2-23-2021

Teaching Expository Writing in the Secondary Classroom

Krista Schroeder
schroedk5@csp.edu

Teaching Expository Writing in the Secondary Classroom

Krista Schroeder

Concordia University, St. Paul

Master of Arts in Education – Differentiated Instruction

ED 590: Research & Complete Capstone Cohort #916

Professor Brian Boothe, Ed. D.

Second Reader: Phyllis Burger, Ed. D.

February 16, 2021

DEDICATION

I dedicate this capstone paper to my eldest daughter. I wanted to meet you so much sooner, but you waited patiently for me to earn my master's before deciding to make your way into the world. Only God knew your timing, and originally, waiting for you was a nudge to pursue a master's degree. Now your small kicks spur me on to finish what I started. I cannot wait to meet you and continue to become a better teacher for you and your generation. May you and your class have the writing skills to communicate light to our world.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Table of Contents

Abstract

This paper synthesized current research on how secondary English-language arts teachers can best teach students to organize their ideas through expository writing. This topic is discussed through research findings about defining "good" writing, organizational indicators of quality writing, assessment, classroom strategies, and the impact of home life during the expository writing process. Research indicated that giving students peer, self, and teacher assessment opportunities could have a positive effect on how students organize their writing. Additionally, recent research has shown that when teachers make the writing process personal and fun, students produced higher quality expository writing. While studies suggested that educators should work to bridge a gap between high school and college writing perceptions, further longitudinal research is needed to determine student growth in expository writing skills from the beginning to the end of high school to better understand which writing skills need additional support.

Keywords: expository writing, genre, organizational markers, peer-assessment, self-assessment, teacher-assessment

Teaching Expository Writing in the Secondary Classroom

Chapter One: Introduction

In a *New York Times* article, education reporter Goldstein (2017) wrote, "Poor writing is nothing new, nor is concern about it. More than half of first-year students at Harvard failed an entrance exam in writing — in 1874." While writing has timelessly proven to be a difficult endeavor, even amongst the academically gifted, it is still a valued academic and life skill. Many students find academic writing difficult and abstract as it is a lengthy process requiring constant revision. Students find themselves discouraged early in the process because of writer's block; often, students do not know how to start, or they write on a tangent and cannot get back to their original thesis. Early high school students are in a crucial window of time as they have a few years to prepare for college writing exams, such as the American College Testing (ACT) writing assignment and Advanced Placement (AP) exams. This is important to use this window of time to build student confidence in expository writing organization so they eventually will not have to worry about structure and can focus on the content of their writing instead. Many factors determine student readiness and ability to be successful in their written organization.

It is important to define good written organization for the sake of teachers and students. Newell, Bloome, Kim, and Goff (2019) defined good writing in the classroom as "...interactionally constructed through instructional conversations in which the teacher and students are acting and reacting to each other as well as to the content and form of the written texts" (p. 5), meaning good writing required revision and guidance. Other researchers have found organizational indicators of quality writing. Both DeMichele (2015) and Berman and Nir-sagiv (2007) defined quality by organizational markers including: frame markers, transitional phrases, and a clear thesis statement. Additionally, Sügümlü, Mutlu, and Çinpolat (2019) observed that

when teachers were enthusiastic about the writing process, student motivation increased (p. 487). Without creating a high interest writing activity that connected to students personally, many students would not invest in the writing process and failed to learn the basic components of written organization. To summarize, when educators dedicated time to engage students in the writing process, they empowered students to have the skills they needed to be autonomous writers later in life.

Scope of Research

Organizing writing is something that all students will be assessed on at one point in time, whether it is a formative piece of writing for a class or a high-stakes test such as the ACT writing section. Despite its prevalence as an academic staple, there is little teaching of the writing process and organization of analytic ideas in secondary education. This paper examines research including defining the writing process in an English-language arts (ELA) classroom. This paper will also explore organizational indicators of quality writing, assessment of organization during the writing process, and writing process organizational strategies. Finally, this paper will delve into the impact of home life on student writing. This paper did not study research on elementary writing practices. After analyzing the research of teaching written organization, this paper will try to determine if there are effective ways to teach expository writing to secondary students.

Importance of the Study

Expository essay structure is typically first introduced to students in middle school as a consistent writing practice and way to assess student writing ability and communication of a genre or idea. During this time, there is "…the expectation that students will become skillful writers of this genre by the end of high school" (Hillocks, 2002, as cited in Uccelli et al., 2013, p. 39). Additionally, the ACT and Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) high-stakes tests make it

important that students know how to organize expository writing topics independently. As Faull (2007) noted, there appears to be little research on high school writing structure and how it can be improved (p. 164). Instead, much academic discussion focused on how students can best appreciate and analyze the texts they study rather than if a teacher should emphasize how to improve the structure of student writing to promote clearer communication of ideas and themes in expository writing. Furthermore, any feedback on students' performance, including ACT and SAT rubrics, was almost exclusively content-based. Is it possible for students to deliver content effectively with only limited practice and instruction on how to organize their communication? Being able to organize expository writing is not only a need for students who are college-bound, but all students should leave high school knowing how to structure their ideas in writing. Furthermore, should high school teachers fear, as Faull (2007) did, that, "essay-writing becomes, at best, an afterthought and, at worst, omitted almost entirely?" (p. 164-165). While the writing process might be intimidating for both students and educators alike, it is valuable and worth time and reflection in a classroom setting.

It is important for educators to teach organization in expository instruction so students can communicate their analytic ideas successfully. For this to happen, students must understand organizational and frame markers of successful written organization. Students must also be given chances to revise and discuss their written work through teacher, peer, and self-assessment. Teachers should understand that many students do not enter high school with a fruitful understanding of written organization and must take time to scaffold it for student success.

Research Question

In light of what is known about differentiated instruction, how can secondary English teachers best teach written organization to students through expository writing instruction?

Definition of Terms

Assessment refers to collaborative revision steps in the writing process. The research in this paper will focus on three types of assessment through the writing process: peer, self, and teacher assessment. Yibre (2019) described peer and teacher assessment by writing, "…learners are supposed to explore a topic through writing, showing the teacher and peers their drafts and read what they write again and again, think about them and move on to new ideas" (p. 125). Self-assessment is often considered the most advanced and final form of assessment before a student submits a final written product.

Expository writing refers to writing that is topic-oriented and "focus[ed] on concepts and issues and express the unfolding of ideas, claims, and arguments in terms of the logical interrelations among them" (Berman & Nir-sagiv, 2007, p. 80). "Topic oriented" writing includes theme and argumentative essays. Uccelli et al. (2013) further described expository writing as, "…characteristically assertive yet epistemically cautious attitude …" (p. 41), meaning expository writing uses researched ideas and formal vocabulary.

Genres refers to "types of discourse defined by different communicative goals and functions" (Berman & Nir-sagiv, 2007, p. 79). Berman and Nir-sagiv (2007) and Uccelli et al. (2013) both note that as students develop as writers, they begin "… moving progressively across three categories: personal genres (e.g., narratives and recounts), factual genres (e.g., procedures and reports), and analytic genres focused on analysis and argumentation (e.g., explanations, persuasive or argumentative essays)" (Uccelli et al. 2013, p. 38). The research in this paper will focus on the teaching of analytic or expositive genres, typically considered the most complex writing genre.

Organizational markers refer to a subgenre of discourse measures relating to development of written organization. Uccelli et al. (2013) defined organization markers as words and phrases that: signal a sequence of claims, introduce an example, indicate interclauses or interparagraph relations of cause-consequence, or express or introduce a conclusion (p. 45).

Summary

To summarize, there appears to be little research on high school writing structure and how it can be improved, specifically for native English speakers in a western high school classroom. This research will attempt to define organizational indicators of quality writing. This research will also define the writing process in an ELA classroom, give suggestions of effective assessment of organization during the writing process. Finally, this paper attempts to share writing process organizational strategies for teachers to use with their secondary students.

A literature review in Chapter 2 examines studies that relate to teaching written organization. In addition, Chapter 2 looks at the most important indicators of successful expository writing. Finally, Chapter 2 also summarizes the findings of the literature review. Chapter 3 offers suggestions for educators to apply teaching strategies for effective organization in writing to their students so they can communicate their ideas clearly. Ultimately, once students master organization of ideas, they will be able to achieve autonomy in writing and focus their energy on analysis.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This literature review attempts to determine best writing practices to improve written organization and autonomy for secondary language arts students through a mix of qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-method studies. This chapter will first discuss literature and research about the findings of previous studies about defining the writing process in the English-language

arts (ELA) classroom through studies conducted by Newell, Bloome, Kim, and Goff (2019) and Spires, Kerkhoff, and Graham (2016). Next, this literature review will cover research based on organizational indicators of quality writing by summarizing studies by Sügümlü, Mutlu, and Çinpolat (2019), Berman and Nir- Sagiv (2007). Third, this literature review will provide teacher assessment strategies of written organization by looking at research from Crossley, Weston, McLain Sullivan, and McNamara (2011), Oi (2014), and Uccelli, Dobbs, and Scott (2013). Fourth, Chapter 2 will provide research on writing process organizational strategies for students through research conducted by Faull (2007), Magalas and Ryan (2016), Yibre (2019), and will review suggestions from by Berman and Nir- Sagiv (2007), Oi (2014), and Uccelli et al. (2013). Finally, the impact of home life on writing will be explored through the research of Diniz, da Rosa Picolo, de Paula Couto, Salles, and Helena Koller (2014), Donovan (2016), Gilliland (2015), Magalas and Ryan (2016), and Relles (2017).

Review of Proposed Problem

In light of what is known about differentiated instruction, how can secondary English teachers best teach written organization to students through expository writing instruction? It is important for students to become more confident in their writing during their high school careers. Good writing requires revision and guidance, and teachers can work with students who are developing their expository writing skills through various assessment and revision strategies during class. Researchers DeMichele's (2015) and Berman and Nir-sagiv's (2007) defined quality by organizational markers including: frame markers, transitional phrases, and a clear thesis statement. Giving students the tools of organizational markers for their writing could benefit them greatly after high school. To summarize the proposed problem of how to best teach written organization to students though expository writing, educators can empower students to

have the skills they need to be autonomous writers later in life by applying steps from the

research outlined in this paper.

Review of Importance of Topic

To review, it is important for educators to teach organization in expository writing

instruction so secondary students can communicate their analytic ideas successfully. For this to

happen, students must understand organizational and frame markers of successful written

organization. Students must also be given chances to revise and discuss their written work

through teacher, peer, and self-assessment. Writing in the classroom might be intimidating for

students because it is an abstract skill that requires modification across different contexts.

Studies, such as Uccelli et al. (2013) also note that teaching the writing process can also feel

intimidating for teachers because classrooms:

> …are becoming increasingly diverse- where students with distinct languages, different
>
> socioeconomic statuses, various ethicalities, and ways of communicating are interacting
>
> ever more closely with one another- understanding the within-grade variability of writing
>
> performances is critical to better serve all students. (p. 37)

This means that teachers need to think beyond content and writing skill sets of their content area

and consider the individual students in the room. While this might seem like a daunting task, the

success of student written communication depends on it.

Defining the Writing Process in an ELA Classroom

Before diving into written organization, one should define the writing process for an ELA

classroom. Furthermore, it is important to create criteria and genre boundaries for teachers and

students. When considering teacher assessment of student writing in the high school classroom,

literacy typically looks different in each core content class. Therefore, it is assumed that students

should be able to code-switch their writing skills for different content areas as well as have ongoing conversations defining good writing organization as they mature in their craft.

In a mixed method study, Spires, Kerkhoff and Graham (2016) discussed the merits of disciplinary literacy and inquiry as two approaches to writing across different core content areas. Spires et al. (2016) studied the role of writing in the core content areas of English language arts (ELA), science, history, social studies, and math. Spires et al.'s (2016) research assumed that ELA classrooms were not solely responsible for teaching writing and how it should be organized. In order to narrow down focus, Spires et al. (2016) noted that ELA classrooms should assume the role of literary critics and be able to construct and interpret a text by going beyond the text to uncover themes and social commentaries (p. 155). The study combined disciplinary literacy with project-based inquiry and focused on a higher-level application for students to demonstrate what they know so that their "…products will have value within and outside of school. The model propose[d] to help teachers create an instructional path for deeper learning within the disciplines" (Spires et al., 2016, p. 156). The study also provided an in-depth example of how a tenth-grade biology teacher applied the writing model in her content class. While sharing responsibility to teach written organization across content is a noble goal, Spires et al.'s (2016) study focused on content results for core classes without a universal plan about how to organize ideas in writing. The study concluded that teachers should look to supplemental research and application steps to give students foundational skills for writing before differentiation can happen for content-specific writing requirements. This study did recognize that teaching writing is a shared responsibility for all content areas.

Additionally, a qualitative study by Newell, Bloome, Kim, and Goff (2019) defined writing organization for both teachers and students. Newell et al. (2019) followed an

international Baccalaureate (IB) ELA classroom of 22 high school juniors. Their study was fueled by the questions, what is "good writing"? and, how do teachers instruct students about good writing, both in how to identify it and how to produce it? Newell et al. (2019) started the study by acknowledging that good writing is multifaceted and difficult to define. However, for the purpose of their study, Newell et al. (2019) defined good writing in the classroom as "...interactionally constructed through instructional conversations in which the teacher and students are acting and reacting to each other as well as to the content and form of the written texts" (p. 5). This means writing was relational and required understanding between the writer and a teacher to communicate ideas successfully. Therefore, they concluded that the writing process should be structured through a pattern of teacher assessment, modeling, and conversations before student self-assessment happens and a student was released to write and organize his ideas on his own.

On a practical level, Newell et al. (2019) found that having samples of "good writing" helped define expectations for students. The study also revealed the dangers of teaching writing organization for only a grade, as it only produced surface-level results:

"Developing, trying-out and judging whether new practices work does not happen only within the confines of the classroom. 'Test prep' and getting an 'A' are perpetual concerns in English language arts classrooms and such a discourse may undercut the benefits of teaching and learning extended, complex written literary argumentation."

(Applebee & Langer, 2013, as cited in Newell et al., 2019, p. 26)

Meaning, instead of labeling an example essay by a grade and a checklist of criteria, Newell et al. (2019) observed that a teacher and students often complicate the writing process when they are caught up in language. Generating content through writing worked best with sample essays if

they "wondered" (Newell et al., 2019, p. 27) about organization and content together before

worrying about writing using academic discourse. This can happen through entextualization, a

process that removes a text from its original context, or by using samples of good argumentative

writing and class conversations about what makes the format and content are effective and

"good." One mentioned limitation to this study was the difficulty moving away from a

prescribed formula for teaching written organization to an organic conversation about how

writing should be organized for the sake of flow and effective communication. Balancing having

a prescribed formula of teaching written organization with flexibility could be a challenge if a

teacher is not confident in her own writing abilities or if students were not familiar with

expository written structure.

Writing Process Organizational Strategies

In addition to defining the writing process for both students and teachers, many studies

have focused on high-engagement and high-interest strategies to help students improve their

writing. A quantitative study conducted by Sügümlü, Mutlu, and Çinpolat (2019) used a

correlational research model to follow 230 students attending three different high schools in

Turkey over the course of the 2018-2019 school year. Their research revealed a strong

correlation between writing motivation and writing skills. Sügümlü et al. (2019) also observed

that teachers' enthusiasm played a role in creating motivation among students for writing (p.

487). Another study that supported the correlation between writing motivation and writing skills

was Kurudayıoğlu and Karadağ's (2010) research which revealed that students responded with

symptoms of boredom and were not willing to write because they found writing difficult

(Sügümlü et al., 2019, p. 488). Other important correlations teachers should keep in mind

included that motivation for writing decreases with grade level (p. 490), and that female students

had higher motivation levels (p. 489). Therefore, Sügümlü et al. (2019) concluded that teachers

made a positive impact on the quality of student writing when they played a role in being

cheerleaders in the writing process. This approach could be modeled through the writing process

at the high school level where writing might be perceived as intimidating or boring to students,

especially males.

      Next, a quasi-experimental, mixed methods study, which also implemented student

engagement strategies to teach writing and organization, conducted by DeMichele (2015)

examined the role of improvisational theater and the development of writing fluency in a high

school context through writing instruction. DeMichele's (2015) study took place at an inner-city

high school in New Jersey during a summer program. The study consisted of one experimental

class and two comparison classes. Students in the experimental class were told they would be

participating in improvisational games; they were not told that the purpose of the games was to

improve their writing. The two comparison groups focused their summer program time on

writing instruction taught by a Special Needs Language Arts Instructor and a music instructor.

The theory behind the study was that engaging students in oral improvisation games and then

transitioning into writing prompts helped assist the writing process. As Moffit (quoted in

DeMichele, 2015) explained, "the most critical adjustment one makes [in learning to write] is to

relinquish collaborative discourse, with its reciprocal prompting and cognitive cooperation, and

to go it alone" (p. 7). In other words, talking out a prompt was a helpful first step for a student to

independently write about it.

      Moreover, DeMichele's (2015) study tracked the transition from oral collaborative

improvisational games to written collaborative improvisational games and then finally to

individual writing. According to both studies, improvement occurred outlined in the journal

respects the complexity of transitioning oral organization to writing organization. After DeMichele's (2015) study concluded, data analysis revealed that both regular and special education populations showed increases in both their word and sentence usage in their final writing products (p. 12). Specifically, results from the pre-journal to post-journal writing indicated a 101% increase in word usage and a 131% increase in sentence usage (p. 12). The increase was even greater in students with special needs.

To summarize, when DeMichele (2015) engaged students in "fun" or high-interest oral activities that gave them a chance to think through content and organization before they started independently writing, students were successful in organizing their thoughts for the writing process. The results of DeMichele's (2015) study correlated to Berman and Nir-sagiv's (2007) study that proved that quality writing is defined by organizational indicators being organizational markers, frame markers, transitional phrases, and a clear thesis statement. Improvisational collaborative activities were one way to boost the quality of writing and organization in the writing process. However, the limitations of DeMichele's (2015) and Berman and Nir-sagiv's (2007) studies in relation to teaching written organization was that the strategies presented relate to the start of the writing process, synthesizing information and overcoming writer's block. Both studies were limited in shedding light on how to walk students through refining their writing after the initial drafting stage.

DeMichele (2015), Sügümlü et al. (2019), and Berman and Nir-sagiv's (2007) were three studies that suggested that it is not enough to give students a rubric to show them "good" writing strategies. Instead, all three studies found that the most successful approach to organizing writing was through personal processes that were repeatedly practiced. Additionally, teachers found

success in using the initial period of the writing process to brainstorm ideas before worrying

about students using expository discourse.

Organizational Indicators of Quality Writing

Studies by Uccelli et al. (2013) and Oi (2014) agreed that there are organizational

indicators that correlate to strong written communication of ideas in expository writing at the

high school level. Important organizational skills included organizational markers and decisive

language choice that frequently direct the reader back to the thesis of the text.

A quantitative study conducted by Uccelli et al. (2013) analyzed 51 SAT persuasive

essays at an ethnically diverse inner-city school in the United States to look at writing quality.

They found that organizational markers, (e.g., phrases and words used to explicitly mark

coherent organization of the topic to guide the reader) correlated with quality writing. Other

frame markers that mattered in predicting quality writing included "transitional phrases (e.g.,

such as first, second; one reason, another reason), as well as code glosses (e.g. *for example, in*

other words), and conclusion markers (e.g., *in conclusion*)" (p. 41). The study also found that a

clearly worded stance was an additional component that improved the writing quality score. A

limitation of the study was not being able to discern if individual variabilities in results were

related to writing ability or a student's understanding of the expectations of the persuasive essay

topics.

Additionally, Oi's (2014) qualitative study of 169 high school Japanese students analyzed

timed expository essay organization. Oi (2014) found that a clearly worded stance repeated

throughout the writing assignment ranked a writing sample high in writing quality. Oi (2014)

also noted that Japanese students often had difficulties mastering rhetorical patterns at the level

of discourse, not the sentences (Oi, K.,1986, as cited in Oi, 2014). Thus, for young Japanese

writers, it was important for students to learn how to develop a topic through organization to make their ideas more persuasive. Oi (2014) concluded that self-awareness and self-reflection worked to develop learner autonomy and encouraged students to revise their written production by themselves. A limitation of Oi's (2014) study was that it focused on Japanese students versus native English-speaking students in the United States. However, the findings correlated with the findings about quality writing that Uccelli et al. (2013) found about American students, as Oi (2014) cited the importance of organizational markers and a clear thesis statement woven throughout the writing.

In Crossley, Weston, McLain Sullivan, and McNamara's (2011) quantitative quasi-experimental study, high school writing was measured, analyzed, and compared to college-level freshman writing to track development. The study focused on providing strong quantitative evidence as to the linguistic difference that "emerge[d] between grade levels" (Crossley et al., 2011, p. 304). The study used organic writing samples from the SAT writing section. Crossley et al. (2011) collected essays from three different geographic suburban areas, and the essays collected included "62 essays from 62 9th-grade writers, 70 essays from 70 11th-grade writers, and 70 essays for 70 college freshmen" (p. 289). Crossley et al. (2011) noted that the prompts all students in the study wrote on were "general knowledge prompts that did not require domain knowledge and were meant to induce a variety of ideas" (p. 289). To measure their research, Crossley et al. (2011) used a computational tool called Coh-Metrix to analyze the linguistic qualities of the writing (Crossley et al., 2011, p. 291).

Crossley et al.'s (2011) study found that higher quality essays had more linguistic sophistication. College freshman writers in general had fewer cohesive devices which Crossley et al. interpreted to mean that as writers grow in their craft, they develop linguistic strategies that

focused on "the sophistication of linguistic features in the text as compared with text cohesiveness" (p. 301). This means when a student was in high school, their vocabulary and word choice in writing was typically still being developed. Freshman college writers in the study also included more lexical diversity in their writing instead of repetitive word choice and phrases. Crossley et al (2011) noted, "Our frequency index demonstrated that more advanced writers used less frequent words… more advanced writers produce a greater variety of words" (p. 302). Furthermore, they found the better writers produced essays that were "more concrete and less ambiguous" (p. 302) in communicating ideas and arguments. Overall, Crossley et al.'s (2011) research confirmed a link between development of linguistic features and grade level.

The conclusion of Crossley et al.'s (2011) study noted some limitations. For example, the researchers discussed their focus on cross-sectional research methods and concluded that more longitudinal methods of data collection were needed to further support their findings (Crossley et al., 2011, 304). Other limitations of the study included the demographic sample and cognitive factors. Their study focused on suburban schools, specifically, high school students who were college-bound. Their research was also limited to mainstream students. With racial achievement gaps and as college becomes less affordable for many families, the study's limitations isolated writing development to affluent students. It missed tracking the development of writing and structure for those students who might go on to pursue an alternative track after high school.

Assessment of Organization During the Writing Process

For students to produce quality writing and organizational components that expository writing requires, research by Berman and Nir- Sagiv (2007), Yibre (2019), Faull (2007), Magalas and Ryan (2016), Uccelli et al. (2013), and Oi (2014) researched how to scaffold the writing process to best support development of a thesis and quality organizational markers.

First, Berman and Nir-sagiv (2007) conducted a quantitative study of 160 personal-experience narratives and expository essays. These essays were produced by writers of all ages. Berman and Nir-sagiv (2007) found that organization in writing developed as cognitive and linguistic skills developed. While elementary students used more complex language and ideas in narrative writing, starting in middle school, Berman and Nir-sagiv (2007) witnessed a shift to more complex language and ideas in expository writing. This research clarified that students at the high school level were still developing cognitive and linguistic skills and learning to apply these developing aptitudes to different genres of writing. Considering their findings, Berman and Nir-sagiv (2007) suggested teachers help students organize their ideas in expository writing by using bottom-up, data-driven tasks:

> … the bottom-up type of organization entailed by narrative construction is cognitively more accessible than the opposite direction required in expository discourse. Bottom-up, data-driven task performance means that children can proceed step-by-step, from item-based, utterance-level text construction to structure-dependent organization by means of an internalized narrative schema. (p. 108)

To review, when a student was struggling to write an expository assignment, teachers found success in scaffolding the assignment by asking the student to write on the topic from an experience narrative perspective. Giving students a chance to make personal connection to an expository topic helped them eventually write more complex ideas and language later. While a limitation of Berman and Nir-sagiv's (2007) study was that it focused on the beginning of the writing process as well as the result, the remainder of this section will discuss organizing the writing process through three categories: teacher assessment, peer assessment and self-assessment.

Yibre's (2019) qualitative questionnaire study conducted research on the effectiveness of 48 collaborative writing activities in an 11th grade English textbook. Yibre (2019) noted that in a traditional classroom, the purpose of most writing activities found in textbooks was to reinforce grammar or vocabulary items learned. However, many textbooks often required students to produce examples of quality writing without explicitly teaching the writing process. Textbook activities also often encouraged collaboration in pairs and group writing activities to master organization in writing. Yibre (2019) concluded that textbook written activities were most successfully completed by students when teachers used different student grouping models to accomplish organizational goals to help learners at different stages of writing. Yibre (2019) wrote, "Textbook developers should consider incorporating the six basic elements of CLL in each stage of writing to structure or organize pair/group work writing activities in preparing materials. Due emphasis should also be given for encouraging and guiding learners on how to work together at drafting and revising stages" (p. 132). Yibre (2019) also suggested that teachers should work in class time for collaboration in the writing process. A limitation of Yibre's study was the lack of student results showing success specifically from collaborating on writing activities with the textbook used in the study.

Faull (2007) conducted qualitative research using one section of high school writing students. Faull recorded her teaching methods of teaching organization through expository writing using a similar collaborative writing processes that Yibre (2019) used with textbooks. Furthermore, Faull (2007) designed an analytical coding framework divided into four broad areas to assess writing organization: planning, opening/introduction, main body of essay and conclusion. Additionally, Faull analyzed three collaborative writing techniques: teacher assessment, self-assessment, and peer-assessment. Her results pointed to successful outcomes

through Key Stages 3 and 4; modeling (teacher assessment) and peer assessment in small groups.

Specifically, Faull noted,

> "... to teach writing to these students necessitates their having time to try things out on
>
> their own and with others… Mixed ability class- they generally responded well to the
>
> same strategies…. Differentiation through questioning, grouping, outcome and,
>
> sometimes, task" (Faull, 2007, p. 173-174).

To summarize, Faull (2007) found that writing process required collaboration and support. A

limitation of the study was that Faull (2007) focused her research on a set text (*Atonement* by Ian

McEwan). Faull's (2007) assessment of students' ability to plan and write an essay based on a

novel they read as a class did not have the same open-ended prompt seen in other studies, such as

Crossley et al.'s (2011) study, which analyzed writing from various timed essay prompts.

An additional strategy of teacher-assessment that helped students organize expository

writing was using a rubric intended to measure organization. Uccelli et al. (2013) remarked, "In

contrast to holistic writing rubrics, more precise tools can help reveal the often-unnoticed

language challenges of academic writing, such as individual student writing strengths and

weaknesses" (p. 57). To summarize, rubrics were effective in the writing process when they

included specific organizational marker goals. Faull (2007) noticed something similar in her

research. When measuring student strength and weaknesses when measuring organizational

success, Faull (2007) coded an analytical framework and her results showed that 40% of her

students did not write an introduction paragraph when independently given an essay prompt (p.

167). Beyond the 40% of students who did not have clear organization because of a missing

introduction paragraph, Faull (2007) reflected on her qualitative findings by writing, "In terms of

learning, it appears that many students have not progressed in their writing of introductions

beyond dissecting the question and they need some teaching in using the opening/introduction as part of their answer" (p. 168). This showed that Faull's (2007) students were not in a place to self-assess their writing because they lacked written organization skills and organizational markers of a basic essay. Faull's (2007) students needed more support through peer and teacher assessment before implementing Uccelli et al.'s (2013) method of individualized feedback strategies.

Next, Magalas and Ryan (2016) conducted a quantitative research report about the effectiveness of writing workshops in elementary, middle, and high school classrooms by measuring the effectiveness of self and teacher assessment methods across twenty writing workshops across the country. Magalas and Ryan (2016) noted that expository writing under pressure and time constraints was part of the American education system and therefore, should be taught and practiced as part of the writing process. Magalas and Ryan (2016) concluded their research by arguing that a successful way to set up a classroom for self-assessment when it comes to writing and organization was to have a structured routine and common writing assignment. The more predictable writing assignments become, the more time teachers had to give direct feedback to individual students while the rest of the classroom stayed on task. Magalas and Ryan (2016) wrote:

> Students should know what they are doing and what is expected of them from the moment the writing workshop begins to the moment it ends. It supports them and helps give them focus and direction. It also helps the teacher to spend more time with students of different writing abilities (p. 332).

Meaning, good writing instruction happened when it was structured and predictable through writing workshops. Though Magalas and Ryan's (2016) study focused on writing workshops

across grade levels instead of expository writing in a high school classroom, their research regarding scaffolding the writing process by meeting with students one-on-one to help with organization correlated to the studies conducted by Faull (2007) and Uccelli et al. (2013).

Oi (2014) also discussed the importance of students being able to revise their own writing for quality organization. Oi (2014) wrote, "... some researchers doubt that learners could evaluate their own proficiency correctly and might overstate or downgrade their achievement (Boud & Falchikov, 1989; Kent, 1980)" (p. 147). This statement correlated to other studies (Magalas & Ryan (2016), Faull (2017), and Uccelli et al. (2013)) which found success in creating a writing process for students with steps which include self, peer, and teacher assessment for students to grow in their understanding and use of quality organization in expository writing.

The Impact of Home Life on Writing

Finally, how can high school English teachers best teach writing organization to high school students from diverse family backgrounds to best prepare all students for academic and career pursuits post high school? First, Relles' (2017) qualitative narrative study tracked 81 low-income high school students' perceptions of college writing using the Funds of Knowledge (FoK) theoretical framework. Relles (2017) interviewed students about the writing process: planning, drafting, and revising. Relles' (2017) research stemmed from previous studies that found, "Students who were prepared for college were twice as likely to earn a degree as students who went to college without college-level skills (DeAngelo, Franke, Hurtado, Pryor, & Tran, 2011)" (Relles, 2017, p. 290). The FoK theoretical framework used in this study provided an alternative and equitable way to analyze data; it implied that prior knowledge had great value in educational settings, especially because American schools often catered to western academic

norms and family backgrounds. Therefore, students who do not come from a western household were found to be at a disadvantage from the beginning of their academic careers. Furthermore, the FoK framework suggested that achievement disparities did not signal a deficit in students from non-western family backgrounds or high school knowledge, but rather a deficit of institution appreciation for knowledge diversity. As such, unlike the traditional perspective that blamed students and high schools for inadequate academic preparation, the FoK framework suggested a solution in the way post-secondary institutions operate.

Relles (2017) interviewed high school students about drafting steps of the writing process and found that students placed an overwhelming focus on the differences between high school and college writing. Because students viewed college writing as much more challenging and very different from high school writing, this alienated students from the foundational writing skills they had already built up in high school and hurt their academic success in college. Furthermore, students from diverse households expressed that their perceptions of college writing made post-secondary education feel unattainable regardless of their actual expository writing ability.

Solutions proposed by Relles (2017) included bridging an understanding between students from diverse backgrounds and the post-secondary institutions in which they were enrolled. Relles (2017) also proposed that higher education institutions should work to discover and make use of students' prior knowledge "regardless of whether or not students are placed into college-level coursework" (p. 295). Furthermore, the data suggested that higher education reforms should encourage students to utilize (not distrust) their prior writing knowledge obtained in high school. A limitation of this study was that it was of the only studies that investigated perceptions of college writing in a way that could help colleges better understand the social and cultural variables at play when it comes to academic writing. More research is needed.

Next, a qualitative case study conducted by Donovan (2016) investigated how rural North Carolina middle school students' connections with their home communities shaped their writing organization and voice. Donovan's (2016) study was conducted at a Title 1 middle school and followed one class of eighth-grade language arts. Donovan's (2016) study also included one case study of an exceptional student. The study focused on place-based writing instruction and how it could improve the quality of student written work through the perspective of a student's identity. Donovan defined "place" as "beyond the locations where people live, but as a narrative which shaped identity and culture and provided an understanding of experience" (p. 1). Meaning, families shaped and influenced place-based writing practices. The study found that when students wrote from place-based writing instruction, they made more connections between themselves and their topic, inspiring more complex ideas and richer communication in writing.

Donovan (2016) found that when writing was connected to a place, it benefitted both struggling and college-bound writers. Donovan's (2016) research also showed that many rural students compartmentalized their school identity from their home identity. This is especially true of students from rural communities who were college-bound and, "...may also struggle with their shifting sense of identity in communities that do not reflect their values nor strive to accommodate…newly acquired interests" (Donovan, 2016, p. 3). This sense of alienation was exaggerated with the use of standardized curriculum that might not address the culture of a student's community or home life. Rural students in the study benefitted from a writing curriculum that stemmed from their experiences. Furthermore, students with rural home lives required a writing curriculum that allowed them the space to ask questions and come to their own conclusions which "may exist outside of a text but may relate to their own world and family experiences" (Donovan, 2016, p. 3). Donovan (2016) also concluded that if students started the

writing process with writing like they spoke, their, "…grammar and the complexity of their writing improved because they were concerned more about what they had to say rather than fixating on how they said it" (p. 6). This implied that students who wrote from a place of understanding were more effective communicators. Overall, writing about what they knew helped the students authentically engage in the classroom activities. Place-based writing strategies lent credibility to the understanding that writing was important to general academic student development. When students were taught through place-based writing practices, they became better, more informed writers with a holistic perspective that connected their home and family identity with their academic identity. A limitation of Donovan's (2016) study was that the exemplar writing pieces were taken from students who were defined by Donovan (2016) as motivated and hardworking. More research is needed to uncover the impact of place-based writing on students with low motivation.

Finally, Diniz et al. (2014)'s qualitative study investigated the effect of home life and gender on academic writing ability in Brazilian adolescents. Diniz et al.'s (2014) study comprised 627 participants, 51% of them female, from grade one to eight, living either with family or in care institutions. Participants answered individually the Teste de Desempenho Escolar (School Performance Test) and the Structured PRONEX Interview.

Diniz et al.'s (2014) study revealed that the adolescent participants from care institutions attained more significant increases in writing than participants living within a family context; and that females attained more significant increases in writing than males. Therefore, school performance progress appeared to be affected by a student's home life and gender. Even though the institution group had a better improvement on the TDE, they presented a significant delay in school grade in comparison to the children living within a family context. Because of this, Diniz

et al. (2014) speculated that transient life conditions contributed to lower TDE scores. The study

also considered that the students living in care institutions might have more gaps in knowledge

from life transitions and could therefore constrain their school improvement over time. Diniz et

al. (2014) speculated that girls made more significant increases in writing because, "Compared

with boys, girls experience an earlier onset of verbal ability and faster vocabulary acquisition,

have better reading skills, use more word roots and speak in longer utterances" (p. 792). Overall,

the study's results confirmed a link between academic skills and developmental contexts.

However, Diniz et al. (2014) was limited to students in Brazil and focused on native Spanish-

speakers. Language development based on gender might be different in native English speakers

growing up in the United States.

   Diniz et al.'s (2014) findings also revealed how school performance needed to be

observed as a multidimensional variable, affected by individual characteristics of students, but

also by external ones, such as home lives. Overall, the results of older students were strongly

predicted by "previous learning skills and knowledge" (Diniz et al., 2014, p. 793). The findings

of their study reinforced the importance of knowing the gaps in education in adolescents in

disadvantaged contexts.

   Not only should educators be aware of the home lives of students who are native English

speakers, but they should also recognize the impact of teaching written organization to students

who are English language learners. Gilliland's (2015) qualitative report looked at teaching

English-language learners (ELL) and argued that the new mainstream students of America come

from many cultural backgrounds; therefore, mainstream teachers should "teach writing in a way

that considers the ELL students in the study" (Gilliland, 2015, p. 288). Gilliland followed two

teachers and their 47 students. The participants were selected purposefully from a diverse high

school where 20% of students spoke a language other than English at home (Gilliland, 2015, p. 289), which gave Gilliland (2015) a large sample size of ELL students to analyze writing language development. In the discussion section of Gilliland's (2015) findings, a limitation was that the research focused on writing instruction in closed ELL classes versus in a mainstream classroom with ELL students. Gulliland (2015) wrote,

> The Transitions classes, however, represented a unique case where mainstream curriculum policy interacted with grouping students by assessed language proficiency, in other…classes for students designated as English Learners, teachers used curriculum specifically developed for Language Learners. (p. 297)

However, Gilliland's (2015) choice to limit her research to a qualitative study of EL students in EL classes left room for future studies and discussions. Overall, Gilliland (2015) deconstructed the teaching methods of the two EL teachers she interviewed in her studies, claiming they were proof that EL teachers were not taught "best practices to instruct EL students in the writing process" (p. 298). Gilliland (2015) implied that the EL students under the guidance of these teachers did perform well enough to graduate into mainstream English classrooms the following year, but she concluded her data analysis section, "Analyses suggested that the teachers held distinct views on how language was learned but could not elaborate clearly how students learned L2 writing" (p. 291). Meaning, when teachers focused more on structural aspects of writing, such as thesis support, ELL students missed out on communicating their ideas effectively through writing because they did not have the English language skills to develop their ideas effectively. While studies such as Magalas and Ryan's (2016) study focused on writing workshop skills with mainstream students emphasized the importance of structure, Gilliland's (2015) research found that ELL students needed both structural and English language support.

Summary of the Main Points of the Literature Review

This literature review attempted to determine best writing practices to improve written organization and autonomy for secondary ELA students through a mix of qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-method studies. In theme one of this literature review the writing process in the ELA classroom was defined. Newell et al. (2019) found that teachers should look to supplemental research and application steps to give students foundational skills before differentiation can happen at content-specific writing style needs; this can be done through collaboration across content areas. Additionally, Spires et al. (2016) suggested that to effectively teach good writing, teachers should model good writing and organizational planning for students so they can internalize and critically think about effective writing strategies for when they write independently.

Next, theme two covered research based on organizational indicators of quality writing. Sügümlü et al. (2019) found that effective teachers are those who were cheerleaders through the writing process. DeMichele's (2015) study supported the findings of other studies by proving the importance of collaboration and engaging students in "fun" or high-interest activities that gave students a chance to think through content and organization before they started independently writing. The results of DeMichele's (2015) study correlated to Berman and Nir-sagiv's (2007) study which suggested that quality writing was defined by organizational indicators.

The third theme provided teacher assessment strategies of written organization. Studies by Uccelli et al. (2013) and Oi (2014) agreed that there were organizational indicators that correlated with strong written communication of ideas in expository writing at the high school level. Furthermore, Crossley et al.'s (2011) study also found that higher quality essays had more linguistic sophistication.

Theme four summarized research on writing process organizational strategies for students. In a classroom, Yibre (2019) and Faull (2007) both concluded that peer assessment is important in teaching writing. Magalas and Ryan (2016) argued that the best way to set up a classroom for self-assessment when it comes to written organization was to have a structured routine and predictable writing assignments. Oi's (2014) study reinforced the importance of creating a writing process that had steps that include self, peer, and teacher assessment for students to grow in their understanding and use of quality organization in expository writing.

Finally, theme five research shared the impact of home life on written organization of ideas. Relles' (2017) study found that students viewed college writing as much more challenging and very different from high school writing which alienated students from the foundational writing skills they had already built up in high school and skewed their academic success in college. Solutions proposed by Relles (2017) included bridging an understanding between students from diverse backgrounds and the post-secondary institutions in which they were enrolled. Donovan (2016) found that when students wrote from place-based writing instruction, they made more connections between themselves and their topic, which inspired more complex ideas and richer communication. Diniz et al.'s (2014) study revealed that students' writing progress appeared to be affected by home life and gender. Finally, Gilliland's (2015) research found that ELL students needed both the structural support and English language support.

Chapter 2 determined to find the best writing practices to improve written organization and autonomy for secondary language arts students through a mix of qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-method studies. This literature review defined the writing process in the ELA classroom and research based on organizational indicators of quality writing. Chapter 2 also provided teacher assessment strategies of organization and research on writing process

organizational strategies for students. Finally, this literature review shared findings on the impact

of home life on writing. Chapter 3 will further summarize the implications of these studies and

their insight on how high school educators can best teach written organization to ELA students

through expository writing. Chapter 3 will also give suggestions for research application and

future studies.

Chapter 3: Discussion/Application and Future Studies

Insights Gained from the Research

First, research indicates that ELA teachers should not be the sole teachers of writing in

high school (Spires et al., 2016). Instead, the writing process is most successfully taught to

students when the teaching of writing is a shared responsibility across all content areas. This

allows ELA teachers to focus teaching on specific genres, such as expository writing. In the ELA

classroom, students benefit from having a variety of samples of writing to read and discuss.

Students also benefit when educators model and differentiate writing and planning so they can

internalize effective writing strategies for when they eventually write independently (Sügümlü et

al., 2019).

Next, the research in the literature revealed that students are most successful in the

writing process when their teachers act as cheerleaders (Sügümlü et al., 2019). This is because

many students, especially males, might perceive writing as intimidating or boring. Furthermore,

students develop more complex ideas and organize their writing better when the writing process

starts with "fun" or high-interest activities that gives them a chance to think through content and

organization before they start writing.

Research also revealed that successful expository writing can be identified organizational

markers and decisive language choice that frequently direct the reader back to the thesis of the

text. When examining student writing, higher quality expository essays had more linguistic sophistication (Crossley et al., 2011). This means when a student is in high school, their vocabulary and word choice in writing is still being developed. A teacher should consider where a student is developmentally during the writing process and differentiate for students based on ability.

Another key point from the research is that peer assessment is important in teaching writing. Collaboration with both a teacher and peers helped the writing process for students of all levels. Additionally, because self-assessment of expository writing might be developmentally beyond where most high school students are capable of to make improvements to an assignment, the writing process requires support from peers and the teacher. Organization of expository writing can happen best when students collaborate.

Further insights provided by research found that writing abilities appeared to be affected by a student's home life. For example, many first-generation college students falsely perceive expository writing college as a more challenging genre than the expository writing they complete in high school. This perception can negatively affect a student's academic success in college (Relles 2017). Additionally, rural students also disconnect their high school writing experience from college writing expectations (Donovan, 2016). However, when students start the expository writing process from a personal, place-based perspective, they made more connections between themselves and their topic, inspiring more complex ideas and richer communication in writing.

Application

There are steps teachers can take to become better instructors of expository writing for high school students. Three applications for educators include giving students peer, self, and teacher assessment opportunities, making the writing process personal and fun, and working to

bridge the gap from high school writing to college writing, especially for students who will be first-generation college students.

To start, high students need assessment opportunities through the expository writing process. Teachers should provide a mix of peer, self, and teacher assessment chances. This can happen through workshop opportunities for students to share their work and give feedback to peers. Since writing is only one form of communication, allowing students to process their expository writing ideas verbally with others might help students engage more with their writing and generate more ideas. Teachers should also take time to structure a classroom to encourage various assessment opportunities. Successful writing workshops have shown that having a predictable and routine structure in place gives students the flexibility to work independently on their writing and schedule assessment meetings with the teacher to help them work towards their goals. While students should be given the chance to self-assess their own writing, teachers should consider making self-assessment a last step of the writing process, as high school aged students are still developing the cognitive skills to write expository essays. Finally, it is important to consider that teacher feedback is often the keystone to student improvement during the writing process. However, teachers could benefit from more trainings on how to teach and assess "good" expository writing. The Future Studies section will cover this later.

Next, students write best when a teacher can make the writing process personal and fun. Adding improvisational games and personal quick-write assignments to the start of the expository writing process can help engage students who are intimidated by writing or need help generating and organizing ideas. Writing is a very personal process, even when formal language is required. Because of this, teachers should be sensitive with student feedback and work to foster a growth mindset during the writing process. Teachers should celebrate small victories in

organizing writing and help students make connections in their own lives to their expository

writing topic.

Finally, ELA teachers can work to build connections between high school writing to

college writing for students since many first-generation college students falsely perceive

expository writing college as a more challenging genre than the expository writing they complete

in high school. High school ELA teachers can address this concern by talking about writing in

relationship to life-long writing goals, not only in relation to graduating high school. Teachers

can also give students rubrics and assignments using similar language and requirements of those

they might see in a freshman level college course. While being aware of this student

misperception is important, the Future Studies section will address the need for more research

between expository writing in high school versus college.

Future Research

Overall, the topic of teaching students to organize their ideas for expository writing is

lacking in research, especially for native English speakers living in the United States. Teaching

writing has limited research because "good writing" is abstract and somewhat subjective to

define in nature. Though the research in the literature review worked to define "good writing" for

teachers and students using rubrics and markers, grading expository writing might intimidate

teachers, especially when educators write their own rubrics and guide students through the

writing process as the sole assessor of their writing. Additionally, few teachers are trained to

identify and teach "good" writing. Some ELA teachers elect to grade AP exams and have

rigorous training around a rubric with markers that indicate clear written communication, but that

is only a small percentage of teachers. Based on the limitations of research, secondary ELA

teachers would benefit from standardized training and understanding on an agreed idea of what

makes "good" expository writing, or at least an understanding of how major written exams, such as the ACT or SAT writing portions are assessed. This type of professional development could help educators understand and define "good writing" for students and provide writing standards for future quantitative research. Conducting a study on professional development and tracking the outcomes to see if it contributes to a positive impact on student writing samples could be enlightening if this type of training could be helpful to future ELA teachers.

Second, a study in genre development would benefit future educators teaching writing. Uccelli et al. (2013) discussed, "In fact, the question of how best to assess students' writing skills to capture their optimal performance across a variety of genres and topics is still an important question that deserves serious attention in educational research" (p. 54). This means, though secondary and post-secondary education focuses on expository writing skills, it could be important to assess how important the expository genre is for students through their adult careers. Future research could address several questions. Which students need expository writing skills past high school? Should high school teachers focus most on fostering expository essay growth because it is deemed the most complex form of writing? Do students need the same scaffolding for organizing their writing in other genres as well? Tackling some of these questions could help differentiate the writing process for students with diverse career goals.

Finally, a future mixed-methods study could examine the development of organization in expository writing by tracking the growth of students from ninth to twelfth grade. This study could include all students at a high school, both students who are college bound and those pursuing alternative career paths. Many current studies measure growth from senior year timed college entrance exam scores into the first few years of college, but no studies have tracked the growth from the beginning of high school to the end for all students. A study as this one could

provide insight on how much students grow in expository writing skills from the beginning of high school to the end and shed light on which skills are developed and which need extra scaffolding. Since most writing samples in previous studies relied on timed writing samples, this study could also compare if there is a shift in quality of expository writing and organization in timed and untimed writing samples.

Conclusion

To summarize, while research on teaching expository writing to high school students is limited, there is a consensus that writing is challenging yet important life skill as colleges have required expository writing excerpts for admission since the beginning of time. High school students are in a key window where they can improve their writing skills with the help and encouragement of educators. Qualitative research suggested that teachers can make a significant difference in a student's journey to become a better writer through the writing process, especially when they help students make personal connections between themselves and expository writing topics (Berman & Nir-sagiv, 2007). Quantitative research has shown that there are certain quality indicators of "good" writing that educators can teach to students (Uccelli et al., 2013). As students consider life after high school, schools should work alongside post-secondary institutions to standardize expository writing expectations and perceptions. More research on how to effectively train teachers on teaching expository writing is needed. However, when educators are dedicated to spending time with students in the writing process, they can empower students to have the skills they need to be autonomous writers later in life.

References

Berman, R. A., & Nir-Sagiv, B. (2007). Comparing Narrative and Expository Text Construction

      across Adolescence: A Developmental Paradox. *Discourse Processes: A*

      Multidisciplinary Journal, *43*(2), 79–120.

Crossley, S. A., Weston, J. L., McLain Sullivan, S. T., & McNamara, D. S. (2011). The

      Development of Writing Proficiency as a Function of Grade Level: A Linguistic

      Analysis. *Written Communication*, *28*(3), 282–311.

DeMichele, M. (2015). Improv and Ink: Increasing Individual Writing Fluency with

      Collaborative Improv. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, *16*(10).

Diniz, E., da Rosa Piccolo, L., de Paula Couto, M. C. P., Salles, J. F., & Helena Koller, S.

      (2014). Influences of Developmental Contexts and Gender Differences on School

      Performance of Children and Adolescents. *Educational Psychology*, *34*(7), 787–798.

Donovan, E. (2016). Learning the Language of Home: Using Place-Based Writing Practice to

      Help Rural Students Connect to Their Communities. *Rural Educator*, *37*(2), 1–12.

Faull, T. (2007). Writing in A-Level English Literature Essays: Professional Reflections on Text

      Organisation. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *6*(1), 164–174.

Gilliland, B. (2015). High School Teacher Perspectives and Practices: Second Language Writing

      and Language Development. *Language and Education*, *29*(4), 287–301.

Goldstien, D. (2017, August 2). Why Kids Can't Write. *New York Times*.

Magalas, L., & Ryan, T. G. (2016). A New Rendition of an Old Classic: The Young Writers

      Program as a Writing Workshop. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, *12*(2),

      7–22.

Newell, G. E., Bloome, D., Kim, M.-Y., & Goff, B. (2019). Shifting Epistemologies during

Instructional Conversations about "Good" Argumentative Writing in a High School

English Language Arts Classroom. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*,

32(6), 1359–1382.

Oi, Y. S. (2014). Self-Assessment of Topic Development in Written Production among High

School Students. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, *18*(1),

145–169.

Relles, S. R. (2017). Funds of High School to College Knowledge: Exploring Low-Income

Student Perceptions of College Writing. *Educational Forum*, *81*(3), 281–300.

Spires, H. A., Kerkhoff, S. N., & Graham, A. C. K. (2016). Disciplinary Literacy and Inquiry:

Teaching for Deeper Content Learning. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *60*(2),

151–161.

Sügümlü, Ü., Mutlu, H. H., & Çinpolat, E. (2019). Relationship between Writing Motivation

Levels and Writing Skills among Secondary School Students. *International Electronic

Journal of Elementary Education*, *11*(5), 487–492.

Uccelli, P., Dobbs, C. L., & Scott, J. (2013). Mastering Academic Language: Organization and

Stance in the Persuasive Writing of High School Students. *Written Communication*,

30(1), 36–62.

Yibre, M. (2019). An Analysis of the Structure of Group Writing Activities in English

Textbook. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, *7*(2), 122–133.

Appendix

Article Tracking Matrix						
Articles: author(s) name and year of publication	**Method** Qualitative/ Quantitative/ Mixed method	**Theme 1** Defining the writing process in an ELA classroom	**Theme 2** Organizational indicators of quality writing	**Theme 3** Assessment of organization during the writing process	**Theme 4** Writing process organizational strategies	**Theme 5** The impact of home life on writing
Berman & Nir-Sagiv (2007)	Quantitative		X		X	
Crossley et al. (2011)	Mixed method (Quasi-Experimental)			X		
DeMichele (2015)	Mixed method		X			
Diniz et al. (2014)	Qualitative					X
Donovan (2016)	Qualitative					X
Faull (2007)	Qualitative				X	
Gilliland (2015)	Qualitative					X
Magalas & Ryan (2016)	Quantitative				X	X
Newell et al. (2019)	Qualitative	X				
Oi (2014)	Qualitative			X	X	
Relles (2017)	Qualitative (narrative study)					X
Spires et al. (2016)	Mixed method (descriptive report)	X				
Sügümlü et all (2019)	Quantitative		X			
Uccelli et al. (2013)	Quantitative			X	X	
Yibre (2019)	Qualitative Questionnaire				X	