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Abstract
This study examines the use of story mapping to help students with Emotional and Behavior Disorders. Story mapping is a strategy used while reading that helps students to think and write about the story in an organized and focused manner. This study was conducted during the school day and the two students were pulled out for a half an hour a day on nine occasions. The students took turns reading from books on their instructional level and would fill in the components of the story map. Their retelling abilities were assessed using the Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI) before beginning work with the story maps and assessed using the same level text with the QRI at the end of the intervention using the story maps. Throughout the intervention the students became more willing to work with the story maps and were providing more detailed information for each element and the retelling abilities of both students increased.
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This study examines the use of story mapping to help students with Emotional and Behavior Disorders. Story mapping is a strategy used while reading that helps students to think and write about the story in an organized and focused manner. This study was conducted during the school day and the two students were pulled out for a half an hour a day on nine occasions. The students took turns reading from books on their instructional level and would fill in the components of the story map. Their retelling abilities were assessed using the Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI) before beginning work with the story maps and assessed using the same level text with the QRI at the end of the intervention using the story maps. Throughout the intervention the students became more willing to work with the story maps and were providing more detailed information for each element and the retelling abilities of both students increased.
Introduction

The topic I have chosen to do my research on is students with Emotional and behavioral concerns and their performance in academics, mainly literacy. I chose this topic because I have been working with students with these types of issues for a few years and have noticed that they struggle with literacy especially. The behavior of these students tends to get in the way of their learning and retaining of information. Another thought is that these students are low performing in literacy and they act out as a way to avoid work or out of frustration. In working with these students I believe it is a combination of those two acting together that is causing the problem. I have seen students become frustrated because the work is too difficult or they feel they aren’t being helped enough, they in turn act out. One of the students in my class will put his head down, crawl under his desk, or tip his desk over when frustrated with his work, because he has not internalized the proper tools to deal with this frustration. Many times, though there are problem behaviors occurring because of a fight with another student or another antecedent, and the student is prevented from doing work in this way as well.

Although these students make up a small population of students, the correlation between literacy issues and problem behavior is prevalent. This problem is noticed in a very high percentage of these students and is not something to be ignored. It is important to find a few literacy strategies that will be helpful in working with this population of students in order to help them become more successful in literacy activities. If this topic is not explored the students will suffer along with the teachers and aides working with these students. The students will continue to struggle with literacy and the teachers and aides will continue to become frustrated that their
teaching seems to be going without reward. It is hurtful for both the teacher and the student when the students are frustrated with their work.

Furthermore, teachers can benefit because they could have some more strategies to use with their students. The students with behavioral concerns would benefit if they felt more confident about the work that they were doing and wouldn’t become as frustrated, increasing their literacy skills and possibly decreasing problem behavior. Research has been done on these students in the past to try to increase literacy skills hoping it would have an effect on the problem behavior (Lane et al., 2007; Nelson et al., 2005). Most of these attempts were unsuccessful at diminishing the problem behavior, but the student’s literacy skills did increase. From experience, I know that when my students feel that work is too hard for them, they shut down or act out, instead of asking for extra help. I also know that these students are capable of learning to read and write and that their retention, medications, and things going on at home may make this process longer and more difficult than with the general population. I know working with these students requires a tremendous amount of patience, and a genuine love for teaching.

**Theoretical Framework: Definition of Literacy**

This research is informed mostly by the socio-cultural theory and by critical literacy. Literacy is an entirely social activity; it involves reading, writing, listening, speaking, and thinking for a variety of purposes. If this is the case, it is not surprising that students with emotional or behavior disorders struggle with literacy acquisition. Students who have emotional or behavior disorders generally lack the ability to socialize appropriately with both peers and adults. Purposes or uses of literacy differ depending on the discourse within which it is being used. The socio-cultural theory “defines the child as an active member of a constantly changing
community of learners in which knowledge constructs and is constructed by larger cultural systems” (Larson & Marsh, 2005, p.100). It is difficult for students with EBD to adjust to different social situations and act appropriately, they don’t always fit in to the community of learners as it is changing.

Larson and Marsh discuss the socio-cultural theory as one that focuses on what children can do, and not what they do not do compared to the dominant discourse. This is an excellent way to look at all of our students, especially those who struggle with literacy for a variety of reasons. This means that learning is more individualized and ideological, taking into account the many types of learners in the world. Students are given opportunities to participate socially in literacy, and classrooms should be learning-centered, rather than teacher or student-centered (Larson and Marsh, 2005). Literacy especially is a very individualized type of learning, students should be reading books on their level and of their interest, to keep motivation high. The learning styles of students need to be explored as well, to keep them interested in the work they are doing. Students with behavior problems often lack the skills to interact and communicate with people in acceptable ways, so they act out in some way or shut down to compensate for that, making it even more difficult to teach them. So it is of even more importance to keep their motivation high, if we hope to see the results that are desired from these students.

Critical literacy is also a theory in which “students and teachers are partners in the learning process, rather than participating in hierarchal models of power” (Larson and Marsh, 2005, p.41). A main component of this theory is power relations and student’s access to the dominant discourse based on their race, social class, or gender. (Larson & Marsh, 2005; Gee, 2001; Delpit, 2001). Students who are not brought up in mainstream homes have literacy events
much different from the ones they will experience once they get to school, and this makes school more difficult for them (Heath, 1982). If a student has a tough home life as many of our EBD students do, it is much more difficult for them to relate home and school. This may be why children from lower-class homes do not respond as confidently to learning as do their middle-class peers. Many nonmainstream students struggle with literacy acquisition because the purposes they are using literacy for in school is disconnected from their use of literacy within their primary discourse (Halliday, 1969). Many students from nonmainstream homes (or those outside of the dominant discourse) have difficulty understanding the text related to them. When acquiring literacy, students need to learn to do many things that they are not familiar with.

Critical literacy focuses on these issues and on giving students the knowledge of inequalities in the world, and having them challenge these inequalities (Larson & Marsh, 2005).

Another theory that is worth looking at for the purposes of this study, is that of Culture as Disability (McDermott & Varenne, 1995). This theory states that disability refers to people performing inadequately on tasks that are arbitrarily circumscribed from daily life (McDermott & Varenne). As it applies to this topic, it is basically saying that people are labeled as disabled when they cannot perform as well on a school task (constructed by culture and society) as can their school age peers. Many students with behavior disorders grew up one way in their homes until they reach school and behaviors that may have been acceptable at home are no longer acceptable in the school culture. Many of these students end up getting kicked out of district based schools and moved to Special Education Schools. The students are then further disabled because they are placed in a class in which the other students have similar behaviors. When this becomes their “norm”, it will make it more difficult for them to enter back into a culture in
which these behaviors are not accepted. This theory is similar to Critical Literacy in that, both deal with the student’s race, social class, gender, etc. and the student being placed into an environment that they are not used to, so they have less of a chance for success.

McDermott & Varenne state that “just about any recognizable behavior has been cited as an instance of a cultural difference. Also over the past decade, there has been an explosion of terms for the kinds of disabilities that can be ascribed to a child: attention deficit disorder is popular now, but we are never far from mentally retarded (sometimes “educably” so), dyslexic (and whom can forget “mixed lateral dominance” and “stretosymbolia”), minimally brain damaged, emotionally disturbed, and so on.” (p.331). There are so many ways we can label children now and that seems to have become more important to many than actually figuring out ways to help them.

**Research Question**

What literacy strategies are there that help build motivation in students, and are these strategies helpful for students with behavioral concerns? I aim to find strategies that are typically useful in helping young children develop literacy. I want to see if those same strategies are helpful with students with behavioral concerns, by doing lessons with students in my classroom. If they are not I aim to find strategies that will work for these students.

**Literature Review**

Although students with emotional and behavior disorders (EBD) only make up about 1-2% of the school population (Billingsley, Fall, & Williams, 2006), “an estimated 2% to 20% of school-age youth exhibit behavior patterns indicative of emotional or behavioral problems” (Lane, Harris, Graham, Weisenbach, Brindle, & Morphy, 2008, p.324). The behavior patterns of
students at risk for EBD can range significantly in severity and the correlation between students with EBD and learning difficulties, particularly reading is striking enough to draw some attention. There is significant evidence that students with EBD or who are at risk of EBD will typically struggle academically (Lane, Fletcher, Carter, Dejud, & DeLorenzo, 2007; Lane, O’Shaughnessy, Lambros, Gresham, & Beebe-Frankenberger, 2001; Nelson, Stage, Trout, Duppong-Hurley, & Epstein, 2008; Wehby, Lane, & Falk, 2005), and these students will face their greatest challenges in literacy and learning to read (Nelson, Benner, Gonzalez, 2005). As Trout, Epstein, Nelson, Synhorst, & Hurley (2006) pointed out, reading and literacy deficits are of particular concerns because a student’s reading ability affects their academic success in all other areas. The exact reason for the parallel of reading difficulties and students with behavior disorders has not yet been pinpointed (Wehby et al., 2005), however there are a few theories.

There are some common themes found throughout the literature on this topic. There have been many interventions attempted with students who have or are at risk for Emotional and Behavior Disorders (EBD). Many strategies that have been tried have been successful for improving the literacy skills of the students, but having little to no effect on the students’ behavior. Many strategies have been most effective on students with EBD when they are done one on one or in a small group setting to give the students more attention. Since these students tend to struggle academically, giving them more individualized academic attention is generally helpful. It may be beneficial for students with EBD to interact with their nondisabled peers, in order to improve their social skills, and have socially acceptable behavior modeled consistently. However, because of the inappropriate behavior of students with EBD, they are generally placed outside of general education classes, in special education classes. In reviewing the research on
this topic, it is clear there is no clear cut solution to the parallel between literacy deficits and behavior problems in the classroom.

In thinking about this topic and how to approach working with students there are many issues to be considered. The interventions discussed in the articles were conducted in many different types of settings, with students of different ages and behaviors. It is important to take into account the students’ background, classroom setting, age, and ability before deciding which strategy to use, and also to have a clear idea of what kind of outcome is going to be predicted. Many previous interventions have hoped to improve behavior simply by trying to improve the literacy skills of students, and have been unsuccessful with the behavior piece. If both literacy skills and behavior are expected to improve, there need be parts of the strategy that very specifically target both.

Nelson et al. (2008) suggests that the high levels of problem behavior exhibited by these students is likely to interfere with their schooling and cause academic achievement deficits. Lane et al. (2001) proposes three possible relationships to be explored, the first is that the academic underachievement of these students leads to the problem behaviors, the second is that the externalizing behaviors lead to academic underachievement, similar to the theory of Nelson et al. (2008), and the third is that there is a transactional relationship between academic underachievement and externalizing behaviors. Whatever the reason may be, there is an ongoing relation between these two, and it leads to very negative outcome for these students. According to Wehby et al. (2005) “Students with emotional disturbance have the lowest grade point average of all disability categories; approximately 50% have failed one or more courses in their recent school year; over 66% have failed the competency exam for their grade level; and only one-third
of students with emotional disturbance have completed high school.” (p.155). This proves a clear need for students with EBD to receive extra assistance in school and it should begin early.

**Risk Factors of Academic Problems**

There are many risk factors associated with emotional and behavior disorders. According to Nelson et al. (2008) “Risk factors are those variables that when present in a child increase the likelihood that the child will subsequently evidence a wide range of problems in school.” (p. 75). Some examples of risk factors are family problems, abuse, neglect, etc. These risk factors are associated with certain types of behaviors which could be either internalizing or externalizing behaviors. Many times these risk factors and behaviors will only lead to short term outcomes, but can sometimes predict long term outcomes such as school failure, Emotional and behavior disorder, and school dropout (Nelson et al., 2008). Other negative outcomes these students risk facing are impaired relationships with teachers and peers, underemployment and unemployment, and delinquent behaviors (Lane et. al., 2008). Since emotional and behavior disorders are generally related to literacy problems (Nelson et al., 2008; Lane et al, 2007; Lane et al., 2001; Wehby et al., 2005), it is beneficial to find out which behaviors and risk factors generally have the greatest affect on academic achievement. According to Nelson et al., the best predictors of low reading skills within students at risk for behavior disorders were gender (male), history of psychiatric hospitalization, abuse to animals, and maternal depression. Children who had these in their history were more likely to act out in class and were more likely to have trouble focusing on their school work.

In many cases behavior can get in the way of academics, so it is important to intervene early and not let it get to that point. According to Lane et al. (2007), many schools are taking the
“wait and see” approach and end up waiting until the child necessitates special education services. Trout et al. (2006) also found that most students with BD continue to not receive any emotional or educational services for BD until age nine or older. This is an example of Culture as a Disability (McDermott & Varenne, 1995), these students are not being helped at the appropriate time and are therefore being disabled in their future. Problem behavior and academic problems are most effectively dealt with when it is done early, before the need for special education comes about (Nelson et al., 2005). Early interventions are more likely to prevent the long term negative outcomes associated with both literacy deficits and behavior disorders, as children become more resistant to interventions as they get older (Trout et al., 2006 & Lane et al., 2008).

**Literacy Related to Social Interactions**

Many studies suggest that children with EBD and Severe Emotional Disturbance (SED) will show difficulty with social behavior, are less likely to be accepted by their teachers and peers, and more likely to act aggressively towards others (Nelson et al., 2008; Wehby et al., 2005; Cooley & Triemer, 2002). Although Cooley & Triemer (2002) found that the ability to decode nonverbal cues in boys with SED did not differ significantly from boys without SED, they concluded that the inability to read nonverbal cues may be a more significant problem for boys with SED, because they lack appropriate verbal social skills. Boys without SED who have some difficulty decoding nonverbal cues, do not have aggressive behaviors because they have other skills to maintain social relationships, such as verbal problem-solving. Since the presence of emotional disturbance is related to limited social development (Cooley & Triemer, 2002), students with SED or EBD may not possess the skills to solve problems in a socially acceptable
way. The sociocultural theory tells us that literacy is a social activity (Larson & Marsh, 2005), so it is logical to assume that children who are less likely to have positive social interactions with others will struggle with literacy.

**Who is Teaching Students with Behavior Problems?**

Many studies that have been conducted have had interventions being done using support staff as the primary interventionist, and not using the general education teacher. There is a major push for inclusion now so it is useful to find out how students with or at risk for EBD would respond to a teacher led intervention, with limited support staff (Lane, Little, Redding-Rhodes, Phillips, & Welsh, 2007). There is a lack of research identifying evidence based practices that can be used by teachers in general education classrooms with limited support. Without the proper training of strategies and practices that can be used with students who have EBD, it can be very difficult to work with students who have behavior problems. Billingsley et al. (2006) reported that there is a disproportionate shortage of teachers of students with EBD, due to stress and burnout among other factors. Because of the high need of teachers in this particular area many teachers are being hired without their certification, with emergency certification, or with certification in another area. The teachers of students with EBD are also more likely to leave in a shorter period of time, leaving the students with a “continual parade of ineffective teachers” (Billingsley et al., 2006, p.260).

According to Wehby et al. (2005), the current reading instruction that occurs in many special education classrooms does not constitute best practice, and is not conducive to students with EBD to experience success in reading. It is however very draining to know how to spend the time working with these students, and the focus of attention for these students has become
more on behavior management, with less attention placed on reading or other academic subjects (Stone, Boon, Fore, & Bender, 2008). Since these students are among the most difficult students to work with, but very much in need of effective teachers who will implement research based practices, one approach offered by Billingsley et al. (2006), was to find highly qualified general education teachers who work well with students with behavior problems, train them to work with students with EBD, and offer yearly bonuses to those effective teachers who stay. This approach may be costly, but worth it in the long run, if it will help attract high quality teachers to this population of students, who need them so badly.

**Strategies and Interventions Used for Students with EBD**

Many studies have been done to determine the effectiveness of early phonological intervention on students with or at risk for emotional and behavior disorders. Many interventions have been attempted with students with EBD or at risk for EBD, both preventative and remedial. Preventative interventions are done with students at risk for developing reading problems, and remedial interventions are done with students who have already demonstrated reading problems and are designed to improve those (Nelson et al., 2005). Many times Paraprofessionals end up working with students with emotional and behavioral problems. According to Lane et al. (2007) more than one third (38.4%) of paraprofessionals have reported working with students with emotional disturbance. Paraprofessionals many times are not trained in education, but are expected in many schools to provide academic and social support to students with disabilities. In many cases the studies were done with a teacher or literacy professional administering the intervention. It only makes sense to find out the effectiveness of using a paraprofessional in the intervention process seeing as they spend much of the day with
Lane et al. (2007) & Nelson et al. (2005) both performed studies on the effectiveness of one-to-one phonological awareness programs with students at risk for reading and behavioral problems using trained paraprofessionals as instructors. Similar to one of the theories proposed by Lane et al. (2001), the one-to-one phonological awareness training hoped to have a collateral effect on problem behavior as the students developed better phonological awareness, neither study found significant effects on the problem behavior of the students (Lane et al., 2007; Nelson et al., 2005). Lane et al. (2001) on the other hand found that with a phonological awareness training program with first graders, who were pulled out three times a week for 30 minutes, all students except for one showed decreases in negative social behavior. It is important to note that the three oldest students in this study showed the least improvement in classroom behavior, after the training (Lane et al., 2001), providing further evidence that these interventions are most effective when done early and preventatively.

Haeseler (2006) discussed an alternate approach in which behavior was worked on in order to promote literacy learning. Conflict resolution and peer mediation tactics are worked into the language arts curriculum in order to foster the feeling of safety within the classroom which will allow the students to feel more comfortable in their environment, and help with problem behavior in order to improve literacy.

**Inclusive Approaches**

Another approach that has been tried with students who have been identified as EBD (remedial), is an inclusive approach, in which these students are responsibly reintegrated into the general education classroom (Wehby et al., 2005). During phase one of this intervention, the
four students with EBD were integrated into the general education room and participated in the Scott Foresman Reading Program 75 minutes per day, four times a week, and none of the students showed improvement during this phase. During phase two which consisted of intervention sessions using Phonological Awareness Training for Reading (PATR) held before the general education reading block to minimize distractions, three out of the four students showed improvements in reading, but not in classroom behavior (Wehby et al., 2005). It has been evident that neither the inclusive approach or the one to one approaches, had any significant effect on classroom behavior (Lane et al., 2007; Nelson et al., 2005; Wehby et al., 2005).

Working in a self-contained classroom with students who all have behavior disorders can be very unpredictable, and pre-teaching isn’t usually an option. Since the school I will be doing my intervention in only has self-contained classrooms, inclusive instruction cannot be done. An intervention used with students in my classroom should also have a behavior component.

Lane et al., 2007 conducted a teacher directed study using Peer Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS). This approach is also in an inclusion classroom where students with or at risk for EBD worked with a teacher selected general education peer who had average or above average reading skills. These pairs remained stable throughout the intervention, and they would do things like partner reading, a speed game, and sounds and words. In order to relieve the competitiveness of the students they were encouraged to give one another praise and points, and to compete only against their own previous scores. All students in this study seemed to improve their academic engagement time, and become more on task throughout the intervention. This intervention did serve to help the students with their reading fluency however, like many other studies, had little to no effect on their behavior.
Staubitz, Cartledge, & Yurick (2005) also conducted a peer- and trainer-mediated instruction study, however in this study the 4th and 5th grade students EBD were not paired with their general education peers, they were paired with each other. This intervention focused on using repeated readings to improve comprehension. The uses of peer mediated interventions are being increasingly recognized for their value with students with EBD (Staubitz et al., 2005 & Lane et al., 2007). Students in this study were trained on how to appropriately read and listen to one another, and correction procedures. Similar to Lane et al. (2007) these students were competing against themselves to get higher scores. They were told they were being timed and were being given opportunities to improve their score as encouragement. Due to varied improvements of the students in this study and student absences, partners needed to be adjusted, and sometimes students would end up working with the experimenter. All students in this study showed a vast improvement in their fluency as well as their reading comprehension.

Using repeated reading with peers “not only addresses the reading needs of students with EBD, but also intervenes with a peer mediated format” (Staubitz et al., 2005). According to Harris, Oakes, Lane, & Rutherford (2009) “repeated readings have been found to be effective in improving fluency skills in young students with reading difficulties” (p.76). This only makes sense, seeing as the more you do something the better you are at it and the more automatic it becomes. Also, once the students are no longer stumbling over the words, they will be more able to focus on comprehension. Peer mediated instruction can also be very beneficial for these students to not only increase their literacy skills, but help out with their social skills as well.

Text Mapping and Graphic Organizers

Text mapping is also a very popular strategy for teaching reading comprehension. It is of
value then to find out how this strategy works with students with EBD, previous studies had been
done on the effects of text mapping with students who were learning disabled, with increased
performance which continued after the instruction had ended. (Stone et al., 2008). The students
with EBD who would be using text maps had no prior experience using any sort of graphic
organizer, story map, or text map. This intervention was done one on one with the teacher and
the student discussing how to use a text map, and what information is contained in a text map.
The results showed that through using these text maps the students began to understand what
they should be taking from stories, and showed significant improvements in reading
comprehension (Stone et al., 2008). However, one downside to an intervention like this could be
that students aren’t actually engaged in the text, they are just picking out the pieces they will
need to complete the text map. Text mapping is a skill that can be transferred to other academic
subjects and increase attention and grades across all areas (Stone et al., 2008).

Text mapping and story mapping can be modified to use with students of any age, there
are very simple text maps and graphic organizers in fun shapes for young students that will still
serve their basic purpose. Many students, especially at a young age, are so excited to be able to
read the words that they rush through the text without gaining much from it. Stone et al. claims
that text maps help students to slow their reading pace and increase their comprehension because
they become more aware of the types of information they should be taking from the text.

**Prereading and Preteaching Strategies**

Prereading and preteaching strategies have also been attempted with students with or at
risk for EBD. These types of strategies are generally done with students in a one to one or small
group setting before their reading instruction occurs. Teaching students unknown words,
unknown letter sounds, or unknown texts in general can increase on task behavior during the reading instruction because they have more of a focus of what they will be learning during that period (Beck et al., 2009 & Nelson et al., 2005). This strategy could be especially useful for students in an inclusive setting, as they may need that extra assistance on reading tasks that they are unable to receive in a less restrictive setting. It is extremely hard to attend to a task when you are confused of what is being discussed or asked of you, Beck et al. (2009) found higher on task behavior from the students in the intervention after the preteaching had occurred. Nelson et al. (2005) found that children who received the prereading intervention showed significant improvements in word reading, rapid word naming, and phonological awareness. These interventions would be ideal for students in an inclusive classroom, with additional support from the literacy specialist or other support staff, as these interventions typically are one to one, and would not be needed for the class as a whole. Preteaching could also be done in a smaller special education classroom as these rooms typically have paraprofessionals who are available to work with the students one on one. It would be difficult for a teacher with limited support staff to implement this type of intervention with her students.

Writing Strategies

Writing and reading go hand and hand, so it is important to also implement writing strategies and interventions with students who are struggling with literacy and behavior. The writing of students with EBD is generally not as polished as their nondisabled peers, because they experience great difficulty with the writing process, including planning and revising (Morris Kindzierski, 2001). One student in a 6:1:1 class of students with EBD remarks “Miss we just hate writing. I’m not any good at it and to be honest, if you ain’t here, I don’t get much of any
writing done…” (Morris Kindzierski, 2001, p.51). With the behaviors displayed by these students (noncompliance, aggression, disruptions, and antisocial responses) students with EBD are often excluded from the general education curriculum and may miss out on some of the key building blocks of writing (Morris Kindzierski, 2001). Teaching students to understand important elements of a written piece, and more importantly to self-regulate that learning is crucial. As the student above stated, these students do not feel like they are any good at writing because they haven’t learned and internalized the strategies necessary to produce a quality piece of writing.

A Self-Regulated Strategy approach has been used with children with EBD, in order to help them learn how to self-regulate, self-monitor, self-reinforce, self-instruct, and set goals (Lane et al., 2008). The planning strategies used here included a mnemonic device POW: pick my idea, organize my notes, write and say more. They were taught how to use graphic organizers, and focus on the important elements of a story or any writing piece. After using the SRSD program the writing pieces produced by students were more complete (including all elements), longer, and of greater quality (Lane et al., 2008). More importantly, these results were sustained through the maintenance phases for all students, meaning that the strategies were internalized and the students were able to self-regulate their writing for themselves. For students who are self-conscious about their writing or academic ability it can be very scary to have a teacher or peer look over their writing. Kindzierski (2001) wanted to examine the effects of peer-revision for students with EBD. The effects of this study had more to do with increased peer interaction that it did on the quality of the writing of these students.

There are many conclusions that can be drawn from the research conducted on this topic.
First and foremost, the research on this topic is very limited and there is a need for more extensive studies in this area. Although a best method or intervention has not been determined for students with or at risk for EBD, we can draw the conclusion that the most effective interventions done, were done very early before the need for special education services came about (Lane et al., 2007; Nelson et al., 2005). Although these interventions significantly helped the students with phonological awareness and reading, the lack in behavioral changes in the classroom indicates that there may be a need for more focus on social acceptability training as well. Most of these articles have actually, possibly even accidentally, shown favor towards early behavior interventions in order to affect literacy, since they have shown that interventions on literacy do not positively affect behavior. There is a consistent parallel between poor academic performance, specifically in the area of literacy, and behavior problems (Wehby et al., 2005). Because literacy is essentially social, the negative behavior and social interactions of these students with others also need to decrease if there is hope to have any long term effects on the literacy improvements of these students. If we don’t want to disable these students further, more research needs to be done to find the most effective interventions for students at risk for EBD.

**Methods**

**Context**

Research for this study occurred in both the classroom of the participants and an empty classroom in their school where the intervention took place. The study was done as part of a research project supervised by St. John Fisher College. The school, located in a suburban district on the outskirts of Rochester, is a school which contains all self contained classrooms, most of which have seven or fewer students. The classroom in which the research occurred, has six
students ranging from six to eight years of age. There are five staff members working in the classroom: the teacher, a classroom paraprofessional, and three one to one paraprofessionals, who work with the students each day. Each student has his (all participants are male) own desk and there are two other tables where the students can work, and whole or small group activities occur. The student’s desks are arranged in a semi circle facing the blackboard. This is where they do their seatwork and other individual work. The strategies I have conducted with the students took place in a room down the hall from the classroom when the other students in the classroom were doing silent reading time.

Participants

The two students in the study, David and Samuel (pseudonyms), are seven and eight years old respectively. David is a second grader who has been at the school since the end of the ’07-’08 school year. He has an Individualized Education Plan (IEP), and has been diagnosed with Emotional Disturbance. He enjoys sports, particularly football and soccer, playing outside, being read to, and computer games. David lives in an apartment in a suburb of Rochester with his mother and two younger brothers. He speaks fondly of his mother and her hard work and schooling, and reports playing with his brothers at home. He generally comes into school with a smile, greets peers and familiar adults, and is very energetic. Since David has attended the school his problem behaviors have decreased significantly, but still can at times interfere with his work, and include putting his head down, swearing, throwing things, tipping furniture, and hitting/kicking staff or other students. David receives services for counseling once a week in a group and twice a week individually.

Samuel is a third grader who has been attending the school since October of the ’09-’10
school year. He has an IEP, and has been diagnosed with Other Health Impaired. Samuel enjoys sports including football, hockey, baseball, and soccer, playing and building with blocks, toy cars, sports cards, and playing games with peers. He lives with his mother, mother’s boyfriend, and new baby brother in a home in suburb of Rochester. He also spends some nights with his father and speaks positively of all of the close adults in his life. He is very eager to please his parents and becomes upset when he knows that they are going to find out about negative behavior he displays during school. Samuel is not happy with his placement at the school, because he would like to return to his previous school; however he still manages to come into school with a positive attitude. He is aware that to return to his previous school or any other district based school he needs to get his behavior under control. Some of Samuel’s behaviors include disrespect to adults and peers, running around the room, throwing things, and threatening. These behaviors have decreased since he started at the school. Samuel, like David, receives individual counseling once a week and group counseling once a week. He also receives Occupational Therapy (OT) services once a week.

Researcher Stance

As a researcher I worked with David and Samuel in a small group in a classroom in the school they attend. I currently work at the school in the classroom with the two boys as a paraprofessional, and I am currently a graduate student at St. John Fisher. I have worked in the same classroom as David since the beginning of the ’08-’09 school year and have been working with Samuel since he began at the school in October. I am working on receiving my Master’s degree in Literacy Education and currently have a bachelor’s degree from SUNY Geneseo in Elementary and Special Education. I am currently initially dual certified in childhood and
Method

I began my work with David and Samuel by taking anecdotal notes to find out more about the two boys and analyze their behaviors in a more in-depth way. During my observations in the classroom and my work with them there were themes that surfaced involving their triggers and things that made them upset. Since I had already been working in the students’ classroom, I tried to take an outsider stance while looking at their behavior. Before beginning my sessions with David and Samuel, I took notes on David’s behaviors and identified a few serious triggers. During my research with David and Samuel, I implemented a variety of comprehension strategies and also implemented a reward system using tickets to reward their behavior and participation. Both boys are at the point where they are reading and can decode most words, but are not able to comprehend or understand what they had just read when they get to the end of a page or even a sentence. I used story mapping, in order to get the students to take the important parts from the text. Story maps allowed the students to think before they read about the type of information they wanted to pull from the text in order to understand better what they have just read (Stone, Boon, Fore, Bender, & Spencer, 2008). There are different kinds of text maps and graphic organizers that can be used, so I had a few different ones from www.eduplace.com/graphicorganizer/ to see which the students benefit most from and find the most motivating to read and then write about the story. The story map I started with is “Story Map 1”, the students liked this one so for the sake of time, I stuck with it throughout the intervention. Motivation is a key component with all students, but especially students who struggle academically, and have behavior problems. It was very important for David and Samuel
to have fun during their sessions with me as well as learn from them. From working with these students I know that if they are not motivated by and interested in what they are doing, they simply will not do it, and this is when we see the problem behaviors mentioned earlier. I chose a book on each student’s independent reading level to start the sessions, to avoid frustration, have them read it to themselves, and have them do a verbal retelling of the book. The teacher of the students has told me where he believes they are in terms of reading level. I conducted a Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI) with the students to get a grasp of their independent reading level, and test their retelling at that level. I modeled story mapping for the students using a think aloud strategy as I read. This showed the students where I stopped to think about something important and jotted it down. There are important story elements that they will need to know. Story mapping can be a valuable tool to help them internalize those elements and think about them as they read. I conducted five sessions with the students using the story mapping and having them take turns reading aloud. At the end of the five sessions I had an individual session with each of the boys to conduct another QRI and evaluate their retelling at the same level I had used during the first QRI.

The reward system used was two-fold, I had two different color tickets that I gave them, the blue tickets were for appropriate behavior (speaking politely, sharing, keeping hands and feet to themselves, etc.). The yellow tickets were given for participation (being on task, offering answers to questions, sharing their retellings, etc.). On the first day I explained the system to the students and after consulting with them about the number of tickets that they thought was fair, we decided 100 total would be a good amount for them to have to earn. I let them know that when they earn those tickets they would get a prize, we decided together that I would get them a
book from the book fair going on at the school. In order to earn one of the prizes their tickets were combined, so that they worked together to get the tickets and encouraged each other, rather than competing against each other.

I collected work samples and took notes on their progress throughout the time I worked with David and Samuel. I monitored their progress through observation of their verbal retellings, and their ability to identify elements of the text. I took notes on their behavior throughout the day and specifically while we were working to see if our work time together was getting any easier for them. I also collected and kept all of their story maps, that we filled out to see how the details improved (Appendix A & B).

**Data Collection**

As I discussed previously I collected several different types of data while working with David and Samuel. Data was collected by collecting work samples from the students and examining them throughout our work together. I took field notes on conversations with the students and observations of their work and attitudes during our sessions together. I referred back to these notes before and after each session, so I could track progress throughout our time working together. I analyzed all of the data collected throughout our sessions so I could report exactly how the strategies worked or did not work with the students.

**Quality and Credibility of Research**

While doing research it is important to make sure credibility and quality are there. Credibility is the researcher’s ability to take into account the complexities that occur during a study and to deal with patterns that may be difficult to explain (Mills, 2007). To ensure this in my study I met with the classroom teacher of the students to discuss what happened throughout
the sessions. I had him look over my data and help me to make sense of the data I was getting from the students. It was very helpful to have another set of eyes looking over my work and the student’s progress, especially someone else who works with them daily. I also met with a colleague from class to share information and help make sense of it all.

To conduct triangulation, which Mills defines as the researcher comparing a variety of data sources and different methods with one another in order to cross-check the data, I collected data from the students and staff in a variety of ways. I conducted interviews with staff who work closely with the students to find out what types of literacy activities they participated in and what their current levels were. I collected work samples from the students to analyze how their quality of work changed throughout the intervention. I also took notes on how the verbal responses of the students changed, and their attitudes. There were brief interviews conducted with the students during the first and last sessions to see how they felt about beginning this intervention process and then how or if they felt it has helped them to better understand what they read.

Transferability refers to researcher’s belief that everything they study is context bound and not to develop statements that can be generalized to larger groups of people (Mills, 2007). I conducted transferability in my study by speaking specifically of the students and their behaviors in order to let the reader know exactly what is going on, so that my results may not be generalized to any other group of students. With the specific context and participants being explained thoroughly, it is up to the reader to determine the effect these strategies would have within the context of their environment. Dependability, which refers to the stability of the data (Mills, 2007), is very important to ensure during this study as well. In order to be sure this study
is dependable, I made sure I collected multiple sources of data and collected them each time I worked with the students and they were consistent. I had the classroom teacher of the students and my class colleague check my data to be sure I was consistently collecting the same types of data and getting enough data to analyze.

It was also important to ensure confirmability in this study. Mills (2007) defines confirmability as the neutrality or objectivity of the data that has been collected. This was ensured by using research based strategies while working with David and Samuel and comparing the results of these strategies. In order to practice reflexivity, I continued to check back with my research question and be sure I was aiming to work towards an answer or at least some strategies that will help other researchers to work with students who have Emotional/ Behavior Disorders.

**Informed Consent and Protecting the Right of the Participants**

Before I began working with David and Samuel, I informed both students of what we would be doing during our sessions together, and let them know when we would be doing it, to avoid distractions in the classroom. I asked them if they were ok with this, and took their verbal responses as their consent. I sent home letters to each student’s parents to inform them of the process and received a signature for their permission to work with their child. I made sure the classroom teacher was okay with me taking the students out of the class for about a half hour a day, to work with them on comprehension. I also received written consent through an e-mail from the assistant principal in charge of our classroom.

**Findings**

**Behaviors and Triggers**
There were many incidences in which these two boys became upset, and a variety of ways in which they expressed their frustrations. It was often difficult for both David and Samuel to control their emotions in an appropriate manner. Although David and Samuel both displayed inappropriate behaviors, the triggers for these behaviors and the behaviors themselves were very different. For David, triggers included seatwork, competition, and being teased by other students. For Samuel triggers included other students acting up, getting poor marks on his chart, and seatwork.

**David’s Behaviors and Triggers**

**Seatwork.** David’s behaviors have begun to escalate within the last month, after seeing a vast improvement from last year prior to this month. David became upset and stubborn in the morning when it was time to do daily seatwork. During this time, he often put his head down, played with things in his desk, flipped his desk and chair over, and made noises to distract other students. Sometimes his behavior escalated to the point that he needed to be removed from the room and taken to a “take five” room to collect himself. I tried to work with David during this time and calm him down, and he would resort to “baby talk” and sometimes yell and swear at me and other staff. I found that when David had a tough time in the morning getting his work done, the rest of his day was usually a little on edge for him, and it wouldn’t take much to set him off. On days when David had a meltdown in the morning, I found he was much more resistant to work for the rest of the day, often shoving papers of the table, ripping them, or throwing his pencil. During days when David was having a tough time, I would not generally have a story mapping session with the boys, unless I found that David was having a better afternoon.

**Competition.** Through my notes and discussions with David’s teacher from last year and
his current teacher, I found that he is very competitive. David tended to be a poor sport during games and sports. I noticed this mostly during Physical Education and free time. His teacher from last year reported that he was very well liked by his peers and was always the one everyone else wanted to sit next to and be friends with. He is used to this type of attention from his peers, so when he is teased by anyone, especially Samuel who is also an excellent athlete, he would become very upset and would swear at whoever is teasing him and sometimes he ran out of the room.

**Writing.** I found another trigger for David was writing. He was much more resistant to work if it involved writing full sentences. When he was asked to write a full sentence, he purposely left out details that he knows because he did not want to write them down. Through work with him, I saw that he is very self-conscious about his spelling of words, and his handwriting. When David was unsure of how to spell a word, and asked to try it on his own, he became upset and puts his head down, until the word is spelled for him, or he is helped to sound it out.

**Samuel’s Triggers and Behaviors**

**Distractions.** Through observations and work with Samuel, a theme I have noticed with his behaviors is that they are triggered by other students. Samuel had great difficulty ignoring the behavior of other students and tended to act out when he was distracted by another student and “tattled” on other students when they were doing something. Samuel was encouraged to ignore the other students as to not get himself in trouble, but he had a very hard time doing this. As a result of his difficulty ignoring other students, he would often yell at them, tell a teacher, run out of the room, or yell at the teachers.
Rewards. In Samuel and David’s classroom charts were used to report the behavior of the boys, and how they did during each activity. Three stars were given if there were no problems during that activity, two if there were some behavior problems or a lot of disrespect, and one star if there were a lot of behavior problems, and the student spent most of the activity elsewhere or causing disruption. When Samuel received fewer than three stars for an activity, he became very upset. It was often very difficult for him to turn his day around after that. He reported that “it doesn’t matter now because I didn’t get all threes and I’m not going to get an Awesome day”. He was very interested in these charts everyday and what his chart said because he knew the chart went home to his parents. Although I and other staff in the classroom would try to explain to him that his parents would be proud if he turned his day around, it took a lot of convincing for him to rejoin the activities, and sometimes he would go back to the issue later. During the times Samuel would get upset, he would often run out of the classroom, yell at classmates and staff, throw objects, and hit his desk or the wall.

Seatwork. Like David, Samuel also became upset at work times, he would try to distract from the task, by engaging staff in conversations about other things. When he was redirected to his work, he would complain that it was too hard and he didn’t know how to do it. Samuel enjoys individual attention and would often request help on tasks he was capable of doing himself. Staff would offer to sit next to him, but only help him minimally because he could do it himself, but wanted someone next to him.

Sessions with David and Samuel

Initial Qualitative Reading Inventory Results

I assessed each student’s retelling using the QRI (Qualitative Reading Inventory). For
Samuel I started at a primer level, to ensure that I wasn’t giving him anything too difficult.

Samuel ended up reading at a level 2, instructionally. The story read was “The Lucky Cricket”. During the retelling he was able to recall 19 out of 52 ideas (36.5%) unaided. There were 8 comprehension questions to go along with this story, Samuel answered 5 of them with the explicit correct answer, and 2 were implicitly correct, this gave him a total of 7 out of 8 questions correct (87.5%). Samuel ended up at an instructional level of level 2.

When I did the QRI with David, I started with a level 1 and found through the running record that this text was too easy for him. I went up to a level 2 with him, using “The Lucky Cricket”, the same story I used with Samuel. David was between an Independent and Instructional level for this story after analyzing his miscues during the running record. David was able to recall 23 out of 52 ideas (44.2%) unaided during the retelling of this story. He was able to answer 6 out of the 8 comprehension questions explicitly correct, and did not get the other questions correct. So he got a total of 6 out of 8 correct (75%), putting him at an instructional level for this level 2 text.

I worked with David and Samuel a total of nine sessions. During the first session I worked with both students, I had them each read a story separately, I had them write down as much as they could remember about the story to get a gage on their retelling skills. I found that they were able to tell me more about the story than they wanted to write. Both students gave a very basic retelling and did not include much detail, but were able to give a more detailed retelling verbally with prompting, than they were able to give on paper.

During the second session I introduced the story maps by modeling how to use one. I introduced all of the components of a story map: setting, characters, problem, plot/events, and
resolution. I had to explain what some of these components meant, and explained that these are what we would be looking for as we read through the story. I read a story called *The Day the Teacher Went Bananas*, and I modeled how to fill out the story map as the boys helped me to fill out each box. Samuel reported that he has used a story map before, and the boys were both very compliant during this session in answering questions and paying attention to the story. I started giving them tickets to work toward their final prize, and they earned 16 tickets total. They were pleased with how they worked together and gave each other a high five when they saw how many tickets they earned. They decided together that 100 tickets was fair for them to earn to get a prize.

**Sessions Using Story Maps**

For our first session with David and Samuel using the story maps themselves, I began by reviewing the components of the story map. The students needed some help recalling all of the components and what they meant. After going over the components we began reading a level 2 story *Annie’s Pet*, by Barbara Brenner. The students sat on either side of me and took turns reading every two pages, I stopped them while reading to fill out the setting and characters as we found them out. The students continued reading the story in this way, and when the story was finished, we filled out the rest of the story map. I had them take turns answering as I asked about the components of the story map, and they received tickets for answering correctly and being respectful while the other one was answering. Both of the students had difficulty adding detail to the plot/events during this session, they reported that they didn’t want to write that much. Devin became upset at the end of this session because Samuel received more tickets than he did, even though their tickets are combined towards a prize they will earn together.
For our second session using the story map, David and Samuel took turns reading *Hamster Chase*, by Ezra Jack Keats. During this session I made the decision to take turns writing with David and Samuel, this way they would not be afraid to tell me everything they recalled from the story during their retelling, because they would not have to write it all down. Both students did well taking turns and began to encourage each other while they were reading, saying “good job” or helping each other with words the other didn’t know. While filling out the story map, David was offering up answers without hesitation, Samuel seemed a little distracted during this session, but was still answering questions when asked. I collected all tickets received during this session before they could count them individually. I counted the tickets for them and reported a total, they were both okay with this, and proud of themselves collectively instead of feeling it was a competition.

The third session using the story maps began with a little resistance from Samuel. He did not want to go with David and me, and said he would rather stay in the classroom. I reminded him that he agreed to help me, the teacher supported me by telling him that if he didn’t go with me now, he would be going during free time. He decided to come, although still not in a good mood, and he was very distracted and upset during this session. We once again reviewed the components of the story map, which they were able to take turns telling me with ease. The students took turns reading *Brave Norman*, by Andrew Clements, a level 2 book. Samuel quickly changed his attitude when we began reading, because he was interested in the story. Samuel was able to tell me the setting, the students took turns telling me the characters as I wrote them, they were each able to identify a problem in the book as there were two. They took turns telling me events in the story and were able to identify four important events. Both David and
Samuel were also able to identify the resolution to the problem. At the end of this session, they had 66 tickets total, and were well on their way to earning their prize.

Before our fourth session I received a little resistance from Samuel, but less than the previous session. The students are now able to identify all components of the story map without prompting, they had been having trouble remembering the word resolution, but knew it during this session and told me it meant the solution to the problem. We read the book Let’s Go. They took turns reading, became involved in the text and Samuel made connections to his own experiences going to a beach. This story was different than the others we have read, in that there was no main problem. When we got to the problem section of the story map David said “well there really wasn’t any big problem”. Samuel then contributed that the dog in the story fell into the water. They were problem solving very well because the dog did fall into the water but they got him out right away, so there really wasn’t a main problem. We talked through this and they were still able to take turns and give me six main events that occurred throughout the story. At the end of this session the boys had earned 91 total tickets and were excited because the next day was our last session and they would earn enough to get their prize.

For our fifth and final session using the story maps, we quickly reviewed components of the story map, which they went through easily. There was another student and teacher in the room working when we got there. David and Samuel took turns reading Harold and the Purple Crayon: Race Car, by Liza Baker. Both students did a great job taking turns and were very cooperative and involved while reading. I could tell that Samuel was distracted by the other people in the room by his wandering eyes, and how he seemed frustrated when asked to answer questions. The boys were able to offer answers up to the problem box, and were able to tell me
that there was more than one problem and what they were. Samuel began counting his tickets, when I asked him to stop and please pay attention, he became angry and stormed back to the classroom. David and I finished up the rest of this session without Samuel, and with the one to one attention David was able to tell me seven main events that happened in this story. He also told me aloud and wrote down three sentences for the resolutions to the problems in the book. With the tickets Samuel earned before he left and the tickets earned by David, they earned a total of 112 tickets which put them at enough to receive their prize the next day. Samuel later in the day apologized for leaving the session, and said he was having a bad day, and would work with me the following day.

**Final Qualitative Reading Inventory Results**

I worked with Samuel and David separately to assess their retelling on another level 2 story in the QRI. When I went to work with Samuel there was another student and teacher in the room working. During Samuel’s reading of “Father’s New Game”, I did a running record and he fell between an independent and instructional level, having 11 miscues total, but only 5 meaning changing miscues. Samuel was distracted during this session because the other student in the room was acting up. He was able to keep his behavior under control very well despite the distraction and expressed only minor frustration, telling me that he was having a hard time focusing. During the retelling he was able to correctly identify 27 out of 49 ideas, and explicitly answer 6 out of the 8 comprehension questions. Although there were some distractions during this session his retelling did improve from only being able to recall 36.5% of the ideas in the initial QRI to 55.1% of the ideas in the story in the final QRI retelling. After this session I thanked Samuel for his help, and took him to the book fair at the school to get a book of his
choice, which is what we had agreed upon as their prize.

By the time I worked with David, the other teacher and student were no longer in the room. David also read “Father’s New Game”, he had a total of 7 miscues, only 3 were meaning changing, this put him at an independent level for this text. During David’s retelling he was able to recall 38 out of 49 ideas, and answer all 8 comprehension questions correct explicitly. During his initial QRI he was able to recall 44.2% of the ideas in the story, and in this final QRI assessment he was able to recall 77.5% of the ideas in the story. After the session with David, I also thanked him for his help during our time working together, and brought him to the book fair to pick out a book, which we later read together.

Implications

This study lends support to the use of story maps with appropriate modifications with young students who have emotional and behavior disorders. During the sessions with David and Samuel, I saw an improvement in their ability to identify the components in the story maps, and in their ability to answer questions about the story. There were some days that I had planned on working with David and Samuel, but was not able to because during the planned time, one of them was having a hard time with behavior. It has to be expected with any students and especially with students with behavior problems that things will not always go according to plan. As I met with the students more and made instructional adjustments based on their needs, they became more comfortable with what we were doing, and less resistant to it. Both students knew what was expected of them, and the goal of our work together. The more we worked together, the easier completing the story maps became for the boys.

Once I knew the students’ triggers and their behaviors during our sessions, I was able to
adjust what I was doing to better suit their needs. Through themes I found in my notes I noticed that writing was a trigger for both of them, and feeling overworked could cause either of them to shut down. Since the ultimate goal of this intervention was to improve their verbal retelling, I decided to adjust our sessions so I would be doing half of the writing as they told me about the story verbally. After making this adjustment, both of the students added more detail to the story components because they knew I would be writing it for them. I also began combining their tickets and counting them, in order to avoid competition between them. I found there were many minor adjustments I had to make between sessions in order to avoid meltdowns, and also keep in mind that sometimes these behaviors are out of my hands and are influenced by outside factors.

I recommend using story maps with students with behavior problems as a way to improve comprehension. It is also especially important with students with behavior problems to modify instruction based on student need and to understand when to hold off on having sessions if the students are not in the right frame of mind for it. These students are typically underachieving in literacy especially, and story maps are a way for them to get more out of the text they are reading. Over the time we worked with the story maps I saw them being able to retell with more detail and recall more elements and ideas of the stories we read. However, storymaps, or any instructional strategy should be used with attention to appropriate modifications based on the behavioral and emotional needs of the students.

There were a few limitations I came across during my study. I had worked out a time with the classroom teacher that I would work with David and Samuel. I planned on having many more sessions with the students by the time I gave them their final assessment. Unfortunately because of behavior, absences, and time conflicts, I was only able to have five real sessions using
the story maps. The room we had to work in was not able to be reserved, so we had to hope that it was empty, and some days there were other people in the room, and it was hard for the boys to focus. If I were to do the study again I would plan more sessions, knowing that many of them may not work out. I would also set up an alternate location where we could work without distraction if there were people in our work area at the time.

**Conclusion**

Students with Emotional and Behavior Disorders generally struggle academically, and mainly struggle with literacy. Through research I found several strategies that had been previously attempted with students with behavior problems. Story and text mapping was one that I found that I could see being beneficial to my students to get them to focus on the text and improve their comprehension of what they read. I found the reading levels of my students using the QRI, and how well they were able to retell what they had just read. The students worked with me for five sessions filling in story maps based on the stories they read. The routine became easier as we went along and the students were adding more detail by the last couple sessions than they had initially. I did a QRI retelling assessment after our sessions together using the same level text, and both students increased the percentage of ideas they were able to recall from the text. This intervention had a positive effect on the detail that both David and Samuel were able to give in their retelling of a story.
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Appendix A

Name __________________________ Date ____________

Story Map 1
Write notes in each section.

Annie's Pet
by Barbara Brenner

Setting:
Place:
Time:
- day
- birthday
- at store
- in zoo

Characters:
- Annie
- Family

Problem:
- She spent all her money

Plot/Events:
- She bought a ball and a caller

Resolution:
- She had a dog
- She got a pet
Appendix A

Story Map 1
Write notes in each section.

Setting: 

Time: Summer
      Day

Place: Beach
      Boat

Characters:

Mom, DAD

Problem:

He fell into the water

Plot/Events:

Started at home and packed up car
Family trip to the beach
The dog ran away
They went on a boat
They tried reaching for a milk action and fell in.

Resolution:

They took him out of the water and gave him a cake.
Story Map 1

Write notes in each section.

Annie's Pet

by Barbara Brenner

Setting:  Time:  Place:
8th May 200

Characters:  AMC FMN

Problem:  She had a pet

Plot/Events:  She bought a cat

Resolution:  She saw a snake

Date: 3/31
Appendix B

Name ____________________________ Date ________

Story Map 1
Write notes in each section.

Setting: __________________________ Place: __________________________
Time: __________________________

Characters: Harold
Lilac (dog)
Farmer

Problem:
CAR BROKE DOWN
FARMER NEED HELP ON A ROAD IN FOG

Plot/Events:
Harold wasn't sleepy. He drew a race track and a car. He drew another race car to race against the other car. He put a fake fog on and passed the farmer. He used a fan for the fog. He used his car.

Resolution:
HE USED A FAN FOR THE FOG. HE USED HIS CAR.
HE HELP THE FARMER.