more frequent use of words and actions directed at the victim than did the compositions of the Non-Drama Group. Guided by this finding, in Story One, for which the topic was “an embarrassing moment”, I analyzed the writing for the following: number of embarrassing events mentioned, and the corresponding number of statements that illustrate the feelings, words, and actions of the embarrassed character as well as the words and actions of other characters that contributed to those embarrassing moments. When recording the data, I first identified and then summarized the embarrassing event(s) found in a story. I placed this information in one column. I then identified the text that related to the embarrassing event, in which the feelings, the words, and/or actions of the involved characters are expressed. One occurrence of any of these was counted as one statement. For example in the sentence *She was really humiliated so she ran away* would be considered as two statements, the first referring to the feeling (*humiliated*) and the second to action (*she ran away*). I placed these statements in the opposing column. In the example below, the total count is 3 for the embarrassing events and 5 for the statements relating to that event.
Dropped her speech (1)  Everyone started laughing their heads off (1)
Passed gas (1)  BB was so embarrassed she ran right out (2)
Look it's the farting girl (1)
Said “bye dad” to teacher (1)  She could feel her face go cherry red (1)

I calculated the number in each category for both groups and recorded it for comparison. Examples of data collected are found in Appendix J.

Point of Interest for Story Two: Plot. This portion of my study was dictated by the instructions I had given the students for Story Two, that is, to rewrite the story of Pied Piper of Hamelin. The students were given permission to stay with or deviate from the original version as much as they wished. In Titter's 1981 study involving two grade 5 classes, findings showed that students who had received the drama/story writing lesson wrote endings that demonstrated a greater divergence from the format and story line than those students who had received a non-drama/story writing lesson. Because the students were given freedom to alter the events in The Pied Piper of Hamelin, I examined this set of stories in terms of the degree to which writers of each group incorporated their own ideas into the rewrite.

In my analysis, I tracked major changes to plot only, not embellishments of the existing story line. For example The mayor thought this was a miracle, the rats would be gone, and the people would be happy, but best of all he would have a wonderful reputation was not counted and We kicked our mayor out of town and forced him to walk. His fat probably left him by the time he got to other villages, that were 100 km away. At the closest he would bribe a horse and kill it on the ride to the big town of Gregory. That useless mayor wasn't worth much anyway was counted. I summarized and recorded these changes for each the Non-Drama and Drama Group and compared the totals. In the
above example, the summary statement is Mayor kicked out of town, travels to neighbouring village. The data collected are found in Appendix K. I then carried out a two proportions independent samples z-test to establish if the proportion of students making changes in the Drama Group is larger than the proportion in the Non-Drama Group.

Point of Interest for Story Three: Setting. In this part of my investigation, I chose to investigate yet another key element of short story writing, the setting. Because I had found differences between the two groups in their approach to describing character and plot, I was interested to see if closer examination would reveal a difference in their approach to setting description. For this investigation, I first identified and recorded the setting and its corresponding text for each story in the Drama and the Non-Drama Group. I then subdivided this text into the three categories that emerged: (1) setting is named only, (2) setting is described in isolation, and (3) setting is described as it relates to plot/character. The following provides an example of each:

(1) April and May worked in a restaurant.

(2) A light breeze playfully swung through the trees in the very early morning and the sky was ablaze with every shade of pink and light purple. Soon the sky would turn back to a blue blazer again as drops of golden sunshine spread their warmth and slowly awoke the cuddly creatures big and small of the land of Fancy.

(3) Sara and I ran to see what it was. It was a huge old haunted house with broken windows, spider webs, pieces of the house falling off everywhere and the boys wanted to go in. I said, I'm not going in there, it's a piece of crap. The boys... took off up the stairs... we didn't want to be in that gross looking thing for a house.
I calculated the sum of the setting narratives belonging to each category for both groups and recorded them for comparison. Examples of data collected are found in Appendix L.

I then carried out a two proportions independent samples z-test to establish if the proportion of the occurrences where the setting is referred to in each of the three ways listed above is different in the Drama Group from the proportion in the Non-Drama Group.

Attitude

IV. Analysis Procedure for Students' Reflective Journals

Students' perceptions about this short story project were documented in their reflective journals. The topic was open ended and the students commented on whichever aspect of the writing unit they wished. I used a qualitative approach, cross-sectional and categorical indexing, to organize and analyze the data (Mason, 1996; Marshall and Rossman, 1995; McMillan and Shumacher, 1997). This inductive process required that I read the journals thoroughly several times in order to get a general impression and then to apply codes to appropriate chunks of text to establish first broad, then more specific categories. I accomplished this by first entering all journal entries into the computer, then by cutting and pasting the information from each journal entry into categories. The following describes the data analysis based on the patterns that emerged.

Prewriting and Story Writing  Student commentary was first divided into the two major topic areas which emerged: (1) commentary relating to the prewriting activities, and (2) commentary relating to the content of students' stories and to the process of their story writing. To get a general idea for distribution of these comments, I used the word
count tool to first get the sum for the entire text, and then the sum for each section. I then subdivided each of these subjects into comments that were positive, negative, and neutral for both the Drama and Non-Drama Groups. For example the following journal entry was placed in three separate categories:

*The drama stuff is helping. I have got a lot of new ideas from it. But on the other hand it is hard to do because lots of people do not act the way they are supposed to do. Like when Paul was overacting and acting very dumb. Anyways I think this is my best story ever.*

Drama Group Prewriting Positive

*Joseph: The drama stuff is helping. I have got a lot of new ideas from it.*

Drama Group Prewriting Negative

*Joseph: it is hard to do because lots of people do not act the way they are supposed to do. Like when Paul was overacting and acting very dumb.*

Drama Group Story/Story Writing Positive

*Joseph: I think this is my best story ever.*

To get an idea for the distribution of positive, negative, and neutral comments, I again used the word count tool to first get the sum for the entire text, and then the sum for each section.

*Types of Comments*  My next step was to examine more closely each section of positive, negative, and neutral comments to get a better insight into how the students responded to the writing unit specifically. I found that with respect to comments on their
stories and story writing, the same patterns emerged for both the Drama and the Non-Drama Groups. I recorded the students' statements as they appeared within those categories.

The comments on the prewriting activities for the Drama and Non-Drama Group differed, yielding their own categories. Again I recorded the students' statements within those categories.

Specific Comments on Prewriting Activities and Story Writing

Lastly, I investigated the two main areas that emerged in which students made most specific comments: (a) an overall impression of the short writing unit, and (b) ways in which it impacted their story writing with respect to ideas, character, and setting. I recorded the statements in their respective categories for each, the Drama and the Non-Drama Group.

V. Analysis Procedure for Teacher/Researcher Fieldnotes

I kept an anecdotal account of my impressions of the project. I organized the notes into three sections for each group: mini-lesson, prewriting activity, and independent writing. After each lesson I recorded the procedures of the lesson, the students' and my own engagement in class activities, my analyses in progress, my interpretive insights, and my thoughts about limitations as they occurred to me.
CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS

Preliminary Statistical Tests

Interscorer Agreement

The interscorer agreement in the components measured in percent when compared to my assessment for each of the two raters was: ideas (87,87), detail (92,85), audience awareness (97,87), sentence structure (94,92), language style (89,83), plot (90,91), setting (86,88), character (87,85), and narration/dialogue (91,88). These levels of interrater agreement are considered moderate to high.

Drama and Non-Drama Groups’ Writing Levels Before Treatment

On the Pre-Treatment stories written by the Drama and the Non-Drama groups, the calculated $p$-values for mean comparison off the total scores was 0.1074 and for $F$-variance comparison was 0.1254. Therefore at 5% level of significance, I concluded that the Pre-Treatment Stories for the two groups were not significantly different.

Content

Results for Scores in the Pre-Treatment and Subsequent Three Stories

The following data describe the level of writing performance in students’ stories. Results for the total and the nine component scores (ideas, detail, audience awareness, sentence structure, language style, plot, setting, character, and narration/dialogue), as well as the gains in these scores, as calculated for the Pre-Treatment Story, Story One, Story Two, and Story Three by both the Drama and the Non-Drama Groups are displayed in Tables 1-8.
### Table 1
Mean and Standard Deviation of Scores (Component and Total) for the Drama and Non-Drama Groups in Preliminary Sample (S0), Story One (S1), Story Two (S2), and Story Three (S3) (n = 27 in each group)

#### Drama Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>S0</th>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th></th>
<th>S2</th>
<th></th>
<th>S3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>2.16 (0.61)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.70 (0.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.86 (0.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.89 (0.60)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td>2.16 (0.72)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75 (0.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88 (0.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.98 (0.62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>2.05 (0.72)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.59 (0.55)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.80 (0.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.80 (0.62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>2.36 (0.56)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.70 (0.52)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.71 (0.60)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.79 (0.57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent. Structure</td>
<td>2.52 (0.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.86 (0.45)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.98 (0.60)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.84 (0.55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>2.14 (0.74)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.82 (0.53)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.98 (0.66)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.93 (0.56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>1.89 (0.72)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.59 (0.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.68 (0.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.93 (0.62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>2.11 (0.72)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.57 (0.70)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.95 (0.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00 (0.56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narr./Dialogue</td>
<td>2.41 (0.62)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.73 (0.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.96 (0.64)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.02 (0.44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19.04 (5.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.39 (4.74)</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.89 (5.68)</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.29 (4.29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Non-Drama Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>S0</th>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th></th>
<th>S2</th>
<th></th>
<th>S3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>1.79 (0.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.61 (0.48)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.64 (0.56)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.30 (0.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td>1.71 (0.57)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.43 (0.49)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.59 (0.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.11 (0.61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>1.66 (0.55)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.57 (0.40)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.57 (0.57)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.21 (0.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>2.21 (0.42)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.45 (0.42)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.63 (0.59)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.36 (0.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent. Structure</td>
<td>2.38 (0.57)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.73 (0.35)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.89 (0.53)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.68 (0.43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>1.70 (0.53)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.61 (0.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.63 (0.57)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.43 (0.49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>1.55 (0.58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 (0.49)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.41 (0.72)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.98 (0.78)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>1.68 (0.58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.71 (0.53)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.63 (0.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.34 (0.71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narr./Dialogue</td>
<td>2.25 (0.48)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75 (0.35)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.79 (0.48)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.64 (0.49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17.02 (4.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.84 (3.38)</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.77 (4.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.95 (4.71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 1, the Drama Group mean component scores ranged from $1.89 \pm 2 (0.72)$ in setting in the Pre-Treatment Story to $3.02 \pm 2 (0.44)$ in narration/dialogue in Story Three. Prior to the instructional unit, on average the Drama Group scored at the lower end of “minimally meets expectations” level in the nine components. In stories written during the unit, their scores showed a steady increase to where, on average, they were close to “fully meets expectations” by Story Three.

The mean total scores of the nine categories for the Drama Group ranged from $19.04 \pm 2 (5)$ for the Pre-Treatment Story, to $25.29 \pm 2 (4.29)$ for Story Three out of a possible total of 36. The scores increased with each story written. The greatest increase between successive stories was between the Pre-Treatment Story and Story One.

The Non-Drama Group mean component scores ranged from $1.55 \pm 2 (0.58)$ in setting in the Pre-Treatment Story, to $2.89 \pm 2 (0.53)$ in sentence structure in Story Two. Prior to the instructional unit, on average the Non-Drama Group scored just below the “minimally meets expectations” level in the nine components. In stories written during the unit, on average, their scores increased to midway between “minimally meets expectations” to “fully meets expectations”.

The mean total scores of the nine categories ranged from $17.02 \pm 2 (4.07)$ for the Pre-Treatment Story to $23.77 \pm 2 (4.81)$ for Story Two out of a possible total of 36. The scores showed a greater increase in Stories One and Two and a lower increase in Story Three. The greatest increase between successive stories was between the Pre-Treatment Story and Story One.
Table 2
*p*-Values for the Paired *t*-Test for Comparing Scores (Component and Total) for the Drama Group between the Pre-Treatment Story (S0), Story One (S1), Story Two (S2), and Story Three (S3) (*n* = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0</td>
<td>0.000283**</td>
<td>0.000222**</td>
<td>0.000010**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0.161179</td>
<td>0.118938</td>
<td>0.118938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.118938</td>
<td>0.118938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0</td>
<td>0.00039**</td>
<td>6.16E-05**</td>
<td>1.33E=05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0.214578</td>
<td>0.118938</td>
<td>0.118938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0.297142</td>
<td>0.118938</td>
<td>0.118938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0</td>
<td>0.00028**</td>
<td>3035E-05**</td>
<td>2.79E-07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0.049594*</td>
<td>0.01657*</td>
<td>0.01657*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0.004311**</td>
<td>0.01657*</td>
<td>0.01657*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0</td>
<td>0.0011**</td>
<td>0.0028**</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0.8514</td>
<td>0.3451</td>
<td>0.3451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0.4242</td>
<td>0.3451</td>
<td>0.3451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0</td>
<td>0.0173*</td>
<td>0.0008**</td>
<td>0.0098**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0.1288</td>
<td>0.8318</td>
<td>0.8318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0.1744</td>
<td>0.8318</td>
<td>0.8318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0</td>
<td>0.0000**</td>
<td>0.0000**</td>
<td>0.0000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0.8566</td>
<td>0.1058</td>
<td>0.1058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0.1177</td>
<td>0.1058</td>
<td>0.1058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0</td>
<td>0.0000**</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
<td>0.0000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0.4333</td>
<td>0.0011**</td>
<td>0.0011**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0.0648</td>
<td>0.0011**</td>
<td>0.0011**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0</td>
<td>0.0040**</td>
<td>0.0000**</td>
<td>0.0000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0.0034**</td>
<td>0.0016**</td>
<td>0.0016**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0.6209</td>
<td>0.0016**</td>
<td>0.0016**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narration/Dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0</td>
<td>0.0215*</td>
<td>0.0009**</td>
<td>0.0000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0.0129*</td>
<td>0.0028**</td>
<td>0.0028**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0.6209</td>
<td>0.0028**</td>
<td>0.0028**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0</td>
<td>9.065E-05**</td>
<td>9.25E-06**</td>
<td>1.15E-07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>3.06E-02**</td>
<td>6.08E-03**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.054E-01**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$

From Table 2, the Drama Group $p$-values associated with the $t$-tests performed for comparison of scores of the stories showed a significant ($p \leq 0.05$) or highly significant increase ($p \leq 0.01$) in all components in Stories One, Two, and Three over the Pre-Treatment Story. In addition, a highly or significant increase over Story One was seen in Stories Two and Three in audience, character, narration/dialogue, and details. Highly or significant increase over Story Two was seen in Story Three in audience. The total scores showed a highly significant increase ($p \leq 0.01$) over each of the stories written, indicating that the students’ stories showed a continuous and steady improvement as the unit progressed.
Table 3

\textit{p}-Values for the Paired $t$-Test for Comparing Scores (Component and Total) for the Non-
Drama Group between the Pre-Treatment Story (S0), Story One (S1), Story Two (S2),
and Story Three (S3) ($n = 27$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>S0 0.000000**</td>
<td>0.000001**</td>
<td>0.000048**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 0.691072</td>
<td>0.027787**↑</td>
<td>0.032844**↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td>S0 9.6E-07**</td>
<td>4.5E-07**</td>
<td>0.00529**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 0.174233</td>
<td>0.000895**↑</td>
<td>0.000625**↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>S0 2.18E-10**</td>
<td>1.03E-08**</td>
<td>1.93E-05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 0.174233</td>
<td>0.004311**↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S2 0.004311**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>S0 0.0166**</td>
<td>0.0006**</td>
<td>0.1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 0.0574**↑</td>
<td>0.4210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S2 0.0407**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Structure</td>
<td>S0 0.0006**</td>
<td>0.0000**</td>
<td>0.0103**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 0.1288</td>
<td>0.8318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S2 0.1744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>S0 0.0000**</td>
<td>0.0000**</td>
<td>0.0000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 0.8566</td>
<td>0.1058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S2 0.1177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>S0 0.0001**</td>
<td>0.0000**</td>
<td>0.0007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 0.0055**↑</td>
<td>0.8894</td>
<td>0.0096**↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>S0 0.0000**</td>
<td>0.0000**</td>
<td>0.0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 0.4210</td>
<td>0.0028**↑</td>
<td>0.0363**↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narr./Dialogue</td>
<td>S0 0.0000**</td>
<td>0.0000**</td>
<td>0.0008**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 0.6777</td>
<td>0.3121</td>
<td>0.1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 3, the Non-Drama Group $p$-values associated with the $t$-tests performed for comparison of scores of the stories showed a highly significant increase ($p \leq 0.01$) in Stories One, Two and Three over the Pre-Treatment Story with the exception of Story Three in language where the difference was not significant. However a highly or moderately significant decrease over Story One was seen in Story Two in language and setting, and in Story Three in ideas, detail, audience, and character. Also a highly or moderately significant decrease over Story Two was seen in Story Three in ideas, detail, audience, language, setting, and character.

The total scores showed a highly significant increase ($p \leq 0.01$) for Story One, Two, and Three over the Pre-Treatment Story as well as in Story Two over Story One. A highly significant decrease was seen in Story Three over Stories One and Two. The scores indicate that the students improved steadily in Stories One and Two but regressed in Story Three.
Table 4
Comparisons in Scores (Component and Total) between Drama and Non-Drama Group
p-Values for the Independent t-Test of Story One (S1), Story Two (S2), and Story Three (S3) (n = 27 in each group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>0.4788</td>
<td>0.2133</td>
<td>0.0005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td>0.51636</td>
<td>0.12081</td>
<td>2.01E-06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>0.889598</td>
<td>0.174809</td>
<td>0.00016**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>0.0510</td>
<td>0.5759</td>
<td>0.0070**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent. Structure</td>
<td>0.2485</td>
<td>0.5589</td>
<td>0.2283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>0.1119</td>
<td>0.0348*</td>
<td>0.0007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>0.0007*</td>
<td>0.1817</td>
<td>0.0000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>0.3963</td>
<td>0.0767</td>
<td>0.0003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narr./Dialogue</td>
<td>0.8706</td>
<td>0.2418</td>
<td>0.0039**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.6171</td>
<td>0.4274</td>
<td>0.0007**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p ≤ 0.05, ** p ≤ 0.01

From Table 4, when comparing the two groups, the Drama Group showed a highly significant greater increase (p ≤ 0.01) in scores in setting in Story One. The Non-Drama Group showed a significantly greater increase (p ≤ 0.05) in plot in Story Two. In Story Three, the Drama Group showed a highly significant greater increase (p ≤ 0.01) relative to the Non-Drama Group in the total score as well as in all components, with the exception of sentence structure.
Table 5
Mean and Standard Deviation of the Gain Scores (Component and Total) for the Drama and Non-Drama Groups from Preliminary Sample (S0) to Story One (S1), Story Two (S2), and Story Three (S3), (n = 27 in each group)

**Drama Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>S0 to S1</th>
<th>S0 to S2</th>
<th>S0 to S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>(0.63)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent. Structure</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>(0.78)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narr./Dialogue</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>(0.69)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>(5.04)</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Drama Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>S0 to S1</th>
<th>S0 to S2</th>
<th>S0 to S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>(0.59)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent. Structure</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>(0.53)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narr./Dialogue</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>(3.35)</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 5, the Drama Group mean component gains over the Pre-Treatment Story ranged from $0.32 \pm 2 (0.69)$ in narration/dialogue in Story One to $1.03 \pm 2 (0.63)$ in setting in Story Three. The mean gains increased with each story written where, on average, in Story One, the increase over the Pre-Treatment Story was somewhat less than a half a level (0.5), and in Story Three, the increase was close to full level (1.0) with the exception of sentence structure and language where the increases were minimal.

The mean total gains of the nine categories for the Drama Group ranged from $4.35 \pm 2 (5.04)$ for Story One to $6.25 \pm 2 (4.63)$ for Story Three. These translate to 12% and 17% increases respectively. The greatest gain was between the Pre-Treatment Story and Story One.

The Non-Drama Group component gains over the Pre-Treatment Story ranged from $0.14 \pm 2 (0.55)$ in language in Story Three to $1.035 \pm 2 (0.55)$ in character in Story One. The mean gains were greatest in Story One and Story Two where, on average, the gain was close to full level (1.0), with the exception of sentence structure, language, and narration/dialogue which were less than half a level (0.5). In Story Three the mean gains dropped to approximately a half of the ones seen in Story Two.

The mean total gains of the nine categories for the Non-Drama Group ranged from $3.92 \pm 2 (4.69)$ in Story Three to $6.75 \pm 2 (4.96)$ in Story Two. These translate to 11% and 18% respectively. The greatest gain was between the Pre-Treatment Story and Story Two and the smallest gain was between the Pre-Treatment Story and Story Three.
Table 6
*p-Values for the Paired t-Test for Gains in Scores (Component and Total) for the Drama Group in Story One (S1), Story Two (S2), and Story Three (S3) over the Pre-Treatment Story (S0) (n = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>S0-S2</th>
<th>S0-S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S1</td>
<td>0.1189</td>
<td>0.0696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S2</td>
<td>0.7221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S1</td>
<td>0.214578</td>
<td>0.01657*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S2</td>
<td>0.297142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S1</td>
<td>0.049594*</td>
<td>0.020362*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S1</td>
<td>0.8514</td>
<td>0.3451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S2</td>
<td>0.4242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent. Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S1</td>
<td>0.1288</td>
<td>0.8318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S2</td>
<td>0.1744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S1</td>
<td>0.1742</td>
<td>0.2812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S2</td>
<td>0.5226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S1</td>
<td>0.4333</td>
<td>0.0011**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S2</td>
<td>0.0648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S1</td>
<td>0.0034**</td>
<td>0.0016**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S2</td>
<td>0.6209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narr./Dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S1</td>
<td>0.0129**</td>
<td>0.0028**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S2</td>
<td>0.6289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S1</td>
<td>0.030558*</td>
<td>0.006082**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0-S2</td>
<td>0.554159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p ≤ 0.05, ** p ≤ 0.01

From Table 6, the Drama Group p-values associated with the t-tests performed for the gains showed a significant increase between the stories in five components: detail (S0-S1 to S0-S3, p ≤ 0.05), audience (S0-S1 to S0-S2 and S0-S3, p ≤ 0.05), setting (S0-
S1 to S0-S3, $p \leq 0.01$), character (S0-S1 to S0-S2 and S0-S3, $p \leq 0.01$), and

narration/dialogue (S0-S1 to S0-S2 and S0-S3, $p \leq 0.01$). The total scores showed a

significant increase ($p \leq 0.05$) from S0-S1 to S0-S2 and a highly significant increase ($p \leq$

0.01) from S0-S1 to S0-S3. As the instructional unit progressed, the gains in the Drama

Group stories became more frequently significant in both selected components as well as

in the total score.
Table 7
*p-Values for the Paired *t*-Test for Gains in Scores (Component and Total) for the Non-Drama Group in Story One (S1), Story Two (S2), and Story Three (S3) over the Pre-Treatment Story (S0) (*n* = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>S0 - S2</th>
<th>S0 - S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S1</td>
<td>0.6908</td>
<td>0.0143**↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S1</td>
<td>0.174233</td>
<td>0.000895**↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000619**↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S1</td>
<td>0.0478*</td>
<td>0.4210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0407**↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent. Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S1</td>
<td>0.0364*</td>
<td>0.5868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0371**↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S1</td>
<td>0.8566</td>
<td>0.1058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S1</td>
<td>0.0055**</td>
<td>0.8894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0096**↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S1</td>
<td>0.4210</td>
<td>0.0028**↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narr./Dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S1</td>
<td>0.6777</td>
<td>0.3121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S1</td>
<td>0.21663</td>
<td>0.013023**↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * *p* ≤ 0.05, ** *p* ≤ 0.01; ↑ = decrease (negative direction of effect)

From Table 7, the Non-Drama Group *p*-values associated with the *t*-tests performed for the gains showed a significant increase between the stories in four components: language and sentence structure (S0-S1 to S0-S2, *p* ≤ 0.05 and S0-S2 to S0-
A significant or highly significant decrease was found in seven components: ideas (S0-S1 to S0-S3, $p \leq 0.01$ and S0-S2 to S0-S3, $p \leq 0.05$), details (S0-S1 to S0-S3, $p \leq 0.01$ and S0-S2 to S0-S3, $p \leq 0.01$), audience (S0-S1 to S0-S3, $p \leq 0.01$ and S0-S2 to S0-S3, $p \leq 0.01$), language (S0-S2 to S0-S3, $p \leq 0.05$), sentence structure (S0-S2 to S0-S3, $p \leq 0.05$), setting (S0-S2 to S0-S3, $p \leq 0.01$), and character (S0-S1 to S0-S3, $p \leq 0.01$ and S0-S2 to S0-S3, $p \leq 0.01$). The total scores showed a highly significant decrease ($p \leq 0.01$) from S0-S1 to S0-S3 and from S0-S2 to S0-S3. At the end of the instructional unit, the Non-Drama Group showed negative gains in Story Three over Story One and Story Two.
Table 8
*p*-Values for the Independent *t*-Test for Gains in Scores (Components and Total)
Comparisons between Drama and Non-Drama Group in Story One (S1), Story Two (S2), and Story Three (S3) over the Pre-Treatment Story (S0) (*n* = 27 in each group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>S0 – S1</th>
<th>S0-S2</th>
<th>S0-S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>0.0667</td>
<td>0.4242</td>
<td>0.2245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td>0.501202</td>
<td>0.423605</td>
<td>0.038465*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>0.02198*</td>
<td>0.397202</td>
<td>0.207468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>0.4133</td>
<td>0.7258</td>
<td>0.0496*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent. Structure</td>
<td>0.9129</td>
<td>0.7278</td>
<td>0.9114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>0.1610</td>
<td>0.6211</td>
<td>0.7692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>0.1144</td>
<td>0.7501</td>
<td>0.0005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>0.0028**</td>
<td>0.6216</td>
<td>0.2468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narr./Dialogue</td>
<td>0.2353</td>
<td>0.9191</td>
<td>0.1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.207318</td>
<td>0.534299</td>
<td>0.068334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * *p* ≤ 0.05, ** *p* ≤ 0.01

From Table 8, the Drama Group showed significantly greater gains in selected components relative to the Non-Drama Group. In the Pre-Treatment Story to Story One the gains of the Drama Group were significantly greater than the gains of the Non-Drama Group in audience (*p* ≤ 0.05) and character (*p* ≤ 0.01). In the Pre-Treatment Story to Story Three the gains of the Drama Group were significantly greater than the gains of the Non-Drama Group in details (*p* ≤ 0.05), language (*p* ≤ 0.05) and setting (*p* ≤ 0.01).
Results for Differences in Word Count, Dialogue, and Perspective in the Pre-Treatment and Subsequent Three Stories

Word Count

Results for the Drama and the Non-Drama Groups in the Pre-Treatment Story, Story One, Story Two, and Story Three are displayed in Tables 9-14.

Table 9
Mean and Standard Deviation of the Word Count for the Drama and Non-Drama Group in Pre-Treatment Story (S0), Story One (S1), Story Two (S2), and Story Three (S3) (n = 27 in each group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drama Group</th>
<th>S0</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>428.21</td>
<td>662.71</td>
<td>695.79</td>
<td>1004.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>223.36</td>
<td>322.93</td>
<td>365.58</td>
<td>845.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Drama Group</th>
<th>S0</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>266.93</td>
<td>490.54</td>
<td>513.79</td>
<td>426.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>101.27</td>
<td>210.28</td>
<td>216.20</td>
<td>249.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 9, the Drama Group mean word count ranged from 428.25 ± 2 (223.36) for the Pre-Treatment Story, to 1004.75 ± 2 (845.66) for Story Three. As the unit progressed, each successive story the students wrote increased in length over the Pre-Treatment Story. The greatest increase was from Story Two to Story Three.
The Non-Drama Group mean word count ranged from $266.93 \pm 2$ (101.27) for the Pre-Treatment Story, to $513.79 \pm 2$ (216.20) for Story Two. As was the case with the Drama Group, there was an increase in length in each of the three stories written over the Pre-Treatment Story, however, unlike the Drama Group, Story Three showed the smallest increase and fell below the one seen in Stories One and Two.

Table 10

*p-Values for the Paired t-Test Comparing Word Count for the Drama and Non-Drama Group between the Pre-Treatment Story (S0), Story One (S1), Story Two (S2), and Story Three (S3) (n = 27 in each group)*

**Drama Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S0</td>
<td>0.0035**</td>
<td>0.0014**</td>
<td>0.0012**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0223*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Drama Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S0</td>
<td>0.000004**</td>
<td>0.000001**</td>
<td>0.001840**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.573016</td>
<td>0.138254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.107336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 10, the Drama Group p-values associated with the t-tests performed for comparison of mean word count between the stories showed a highly significant increase ($p \leq 0.01$) in Stories One, Two, and Three over the Pre-Treatment Story. A
significant increase \((p \leq 0.05)\) was also seen between Story One and Story Three as well as between Story Two and Story Three.

The Non-Drama Group \(p\)-values associated with the \(t\)-tests performed for the comparison of word count between the stories also showed a highly significant increase \((p \leq 0.01)\) in Stories One, Two, and Three over the Pre-Treatment Story. Unlike the Drama Group, however, no other significant differences were seen.

### Table 11
\(p\)-Values for the Independent \(t\)-Test for Word Count Comparison between Drama and Non-Drama Group of Story One (S1), Story Two (S2), and Story Three (S3) 
\((n = 27 in each group)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0223*</td>
<td>0.0283*</td>
<td>0.0015**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * \(p \leq 0.05\), ** \(p \leq 0.01\)

From Table 11, the Drama Group showed a significantly greater \((p \leq 0.05)\) mean word count over the Pre-Treatment Story in Story One and Two than Non-Drama Group. In Story Three, the Drama Group showed a highly significant greater word count \((p \leq 0.01)\) relative to the Non-Drama Group.
Table 12
Mean and Standard Deviation Gains of Word Count for Drama and Non-Drama Groups from Preliminary Sample (S0) to Story 1 (S1), Story 2 (S2), and Story 3 (S3), (n = 27 in each group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Drama Group</th>
<th>Non-Drama Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S0 to S1</td>
<td>S0 to S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>234.50</td>
<td>267.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>(387.90)</td>
<td>(396.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>223.61</td>
<td>246.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>(206.68)</td>
<td>(211.37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 12, the Drama Group gain in mean word count over the Pre-Treatment Story ranged from 234.50 ± 2 (387.90) in Story One to 576.54 ± 2 (846.48) in Story Three. The gains increased with each story written.

The Non-Drama Group gain in mean word count over the Pre-Treatment Story ranged from 159.68 ± 2 (244.65) in Story Three to 246.86 ± 2 (211.37) in Story Two. The gains in Story One and Two were similar to the Drama Group, however, unlike the Drama Group, least gains were made in Story Three.
Table 13
*p*-Values for the Paired *t*-Test Gains for Word Count for Drama Group and Non-Drama Group in Story One (S1), Story Two (S2), and Story Three (S3) over the Pre-Treatment Story (S0) (*n* = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Drama Group</th>
<th>Non-Drama Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S0 - S2</td>
<td>S0 - S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S1</td>
<td>0.5631</td>
<td>0.0191**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0 - S2</td>
<td>0.0223*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * *p* < 0.05, ** *p* < 0.01

From Table 13, the Drama Group *p*-values associated with the *t*-tests performed for word count gains showed a significant increase between the stories S0-S1 to S0-S3 as well as S0-S2 to S0-S3. There were no significant results for gains in word count between stories in the Non-Drama Group.

Table 14
*p*-Values for the Independent *t*-Test Gains for Comparing Word Count between Drama and Non-Drama Group in Story One (S1), Story Two (S2), and Story Three (S3) over the Pre-Treatment Story (S0) (*n* = 27 in each group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S0 - S1</th>
<th>S0-S2</th>
<th>S0-S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8963</td>
<td>0.8084</td>
<td>0.0178*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 14, the Drama Group showed a significantly greater gain (*p* < 0.05) in word count in Story Three when compared to the Non-Drama Group.
Dialogue

Results for the Drama and the Non-Drama Group in the Pre-Treatment Story, Story One, Story Two, and Story Three are displayed in Tables 15-17.

Table 15
Percent of Dialogue of Total Text for the Drama and Non-Drama Group in Pre-Treatment Story (S0), Story One (S1), Story Two (S2), and Story Three (S3)
(n = 27 in each group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drama Group</th>
<th>S0</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>(7.74)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>(9.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>(10.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.74</td>
<td>(11.95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Drama Group</th>
<th>S0</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>(8.32)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>(10.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>(7.58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>(10.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 15, the Drama Group percent of dialogue of total text ranged from 7.04 ± 2 (7.74) for the Pre-Treatment Story, to 18.25 ± 2 (11.95) for Story Three.

The Non-Drama Group percent of dialogue of total text ranged from 4.71 ± 2 (8.32) for the Pre-Treatment Story, to 9.57 ± 2 (10.14) for Story Three.
Table 16

*p*-Values for the Paired *t*-Test Comparing Percent of Dialogue of Total Text for Drama and Non-Drama Group between the Pre-Treatment Story (S0), Story One (S1), Story Two (S2), and Story Three (S3) (*n* = 27 in each group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Drama Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Drama Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0</td>
<td>0.001548**</td>
<td>0.000447**</td>
<td>0.000511**</td>
<td>0.081347</td>
<td>0.007313**</td>
<td>0.038339*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0.356393</td>
<td>0.512231</td>
<td>0.847921</td>
<td>0.626192</td>
<td>0.642441</td>
<td>0.96265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * *p* ≤ 0.05, ** *p* ≤ 0.01

From Table 16, the Drama Group percent of dialogue of total text between the stories showed a highly significant increase in Stories One, Two, and Three over the Pre-Treatment Story.

Non-Drama Group percent of dialogue of total text between the stories showed a highly significant increase in Story Two and significant increase in Story Three over the Pre-Treatment Story.
Table 17
*p*-Values for the Independent *t*-Test for Comparing Percent of Dialogue of Total Text between Drama and Non-Drama Group of Story One (S1), Story Two (S2), and Story Three (S3) (*n* = 27 in each group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.009816**</td>
<td>0.001281**</td>
<td>0.0012229**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * * * * 0.05, ** * * 0.01

From Table 17, the Drama Group showed a highly significant greater

(*p* ≤ 0.01) percent of dialogue of total text in Stories One, Two, and Three over the Pre-

Treatment Story relative to the Non-Drama Group.

**Perspective**

The results for the Pre-Treatment Story and Stories One and Three are displayed

in Table 18.

Table 18
Number of Students in the Drama and Non-Drama Group Using First Person Narration in the Pre-Treatment Story (S0), Story One (S1) and Story Three (S3) (*n* = 27 in each group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Non-Drama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 18, seventeen students wrote their Pre-Treatment Story in the first

person in each of the Drama and the Non-Drama Groups. Approximately the same

number of students continued to write in the first person in the Drama Group in Stories
One and Three whereas the number was reduced to approximately a half for the Non-Drama Group.

Results of the two proportions independent samples $t$-test indicate that for Story One, the value of the tests statistic $Z$ is 2.2544 and its $p$-value is 0.0121. For Story Three, the value of the tests statistic $Z$ is 2.4768 and its $p$-value is 0.0066. The results indicate that the use of first person narration used by the Drama Group is significantly higher in both Story One ($p<0.01$) and in Story Three ($p<0.02$).

Results for Selected Points of Interest Specific to Each Story

The results for Story One: character (number of embarrassing events); Story Two: plot (diversions from the story line); and Story Three: setting (description approach); are displayed in Tables 19 – 21 respectively.

Table 19
Number of Embarrassing Events and Corresponding Statements found in Story One of the Drama and Non-Drama Group ($n = 27$ in each group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Embarrassing Moment</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Non-Drama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponding Statements</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that the Drama Group used approximately twice as many statements relating to an embarrassing moment than the Non-Drama Group.
Table 20  
**Number of Students Incorporating Major Changes to the Original Version of Pied Piper of Hamelin by the Drama and the Non-Drama Group (n=27 in each group)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Non-Drama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 20, the results show that 16 of the 27 students in the Drama Group and 7 of 27 in the Non-Drama Group made major changes to the story. The results of the two proportions independent samples $t$-test to establish if the proportion of students making changes in the Drama Group is larger than the proportion in the Non-Drama Group. The calculated value of the two proportions independent samples $t$-test is $Z$ is 2.7386 and its $p$-value is 0.0031. The results indicate that a highly significant ($p<0.01$) greater number of students in the Drama Group made major changes to the story as compared to the Non-Drama Group.

Table 21  
**Number of Occurrences where Setting is Named, Described, and Described as it Relates to Plot/Character by the Drama and Non-Drama Group (n = 27 in each group)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Non-Drama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Named</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Described</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Described as it relates to plot/character</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the two proportions independent samples $t$-test showed that for number of occurrences where the setting is named only, the value of the test statistic is 4.899 and its $p$-value is 0 indicating a significantly greater proportion of occurrences by the Non-Drama Group using this type of reference. The number of occurrences where
the setting is described, the value of the test statistic is 0.0127 and its p-value is 0.238 indicating there is no significant difference in the proportion of occurrences between the Non-Drama and the Drama Group using this type of reference. For the occurrences of the setting described as it relates to plot/character, the test statistic is 5.7886 and its p-value is 0, indicating a significantly greater proportion of occurrences by the Drama Group using this type of reference.

**Attitude**

_Results for Students' Reflective Journals_

*Prewriting and Story Writing*

Two major topic areas emerged: (1) commentary relating to the prewriting activities, and (2) commentary relating to the content of students' stories and to the process of their story writing. I found that most of the text in the Drama Group dealt with the drama prewriting activity whereas in the Non-Drama Group the text was more equally divided between commentary on the lesson/discussion prewriting activity and commentary on the story writing activity. Exact figures are displayed in Table 22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Non-Drama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Story and Story Writing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prewriting Activities</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, I found that both groups made overwhelmingly positive comments about the prewriting activities and, for both groups, the comments about the story writing process were divided approximately evenly between feeling positive and neutral. The negative comments about either of the two subjects, story writing or prewriting, comprised a small portion for both groups. Tables 23 and 24 display these results.

Table 23
Percent of Total Text of Positive, Negative, and Neutral Statements related to the Major Topics that Emerged in Student Reflective Journals by the Drama Group (n = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Story and Story Writing</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prewriting Activities</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24
Percent of Total Text of Positive, Negative, and Neutral Statements related to the Major Topics that Emerged in Student Reflective Journals by the Non-Drama Group (n = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Story and Story Writing</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prewriting Activities</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of Comments

The same patterns emerged for both the Drama and the Non-Drama Groups when I examined the positive, negative, and neutral comment sections of the students' journals. I found that with respect to comments on their stories and story writing, for both groups the positive statements included enjoying writing, noticing improvement in their writing,
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and being happy with the progress they are making. The negative comments, for both groups, included not enjoying writing and finding certain aspects of writing difficult. The neutral comments, for both groups, included describing the process of their writing and describing the story they are writing. The results are displayed in Table 24.

Table 24
Number of Positive, Negative, and Neutral Statements in Student Reflective Journals by the Drama and Non-Drama Groups on their Stories and their Story Writing Experience (n = 27 in each group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Non-Drama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy Writing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Improved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy with Story Progress</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Non-Drama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Enjoy Writing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing is Difficult</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Non-Drama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Writing Progress</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Plot</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comments on the prewriting activities for the Drama and Non-Drama Group differed, yielding their own categories. For the Drama Group, the most frequently occurring positive comments were that doing drama is fun and that it helped their story writing by getting ideas. Additional comments related to helping to make the story longer, putting in detail, and helping with character development. The negative comments about the drama activities were that students didn’t need drama to generate ideas for them, that they either received no ideas or they didn’t like them, the drama didn’t work
because of lack of cooperation or inability to participate, and that they needed more time
to do drama and to write. The results are displayed in Tables 25 and 26.

Table 25
Number of Students Using Positive Statements on the Prewriting Activity and/or its Impact on Story Writing in Student Reflective Journals by the Drama Group (n = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detail</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26
Number of Students Using Negative Statements on the Prewriting Activity and/or its Impact on Story Writing in Student Reflective Journals by the Drama Group (n = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rejected Ideas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Ideas</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama Doesn't Work</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Drama Time Needed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Writing Time Needed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Non-Drama Group, the most frequent positive comment was that the lessons/discussions were useful. Additional comments related to helping with ideas, character, setting, introduction, and ending.
Negative comments about the prewriting activities were that they didn’t need the
discussion to get ideas, discussions didn’t work because people didn’t cooperate, and
more time to write was needed. Results are displayed in Tables 27 and 28.

Table 27
Number of Students Using Positive Statements on the Prewriting Activity and/or its
Impact on Story Writing in Student Reflective Journals by the Non-Drama Group
(n = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28
Number of Students Using Negative Statements on the Prewriting Activity and/or its
Impact on Story Writing in Student Reflective Journals by the Non-Drama Group
(n = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t Work</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Writing Time Needed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific Comments on Prewriting Activities and Story Writing

Overall Impression

Every student in the Drama Group, in at least one entry, made a positive comment
about the drama activity and/or its impact on the writing. The consensus was that "doing
drama makes learning fun” and a third of the students indicated it made writing easier. Examples of comments are “the drama thing is fun and it gives you thoughts of what to do and say in your story, it makes your story easier to write”. From another student, “We acted out a part of my story that I was having trouble writing, now I am not having trouble writing it”. And a somewhat convoluted statement with similar sentiment, “When you’re writing you would think how fun you were having when you were acting so while you’re thinking that in your own mind you will be having fun.” When commenting on their stories or story writing independently of the drama connection, most students remarked “I think my story is going well” and/or “I like writing these short stories.”

In the Non-Drama Group, less than half of these students made a reference to the lessons/discussions prewriting activities and the rest of the comments dealt with describing their stories or their story writing progress. Whereas the overriding sentiment in the Drama Group was that drama prewriting activities were fun, this group’s feeling with regard to lesson/discussion activities is that The class discussion mostly help with ways to write. Students commented that they learned different elements of short story writing. A student explains, “the class discussions and partner work before writing the stories helped because I know what to do and know how to do a part in the story like how to say things or how to write things” and “from the lessons I have learned, they have been very helpful to improve my writing” or “before I had these lessons I couldn’t write good stories but now I know I can.” As was the case with the Drama Group, most students said they were happy with their story writing progress, “The story is going good” and/or “my writing is getting more enjoyable.”
Ideas

The topic of ideas was a recurring theme in the Drama students' journals where the most common statement was "acting out our stories gave me a lot of ideas". For the most part, the students were pleased about the ideas generated within drama and they felt the activities benefited the writing of their stories. Students reported different ways in which the generated ideas were beneficial to them. They stated the story could be improved: "Drama helps a lot it gives you ideas that can definitely make your story more interesting." They were able to add more detail: "Ron gave me a good idea about not just breaking his board but by breaking it with a sledge hammer and sawing off the wheels by a saw". The stories were longer: "I think acting the parts out helped the story progress, my story filled out it lengthened". And established clarity: "the drama before we went to write really helped me form the story, there were some parts I did not think would fit in properly but they did."

Negative comments about the generation of ideas were threefold. First, four students reported they helped the other members of their group with ideas but they themselves did not receive any. Three of these students, however, in a different journal entry, said they did get ideas. Second, five students indicated that they were not interested in getting ideas from others as they preferred to use their own. Again, in another entry, three of these spoke favourably about receiving ideas from others. Lastly, two students stated they did not like the ideas that were generated through the drama. The following journal entry encapsulates all three of the above complaints, "Today I was with Les and Jamie, we didn't have enough time to do mine. I think I can think of a better
story than with using the drama, it gives you some ideas but they are not always what you want, some people don't follow how you want to go”

Although not as numerous or detailed, the Non-Drama Group also made statements indicating that the lessons and discussion prewriting activities gave them ideas. The comments were general such as, “I like the discussions because when we work as a group it gives me lots more ideas” or “while I was discussing things with my partner, she gave me more ideas to add to my story”. Others were more specific, “From the partner discussions I have made my events better, I have thought of what should happen in that event and how long the main part should be” or “seeing other people’s way of writing kind of showed me new techniques of writing.”

The two negative comments on idea generation were similar. “The class discussions and group work before writing stories did not help me get ideas because I think I can do my story just fine by myself” and “the discussions don't really help me with ideas, I just want to write.”

Character

Specific mention was also made by the students as to ways in which the prewriting activities helped with character development. In the Drama Group, a student explains, “Acting out helps because it is easier to imagine what the characters are like” and “you can almost think of them as real people”. Another student illustrates, “I can feel what it would be like for the characters, by pretending to be in their situation walking up to that scary house could show me maybe how they would walk or what they would say”. In another entry a student demonstrates how he gained more clarity, “The
scene where the Galactic Voyager's engines overheat was helped by acting it out mostly because it was easier to understand who Pearl was and what was happening in her mind.” The drama was also helpful with communication between characters, "the acting out also helps develop the interaction between characters. I discovered that yesterday while we acted out the meeting, you know a little bit about your character and your partners know a little bit about their character, when you act it out you can really imagine how the characters would work together". Lastly, through improvisation new behaviours for characters were developed, “when she was acting out my main character she made her making supper for Chad which gave an action for her to do”.

The one negative comment in the Drama Group that dealt specifically with character was with conflict in portrayal, “the acting ruins it, my partner didn’t act the way my character should in the story, it took all the excitement out of the story, boring is what it became... I wanted them to be the hero in my story but he was turned into a fat lazy slob, I was not happy”.

Like the Drama Group, comments made by the Non-Drama Group about the impact of prewriting activities on character development were positive and numerous. Unlike the Drama Group, however, the comments were succinct and general without elaboration on how they might have been of assistance. Typical comments were, “I liked discussing, it would help you improve things on character”, “I’ve learned lots such as how to write about character”, or “I’ve learned how to describe the character better and express what they are saying.” One student was somewhat more explicit, “I remember the format better with conversations and doing character”. No negative comments were made.
Setting

For both groups less commentary related to setting. In the Drama Group, several students indicated that by picturing themselves in different situations through drama, they were able to envision the surrounding. A student explains, "I think that doing drama gives us more of an idea of what’s happening and how the characters feel and what the character would see in the situation you are in and how it would look around you like if there is a big warehouse you could imagine how it looks and then add more detail.” There were no negative comments on this subject.

The Non-Drama Group’s comments about setting were phrased vaguely as was the case when referring to character. The following provide examples: “I learned more about setting” and “The other thing that made my stories better are the overhead presentations, it helped my setting.” As with the Drama Group, there were no negative comments.

Process Observations from Researcher’s Fieldnotes

The project began on a positive note. Both groups looked forward to writing short stories and expressed excitement about taking part in a study. In general, they responded favourably to the choice of topics and were pleased with the latitude they were given for the individual choice within them.

The activities in which the Non-Drama Group was involved, teacher-prepared lessons with associated whole-class and small-group or partner discussions, were typical of their experiences in school and the students also responded in a typical fashion. Generally they were on task during the teacher-directed activities and the level of their
engagement during the less structured partner or small group discussions depended on individual students’ interest or their ability to focus. To this effect, I noted that most students were highly engaged for the duration of the Pre-Treatment Story, September 11th and Story One, embarrassing moment, as well as for Story Two, the rewrite of the Pied Piper of Hamelin. In the final story, however, there was a noticeable decline in student participation during activities that required self regulation. I found myself having to provide prompts and reminders to stay on task during both, small group/partner discussions as well as when students were drafting their stories in the latter part of the lessons.

My observation of the Drama Group is that the students stayed equally on task as the Non-Drama Group for the writing of the September 11th Pre-Treatment Story, as well as during the teacher directed mini-lesson segments of the lessons. Unlike the Non-Drama Group, however, the students appeared to remain highly involved during the prewriting activities, improvisations, and the follow up drafting of their stories throughout the entire course of the unit. The difference that I noticed for this group was not in the level of engagement but rather in the level of efficiency with which they conducted their improvisations. In the first week of Story One, the students displayed both excessive excitement and confusion. Although I had role modeled the activity and provided explicit directions as to how and where to enact the scenes, much time was spent in organizing their groups and deciding which segment to improvise. During these first improvisations, the level of participation in the improvisations of the students often varied between being overly subdued, where students used minimal dialogue and/or expression, to overly active, where students were vocal and boisterous but not successful
in developing or fleshing out the given story outlines. I found myself circulating from
group to group providing much needed assistance in guiding students to maximize their
drama experience. As time progressed, however, I noted an increase in effective
commitment to the drama. Students showed greater focus and self control, less self
consciousness, more cooperation within groups, and a greater ability to listen, respond,
and, in the process, develop their scenes. I found the students were solving their own
problems and my intervention was less and less necessary. In Story Two, where I
sometimes participated as Teacher-in-Role in the dramatization of The Pied Piper of
Hamelin with the whole class, the students also showed a high level of involvement. By
Story Three, students appeared to be very comfortable and knowledgeable in conducting
their improvisations; they moved easily from task to task, and they drafted their stories
without incident.

Summary

The results of my analysis of the data are summarized in this chapter. The data
collected included a Pre-Treatment Story and Story One, Two, and Three written after
exposure to prewriting activities. As well, I analyzed the student reflective journals and
my field notes. The impact of the prewriting activities was assessed through two
measures: (a) the content of Stories One, Two, and Three compared to the Pre-Treatment
Stories and (b) student attitudes towards the writing activities as indicated in their
reflective journals and as well as my observations of them.

There were five stages to this analysis: First, I assessed the stories using a BC
Performance Standards guide. Both the Drama Group and the Non-Drama Group showed
a significant improvement in scores over their Pre-Treatment Stories in all three stories written following the prewriting instruction, for both the total score, as well as in the nine components measured. When comparing these scores between the Drama and the Non-Drama Group, the Drama Group showed significantly greater improvement in setting in Story One and in all components measured, with the exception of sentence structure, in Story Three. The Non-Drama Group showed significantly greater improvement, relative to the Drama Group, in plot in Story Two. Similar to the findings for comparison in scores, both the Drama and the Non-Drama Groups showed a significant gain in scores over the Pre-Treatment Story with the exception of Story Three for the Non-Drama Group where the gain was not significant. A comparison between the gains of the two groups showed a significantly greater gain by the Drama Group in audience and character in Story One, and details, language, and setting in Story Three.

Second, using my pilot study as a guide, I assessed all stories for word count, dialogue use, and perspective. I found that both the Drama Group and the Non-Drama Group showed a statistically significant greater word count in all three stories over their Pre-Treatment Story and, when compared to one another, the Drama Group showed a significantly greater word count in Stories One, Two, and Three relative to the Non-Drama Group. For the amount of dialogue use, it was significantly greater over the Pre-Treatment Story in Stories One, Two, and Three in the Drama Group. The Non-Drama Group showed a significant increase only in Story Two. When comparing the two groups, the Drama Group showed a significantly greater use of dialogue in all three stories relative to the Non-Drama Group. With regard to first person narration, the incidence of students continuing to write stories from that perspective after prewriting
instruction was statistically higher for the Drama Group than the Non-Drama Group in the two stories analyzed, Story One and Story Three.

Third, I assessed the prevalence of chosen points of interest in each of the three stories. In Story One, character, I found that the Drama Group made approximately twice as many references to characters’ feelings, words and/or actions when describing an embarrassing event than the Non-Drama Group. In Story Two, plot, I found the Drama Group adapted the original version when rewriting Pied Piper of Hamelin approximately twice as many times as the Non-Drama Group. In Story Three, setting, I found the Drama Group’s information about setting was more frequently described as it related to plot/character relative to the Non-Drama Group and in the Non-Drama Group the setting was more frequently just named or described relative to the Drama Group.

Fourth, I assessed students’ attitude using their reflective journals. Both the Drama and the Non-Drama Groups made mostly positive comments about the writing project. The Drama Group commented primarily on the pre-writing drama activities whereas the Non-Drama Group’s comments dealt slightly more with their stories and the story writing process than the pre-writing activities. The Drama Group’s main comment about the prewriting activity was that it was fun and it provided them with ideas for their story writing. The main comment by the Non-Drama Group was that the lessons and discussions were useful and they helped them develop skills for short story writing. Negative comments, by both groups, were less frequent. The complaints were that the drama or discussions were either unnecessary, useless, or ineffective and that more time was needed for writing. The Drama Group also stated there was not enough time for drama.
Fifth, I made observations on the student participation in the lessons. I found that both groups were keen at the beginning of the project, the Drama Group remained interested throughout, and the Non-Drama lost interest towards the latter part. The Non-Drama Group was able to participate with ease in the prewriting activities. In comparison, the Drama Group experienced difficulties at the beginning but, as the unit progressed, they worked more efficiently and comfortably.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION

I begin the discussion with the most broad and simple statement that sums up this study—students who participated in creative drama prewriting activities found the experience, in general, to be positive and, towards the end of the instructional unit, wrote better stories than students who participated in a lesson/discussion prewriting activities.

Content

Level of Performance

The results of the total scores, as well as the nine components measured in this study, support the view that creative drama is an effective option to include in prewriting when composing short stories. The results also indicate that this instructional method is a particularly effective strategy when carried out over an extended period of time. I base my statements on the following information.

First, the students who experienced drama showed better results for gains made from one story to another. They also received higher scores in each of the three stories they wrote after the onset of instruction over the Pre-Treatment Story. Although there was no significant difference in the Drama Group’s score in Story One or Story Two as compared to the Non-Drama Group, the Drama Group scored higher than the Non-Drama Group on Story Three both in total score, and on all but one of the components—sentence structure. The fact that there was no significant difference in sentence structure between the two groups is reasonable. Neither group received direct instruction in this area during
the unit and thus neither had the opportunity to respond to a particular treatment. Also, in a 1990 study by Chiste and O’Shea on writing performance and prewriting activities, results showed that conventions, such as spelling, punctuation, and sentence structure were least affected.

Second, these findings indicate that the drama prewriting strategy gathers strength with extended exposure. The total scores, as well as virtually all component scores, increased steadily with each story written. The Non-Drama Group’s scores, on the other hand, increased in Stories One and Two, but dropped in Story Three to a level below that achieved in the previous two stories. This difference in performance levels between the two groups in Story Three may be connected to the fact that, unlike the previous two stories where the topic was provided, in Story Three it was open ended. In the case of the Non-Drama Group, where explicit teaching and teacher-led discussion was used, the common topics allowed more opportunity for me to use examples related to that topic. Students could later use these examples as templates and incorporate them into their own stories. When the topic was open ended, this opportunity was diminished and may have contributed to the drop in scores. In comparison, the prewriting strategy of dramatization helped students to develop more ownership and self-regulation of the composition process so they were not as dependent on teacher guidance.

Another explanation for the difference in scores in the third story is that the learning experience differed for the Drama Group. Instead of using understandings gained from direct teaching and the follow-up discussions to develop their stories, these students used the experience of their improvisations. It appears that, as the students became more familiar with the drama activity, their story writing improved. Also, the
continued improvement suggests that once the students demonstrated growth in a specific component, that is, once the learning was acquired in setting development for example, it became a part of their long term skill set.

**Word Count**

When viewing the word count results for the Drama and the Non-Drama Group, I noted that they parallel the scores the students received in their level of performance. In both instances, in all three stories, the Drama Group had greater word count than the Non-Drama Group and in Story Three, the Drama Group also showed a greater gain in length. Moreover, both groups showed gains over their Pre-Treatment Story in the first two stories, but in the third, where the Drama Group continued to show a steady increase, the Non-Drama Group’s word count dropped to below the level of what was achieved in Stories One and Two.

A correlation between the two can, to a certain extent, be expected. Although I recognize that ‘more’ does not necessarily mean better as excessive rambling raises word count, a common difficulty observed in young writers is not providing enough text to develop the story. The fact that the Drama Group’s total scores for level of performance were higher as the word count increased, indicates that the students in the Drama Group did indeed write effectively instead of simply rambling. Increased attention to detail, a component in which the Drama Group scored significantly higher, for example, can produce more text. Regardless of the specifics responsible for the word count increase, it does appear that those students who experienced drama had more to say than those who did not.
Dialogue

The results for dialogue are consistent with the findings I obtained in my pilot study. The Drama Group showed greater use of dialogue in all three stories over the Non-Drama Group. In addition, the Drama Group also showed higher scores in Story Three in the narration/dialogue component. This means that the Drama Group not only used more dialogue but the dialogue was effective, that is, easy to follow and served to add interest to the story and characters. These findings suggest that in the creative drama forum, the students were able to practice and develop dialogue that is natural and believable. This reasoning is supported in the Ministry of Education curricular guideline (1995) which states that drama encourages development of different forms of language, one of which is dialogue.

First Person Narration

Similar to Tritter's (1981) study where 3 of 11 participants in the Drama Group used first person narration compared to none in the alternate group, in this study the Drama Group also choose to write from this perspective more frequently. More than twice as many students in the Drama Group used first person narration compared with the Non-Drama Group. Possibly, the students who took the role of a main character in their improvisations, were also prone to write their stories from the first person perspective. For some students, the events affecting the character in the drama activity would have become the writer's experience. This feeling of personal ownership of the character may in turn have prompted these students to write in the first person.
Interesting to note is that in this study, the use of first person narration was approximately the same in the Pre-Treatment Story and subsequent stories for the Drama Group but dropped to approximately a half in the subsequent stories in the Non-Drama Group. It seems that the drama prewriting activity did not actually increase the use of first person narration, but simply maintained it. In the Non-Drama Group, on the other hand, the lessons/discussion prewriting activities may have served to discourage the use of first person narration. Unfortunately, neither group made reference to this choice in their journals and thus the reasons remain unclear.

*Story One, Character:* Statements illustrating a character's own feelings, as well as words/ actions of other characters contributing to an embarrassing moment.

The results of this study support my pilot study results, in showing that students who are exposed to the drama treatment describe characters' responses to an emotional event more fully. In this study the Drama Group produced more than twice as many statements relating to characters' feelings, words, or behaviours connected to emotional moments than did the Non-Drama Group. The fact that they had higher scores and made significantly greater gains in character development than the Non-Drama Group suggests that the drama experience enhanced the students' understanding of and subsequent narrative on character.

*Story Two, Plot:* Divergence from the Original Story Line

In Story Two, The Pied Piper of Hamelin, twice as many students in the Drama Group than the Non-Drama Group chose to implement significant changes to the plot in
their rewrite of the story. Possibly the structured environment of teacher-directed lessons/discussions, as experienced by the Non-Drama Group, supports uniformity whereas the creative drama experience, in which boundaries are less defined, supports exploration and moving away from the norm. The relatively unstructured drama environment allows for diversions to occur more readily and ideas to flow more freely. As Krogness (2001) points out, “Implicit in improvisational drama is the notion that there’s not just one solution but, indeed, infinite solutions or possibilities” (p.23). Conversely, I feel the more structured teacher directed lesson/discussion format is less conducive to students taking risks when generating ideas.

In Story Two, the Non-Drama Group also received higher scores in plot than the Drama Group. Although the Drama Group made their stories more engaging by moving away from the original story line, the rewrites were most likely not as logically sequenced, with a clear problem and solution, as those of the Non-Drama Group whose stories more closely followed the original story line.

*Story Three, Setting: Types of Descriptions*

The most interesting finding that emerged from this study for me is that setting was presented differently by the two groups. The Non-Drama Group had a higher incidence of describing the setting in isolation whereas the Drama Group had a higher incidence of describing the setting by entwining it with plot and character development. The fact that the Drama Group received significantly higher scores and greater gains in setting in two of the three stories suggests that the Drama Group’s way of describing setting was a better choice. The students were more able to effectively describe setting
that included an appeal to the senses, created mood, and enhanced their story. I have not seen commentary on this observation in my reading of the research on the relationship between creative drama and writing.

Attitude/Process

"Fun! Fun! Fun!" These words, written in a student’s journal, and voiced many times by her peers, made my heart sing. And race in fear. With good reason, I believe. For approximately half the time of each writing class these students were far removed from pen and paper. They were scattered around the class, mudroom, and hallways, usually grouped in threes or fours, playing. Playing out a scene, that is, from their partially developed written stories.

Student Overall Impressions and Teacher Observations of Student Participation in the Writing Project

In the first few days, at the onset of the unit, I had doubts about the Drama Group being able to participate in the creative drama activities successfully. The students appeared very excited about the prewriting activities but also ineffective in implementing them. Forming groups, finding a spot, taking turns to explain their scenarios, assigning roles, and developing the scenes through improvisation was all very time consuming and disorganized. Some students complained, "we didn’t get enough time to do mine" and "some people don’t follow how you want it to go." Although I had modeled the activity on several occasions to the students, it was nonetheless unfamiliar and demanding in terms of letting go of inhibitions and committing to the drama. Over time, however, with
practice and experience, as well as with my participation, guidance, and support, the students became much more able and willing to engage in the activity. By the end of the first week, the students became more proficient in moving quickly from task to task and my primary role changed from negotiating procedural issues and behaviour difficulties to assisting the students to maximize the drama experience. Apparently, the learning gained in drama by this particular group, with myself as their instructor, took time and surfaced to a greater degree after a lengthier exposure. This reasoning is in accordance with drama educator Byron’s (1986) belief that, in order for drama to be effective, the general rule is to build slowly in order to establish comfort in role and in imagined contexts. The greater the confidence in one’s ability to “do” drama, the greater the potential to elicit writing that stems from it.

Like drama educator Kaplan (1997), I watched the students reveal their ‘playground selves.’ They delighted in embodying different characters and their associated idiosyncrasies. They became more and more comfortable reacting to new situations and improvising bold thoughts and actions. A student commented, “I like the acting it’s cool. Dawn and I are mechanics working on a F-1 engine.” Another student spoke to the variety of situations his group improvised, “I was with Ron, Jason, and Pete. We were rehearsing our stories, I think it was good. Ron’s was about a war, Jason’s about hockey, Pete’s about getting pantsed, and mine about falling in a ditch.” I soon realized that in this formal setting of the classroom, the students were in fact not only able to play but readily took the opportunity to do so and to exercise their imagination. Courtney (1989), a leading authority in drama education, supports the notion that this
outcome would be inevitable. He argues that creative imagination, is inextricably linked to dramatic action and is the foundation of human experience.

"Acting is the way we live with our environment....we pretend, physically or overtly when we are young; or we may do it internally when we are adults. But we are Being "as if" every day whether we know it or not with our friends, family, strangers (p.17).

It turned out my doubts in the students' ability to engage in the drama experience were soon erased.

The Non-Drama Group, at the beginning of the unit, responded with ease to the lesson and discussion activities as this model was similar to ones I had exposed them to on previous occasions in the year when teaching other writing genres. I think it also worked because I believe I designed a unit that was engaging and incorporated a variety of discussion, as well as 'drill and practice' activities to keep the students involved. Unlike the Drama Group, however, whose interest in the drama prewriting activities continued, these students did not appear to sustain the same interest towards the end of the study, especially during partner or small group discussions. Students were often off task and needed reminders to focus. In fact, I needed to resort to keeping five students in at lunch time to complete their stories. In retrospect, this does not surprise me. The school year was coming to an end, it was hot in the classroom, and the completion of four short stories in ten weeks is a heavy load. Nevertheless, the Drama Group maintained their enthusiasm and increased their performance level, and the Non-Drama Group did not.
The pattern I observed in the level of student participation in the prewriting activities of the two groups correlates with my findings in the scores the students received in their stories. As the Drama Group became more proficient and involved in the drama activities, the scores improved. Conversely, as the Non-Drama Group's interest in the project waned towards the end of this ten week project, the scores fell.

The findings suggest that when implemented over a longer period of time, the Drama prewriting activities continued to sustain the students' interest because they found them more motivating. Possibly their enjoyment of the drama activity, which was mentioned in their reflective journals repeatedly, had a positive influence on students' desire to write. As one student says, "It was funner to act it out then to just think of it, it made me want to do this story more." Or possibly, the students were eager to write down the scenarios they had worked to create, "When we acted it out, we got so many ideas we had to stop early so we could write it all down, and it was fun, it's a great way to get kids interested in writing." Neelands (1993) supports this notion of personal involvement playing an important role in encouraging students to write: "Traditional motivations for writing deal with the completing of writing tasks. However, when the writing is embedded in a [drama] context that has a personal significance for the writer, the motivation for writing changes drastically" (p.10). This sentiment is further echoed by Schneider's (2000) observations of students who, when involved in role play activities, "had a real need for writing" and Waterman's (1999) assertion that because the feelings and experiences are real in drama, the follow up writing for them can be rich and rewarding.
It is interesting to note that my observations of changes in students’ engagement and apparent motivation during the time of this writing unit were not substantiated in the students’ journals. In their comments, I saw no evidence of decline or increase in interest over time for either group. Although positive and negative comments were made by both groups, they did not necessarily coincide with the pattern over time that I observed.

Possibly because entries were done in notebooks specifically designated for this journaling, their previous comments could easily be seen and the students were tempted to write in the same vein. It is also possible that Hawthorne effects (McMillan, J. and Shumacher, S., 1997) which are always a concern in applied research, may have been a factor. The students, knowing that they were a part of a study, may have spoken favourably as they wanted the study to be a “success”.

Recurring Theme in Student Journals: Ideas

If generation of ideas is one of the key purposes of prewriting, then according to the students, both strategies served their purpose. Students in both groups indicated that the collaborative approach used when improvising their scenes in Drama, or when discussing their work with other students in Non-Drama, assisted them in coming up with ideas for their stories. The difference between the two is that the Drama Group spoke more elaborately and provided more specific examples in how the drama helped. In short, the Drama Group appeared to be more cognizant of the positive influence of the prewriting activities on the generation of ideas for their stories.

Their scores suggest that the most profound growth in idea generation took place towards the end of the unit. Possibly, the more the students became familiar and
comfortable in participating in the drama activity, the more they were able to appreciate the opportunity for idea generation by letting go of their inhibitions and giving free rein to their imaginations. In his effort to promote drama as a teaching strategy, Mallika (2000) states, “if learning can occur through an active imagination, instead of through passive reception, a space for freedom may open up...a power to choose” (p.53). Woods (1993), found evidence of this assertion in his study of aesthetic learning, where involvement in drama activities encouraged students to risk expression of ideas. I too observed this notion come to play when, in one group, a student introduced a hobo into his Pied Piper story. This character’s preference for alcoholic beverages made him instantly popular with the group and the students quickly latched on to developing a scene that took the story in a different direction.

The drama forum may also have encouraged a greater generation of ideas because it may have enticed some students to portray an extraordinary situation and/or an extraordinary character which may be more exciting to role play than to simply discuss it. This “imaginative involvement that arises in drama,” Neelands (1993) argues, can in turn be “a powerful stimulus for writing” (p.11).

It is worth mentioning that of the two groups, only the Drama one made specific references to word count as it related to number of ideas in their journals. Seven students indicated that the prewriting activity, enabled them to write longer stories by using more detail to develop their ideas. Again, this supports the idea that the Drama Group were more aware of how the prewriting activity helped in developing their ideas.
**Recurring Theme in Student Journals: Character**

In two of the three stories written after the onset of the prewriting activities, the Drama Group showed greater gains in characterization than the Non-Drama Group. It is not surprising, then, to see that the Drama Group’s extensive commentary in their journals, demonstrates both a clear understanding of, and an appreciation for how the drama activities enabled them to develop characters in their stories.

If one accepts the theory that writers write about what they know, then presumably the Drama Group was able to identify with the characters they role played in their scenes and became familiar with the feelings of their own character as well as how their character impacted others. First, the fact that twice as many students in the Drama Group than the Non-Drama Group chose to write in the first person suggests that they were able to put themselves into their stories, that is, assume and “live” a character in role play. Examples of the following journal entries demonstrate the students’ ability and willingness to identify with their characters: “in the skit, I am a street racer and I win and get $100 000, I like doing it”, and “I liked being the Piper” or “my story is about a wrestling pro and I got to act out the moves”.

Second, the students’ descriptions of events involving character in their stories about embarrassing moments provide further insight into their understanding of character through drama. In his commentary on the power of drama, Taylor (1996) supports this notion that “though drama experiences are imaginary, they can nevertheless be deeply felt personal lived experiences or phenomenological experiences for the students” (p.91). In their journals, the students repeatedly made comments about gaining understandings about their characters and their situation through drama. In reference to a scene
involving her main character a student explains, “you can write what you’re acting and your story might turn out better if you really know what you’re talking about”. Another student adds, “when we were doing drama at certain times it would help like how the character would feel or his/her emotions”. Students also indicated drama would help them with ideas about how other characters would behave or react in different situations, “Penny pretended to be the main character, I learned a few things when she acted, I decided to put them in my story”. Understanding how the character felt was also gained through discussion following the drama. “She acted out her part then at the end she told me how she felt and that she doesn’t want to be in that kind of situation ever in her life”. These comments support the assertion voiced by many in this field that role play encourages a better understanding of the perspectives of others and allows for a greater development of empathy (Gitlin-Weiner, 1998; Waterman, 1999, Nixon, 1988; Conrad & Asher, 2000; McNaughton, 1997).

Recurring Theme in Student Journals: Setting

Both groups commented that the prewriting activities were beneficial in helping them develop setting. A relationship can be seen between their comments and the findings on the differences in the approach the two groups used to setting development. The Non-Drama Group focused on describing setting in isolation whereas the Drama Group described setting in reference to plot and character development. It is possible that the structured format of the lesson/discussion prewriting activities, where examples of narratives on setting were provided on several occasions, may have prompted the Non-Drama students to use them as a template to demonstrate similar examples in their
stories. When referring to effective writing instruction, experts (Isaacson, 1994; Fowler, 1999) posit that when students are exposed to good models of writing they can use them to develop their own written expression. Isaacson (1994), for example, believes that students “can use those examples for text structure and audience needs” (p. 41). These students made several references in their journals about the way in which the lessons were helpful in learning to write an effective setting. “Mrs. Cormack showed us how to write detail (how the place looked, smelled, felt, etc) it inspired me to write like that” and “before I didn’t know how to write short stories, but now I know, like how to do the setting” or “I got ideas for my setting from the one we did in class”.

In contrast, the Drama students’ direct instruction in setting, as with all other elements of story writing introduced in mini-lessons, was much more limited. Once concepts and related examples were briefly introduced, these students left their seats and moved on to improvising their stories. No requirement was made to build on concepts, by way of discussion and/or practice, introduced in the mini-lesson. Possibly because of this reason, when these students spoke of setting in their journals, it was more in reference to character or plot. The following provides an example, “I think drama gives us more of an idea what the character would see in the situation you are in and how it would look around you like if there’s a big warehouse and you could imagine how it looks and then add more detail”. In drama, the students had an opportunity to place themselves imaginatively within the context of the scene. As opposed to discussion, which can be viewed as a two dimensional activity, in drama the third dimension of oneself moving about within the scene is added. This addition may have enhanced the imaginative experience by allowing the essence of setting to get embedded in the story rather than
viewing the setting in isolation. This idea is supported by Annarella’s (2000) observation that, when students are involved in role play, they “get in touch with their own imagination and creativity… in the development of theme, mood and setting, time and place” (p.4).

**Differences in the Detail used in Students’ Comments about the Writing Experiences**

Students in the Drama Group were more inclined to explain in detail the ways in which the prewriting activities assisted them with writing their stories. Maybe they reported more fully because being involved in drama activities for the purpose of writing was new and therefore more interesting to write about in their journals. Or, perhaps, the students found that activities that are experienced concretely, such as participation in story enactment through drama, are more clear and therefore more easily described in their journals. Krogness (2001) supports this possibility when she argues, “weak storylines and characters are obvious in drama while they’re not so clear to a person writing or [discussing] a story”(p. 24).

It is also possible that the students wrote in greater detail because their learning experience was different. The Non-Drama Group speaks to learning resulting from teacher prepared short story writing lessons and related discussions, and applying those understanding to their stories. The Drama Group speaks to learning that was “discovered” through their participation in the drama. In their journals, the students in the Drama Group frequently used words/phrases such as “I figured it out”, “we started realizing”, “it made me think”, and “I discovered” demonstrating this kind of learning. Numerous theorists and educators have argued that learning through discovery is common in
students who participate in a drama activity (Halliday, 1975; Verriour, 1984; O’Neill, 1984; Flemming, 1982). Halliday (1975) defines drama as a process that is “dynamic and immediate; therefore it directly involves students in learning through experience and discovery” (p. 2). O’Neill (1984) speaks specifically about character: “In process drama, any development of characterization is a process of discovery. The initial outline as well as the detail of the character has to be discovered through the encounter” (p. 91). Those who support the idea of discovery learning in drama, further explain that these discoveries evolve through reflection. Reflection first occurs during the time when students act as both “participants” as well as “spectators” in the scene construction. “Participants in roleplay are simultaneously an audience to their own acts and observers of the consequences of these acts” (O’Neill, 1984, p. 80). Reflection occurs again after the drama is completed when the students discuss the drama experience. In the latter part of this process, students draw on the active, contextual experiences of their scene construction to arrive at more abstract, central themes. In the case of this study, the concepts in which students demonstrated understanding included incorporating detail in their stories, developing characters that are believable, and establishing a sense of the setting.

**Social Construction of Meaning**

Although my exposure to the theory of social construction of meaning did not occur until I entered the master’s program, I believe I have been putting aspects of this theory into practice from my first day of teaching. The Non-Drama Group approach in this study provides an example. First, the lessons involved small group and partner discussion. This enabled students to develop a shared understanding, to build on their
existing schemata and to construct meaning in a social setting. Second, the story topics
were dictated by the students' interests that were communicated to me through the course
of the year. Within those topics, much latitude for individuality was provided. The first
three stories were largely open ended and the last was completely open ended. This
arrangement enabled the students to write about material that is relevant and meaningful
to them. In short, although the lessons included explicit instruction, the students were
also provided with numerous opportunities to construct their own meaning on relevant
topics in a social setting.

The implementation of a social constructivist approach in the Drama Group
required that I take risks and stretch those principles to new lengths. First, in addition to
experiencing learning through language, as was done in partner/group discussions with
the Non-Drama Group, a new dimension to this social exchange of meaning was added
when working in the drama context. Students created meaning in assumed roles as they
orchestrated their scenes. Within these roles, as the dramas unfolded, the students were
required to negotiate and find joint solutions. Although the situation was make-believe,
they relied on their own experiences and judgment to make the scene work. Secondly,
where I had exposed the students in the Non-Drama Group to elements of short story
writing by providing them with mini-lessons and supporting those concepts through
practice and associated discussion, the Drama Group were left to develop the
understandings introduced in the mini-lessons through the enactment of their stories. For
the Non-Drama Group, to a much greater degree, I dictated and expected specific
learning objectives. By presenting students with examples of effective narration on
setting, for example, I not only supplied the selection but, in the follow-up discussion, I
looked for particular answers. In the Drama Group, my involvement in reinforcing concepts introduced in the mini-lesson was dictated by the nature of students' unfolding scenes. If the scene involved a focus on dialogue, for example, it was not an appropriate time to reinforce concepts related to setting introduced in a mini-lesson at the onset of the lesson. Generally my role, when talking to the students about their dramas or involving myself directly in them, was on assisting the students to create believable scenarios. The previously introduced elements of short story writing were not the focus but rather became the byproduct of these exercises when they were pertinent to the students' scenes. Thirdly, in the Non-Drama Group I provided scaffolding through presentation of material related to elements of short story writing and associated leading questions. Students further scaffolded one another in partner or small group discussion when working on these assignments. In the Drama Group, scaffolding occurred whenever students acted and reacted in continuously newly developing scenes. When I joined their drama I became a part of this process. I worked inside the drama to help stimulate a dramatic response among the students, extend their story line, deepen their characterization, or develop dialogue. The difference for me, however, was that where the direction in which I was going was usually clear with the Non-Drama Group, in the Drama Group it was often not. This lack of control I sometimes found unsettling.

To summarize, I believe that when working with the Drama Group in this study, I had participated in my most social constructivist setting to date. While retaining control of the teaching processes through mini-lessons and facilitating the drama improvisations, my conduct was largely non-authoritarian and non-hierarchical. I operated on a level with the students in a common endeavour from which I also learned, sometimes from
them. The students had control over their learning process and were given freedom to incorporate the concepts introduced in the mini-lessons into the dramatic display of their stories as they saw fit. Similarly to Sierra (1998), who investigated dramatic play in the education of middle school children, I too saw the fleshing out the skeleton of their stories in these unfolding dramas as “an eminently social activity constructed through participants’ understanding of their social world, their personal histories, and cultural backgrounds” (p.5). In short, I saw my role more than ever as a facilitator, negotiator, scaffold, and catalyst, rather than one who seeks to meet predetermined goals. At the same time, again more than ever, I saw the students as being major players in their own learning.

The following journal entries, written by the Drama Group, provide a glimpse into the students’ own understanding of their role in this processes of construction of meaning, and the value they place on their own power to create:

“I was with Bob and Ted. We first talked about our stories then we acted them. We gave each other ideas on how to improve our stories”.

“When she was acting out my character named Chase she made him seem mad when I was going to make him happy and I thought it sounded better with him mad”.

“Every time you act out the story more things come up and change, like my story didn’t have much talking in it until we did the skit and that made me think that more language is better”.

""
Summary and Implications of the Differences found in the Content of the Stories

Creative drama presents a viable option as a prewriting strategy.

Scores showing a steady increase in the level of performance of the three stories written by students exposed to drama demonstrate that the use of creative drama during the prewriting phase of the writing process may be used with success as a strategy in short story composition.

These findings further suggest that its potential may be maximized in two ways. First, this strategy appears to work best when implemented over an extended period of time. A longer duration allows the students more opportunity to familiarize themselves with the improvisation process, and thus to become more readily engaged in the drama activities, which may in turn lead to more engaged follow up writing. Second, creative drama activities may work best when supplemented with explicit lessons on relevant concepts. This reasoning is based on the positive results in the level of performance by the Non-Drama Group when the teacher clearly specified and provided both samples of relevant material, and an opportunity to discuss and practice the skills found within that material. If we accept the theory that by imitating the best features of a writer's style one can produce writing that in time will come to rival the model itself, then we can apply the same principle to the drama prewriting strategy. By exposing students to activities where specific concepts may be practiced in the drama context, students can then imitate those features in the improvisation and subsequent composition of their stories. For example, when teaching setting, students can be directed through an exercise that builds specific concepts. Effective narrative of setting requires that the author use not only
visual descriptors but also those that appeal to the reader’s sense of touch, smell, taste, and sound. For example, the teacher can assist students in the portrayal of a forest just before a storm, by having some students represent trees of different shapes and sizes, another student becoming the wind rushing between them forcing their branches to move, yet another makes wind sounds matching the movement of the wind, while another creates the force of the wind by flapping cardboard. The discussion and exchange of ideas prior to, during, and after such an exercise can further assist in developing images and vocabulary fitting for the setting description.

*Creative drama may be the strategy of choice when assisting students to develop specific skills or concepts in writing.*

This assertion is based on the predominance of specific characteristics found in the compositions of students exposed to drama prewriting strategies. These are a) use of first person narration, b) use of dialogue, and c) display of emotion associated with a character and/or a situation. When students are given an opportunity to practice skills, they are likely to improve in those areas. The nature of drama allows these skills to be highly utilized and practiced. The drama format demands that students experience, albeit vicariously, the life of a character. It also demands that the character communicates, often through dialogue, with others during scene development. Finally, this improvised exercise stimulates creativity as students are required to respond to continuously occurring, largely open ended, new developments. Experiences gained in these areas during drama can then be more readily portrayed in writing to paper.
Creative drama prewriting strategy may serve as a motivating factor in encouraging students to write.

The drama activities were perceived by many of the students as not only being useful when writing their stories but also as being fun. If we can keep the students interested and engaged in learning situations they enjoy, the lessons become more positive for the students and teacher alike. At the same time, we must not equate the motivating fun factor of drama with students' motivation and ability to write. Rather, we must ensure students have the prewriting strategy that includes the necessary reflective thinking and/or social interaction processes that may aid in the development of students' writing.

Managing creative drama activities may be problematic.

The drama activities in this study can be described as, first, requiring freedom in movement and noise levels within a space which exceeds that of a typical classroom. Second, this approach requires that the students display an interest in both commitment to the drama activity by "letting go", as well as self regulation by not allowing themselves to get unruly. And thirdly, it requires that the teacher suspend the need or desire to be in full control. In short, if space is not available, if the students do not have the desire to participate in drama, if the teacher is accustomed to suppressing physical and verbal classroom activity, or if she feels the need to be the dominant figure in the classroom, then implementing this prewriting strategy may be difficult.

In conclusion, we know that writing is a complex process. We also know that students learn in different ways. In this study, two forms of prewriting strategies were employed. Each one displayed positive and negative attributes and each one offered a
different doorway through which students arrive at their learning. If we want to encourage our students to write, whether through the lesson/discussion or the drama avenue, we must strive to provide an atmosphere where students experience writing as a flexible generative process through which they discover that they can and do have something to say.

Limitations of Study

Method First, this study, which involved a teacher/researcher working with fifty-four students for a period of ten weeks, yielded a variety of data. Any interpretations, however, that are based on this data must be viewed in the light of the fact that they are founded on the perspectives and experiences of one teacher with one particular set of students at one particular time. The advantage, however, is that this approach yielded a rich, in depth view of learning processes within these two classrooms. Second, I chose to examine and report on several aspects within the content and attitude areas. Although this strategy allowed for a more encompassing view of the project, it also compromised the in depth view of any one of those aspects.

Attitude Students were instructed to write freely in their journals about the prewriting activities, their story writing, and/or their stories. Although this format revealed data I may not have thought to solicit, it also omitted data of interest. Had I also included a questionnaire, I would have gained more information about specific areas. This would be particularly useful as a pre and post treatment indicator. For example, on a Likert scale students could have reported their attitude on the following statements: I look forward to writing; I have trouble when I first start writing my composition; Discussing my writing
with others is enjoyable; I am not good at writing; I really understand the character I write about; and so forth.

My fieldnotes on student attitude toward the project were based only on my observations. This method records behaviours but is open to error when interpreting those behaviours. For a more thorough analysis, I would like to have also interviewed the students and asked specific questions about their behaviours and perceptions of the writing unit, the prewriting strategies, and their compositions.

**Level of performance** Although I took measures to implement interrater reliability by having 16 randomly selected compositions scored by two other raters, the study would have been stronger if there were multiple raters for each composition and if I had excluded myself completely from the rating. The present design allows for some compositions, not included in the random sample, to be scored inaccurately. That option was not practical nor available to me, however, as I held the dual responsibilities of being both the teacher and the researcher.

**Dialogue** This study measured the amount of dialogue in all four stories. However, no attempt was made to see to what extent the specific dialogue used in the improvisations was transcribed in the follow up compositions. As a result, I cannot make causal conclusions about the learnings or the transfer of language from the oral mode to the written.

**Statements illustrating a characters’ feelings relating to an embarrassing moment** *(character), divergence from the original storyline (plot), types of description (setting)*. Findings for all three of qualitative characteristics were based on comparisons made between only one set of stories. For a more comprehensive measure regarding plot
creativity, expressing character’s feelings, and choice of setting description, all three stories, as well as the Pre-Treatment Story, could have been examined for each qualitative category. However, in designing the writing unit while also meeting the full range of curricular objectives, I did not believe such an extended focus to be practical.

**Transfer of learning** This study did not examine in detail the parallels between the student improvisations and student compositions. To get these findings, it would have been necessary to videotape and transcribe the enactments, then closely examine the stories. This would be a fruitful method to employ in a follow-up study.

**Contributions of Study**

This research added information to a relatively impoverished field of study. My study provides evidence that participating in role play is conducive to understanding and writing about characters and their issues. It also encourages creativity and risk taking. These assertions are based on the greater detail describing characters’ embarrassing circumstances in Story One and showing greater divergence from the original story line in Story Two. Also, we now have more data on qualitative characteristics found in the compositions written by those exposed to drama. Predominance of first person narration has been noted in a previous project (Titter, 1981). The new information I report includes the predominance of dialogue use, mode of setting description, and divergence from the original story line. For those teachers interested in focusing on teaching a specific concept, this information can be useful in determining the form of instruction.

The design of this study is original in that it provided information about the impact of the prewriting strategy at different stages of implementation, that is, at the end
of three weeks, six weeks, and nine weeks. This knowledge is valuable for educators when making decisions about the length of a unit involving drama activity, and for providing educators with an idea as to what results they might see as the unit progresses.

This study generated a rich collection of student commentary about their experiences surrounding the drama prewriting activities and their impact on subsequent writing. The comments were informative in not only explaining what was learned but also the way in which this learning occurred. This metacognitive commentary is particularly useful to educators who are interested in lesson design and mode of instruction. The more we know about the intricacies of student learning, the better we can accommodate that learning.

The short story writing unit in this study can easily be reproduced and/or used as a template by educators who are interested in introducing drama into their teaching. The basic strategy of having students flesh out segments of their previously outlined stories through improvisation requires minimal drama experience by the teacher. As they gain experience, teachers can become more involved by participating as a teacher-in-role to help enhance the drama activity but that form of input is not mandatory for the students’ drama to work. In short, this study is encouraging for those teachers who wish to implement a similar instructional model into their class.

Finally, this study is promising for those teachers interested in implementing social constructivist practices in their classroom. Using the basic principles derived from Vygotsky’s (1978, 1986) work that we acquire and use language socially, that language is the basis for thought, and therefore learning has sociocultural roots, creating a classroom culture where students can maximize their construction of meaning is essential are social
constructivist tenets inherent in the design of this study. First, collaborative learning occurred during group improvisation and follow up reflection of the developing stories. Second, both teacher and students participated in the learning and teaching of improvisational activities and the discussions on story writing. Third, curriculum was negotiated as students, through improvisation, created stories reflecting their own interests.

**Future Research**

In my observation of the students over the course of the study I noted that, for the large part, they chose the same groupings. I also noted that the students improvised/wrote stories that reflected their personalities. For example, a particularly boisterous group of five boys chose topics containing high levels of action: war, car racing, wrestling, soccer, hockey. During their improvisations, the students appeared to be committed and fully engaged in their very physical scene enactments. A group of three girls, on the other hand, who were very much interested in boys and relationships, improvised/wrote stories about those topics. This group also appeared to be fully engaged in their enactments. My observations made me pose the following questions: Does participation in scene improvisation influence the topics about which students will write? What differences would one see if students were placed in designated groupings rather than given the freedom to self select?

I also noted that several of my low achieving students responded positively to both the improvisation as well as the subsequent writing of their stories. I would be interested to see if the drama prewriting strategy is particularly useful, or detrimental, for
students belonging to specific social categories. What might be learned about the differences in academic achievement, gender, age, class, race, and ethnicity in relation to responding to drama as a prewriting strategy?

In my study, the creative drama strategies were limited to student role play and, on occasion, the teacher participating as teacher-in-role. Many other strategies, such as tableaux, freeze frame, and imagery visualization, exist. I would like to see a comparison between the use of these strategies. How do students respond to the different strategies in terms of participating in them or in the follow up writing they produce? What is the appeal or difficulty with each?

I found that managing improvisation posed some difficulties. The more students became engaged in their improvisations, the more space and freedom to make noise was required. I found myself in a struggle of enabling the improvisations to function to their potential and being cognizant of the possible disturbance of other classes. How does the school culture and physical structure impact the ability of a teacher to incorporate drama into the curriculum? What management strategies are effective in classroom creative drama sessions?

This experience of using drama was a positive one for me and, I believe, also for the students. At the same time, throughout the study I had twinges of doubt and concern about effective use of time. What happens in the classroom when a teacher uses drama? What is accomplished, what is not accomplished?

Although I have a long standing interest in theatre and have recently begun to introduce drama to my students, at times, when working as a teacher-in-role, I felt like a novice. For others, who have less experience than I, the idea of incorporating drama into
their teaching may be overwhelming at first. How can we best support the nonspecialist classroom teacher who strives to integrate drama into the curriculum? What experiences make it possible for teachers to establish a classroom culture that supports drama in the classroom? What commitment in terms of time and resources does providing assistance involve? How might teacher education programs provide experiences that facilitate the transformations of teachers' thinking to enable them to offer drama across curriculum?
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Appendix A
Letter of Written Disclosure to Parents/Guardians

April 3, 2002

Dear Parents/Guardians,

I would like to request your child's participation in a ten week study I will be conducting in this third term.

For the past three years, I have been a graduate student in the Curriculum and Instruction program at the University of Northern British Columbia. For my masters thesis I have chosen to address an area of my interest, writing. Specifically, I intend to explore the impact of different prewriting strategies that I will use when teaching short story writing. I have chosen to do this study because, as a teacher, I am continually challenged to find ways in which to best assist my students to become more effective and motivated writers.

The data I intend to use in this study are the students' short stories, their reflective journals, and video recordings of selected lessons. The purpose of the video recordings is to allow me to review and record, in detail, what took place in a lesson.

The study will present no intrusion to the students as my teaching during that time will not differ from what I normally do in the classroom. The strategies and assignments are a part of the established Language Arts curriculum and therefore participation in the study will present no greater risk to students than occurs during usual school activities.

Your child has been chosen to participate in this study as I am his/her writing instructor. All students will be required to participate in the short story writing unit as a part of the regular curriculum and marks will be collected and reported in the usual manner. Your child will be expected to participate in the prewriting activities and related discussions as well as the subsequent short story writing. I will only use data in my thesis for which I have received your consent. This means your child will be required to complete assignments, but your child's data will not be included as a part of the study unless permission by you has been granted. You may terminate your child's participation in the study at any time without penalty to your child.

The data collection for this study will be available to the school and School District 57 administrative staff as well as the UNBC research committee. Also, the information from this study may be published in academic research journals. As a parent you have access to your own child's data but not the data of the other students involved in the study. A copy of the research results will be available to you upon request once the study is completed.
Throughout the study, strict confidentiality will be maintained in the handling of the data and reporting of results. This means that your child’s identity will remain anonymous and ethical guidelines will be strictly followed. All interpretation of the data will be kept confidential and off the school premises. Data will be kept for five years.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please contact me at . You may also contact the members of my committee, Dr. Dennis Procter at Dr. Judith Lapadat, at . and Dr. Bruce Wyse at . If you have complaints about the study, please contact the Vice-President Research at UNBC at 

Please complete the attached consent form and have your child return it to me as soon as possible. A copy of the consent form is available to you upon request.

Thank you very much for your support,

Rumiana Cormack
Appendix B

Informed Consent Form

Please answer the following questions by circling a YES or NO.

1. Do you understand that you have been asked to give permission for your child to be in a research study? YES NO

2. Have you read and received a copy of the attached information sheet? YES NO

3. Do you understand that your child may be video recorded? YES NO

4. Do you understand the benefits and risks of your child’s participation in this study? YES NO

5. Do you understand that you may ask questions and discuss this study? YES NO

6. Do you understand that you are free to refuse or allow your child to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time? YES NO

7. Do you understand that your child will remain anonymous in the reporting of the data? YES NO

8. Do you understand who will have access to the data collected in this study? YES NO

I agree to allow my child to take part in this study:

________________________________________  __________________________
(Signature of Parent/Guardian)  (Date)

________________________________________
(Printed Name of Parent/Guardian)

I, Rumiana Cormack, believe that the person signing this form understands what is involved in the study and voluntarily agrees to let his/her child participate.

________________________________________  __________________________
(Signature of Researcher)  (Date)
Appendix C

Letter of Written Disclosure to School District #57

Rumiana Cormack

c/o Administration Offices
1849 -9th Avenue
Prince George, BC V2M 1L7
Phone:

Re: Research on The Impact of Creative Drama on the Quality of Short Stories When Used in the Prewriting Stage of the Writing Process by Grade 6/7 Students

March 15, 2002

Dear Bonnie Chappell,

I am writing to request your permission to conduct a research study with my own and one other grade six/seven class in Blackburn Elementary School. I am currently a graduate student in Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Northern British Columbia. The data I intend to collect is toward my masters thesis: The Impact of Creative Drama on the Quality of Short Stories When Used in the Prewriting Stage of the Writing Process by Grade 6/7. My thesis committee consists of Dr. Dennis Procter, Dr. Judith Lapadat, and Dr. Bruce Wyse.

The idea for my thesis stems from both, my professional and my personal life. As a teacher working with grade six/sevens for the past six years, I’ve been searching for ways to assist my students to become more effective and engaged writers. I became curious to see if incorporating drama, a personal interest of mine for many years, into the teaching of short story writing, would have a positive impact on the quality of their stories and/or on their motivation to write. In my research into this subject I found that studies that have investigated the capacity of drama to enrich learning have yielded positive results. It has been associated with gains in language acquisition, problem solving, cooperative learning, empathy and values clarification as well as self-esteem and social development. The studies/projects that deal specifically with the impact of drama on the writing of short stories, however, are few in number. It is my intention to help fill this gap by collecting data and reporting qualitative descriptions of my experience in teaching a short story unit using creative drama. My first goal in the study is to examine the impact that creative drama activities, introduced during prewriting, have on the quality of the short stories written by students. My second goal is to describe the impact that creative drama has on writing instruction from my perspective and that of my students.
The intended duration of this qualitative study is ten weeks and it is to be conducted during the last term of year 2002. Two grade 6/7 classes will be involved in the study, each receiving a different prewriting strategy. One class will receive drama and related discussion as part of prewriting instruction and the second class will receive direct teaching - a traditional instructional method where discussions are led by the teacher through a teacher question, student response model. Class time for both groups in this study will be two 40 minute blocks per week for writing instruction and one 15 minute block per week for reflective journal writing. In the first week, the students will write a short story that will be used as a Pre-Treatment Story. In the following 9 weeks, the students will be given instruction on short story writing and will be expected to produce three short stories, based on different themes, one at the end of every third week. Prewriting, for both groups, will be incorporated into most lessons.

All short stories, including the Pre-Treatment Story, which will serve as the base to track growth in the quality of writing between the two groups, will be assessed using the British Columbia Ministry of Education Performance Standards. To ensure consistency in marking and to provide inter rater reliability, a second marker will assess a randomly selected subset of the stories. This marker is an English teacher who is familiar with the Performance Standards. The weekly student reflection logs will be used through the course of the study to track the students’ experiences, perception, comfort level, and attitude toward the prewriting activities as well as the subsequent writing they produce. My field notes will be used to monitor the progress of the study. I will write a detailed account on the creative drama and non-drama prewriting activities and the corresponding student, as well as my own, participation and reaction to these activities. Analysis of the videotapes will enable me to capture the process of the work, and afford the possibility of reviewing the lessons closely.

I perceive this study to be useful in that it will contribute information to a field of research that presently lacks sufficient data. More important for me, however, is my own professional development and the possibility of sharing my findings with my colleagues. I believe that using a creative drama prewriting strategy will enable my students to feel more comfortable during writing, take control of their writing, and improve their writing quality. First, creative drama involves the participation in the construction and enactment of scenes using all human functions: cognitive, physical, and emotional. If we accept the notion that one “learns by doing” then the learning that takes place when constructing scenes is significant because the learner, as a writer, gains direct experience about which he/she can write. Second, the “as if” feature of creative drama allows students to experiment with different situations and understand different perspectives. Through role play, they put themselves in the place of others, and come to understand and empathize with their thoughts and feelings. After they have experienced “living” as others, the students can more effectively write from different perspectives. Third, when students participate in creative drama activities, they come away with both, the material and the need, for writing. The writing is embedded within a context that has personal meaning for the writer and thus a motivation for writing is created.
In addition to reporting on the impact of creative drama on the quality of short stories, it is my intent to provide the groundwork for the development of a tool that will more specifically describe a student’s writing in areas such as dialogue and characterization. This will be an analytic assessment tool that can be used together with a holistic measure such as the one found in the Performance Standards. Teachers may find this useful if they want to focus on these particular elements of a short story.

In my experience and contact with other teachers, drama is not integrated readily into the curriculum. I believe that the drama expertise of the teacher is not a requirement. Theorists, such as Vygotsky, claim that play and improvisation are inherent in children. I hypothesize that my study will show that tapping into this dramatic side of children does not require great expertise on the part of the teacher, can be integrated into existing programs such as writing, and can be developed mutually with the students without a great change to the teacher’s regular procedures.

Finally, for those interested in creating a more social constructivist classroom, I believe that drama is a natural medium. According to social constructivism, students are viewed as being active participants in constructing meaning, by using their past/current knowledge, within a social setting. Creative drama activities are inherently social because they encourage group work and dialogue. If a teacher wishes to adopt a more social constructivist perspective, she can introduce creative drama in discrete blocks of time into already existing units in content areas such as language arts, socials, math or science. By structuring this in, and stepping back to allow the students’ natural ability to play be exhibited, the process may yield new, far reaching dynamics in the classroom.

I have taken care to fulfill all requirements for this study. Please find enclosed my thesis proposal that includes the theoretical framework, pertinent literature, a detailed description of the proposed study, and all necessary documentation dealing with ethics.

Thank you for considering my request to proceed with this study.

Sincerely,

Rumiana Cormack
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Rumiana Cormack
c/o Administration Offices
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Prince George, BC V2M 1L7
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Re:  Research on The Impact of Creative Drama on the Quality of Short Stories When Used in the Prewriting Stage of the Writing Process by Grade 6/7 Students

March 15, 2002

Dear Research Ethics Board Member,

I am writing to request your permission to conduct a research study with my own and one other grade six/seven class in Blackburn Elementary School. I am currently a graduate student in Curriculum and Instruction here at University of Northern British Columbia. The data I intend to collect is toward my masters thesis: The Impact of Creative Drama on the Quality of Short Stories When Used in the Prewriting Stage of the Writing Process by Grade 6/7. My thesis committee consists of Dr. Dennis Procter, Dr. Judith Lapadat, and Dr. Bruce Wyse.

The idea for my thesis stems from both, my professional and my personal life. As a teacher working with grade six/sevens for the past six years, I’ve been searching for ways to assist my students to become more effective and engaged writers. I became curious to see if incorporating drama, a personal interest of mine for many years, into the teaching of short story writing, would have a positive impact on the quality of their stories and/or on their motivation to write. In my research into this subject I found that studies that have investigated the capacity of drama to enrich learning have yielded positive results. It has been associated with gains in language acquisition, problem solving, cooperative learning, empathy and values clarification as well as self-esteem and social development. The studies/projects that deal specifically with the impact of drama on the writing of short stories, however, are few in number. It is my intention to help fill this gap by collecting data and reporting qualitative descriptions of my experience in teaching a short story unit using creative drama. My first goal in the study is to examine the impact that creative drama activities, introduced during prewriting, have on the quality of the short stories written by students. My second goal is to describe the impact that creative drama has on writing instruction from my perspective and that of my students.
The intended duration of this qualitative study is ten weeks and it is to be conducted during the last term of year 2002. Two grade 6/7 classes will be involved in the study, each receiving a different prewriting strategy. One class will receive drama and related discussion as part of prewriting instruction and the second class will receive direct teaching - a traditional instructional method where discussions are led by the teacher through a teacher question, student response model. Class time for both groups in this study will be two 40 minute blocks per week for writing instruction and one 15 minute block per week for reflective journal writing. In the first week, the students will write a short story that will be used as a Pre-Treatment Story. In the following 9 weeks, the students will be given instruction on short story writing and will be expected to produce three short stories, based on different themes, one at the end of every third week. Prewriting, for both groups, will be incorporated into most lessons.

All short stories, including the Pre-Treatment Story, which will serve as the base to track growth in the quality of writing between the two groups, will be assessed using the British Columbia Ministry of Education Performance Standards. To ensure consistency in marking and to provide inter rater reliability, a second marker will assess a randomly selected subset of the stories. This marker is an English teacher who is familiar with the Performance Standards. The weekly student reflection logs will be used through the course of the study to track the students' experiences, perception, comfort level, and attitude toward the prewriting activities as well as the subsequent writing they produce. My field notes will be used to monitor the progress of the study. I will write a detailed account on the creative drama and non-drama prewriting activities and the corresponding student, as well as my own, participation and reaction to these activities. Analysis of the videotapes will enable me to capture the process of the work, and afford the possibility of reviewing the lessons closely.

I perceive this study to be useful in that it will contribute information to a field of research that presently lacks sufficient data. More important for me, however, is my own professional development and the possibility of sharing my findings with my colleagues. I believe that using a creative drama prewriting strategy will enable my students to feel more comfortable during writing, take control of their writing, and improve their writing quality. First, creative drama involves the participation in the construction and enactment of scenes using all human functions: cognitive, physical, and emotional. If we accept the notion that one "learns by doing" then the learning that takes place when constructing scenes is significant because the learner, as a writer, gains direct experience about which he/she can write. Second, the "as if" feature of creative drama allows students to experiment with different situations and understand different perspectives. Through role play, they put themselves in the place of others, and come to understand and empathize with their thoughts and feelings. After they have experienced "living" as others, the students can more effectively write from different perspectives. Third, when students participate in creative drama activities, they come away with both, the material and the need, for writing. The writing is embedded within a context that has personal meaning for the writer and thus a motivation for writing is created.
In addition to reporting on the impact of creative drama on the quality of short stories, it is my intent to provide the groundwork for the development of a tool that will more specifically describe a student’s writing in areas such as dialogue and characterization. This will be an analytic assessment tool that can be used together with a holistic measure such as the one found in the Performance Standards. Teachers may find this useful if they want to focus on these particular elements of a short story.

In my experience and contact with other teachers, drama is not integrated readily into the curriculum. I believe that the drama expertise of the teacher is not a requirement. Theorists, such as Vygotsky, claim that play and improvisation are inherent in children. I hypothesize that my study will show that tapping into this dramatic side of children does not require great expertise on the part of the teacher, can be integrated into existing programs such as writing, and can be developed mutually with the students without a great change to the teacher’s regular procedures.

Finally, for those interested in creating a more social constructivist classroom, I believe that drama is a natural medium. According to social constructivism, students are viewed as being active participants in constructing meaning, by using their past/current knowledge, within a social setting. Creative drama activities are inherently social because they encourage group work and dialogue. If a teacher wishes to adopt a more social constructivist perspective, she can introduce creative drama in discrete blocks of time into already existing units in content areas such as language arts, socials, math or science. By structuring this in, and stepping back to allow the students’ natural ability to play be exhibited, the process may yield new, far reaching dynamics in the classroom.

I have taken care to fulfill all requirements for this study. Please find enclosed my thesis proposal that includes the theoretical framework, pertinent literature, a detailed description of the proposed study, and all necessary documentation dealing with ethics.

Thank you for considering my request to proceed with this study.

Sincerely,

Rumiana Cormack
**SHORT STORY RUBRIC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>MARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASPECT</td>
<td>Not Yet Within Expectations</td>
<td>Minimally Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Fully Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNAPSHOT</td>
<td>Story is loosely connected;</td>
<td>Story is complete, some detail;</td>
<td>Story is complete; has some</td>
<td>Story is expressive; has</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brief; serious errors.</td>
<td>quality uneven; frequent errors.</td>
<td>engaging features.</td>
<td>emotional impact in places.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEANING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on other work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interesting twists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Few, irrelevant, or repetitive.</td>
<td>Limited. Tell rather than</td>
<td>Begins to “show” rather than</td>
<td>“Shows” rather than tells.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“show”.</td>
<td>tell.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>No sense.</td>
<td>Little sense.</td>
<td>Some sense.</td>
<td>Awareness and consideration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narration/dialogue</td>
<td>Inconsistent point of view and/or past/present tense. Confusing dialogue.</td>
<td>Sometimes point of view and/or past/present tense incorrect. May be unnatural, confusing dialogue.</td>
<td>Consistent point of view and/or past/present tense. Appropriate, easy to follow dialogue.</td>
<td>Choice of narration adds to story and characters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Example of a Story Graded Primarily at Level 1 (Not Yet Within Expectations)

747 CRASH!!!

On September 11, 2001 two 747's crashed into the twin towers. People ran down the stairs as fast as they could. Soon to figure out that the towers were going to collapse on them. All the people were killed from the debris from the planes. Half an hour later the towers collapsed. The FBI came to figure out who it was. When they were finished they knew it was Osama bin Laden.

George Bush declared war. Sent in troops to find Osama bin Laden. In the USA they were trying to find any living people. At the airport one of the workers looked at the scanner and a 747 was heading straight for the Pentagon. She called the brig and told them that a plane was heading straight for the Pentagon.

In Afghanistan they caught bin Laden. And brought him back to the USA and sentenced him to death.
Appendix G

Example of a Story Graded Primarily at Level 2 (Minimally Meets Expectations)

Road Trip to AC/DC

It was one afternoon when Eddie decided that he was going to get out of bed to go to the washroom. It took some hard thinking then he remembered in two days he and Superfly were going to go to AC/DC in Idaho. He went to the bathroom then he picked up lunch from Tacobell. He spent about fifty bucks on burritos then he said, “It’s time to scope out some serious chicks.” He drove down Main Street then went to Superfly’s apartment. He had just bought an awesome entertainment system with six foot speakers two footers and one foot. It was so loud it could blow a rhino’s nose off with the dial only on three.

Superfly was still in bed because he had a burger eating contest which he won by eating fifteen big macs. So Superfly poured ice cold water all over him and he got up in a hurry. After they ate the burritos Superfly and Eddie started on their trip they’ll never forget. They hopped into Eddie’s old 54 Chevy that was all rusted with no hood. So they started off. It was a nice sunny day, they were listening to some AC/DC, just days away from the concert in Boise Idaho.

The next morning when they were in Washington Eddie was fixing his truck because his door fell off for some reason. He thought maybe because the bolts were too rusty and they might have cracked or something like that. They got to DC and stayed overnight in a hotel with a huge pool, a big bar and lots of chicks. Superfly’s favourite part of the hotel was all the free food that he got. It was usually pizza.

Then they started on the road and got to Boise in twelve hours. They were doing about 120 km 30 km over the speed limit. They stopped in a small bar to have a few drinks and Eddie had about fifteen beers one shot of rum and he was drunk. Superfly the smart one remembered the time and they rushed to the concert and they thought it started already but they were just in time for it.

They both jumped in the mosh pit and they were jumping around. The concert was over and they had super backstage passes. After the concert they were partying all night with the band and in the morning they started to drive back to their hometown. When they got there they waited till their next concert and road trip.
Appendix H

Example of a Story Graded Primarily at Level 3 (Fully Meets Expectations)

THE PIED PIPER OF HELMALIN

The meeting was boring and my sluggish partner Tom was snoring loudly. The councilors were doing all the talking while the mayor was sitting at the table stuffing his face with food. I tried to sneak two bottles of Powerade for Tom and I because that always keeps us going and besides, we were thirsty. Then the Mayor yelled out, “Someone took two bottles of Powerade!” So I had to return them to him, that lazy jerk! Then there was a knock at the door and everyone stopped, then one of the mayor’s servants walked over and opened the door. In walked a very strange looking person that certainly got everyone’s attention. He was wearing all the bright colours you could think of, yellow, light blue, red, and many more. The Mayor said, “Who are you and what do you want?” The stranger said, “My name is the Pied Piper.” My partner Tom had woken up finally and said, “Wow, he is more like the hobo of colours.” Everyone laughed and the Mayor chuckled while eating a greasy chicken wing.

It was interesting that this person showed up as we had been discussing the rat problem in the city. Somehow he seemed to know everything about how the rats came to be. The Piper then told the councilors what he would do to the rats to get them away from here. He also announced what it cost. The Mayor spit out half of his drink when the Piper told him how much it would cost. The Mayor gasped, “1000 gidars, you must be crazy!” The Piper answered, “No, not really.” So the Mayor said, “Only a nimerod would agree to that.” After a few minutes the Mayor agreed to it and sent him on his way even though he was suspicious of this unusual stranger. The meeting finished and then my partner and along with this other guy we knew from a bar in town met outside the Mayor’s house and we talked about the meeting. He said, “Wasn’t that meeting boring?” My partner, Tom, said, “Not at all.” I said, “How would you know, you were asleep the whole time.” Tom’s face went red and he quietly said, “Oh.”

A small rat walked by and two hobos jumped out of nowhere and killed it. Tom, being startled pulled out his gun and said, “Wooh, now what the heck are you two doing?” They answered, “Killing rats for our mom.” I asked, “Why would you do that?” The two scruffy kids
"The rats killed our mom last week so we are killing them for her!" They then told us their names, which made us giggle because one was named Ho and the other was named Bo.

Then a rat jumped on Ho's leg and bit it hard. He yelled, "The crazy sucker bit me!" Suddenly Bo said, "Pet rat kill him!" As we watched, another rat with a kind of rag jacket on, jumped through the air and body checked the rat and bit into its neck killing it. We asked Ho and Bo if they had been at the meeting at the Mayor's office. They looked at each other and said, "What meeting?" So we told them about how the Mayor just ate and did nothing. Bo said, "That old lazy bum!" Then we departed and went on to our own business. I finished up the day and went to bed and noticed it was quieter than the week before.

The next morning, when I woke up, I noticed there were no children around. I thought it was strange that it was 11:00 am and that they should be running around the street by now. Then I rounded a corner and saw five guys loading a jeep with guns and boxes of ammunition. They also had two huge swords that were not the usual type. I walked over and said, "What you doing with all those weapons in the jeep?" They answered, "The Pied Piper took all of the children and led them out of town so we're going to find the Piper to kill him and bring back our kids." I said, "Good luck." They said, "We're going to need it!"

Two days later I was in my office working at my desk. Well, it wasn't much of a desk because it had maybe 100 holes in it and I was amazed it even stood up, but that is another story. When I looked up and saw two of the guys I had seen at the jeep. They were badly battered up with holes in their clothes and were cut everywhere. They stuttered as they spoke and they said, "The Piper! The Piper!" I asked, "What about the Piper?" They were too scared to talk so I got them two glasses of water that weren't dirty from the rats. They asked for one more and then they told me about how the Pipe Piper had taken all of the kids to make them into super soldiers. I remembered how the news had spread quickly that even though the Pied Piper had done his job to get rid of the pesky rats, the Mayor wouldn't pay him the amount they agreed on. As the Pied Piper was leaving the Mayor's office he told him, "You will pay for the trickery!" The Piper had somehow brainwashed the kids and they were constructing war weapons to come back to Hamelin and take the city over. Ho and Bo told me that one of the guys had tripped and fallen and gave away their hiding position to the Piper. The Hamelin men had injured one of the Piper's warriors but they shot and killed three of the men. These two hat were in my office were very lucky. I wasn't sure what to believe and like most people would have thought it was a joke.
They could see that I wasn’t convinced so they said, "Do you want us to prove it to you?" I said, "Sure."

The next morning, bright and early, the guys came and knocked at my door. I got ready and I took a piece of bread with butter on it and went out the door with my pistol and double barrel shotgun. I got into the jeep and drove off with ho and Bo. Almost one hour later we arrived at the point where they had been last. I could tell because there was one of the townsmen on the ground dead. The guys said in a whisper to me, "We have to push the jeep into the bushed because there is a daily patrol on the road." So we pushed the old jeep into the bush and covered it up and trudged on until we found Sean. He was on the ground barely alive, when he said with his last few moments of breath, "Kill the Piper." Then he died. It was a sad moment for a while but then we picked up his rifle and continued walking. About ten minutes later we came to a very tall kind of a wall with many large holes in it. We peeked in one of the holes and sure enough there were the kids making catapults and other weapons. One of our guys sneezed loudly which made one of the kids look up at us and then he yelled, "Intruder!" We took off running as the big wall opened and out ran roughly 2000 kids with guns and swords. We ran, like the wind, afraid of what our kids might do. Being first to the jeep, I jumped into the driver’s seat and put the pedal to the metal just as the kids rounded the corner. They opened fire and hit the bumper of the jeep. I took my pistol from my pocket then I dropped it suddenly just as bullet grazed my hat and smashed the window in front of me. I picked up my pistol, looked up and said, "Holy cow, that was a close one!" I fired two rounds, hitting several of them, but it didn’t do much damage because they had bulletproof vests. I believe I got one in the arm. We got back to town and screeched to a stop in front of the Mayor’s house. We jumped out and ran into the building, pushed open the doors, and then told the Mayor what we had seen. He seemed very surprised but said, "Take this key and to the cellar and take out all of the weapons we have!" He then pointed to the guy beside me to go around and assemble an army. The Mayor wanted the loaded, to get over there and destroy the Pied Piper. We did as we were told as quickly as we could. One hour later, six loaded jeeps rode off to the Piper’s village. My partner Tom was told, along with five other sheriffs, to guard the mayor if the Piper slipped away and came to the house.

Half an hour later we reached the hill where the Piper was assembling his army of warriors. The people from Hamelin took the weapons and went to take over the grounds where the children
warriors were. The other two guys and myself went to look for the Piper. We got to the wall and looked through it to see our men beating Piper's men. We also saw the sneaky Piper going through another door about 250 meters away. Quickly we turned and ran in that direction to try and stop him. We got around the corner just as the piper's jeep sped off so we followed it as fast as possible. Ahead we saw the Piper and his two bodyguards meet with eighteen other guards. They went through a passage way up the mountain so we followed up the stairs. At the top there was tall grass and we saw the guards on another hill twenty feet away. I took the scope from my bag and slid it into the gun and took aim. Just at that second, two other guards came into view and I spied the four out. We trudged on and saw the remaining sixteen and the Piper going down a steep hill. Running fast down some steps, one of the guys stripped on a rock and started to roll down the hill. We could hardly believe our eyes as we watched the Pied Piper's men being hit down, like bowling pins, as the man kept rolling. As the men fell over the side of the hill, the Piper was thrown into a shallow trench. We ran over to the trench and prepared for shots being fired. I slowly looked over the edge to see if he was still alive. Instantly, a shot was fired that made a hole in my hat. I said, "You shot through my good hat." And added "Now you're in big trouble."

We all returned to the city with our prisoner. The Mayor put the Pied Piper in jail after he made him turn the children back to normal. I was a hero to the people of Hamelin and four months later I was named the mayor of Hamelin.
Appendix I

Example of a Story Graded Primarily at Level 4 (Exceeds Expectations)

Journey to the Black Hole

The enormous spaceship, christened the Andromeda Silvership Galaxy Pathfinder because of its brilliant silver colour, took off from earth. The captain of the ship was Mathias. It was all his idea: to travel farther than anybody had ever traveled before into space, to find unidentified forms of life. He claimed to have seen a spaceship fly low over his lab in Ontario. The spaceship, according to Captain Mathias, was sleek and black with jagged wings. Flashing blood red lights had adorned it and the lights blinked at a furious speed. Some of the lights, he claimed, stayed on constantly. These were green.

Not many people had believed him. But Captain Mathias did not give up though. He built a ship with very powerful rocket thrusters and engines. It was huge, four hundred meters long, three hundred meters wide and seven stories high. He picked a crew of two hundred to go with it on January 1, 5004. Now it was January 24 and it was the day scheduled for take-off.

Many people were there just to operate the ship when landing and take-off occurred. Right now the Silvership was very busy and people were running around yelling orders and smacking into each other. But everything went smoothly and they left Earth’s gravitational pull quickly at a speed of sixty light years an hour. Captain Mathias happily set the Silvership on autopilot and started to write in his journal.

January 24, 5004

The Silvership took off successfully. My years of hard work have finally paid off. In a few days we will be flying over Pluto and out of this galaxy. That’s how fast my ship can go! Seventy years it took me and now I am finally on my journey or should I say quest to find unidentified forms of life. Yes, I have set off to find the strange ship that flew over my house seventy years ago. And I will, even if it takes me another seventy years.

“Captain, take-off was successful,” came the voice that belonged to the Captain’s second in command.
“Thank you Urgan,” Captain Mathias replied. “Tell Isdera to lower the speed to forty-five light years an hour. That is all.” Urgan nodded and went to tell the speed monitor her instructions.

In one week they had left the galaxy for the unknown. Nobody had attempted to fly out of the galaxy before. The departure and purpose of the Silverhsip had been on the news everywhere. Captain Mathias had been interviewed. Then ridiculed. Even the news reporter had laughed when Captain Mathias said that he would try to reach the collapsed star of Betelgeuse with his ship. If supplies ran out he would turn back and head for Polaris. That star was not so far away.

There were wonderful blazing balls of gas flying by them in magnificent colours and shapes. Asteroids as big as Venus came flying out of nowhere and there was a mad scramble to get out of their way. They encountered Haley’s Comet, as it had been knocked off its course a long time ago by some bigger and meaner comet. You could see a huge hole in the comet’s side as it came hurtling by. Then there were black holes. They seemed to suck the happiness out of the air let alone everything else. Every time Urgan looked at one, all his happiness and joy ran out.

“Captain, we are approaching Betelgeuse at fifty light years an hour,” said Isdera. “It appears to be a black hole. It’s massive! Captain, even suspected alien civilizations have never come out of that black hole. Why are you taking such a risk? Why do you want this crew to die?”

“Isdera,” said Captain Mathias in a calm voice, “I do not plan to kill this crew and I most certainly don’t want them to die. I just suspect that my alien spaceship came from here. I have worked long enough to get here and I would be pleased if my efforts paid off.”

“But Isdera is right Captain,” Urgan argued. “Wouldn’t it be better to keep the lives of two hundred than to sacrifice them for a glimpse of an alien world? I mean look”, Urgan pointed to a computer, “at the size of that thing! Why wou-“

But the Captain interrupted Urgan. “Look!” Captain Mathias shouted suddenly, “Look! It’s the ship! It’s the ship! We must follow it!”

The Silvership was hovering above the black hole and they were able to see with the ship’s extra sensitive motion sensors that went haywire when anything moved and certain telescopes that could see tiny objects several thousand light years away more clearly than
anything ever invented before, saw the alien ship head straight into the black hole. The speed of
the foreign ship was terrifying. It was going at least one hundred light years an hour. And that is
fast. But the ship was unmistakable for any other.

Urgan, Isdera, and Captain Mathias were stunned with shock at what they saw next. A
city. An enormous city, built much in the fashion of the spacecraft, loomed up into the screen
they were watching. There were flashing blood red lights and they lit up the city in a continuous
pattern. Jagged roofs were placed on top of what looked like flawless floating spherical houses.
The spaceship that the three of them had seen was heading towards one large building without a
roof. It was just a colossal floating crystal ball. Everything was black except for the one
building. It was bright white and it stood out against the other buildings. But these things were
not what shocked them the most.

Extra Terrestrial bat people,” said Urgan.

The bat people had huge wings that were at least ten feet across and eight feet top to
bottom. They had legs and arms but they were covered with black and silver fur. Their faces
were bat-like but razor sharp three-inch long teeth replaced the usual one and a half. And claws.
Long sleek claws that were four inches long and deadly sharp. Their feet were like an eagle’s,
easy to walk on and easy to tuck away when flying. Trillions of the bat people lived here. Even
the smaller bat people with a wingspan of only five feet were still terrifying. That was Urgan’s
opinion. Captain Mathias thought otherwise. He probably never did a stupider thing when he
angled the ship to follow the foreign one into the black hole. They were in the black hole’s
gravity pull before you could say stop. It was like a stone being dropped from a great height.
Nothing could stop the Silvership now. Her engines were not strong enough. Isdera yelled in
panic s the ship lurched when it hit an alien satellite, covered with tiny spikes, and tipped
clumsily.

Then came the roof of a particularly large alien building. Urgan covered his eyes and
waited to die on impact. But it never came. Instead there was jolt that almost sent him flying
into the computer screen in front of him. The computer told him that they had not crashed. The
Silvership had just on inch to go to make a crash. Any more and the whole crew would have
been lost. An invisible barrier had stopped them. But they were not alone.
The moment the Silvership had entered the bat people’s territory, their presence had been identified. Now the evil faces of the bat people leered at them from every direction. An authoritative looking bat person stuck his ugly face up to one of the cameras on the outside of the ship. “Welcome,” said the bat person in a cold, grating, and screechy voice.

Urgan and Isdera were shocked but apparently Captain Mathias was not. “You speak English?” he cried delightedly.

“English?” replied the bat person. “We speak no English here. Only Iraktan, language of the bat people. Why are you here?”

Urgan unstuck his throat. “We were sucked in by the black hole’s gravity pull,” he said. “We didn’t mean to be here. Can we go now?”

“You cannot get out with this...this thing!” the bat person said. “Only our ships can do that. This tiny little toy could not even get one thousand iaks into the air. And anyway, the King wants to meet you. Come, get out of your toy and follow me. All of you.”

They had no choice. Captain Mathias made an announcement for everyone to meet at the main exit where aliens were waiting for them. Urgan took count of the crew as they filed out the door. His heart sank as the last person got off. Only one hundred eighty people were left including Captain Mathias, Isdera, and himself. Twenty had died on impact. Most of the crew were too afraid and in terror in order to say anything about the strange creatures with hungry looks in their eyes. Urgan stepped out of the ship. Then everything went black.

Urgan woke up in an ordinary prison cell with Isdera and Captain Mathias. Urgan had a sore head, as if he’d been hit over the head with a club. Isdera was up and pacing while Captain Mathias lay on the floor, still out of it. “You all right?” Isdera asked.

“You’re fine. What is the date?”

“February first.”

“February first! Is there anybody here?”

“Yes, there’s a guard down the hall.”

Urgan walked up to the prison door and called at the guard. “Hey, you!” Urgan cried.

“Be quiet. There’s no need to be making noise. You’ll be making enough of it soon,” came the wicked voice of the bat guard.

“What do you mean?” Isdera asked.
“When the King comes,” the bat person laughed with a shake of his head, “he will give you a nightmare that you’ll never forget. If you live.”

“What happens?” Urgan asked.

“Oh, it’s not my place to tell you. You’ll find out soon enough anyway.”

“What are you going to do to us?” yelled Isdera.

“Here comes the King now. Your Majesty,” the bat guard said to the approaching King, “these things, humans I believe, are inquiring about what will happen to them and their fellow living species.”

The guard shivered with fear as the King came closer. Urgan felt terrible fear as he first beheld the King of the bat people. Fifteen feet wingspan and fourteen feet tall, six inches of teeth and eight-inch claws, blood red fur and gray eyes. When he opened his mouth to speak, his voice grated harshly. Urgan noticed his teeth were black. Black diamonds. “Bring them all to the arena,” was all the King said with a voice that could freeze lava.

Fifteen minutes later, the entire crew had been assembled in front of the King. They were frozen with terror at the sight of the King. There was silence. Everybody seemed to feel that something was going to happen. Something bad. “So,” the King said. The crew winced as if they had been slapped in the face. “Why have you come here?”

It seemed that Urgan was the only one with enough stability to speak. “We were passing by your abode when the black hole sucked us in.”

The King glared at him. Urgan trembled visibly under his gaze. “A likely story. Don’t lie to me,” the King snarled.

“I’m not! I was telling the truth!” Urgan cried.

“You lie! Where is your army to come and invade my world? Probably hiding, waiting for you to come and report to them because you are spies! Release my friend!”

A moan came from the guards watching, but they went to open a gate at the far end of the arena. All the bat people did was unlock the door and then they flew off like lightning was chasing them. A huge and hideous something burst its way through the barrier that had held it back.

It was a horrific sight. The creature looked as if it had been a massive bat. It unfurled its wings and electricity crackled along the membranes as it shook dust and rocks away. The simple act of these wings unfolding – hundreds of feet long, Urgan guessed – created a shock wave of
searing wind that blasted everybody backwards. The head was furless and scales replaced the fur. A forked tongue flicked in and out of the open mouth with endless rows of silver teeth, each sharper than a honed dagger. Four green eyes stared at its prey. Spikes protruded down its back and the end of its tail was completely made of poisonous spikes. The claws on its feet curved in a ripping position.

The monster paused. Then it charged. Urgan grabbed the two things nearest to him – Captain Mathias and Isdera – and dragged them to the wall where they were to be less noticed. In the monster’s first charge, it had destroyed about fifty crew members. Urgan turned his head from the awful carnage and looked for an escape route. “There!” he shouted. “The door!”

They ran. They ran straight at the door than straight through it, driven by fear of the monster, which was now pursuing them. Isdera chanced a glance backward and immediately regretted it. The monster was gaining. Captain Mathias tripped and fell, bringing Urgan down with him. The monster was upon them. It raised its great had and opened its jaws. “This is the end,” Isdera thought, “the end.”

She closed her eyes and waited to be crushed in a zillion pieces. It took her a moment to realize she was flying. “Don’t say anything, don’t question me. I am helping you get away but you must bring me with you.”

A bat person was holding them and flying extremely quickly towards the spaceport. “Help us,” Captain Mathias croaked.

“We’re going to get a ship. The King’s ship. It’s the fastest.”

The three of them were flown over to the place where the ships were kept. Then all four of them climbed into the King’s ship. The interior was covered with strange flashing lights. It was really eerie. Urgan, Isdera, and Captain Mathias followed the bat person to the control room, which was surprisingly enough, very small. There were buttons with things like Thrusters and Gravity Release, printed on them. There was only one driver’s seat with a steering mechanism much like the Silvership’s. “My name is Shrike,” said the bat person.

“Mathias,” said Captain Mathias.

“Urgan,” said Urgan.

“Isdera,” said Isdera.

“Pleasure. Now, prepare for take-off,” said Shrike as he turned on the ship with a simple nod of his head.
The ship gave off a faint humming sound and it flowed lightly. Then they rose. Faster and faster by the second. It was so fast that they were almost invisible, despite the red flashing lights that had been activated when they took off. Urgan could not understand how Shrike could even steer. But he was steering and very well at that. Then a warning light came on. A missile flew past them and the ship’s rear camera told them that many spaceships were following and shooting very powerful explosives at them. “Hold on,” said Shrike.

Shrike pressed another button and they went even faster. The mere speed at which they were traveling was smushing Urgan, Isdera, and Captain Mathias to the floor. “We’re out of the black hole,” said Shrike, “but they’re still following us.”

Then suddenly a thought hit Captain Mathias so hard it made his brain throb. “What about my crew?” he wailed. “What will happen to them?”

“You have seen what the monster can do. Your crew is fishbait.”

“Can’t we go back and rescue them?”

“Not without killing ourselves. It would be suicide to do that. We head for Earth. There is nothing we can do for your crew now.”

“But - ,” Captain Mathias started to say.

“No. I know that it feels bad but there is nothing we can do.”

Shrike glanced at the screen that told him what was behind the ship. The other spaceships could not catch the King’s one and only spacecraft. They were specks in the distance. The black hole was barely there, just a shimmering, swirling light. They had escaped. Earth. The glorious planet had only taken a day to get to. “Home,” Isdera whispered.

She did not see the hungry look in Shirke’s eyes. “We are in the atmosphere. Prepare for dive position,” said Shrike.

Almost instantly, the ship tilted so it was nose down at a ninety-degree angle. The ocean loomed up before them. Shrike cut off the engine as they left the clouds. The ship had barely enough time to slow down before it hit the Pacific Ocean. They were under the ocean. It was seconds before the ocean floor appeared. “We’re going to crash!” yelled Captain Mathias.

Shrike righted the ship so quickly that everything went flying. Including the three people on board the ship. In five seconds they were out of the ocean and hovering above the surface. “Which way?” asked Shrike.

Shrike turned the ship with a quick jerk and everything went flying again. “Don’t turn so fast!” yelled Urgan. “What are you trying to do, get us killed?”

Shrike slowed the ship down to one thousand miles per hour. In no time they were at the Captain’s house. The ship almost squashed the house but Shrike managed to land next to it.

Captain Mathias opened the door of the ship. “Welcome to earth,” he said.

Shrike stared at the mansion surrounded by trees and tulips. The metal roof glinted in the sun. High tech equipment like robots and sun programmed time machines were in individual buildings. “Strange,” said Shrike, “everything is so very different from Betelgeuse. What is that thing over there?”

“It’s a power smart thing that charges your brain to make you smarter,” said Captain Mathias.

Shrike glanced at the sky. He smiled. “Interesting,” he said as a bomb fell from an enormous pack of the bad people’s spaceships. The house was destroyed in an instant.

Shrike grinned evilly. “You people on Earth don’t deserve to live. You’re all spies and you’ll pay for it!”

He took off and flew to a waiting ship in the sky. “Run!” yelled Urgan, “to the ship!”

They got on the ship and Urgan started it. Urgan had been the only one smart enough to observe Shrike while he was piloting. So he knew how to control the ship. Isdera had found out how the weapons worked. The ship was equipped with the best weapons the bad people had, including Dead on Target Missiles and Long Range Explosives.

Urgan aimed the ship up and put it on its highest speed. They were up and gone before uyo8u could say fast. They all looked back though, and saw the Earth as it exploded into tiny bits under a rain of weapons called Vipers. Rapid Fire Lasers took care of whatever was left of the Earth after the Vipers got to it.

A terrible ache came into Isdera’s heart. Billions of people had died because of them. All their fault. There were the only people left alive in the universe. And there was an army of bat people coming after them. The ache turned to horror and then to fear. The fear of death. “Do we have any weapons on board?” yelled Urgan.

“Plenty!” Isdera yelled back.

“Kill the aliens! Destroy them! It’s either them or us!” Captain Mathias screamed hysterically.
Isdera released a Viper. It took out two of the thousand ships following them. Isdera then installed the defense shield, which could have nothing destroy it. Then Isdera set off a Laser but missed when the ship swerved.

"Give me that!" Isdera said angrily to Urgan.

She took the controls. Then she fired invisible long-range bombs, which reproduced when they hit something. The whole fleet was destroyed in a matter of seconds. Urgan flew the ship towards Betelgeuse. "What are you doing?"

"Revenge time," said Urgan.

In a day they were flying over the black hole. "Which weapon is the most powerful?" asked Urgan.

"The FFF. The ship only carried one though so you must aim carefully," answered Isdera.

They hovered over the black hole. Then they dropped the bomb. The civilization blew up with enormous force. The force sent them hurtling towards another star. In minutes there was nothing left. Not even the black hole remained, which was quite astonishing. Isdera was frozen. "We just murdered all those aliens," she said.

"Yes we did. But they deserved it," said Captain Mathias. "But I have a question to ask. Where do we go now?"

"There is our secret hideout on Jupiter. We shall go there," said Urgan.

And he turned the ship and headed back to begin a new life.
Appendix J

Examples of embarrassing events and the associated statements illustrating feelings, words, and actions of the involved characters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Embarrassing Event</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Associated feelings, words, and actions</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Water on pants looks like an "accident" | 1 | It's the worst thing that could happen to me  
It just had to happen to me didn't it?  
I was so embarrassed.  
he started laughing his head off.  
I was so embarrassed.  
I just wanted to cry  
I ran into the girls' washroom until everyone went home. | 7 |
| *Misses goal by three meters. | 1 | Ethan was so embarrassed  
his face turned bright red.  
Ethan sat four seats away from his team because again he didn't want to face his coach.  
He retired as pro soccer career of embarrassment | 4 |
| *Priest gets caught speeding | 1 | | 0 |
| *Gets caught blowing a kiss to boyfriend  
*Got tongue stuck to a pole | 2 | Oh, my god, I was so stupid to have blown him a kiss  
Oooohh, I groaned in embarrassment.  
They all laughed  
They were mimicking me | 4 |
| *Stubs toe  
*Toilet paper stuck on shoe  
*Falls dancing  
*Trips running | 4 | All the people around her stared at her as if she was insane.  
Stifled laughter was everywhere  
Embarrassed, she fished her shoe out  
She collapsed onto the floor / amid a chorus of laughter.  
Now everyone was laughing | 6 |
| *Falls off bike into muddy water in front of friends | 1 | Everyone was laughing.  
He was so embarrassed.  
The next day at school was the worst day of his life  
At the end of the day he wished he was dead. | 4 |
| *Polkadot panties seen when loses pants | 1 | My face turned beat red.  
I stuck out like a sore thumb.  
For me it was a horrible, embarrassing moment  
My friends were all laughing.  
There I was with my face turned red standing in the middle.  
I am so embarrassed.  
So I had to go home all summer and think about how I can show my face again | 7 |
| *Caught with a pink sock  
*Voice cracks in choir | 2 | The auditorium was silent but the silence only lasted about two seconds, then the air was filled with laughter.  
I felt my face get redder and redder until I couldn’t hold it anymore.  
Tears streamed down my face  
I ran back to the cabin  
In my dreams I was away from humiliation and harassment.  
I couldn't stop thinking about yesterday "choir" kept going through my head. | 6 |
### Appendix K

Changes to the Original Version of Pied Piper of Hamelin by the Drama Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Children respond to Piper's tune by being nice to their parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Villager blasts his way into a rock where children are hidden, he perishes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Town still infested as the children instead of rats follow the Piper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Children pester the mayor; he asks the Piper to take children away; village celebrates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mayor and Piper renegotiate a deal to get the children back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>While with their grandmother, the children want to hear a story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Piper pipes food away from the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Female rat exterminator flies in to deal with rat problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Children are taken because mayor can't solve a riddle, parents are hung.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Children living happily with the Piper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Piper lures rats into a cage; when he doesn't receive his money, he sends the rats to steal the children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>After some time of being prisoner in land of music making instruments, the children are saved by the Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Piper teaches children to play musical instruments, they form a successful orchestra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>All villagers of Hamelin jump to their deaths off a cliff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A war ensues following the disappearance of the children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Piper turns children into super soldiers, villagers win the battle against the Piper and his men, children turned back to normal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes to the Original Version of Pied Piper of Hamelin by the Non-Drama Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Piper takes rats only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Piper rids town of rats by planting bombs in people's houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Piper turns children to cool skaters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mayor pays his next door neighbour, the Piper, to remove rats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Villagers kick the mayor out of village, he travels to a neighbouring town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mayor keeps money meant for the Piper for himself, has a nice life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A baker and his friends find the children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix L

Examples of setting described in isolation and setting embedded with plot/character development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting Isolated</th>
<th>Setting Embedded with Plot and/or Character Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mansion had six floors and was strangely creepy. It was beside a beautiful</td>
<td>Sara and I ran to see what it was. It was a huge old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calm lake that never stormed or flooded and was surrounded by a beautiful forest of</td>
<td>haunted house with broken windows, spider webs, pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blooming apple trees. It was atop a small hill that overlooked the countryside. The</td>
<td>of the house falling off everywhere and the boys wanted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walls were white washed and each wall had at least four windows followed by beautiful</td>
<td>to go in. I said, “I’m not going in there, it’s a piece of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veins of the gardens on every lawn. The thing that made it a bit spooky was a nasty</td>
<td>crap.” The boys took off up the stairs. We didn’t want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>little gargoyles statue that glared at you as you walked by.</td>
<td>to be in that gross looking thing for a house. Tom kicked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A light breeze playfully swung through the trees in the very early morning and the</td>
<td>down one door and ran toward another. I followed and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sky was ablaze with every shade of pink and light purple. Soon the sky would turn</td>
<td>came upon a few boxes shoved in a corner. Then I found my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back to a blue blaze again as drops of golden sunshine spread their warmth and</td>
<td>way to a bedroom, it had a bed, a bathroom and dressers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slowly awoke the cuddly creatures of the Land of Fancy.</td>
<td>and everything. It didn’t look like kid’s bedroom but not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past the foliage of the forest was a breath taking sight of remains from beautiful</td>
<td>an adult’s room either. I went to the bathroom to wash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ancient buildings. The sun was shining and everything was aglow. The remains</td>
<td>up and out of the corner of my eye I saw the curtain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sparkled and looked like they were alive with the sun glittering on them. Even</td>
<td>slowly opening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>though only a little of the buildings remained they were very beautiful and even</td>
<td>He was dragged into the police station and locked into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looked majestic with the golden glow of the sun on them.</td>
<td>his new jail cell. Suffering from claustrophobia, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sat in his jail cell searching for a way out. The guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>set down his lunch tray and locked the steel door. John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>looked at the wall on the left side of the room. Here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>was a grate or heat vent at the very top of the wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John pushed his bed against the wall and underneath the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grate and climbed in and crawled away quickly. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>passageway was very tight and the air was stale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was a dark and stormy night the wind was blowing, the trees were bending and the rain was thrashing against the hospital window and inside it warm.

The big ship had a helm, bridge, mess hall, bar room and quarters. The ship was 10 misers by 12 misers. The bar room was big with lots of controls, levers and little lights. The bedroom quarter had a fridge filled with food.

The canyon was brown and deep with green bushes in some places, the sky was blue and the sun was hot like a burning ball.

It was nice and warm day. There were brick houses and sidewalks and green grass on lawns.

The cabin was on the shore of a beautiful blue sparkling lake, on the shore of lake Winnipeg.

The camp was nice looking. The lake was clear and looked smooth as silk in the orange and red sunset.

The forest was dark, damp and scary, even in the bright light over the sun as it set over the hill. There were wild animals and bugs and other creepy things.

Kurtis liked the house. It had white siding and it had a big basketball court, the house had an indoor and outdoor pool, it had a hot tub too. He thought this was going to be the best party, so much to do like play ball and swim.

I ran off through the deep forest. As I ran through the bush, I fell over a root from a tree. I rolled head over tail through the underbrush. It was prickly, but the yellow, brown, and red leaves on the ground made it sometimes soft so I didn’t get hurt. Then I fell into a huge hole.

Over the next two weeks Serena saw all the wonders of Strigiforme. She stayed in the majestic floating city of Arachniom. She viewed the methane ice crystal art at the Royal Museum. She loved it. She was even allowed inside the Imperial Palace, all decorated with gold and silver, to dine and experience the luxury. This is just like heaven, she thought.

Joe started working around the neighbourhood by mowing their big lawns and washing cars and doing chores like cleaning their fancy houses and painting their fancy fences.

They walked around the corner of the back of the new cabin and seen that every single window in the cabin was broken. The doors had been knocked out the things on the shelf had been knocked off the water beds and leather couches had been cut. The radio, TV and fridge had been stolen.