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CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Background of the Study

Lortie (1975) asserts that the teaching profession is unique in that the novice, upon completion of undergraduate preparatory experiences in content and methods of teaching, can assume the stature and responsibility of the most seasoned veteran of the profession. Once hired as a teacher, the novice is given the responsibility of and assumed to be equivalent to the teacher who has spent many years perfecting her craft. The insecurities, inadequacies, failures, and self-selection out of the profession which often result from this unwarranted assumption may have been one of the best kept secrets of the profession. However, since the early 1970's qualitative studies of the experiences of first year teachers have begun to expose this secret and reveal the novices' experiences for what they are. As a result, teacher educators have begun to look at the growth and development of teachers as a legitimate area for study, research, and rationale for pre-service and inservice education programs.

The first growth and development studies addressed the concerns of undergraduate education students as they adjusted through student teaching (Fuller, 1969) or other supervised teaching experiences (Ryan, 1970) to their role as teacher. The next studies addressed the first few months of unsupervised, legitimate, paid teaching experience
The latest studies have focused on the concerns of experienced teachers as they respond to changes mandated by their school systems (Hall et al., 1975) or seek ways to change and improve their teaching effectiveness by participating in Teacher Center programs (Apelman, 1978; Bussis et al., 1976; Field, 1979; Katz, 1972). These studies have resulted in a growing body of literature which describes teachers' concerns as they develop and grow as professionals. As a result of these studies, novice teachers are no longer seen as equivalent to seasoned teachers, and the needs of seasoned veterans for inservice are no longer combined with those of the novice. Several researchers (Apelman, 1978; Hall, 1975, 1977; Field, 1979; Fuller, 1969; Katz, 1972) have hypothesized that teachers pass through various stages of development as they begin to change and gain experience in their profession. Other researchers (Witherell and Erickson, 1978; Loewinger, 1976) have attempted to link various concerns of teachers to hypothesized stages of adult development. The ultimate purpose of growth and development research in Teacher Education is to enable teacher educators to design pre-service and in-service education programs that teachers will see as relevant, innovative, and adaptable to their own situations and will, therefore, use in their own classrooms to improve the learning climate for their own students.

Many researchers, administrators, and teacher educators have noted that inservice programs for meaningful, long-lasting change cannot be engineered by an outside agent and that:
"...Genuine change takes time. Long-term growth comes from awareness of need which often emerges in the process of trying something out. As problems arise, teachers begin to see better what they need to know or be able to do" (DeVaney, 1977, p. 26).

However, although growth and development studies are beginning to emerge in the literature, the studies thus far reported have not dealt with the question of teacher change over time. Also, they have not considered teacher change in belief and/or practice about a particular subject area, and they have not qualitatively studied teacher change with respect to any particular style of inservice program. Much of the research in Teacher Inservice Education to date has focused on surveying the amount of inservice available in various states and the type of inservice delivery system used most frequently (Harris, 1980; Howey and Joyce, 1978; Lawrence, 1974; Rubin, 1976). However, Harris (1980) contends that a nationwide movement for Inservice Education seems to be building. He cites the federal efforts to support Teacher Centers (section 532 of PL 94-482), Teacher Corps, and Regional Educational Centers with local mandates and funding to assist local schools with inservice, the staff groups in local school systems that have been organized to focus on inservice, the state legislation and funding for inservice education, and the attempts of professional organizations (NEA, AACT) to guide colleges and universities to be more active in inservice to support this contention.

Statement of the Problem

If teacher inservice education will occupy increasing attention of teacher educators, administrators, and legislators as one way to improve
the learning situation for children in the next few decades, and if it is recognized that "genuine change takes time" and cannot be engineered by outside agents, then teacher educators will be looking for inservice programs which, though they take time, will help teachers make the kinds of changes in their teaching that will be long-lasting and meaningful for their students. Programs with a strong theoretical base, modeled by experts, and based on the kinds of changes teachers make as they apply new ideas in their own classrooms might be the most relevant for teacher educators to implement.

The purpose of the present study was to discern and describe changes in beliefs and practices of a group of teachers who took a special inservice program which emphasized the integrating of Language Arts, Reading, and Children's Literature. Nineteen elementary teachers shared a common inservice experience as students in a six month alternative graduate program leading to an MA in Reading Education during 1979-80. These teachers were interviewed and observed in their classrooms before and after the six month program and again one year later to ascertain whether they had changed any beliefs or practices about teaching Language Arts, Reading, or Literature during the two year time span. Using qualitative techniques of data collection, the investigator attempted to ascertain the belief system behind each teachers' observed and/or reported classroom practices of teaching Language Arts, Reading, Literature, to capture change in these beliefs or practices as they occurred, and to record each teachers' perceptions of any changes in beliefs or practices that might have taken place during the two years. The specific problem of the study was to explore the teachers'
changes in beliefs and practices to determine whether change really occurred, how much time it took teachers to change, whether the changes were long-lasting, whether changes could be linked to hypothetical stages of development, whether the inservice program shared by these teachers contributed to their change, and finally, whether components or underlying principles of the inservice program could be identified for use in future inservice programs dealing with other subject areas. The following questions, thus, guided the research:

(1) Did change really occur?

(2) How long did it take teachers to change? Were changes long-lasting?

(3) Can changes found be linked to the hypothetical stages of development reported in the literature?

(4) Did the inservice program shared by these teachers contribute to their change? What components or principles underlying the inservice program seemed to contribute to change?

Limitations of the Study

The questions posed by this study did not lend themselves to an experimental research design. The investigator was interested in subtleties of change as it occurred and continued over time. Therefore, responses which could be coded and quantitatively enumerated were not sought in the research design. Instead, interviews centered on open-ended questions and videotapes were used to probe for beliefs and practices of integrating Language Arts, Reading, and Literature to enable the teacher and investigator to discuss these beliefs and practices or any changes that might have occurred or be occurring.
Although the investigator made a deliberate attempt to interpret responses from the "inside voices" perspective of the teacher as well as the "outside eyes" perspective of a participant observer (Applegate, et.al., 1977) the synthesized interpretation of each teachers' response was, finally, that of the investigator. In an attempt to allay investigator bias, or, at least, expose it, a description of the investigator's background and theoretical perspective was presented in Chapter IV. As a participant observer in the research process, the investigator had the advantage of having had experiences similar to every teacher in the study. These experiences, reported in Chapter IV, comprised the background against which the investigator attempted to interpret teacher responses. It is hoped that this description will be helpful to the reader in interpreting the findings of the study.

Plan of the Study

A Review of Related Literature will be found in Chapter II, Procedures for the Study in Chapter III, a Description of the Alternative Masters Program and the Investigator in Chapter IV, A Report of Changes of the Group and of Two Typical and One Atypical Case in Chapter V, and a Summary and Discussion of the Changes Found, their Implications for Teacher Inservice Education, and Suggestions for Further Research in Chapter VI.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Introduction

Although the purpose of Inservice Teacher Education is to assist experienced teachers to change, develop, and grow in their profession (Katz, 1977), the question of how experienced teachers change beliefs and practices in particular subject areas has not been asked nor reported in the literature of Teacher Inservice Education. One reason the question has not been asked can be found in the history of Inservice Education itself.

According to Harris (1980), Lawrence (1974), Purves (1978), Rubin (1978), Jackson (1974) and others, Inservice Education historically has been reactive rather than proactive, to pressing community needs. For example, when teachers were in short supply and often uncertified, Inservice Education addressed teacher certification and teacher-deficiency problems; during the post-Sputnik era Inservice Education addressed pressures to upgrade science and math programs; during the 1960's Inservice Education addressed demands to "open up the classrooms". In addition, Teacher Inservice Education has been based on an administrative view of teacher's needs as they related to school systems' needs (Arends, Hersch, Turner, 1978; Harris, 1980; Howey, 1976, 1978; Lawrence, 1974; NEA, 1966). Teachers were told--
not asked—what their professional needs for growth and development might be.

During the 1970's this "top-down" view of Inservice Education began to change. Enlightened administrators began to realize that mandated inservice programs based on administrator's perceptions of teacher needs were ineffective (Ambrose, 1978; Edelfelt, 1977; Gorden and Branch, 1978; Howey, 1978; Rubin, 1976). Administrators watched teachers attend all-day lectures or participate in workshops, learn how to implement a change mandated by Administrators, and then abandon the new idea when they returned to their classrooms. Even teachers who might have enthusiastically supported the new idea often found that they could not carry it out in their classrooms—either because they did not know how (they were not given enough appropriate on-site support), or they were just too busy meeting other district needs to give the idea a fair chance in practice (Lawrence, 1974). Consequently, the inservice program whatever its content, was often labeled as "a good idea for someone else" and quickly forgotten.

Fuller's work with pre-service teachers in the late 1960's (Fuller, 1969, 1970) prompted teacher educators to look at the growth and development of teachers as a new way to approach Inservice Teacher Education. Several researchers began to study the needs of teachers at different points in their careers (Apelman, 1978; Eddy, 1969; Field, 1979; Fuller and Bown, 1978; Hall et al., 1975; Katz, 1972; Witherell and Erickson, 1978). They hypothesized that different stages of development for teachers would demand different kinds of inservice programs.
Growth and Development of teachers became a new thrust in Teacher Education research.

Feiman and Floden (1980) classify the Growth and Development studies into three types:

1) those which attempt to construct a developmental theory (Fuller, 1969, 1975; Hall, 1975)

2) those which attempt to apply existing developmental theory to practice (Witherell and Erickson, 1978)

3) those which describe teacher practices and attempt to justify them in developmental terms (Bussis, Chittenden, and Amarel, 1976).

Although most of the early studies of Teacher Growth and Development were done with preservice and first year teachers (Applegate et al., 1978; Blackburn, 1977; Eddy, 1969; Ryan, 1970), more recent studies with experienced teachers have begun to be reported in the literature. The intent of these studies is to provide a theoretical and practical basis for Teacher Inservice programs. These studies also provide a description of experienced teachers from different perspectives. They will, therefore, be briefly reviewed so that they may serve as a background for discussion, evaluation, and interpretation of the changes the experienced teachers in the present study made during the two years in which they were followed.

Studies Which Attempt to Construct a Developmental Theory

Fuller attempted to construct a developmental theory of teacher growth. Initially, she studied pre-service teachers to discover what they were concerned about and whether their concerns could be conceptualized in some useful way (Fuller, 1969). She hoped to find regularities in teachers' concerns over time that could help teacher educators
choose more appropriate course content and experiences. Fuller's first study was designed to help counselors better understand teachers. She organized weekly, two hour seminars in which small groups of student teachers were encouraged to talk about anything they chose. Sessions were taped and each statement was classified according to its main topic. The frequencies of topics discussed as well as clinical impressions gained from listening to the tapes suggested a dichotomy between concerns with self (the first three weeks of student teaching experience) versus concerns with students (the last three weeks of student teaching experience). In another study, student teachers were asked every two weeks to write about what concerned them most. Their statements were classified as to concern with self-adequacy, concern with misbehavior and class control, concern with pupil learning. Of the 29 student teachers studied, 22 expressed concerns about self-adequacy, none about pupil learning. Fuller integrated these findings with existing research on perceived problems of student teachers and beginning inservice teachers (six surveys published from 1936 to 1965 and two unpublished surveys) and came up with her first "developmental conceptualization" i.e., that teacher concerns were in terms of a self-other dichotomy.

Gabriel (1957) investigated the concerns of 736 beginning and experienced teachers in England and found that problems and satisfactions differed significantly between experienced and inexperienced teachers. Inexperienced teachers were significantly more concerned with criticism from superiors, maintaining discipline, praise from inspectors,
and holidays. Experienced teachers were more concerned with the slow progress of pupils and success of former pupils.

Jackson (1968) interviewed experienced teachers considered to be outstanding by their supervisors and peers. He found that they expressed most concerns about pupil progress and that several spontaneously recalled their decreasing preoccupation with discipline and self-adequacy.

Fuller regrouped Gabriel's data and included Jackson's work in her subsequent modified conceptualization of teacher development in which she suggested three stages of concern: self-as-teacher concerns, teaching situation concerns, and pupil concerns (Fuller and Bown, 1975). She tentatively characterized the "late teaching phase" as a time when teacher concerns focus more on pupil gain and self evaluation as opposed to personal gain and evaluation by others. "Mature" teacher concerns, she said, include the ability to understand pupils' capacities, to specify objectives for them, to assess their gain, to recognize one's own contribution to pupil's difficulties and gains, to evaluate oneself in terms of pupil learning (Fuller, 1969).

Fuller continued to expand and refine her suggested stages. She developed a Teacher Concerns Statement, a Teacher Concerns Checklist, and a Teacher Concerns Questionnaire. Based on a factor analysis of the Teacher Concerns Checklist, three phases of teacher concerns emerged:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early Phase</strong></td>
<td>Concerns about self; non-teaching concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Phase</strong></td>
<td>Concerns about professional expectations and acceptance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerns about one's own adequacy, subject matter, and class control

Concerns about relationships with pupils

III Late Phase

Concern about pupils learning what is taught

Concern about pupils learning what they need

Concern about one's own (teacher) contributions to pupil change.

Fuller used the term "stage" or "phase" to mean "cluster of concerns which describe the experience of learning to teach. She said that:

"whether these really are 'stages' or only clusters, whether they are distinct or overlapping, whether teachers teach differently or are differently effective at different stages has not been established" (Fuller and Bown, 1975, p. 37).

She did not account for the shift in progression from one stage to another. One researcher has pointed out, however, that Fuller's stages parallel the sequence of Maslow's theory of motivation, at least at the intermediate stages of safety, love, belongingness, esteem (Warner, 1975). For example, Fuller's Phase I (Where do I stand, perceptions of adequacy in the teaching role, anxieties about subject matter and class control) are ego-centered, safety concerns. Phase II (desire to determine causes of deviant behavior, desire for feedback, evaluation from supervisors, parents, etc., concern with what pupils were learning as opposed to what they were being taught) exhibit a movement from safety to belongingness, from ego-centered concerns to concerns about others. The Final Phase (concern for pupils, new understandings of self and the
relationship with pupils) shows the beginnings of a synergic environment where the needs of the individual (the teacher) and the needs of those about him are both being satisfied by the mutual relationship (Warner, 1975).

Fuller stated that:

"...early concerns can be thought of as more potent security needs and later concerns to task-related and self-actualizing needs which only appear after the pre-potent security needs have been satisfied. There is a clear indication that pupil concerns are more desirable than self-concerns and that later concerns cannot emerge until earlier concerns are resolved. Somehow teachers get to the third stage with time, experience, and a little help from teacher educators."

It is with the transition to this last stage that Inservice Teacher Educators need to be concerned. Fuller did not examine teacher change in this area.

Lillian Katz (1972) extended Fuller's work and studied preschool teachers in their first five years of teaching experience. She identified four developmental stages for teachers:

1) Survival: Teachers are anxious about being responsible for a group of children and meeting parents. The discrepancy between ideals and classroom realities intensifies feelings of inadequacy.

2) Consolidation: Occurs usually towards the end of the first year. The teacher begins to consolidate what she has learned and to differentiate skills to be mastered. The teacher begins to focus on problem children and problems to be mastered.

3) Renewal: Occurs at the end of the third or fourth year. The teacher gets tired of doing the same old things and becomes interested in new teaching materials and methods.
4) Maturity: The teacher has come to terms with herself as a professional and has the perspective to reflect on more fundamental educational questions.

Katz did not report how she arrived at these "stages." Clearly, however, they reflect global stages of teacher concerns to which Katz matched suggestions for appropriate Inservice Education.

Hall et al. (1977) continued Fuller's work on stages of teacher concerns and developed a Stages of Concern About Innovations instrument to measure teachers' stages of concern as reflected by their adoption of innovations in their classrooms. He noticed that teachers involved in change appeared to express concerns about innovations that were similar to those concerns Fuller had identified with teachers about teaching. In a three year study of concerns expressed by adoptees of various educational innovations, he found that concerns could be categorized and that they changed in a logical progression as users became increasingly skilled in using the innovation. He identified seven stages of concern which appeared to develop from early unrelated, to self, to task, and finally to impact concerns. Hall's Stages of Concern About Innovations are:

0 Awareness Little concern about or involvement with innovation.

1 Informational A general awareness of innovation and interest in learning in more detail. Person not worried about self in relation to innovation. Interest in substantive aspects of innovation in a selfless manner such as general characteristics, effects, requirements for use.
2 Personal
Individual is uncertain about demands of the innovation, adequacy to meet those demands, role with innovation.

3 Management
Attention is focused on the processes and tasks of using the innovation and the best use of information and resources. Issues related to efficiency, organizing, managing, scheduling, time demands are utmost.

4 Consequence
Attention focused on impact of innovation on own students. Focus on relevance of innovation for students, evaluation of student outcomes, changes needed to effect student outcomes.

5 Collaboration
Focus on coordination and cooperation with others regarding use of innovation.

6 Refocusing
Focus on exploring more universal benefits from innovation, including possibility of major change or replacement with a more powerful alternative. Individual has definite ideas about alternatives to the proposed or existing form of the innovation.

Hall stated that concerns about innovations are developmental in that earlier concerns must first be resolved before later concerns can emerge. This is not accomplished simply by having more knowledge about or time or experience with the innovation. The process of arousal and resolution of concerns, he said, is highly personal and requires time as well as timely intervention of both cognitive and affective natures. He did not develop this point nor report any studies to substantiate it.

Hall did say, however, that concerns generally develop towards later stages (impact concerns) and that higher levels cannot be engineered by an outside agent.

Hall (1975) hypothesized another dimension of innovation's adoption which attempts to assess what the individual innovation-user actually
does in using an innovation. This is called the Levels of Use of the Innovation and focuses on the knowledge, skill, and behavioral aspects of an individual's involvement with change. Hall has identified eight discrete Levels of Use which range from lack of knowing that the innovation exists to an active, sophisticated, and highly effective use of it and further, to active searching for superceding innovation. He further hypothesized that growth in quality of use of the innovation (movement toward higher levels) is developmental. The eight Levels of Use are:

**Level 0**
Non-use: User has little or no knowledge of the innovation, no involvement with the innovation, does nothing toward becoming involved.

**Level I**
Orientation: User has acquired or is acquiring information about the innovation and is exploring its value orientation and its demands on user and user system.

**Level II**
Preparation: User is preparing for first use of innovation.

**Level III**
Mechanical Use: User focuses most effort on short-term, day-to-day use of innovation with little time for reflection. Changes in use made more to meet user needs than client needs. User engaged in step-wise attempt to master the tasks required to use the innovation, often resulting in disjointed and superficial use.

**Level IVa**
Routine: Use of innovation is stabilized. Few if any changes are being made in on-going use. Little preparation or thought is being given to improving innovation use of its consequences.

**Level IVb**
Refinement: User varies use of innovation to increase impact on clients within immediate sphere of influence. Variations based on short- and long-term consequences for clients.
Level V  Integration: User is combining own efforts to use innovation with related activities of colleagues to achieve a collected impact on clients within their common sphere of influence.

Level VI  Renewal: User re-evaluates the quality of use of innovation, seeks major modifications of alternatives to present innovation to achieve increased impact on clients, examines new developments in the field, explores new goals for self and the system.

Hall's Stages of Concern and Levels of Use hypotheses are useful categories for describing teachers who have been mandated to implement change. They may also be useful for describing teachers who are attempting to implement ideas and practices gleaned from their own search for ways to change and use innovations in their classrooms.

Studies Which Attempt to Apply an Existing Developmental Theory to Practice

Several studies in the literature of Teacher Growth and Development view teacher development as a form of adult development and assume that characteristics which describe effective adult functioning are applicable to effective teachers and teaching. For example, Witherell and Erickson (1978) used Loevinger's theory of ego development and Kohlberg's theory of moral development as a framework for studying the relationships between teacher's conceptions of teaching and human development, and their patterns of teaching behavior. These developmental theories hold that development occurs in stages with the following characteristics:

1) stages represent qualitative and structural changes in thinking, responding, modes of problem solving

2) at each stage there is an underlying holistic organization of thought and awareness
3) stages are hierarchically integrated; each stage is succeeded and subsumed (not replaced) by a more differentiated, complex, integrated stage.

4) stages are sequentially invariant.

Kohlberg's stages of moral development are used to explain teachers' ability to initiate structural changes in their classrooms, to encourage student participation and leadership, and to contribute to the moral development of their students. Witherell and Erickson maintained that teachers who are autonomously committed to the ethical development of students and to principles of the social contract because of their own beliefs in equity, reciprocity, and human rights are more likely to initiate changes in their classrooms. Therefore, it is important to identify the teacher's level of moral development when designing inservice programs. Kohlberg's stages as they apply here are:

Preconventional: follows rules to avoid punishment; follows rules in own self-interest.

Conventional: is good for the sake of the role; obeys laws because of conscience.

Post Conventional/ Principled: social contract rules; relativity, universal, ethical ramifications.

Loevinger (1976) views the ego as a master trait subsuming (1) impulse control or character development (2) interpersonal style (3) conscious preoccupations (4) cognitive style. For him, ego development involves an increase in complexity and differentiation in the conception of self in the social context. Ego "stages" are "equilibrated structures" related to each other in invariant hierarchical sequence.
Loevinger has identified ten stages of ego development, six of which describe the normal adult range of development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformist Stage:</td>
<td>Views self as conforming to socially approved codes and norms. Explanations of behavior and situations are conceptually simple. Little awareness of inner life or depth of feeling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious-Conformist Stage:</td>
<td>Begins to allow for exceptions and contingencies in generalizations. An increase in self-awareness and the capacity to imagine multiple possibilities in the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious Stage:</td>
<td>Person displays and perceives complex thinking. Behavior is viewed in terms of patterns, traits, motives. Capacity to take the role of others cognitively and emotionally deepens. Self-evaluated goals and rules, differentiated feeling, high achievement characterize this stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic Stage:</td>
<td>Begin to tolerate paradoxes and inner conflicts. Persons demonstrate a respect for individuality and an emerging cherishing of interpersonal ties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous:</td>
<td>Able to integrate unrelated ideas. A heightened respect for autonomy and emotional interdependence. Interest in development, role conceptions and a richly differentiated inner life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Stage:</td>
<td>A rare attainment. Adds the integration of a sense of identity and self-actualization to the characteristics of the autonomous stage. Increased objectivity, transcendence of self, openness to development, democratic character structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Witherell and Erickson maintain that advancement in ego-development can stand on its own as educationally desirable for teachers. They presented five case studies which investigated the relationships between ego-development and teachers' beliefs and classroom behaviors. Three hypotheses emerged from their data:
(1) Teachers' actions are linked to (and linked by) the theories and values they hold;

(2) Patterns of teaching behavior and educational beliefs are associated with differences in developmental stage;

(3) Teachers who have reached a higher developmental stage demonstrate greater complexity and commitment to individuals in some areas.

Witherell and Erickson defined teacher effectiveness in terms of more differentiated and complex frameworks for understanding and coping with classroom realities. Professional development was equated with personal development.

Theoretical frameworks such as Loevinger's and Kohlberg's help the teacher educator understand the complexity of the teaching process and the events in classrooms as they relate to personal development of the teacher. They provide a view of the teacher as growing and changing, as a colleague in classroom research, as an important source of knowledge in the field of human development. They do not, however, present a complete picture of teacher professional development as it relates to particular instructional beliefs and how these beliefs are translated into particular practices in the classroom nor in how these beliefs and practices change over time.

Studies Which Describe Teacher Practices and Attempt to Justify Them In Developmental Terms

Katherine DeVaney (1977), Kristen Field (1979), Maja Apelman (1978), and Bussis, Chittenden, and Amarel (1976) have developed a third approach to Teacher Growth and Development. This approach involves a
set of ideas about professional learning and the conditions necessary to support them gleaned from observing teachers at work in Teacher Centers. The Teacher Center movement began in the early 1970's (Yarger and Yarger, 1978) and is based on the idea that small, informal places for teachers to go on their own initiative to work on curriculum for their own classrooms can best help them to grow and develop professionally. Staff advisors at Teachers' Centers work with teachers to stimulate, support, and extend growth in the teacher's own direction rather than in implementing any particular instructional model or strategy (DeVaney, 1975; Katz, 1977). Those who approach teacher development from this perspective see a supportive environment as crucial to professional growth characterized by continual learning and change. They propose a "developmental style" of Inservice characterized by warmth, concreteness, time, and thought (DeVaney, 1977). The teacher, as learner, is viewed as being responsible for her own growth. Experiences with curriculum materials are real-life, hands-on; teachers are expected to construct their own materials. Long-term growth is expected to take time; periods of high activity are expected to alternate with periods of assimilation in which little movement is apparent. The goal of this approach to Teacher Development is that teachers will eventually reach a state of development where they can see the teaching act itself as a source of knowledge (DeVaney, 1977; Katz, 1977). Development is thus seen as an active, self-regulating process which cannot be engineered by others. Professional growth is defined in terms of increased responsibility for educational decision-making.
Field (1978) from an interview study with teachers hypothesized three identifiable stages of growth:

Stage 1  Day to Day survival; hit or miss solutions; intense feelings of inadequacy.

Stage 2  Increased self-confidence; some appropriate solutions to problems; planning in terms of weeks.

Stage 3  Teacher is whole; children are real people; learning is a whole process not divided by time or subject.

Similarly, Maja Apelman (1978) worked with teachers in a Teachers Center and identified three overlapping stages of growth:

(1) Teacher is concerned with classroom management and organization; need for practical help.

(2) Teacher is concerned with "how to" questions directed towards new materials and activities.

(3) Teacher realizes she could do more to extend children's learning and needs help with curriculum-building. Teacher has good classroom organization and plentiful materials, the children are interested and involved but teacher is looking for greater depth and continuity to children's work.

Bussis, Chittenden, and Amarel (1976) have done, perhaps, the most impressive research to substantiate this approach to Teacher Development to date. They conducted in-depth interviews with sixty elementary teachers who were trying to diversify their curriculum and move away from whole-class learning. These interviews focused on teacher beliefs about children, curriculum, and the work environment. They assumed that the quality and quantity of teacher decision-making depended on teachers' understandings of children, curriculum, and degree of institutional support. In analyzing their data, they devised coding systems which became subsequent categories of teacher's perceptions about various issues. These categories were placed on a continuum to show a
progression from a consumer orientation to a more active role by the teacher for decision-making in terms of self-investment, critical judgment, inference, conceptual reorganization. Bussis, Chittenden, and Amarel were interested in the correlation between teachers' perceptions of advisors and the use they made of advisors in their attempts to change to more open classroom environments. This is the only study reported in the literature which attempts to link teacher beliefs with subsequent practice of particular instructional methods in particular subject areas. It does not, however, look at change in belief or practice over time; the purpose of the present study.

Summary

Although the purpose of Inservice Teacher Education is to assist experienced teachers to change, develop, and grow in their profession, the question of how experienced teachers change beliefs and practices in particular subject areas has not been asked nor reported in the literature of Teacher Inservice Education. Teacher Inservice Education, historically, has been reactive rather than proactive to community demands and has focused on administrative rather than teacher-perceived needs for professional growth and development. Inservice programs have been ineffective in the past because of this top-down view. Mandated changes in teaching practices typically have not been carried out by teachers in the classroom.

Since Fuller's work on the growth and development of preservice teachers in the late 1960's, some educators have begun to look at Teacher Inservice Education from a new perspective—that of Teacher
Growth and Development. Studies in Teacher Growth and Development have been classified into three major types:

(1) those that attempt to construct a developmental theory (Fuller, Hall).

(2) those which attempt to apply existing developmental theory to practice (Wetherill and Erickson).

(3) those which describe teacher practices and attempt to justify them in developmental terms (Bussis, Chittenden, and Amarel).

Studies in Teacher Growth and Development were reviewed to provide a background for discussion of the changes in beliefs and practices experienced by the subjects in the present study.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to explore change in experienced teachers' beliefs and practices of integrating Language Arts, Reading, Literature in their classrooms. Twenty-two graduate students enrolled in the Alternative MA course at Ohio State University were approached as possible subjects for the study. All were experienced teachers teaching full time in September, 1979. During the first meeting of the Alternative MA class the purposes of the study were explained to potential subjects (see Summary of Oral Presentation, Appendix A). The investigator was introduced as a Ph.D. student interested in documenting teachers' experiences and changes as they attempted to integrate Language Arts, Reading, Literature in their classrooms. The investigator presented a brief outline of requirements for participation in the study and answered questions pertaining to the study. No attempt to distort or conceal information about the purposes or procedures was made. Participants were aware of the investigator's purposes and methods; they were invited to question and share ideas about the study or their own perceptions about change from the very beginning. Teachers were neither paid nor granted any special privileges for their participation in the study.
All twenty-two teachers agreed to participate in the study. During the second, third, and fourth class meetings, they were given sections of the 1979 Indepth Interview to complete and return to the investigator. All twenty-two teachers completed this interview. During October, 1979, the investigator visited each teacher in his/her classroom to videotape the classroom environment with students present. Although the investigator concentrated most attention on videotaping the provisions in the environment i.e., the classroom collection, the availability and accessibility of materials, the location and arrangement of desks and interest centers, the content of classroom displays, etc., videotapes also captured student movement, talk, interactions with each other and with the teacher, and use of the environment. Although finished videotapes were approximately 15 minutes long, these 15 minutes were not continuous i.e., the investigator did not just turn on the camera and record for 15 minutes, but rather frequently, stopped the camera to change position, location, or subject matter. The camera was used to record particular aspects of the environment for later discussion. Often, however, the on-going lesson was heard as background talk while the camera focused on the physical setting.

Videotape sessions lasted about one hour. Part of each tape was played back during this time for students to "see themselves on t.v." The investigator deliberately replayed portions of the tapes for immediate student and teacher viewing—to reassure the teacher that she was not being evaluated but only taped as part of the environment, to
reward the children for their "natural" participation, to reassure
the investigator that the video equipment was functioning properly.
Teachers were invited to view and discuss complete tapes with the
investigator during the Saturday workshop following their taping.
However, although most teachers took advantage of the invitation to
view their own and others' tapes, they were not particularly interested
in discussing their tapes at this early stage.

At the end of the first quarter of the Alternative MA program two
teachers discontinued the MA program—one to pursue graduate work in
a different field, the other because she became pregnant. Because
they did not complete the entire MA program nor subsequent interviews
and videotapes, these two teachers were dropped as subjects from the
study. In February, 1980, a third teacher was hospitalized and did not
experience the entire MA program nor complete the subsequent set of
interviews or videotaping. This teacher was also dropped as a subject
from the study. The remaining nineteen teachers completed the Alterna-
tive MA program and the subsequent set of interviews and videotapings.
These nineteen teachers became the subjects for the study.

The Teacher/Subjects

All nineteen teachers were trained and employed as full-time
teachers of elementary-aged children at the beginning of the study.
During the second year of the study (1980-81) two teachers temporarily
left their classrooms to pursue full-time graduate study in whole-
language education. These teachers completed all interviews and were
retained as subjects of the study. Two other teachers, during 1980-81,
changed teaching situations i.e., one left a 6th grade inner city class to become a reading specialist in a parochial school, the other left a second grade parochial class to become an inner city substitute teacher. Both teachers completed all interviews and videotapes and were retained as subjects of the study. All other teachers (15) continued in their original teaching situations, either at the same or different grade levels.

At the beginning of the study the majority of subjects (16) had had from one to six years of teaching experience; one subject was a first year teacher; two subjects had had twelve or more years of teaching experience. In 1979, half of the nineteen subjects (9) were teaching in suburban schools, four in rural schools, three in inner city schools, two in parochial schools, and one in an alternative school. The two teachers who left to pursue full-time graduate work in 1981 left a rural second grade position and a parochial reading specialist position. As a point of interest this same parochial reading specialist position was filled by the teacher/subject who changed from a sixth grade inner city assignment to the parochial school reading specialist situation. This switch, though coincidental, became important during interpretation of teacher responses to the Indepth Interview in 1981.

At the beginning of the study four subjects were just beginning graduate work in EMCE/Reading at Ohio State University, fourteen (the majority) had completed three to six courses, and one was nearing the end of coursework required for an MA in Reading. One subject held an MA in Library Science but was just beginning coursework in EMCE/Reading
when the study began. This subject was one of the two who left the classroom during 1981 to pursue full-time graduate work.

During the second year of the study (1981) most subjects continued to take courses toward the MA in EMCE/Reading as well as teach full-time. At the end of the study (May, 1981), three subjects had completed the MA, four were nearing completion, and ten were in the middle of required coursework. Only two subjects did not continue coursework during 1980-81 but reported that they planned to do so during the coming academic year.

Data Collection

Information about teachers' changes in beliefs and practices of integrating Language Arts, Reading, Literature was extracted from three indepth, open-ended interviews, two, fifteen minute videotapes, one interview about these videotapes, individual teacher journals kept during 1979-80, informal conversations with teachers, and investigator field notes and observations about all of the above.

Indepth Interviews

Three Indepth Interviews framed the study and served as the core for analysis of all data. The Indepth Interview consisted of 28 open-ended questions phrased in such a way as to discourage yes/no response and elicit factual, relevant information. For example, rather than ask:

"Do you integrate Language Arts with Reading and Literature in your classroom?"

the question was phrased:

"How do you integrate Language Arts, Reading, Literature in your classroom? Briefly describe."
And rather than ask:

"Do you display children's work in your classroom?"

the question was phrased:

"What is displayed in your classroom at present? Briefly describe. Who is responsible for displays? How is display used?"

The investigator made the assumption that teachers would respond to these open-ended questions to put themselves in the most favorable light i.e., their responses would reflect not only their classroom practices and procedures but also their current perception of what would make them look most enlightened--thus reflecting current understandings and beliefs as well as (perhaps) current practices.

The Indepth Interviews were completed by teachers in writing in September, 1979 and March, 1980, and by telephone in May, 1981. The majority of questions were phrased in the same way and presented in the same order for each interview (See Appendix B). However, several questions asked in 1979 were not asked again in 1980 or 1981 i.e., demographic questions such as "How many years have you taught?" and "What grade levels have you taught previously?", questions that did not need to be answered again such as "Who read to you as a child?" and "What books did you like best as a child?", and questions that elicited responses duplicated in other questions such as "Briefly describe the organization of activities during the course of a typical school day.", and "How do you go about utilizing or building on a child's interest?" In addition, the May 1981 Indepth Interview added the tag question "Has this changed since last year? How? Why?" to each question.
Although the same questions were presented at three different times, most teachers reported that they did not remember answering these questions previously. Questions were presented in the same order because some naturally occurred together i.e.,

"6. How do you teach reading in your classroom?"

"7. How do you think children learn to read?"

"8. What kinds of activities do you feel are most important for reading instruction?"

And others helped keep responses tied to concrete events i.e.,

"15. What kind of books do you have in your classroom collection?"

"16. How is your classroom arranged?"

"17. What kind of instructional materials do you use?"

In addition, the presentation of questions served as an attempt to keep interviews somewhat consistent across teachers as well as to facilitate comparison of responses for each teacher across time. Written interviews took about two hours to complete; telephone interviews about ninety minutes. Teachers were informed that telephone interviews would be taped for transcription and analysis. All teachers gave permission for this taping.

**Videotapes and Interviews**

Two, fifteen minute videotapes were made of each teacher in her classroom in October, 1979 and April, 1980. The intent of these videotapes was to record the provisions made by the teacher for Language Arts, Reading, Literature instruction as reflected by the organization of the classroom, selection of books for the classroom collection,
selection of teacher's and children's work to be displayed, selection of materials to be made available and accessible for children, physical movement of children, arrangement of desks and interest centers, and spontaneous student-student and student-teacher interactions. The videotape camera was used to photograph and document rather than record continuous, on-going series of events for naturalistic observation and analysis. As mentioned previously, teachers were neither evaluated nor critiqued on the basis of videotapes. Many viewed their complete tapes in 1979 in a rather informal way i.e., tapes were played in the background during several Saturday workshops. Teachers watched them, intermittently, as they worked on various projects and discussed them casually with each other.

In April, 1981, teachers' classrooms were videotaped a second time. The investigator deliberately taped each subject at the same time of day as the first tape. Immediately after this second taping, teachers were shown both 1979 and 1980 tapes and were asked to comment on them—on any changes in practices or beliefs about teaching Language Arts, Reading, Literature or providing for integrated Language Arts, Reading, Literature learning that they saw. These interviews were audio-taped and transcribed by the investigator for use as additional information about teachers' perceptions of their own change. Interviews centered on videotapes were approximately 45 minutes and were conducted at each teacher's school.

**Teacher Journals**

At the beginning of the study, teachers were asked to keep a journal of their experiences in the Alternative MA program and in their
classrooms as they began to integrate Language Arts, Reading, Literature into their Language Arts programs. Journals were collected in December, 1979, read by the investigator, and returned in January, 1980 with investigator comments to the teacher/journalist. The purpose of investigator comments in the journals was to assure the teacher/journalist of an interested, non-evaluative audience for journal reflections on frustrations, triumphs and/or any changes of belief or practice that might be recorded. Teachers re-submitted their weekly journals in March, 1980. The investigator did not comment on the journal entries in 1980 but added them to the data compiled for each teacher. A sample journal entry with investigator comments can be found in Appendix C.

**Investigator Observations and Field Notes**

Throughout the first year of the study, the investigator kept field notes about the Alternative MA program, about her experiences as a participant-observer in this program, about the teachers participating as subjects. In addition, the investigator took careful notes, counted books, noted book and text titles, drew diagrams, and otherwise documented observations during classroom visits, lecture-discussions, and workshops. Investigator notes and observations were added to the data compiled for each teacher and served to provide background information to teacher responses on Indepth Interview questions.

**Role of Investigator**

At the beginning of the study the investigator was introduced as a former elementary teacher presently completing Ph.D. studies, interested in teachers' reactions to the Alternative MA program. She assumed the
role of participant-observer in all lecture-discussion and workshop experiences related to the Alternative MA program. Her main role was to assist in setting up workshops, to talk regularly and informally with teachers about their work, to assist in small group book discussions and workshop activities. The investigator made a deliberate effort to divorce herself from evaluative comments and did not answer or acknowledge questions about class assignments or faculty interpretations of particular assignments. Although a participant in the sense that she attended every class/workshop session, the investigator was also an observer of events—a recorder of class sessions, teachers in their own classrooms, teacher comments about the MA program and about the changes in their own classrooms. During the second year of the study, the investigator had no contact with teachers until May, 1981 when the third and final Indepth Interview was conducted.

Analysis of Data

The research process chosen for the study was ethnographic in the sense that it began not with conventional experimental hypotheses, models, or theorems, but with understandings of fairly minute episodes—teachers responses—which were systematically examined for broader patterns and processes. The investigator attempted to understand teachers' responses from their own point of view and perspectives in terms of the teachers' own situation. The investigator also attempted to stand back and constantly monitor and test her own reactions, as well. As an inside participant and an outside observer, the investigator systematically attempted to understand the responses of teachers from different perspectives.
Data were analyzed in a manner analogous to that of creating animated film from a set of still photographs i.e., a content analysis of each teacher's responses to probes (the three Indepth Interviews, the interview centered on videotapes, teacher journals) was made. Investigator observations from field notes, journals, and videotapes were added to this content analysis. Particular attention was paid to differentiating between teacher responses and interpretations and investigator observations and interpretations—the "inside voices, outside eyes" strategy of Applegate et.al. in The First Year Teacher Study (1977). Discrete descriptions of teacher beliefs and practices as seen by the subject as well as by the investigator emerged from this scrutiny of data. They became the "still photographs" of the animated film analogy. Descriptions were then spliced together (as in creating animated film from still photographs) to reveal patterns of change for each teacher over time--the two year span of the study.

During the second phase of analysis, patterns of change for each teacher were compared to those of every other teacher. Categories of change about beliefs and practices in integrating Language Arts, Reading, Literature began to emerge for the sample of teachers as a whole. An evaluator not connected with the study was asked to review some of the data to check the reliability of the categories of change which seemed to emerge from the data. These categories and changes will be reported in Chapter V, Description of Teacher Changes, and discussed in Chapter VI, Summary, Discussion and Implications for Further Research.
The method of data analysis (still photograph, animated film) comes from Glaser's (1965) method of constant comparative analysis of qualitative data. This method combines explicit coding procedures and inspection of data for new properties of one's theoretical system (typical ways to analyze qualitative data) into one method whose purpose is joint coding and analysis to generate theory. It is designed to aid analysts create theory which is integrated, consistent, plausible, close to the data, and clear enough to be readily operationalized for testing in quantitative research. It is not designed to guarantee inter-rater reliability. The data are coded only enough to generate theory. The constant-comparative method may be applied to any kind of qualitative information including observations, interviews, documents, books, articles, etc.

Specifically, the constant comparative method analyzes data in four stages: the investigator 1) compares incidents applicable to each category; 2) integrates categories and their properties; 3) delimits theory; 4) writes the theory. The analyst begins by coding each incident in his data into as many categories which adequately explain the incident as are possible. While coding an incident for a category, he compares it to previous incidents coded in the same category. According to Glaser, this constant comparison of the incidents soon starts to generate theoretical properties of the category. As the analyst "muses over these notions" he stops coding and records a memo on his ideas. As coding continues the constant comparative units change from comparing incidents to each other to comparing incidents to properties of the category.
As comparisons continue, theory develops and begins to solidify in the sense that "major modifications become fewer as one compares subsequent incidents of a category to properties of it" (p. 41). At the end of this process, the analyst has coded data, a series of memos, and a theory. The discussion in the memos provide the content behind the categories, which are the major tenets of the theory.

The theory and hypotheses which emerged from this study will be discussed in Chapter VI, Summary, Discussion and Implications for Further Research.
CHAPTER IV
DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM AND THE INVESTIGATOR

The Alternative MA program, though not a treatment in this study, was a common experience shared by all teachers. Therefore, a brief description of the program is included as part of the background data.

A Typical Experience

It was damp, misty, and too early to be unloading cartons filled with watercolors, chalk, crayons, beads, felt-tipped pens, oaktag, wire coat hangars, and other miscellanea. The graduate research assistant and several teachers offered weak jokes and coffee as they set about their task in the Saturday morning quiet of a metropolitan park shelter. They were waiting for the rest of the Alternative MA class to arrive for an all-day workshop entitled "Environmental Study of Woods and Creek". What this topic had to do with child language development and integrating the language arts in elementary classrooms remained to be experienced.

The MA teachers straggled in. By 9:00 everyone had assembled, stowed her lunch and had her picture taken. Each teacher was handed a "trip booklet" and the day began. The first assignment was to explore the woods and to select one specimen (a rock, leaf from a tree, a bird or insect) and study it in detail in its natural habitat, look at it and draw several pictures of it from different angles, write an accurate description of the shape, texture, color, and distinguishing
characteristics, write an imaginative story or poem about it, and
finally, do something with it--make a print with ink, a plaster of
paris mold, a tissue paper collage with a black silhouette, a water
color painting--something that would make the specimen memorable.
Sometime during the morning the teacher was asked to go off by her­
sel to a quiet place and sit for 20 minutes and then write down what­
ever she felt, saw, thought in whatever form she wished--a thought
rambling.

At noon everyone reassembled for lunch and an introduction to
print-making and other extension materials. Teachers then formed
themselves into small groups to plan and execute a group extension of
some aspect of the environment which they had experienced during the
morning. Group projects ranged from describing insect habits and
habitats and following animal tracks to exploring the nuances of
patterns in nature. In addition to planning, making, and presenting
these projects, teachers were also asked to record the process as they
went along--so that someone reading their record could reproduce the
product. The workshop, thus, enabled the Alternative MA teachers to
participate in a planned language experience. They were asked to
express themselves in several ways; they engaged in small and large
group discussion; they wrote in various modes--transactional, expres­sive, poetic (Britton, 1970); they worked alone, in small groups, in a
large group; they made some representation with other media (paints,
clay, print, etc.); they were asked to summarize, synthesize, and
 criticize their learning; they used language to formulate and explore
their own real questions. During subsequent class meetings the teachers analyzed this language experience, discussed ways to adapt it to their own classrooms, and carefully displayed their projects with written observations and stories. In addition, they were asked to reflect on their experience and consider such questions as:

1. What kinds of oral and written expression grew out of the experience?
2. What thinking process did you have to go through to create (the project) you did?
3. What did you have to know to do what you did?
4. What are the educational implications for such an experience?

Teachers were asked to reflect on these questions because, as one faculty member stated:

"Reflection and self evaluation need to be part of all teaching. Implicit learnings need to be made explicit" (Huck, 1980, p. 7).

In addition, teachers were asked to write what they thought the objectives of the trip were. Later they were given their instructor's original objectives to compare with their own. The intent of this comparison was to help teachers take a look inside the teaching process being used with them. The goal of the program was to produce informed teachers who knew why they taught as they did and could explain it to others.

The Alternative MA Program

The intent of the Alternative MA program was to provide a time for regular classroom teachers to search out ways to make their Language Arts curriculum an integrated whole. With roots in the informal
classroom where reading, writing, speaking, listening are seen as four interrelated aspects of whole-language learning, the Alternative program sought to help teachers see connections between these areas and make instructional decisions based on these interrelationships.

"...By freeing youngsters' powers of language learning, teachers will be able to facilitate their students' sophistication in language use" (Fox, 1979, p. 1).

The underlying assumption of the program was that children learn language in a natural way at home according to functional needs and uses. By the time a child enters school he commands a wide, grammatical use of language which has served to get him what he wants and needs. The role of the school is to expand and enrich this spoken language use and to enable him to express himself and be understood in written language as well. The teacher's function is seen as one of building on what the child already knows about language and, using the model of natural language learning i.e., language learned to express real needs about real experiences, facilitate his learning of reading and writing. Rather than teaching reading and writing as sets of discrete skills to be mastered (phonics, spelling, reading comprehension, grammar, etc.) in discrete time periods during the day, the whole-language approach to language arts seeks to create an environment in which the learner can engage in activities which are not only personally meaningful and purposeful for him, but also provide opportunities to discover and practice the component parts of the language arts--reading, writing, speaking, listening. Thus, for example, rather than assigning a student to write a report about insects
so that he can learn how to use the library to find information in books, the whole-language teacher might capitalize on a student's interest in the spider he captured on a class outdoor walk. The teacher might note the student's fascination with the trail the spider leaves and might suggest that the student draw the spider from a studied observation, think about it, describe it, write or talk about it, and share his observations with others. In the process of investigating his spider, the whole-language teacher trusts that the student will begin to generate some questions of his own about the spider. Since the answers to these questions can be found in a reference book, the teacher then has an opportunity to present a "lesson" on how to use the reference material to find answers to these real questions. The questions are meaningful and finding the answers has become a purposeful activity for the student. Direct teaching at this point is appropriate. In the meantime, however, the student has practiced observing and using transactional, expressive, poetic language either in oral or written form and has generated his own questions and his own purposes for expanding his language repertoire. The teacher can further expand his learning by providing additional books about spiders and show him how to use them to answer his own questions. In addition, with a careful selection of books about spiders and other insects the teacher might create a new interest or pique a new curiosity about other insects or topics only generally related to spiders. From her knowledge of Children's Literature the teacher might include some non-fiction books about spiders such as A Spider Might. The
student might then extend his reading to such books as Charlotte's Web or Be Nice to Spiders. Additional oral and written language extensions might then be culled from this reading. Thus, by providing real experiences and by using real books to answer real questions, the whole-language teacher enables the student to expand his language repertoire and learn what he needs to know about language, reading, and writing, when he needs to know it. This is the natural language learning model discussed earlier.

The Alternative MA program had as its objective to make the teacher aware of the process of child language acquisition, the functions of language in the classroom, the development and evaluation of written and oral language, and the use of children's literature and real books as an exciting and integral part of the curriculum. To maintain the integrity of the interrelationship between the component parts of the Language Arts (reading, writing, speaking, listening) and to make this interrelationship explicit to teachers, the program was taught across two consecutive quarters with two faculty members sharing equal responsibility for course content, teaching, and evaluation. Although teachers were not recruited for the program, or selected in, enrollment was limited to those graduate students who wished to take the advanced Children's Literature and Language Arts methods courses as a continuous program. The only requirement for admission to the program was a commitment to enroll in the entire sequence as scheduled i.e., enroll for 12 hours graduate credit over two consecutive quarters under the title Alternative Masters Reading Program. Parenthetically it might
be useful to note that both the Advanced Children's Literature and Language Arts methods courses could be taken as discrete courses at other times during the academic year. The Alternative program, however, offered 6 hours credit for the two methods courses plus 6 hours credit for eight workshops run contiguously with these methods courses. In actuality, the program met once a week for twenty, 3 hour lecture-discussion, demonstrations and four times a quarter for eight, 6-8 hour workshop sessions.

The lecture-discussions covered the following topics: language acquisition, oral language (story telling, reading aloud, sharing experiences, establishing opportunities for a variety of language functions, drama), assessing growth in oral language, written language (role of authentic experiences, thought ramblings, input of literary language, using literature as a basis for writing, establishing opportunities for a variety of language functions), assessing growth in written language, creating an integrated language arts program, children's response to literature, investigating and reading and interpreting books from various genre of Children's Literature (picture books, folktales, poetry, fantasy, biography, realistic fiction), small and large group book discussions, a literature program for middle grades, and an overview of the integrated Language Arts/Literature program.

Class assignments included the following:

1) keeping a record of own reading (Children's Literature, professional, adult literature).

2) keeping a record of books read aloud to own class (Children's Literature).
3) keeping a record of Sustained Silent Reading selections for each child in own classroom.

4) saving samples of a student's writing and artwork, dated.

5) participating in two indepth book discussions during lecture/discussion meeting.

6) interpreting a child's (or small group's) response to a book.

7) reviewing a picture book, in depth, plus an annotated bibliography of ten titles.

8) reviewing several middle grade books, indepth, plus an annotated bibliography of ten titles.

9) participating in a small group presentation around a theme from books or poetry.

10) preparing a case study of one child's writing over two quarters.

11) preparing a case study of one child's growth in spelling over two quarters.

12) reading from professional journals and text in language acquisition, functions, spelling, writing, children's literature.

The eight all-day contiguous workshops were held on alternate Saturdays throughout the two quarters. Workshop activities included:

1) Environmental Study of Woods and Creek at a nearby metropolitan park. Trip booklet and activities provided.

2) Independent Small Group Trip to a place of group's choice in Central Ohio. Trip booklet, activities generated by groups.

3) Writing Workshop on campus featuring Literature as Springboards to Writing, book-binding, slide-making, children's growth in writing.

4) Language Experience Workshop at the homes of faculty featuring cooking, making cornhusk dolls, Swedish hearts, and traditional Christmas ornaments and decorations; writing directions, reading about, and sharing the customs and legends of the holiday season.
5) Folktales Workshop comparing folktales, folktale variants; featuring charting, game-making, story-telling, Caldecott-Newbery Awards.

6) Poetry Workshop featuring studies of children's poetry preferences, poetry writing, sharing poetry with children, experimenting with poetry forms.

7) Book Extensions Workshop featuring extending books through drama, book-binding, marbleizing, slide-making, puppets, story-writing, game-making.

8) Drama Workshop featuring spontaneous, unrehearsed drama, formal dramatics, and small group presentations of book extensions around themes in children's literature.

Workshop activities usually generated individual or small group products such as teacher-made cloth bound books, games based on books, Swedish hearts filled with teacher-written poetry, original stories, etc. In addition, teachers were asked to participate in the research study whose requirements are listed separately.

The workshops and lecture-discussion topics and presentations were based on the principles underlying good teaching for young children and the parallel principles for good teaching at the university level. These principles were reiterated in an NCTE/IRA Impact Conference speech (1981) by one of the faculty members (Charlotte Huck) of the Alternative MA program:

MAKING CONNECTIONS WITH TEACHER EDUCATION

Many of the principles underlying good teaching for young children may also be applied to the teaching of teachers. While it may be dangerous to extrapolate from the research with youngsters to college students, it appears that there are many connections between good teaching in the elementary school and good teaching at the university level. The theme of this talk will focus on the following parallel principles:
**Educating Children**

1. A less fragmented and more natural approach to learning to read integrates the child's experience, language, reading and writing.

2. Children need time to learn - does not happen first week of school, first month or perhaps the first year.

3. Children need many opportunities for real experiencing of cooking, taking walks, field trips, interviewing, constructing.

4. Child searches for personal meaning in all he/she does. Children take an active part in constructing their own learning.

5. Child needs to talk in order to help order and formulate his thinking.

6. Basic skills of reading and writing should be taught in meaningful context.

7. Reinforcement of learning skills through use in purposive activities.

---

**Educating Teachers**

1. Integrated methods courses should emphasize the relationships among language acquisition, reading, writing, literature and child development.

2. Students need time to become knowledgeable, competent teachers. Does not happen in one quarter.

3. Students need many opportunities for real experiencing of cooking, taking walks, field trips, interviewing, constructing.

4. Teachers need to make sense of their own teaching, to know why they teach as they do in order to be informed teachers. Need to question principles underlying certain practices.

5. Pre-service and in-service teachers need to talk to help order and formulate their thinking.

6. Basic skills and techniques for child watching in the classroom environment should be emphasized. Students should have knowledge and understanding of Concepts of Print Test, Miscue Analysis, ways to evaluate the writing process, measure a child's sense of story, etc.

7. Reinforcement of basic principles of education through student teaching and modeling done by university professors.
8. Belief in child's ability to do and to learn. Much positive reinforcement.

9. Continued support from home, school, and community.

The integrity of the relationship between reading, writing, listening, speaking through meaningful experiences with language use and children's literature was maintained and made explicit by the way the Alternative MA program was presented. Teachers actually experienced a creek walk, were asked to write about it as a thought rambling, poem, short story, or piece of investigative reporting. They were asked to extend their language by generating their own real questions, talk to their classmates, learn from each other, discover answers (and further questions) in books, write from different perspectives, be aware of their own language usage. Teachers were not told how to bind a book or marbelize end papers--they actually bound books and experimented with oil based paints and water trays so that they could take book-binding and marbelizing back to their own classrooms and repeat these activities with their own students. Teachers were not taught how to lead students in small group discussions of children's books--they actually read children's books and participated in many small group discussions about the books--experiencing and analyzing the process as they went. Teachers did not hear lectures about how to integrate reading, listening, speaking, writing with Children's
Literature; they planned and executed integrated lessons in workshops with their peers, and then carried these plans to their own classrooms and students. For twenty weeks teachers were immersed experientially in an integrated whole-language program at the graduate level. They learned the value of small group discussions by participating in small group discussions; they learned the value of student's talking to each other by actually talking to fellow students to solve mutual problems; they learned the value of reading and extending interesting and exciting books by actually reading and extending these books in small groups, individually, and in their classrooms. They learned how to make connections between reading, writing, speaking, listening, and literature by having those connections explicitly modeled by those in charge of the program and by trying out their own interpretations of connections with peers and with their own students. Teachers were taught as their teachers would have them teach.

The Investigator

Since this is a qualitative ethnographic rather than quantitative experimental study, control of experimenter bias must be approached in a more descriptive fashion. Teacher responses to open-ended questions were interpreted in a systematic qualitative rather than quantitative way. Rather than coding and making a frequency count of responses in various categories, the investigator attempted to analyze and interpret the corpus of each teacher's data, to "get inside that teacher's head" and see the world from her point of view. The investigator also attempted to observe and analyze each teacher from a detached, analytical, outside observer's point of view and to interpret
teachers' responses and behavior against a background of the shared Alternative MA experience. Since each teacher's responses were processed through the investigator's brain, it seems helpful to include a description of the investigator--her role in the study, experiences as a teacher, experiences as a MA and Ph.D. graduate student in Informal Education, Integrated Language Arts/Literature/Reading and Inservice Teacher Education at Ohio State University.

The investigator was a fairly typical middle class woman in her late 30's enrolled in the third year of full time graduate study in the above mentioned areas. As the mother of two school-aged children she found it difficult, but not impossible, to pursue graduate work, maintain a healthy family life, and assist in the Alternative MA program which met once a week for three hours and eight Saturdays throughout the twenty weeks. With family and professional responsibilities, she could empathize with the teacher who said at the end of the MA program:

"I least enjoyed the 'thought' of spending all day Saturday in class when there's so much to do at home, but once I got there, I thoroughly enjoyed the activities planned there, too."

The investigator had not begun her career as an elementary teacher. After she graduated in psychology from a small, liberal arts college in Pennsylvania, she joined the Peace Corps and travelled to remote villages in West Pakistan teaching women and children how to keep themselves clean, treat burns and infections, read Urdu and English bus signs and wall posters, etc. Although she had no training in education she found that tackling basic literacy and problems of health and
sanitation by teaching through modeling was effective and challenging. She taught a core of village women to take over her village duties before she returned to the United States. These women were her first "in service" group of teachers.

After returning to the United States the investigator joined the President's (Johnson) War on Poverty and worked as a Youth Counselor with unemployed high school drop outs, and retarded and handicapped adolescents and young adults. When she became pregnant with her first child she decided to return to the university to become certified to teach elementary school. By the time she was certified (a total of 105 quarter hours of methods courses plus student teaching was required at the time) she had two children ages two and four. She began teaching, part time, in a private open-spaced, informal primary school which her children were attending as preschoolers. At the time she considered herself a part time teacher, full-time mother. She was thrilled, though apprehensive the next year when she was asked to become the Master Teacher for the 1-3 Primary class. Although she had had several years of mothering, several years of study, and several years of related work experience, she was not sure how to teach a class of 25 children aged 5-9 in an open-spaced, informal school. She was assured that she would have an aide and that her own children would be cared for in the pre-school and kindergarten areas—but she began the year with trepidation. There was no curriculum guide to be followed and only one expectation—"love the children and help them learn". She was prepared to love the children—she was not sure she knew enough about what they "should" learn to help them learn it.
Nevertheless, she began the year with many hopes and ideas about how to set up her classroom with various learning centers—a library corner, housekeeping/drama corner, math/science area, art area, language/writing/listening area, rug area for class meetings and sharing. Her aide, though inexperienced as well, was willing to follow her lead.

The first day of school an undergraduate class of elementary education majors visited the classroom to observe the initial class meeting. Someone opened the cover of the white mice cage and soon 18 white mice, 25 five to nine year olds, and twelve elementary education majors were scurrying in every direction trying to catch each other. It took the investigator until December to calm her class, calm herself, replace her aide (who quit) and figure out how to "love the children and help them learn". She made all the typical first year teacher mistakes. She was concerned with her own survival—what would others think of her, how could she keep the class "under" control, what should they be learning and how should she teach it. Since there were no curriculum guides or text books, what to teach was a major concern. The teacher scrounged books, old workbooks, suggestions from teacher's Idea Books. She made hundreds of dittos, spent hours planning clever, interesting, spectacular activities and felt guilty because she never did get to forming or listening to reading groups. She read aloud to her class—it used a lot of time and she had loved Read Aloud time as a child—and made books and language experience stories with them. She provided many books and magazines for students to read, but gave them little time to read them. She
became frustrated when students messed about in her carefully planned learning centers, upset when they disturbed each other in the library corner, and irate when they refused to do or never completed her interesting, spectacular assignments. No matter how much she planned—and she did plan—her days and weeks seemed to lead to only more confusion and frustration. By the end of the year, she decided she needed more practical help—"loving the children and helping them learn" was just not enough direction for her lack of experience.

The following year, the investigator became a Learning Disabilities Tutor for elementary students while attending graduate classes in Learning Disabilities and Reading. She was fascinated by the diagnostic approach to remedial reading and was able to connect it to her earlier training in experimental psychology. Her graduate classes were a mixture of learning and reinforcement theory and psycholinguistics, miscue analysis, and whole-language learning—a confusing combination for a novice teacher/graduate student. During the next year the investigator continued to combine coursework in diagnostic/direct teaching and psycholinguistics/whole-language learning, eventually coming to the conclusion that whole-language learning/informal teaching made more sense to her—that direct teaching could only be effective when it met the student's real purposes as defined by him. While coming to this conclusion, she had again begun to teach in a newly organized private, informal school where she had responsibility for organizing and teaching Language Arts and Math to the school's 36 first through sixth graders. This teaching opportunity gave her the chance to try out, refine, discard some of the ideas she was encountering in graduate
classes. Although she, again, had no curriculum guide, textbooks, nor any real administrative support, she now had a heightened self-confidence and a firmer theoretical base upon which to structure a learning environment—to enable her to "love the children and help them learn." She had also learned how to manage a group of children without manipulating them and was able to profit from the combined graduate study/teaching experience in many concrete ways.

Having decided on the theoretical base of whole-language learning, the investigator then began full time graduate work in Integrated Language Arts/Reading/Literature, Informal Education, and Inservice Teacher Education towards a Ph.D. degree. The following year she worked as a part time graduate teaching assistant, supervising student teachers in their elementary classrooms. She had the opportunity to visit, talk with, and videotape many different teachers, principals, and student teachers in a variety of educational settings during this year. In June she participated in a three week seminar and visited a number of informal infant and junior schools and Teachers' Centers in England where she talked with and documented many observations of teachers implementing whole-language learning in a variety of settings.

During the two years of the present study, the investigator spent the first year as a participant observer in the Alternative MA program. Although she was paid as a graduate research assistant, she had no formal role in planning or presenting course content or in evaluating students. She was introduced to students as a Ph.D. student, former teacher, interested in their experience in the Alternative program. She did not take the courses for credit (she had completed both during
her own MA program) and did not participate, formally, in small group or individual assignments. Her main role was to assist in setting up (and cleaning up) workshops, talking informally with students about their work, view of assignments, work as teachers. She also assisted in leading several small group book discussions and in presenting several workshop activities. However, she never assumed the role of instructor. Because she was involved in videotaping teachers in their own classrooms, and because she used this time to talk informally with teachers about their classrooms, she was seen as a colleague rather than evaluator of teachers' work. The investigator made a deliberate effort to divorce herself from evaluative comments and did not answer questions about assignments or comment on evaluations faculty had made about particular assignments. She did not want to be seen as an interpreter of teacher or faculty needs, representing one to the other and thereby becoming a middle-man. As a result, her role with teachers became one of "fellow student--a little further along; fellow-teacher, not presently teaching; colleague rather than faculty". The faculty, however, were not as removed from the teachers as is typical of many graduate education classes at OSU. Because the class size was small (22 as compared to normal size of 40 to 60), and continuous over two quarters, teachers and faculty were able to be much more informal. They were on a first name basis and teachers often met at each other's and/or at faculty homes for special projects or discussions. Distance between student and faculty was therefore shortened, and the investigator seldom found herself in a position to mediate between the two. During the second year of the study, the investigator left the university and
began a full time teaching assignment at a well-endowed private school in the city. Contact with teacher subjects was not maintained until May of that year. At that time the investigator sent a letter (Appendix D) and stamped postcard to each subject asking her to participate in a final interview, by telephone, to complete the study. Since only six of the nineteen postcards were returned, the investigator telephoned each of the teacher subjects to make arrangements for a final interview. During this conversation the investigator re-introduced herself as a Ph.D. student finishing up her study and currently teaching 4, 5, and 6 year olds full-time. Questions directed to the investigator during these and final interview conversations indicated that teachers perceived the investigator as a well-informed colleague with practical and theoretical experience relevant to their situation. The fact that they had experienced the same courses, by the same instructors during their separate careers as graduate students, the fact that they were both teaching full time, the fact that they had shared an experience together gave them a common bond for talking. Conversations tended to be long, informal, friendly, and professional.
CHAPTER V
DESCRIPTION OF CHANGES OF TEACHERS

Introduction
Teacher responses to the indepth questionnaires (September, 1979, March/April, 1980, May, 1981), the interviews centered on respective videotapes, and comments from respective journals were analyzed by the investigator for patterns reflecting changes in teachers' beliefs and practices about integrating Language Arts, Reading, and Literature in their classrooms. The complete corpus for each teacher was systematically transcribed, organized, and read to determine whether a particular pattern of change could be found for that teacher. The outside evaluator and investigator agreed that the following categories of change emerged from this scrutiny of the data: (1) teachers' goals for their Language Arts programs; (2) teachers' views of the component parts of Language Arts and how to teach these parts; (3) teachers' organization of classrooms to facilitate Language Arts learning; (4) teachers' perceptions of themselves as learners/teachers; (5) teachers' perceptions of their own change.

The nineteen teachers as a group will first be described in terms of the above categories. Responses included in each category will be reported chronologically so that the patterns of change from the beginning of the study (September, 1979), during the first year of the study (1980), and after two years (1981) will become evident. After
this description of the entire group and their changes has been presented, one atypical and two typical cases will be reported. Patterns of change for the group as a whole and individuals in particular will be discussed in Chapter VI, Summary, Discussion, and Implications for Further Research.

PATTERNS OF CHANGE FOR THE GROUP OF TEACHERS

Teachers' Goals for Their Language Arts Program

In the Beginning (1979)

At the beginning of the study the majority of teachers (11) expressed vague, broad, non-specific goals for their classroom Language Arts program. They said, for example:

"...to get children to enjoy and be enthusiastic about reading, writing."

"...to feel secure in and positive about Language Arts."

"...to appreciate books."

"...to grow in Language Arts."

A minority of teachers (6) expressed very specific goals based either on a skill-deficiency model of learning or an unexamined acceptance of district goals for mastery and competence in various skill areas. For example, these teachers stated their goals as:

"...for each child to (correct) specific skill deficiencies (in) various areas."

"...for children to read, comprehend, follow written directions on grade level."

"...for mastery and competency of goals set by the district."

Two teachers expressed goals consonant with the goals of whole-language teachers:
"...to integrate the Language Arts subject areas."

"...to have children read real books, communicate real ideas based on their own real purposes."

**Changes During the First Year (1980)**

In the middle of the study after completing the Alternative MA program (March, 1980) responses to questions about goals reflected a growing awareness among teachers that their previous goals were either too broad and vague or too specific. They remarked:

"...before I didn't have any goals except to cover the material."

"...before my goal was just to get them to enjoy reading. That goal is the same but my approach is much more specific now."

"...my goals have deepened."

"...my goals are much more specific now--before I really didn't have any."

Teachers began to include more "enrichment" activities such as writing about responses to books, reading literature books for extra credit, letting children talk in small groups; they started to connect these activities with particular goals for their program "to have children communicate more effectively with each other." One teacher said she had begun to enrich the district curriculum with other activities and that:

"...it makes me feel good to do something other than a practice page or a study page. My goals have changed from a narrow concern with meeting district objectives for each subject to adding literature and literature extensions to enrich my Language Arts program."

**Changes After Two Years (1981)**

At the end of the study those teachers who had had vague and non-specific goals in 1979 and who had begun to realize this in 1980
reported that their goals for 1981 had begun to include many more opportunities for children to interact, to learn from each other by talking and listening to each other, to write more, to create things with their minds and hands, to do whole projects and write about them, to keep track of spelling needs through writing, to use more interest centers and manipulative materials and fewer dittos, to read more and better quality books, to communicate more effectively with meaningful writing and speaking activities. These teachers' responses typically included specific ways in which they acted upon their goals. Their broad, vaguely defined goals of 1979 had become more concrete and articulate; the range of activities they offered to meet these goals had broadened and become more encompassing while at the same time more goal appropriate. Activities in 1981 seemed to have become rooted to a purpose. One teacher expressed it for her colleagues:

"...I never really sat down and thought too much about goals, other than knowing at the beginning of the year (children) should be at one place and at the end of the year they should be at another place further along. I sort of let somebody else say 'well, now this is where they should be at the beginning and this is where they should be at the end'...but you can't really stick children into a mold and say they will be here and they will be here. You can expect certain things but you can't have your boundaries too rigid because you'll be disappointed sometimes and amazed sometimes."

One teacher, however, neither examined her own goals for a Language Arts program nor changed her goal orientation during the two years of the study. She said her goals had remained the same--

"...to have children correct skill deficiencies"
and offered reasons why the activities to meet these goals couldn't change:
"...I feel helpless to change anything in my classroom that my students won't like. I would like for them to do more writing but they insist on using spelling books; they'll only write words from their spelling books."

Summary: Goals

In summary, the majority of teachers (11) began the study with vague, broadly defined goals for students in their language arts programs. Six teachers began the study with un-examined and/or very specific goals based on a skill deficiency model of learning. Two teachers began the study with goals consonant to those held by teachers of whole-language learning. During the first year of the study, after completing the Alternative MA courses, those teachers whose goals had been broad and vague became aware of their previous lack of goal specificity; the two teachers whose goals were consonant with whole-language learning became aware that their goals were appropriate and could be deepened; five of the six teachers whose goals had been narrow or unexamined became aware of the limits they had placed on their programs by adopting such goals; one teacher neither examined nor changed her goals during the study.

Teachers' Views of the Component Parts of Language Arts and How to Teach These Parts

In the Beginning, 1979

In 1979 the majority of teachers (15) viewed the various components of the Language Arts as separate subjects to be taught as discrete lessons throughout the day or week. They structured these lessons with basal spelling texts, language arts or English texts, and well-defined district curriculum guides. The core language arts subjects were
considered to be spelling, handwriting, grammar. Creative writing was often added to the language arts time block on a weekly or bi-weekly basis. Most writing activities came from workbook or textbook assignments, teacher's story starter ideas, or spelling exercises. Opportunities for listening were not considered part of Language Arts and were limited to story tapes or assignments in listening centers, listening to teacher directions, or listening to students share personal experiences in front of the class. Most teachers discouraged talking, particularly social/personal talk during "work times". Most language arts assignments were either individually prescribed or undertaken by the class as a whole. Small group discussions or sharing of ideas were limited to infrequent social studies or science projects. Literature was extended by book reports or gimmicks such as writing the author and title of books read on paper feet and taping these feet around the room. The number of books read was often competitive.

In 1979 the majority of teachers (15) taught reading as a subject separate from the language arts. As with their approach to language arts, all used a basal reading series in fairly similar ways, i.e., children would be tested at the beginning of the year to determine from which book in the adopted series they should receive instruction. Children would then be grouped according to reading level and teachers would follow the instructional sequence in the Teachers Manual for each group. Typically, a teacher would have three levels of reading groups during a morning or afternoon work period. Five of the fifteen teachers, however, were in schools where children changed classes for reading instruction. These teachers, typically, would have one large
group of students (25-30) all at the same tested basal reading level for a particular time block each day. Students would change back to homeroom sections for instruction in other subject areas. In 1979 basal reading instruction was fairly similar across the fifteen teachers who used basals. For example, the teacher would meet with a small group from each basal level each day to assign basal stories to be read and to instruct a particular reading skill emphasized in that story. Students would practice the instructional lesson by completing work book pages or other assignments which accompanied the basal reading book. Teachers typically discussed the previous day's story and workbook assignments during this reading group time. When not involved with the teacher in a reading group, students would work at their desks on basal reading assignments. When they were finished with basal reading assignments, most teachers encouraged students to read a book of their own choice or complete unfinished assignments in other subject areas. Nine of the fifteen teachers had various teacher-made interest centers set up in their rooms—often a writing corner with story starters or other story-writing ideas, a listening center with tape recorders, headphones and story tapes, and either a math-practice center or a center to practice some aspect of reading or language arts (a "Match the Homonyms" or "Crazy Capitals" activity). Students were encouraged to use these centers after their basal work was completed. At the beginning of the study, most of the teachers who used basals included two activities in their programs which they considered neither Language Arts nor Reading. These two activities were Sustained Silent Reading (SSR)—a period of time during which students were required to
read to themselves a book of their own choice—and Reading Aloud—a
time when the teacher (or occasionally another student) read aloud to
the class. Because these activities were not a part of Language Arts
or Reading they were sporadically scheduled (daily or weekly) and
easily eliminated if the schedule became overcrowded or interrupted.
Reading Aloud was a more popular activity for these teachers than SSR.
In 1979 eleven teachers said they tried to read aloud for 10 to 15
minutes a day; three said they tried to read aloud several times a
week; one said she never read aloud to her class "they just can't sit
still long enough." Most teachers, however, reported that they liked
to read aloud and did it "because I liked it when I was in school" or
"It's a good filler while you're waiting for the final bell to ring."
They chose read aloud selections from the anthology accompanying the
basal reading series or from books previous classes had enjoyed. Read­
ing aloud was considered an extra and valued for its entertainment
potential.

Sustained Silent Reading was not as frequently scheduled by the
majority of these teachers in 1979, i.e., 4 teachers scheduled SSR
daily for 10-15 minutes, 3 scheduled SSR weekly for 15-30 minutes, 8
did not schedule SSR at all. As with reading aloud, however, SSR was
not considered a part of either Reading or Language Arts and was, there­
fore, easily eliminated for other scheduled activities.

A minority of teachers in the study (4) did not view the Language
Arts as discrete subject areas of spelling, handwriting, grammar to be
taught in discrete time blocks during the day. Instead, these four
considered reading, literature, writing, spelling, listening, talking
as component parts of whole language learning which involved the student throughout the day. "It's all the same to me. Reading groups involve reading books or stories, writing about them, sharing ideas by talking and writing, finding spelling errors in writing, discussing punctuation found in writing." In 1979 these four teachers were both atypical of the group as a whole and heterogeneous as a subgroup. Two of them taught in informal schools, two in traditional schools. Of the informal teachers, one had been trained as a whole-language teacher in the undergraduate EPIC program at Ohio State University, the other was trying to become an informal teacher by teaching in an informal, alternative school. The two teachers from traditional schools were not trained in whole-language learning or informal education but were, nevertheless, attempting in 1979 to adopt many informal values and practices on their own. At the beginning of the study they were already in a state of spontaneous transition to whole-language teaching. For example, one began the 1979 school year by discarding her basal text books in reading, spelling, and English. She attempted to integrate these subject areas by having students write or dictate stories for use in reading groups, write about personal experiences in journals, work in small groups on problem-solving tasks, share ideas in small and large group settings and read literature books from the library. However, she reported that she felt so guilty about discarding the basals that she went back to them several times a week "just to make sure we covered everything". The other teacher in this transition state at the beginning of the study had also decided to discard basals and teach reading, spelling, grammar, handwriting from students'
own writing. She encouraged expressive writing in daily journals, dictated language experience stories, and student-written story books in wallpaper covers. She assigned workbook pages and stories from the basal reading series but only individually and infrequently. She did not organize reading groups but administered "end of unit" tests from the basal reading series on an individual basis to meet district requirements. She was very careful to separate basal reading instruction from real reading of books from her classroom collection. Rather than feel guilty and insecure about abandoning basal texts, she reportedly felt resentful that she had to use basals at all--she considered them a nuisance which interfered with a language arts program based on writing and reading "real" (other than basal) books.

All four teachers were atypical of the group as a whole in 1979 because they did not use basal texts as the basis for their language arts programs. Their view of language arts was broad enough to include reading instruction, reading from literature rather than text books, writing from real experiences, learning spelling, handwriting, and grammar by using them in the process of writing, speaking, listening, and learning to communicate in a variety of ways for a variety of purposes. They scheduled SSR and Read Aloud periods as part of the daily work routine and seldom sacrificed these activities to schedule changes. They encouraged students to read and write throughout the day. Reading and writing were not added on to work time; they defined worktime.
Summary: Components of Language Arts in 1979

The majority of teachers (15) at the beginning of the study, then, believed the components of language arts were spelling, handwriting, grammar and occasionally creative writing. They taught these subjects as discrete lessons isolated from each other and divorced from other subjects such as reading, social studies, science, math, physical education, art, music. These teachers structured lessons from basal text books adopted by their school districts. They taught reading from basal texts for about half of every instructional day. Although these teachers read aloud to their classes, read-aloud selections were neither carefully planned nor faithfully executed. Reading aloud was usually sandwiched between other work activities and often the victim of an overcrowded schedule or schedule changes. Although most of these teachers reported that they encouraged "free reading" during the school day, it was understood that reading was only available to those who had finished other assigned work. Less than half of the teachers scheduled a time for Sustained Silent Reading and only half of these scheduled SSR on a daily basis.

Four teachers were atypical of the group as a whole in 1979. These teachers viewed writing, speaking, listening, reading as parts of the same language arts process and attempted to combine subject areas and involve students throughout the day in various whole-language activities. Children read from selected Children's Literature and wrote about real books and real experiences. Only one of these teachers had had any previous training in whole-language learning; two were experienced teachers in a stage of spontaneous transition to whole-
language learning, the other was trying to learn to teach in a more informal way in an alternative school.

**Changes During the First Year (1980)**

During the first year of the study, 18 of the 19 teachers began to change their views of the component parts of the language arts and how to teach these parts. Fifteen teachers began the study with a narrow definition of Language Arts and a firm reliance on basal texts to teach Language Arts and Reading. By March of 1980, fourteen of these teachers had begun to broaden their definitions of Language Arts to include more subject areas. For example, one teacher who had previously defined Language Arts as English, spelling, handwriting, said in 1980: "whenever you use skills involving oral and written language you are teaching Language Arts."

Each of the eighteen teachers added some literature, literature extension activities, real writing, and real talking to her program during 1980. However, for the four teachers who already taught language arts by reading real books, writing about real events, talking and sharing ideas in problem-solving tasks, this was not a major change. For those fourteen teachers who had previously defined Language Arts as discrete subjects to be taught in isolation from reading, writing, and speaking, however, the addition of these activities represented, in some cases, a major change. With only one exception, all of the 15 teachers who had relied heavily on basal language arts and reading texts in 1979 added new reading, writing, speaking, listening activities to her language arts program in 1980. For example, writing activities became for most teachers "an integral part of
everything we do—we write about experiences we've had, things we've seen, stories about books". Different kinds of writing began to be encouraged as well, i.e., writing about projects, books, research reports, newspaper articles (transactional); writing of stories, poems, games (poetic); writing in journals, diaries, language experience stories, thought ramblings (expressive). Teachers began to look for patterns of spelling, grammar, punctuation errors in students' writing. They began to evaluate writing according to student purposes for writing and content of the message. They began to follow a teaching sequence based on student needs for spelling and mechanics rather than the sequence of the basal text books. Teachers also began to encourage more talking among students. They set up small groups to discuss special content area projects, book extensions, or regular classroom assignments. As one teacher said:

"Before (the children) thought they couldn't talk to anyone but me. Now there's a lot more cooperation. They realize they don't have to get everything from me anymore. The children talk to each other. They now feel free to gather round the room in groups to do morning work together."

Teachers also began to allot more time to reading aloud to students. Their read aloud selections were more carefully chosen—either by theme to accompany a particular course of study (giants, magic) or literature genre (a unit in fantasy, poetry, or realistic fiction), or by author (all the Leo Lionni books, Katherine Paterson books). Although two teachers still maintained a sporadic read aloud schedule in 1980 and several admitted that Read Aloud time was still easily sacrificed if the day became overcrowded, all but one of the 19
teachers in 1980 did read aloud to their classes on a regular basis. Significantly, Read Aloud time was not only increased but enriched by a more careful selection of books, more discussion before, during, and after the reading and more class extension activity with the book itself. Teachers also scheduled and/or increased time for SSR. By the middle of the study (1980) fifteen teachers had instituted a daily or bi-weekly SSR time—an increase of 100% from 1979. Those seven teachers who had previously scheduled daily or weekly SSR, increased SSR time from 15 minutes to, in some cases, an hour or more daily. In addition, several teachers added daily or bi-weekly small and large group discussions about SSR books being read. In addition, teachers began to plan more field trips and to more carefully plan the field trips normally scheduled for their grade levels. For example, one teacher rearranged her class yearly trip to a nearby career center. Instead of the usual whole-class observation, follow up class discussion, and group dictated thank-you note, this teacher made up trip booklets for each member of the class before the trip began. In their trip booklets students were asked to observe and record their observations, and reflect about their visit in a thought-rambling. They were asked to imagine themselves in a particular occupation, describe it, and follow up this description by interviewing someone in the occupation. Some of the students talked about, wrote about, drew, painted, and dramatized their experience as patrons of the cosmetology class; others represented their experience in food-handling by setting up a mock restaurant when they returned to the classroom, dramatizing the role of food-handler, waitress, cook, and dishwasher. All displayed
their paintings, interviews, descriptions, and writing back in the classroom and in a class newspaper begun as a result of the trip. The traditional thank-you notes were not forgotten, but were written spontaneously by individual children to truly communicate thanks for a meaningful, on-site experience which was carried back to the classroom and explored, written about, talked about, read about, and dramatized for many days afterward. The teacher had changed the standard career center field trip, taken every year by her LBD students into a meaningful experience in whole-language learning.

The most dramatic change during 1980, however, was for those teachers who had begun the study with a heavy reliance on basal texts. In order to add on reading of real books, literature extensions, small group discussions, writing and talking about real events for real purposes, dramatics, Reading Aloud, Sustained Silent Reading and trip booklets for whole-language field trips, something in their curriculum had to be changed. During the study, while teachers were enrolled in the Alternative MA course, the part of the curriculum they changed to accommodate these new activities was their basal Reading and Language Arts program.

The majority of teachers borrowed time from the basal reading and language arts series so that children could read from literature books, hear literature read aloud, extend books in small groups, have large group discussions, write about books, write about their own experiences, and listen and talk to each other about their own learning experiences. Some teachers felt guilty about using reading group time for these activities and only suspended basal reading groups while working on a
particular project. Other teachers tried to incorporate literature, book extension activities, writing, and talking into their on-going basal reading group and language arts series. One teacher began to meet with students individually about basal reading assignments and used her former basal reading group time for students to read and discuss survival stories from multiple copies of *Julie of the Wolves*, *Island of the Blue Dolphins*, *Where the Lillies Bloom*. Other teachers continued to teach the basal sequence but substituted literature, students' own writing, and real life experiences for the basal reading texts and English workbook pages. Many teachers began to realize that:

"a lot of the skills emphasized in our reader are really unnecessary, so now I skip them..."

"...I don't do all of the work pages and dittos anymore..."

"...I used to expect children to read through these books by sequence. As dull and boring as they are, I thought 'this is it--this is what reading is all about'. But I'm beginning to see there is an alternative--that reading can be more interesting for children."

"...My reading groups are in a state of revision as to what and when I work with them. In the past the basal was read story by story either independently or orally or silently at reading group time. Now I include multiple copies of literature books and discuss them. We have more time for SSR and reading throughout the day."

**Summary: After the First Year, 1980**

By March 1980, then, at the end of the Alternative MA course sequence, the majority of teachers had begun to realize that there was more to Language Arts than just spelling, handwriting, and grammar. Although the majority of teachers began to enrich their programs with more literature, writing, speaking, listening, and reading; fourteen
teachers broadened their definition of language arts and added a variety of literature-based reading, writing, spelling, listening activities to their language arts curricula. In the middle of the study, during 1980, these activities were added to ongoing basal reading and language arts programs; they did not replace basal programs (except temporarily for completion of special projects) nor define the language arts curriculum. With only one exception, however, teachers added on whole-language activities and began to become aware that alternatives existed for teaching and learning in the language arts.

Changes After Two Years, 1981

Responses to interviews in 1981 revealed that with two exceptions all teachers in the study maintained or continued the changes begun in 1980 in beliefs and/or practices of integrating Language Arts, Reading, Literature during the 1981 school year. Three of the four teachers who began the study with whole-language rather than basal text curricula continued to define themselves as whole-language teachers and continued to use literature, literature extensions, writing, and speaking from real experiences for real purposes as the core of their language arts programs. The fourth teacher of this group was required by her school principal in 1981 to de-emphasize whole-language reading and writing activities in favor of basal reading and language arts texts adopted by the school. This teacher did not change her professed beliefs about whole-language learning but reported that she was demoralized by the principal's lack of confidence in her ability to teach using reading, writing, and literature as the basis for her language arts program.
This teacher, in 1981, changed to a basal text and curriculum guide for language arts and reading instruction. She continued to have her students write from real experiences and read real books and was careful to separate basal instruction from "real reading" for her students. She changed from practices based on a whole-language orientation to a more structured basal presentation from 1980 to 1981.

One teacher did not change from 1980 to 1981. She reported that "I do things basically the same as always...my students go out of control whenever I try to change anything."

In contrast, the fourteen teachers who had begun to change from heavy reliance on the basal language and reading texts in 1979 to less reliance and addition of more reading, literature extensions, writing, talking, and listening activities in 1980 maintained this change during 1981. For example, those teachers who had begun to use basal reading group time to read and discuss various selections from children's literature (e.g., survival stories) in 1980, continued to do this in 1981; those teachers who had begun to replace basal workbook activities with writing about real experiences, writing to extend stories, writing to make comparisons in 1980, continued to do this in 1981; those teachers who had begun to pull spelling and grammar needs from children's writing rather than spelling or English text assignments in 1980, continued to do this in 1981; those teachers who had begun or had increased SSR time and discussion in 1980, continued this activity in 1981; those teachers who had begun to recognize the value of talk and the different functions of talk in the classroom continued to encourage talk for small group projects, book discussions, and sharing
of learning experiences in 1981; those teachers who had added the celebration of books and different kinds of literature extensions (puppets, dioramas, art projects, cooking, game-making, book-making, writing, drama, slide-making, etc.) in 1980, continued to enrich their more broadly defined Language Arts, Reading curricula with these activities in 1981. Those teachers who had begun to plan field trips around whole-language experiences, using trip booklets to extend and enrich field trip activities in 1980, continued or expanded this practice in 1981. The majority of these teachers added all of the above to their existing Language Arts/Reading curricula. Language Arts became more broadly defined to include all writing, reading, speaking, listening activities—including literature. Reading aloud to children continued to occupy a planned part of every day in 1981 and books to read aloud continued to be carefully and purposefully selected by genre, theme, author, or appropriateness to current topic of study. Changes begun in 1980 regarding the definition of the Language Arts program and activities to be included as part of Language Arts, then, continued in the majority of teachers' classrooms during 1981. In addition to solidifying and amplifying these changes during 1981, however, teachers were also better able to articulate the purposes behind activities and changes in 1981. For example, teachers said:

"...I generally have more connections between things now—not so many separate lessons. I make more of an effort to have more literature selections relating with topics either in the basal or science topics..."

"...I let kids talk more now because I think they learn by sharing ideas and it's not detrimental to their learning. I encourage them to share ideas."
"...My reading groups don't take as long now but we spend more time reading—or I read to them. Research has me convinced that the more they hear (good literature) the more it becomes part of them...they become excited about reading, they hear an adult reading or see an adult reading and attribute more importance to it."

"...I read aloud so my children will hear good quality literature."

"...Children learn to read by a variety of methods—but most important is having time to read, hearing stories read, seeing others read, and having lots of books around so they can choose interesting things to read."

"...learning to read is not magic but familiarity with books, pictures, text, and being read to. I don't think it's by learning vowel sounds or consonant sounds but in reading as a whole...I used to do skills because it was such a big part of the reading program and everyone else did it."

"...My slower readers try harder, have a better attitude, are more excited about books because of the enthusiasm I've tried to give children by reading, by being involved with books."

"...I used to do only phonics dittos, word searches—things like that. I always liked story writing but never before had the confidence to go ahead and do it."

Summary: After Two Years

During 1981 seventeen of the nineteen teachers maintained and amplified the whole-learning activities they had begun to add to their Language Arts programs during 1980. In addition, during 1981 they began to reflect on and articulate why they had added these activities. Their responses indicate that fourteen teachers made a major change in their beliefs and practices of integrating Language Arts, Reading, Literature; three teachers deepened their commitment to and understanding of whole-language learning; one teacher maintained a belief in whole-language learning but was obliged to add more basal text activities
to her whole-language program during 1981; and one teacher did not change from her original view of the Language Arts and Reading as discrete subject areas best taught through basal, skill-oriented activities.

Teachers' Organization of Classrooms to Facilitate Language Arts Learning

In the Beginning, 1979

In 1979 the majority of teachers approached Language Arts and Reading as separate subjects to be taught from separate basal texts. The arrangement of their classrooms, classroom book collections, arrangement and use of furniture, the opportunities they gave to children for choice, movement, and talking, and the way they grouped children for instruction reflected this approach. At the beginning of the study, the majority of classrooms were arranged to facilitate whole-class learning from teacher presentation of discrete subject matter. Typically, student desks were clustered in one section of the classroom, all facing in the same direction, occasionally side by side, usually not touching. Bulletin boards and chalk boards around the room displayed a variety of activities: daily and weekly schedules; helper job charts; a seasonal calendar; daily assignments; class art projects. Most classroom displays in 1979 were teacher-made or commercially produced and centered on "educational motivators" (a display of famous Ohio Indians, a poster of nutritional meals, a series of group discussion starters from a transactional analysis kit) or seasonal themes (Halloween, snowmen, flowers of Spring, the changing landscape). If children's work was displayed at all, it was tacked up
without explanation or under the aegis of "Good Work" or "Math Whizzes" or "100% Spellers". Although the majority of classrooms were bright, cheerful, and busy-looking, close inspection of displays revealed that teachers' typically displayed their own work and, with the exception of art projects and "Good Work," students made little contribution to the classroom display environment.

Most teachers in 1979 made some provision for a library or book corner in their classrooms. These corners were typically set off from the rest of the room by low book shelves, a piano, or a small rug and pillows. Most book corners contained the classroom collection of books available to be read for SSR, free reading, and reference work. Most of the books in these collections, in 1979, were supplementary basal readers, science or music texts, encyclopedias, dictionaries, and discarded basal readers no longer used by the school. In addition, most collections included some badly worn paperback books from Scholastic, Weekly Reader or Xerox. The great majority of collections were stacked tightly on shelves or strewn in disarray across shelves. Books were not categorized according to theme, author, or ease of reading. The overall impression in the majority of classrooms was that the library corner was available for those few students who had finished their assigned work; that not much reading was really expected to take place there. Book corners were typically dusty, dirty, sparse, and neglected.

In 1979 the majority of students were not encouraged to talk to each other during work time. Most students worked on assignments individually at their desks. Desks were usually isolated from each
other. When assignments were completed, students were allowed to visit the various activity centers set up around the room. Again, access to these centers was individual and usually reserved for the few students who consistently finished their assigned work.

In 1979 teachers grouped students for instruction on the basis of reading and math achievement, usually determined by group testing. Most groups remained the same throughout the year.

In 1979 teachers gave students few choices. Most teachers defined choice as an activity to do when basal assignments were complete. These choices included reading, playing a game, or completing the activity at an interest center (listening to a tape, writing a story from a story starter). The majority of teachers filled their time with small and large group instruction from basal texts of Reading, Language, Social Studies, Science, Health, and Math. Student activity and display reflected this whole class, basal instruction.

Changes During the First Year, 1980

Videotapes, journals, and interviews in 1980 revealed the following changes in classroom arrangement, classroom book collections, classroom displays, movement and talking of children, choice of activity, and teacher grouping of children:

Eighteen of the nineteen teachers (including those four who taught from a whole-language approach from the beginning of the study) rearranged their classrooms in such a way that more emphasis was given to books, reading, writing, and talking. Again, change among the teachers who had relied most heavily on basals was most dramatic. Most of these teachers rearranged the desks in their classrooms so that
students sat together in groups of four or five. One teacher spoke for her colleagues when she said in a 1980 interview:

"...I rearrange the room often now so (the children) can talk among themselves and exchange ideas.... Before I started the program it was important that everybody was in his place in rows. I kept the children away from each other so they wouldn't talk. Now I think it is important for them to interact with each other. So I began putting their desks and tables together--trying to group them in some way."

Videotapes of teachers' classrooms corroborated this statement for these eighteen teachers.

Videotapes also revealed a dramatic change in classroom book collections, use of books, and display of books in 1980. In most cases, classroom book corners were rearranged to include library books from various genre of children's literature, many more picture books, Caldecott and Newbery Award books, books grouped by author (Keats, Lobel, O'Dell, L'Engle) and theme (magic, circus, giant), displayed on top of book shelves, tables, and chalk board ledges. Library corners still harbored the out-dated basals, encyclopedias, and dictionaries, but more "free reading" books were available from the library and displayed for children's use. The library corner was, consequently used more often for reading in 1980. Many students chose it for SSR: "...they need to sit where it's comfortable--there's nothing worse than having to sit nice and straight in a chair" remarked one teacher.

Videotapes also revealed that teachers had begun to include books with displays of children's work and with displays of different topics being studied in other subject areas during 1980. For example, a display of children's stories about baseball was accompanied by various
fiction and non-fiction books about baseball; a display of seashells and sea life was accompanied by many child and adult coffee-table books and magazines of the sea; a display of wire sculpture was accompanied by a collection of art books and prints of wire sculpture and sculptors.

Classroom displays also changed dramatically in 1980. With one exception, all teachers made an effort to display children's work rather than commercial posters on their own teacher-made creations. Most teachers began to devote most wall space to children's projects and writing accompanying these projects. Although some displayed more than others, all (with the one exception) remarked spontaneously on her own change with respect to display in 1980:

"...I never thought of the value of displaying children's work--so they can re-read it and feel good--before."

"...I've always tried to display children's work--but I think about it more now--and encourage the children to choose different media."

"...I never used to go to all the trouble of matting before--but they like it. They just love putting their book reports on matting."

"...I always used to make one big thing and the children's stuff would be displayed around it. Everybody made the same kind of thing. I don't do that anymore. I don't have to have my flower or my tree with their stuff around it. Now I take more time mounting and displaying. If you spend time in displaying it, the children will spend time in doing it."

"...I no longer use commercial posters--just children's work. When they see me value their work, they value it. And their work is so good."

In addition to more books and more children's writing, videotapes and interviews revealed a greater emphasis on book extensions for the
majority of teachers in 1980. Individual, small group, and whole class stories, murals, puppets, mobiles from books decorated all but one classroom, and many halls and stairwells in addition. Even those teachers who still used paper feet taped to the wall to record books read (2) had added other kinds of projects and displays to celebrate and extend books. Although close inspection of these displays and extensions revealed that many of them had been completed for OSU class assignments, the proliferation of book extensions in each classroom was a vivid change from the previously displayed seasonal and teacher-made bulletin boards for "educational motivation" seen in 1979.

Finally, in 1980 the majority of teachers revealed that they were beginning to change their views about giving choices to students. In 1979, most agreed with the teacher who said "I have found that the more choices you give primary children, the more confusion results. I don't give choices." In 1979, a few teachers gave a few choices to a few students. Most teachers felt children could not handle choice. In 1980, however, teachers began to give more students more choices of more meaningful activities. Most choices were centered around books and book extensions. One teacher summed up these changes for 1980:

"...I am allowing my children more movement within the room. Except for reading, all groups are now based on themes and interest. Children choose their own projects and media to represent these projects...now there are plenty of stimulating choices available and the children are learning to handle them wisely."
Another teacher added:

"...I am continuing to gradually add more choices in different situations...adults like a choice--kids do too--so I give them choices. I used to decide everything for them."

Changes After Two Years, 1981

In 1981 those fourteen teachers who had changed most and begun to emphasize books, reading, writing, and talking continued to support a more talkative, book-oriented, reading-and writing-facilitated environment in their classrooms. One change begun in 1980 continued and increased momentum during 1981, i.e., the majority of teachers in 1981 spontaneously reported that they had gone through their classroom book collections at the beginning of 1981 and weeded out all the unattractive, unappealing, and un-used books. These out-dated basals, unread texts, and tattered paperbacks were replaced by multiple copies of fiction from various genre of children's literature--realistic fiction, fantasy, picture books, poetry, biography, easy-to-read books--purchased by the teacher either from her own pocket or (in some cases) department funds. One teacher added 250 fiction titles to her predominantly natural science and non-fiction classroom collection. Another convinced her grade-level colleagues to swap classroom collections to add variety and interest. All teachers continued to use the school and public library to supplement classroom collections with hard cover editions of Caldecott and Newbery Award books, multiple copies of titles for small group discussions, and hard-to-find books to read aloud to the class.

Those four teachers who had begun the study either as a whole-language teachers or in a state of transition to whole-language learning
also continued to change in 1981. For three of these teachers, the change was very personal and subtle. Since they had always taught reading and language arts as a whole, had always emphasized books and celebrated with book extensions, had always emphasized and displayed children's writing, there was no dramatic shift in activities in their classrooms. The change, for these teachers, was that they became more confident and sure of their non-basal approach to teaching reading and language arts. The activities continued, but with a firmer foundation. One teacher reported that she had picked up many ideas from the program which she was able to integrate into her existing program to make it even richer. Another reported an increased self-confidence because she had more knowledge of books and research to back her up. Three of the teachers who did not use basals when the program began were able to use the MA Alternative program as a support group for their own self-confidence and budding whole-language programs.

One of these four teachers, however, was not able to maintain a whole-language approach to Language Arts, Reading during 1981. This teacher has already been described in a previous section. Not only was she required to teach from basal texts in 1981, she was also urged by her principal to maintain a less-talkative classroom. She rearranged the furniture to isolate children from each other during work periods; she gave away the couch that defined her library corner, and allowed less talking and free choice of activities during 1981.

One teacher did not change her beliefs or practices about classroom organization, classroom book collection, use of display or opportunities for choice in 1980. Videotapes of her classroom in 1980 revealed
walls barren of display—either teacher-made or student-made. There was no evidence of book extensions or student writing, no attempt to create an attractive corner for reading, no display of books (other than science and health texts piled on the floor in one corner of the room), no evidence that students should be encouraged to talk to each other to learn. Interviews with this teacher in 1981 revealed that her classroom was about the same as it had been the year before except that she had changed rooms and now had a more cheerful environment in which to work. However, her basic approach to Reading and Language Arts continued to be as it had been in 1979 and 1980. This teacher will be discussed in detail at the end of this chapter.

**Teachers' Perceptions of Themselves as Learners/Teachers**

The category of teachers' perceptions of self as a learner/teacher emerged from teachers' responses to the following questions:

- If you were able to take an extended time off for learning, what would you want to learn and how would you go about it?
- What advice would you give to the teacher who gets your class next year?
- What excites you about teaching?
- What inhibits you from teaching the way you would like?

Analysis of responses to these questions indicated that teachers had definite views of themselves as teacher/learners and, though these views did not change during the two years of the study, those teachers viewing themselves in a particular way, seemed to all change in the same way. For convenience and purposes of readability, teachers holding a particular view of themselves as teacher/learner will be given a
group name (Practitioner, Learner, or Practitioner-Learner) and will be discussed as members of these particular groups.

Practitioners: Eight of the fifteen teachers who began the study with a heavy reliance on basal texts were categorized as teachers who saw themselves primarily as Practitioners. These teachers were most interested in learning more about their craft--how to teach more effectively, learning about how other teachers manage children, seeing other teachers' classrooms, getting new ideas to expand their own repertoires of presentations. Their style of learning was one of visiting other teachers in their classrooms, talking with these teachers, observing them work. Their advice to other teachers was generally very specific: "Continue to read everyday" and child-specific: "Kevin tends to have temper tantrums--give him a helper job everyday" and centered on management of activities and behavior rather than the content of the curriculum itself. Teachers who were categorized as Practitioners tended to see themselves as followers:

"I do what I'm told."

"If I'm employed by a school system I feel it's my responsibility to teach what they want me to teach."

"I go along with her (my co-teacher) to keep peace--it's easier that way."

They felt a loyalty to their districts to follow the prescribed program even though they might question the program.

Changes for Practitioners During the First Year (1980)

During 1980 those teachers categorized as Practitioners reported that they were in conflict. Seven of them began to question district
goals and practices and felt uncomfortable and guilty about instituting the new ideas they were learning at the university. However, they also felt pressured to try the ideas heard at the university—not only because some activities were required, but because other teachers were supporting and contributing to these ideas. In 1980 these Practitioners were in conflict because they were excited by the new ideas and activities from the university and frustrated by their perception of district requirements to follow a prescribed curriculum, using prescribed texts.

Changes for Practitioners After Two Years (1981)

In 1981 most of the teachers in the Practitioner group had begun to resolve the conflict they saw between university and district expectations. While they continued to add reading, literature, and writing activities to their language arts programs, they also continued to follow basal outlines and use basal texts to structure their curricula. They reported that they were more relaxed with students and were rewarded by other teachers' positive comments about the enriched curricula they were able to provide. These teachers were excited by children's enthusiasm for the other-than-basal activities they planned and by the feeling that they were contributing to a more meaningful education for their students.

Learners: Five of the original nineteen teachers were categorized as teachers who saw themselves primarily as Learners. These teachers, although interested in teaching, wanted to learn more about the content of the curriculum they were teaching. They were interested in a variety of
subjects—outdoor education, child abuse, English literature, natural science, aerobic dancing—as well as children's literature, folklore, psycholinguistics, drama, writing, and the philosophical basis of informal education. These teachers tended to pursue these interests outside of the university setting—by experiencing rather than taking courses. They were interested in "why" questions, in discovering the purpose behind activities and the reasons for presenting material in particular ways. These teachers reported that they did not give advice to other teachers, that they as teachers preferred to find out about children for themselves and expected other teachers to feel the same; they were adamant about not pre-judging children and eager for each child to have a chance with his next teacher. They saw themselves neither as followers nor leaders but rather as independent and confident about their ability to teach and to decide what and how to teach. They were not in conflict in 1980 and saw themselves as inhibited only by their own lack of knowledge or expertise. District and university expectations were easily met—either because they were seen as congruent or because the teacher had chosen to disregard one or both and follow her own best instincts.

Changes for Learners, 1980 and 1981

As a group the teachers categorized as Learners were self-confident, independent, and interested in their own as well as children's learning. They changed in 1980 and 1981 by becoming stronger and more sure of themselves. They were consistently excited by children being involved in and taking responsibility for their own learning. Three of these five teachers were from the minority subgroup who began the
study either as whole-language teachers or teachers in a state of transition toward whole-language learning. Two of the teachers in this group began the study with a heavy reliance on basal texts. Of these two, one became a full-time Ph.D. student of whole-language learning in 1981; the other continued to emphasize the whole-language approach which she had begun as a supplement to the basal during 1980. In 1981 she paid minimal attention to basal texts and continued to add to her whole-language program.

Practitioner-Learners: Six teachers were categorized as seeing themselves as neither Practitioners nor Learners but as Practitioner-Learners. All but one of these teachers were from the group who relied heavily on basal texts at the beginning of the study but moved furthest away from the basal toward whole-language learning by 1981. (The one exception was the teacher who began with a whole-language approach but changed to basal teaching during 1981.) If a continuum were to be constructed between those who followed other's ideas about how and what to teach and those who independently charted their own course, Practitioners would be at one end, Learners at the other, and Practitioner-Learners somewhere in between. Teachers who fell into this category were interested in learning how to replace basal texts and curriculum guides with whole-language learning. In contrast to the Practitioners who were interested in finding out how to present new ideas and add more exciting activities to their existing programs, Practitioner-Learners wanted whole-language learning to become the core of their Language Arts, Reading curriculum. They reported that they were interested in
what to teach as well as how to teach it, and, as a group, exhibited a fascination with purposes behind particular activities and methods. They wanted to learn about subject matter in depth and how to communicate ideas and activities based on this subject matter effectively.

**Changes for Practitioner-Learners During the First Year, 1980**

In 1980 the teachers categorized as Practitioner-Learners were in conflict between what they perceived to be district expectations of them and expectations they had internalized from the university as their own. However, during 1980 they became aware that this conflict was self-imposed.

"...I began to realize that the district curriculum 'musts' were really my own."

"...I realize now that I can do as little or as much as I want--I can teach or I can expose. No one comes out at the end of the year and tests my children. It's really up to me when and how I teach."

In contrast to the Practitioner teachers who resolved the conflict between district and university pressures by adding whole-language activities to a basal curriculum, Practitioner-Learner teachers began to replace the basal curriculum with whole-language activities, realizing that the requirement to teach the basal curriculum they had formerly attributed to the district was really a self-imposed requirement which they could now begin to discard with confidence.

**Changes for Practitioners-Learners After Two Years, 1981**

In 1981 one teacher remarked:

"...In 1980 I still felt a little guilty, until I realized I was responsible for my own teaching. Now I occasionally touch base with the curriculum guide to make sure some areas are being covered. But I feel no pressure to teach a certain curriculum a certain way."
Comments from the other Practitioner-Learner teachers agreed with this statement.

Teachers categorized as Practitioner-Learners were similar to teachers in the Learner group in that they did not give specific advice to other teachers about students; they were careful not to prejudge students or cause other teachers to do so. They were concerned, as a group, that future teachers follow the kinds of programs they had begun with students, i.e.,

"...keep them writing"
"...continue where I left off"
"...give them time to read"
"...don't be overwhelmed by the paperwork and outside activities"

As a group they were most concerned that the kinds of experiences they had given students to write, read, share ideas, and celebrate books be continued. As with teachers in the Learner category, they were also most rewarded by seeing students involved with a project, watching them grow as readers, writers, and thinkers, and having them assume responsibility for their own learning.

Teachers' Perceptions of Their Own Change

Teachers' perceptions of their own change of beliefs and practices in teaching Language Arts, Reading, Literature were gleaned from the 1980 videotape interviews and the 1981 in-depth telephone interviews.

In 1980 one teacher commented that she had not changed during 1979-80. She said she did basically the same things she had always done because every time she tried to do something different in her
classroom she lost control of her students. She said she had tried to change her goals and have students do more writing, but they refused so she gave up. In 1981 this teacher reported that:

"I'm sure I'm different--more relaxed, more individualized.
I'm sure I've grown in some ways."

However, she could not articulate how or in what ways she had changed beliefs or practices about Language Arts, Reading, Literature since 1979.

The teacher who began the program attempting to teach with a whole-language rather than basal approach to Language Arts and Reading and then changed to a basal approach during 1981 reported that only her practices of teaching Language Arts and Reading had changed; that she still believed in a whole-language approach and still integrated as much writing, literature, and book extension activity into her basal program as possible but was discouraged by her principal's insistence that she use basal texts. She perceived her own change to be negative; she was depressed by her own inability to convince her principal that she could teach more effectively with a whole-language curriculum based on literature, students' own writing, and students' perceived needs and purposes.

The three other teachers who began the program already committed to a whole language approach to Language Arts, Reading, Literature perceived that they had changed moderately during 1980 and 1981. As one teacher said:

"The changes were small--not something you would see coming in for 10 minutes."
She referred to changes in her own thinking which resulted in a program tied more closely to purposeful goals. Each of these teachers felt she had obtained many new ideas from the Alternative MA course and had incorporated these new ideas into already existing whole-language programs, i.e., more ways of grouping literature, better use of themes to integrate Language Arts, Literature, Reading, with other subject areas, better ways to analyze spelling errors from children's writing. For those two teachers who were just beginning to teach without basals in 1979, the Alternative MA program was perceived as a support system which gave them the confidence and research base they needed to try their ideas in spite of a lack of support from their respective schools. Each of these teachers reported a great gain in self-confidence and knowledge during the two years of the study.

The fourteen remaining teachers who had all begun the study with a heavy reliance on basal texts to teach Language Arts, Reading, and Literature as isolated subjects perceived a great change in their own beliefs and practices in integrating the three subject areas. Most of these teachers mentioned the obvious changes in practices first: more use of literature; providing a better quality of books; adding SSR; providing more time to read; reading aloud more often, longer, and from a better selection of books; having students do more writing and more varied forms of writing; relying less on basal reading texts and having more flexible reading groups; having students do more book extensions and more varied book extensions; allowing more talk during work time; providing for more small group projects and discussions and more in-depth whole-class discussions; planning more meaningful
extensions of field trips; using trip booklets; displaying children's work with more thought and attention; arranging the furniture for more flexible groups, more interactions; creating more interest centers with fewer dittos and more creative activities; reading more poetry; providing for more integration of subject matter with more activity and less busy work.

Perceived changes in thinking were also mentioned by these fourteen teachers. Most teachers reported a great gain in confidence to teach writing, spelling, reading, literature. One teacher was so struck by the ideas and innovations presented in the MA Alternative program and so stimulated by the other teachers in the program that she quit her teaching job to pursue a more varied teaching experience as a substitute while finishing her MA degree.

"...When I first went to college I didn't want Education because I didn't want to become 'that' kind of teacher. The (MA) class has made me realize that I am that kind of teacher—very structured, very rigid, not flexible in what I do, not in tune with what kids are interested in doing. The (MA) course helped me make the decision to quit my job...My teaching situation didn't allow me as much freedom to try those things that I feel are desirable."

Another teacher felt she had gained confidence to follow her own ideas:

"...I used to feel so insecure because I didn't send dittos home—but at the same time I was thinking my way was right. I was trying to do (these same things) last year without any support—and I didn't do it with as much vigor."

Another said:

"...I've grown as a teacher this year. I find a much better way to integrate what I'm teaching...I'm aware of more sources—like webbing—and I realize there are lots of ways to approach a subject. I realize not every kid has to learn all the same things. I feel
more comfortable because I know what I'm doing is O.K.—that there's a precedent for it."

Another said:

"...I'm not so worried about what everybody's going to think of me because now I know that what I'm doing is right."

Some teachers perceived the change in their own expectations of children:

"...My attitude towards kids' achievement has changed. I had become accustomed to very specific criteria—achievement tests at a certain level. I had lost the feeling that kids are different."

"...I've found children can do so much more than I ever expected. Their writing is so much better when they have something to write about...book extensions are so creative."

Some teachers perceived the change in their own expectations of themselves:

"...I think I've changed a lot as to what I'm looking for as far as growth and valuing what I want to see from [children]—growth and change in their writing. I've always been so grade-oriented—averaging little grades all the time—I missed a great deal. Now I'm looking at their writing more, trying to extend them—not so many short, choppy sentences. I make comments—I don't just grade anymore."

"...Having experiences (in the MA program) showed me the importance of providing experiences for my own students...experiencing what kids need to experience has made me more open—because I've tried things out myself."

One teacher was quite insightful about her own change of beliefs and the consequent change in practices in her classroom:

"...When I started letting the students take over their own learning by giving them more choices, opportunities to work with each other and talk with each other, the structure of the room changed from isolated little people
to people really working together in groups. Previously group projects weren't really group projects. They were just something to do—I wanted the children to do things my way. Now students do more real work and less busy work...more things that really interest them and are meaningful to them--things they will remember."

In 1981 most teachers reported that they had not changed much from 1980 to 1981. The biggest change, they all agreed, had come during 1979-80 while enrolled in the MA Alternative course. Most changes begun then continued through 1981. The majority of teachers reported the 1981 year to be one of solidifying and amplifying the changes begun in 1979-80. Only one teacher perceived little or no change in her beliefs and practices about teaching Language Arts, Reading, and Literature.

THREE CASE REPORTS: A TEACHER WHO DID NOT CHANGE; A TEACHER WHO CHANGED BY ADDING ON TO HER BASAL CURRICULUM; A TEACHER WHO CHANGED BY REPLACING HER BASAL CURRICULUM

Mrs. Lewis--A Teacher Who Did Not Change

At the beginning of the study Mrs. Lewis began her third year of teaching in a rural consolidated middle school near her home outside the city of Columbus. Although originally trained as an elementary teacher, during the two years of the study Mrs. Lewis' class were fourteen 6th, 7th, and 8th grade special education students in a self-contained classroom. Unlike the two other Special Education teachers in the study, Mrs. Lewis team-taught in a four room complex with one other teacher. Otherwise, there was nothing to differentiate Mrs. Lewis from any of the other teachers in the study in 1979. For example, she had completed some graduate work (six courses) before the MA program began, had had two years of teaching experience, was interested in pursuing an MA
degree in Reading. The only noted difference between Mrs. Lewis and the other teachers at the beginning of the study, aside from her team-teaching situation, was that Mrs. Lewis reported that no one had read to her as a child. All other teachers reported that either a parent, teacher, or other relative had read to them.

In 1979, Mrs. Lewis reported that her goals for her Language Arts and Reading program were individualized for each child, i.e., that each child become competent in deficient skill areas. Her view of goals was maintained throughout the study. Mrs. Lewis reported, however, that she had tried to change some goals during 1980 to include more writing experiences for students—but her students would not write and insisted on doing exercises from spelling books.

"...They think it makes them more normal—more like the other kids."

Although her class was self-contained, Mrs. Lewis shared teaching responsibilities with a colleague. Mrs. Lewis was responsible for teaching Reading, Language Arts, Health, and Science; the other teacher for Math, Careers, and Art. Mrs. Lewis reported that she was constantly frustrated by her colleague's refusal to abandon a schedule regulated by bells intended for the rest of the school. Even though Reading was scheduled for the 40 minutes before lunch and Language Arts/English for the 40 minutes after lunch, Mrs. Lewis reported that she was unable to integrate the two subject areas and treat them as one experience during 1980.

"...Before lunch (the students) are too hungry and disruptive. After lunch they're too hyper...too many carbohydrates and sweets, no exercise."
Mrs. Lewis also reported that she was required to teach from the State EMR curriculum—a program of survival skills mandated for each child to learn "to the best of his ability". Mrs. Lewis did not deviate from her basal presentation of skill-oriented Reading, Spelling, English grammar during the two years of the study. She did not often find time to read to her students. In 1980 she said:

"...I tried a poem once. I haven't gotten around to it again. I read other things--from short books--folk tales."

However, she could not name any titles of the books she claimed to have read aloud during the year. (The eighteen other teachers in the study provided extensive Read Aloud lists in 1980 and 1981.) In 1981 Mrs. Lewis said she didn't read aloud

"as much as last year...occasionally I take time from a reading group to read to a smaller group--but never to the whole class...I'd end up baby sitting for all of them while (my colleague) went for coffee."

Mrs. Lewis' class was not quiet; she encouraged students to speak out whenever they had something to say.

"Often we just sit around and talk about different things...or personal problems...they can always see me privately...I'm always available anytime they have something they want to talk about."

However, Mrs. Lewis did not arrange her classroom for purposeful talking about work-related projects. She reported constant frustration with disruptive, non-work related talk but said she could do nothing to prevent it.

During the two years of the study Mrs. Lewis reported that she was unable to get her students to write.
"...Every time they read a story they are required to write about it. But I can't seem to get them interested in creative writing. In English sometimes they do letter-writing or learning how to fill out a form. They don't like to write."

In 1981 Mrs. Lewis said:

"...I don't expect too much...mostly I look for my capital letters and periods at the end of sentences or complete thoughts if they try. I'm very strict if they don't try—more lenient if they do try."

Mrs. Lewis said she did very little with literature extension in 1980—"...mostly just writing after reading a book", and none in 1981. Although she sent students to the library once a week during 1980 and 1981, she reported that they usually chose books they could not read:

"...They sit and look at the pictures—which is O.K. by me—but then they start talking to somebody else about it and then that other person isn't reading. It's really difficult to get them to just sit down and look at something for an extended period of time—10 minutes."

She reported that:

"...I've always put an emphasis on reading. I know I've stayed the same because when I say 'O.K. take out a book, we're going to spend some time reading silently to yourself' they go 'oh no, not again!'"

Videotapes and interview responses in 1979 and 1980 revealed that Mrs. Lewis' classroom collection of books consisted of discarded library books, out-dated basal readers, Science and Health texts, encyclopedias, all above the purported reading level of her students. These books were stacked in a corner of one room—dusty, dirty, and unused. Students read their library books for free reading (Mrs. Lewis did not have a scheduled time for SSR during the study); there were a few low-readability-high-interest books but no picture books, magazines, or selections from Children's Literature. In 1981 Mrs. Lewis reported
that there was no change in selection or quality of books available to students. In addition, she said she had discontinued use of the school library:

"...the librarian is untrained and uncooperative—I don't go down there much anymore."

The physical facility of Mrs. Lewis' class during 1979-80 was at the back of the school building—a former industrial arts shop. Although beaverboard partitions made four rooms available, Mrs. Lewis taught primarily in one room. Student desks and tables were scattered in the center of the room, facing in the same direction. In 1979 several commercial posters and one teacher-made seasonal bulletin board were the only wall displays in Mrs. Lewis' room. In 1980 there were no displays on the walls.

In 1981 the physical facility for Mrs. Lewis' class was changed to the former Home Economics room. Mrs. Lewis reported that since stoves, sinks, and sewing machines were now available, more activities of this nature had been instituted by her colleague. The walls, however, were still bare because:

"...(My colleague) takes things down as fast as I put them up. She took all my nutrition posters—and my stapler...and also, we have cupboards instead of wall space...so there's not room for much to be displayed."

Mrs. Lewis reported that she tried to give students choices even though

"...it's always a disaster. I asked them (as a class) what they would like to do in Science lab and they didn't really know. I gave them suggestions and they couldn't decide what to do. In English I asked them what they would most like to get into. We went through the English book and they went by the pictures
and the chapters. They chose chapters by the pictures—not the content. They have a lot of trouble making a decision about things."

Mrs. Lewis sees herself as a Practitioner prevented from teaching the way she would like by a number of obstacles—her colleague, the schedule, lack of money, materials, requirement of State EMR curriculum, defeated attitude of students. At the same time, she also said:

"...I really do not have any pressure. My principal is just wonderful and quite flexible with our classes. Our supervisor is very free and allows us to teach as we see fit. I feel completely at ease to do as I wish and teach as I wish within my classroom."

In 1980 Mrs. Lewis did not think that she had changed her beliefs or practices of teaching Language Arts, Reading, or Literature.

"...I do basically the same things I've always done because everytime I try to do something the kids are not used to, that's not structured, they lose self-control. They can't handle it. I have a tendency to lose control whenever I try anything. Once they are up, I can't get them down."

Mrs. Grayson--A Teacher Who Changed by Adding on to Her Basal Curriculum

In 1979, Mrs. Grayson, a second grade teacher in a rural school defined Language Arts as spelling, handwriting, reference skills, and grammar. Her goals for Language Arts were vague—"to meet the district goals"; she did not, off hand, know what the district goals were. In 1979 Mrs. Grayson did not integrate Reading instruction with Language Arts or Literature. She taught Reading by meeting with three basal reading groups, listening to children take turns reading basal passages aloud, and assigning and checking workbook pages. She taught handwriting, spelling, reference skills, and grammar from their respective
texts at discrete times during the day. Because some of her home room
students changed classes for Reading instruction, she did not incorp­
orate any writing or Language Arts activities into reading instruction
or schedule SSR or Read Aloud time during "reading group" time. When
asked what opportunities her students had for writing in 1979 Mrs.
Grayson replied "I could count them on one hand". In 1979 Mrs. Grayson
occasionally Read Aloud to her home room class. One such Read Aloud
session was recorded on videotape. Mrs. Grayson stood in front of the
class looking down at a picture book. At the end of each page, she
quickly held the book over her head and panned the room with its pages
towards the students assembled at desks in front of her. Her tone of
voice, speed of reading, and lack of intonation revealed that she was
inexperienced in Reading Aloud; the restlessness and inattention of
her students indicated they were inexperienced in hearing stories read
aloud--at least in a large group situation. Mrs. Grayson reported that
she tried to read something aloud at least 10 minutes every day but
admitted that Reading Aloud was often eliminated when the schedule
changed or she ran out of time.

During 1979, Mrs. Grayson did not schedule SSR.

"...My students change classes for reading and we
just don't have time during the day...phonics, skill
building, answering comprehension questions, doing
dittos and workbook exercises that emphasize these
are the most important activities for reading
instruction."

She did not know what a book extension was and tried to motivate stu­
dents to read by sending them to the school library once a week to
choose a book, by setting up a corner of her classroom where they could
read or write, and by recording the titles and authors of books they
read on construction paper feet taped around the room leading, eventually, to the school library. Mrs. Grayson said that it had never occurred to her to discuss books with second graders or to have her students celebrate the stories they read or heard read aloud.

In 1979 Mrs. Grayson’s room was arranged to accommodate a basal Reading, Language Arts program taught in discrete periods of time. Student desks, in rows, faced forward so that students could copy handwriting assignments from the chalkboard. When not at their desks, students gathered in small groups at the "reading table" in the back of the room for basal reading instruction or in the several corners of the room designated as interest centers. These interest centers were equipped for listening (with tape recorders and head phones), for writing (with story-starters and spelling games), for "free" reading (with out-dated basals and discarded library books), for art (with an easel and crayons). Students were free to engage in the activities at these centers when their basal assignments were completed.

Mrs. Grayson admitted that she spent a lot of time creating attractive bulletin boards that would interest and motivate her students and elicit compliments from other teachers. Thus, the classroom walls were filled with teacher-made displays, commercial posters, and reminders about assignments and schedules. Children’s art work and social studies projects (log cabins made from milk cartons) were displayed during the 1979 videotaping. However, displays were neither titled, mounted, nor accompanied by any writing. Mrs. Grayson reported that most of the children’s work was sent home

"...it's mostly dittos and they lose them before we can hang them up."
In 1979 Mrs. Grayson thought of herself as a Practitioner—she wanted to find out everything she could about "how to" teach.

"...Everything about teaching excites me--planning, arranging my room, other teachers' complimenting me...I love to present things in a new and different way. I enjoy motivating children...setting up my room...meeting parents...It's an exciting, invigorating profession. It's a challenge."

At the beginning of the Alternative MA program, Mrs. Grayson was looking for new ideas and ways to use them in her own classroom.

Changes for Mrs. Grayson During the First Year, 1980

Some time during the first year of the study (1980) Mrs. Grayson realized that she had no goals for Language Arts:

"...I didn't have specific goals set out at the beginning of the year--my goal was to cover the material."

This lack of goal specificity changed in 1980:

"...Now I'm thinking more about having children develop an appreciation for Literature, about them being able to write about an experience and put their ideas on paper in a more creative way..."

She contrasted her 1980 goals with her lack of goals in 1979:

"...Before it was--'we gotta cover this'. Now it's 'how can I cover this to make it meaningful to the kids--so that they really appreciate literature or appreciate what they're writing about....Now I want to cover all the books written by this author--or all the books about friends. Now I'm actually making Literature goals--I want to cover folk tales. Before I got it from whatever the curriculum was."

During 1980 Mrs. Grayson began to add writing activities to her Language Arts program:

"...We're doing a lot more creative stories. We're not just writing about something that happened, we're creating characters."
"...we write everyday now. At the beginning of the year I had them write creatively as many times as I can count on my fingers. I feel so bad. I feel like I let these kids down in developing them. But now I notice a real difference in their writing--expressing themselves."

and integrating writing with other subject areas:

"...we write a lot. For instance, for Science--they learned about different dinosaurs and did their own projects. Then they had to write about a pet dinosaur. Then they went on to more activities. Then they had to write a story 'What Would Happen If A Dinosaur Came Back to Our Town'. So we write in science, too.

She began to incorporate other methods of teaching spelling into her basal spelling program:

"...In addition to their spelling books, they make dictionaries. Whenever they need to spell a word they bring me their dictionary and I write it in. If the word is already there, I point to it...I also make out a spelling list with about 8 bonus words on it--words that I've noticed they've made mistakes on in their writing. When I give the (weekly basal) spelling test they draw a line on their paper and write those extra words. That way I can kind of individualize but still follow the basal as well."

Mrs. Grayson added some reading from "real books" to her basal reading program:

"...Reading is the basal reader with the skills that go with it--and the workbook. I have no choice. But when we were doing the story on mice I stopped using the basal for about a week--and I got all different books and the kids read them and did a lot of neat little things."

However, she returned to the basal when the activities were over:

"...But after the week was over I had to go back to the basal--you have to get through the book and cover so many skills and the kids have to get a certain percentage on their tests or that reflects on you...Now I can incorporate picture books and other books--but it's extra. I have to get it in after I teach the skills and do the workbook."
During 1980 Mrs. Grayson added SSR to her homeroom time:

"...When I'm doing clerical things in the morning—collecting milk money—they can go anywhere in the room and read."

However, in 1980 she did not read with them during SSR:

"...I don't read with them—I should—but I figure they have this time available so I let them—and I do Read Aloud to them—so they know I read. It's not a true SSR where everyone's reading."

She also began to Read Aloud more consistently, with a better selection of books:

"...the last half of the year I've done a lot of reading to the kids. Especially when we were having to do all these readings ourselves. I was trying out some of the books on the children...so we did a lot of reading and I was using some of the ideas (from the MA course) trying them out on children."

After Reading Aloud, Mrs. Grayson began to ask her students to do book extensions:

"...we don't do them for every book—but the kids have so much fun doing it—and it makes the story really meaningful. Plus, you find out how much they really know about the story—what characters were important to them. With Charlotte's Web I found out which characters were important by who they chose to do—and what they wrote about the story."

She began to display their work:

"...I display (their work) in the hallway, now. I put borders on...I see the importance of making something they've done more special by displaying it well. Sometimes I put a border on first--this makes a difference in how they write. They want to be more careful--it's more special to them."

She began to have more materials accessible and more options about how to use materials:

"...I have three boxes back there—full of material, yarn, scraps. I don't allow them to use their crayons
now—they have to create—Today one of the groups had
to make a Boggart. I gave them a choice—they could
use chalk or paint. I had the things laid out—they
went back and used what they needed...I have more
materials out now and I'm giving more options. Be­
fore it was CRAYON--only.''

In 1980 Mrs. Grayson began to add whole-language activities to her
basal Reading and Language Arts program. She began to incorporate
Children's Literature into the classroom by Reading Aloud, scheduling
a daily SSR period and providing students with more time to read, and
by planning and providing for book extensions through whole class dis­
cussion, art projects, and individual writing. She began to integrate
different kinds of writing with other subject areas (Science, Social
Studies) and pull spelling needs from students' own writing. She
enthusiastically, if naively, added on to her basal program those
ideas and activities she herself had tried in Saturday workshops and
had analyzed and discussed in weekly lecture-discussion meetings with
her colleagues in the Alternative MA program. Although she considered
these whole-language activities "extra" she began to feel comfortable
adding them to her everyday program. Indeed, with one activity (Read­
ing Aloud) she said:

"...Before, if I read, I read--if I didn't get to it,
I didn't get to it. If I had time that day, I'd fit
it in. Now I feel--unfulfilled--if I don't read...
But I still feel hungry...I need to do more with
language and writing."

Changes for Mrs. Grayson After Two Years, 1981

In 1981 Mrs. Grayson's goals were very specific:

"...to have the kids write more and more creatively,
to make lots of books, to express themselves clearly,
to keep track of their spelling through their writing,
...to read more. My biggest goal is to keep track of kids growth through their writing."

She attempted to meet these goals by instituting a daily time for Sustained Silent Writing, a time for sharing stories written by students, a time for sharing books, a time for sharing experiences. Most dramatically, Mrs. Grayson added more time for reading from "real books".

She replaced 15 minutes of basal reading time with 15 minutes of SSR from other-than-basal books:

"...We have basal reader every day for two hours. But I take 15 minutes out of that two hours--go away from the basal--set the timer. The children each have a book--can't be a basal--a book from the library or Scholastic Book Club--I set the timer and we read. I do it too! They can sit anyplace in the room."

She also changed SSR for her homeroom students:

"...We also do SSR in the afternoon. The kids have loved it and on days when we have had to cut out SSR--had an assembly or something special--the kids just begged 'can we still have SSR'."

In 1981 Mrs. Grayson continued to Read Aloud to both her Reading class and her homeroom class:

"...I read constantly to them. I didn't realize how important it was until I took the course. I used to say, well, if I don't have time I'll just skip reading to them--but I find something else that I get rid of before I get rid of Reading Aloud when I run out of time, now."

Mrs. Grayson continued to use the district's basal reading series in 1981--but she also continued to add on whole-language activities to make these basal reading experiences more meaningful:

"...I've used lots of language activities that I learned in the MA course and incorporated them into my basal reader. Some of the basal stories can be extended with other books and other language activities. You can
really make it interesting—even though you are stuck with the basal reader."

In 1981 she continued to try to integrate subject areas:

"...At the beginning of last year Language time was Language time, and Reading time was Reading time and I didn't do many activities with the stories. Now I'm able to be more creative with the basals I have to use—I go to the library and get lots of other picture books to go along with the stories and think up ideas the kids can do individually—book extensions and such...I used to stick strictly to the basal and what the story was about and what the skills were. But now I find I can be more creative by adding activities to the basal—I can do both."

also:

"...We've done a lot more book extensions. Many times after they get done with their basal activities and with the skills, there will be lots of mural paper lying on the floor, shoe boxes, giant boxes of material, all kinds of buttons...kids can freely go back and use materials to create things for the basal stories. We do a lot of that to share."

Mrs. Grayson's provisioning for reading changed in 1981:

"...I have a bigger collection this year. I've gone to more effort to order books that have a lower vocabulary, higher interest. I've selected books purposefully and more thoughtfully for children. I've been more thoughtful and concerned with the selection of books for children than in the past—this may be one of the reasons for more success with the lower ability children."

She continued to extend books:

"...the kids all know what book extensions are. We've made murals and puppets and plays based on books they have read. Several of them read the same books. They've written stories and made wallpaper covers. A lot of times when they get done reading a book I'll ask them if there is a project they would like to do. Sometimes I wait for a special time during the month—I choose weeks to highlight reading more and we do more group activities. I try to plan at least a couple of times during the month when they can really do a project with a story."
Consequently, her classroom collection of books grew during 1981:

"...My book collection has grown. I have a little bit of everything--fiction and non-fiction and informational books--just plain old silly stories and some low vocabulary high interest books. A lot of Arnold Lobel...I knew I needed to extend my library selection in my room. I've tried to pick out a variety of books for the different needs of the children and interests."

In addition, Mrs. Grayson began, in 1981, to share her ideas with her colleagues:

"...I have had a lot of teachers ask me about (what I am doing)...They've seen the kids develop a real interest in books and they've seen their work and a few of the teachers--it looked to them like it was a good idea. The teacher (across the hall) has been using some of the ideas. The Title I teacher and the other second grade teacher have begun to do book extensions and SSR. It's almost a carbon copy of what goes on in my room. The other second grade teacher--she's in her 60's and has been teaching for 38 years...she has shared a lot of ideas--years ago reading was really important. They didn't have basal readers and teachers read a lot more to the children back then--she is able now to share some of the ideas she had when she was first teaching...and I've shared some, too...I don't know if it has been competitive with the things I've done and she feels she needs to do it or that she has seen her children who have me for reading have developed a real interest in books--I would say she has benefitted from the courses I've taken. Between the two of us--we've shared a lot."

Finally, Mrs. Grayson perceived that she had changed greatly during the two years of the study:

"...I've learned more about children and more about the books I'm teaching out of...I'm a better judge of the child's progress...The MA course gave me a lot of ideas--keeping track of children's writing and Language Arts activities...I'm more positive about books. I feel modeling is important. I read more in my room. I read more to my children. I've gotten parents involved this year, too. I've shown them how they can read to children and how reading is important to the kids and how they should keep taking them to the library."
She summarized for all the teachers who changed most by **adding** whole-language activities **on** to their basal reading programs during the study:

"...I think teachers are looking for things they can use in their basal programs. The book extensions and some of the things we learned in the MA program are things you can use to enrich your basal program and other programs you have. You just don't have a game—you have a concept. (The MA program) taught us concepts—a way of teaching."

Mrs. Grayson was typical of the teachers who changed most by adding whole-language activities to their basal programs during the first year of the study and amplifying and solidifying these additions during the second year. Although these teachers never completely replaced the basal with whole-language activities, they came to depend less on basal workbooks and Teachers Manuals and more on their own knowledge of children, of theory about how children learn to read, write, and use language and on the practical ways to facilitate this learning which they themselves had experienced in the MA workshops and lecture-discussion classes.

**Mrs. Patterson--A Teacher Who Changed by Replacing the Basal With A Whole-Language Approach**

In 1979 Mrs. Patterson began her sixth year as a second/third grade teacher in a suburban school. Although she had had more teaching experience than either Mrs. Lewis (three years) or Mrs. Grayson (two years), at the beginning of the study she also defined Language Arts as spelling, handwriting, grammar, and story writing. However, her initial definition of the components of Language Arts also included Reading instruction, silent reading (SSR), and Reading Aloud. Thus, at the
beginning of the study, her definition of Language Arts was more inclusive than either Mrs. Lewis or Mrs. Grayson. Indeed, Mrs. Grayson did not report such an expansive view of the component parts of Language Arts until March of 1980. Mrs. Lewis, of course, never changed her initial view of the components of Language Arts. Mrs. Patterson, however, began the study with a more inclusive definition of Language Arts than most of the teachers who began the program with a heavy reliance on basal instruction. Mrs. Patterson's initial goals, however, were global:

"...for children to be aware of and enjoy reading, to express themselves in written form, to speak clearly."

In 1979 Mrs. Patterson taught spelling, reading and handwriting from basal textbooks. She assigned topics in specific subject areas for class writing projects and evaluated this writing for general points of story structure and grammar. She taught spelling with weekly spelling exercises and tests from the basal spelling book. In 1979 Mrs. Patterson believed that children learned to read by a variety of methods--primarily phonics instruction, looking for context clues, and practicing skills. The major thrust of her reading program was 45 minutes of basal instruction with each of three small groups, assigning workbook pages and other skill activities for students to practice. She did, however, schedule SSR for 15 minutes daily and encouraged students to "read freely" after basal reading assignments were finished. She also Read Aloud from the anthology accompanying her basal reading series for 15 minutes each day. In 1979 Mrs. Patterson borrowed books from the school and public library to supplement her classroom book
collection. However, most of these books reflected her own interest in natural science and the outdoors; she selected very few fiction titles and most books available to her students in the classroom collection in 1979 were non-fiction.

In 1979 Mrs. Patterson encouraged students to extend the books they read during SSR or free reading times by writing research reports about particular subjects, writing book reports, painting or drawing pictures, or giving oral book reports. These activities, however, were added on to the regular basal reading curriculum. Mrs. Patterson considered book extensions to be extra—not an integral part of Reading or Language Arts instruction.

In 1979 Mrs. Patterson's room was arranged to accommodate basal instruction in Reading, Language Arts, Science, Social Studies, Math. Student desks were grouped side-by-side in the center of the room, facing forward but touching each other. The corners, back, and sides of the room were defined by small rugs and low shelves of reference books, math, science, and art supplies, and low tables for reading, writing, or listening to tapes. Students worked quietly at their desks when not meeting with Mrs. Patterson in a reading group. They were encouraged to choose an activity from the math, science, reading, writing, or listening centers when their basal assignments were completed.

Changes For Mrs. Patterson During the First Year (1980)

When interviewed in April of 1980, Mrs. Patterson commented that her goals for Language Arts and Reading had been expanded to include more Literature and more time for children to read and to hear and extend good books.
"...Last year I didn't have any Literature goals. I read to the kids—but only different selections from their basal anthology. I've done more with authors this year—and types of books and book awareness... endpapers and titles...that kind of thing."

She said that she had increased SSR from 15 to 30 minutes a day and Reading Aloud time from 15 to 30 minutes a day. In addition, she chose Read Aloud selections from a wider array of fiction borrowed from the school and public library and made them accessible to children by displaying them along the chalkboard ledges around the room and in the library corner.

Mrs. Patterson felt good about the expanded opportunities for writing which she provided during 1980:

"...Now they do different kinds of writing--creative or factual or retelling or changing endings--thoughts based on books. The beginning of the year was more factual writing—and I felt I had to give them ideas and a topic. Now I just talk about the topic...whatever...for ideas. They start out better...I'm a lot freer. I give more choices of things to write about and am willing to accept more differences."

and the fact that she had begun to integrate spelling by basing spelling instruction on miscues made in writing:

"...I've got lists of words they misspell from their stories. I've started giving spelling lists from those--types of patterns--like what we did in (the MA class)."

She had also begun to provide concrete experiences for children to explore, talk about, write about, read about, and ask their own questions about. During the Spring of 1980 Mrs. Patterson's classroom became a microcosm for sea life. Collections of ocean plants, animals, shells, and fish accompanied by adult and child information books, fiction, magazine articles and pictures, student written stories,
reports, and observations were displayed on the walls, tables, and shelves around the room. Fish nets suspended from the ceiling held mobiles and art projects connected with sea life. Mrs. Patterson used this display as the basis for a whole-language experience about sea life. She explained the function of each item in the display:

"...They use it to write—to do creative writing, observe, compare, chart. They do factual reporting, use encyclopedias, pick a specimen they like, like starfish—take facts down, write a report. They do something with their specimen—make posters, mobiles, striated sand pictures.... They describe their projects and specimen to each other, compare them. Some parents have donated books and specimen—we have art books and sea books from the library, Jacques Cousteau books that the children have brought in...The sea was a loose unit—not a lot of definite objectives. More observing, describing. A chance for the kids to mess with things, look through magnifying glasses, use language to describe what they saw and books to answer the questions they raised."

The display was used for more than decoration or presentation of student's or teacher's work.

Units such as the sea unit, as well as literature extensions, however, began to encroach on the time Mrs. Patterson had previously devoted to basal instruction. She reported in 1980 that her students had begun to read more:

"...The kids do a lot of reading. That's been a help from the (MA) class...I think the (MA) class helped me help them read more. I pay more attention to books--get them interested in different authors. We study the art work. Sometimes we go through the art work of a particular illustrator—like Lionni—his watercolor technique and try to reproduce it..."

and do more book-oriented writing:

"...Now the kids do more writing about books—ideas from books, retellings of stories. They like writing now. And I can see an improvement in their factual writing. These kids can naturally go to an encyclopedia and use it carefully. We go to the library
upstairs to do research. This year we've done a lot more story telling. They made books last year but more kids have made more books this year than last. They make their stories into books and I save them and let them take them home at the end of the year."

However, to increase the time for SSR, Reading Aloud, writing about concrete experiences, and reading and doing literature extensions, Mrs. Patterson found she had to decrease the amount of time spent in basal reading and spelling instruction. In 1980, this decrease of basal instruction bothered her:

"...My reading groups are in a state of revision as to what and when I work with them. In the past the basal was read story by story, independently or silently, at reading group time....I still do the reading series in the traditional way, but I don't get all wrapped up in discussion questions and phonics skills and all that. This year I've done less phonics—and in some of the kids I can see a pretty big weakness—I've neglected them in that way. That might be the cause of some of their spelling weakness too."

She struggled with the idea of replacing basals with whole-language learning:

"...I'm still mixed up about reading instruction--as far as how effectively you can instruct reading with just literature....It seems like they need some skill-oriented instruction as well. This year I haven't done that—and a few of the kids—I worry they have a deficit because of what I've done. They don't decode or spell."

and

"...I'm mixed up about not using spelling books....they do a lot of reading and writing but you wouldn't think of (correcting) every misspelled word in their stories...and with Literature....the kids who are really interested in the story or characters go into depth in the story—but the kids who aren't, don't. At least with a mixture of basal (instruction) and literature they would probably have a better chance of just hitting base more. And if your spelling program isn't strong phonics—well, at least their reading book has some phonics in it—so you're touching base there. I'm no big proponent of
basals—but with a total literature program (replacing basal reading, language arts, spelling instruction) I can see how it could be pretty weak. So I'm kind of a mixture."

At the end of the first year of the study Mrs. Patterson had changed and was at the same point of change (in terms of adding on whole-language activities to the basal program) as Mrs. Grayson was at the end of the study.

Changes for Mrs. Patterson After Two Years, 1981

In 1981 Mrs. Patterson reported that her goals for Language Arts during 1981 had been to increase the amount of Read Aloud time, writing, reading, literature extensions, and opportunities for students to interact with each other—speaking and listening. She had aimed for more correlation between subjects and more integration of Language Arts, Reading, Literature with other subjects in the curriculum. For example, she said:

"...Like with Science--trying to make sure there was more Literature involved with it. Writing stories all connected with projects we were doing and books we were reading. Just generally making more connections between things. Not so many separate lessons."

and

"...I have topics and titles from Literature that relate to what we are doing in Science and Reading available. We make a lot of connections back and forth that way. I make more of an effort to have more Literature selections relating to topics in the basal or other areas."

Her method of teaching Reading had moved dramatically away from reliance on small group basal instruction to:

"...Just providing the kids with a lot of time to read, first of all. Silent reading and Reading Aloud so they hear the quality of literature. I spend more time
Reading Aloud than I ever did before...because...the more they hear the more it becomes a part of them. If reading is important to an adult, kids attribute more importance to it."

She increased SSR time in 1981 from 30 to 45 minutes daily, increased Read Aloud time from 30 to 45 minutes daily, and increased the availability of free time for reading throughout the day by decreasing the amount of time used for reading instruction in small groups. Her reading groups became very flexible and reading selections from Children's Literature began to replace reading selections from basal readers. In addition, basal workbook activities began to be replaced by small group book discussions, individual or small group book extensions and/or individual writing projects. Whole-language activities were no longer added on to basal activities--they began to replace basal activities. The 150 minutes formerly spent in small group basal reading instruction became devoted, instead, to reading from Children's Literature, writing, talking, and extending reading with meaningful activities based on children's interests and recognized needs. Mrs. Patterson taught the children a variety of ways to extend books:

"...At the beginning of the year I gave more directive assignments to help them know the different ways they could respond to books--poetry and thought ramblings about books. As the year went on they had more and more choices about how to respond to books--whether they retold, wrote poetry or other writing, or did a mural. At the beginning of the year I guided them through a lot of different art mediums like ink and watercolors and collage, story writing in general, point of view and retellings. They knew more ways to extend their reading this year."

Mrs. Patterson purchased over 250 paperback titles, mostly fiction for her classroom library collection. She began to change the classroom
display of children's writing and book extensions more frequently and
to display more of their work in the school hallways and library. She
began to give children many more choices in 1981 than in former years

"...I now realize it's not necessary for a teacher
to direct everything. I rely on the kids' abilities
and their capability to see what they need."

and she reported that she was no longer mixed up about following her
own goals and Language Arts, Reading program instead of district goals.

"I do it my own way and occasionally look at the curric­
ulum guide to make sure things are being touched."

She said:

"I used to feel inhibited by district curriculum 'musts'
and guilty because I didn't follow the 'musts' all the
time. But I began to realize these 'musts' were my
own—I was sticking to them because I didn't know any
better way. Now I feel no pressure to teach a certain
way or cover a particular curriculum."

Finally, Mrs. Patterson said:

"I have more confidence to try new things now. I'm
more flexible with the kids, have a more casual atmos­
phere in my classroom, use more books for everything,
provide for more experiences for language usage, have
more display, more integration of subject matter and
have fewer hit-or-miss lessons....I see more connec­
tions. I'm more aware of the finer points."

Mrs. Patterson is typical of the seven teachers who changed most
by replacing basal Reading and Language Arts activities and instruction
with whole-language experiences and activities which they tried out,
analyzed, and internalized during the Alternative MA workshops and
lecture discussion meetings.

Summary of Results

Responses of nineteen experienced elementary teachers to three in­
depth open-ended interviews, an interview centered on videotapes of
their own classrooms, personal journals, and investigator field notes were collected and analyzed for patterns of change in beliefs and practices in integrating Language Arts, Reading, Literature during a two year period. During the study all teachers shared the common experience of a six month Alternative MA program in Language Arts and Children's Literature. Five categories of change emerged from the data: 1) teachers' goals for their Language Arts programs; 2) teachers' views of the component parts of Language Arts and how to teach these parts; 3) teachers' organization of classrooms to facilitate Language Arts learning; 4) teachers' perceptions of themselves as learners/teachers; 5) teachers' perceptions of their own change.

Eighteen of the nineteen teachers changed in each of these categories. One teacher did not change. Changes for all teachers were reported according to categories. In the category of goal changes it was found that eleven teachers began the study with broadly defined, vague goals, six with unexamined, skill-specific goals, two with goals congruent to whole-language learning. During the first year of the study, all but one teacher reported that they had begun to examine their goals for Language Arts, Reading, Literature during the year. Although all teachers had verbalized goal statements in 1979, the majority (14) admitted that they had never really set Language Arts goals before. During the second year of the study, however, they began to change this practice. At the end of two years those teachers with vague, ill-defined goals at the beginning of the study had changed them to be more concrete, articulate, and congruent with whole-language learning; those teachers with skill-specific, unexamined goals at the
beginning of the study had changed them to be broader, less skill-specific, and more congruent with whole-language learning; those teachers who had begun the study with goals congruent to whole-language goals had deepened their commitment to whole-language goals.

In the category of views of component parts of Language Arts and how to teach them, fifteen teachers began the study viewing the component parts of Language Arts as the discrete subjects of Handwriting, Spelling, Grammar, and occasionally, Creative Writing. They taught these subjects from a basal Language Arts textbook and/or specific district curriculum guide. These teachers considered reading instruction as separate from Language Arts; they taught Reading with heavy reliance on traditional reading groups and basal readers. At the beginning of the study four teachers viewed Language Arts from a whole-language perspective of reading, writing, speaking, listening, and taught these component parts using Children's Literature and children's own writing about concrete experiences.

During the first year, fourteen of the fifteen basal-oriented teachers began to include more whole-language activities and Children's Literature in their basal Language Arts and Reading programs. The four whole-language teachers continued to add whole-language activities to their Language Arts, Reading programs. At the end of two years those fourteen teachers who had begun to change by adding whole-language experiences to their basal programs during 1980 maintained or amplified these changes in 1981. Half of these teachers began to move towards replacing basal reading and language arts instruction with whole-language, integrated activities. The other half maintained a balanced
basal-whole-language program. Three of the four original whole-language teachers reiterated their commitment to whole-language learning and expanded their existing programs with more ideas and integrated, connected activities. One whole-language teacher decreased whole-language activities and added more instruction from basal reading and language arts texts. One teacher in the group of 19 did not change.

In the category of teachers' organization of classroom to facilitate whole-language learning, eighteen teachers rearranged their classrooms during 1980, 1981 to emphasize books, reading, writing, talking, and children's literature. Videotapes and teacher responses to interviews revealed that more and better quality books became available to children; children's work (as opposed to teacher's work) was more attractively displayed; the function of displays changed from that of decorating the walls to that of creating an environment for whole-language activities to occur; furniture was rearranged to encourage interactions and small group activities; classroom activity centers were rearranged for purposeful, whole-language (rather than skill building) activities; book extensions and children's writing became an integral part of the displayed Language Arts/Reading curriculum; field trips were more carefully planned to encourage whole-language activities and trip booklets became a part of every field trip; unattractive, unappealing, unused books were weeded out of classroom book collections and replaced with teacher-purchased or borrowed books reflecting a more balanced set of titles from different genre of Children's Literature.

In the category of teachers' perceptions of themselves as learners/teachers, the perceptions that seemed to emerge from the data enabled
the investigator to group the teachers into three groups. These groups were called: (1) Practitioners, (2) Learners, and (3) Practitioner-Learners. Although a teacher's perceptions of herself did not seem to change during the two years, the teachers who perceived themselves in the same way (thereby constituting a group) seemed to change in the same way. For example, after two years, those teachers described as Practitioners had changed most by adding more whole-language activities on to their basal programs. They resolved the conflict they perceived between university and district requirements by meeting some of each. They enriched their basal program with some whole-language activities. Those teachers described as Practitioner-Learners changed most by beginning to replace their basal programs, after two years, with whole-language programs. They resolved the conflict they initially perceived between university and district requirements by realizing that they had imposed these requirements on themselves. Consequently, they began to assume more responsibility for their own whole-language programs. Those teachers described as Learners did not perceive a conflict between their district and university requirements. They saw university expectations for whole-language learning as congruent with their own expectations. However, during the two years of the study they gained confidence to continue and expand the whole-language programs they had already started when the study began.

In the category of teacher perceptions of their own change, one teacher reported that she did not perceive any change in her beliefs nor practices of integrating Language Arts, Reading, Literature during the two years of the study. One teacher who had begun the program with
a whole-language orientation, became discouraged during the two years of the study when her new principal insisted that she abandon whole-language approaches and teach from basal reading and language arts texts in a more traditionally organized classroom. She perceived her own change to be negative in terms of practices. However, she maintained an unchanged belief in whole-language learning and an integrated Language Arts, Reading, Literature program even though her practices during the second year of the study seemed to deny this. Three teachers who began the study with a commitment to whole-language learning perceived that they had changed moderately during the course of the study. They felt they had obtained many new ideas and had incorporated these ideas into their already existing programs. They perceived their biggest change to be in self-confidence and ability to defend their ideas.

Fourteen teachers perceived a great change in their beliefs and practices of integrating Language Arts, Reading, Literature during the two years of the study. During the first year they reported that they added on many of the whole-language activities they had experienced, discussed, and analyzed during Saturday workshops and regular Alternative MA class meetings. They borrowed time from their basal Reading and Language Arts instruction to enable students to read books from Children's Literature, to extend books, to have concrete experiences and write, talk, and read to extend these experiences, to share books and ideas in small groups, to hear quality Literature read aloud, to read silently during scheduled Sustained Silent Reading, to observe, record, and reflect about field trip experiences using trip booklets.
Teachers reported that they began to display children's work and to use displays to generate ideas and extend themes. They said they began to give children more choices and expect more from their writing, talking, and reading. They said they began to make connections between the various components of Language Arts pulling spelling and grammar instruction from needs revealed in student's own writing, using books and literature as "springboards to writing," creating authentic experiences about which students could ask and seek answers to real questions using the components of Language Arts—reading, writing, listening, speaking—from a whole-language orientation.

After two years, these teachers continued to believe they had changed a great deal since the beginning of the Alternative MA program. Most stated that their biggest change had come during the first year. They attributed this change to the Alternative MA program and pointed to the Saturday workshops and the opportunities to try out new ideas in their classrooms over a sustained period of time as the cause of this change. The majority of teachers commented that it was the continued support of faculty and colleagues over two quarters, the opportunity to try out new ideas in workshops before adapting them in their classrooms, the expertise and ability of their instructors to mesh whole-language theory with practical applications and to make theory relevant to their needs, and the ability of their instructors to model a whole-language learning and teaching style and create a whole-language learning and teaching environment that helped them to change. The majority of teachers perceived that they had changed a great deal in beliefs and practices of integrating Language Arts, Reading, Literature
during the two years of the study. Most agreed that the biggest change had come during the first year and that the second year had been a time to amplify and solidify the changes begun during the first year.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to discern and describe the changes in beliefs and practices of a group of teachers who took a special inservice program which emphasized the teaching of Language Arts, Reading, and Literature from an integrated, whole-language perspective. These teachers were followed for two years. Their responses to three in-depth, open-ended interviews at the beginning, middle, and end of the two years, to videotapes of their classrooms taken before and after the six-month inservice program, and to journals kept during the inservice program were compiled and added to investigator field notes and observations. The corpus of data for each teacher was analyzed for patterns of change in beliefs and practices about integrating Language Arts, Reading, Literature in her own classroom during the two years of the study.

Eighteen of the nineteen teachers who took part in the study changed their beliefs and practices of teaching Language Arts, Reading, Literature during the two years of the study. The most dramatic changes took place during the first year while the Alternative MA program was in progress. Fourteen of the nineteen teachers accurately perceived their biggest change to be that of adding on whole-language activities to their Language Arts, Reading curricula which they had formerly
taught with strict adherence to the basal Language Arts and Reading series adopted by their school districts. During the first year of the study these teachers borrowed time from traditional basal reading groups to provide the authentic, whole-language experiences for students they themselves were experiencing in the Saturday workshops and Alternative MA classes. For example: they planned field trips around themes and used trip booklets for students to observe, record in different ways, analyze, hypothesize, and use language in a variety of ways to extend the experience; they began to Read Aloud to their students on a regularly scheduled basis and carefully selected the books and stories for Reading Aloud from various genre of Children's Literature; they taught students how to extend books by making games, dramatizing portions of the story, dressing up as favorite characters, making puppets and creating puppet shows, cooking favorite foods of characters or trying recipes found in stories, painting murals, retelling stories from a different point of view, charting similarities and differences of stories, themes, or characters, comparing characters from different books, reading other stories around a particular theme, creating wall-hangings, mobiles, quilts, etc.; they provided time for students to read throughout the day by scheduling a regular Sustained Silent Reading time and by making a variety of attractive, interesting, and appealing books available. In addition, these teachers changed their rooms around to facilitate whole-language learning. For example: they moved student's desks closer together and rearranged furniture to facilitate small group discussions and to encourage talking to exchange ideas; they weeded through and discarded old, unattractive, unused
books and replaced them with multiple copies of various titles from Children's Literature, picture books, informational books at an appropriate reading level and put them in the classroom reading collection; they began to show that they valued children's work by displaying it in an attractive, aesthetic way with careful attention to matting and mounting; they began to use displays to extend themes and generate ideas for more experiences with writing, reading, listening, talking; they began to give children more choices of activities and to provide more authentic, less skill-drill activities for children to choose. Teachers also began to expect and demand more from students. They provided experiences for students to experiment with different forms of writing--transactional, expressive, poetic--and expected them to make connections between spelling and writing, writing and speaking. Finally, because they began to see connections between reading, writing, spelling, listening, speaking themselves, they began to borrow time from other discrete subjects and to integrate subjects for more meaningful, continuous whole-language experiences for students. They began to realize, for example, that spelling instruction of words misspelled in a story written to extend a book read during SSR might be legitimate and perhaps even more relevant to the student's spelling needs than learning a list of words from a basal spelling book and taking a test on those words at the end of the week. They began to realize that writing about a spider found on a class walk, observing and recording that spider from different perspectives with different media, finding answers to questions about that spider from a real curiosity, and extending the experience of spiders by reading stories
from Children's Literature were legitimate, integrated experiences for more powerful teaching of the component parts of Language Arts—reading, spelling, listening, writing—than sterile workbook activities based on stories written to practice a phonetic skill rather than to extend an experience or to expand a horizon.

During the first year of the study, then, the majority of teachers (14) added on new, whole-language experiences to their basal reading and Language Arts programs. They borrowed time from basal reading groups, basal spelling lessons, and grammar and handwriting activities to provide integrated experiences in reading, writing, listening, and speaking. During the first year, these whole-language activities were added on to basal programs. They did not replace basal programs. The four teachers who had begun the year already committed to whole-language learning in an integrated way, also added new activities and ideas to their ongoing programs. These teachers, however, had already decided at the beginning of the study not to use basal reading or language arts texts in their programs. Their change, then, during the first and second years of the study was to deepen their commitment to whole-language learning, to increase their confidence and ability to defend their whole-language programs on theoretical grounds, and to broaden their knowledge and experience with whole-language learning in their classrooms. Their change, though meaningful, was not as dramatic as the change of the fourteen teachers who began, during 1980, to borrow time from basal reading and language arts instruction for whole-language activities.

After two years, the fourteen teachers who had begun to add whole-language activities to their Reading/Language Arts programs continued
to provide whole-language experiences for their students. Their rooms were still rearranged to provide for more small group discussions, more student-student interactions, more emphasis on books and book extensions. They had weeded out their classroom book collections and expanded them to include more Caldecott and Newbery Award books, more multiple copies of books, more titles from every genre of Children's Literature. Children's work was still attractively mounted and displayed around the walls, halls, and stairwells of school buildings. Teachers were continuing to use display to present and generate ideas for whole-language learning and teachers reported that they continued to expect and demand a higher quality of writing and talking about experiences, books, and ideas from their students.

In addition, during the second year of the study, half of the fourteen teachers (7) continued to change their beliefs and practices of integrating Language Arts, Reading, Literature. These seven teachers began to replace basal reading and language arts instruction with whole-language activities and began to move toward abandoning the basal texts altogether. Although they reported that they "occasionally touch(ed) base" with basal sequencing or district curriculum guides, these seven teachers reported that:

"...We don't meet in traditional reading groups anymore. When someone has a problem or needs to know (a skill) I teach it individually or form a quick group to teach the skill."

"My reading groups are much more flexible. Sometimes we don't meet for weeks. Students still do basal assignments, but they're on their own more. I don't use valuable class time to discuss workbook pages—we read and discuss books instead."
"Instead of reading the basal, my reading groups are reading multiple copies of books I ordered from (the library). Each group discusses and extends their books—sometimes as a group, sometimes individually. We switch books so that everyone gets a chance. Some of the kids borrow from their friends before they're supposed to read it. I don't care—they're reading."

These seven teachers, during the second year of the study, began to define Language Arts in terms of language and reading activities planned to happen throughout the day. Students were expected to read throughout the day—and they did. They were expected to write about their experiences on field trips, extending books, creating art projects, investigating science problems—and they did. Students were expected to pay attention to spelling and sentence construction as they experimented with different forms of writing—and they did. Teachers expected first drafts of writing to be rough and, rather than grade these rough drafts, they began to use them as teaching guides for particular students' needs. Students expected teachers to value and display their work with thought and care. This also happened.

After two years, these seven teachers no longer taught Language Arts, Reading as discrete subjects in specific time periods during the classroom day. They no longer merely added whole-language activities to basal Reading/Language Arts programs or squeezed in time for SSR, Reading Aloud, and Literature. After two years, these seven teachers had begun to replace discrete teaching of discrete subjects from discrete basal textbooks with the ideas, activities, books, trips they had experienced during the Saturday workshops and weekly class meetings of the sixth month Alternative MA program. They had begun to rely on the ideas and knowledge from their own teaching and learning
experiences to define and structure the Language Arts, Reading curricula in their own classrooms. They were confident, enthusiastic, and able to articulate their goals, the reasons behind the activities they planned, and the research supporting their theoretical positions. While all eighteen of the teachers who changed were better able to articulate their goals, methods, and theoretical perspectives at the end of the study, those seven teachers who began to replace their basal programs (rather than merely add on or just enrich already existing whole-language programs) seemed to change most dramatically.

**Discussion of the Study**

The questions originally asked of this study:

(1) Did change really occur?

(2) How long did it take teachers to change? Were changes long-lasting?

(3) Can changes be linked to the hypothetical stages of development reported in the literature?

(4) Did the inservice program shared by these teachers contribute to their change? What components or principles underlying the inservice program seemed to contribute to change?

can thus be answered within the limitations of the research design.

(1) Did change really occur?

Responses to the three in-depth interviews, the comparison of videotapes of teachers' classrooms before and after the inservice program, comments in teacher journals and comments based on investigator observations and field notes indicate that eighteen of the nineteen teachers in the study changed in some way during the two years of the study. For the four teachers who began with a whole-language orientation and commitment to teaching Language Arts, Reading, and Literature
in an integrated way, the change was subtle and undramatic. They continued to believe in, practice, and provide a whole-language environment for their students. They broadened and deepened their knowledge about language learning, children's literature, and reading, and reported an increased self-confidence and ability to defend their whole-language beliefs and practices at the end of two years. They attributed this change to the Alternative MA experience. One teacher in this sub-group of four, during the second year of the study, was obliged to provide fewer whole-language experiences and follow a more traditional basal reading and language arts series adopted by her school system. She reported that although some of her practices of teaching had changed during the second year of the study, she still believed in whole-language learning and tried to add to her basal curriculum wherever she could during the regular instructional day.

Fourteen of the eighteen teachers changed dramatically during the two years of the study. These teachers had all begun the study with a narrow definition of Language Arts which did not include writing, reading, or literature. They taught Language Arts, Reading, and Writing as discrete subjects in discrete periods of time during the classroom day. They relied heavily on basal textbooks for Reading and Language Arts instruction and followed the goals of the curriculum guides adopted by their districts without examining or questioning these goals.

During the first year of the study, all fourteen of these teachers began to add on whole-language activities to their Language Arts/Reading curricula. In some cases they ignored basal reading or language arts texts, temporarily, while trying out the whole-language ideas and
activities they had experienced themselves in Saturday workshops and weekly Alternative MA class meetings. They added a scheduled SSR and Read Aloud time to their Reading programs and began to borrow time from basal reading group instruction to read and extend books from various genre of Children's Literature. They began to rearrange their classrooms to facilitate student-student interactions and small group discussions. They gave children more choices of activities and re-designed the activities available in interest centers for more authentic experiences. They began to emphasize books, book extensions, and reading and reorganized and expanded their classroom book collections to make a wider, more balanced reading selection available to students. They began to show the value they placed on children's work by thoughtfully and carefully displaying it in their classrooms, hallways, and stairwells. They began to plan and provide more authentic experiences through classroom display and field trips for writing, listening, speaking, reading.

The most dramatic change occurred during the second year of the study for half of the fourteen teachers who began the study with a basal orientation to reading and language arts. These seven continued to change toward whole-language, integrated curricula during the second year. They began to replace their basal reading texts with selections from Children's Literature, replace basal reading skill practice and workbook pages with book extensions and small group discussions, and they began to replace spelling lists and grammar texts and teach these subjects individually as needs become evident through students' own writing or speaking. They began to replace the basal-
oriented Language Arts, Reading teaching environment with a more authentic speaking, listening, writing, reading, whole-language environment.

Thus, the question "Did change really occur?" can be answered "yes" for eighteen of the nineteen teachers studied. While most teachers felt that the biggest change occurred during the first year of the study, and stabilized during the second year, seven of the fourteen who made the most dramatic change during this first year continued to change toward an even more integrated whole-language approach to teaching Language Arts, Reading, Literature during the second year of the study. All teachers but one changed during the two years of the study.

(2) How long did it take teachers to change? Were changes long-lasting?

The changes among teachers observed and reported in this study seemed to emerge gradually during the two years of the study. Although the responses to discern change (from the second in-depth interview, videotaping, and interview comparing videotapes) did not become available until April and May of 1980 (six months after the MA program had begun), journals kept by teachers during the course of the Alternative MA program were collected and read by the investigator in December, 1979--three months after the MA program had begun. These journals, plus investigator notes and observations about teachers' responses and participation in Saturday workshops seemed to indicate that, by December, some change in practices of teaching Reading, Language Arts, and Literature had already begun to take place in most
teachers' classrooms. For example, after the Saturday workshop "Using Books as a Springboard to Writing", one teacher recorded in her journal:

"Monday, November 12--Brought in to class those poetry books for the writer's table--Street Poems, Seeing Things, and A Hunting We Will Go. Read aloud from each book and set them on the back table. Two poems have emerged so far.

Tuesday, November 13--Put up a sign today -- "Writer's Table" and am planning to put out two books with a couple of activities to go along with them. Also went to the public library for the first time this evening and checked out 3 books. I am planning on reading Wrinkle in Time to the class and sharing sequels to it. Also found a wonderful book on children's plays and am planning on running off several copies so that the children can decide which plays they would like to do.

Wednesday, November 14--Brought in all of L'Engle books and children wanted to start reading A Wrinkle right away and they wanted to read the sequels out loud also.

Thursday, November 15--Reading Aloud is getting extremely difficult as my cough is getting worse and worse. I have found that several children have checked out whatever book I am reading to the class and are following along. I selected these children to read orally to help me out--this worked very well.

Friday, November 16--Yesterday I changed reading--SSR was in the afternoon instead of the morning and I read to them first thing--this was due to my voice (cold)--by the afternoon I was afraid I would not be able to read. I really didn't think the change even phased them until this morning they asked me to read first. The kids also wanted to sit in the round again. This is a good practice, I feel, for really getting into discussions."

These journal entries indicate that by November, this teacher had added Read Aloud and SSR time to her daily schedule. Students were clamoring for the books she provided for SSR and several had checked out the current Read Aloud book from the library to follow along during Read Aloud time. This teacher's practice of daily SSR and Read Aloud seems
firmly in place by November (she began the study with neither). Not only were these two activities in place, however. The teacher considered Reading Aloud so important that when she had a cold and consequent scratchy voice, she rearranged her schedule so that she could Read Aloud in the morning—in case her voice was too weak by afternoon to Read Aloud. She also rearranged the seating during Read Aloud time (in the round) to facilitate discussion. In addition, the Monday following the Saturday workshop on writing she began to set up a writer's table in her classroom, share some poetry, and make poetry books available (on the writer's table) to her students. Her Monday and Tuesday journal entries indicate that she was beginning to form plans for the writer's table so that it could become incorporated into her on-going classroom activity. The writer's table idea was her version of how to incorporate more writing into her curriculum—the general theme of the Saturday "Using Books as a Springboard to Writing" workshop.

Journal entries for all teachers indicated reflections, plans, accomplishments similar to the ones cited. By comparing these journal entries to September in-depth interview responses as well as investigator observations and subsequent interview responses, it was found that change began during the first few months of the Alternative MA program. Often ideas were carried directly from the Saturday workshop to the teacher's Monday morning classroom. As one teacher said in her journal:

"...On Monday morning, after a Saturday of input I just come roarin' into the classroom and my children pick up my enthusiasm....I can't wait to get started
and show them the neat thing I did...on Saturday."

The effects of the lecture-discussion classes were also carried directly to the classroom. As one teacher noted in her journal:

"December 1, 1979--Knowing the results of Donald Graves' study sure helps in feeling secure about methods to use with children and writing. Also it helps in knowing what to expect. I have observed children in the classroom talking about what they are going to write and, also, reading what they did write to someone. I felt good knowing that I was observing important stages in writing. The teachers in my building think writing is a quiet activity. Instead of feeling that I wasn't doing a good job because my students talk, I know it is okay."

This gradual change as reported to journals was confirmed by teacher responses to the in-depth, open-ended questionnaire administered in March, 1980 and by the interviews comparing videotapes of October and March/April classrooms.

The use of videotapes to focus discussion on particular change in beliefs and practices was a unique and valuable method of data collection for the study. Immediate play-back features of videotaping enabled the investigator to re-focus and/or probe particular points if teacher's responses became tangential or unclear. Videotaping also captured the fluid atmosphere of on-going classroom activity. This fluid motion is not easily captured by still photography nor inexpensively or immediately viewable with regular film. In addition, interviews comparing videotapes enabled the investigator to probe for teachers' perceptions of their own change and forced teachers to articulate these changes.

Eighteen teachers saw changes in the March/April 1980 videotapes that had occurred since the original videotaping in October. The first
comment of the majority of teachers was that the children had grown
and changed a great deal during the year. Subsequent comments
focused on particular features of classroom organization and arrange­
ment. Teachers' comments in April about October videotapes revealed
current beliefs and practices. For example, one teacher commented:

"There's that old typewriter--I finally put it away--it made writing more frustrating 'cause it didn't work properly. And the kids write so much more, now--they couldn't be bothered with that thing. It was just a gimmick anyway."

and another said:

"...these are the (construction paper) feet...in September I planned for them to go all around the room and down the hall to the library. We were gonna surprise the librarian by how many books we'd read. You know...we got so busy with other (more meaningful) ways to extend books, we never did finish those feet. I guess they weren't such a hot idea after all...that used to be the only way I would extend books. Maybe we should record all the books we've read and extended on them--finish the feet. You know, I'd kind of forgotten about (those feet) until I saw them on tape."

By comparing April, 1980 to September, 1979 responses to in-depth
questionnaires, interviews about videotapes, journal entries, and
investigator field notes and observations, it was found that eighteen
of the nineteen teachers had changed in their practices, gradually,
during the six months of the inservice program. Obvious changes in
practice were easy to document, i.e., adding on SSR, Reading Aloud,
decreasing time and attention to basal reading and Language Arts series,
increasing emphasis on Children's Literature and book extensions, re-
arrangement of furniture, addition of different kinds of books to class­
room book collections, increase in display of children's work and
writing to accompany this work, more thoughtful attention to display
and use of classroom display. These changes seemed to occur first. That is, after a Saturday workshop in which teachers participated in book-making, slide-making, marbleizing paper, their journals and investigator field notes from conversations with teachers indicated that most teachers had immediately returned to their classrooms to start these activities with their students. Subsequent reports indicated that these activities were eventually incorporated into a unit or subsequent theme of study, and they appeared again and again in book extensions, displays, and writing projects submitted by the teachers for inservice class assignments.

Teachers seemed to change by adding on activities and trying out ideas almost immediately upon hearing these ideas. These changes in practice seemed to occur in tandem with the ideas and activities presented in the Saturday workshops and weekly lecture-discussion classes. However, had the study ended at the end of the six month inservice program (March, 1980) it would have been possible to report changes in teachers' practices alone. Change of belief behind these practices could not have been stated with confidence at the end of the six month inservice program. Since the study continued for another year, however, and since long-lasting changes in practice were found for eighteen of the nineteen teachers who participated in the study, it is possible to hypothesize that these long-lasting changes occurred because teachers changed their beliefs about integrating Language Arts, Reading, and Literature during the two years of the study.

At the end of two years (May, 1981), teachers were re-interviewed about their beliefs and practices of integrating Language Arts, Reading,
and Literature in their classrooms. When their responses to these in-depth, open-ended questions were compared with responses to in-depth interviews, interviews about videotapes, journal entries, investigator field notes and observations at the beginning and end of the six month inservice program, it was found that changes of adding on whole-language activities to on-going programs had continued for eight teachers, had expanded and replaced basal programs for seven teachers, had expanded and deepened for three teachers. The one teacher who did not change during the six month program, continued to be unchanged at the end of two years. However, for those eighteen teachers who did change, the change was long-lasting. Witherell and Erickson (1978) hypothesized that "teachers actions are linked to (and linked by) the theories and values they hold. It would seem that the long-lasting changes in activities found for the eighteen teachers of this study might be attributed to a change in "the theories and values they hold"--the teachers' beliefs about teaching Language Arts, Reading, Literature. These beliefs seemed to have changed during the two years of the study. As with change in practices, these changes in beliefs seemed to occur gradually. It seemed that teachers tried out activities in Saturday workshops, reflected, discussed, and analyzed theory and practice during weekly Alternative MA class meetings, tried out activities in their classrooms and then, after trying out and experimenting and reflecting on these experiments in relevant settings, began to struggle with changing their beliefs. The interviews centered on videotapes in
April, 1980 reflect this struggle and process of changing beliefs.

For example, in 1980 one teacher said:

"I'm a mixture. I'm still mixed up about reading instruction...I worry that (the children) have a deficit because of what I've done...(neglecting basal instruction for reading from literature books)...I'm no big proponent of basals--but with a total literature program--I can see how it could be pretty weak. So I'm kind of a mixture."

A year later, this same teacher said:

"Children learn to read by having time to read, hearing reading, seeing a good model of reading--people reading. The most important kinds of activities for reading instruction are the teacher reading aloud, silent reading, and having a wide variety of reading material available. A positive atmosphere. (I believe this) because of the research...I'm convinced that the more they hear, the more it becomes a part of them. The more they become excited toward reading, and hear and see adults reading, the more importance they attribute to reading--the more they will read, the more confidence they will have. It's confidence and providing lots of time to read--and the fun of reading--not skill exercises and phonics that teaches kids to read."

The April, 1980 interview at the end of the inservice program reflected that the teacher had changed some practices of teaching reading during the time of the inservice program but was struggling with her own beliefs about how to teach reading. Formerly, she had relied heavily on basal instruction. She had experimented with adding literature and whole-language activities to her program during the 1980 year but was not sure whether she had done a disservice to some of her children. During 1981 she continued to experiment by replacing basal programs with literature and whole-language experiences. In May, 1981 her responses revealed a firm commitment to literature and whole-language learning--a change in belief as well as practice during the two years of the study. Apparently, the teacher had used the 1981 year to reflect on and tie
down the theory behind the practices she had begun to use. This teacher's responses were similar to those of the other teachers who changed most dramatically by beginning to replace basal instruction with whole-language activities during 1981. The seven teachers who added on whole-language activities to their basal programs in 1980 and the four teachers who had begun the inservice program with a commitment to whole-language learning all sustained the changes they had made in 1980 during the second year of the study. Their responses to the in-depth interview questions in 1981 indicated that their beliefs were consistent with the changes they had made in practice during 1980. That is, the four who began the inservice program with a belief in whole-language learning, deepened their commitment to whole-language learning; the seven who added whole-language activities to on-going basal programs continued to add on whole-language activities and express a belief in them as well as basal programs. The responses of these teachers, in 1980 and 1981 interviews did not indicate that they were struggling to change beliefs any more than they had already changed. These teachers seemed satisfied with the ways they were teaching. Their beliefs and practices were congruent and had been maintained over the two years of the study. The seven teachers who seemed to change the most, however, were those who also struggled with the change in belief—the underlying purposes of the practices they had adopted.

One hypothesis seems to emerge from this finding. Perhaps teachers change along a continuum. They begin by trying out new activities and ideas in relevant settings. This process of experimentation occurs for varying lengths of time—perhaps related to the way teachers
perceive themselves (Practitioners, Learners, Practitioner-Learners). As teachers gain experience they move along the continuum from Practitioner, to Practitioner-Learner, to Learner or, from experimenting and adding on to experimenting and replacing and struggling with underlying theory or purposes, to relating beliefs and purposes to new activities. The teachers in this study seemed to follow such a course of change.

Thus the questions "How long did it take teachers to change?" and "Were changes long-lasting?" can be answered by Katherine DeVaney's (1977) statement:

"Genuine change takes time. Long-term growth comes from awareness of need which often emerges in the process of trying something out. As problems arise, teachers begin to see better what they need to know or be able to do" (p. 26).

The changes found for eighteen of the nineteen teachers in beliefs and practices of integrating Language Arts, Reading, Literature in their classrooms occurred gradually, over a two year time. Changes in practices were maintained over the two year period. Changes in practices were easy to observe and document. They were easy for teachers to perceive. Changes in beliefs also seemed to occur gradually. Those teachers who struggled to probe the purposes behind activities and articulate these purposes as beliefs seemed to change most in terms of practices. Changes in beliefs were more difficult to observe and document. They were more difficult for teachers to perceive. Changes in belief were assumed from the teachers' responses which indicated the teacher was struggling with underlying purposes, from the long-lasting
nature of changes in teacher practices, and from the comparison of teachers' responses which clearly stated a change in belief.

(3) Can changes be linked to hypothetical stages of development?

The focus on development in Teacher Inservice Education research has resulted in various hypothesized stages of development (see Chapter II) for pre-service and experienced teachers. These hypothesized stages of development, in turn, are looked on to provide the rationale for various types of pre-service and inservice education programs.

The present study describes the changes a group of experienced teachers instituted in their beliefs and practices about Language Arts during a two year period. These teachers shared a six month inservice education experience at the beginning of this two year period. The inservice experience they shared was not designed for teachers at any particular stage of development. The only requirement for admission to the program was a commitment to enroll for the duration of the program under the title Alternative MA Program in Reading. Teachers were not screened for admission nor described at the beginning of the program as being in any particular stage of professional development. Nevertheless, it is possible, in retrospect, to speculate about the nineteen teachers' particular developmental stages (as described in the literature) at the beginning, middle, and end of the study from their responses to questions and interviews during the two years of the study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katz (1972)</td>
<td>2 Stage 1: Survival or</td>
<td>1 Stage 2: Consolidation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 2: Consolidation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 3: Renewal</td>
<td>16 Stage 3: Renewal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Stage 4: Maturity</td>
<td>Stabilized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field (1979)</td>
<td>15 Stage 2: Increased self-confidence; plan in weeks.</td>
<td>1 Stage 2: Plan in terms of weeks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Stage 3: Learning/teaching as a whole process.</td>
<td>18 Stage 3: Learning/teaching as a whole process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apelman (1978)</td>
<td>15 Stage 2: &quot;How to&quot; questions.</td>
<td>1 Stage 2: &quot;How to&quot; questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Stage 3: Curriculum building for depth and continuity.</td>
<td>18 Stage 3: Curriculum building for depth and continuity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall (1977)</td>
<td>15 Stage 1: Informational or</td>
<td>1 Stage 1: Informational</td>
<td>1 Stage 1: Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stages of Concern:</td>
<td>Stage 2: Personal</td>
<td>14 Stage 3: Management or</td>
<td>14 Stage 5: Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 3: Management or</td>
<td>Stage 4: Consequence</td>
<td>4 Stage 5: Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 4: Consequence</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Stage 6: Refocusing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of Use:</td>
<td>15 Level 0: Non-Use</td>
<td>1 Level 0: Non-Use</td>
<td>1 Level 0: Non-Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Level III: Mechanical Use</td>
<td>14 Level IVA: Routine</td>
<td>7 Level IVA: Routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Level IVA: Routine or IVB: Refinement</td>
<td>11 Level IVB: Refinement or Level V: Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loewinger (1976)</td>
<td>15 Conformist</td>
<td>1 Conformist</td>
<td>1 Conformist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Conscientious/Conformist</td>
<td>14 Conscientious/Conformist</td>
<td>7 Conscientious/Conformist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Conscientious or Individualistic</td>
<td>7 Individualistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Individualistic or Autonomous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stages of Development, in the Beginning, 1979

In 1979, the majority of teachers (16) had had between one and six years of teaching experience, one was a novice teacher, and two had been teaching more than twelve years. In terms of years of teaching experience, the teachers might be described by Katz (1972) as primarily those at the Renewal Phase of development (i.e., they were at the end of the third or fourth year, tired of doing the same old things, interested in new teaching materials and methods). Indeed, when asked why they had enrolled in the MA program, most teachers replied:

"...to get new ideas"

"...to become a better teacher"

"...to learn more about Language Arts and Literature"

"...to stay fresh".

Most teachers in the sample had solved survival and control problems and were looking for help in the curriculum area of Language Arts. Field might classify the majority of teachers (15) at the beginning of the study as Stage 2 teachers; i.e., teachers who had increased self-confidence, developed some appropriate solutions to problems, and planned in terms of weeks rather than days. Four teachers, at the beginning of the study could be classified in Field's terms as Stage 3 teachers: teachers who viewed learning as a whole process not divided by time or subject. Apelman (1978) would agree that the majority were Stage 2, i.e., concerned with "how to" questions directed towards new materials and activities, and four were at Stage 3, i.e., realizing they could do more to extend children's learning and needing help with curriculum-building.
Similarly, on Hall's *Stages of Concern About Innovations*, the majority of teachers (15), at the beginning of the study could be described as being at **Stages 1** (Informational) or **2** (Personal), i.e., they had a general awareness about the innovation (whole-language learning), interest in learning about it in more detail or were uncertain about their own adequacy to meet the demands of the innovation. The four teachers who began the study with whole-language goals and/or programs could be described on Hall's *Stages of Concerns* being at **Stage 3** (Management, i.e., their attention was focused on how to organize, schedule for innovation) or **4** (Consequence, i.e., their attention was focused on impact of the innovation on their own students).

In terms of Hall's *Levels of Use* categories, the majority of teachers at the beginning of the study (15) were at **Level 0** (Non-use). The four teachers who began with a whole-language orientation would be classified as **Level III** (Mechanical Users) as most of their effort was expended on short-term, day to day use with little time for reflection.

In terms of Loevinger's ego-development stages, the majority of teachers at the beginning of the study could be classified as being at the **Conformist Stage**, i.e., they viewed themselves as conforming to socially approved codes and norms; their explanations of behavior and situations were conceptually simple. The four who began the study with whole-language orientation could be classified as **Conscientious-Conformist** as they allowed for exceptions and contingencies in generalizations, had increased self-awareness and a capacity to imagine multiple possibilities in situations.
Stages of Development During the First Year, 1980

During 1980, most of the teachers who began the study in Katz' Renewal Phase continued to be interested in adding new materials and methods to their teaching repertoire. Several teachers, however, seemed to move toward Katz' Maturity Phase, i.e., they came to terms with themselves as professionals and began to reflect on more fundamental educational questions. At the end of the 1979-80 academic year, one of these teachers resigned from her parochial school teaching situation to gain wider teaching experience in the inner city and one teacher resigned from her rural teaching situation to pursue a Ph.D. in whole-language learning.

In terms of Apelman's (1978) and Field's (1979) stages of development, fourteen of the fifteen teachers who began the study in Stage 2 (concerned with "how to" questions) began to shift towards Stage 3 in 1980. Both Field and Apelman describe Stage 3 as a time when the teacher begins to view learning as a whole process, not divided by time or subject (Field) and a time when the teacher realizes she can do more to extend children's learning and looks for help with curriculum building (Apelman). During 1980 these fourteen teachers began to broaden their definition of Language Arts to include reading, literature, writing, speaking; to provide for more whole-language activities and fewer basal activities and to become more responsible for their own Language Arts, Literature, Reading curricula. One teacher did not move to Apelman or Field's Stage 3 during 1980. This teacher, probably closer to survival needs at the beginning of the study, remained at that level for the duration of the study. Her responses indicated that she did not
change developmental levels during the two years. The four teachers who began the study at Field's and Apelman's Stage 3 respectively, continued to function at that level.

In 1980, the fourteen teachers described in 1979 as being at Hall's Stage 1 (Informational) and 2 (Personal) of Concern seemed to move to Stage 3 (Management) and 4 (Consequence). Teacher attention at these stages seemed to be focused on issues of organizing and scheduling and on the impact of the innovation on their own students. In terms of Hall's Levels of Use, these fourteen teachers seemed to move from that of Level 0 (Non-Use) to Level IVA (Routine Use). One teacher remained at the Stage 1 (Informational) and 2 (Personal) Stage of Concern and the 0 (Non-Use) Level of Use throughout the two years of the study. The four teachers who began the study at Hall's Stage 3 (Management) and 4 (Consequence) Stage of Concern seemed to move to Stage 5 (Collaboration) and from Level III (Mechanical) Level of Use to Level IVA (Routine) and IVB (Refinement) during the two years of the study.

With the exception of the teacher who didn't change, those teachers who began the study at Loevinger's Conformist stage of ego development seemed to shift during 1980 to the Conscientious-Conformist stage. The four teachers who began the study in Loevinger's Conscientious-Conformist stage seemed to begin to shift toward the more complex Conscientious and Individualistic stages. With the exception of one teacher, then, all teachers seemed to become more self aware during 1980, thus enabling them to be described at a higher stage of ego development, according to Loevinger, in 1980.
Stages of Development After Two Years, 1981

During 1981 the developmental stages hypothesized by Katz, Field, and Apelman and attained by teachers in 1980 seemed to stabilize, i.e., those who had reached Katz' Renewal and Maturity Phase seemed to stay there; those who had reached Field's and Apelman's Stage 3 seemed to stay there.

However, according to Hall's two hypothetical stages of development (Stages of Concern About Innovations and Levels of Use of Innovations), and Leovinger's hypothetical Stages of Ego Development, eighteen teachers continued to change during 1981. Many of the teachers described at Hall's Stage 3 (Management) and 4 (Consequence) during 1980 seemed to shift to Stage 5 (Collaboration) during 1981; they seemed to become more concerned with coordinating their Language Arts/Literature, Reading programs and with sharing ideas about how to implement changes in their own classrooms with their colleagues. Similarly, several teachers seemed to move from a 1980 Stage 5 (Collaboration) to Stage 6 (Refocusing) during 1981. These teachers completely renovated their spelling, reading, and writing programs in 1981 and began to replace their former basal programs with a core program of whole-language. Of those fourteen teachers who were at Level IVA (Routine) in 1980, half (7) instituted changes in 1981 which seemed to indicate that they had shifted to Level IVB (Refinement) and Level V (Integration) in 1981. In addition, these seven seemed to move to a more Individualistic stage of Leovinger's ego development, indicated by their ability to tolerate paradoxes and inner conflicts. These are the teachers described earlier as Practitioner-Learners who began to see district requirements as self-imposed
Inhibitions. Those teachers who had been described at Loewinger's Individualistic stage of ego development in 1980, seemed to move toward a more Autonomous stage of ego development in 1981. They were better able to integrate unrelated ideas and seemed to have a heightened respect for autonomy and emotional interdependence.

Conclusion

In terms of stages of development hypothesized by various researchers, then, eighteen of the nineteen teachers in the present study seemed to change to a more complex level of development during the two years of the study. Systematic analysis of teacher responses to a series of open-ended questions, interviews about videotapes, journal entries, and investigator field notes revealed a similar pattern of change for each of the teachers who changed during the study. Analysis of one teacher's responses indicated that she did not change during the study. All teachers were exposed to a common experience in whole-language learning. Eighteen of the nineteen teachers changed. For the four teachers who began with a whole-language orientation, the change was moderate. For fourteen of the fifteen teachers who began with a narrowly defined, basal approach to Language Arts and Reading instruction, the change was major. Although the inservice program shared by these teachers was not specifically designed to move teachers from one hypothetical stage to another, nor for teachers at any particular stage of development, eighteen of the nineteen teachers studied did change and could be described (retrospectively and speculatively) as seeming to progress from lower to higher developmental stages during the two years of the study.
(4) Did the inservice program shared by these teachers contribute to their change? Can components or underlying principles of the inservice program be identified for use in inservice programs dealing with other subject matter?

The purpose of this ethnographic study was to discern and describe the changes in belief and practice in integrating Language Arts, Reading, and Literature made by a group of experienced teachers during a two year period. Since it was not an experimental study and no treatment was administered to either an experimental or control group, cause for the changes found and described cannot be positively identified. However, since change did occur for eighteen of the nineteen teachers, and since this change seemed to progress from lower to higher stages of development as described by various theoreticians, it is legitimate to speculate about reasons for the change.

The Alternative MA program, though not an experimental treatment, was a common experience shared by all teachers at the beginning of the study. For this reason, a detailed description of the Alternative MA program was presented in Chapter IV to provide a context for interpretation of teacher responses. Particular features or principles of the Alternative program might have contributed to the changes in teacher belief and practice discerned and described in the study. These features include:

(1) Modeling, or the Principle of Congruity
(2) Experiencing, or the Principle of Doing
(3) the Principle of Relevancy
(4) the Principle of Knowing the Learner
(5) the Principle of Time
(6) the Principle of Faculty Expertise
(1) **Modeling or the Principle of Congruity**

"...the way we teach teachers should be congruent in many basic aspects—but not all—with the way we want them to teach children...we...constitute a model for many of our learners...there are some elements of teaching which are applicable to all teaching, whether of young children or adults in teacher education...(there should be) a kind of consistency, harmony, or concordance between the way we teach teachers and the way we want them to teach..." (Katz, 1977, p. 58).

One of the basic tenets of the Alternative MA program was the principle of congruity or modeling. In order to teach teachers how to arrange an environment to facilitate whole-language learning and integrate Language Arts, Literature, Reading in their own classrooms, the faculty of the Alternative MA program created an integrated, whole-language environment for teachers. The design of the program itself modeled a consistent, uninterrupted approach to integrating writing, speaking, listening, reading. Faculty did not lecture about how to get a small group discussion started—they arranged for teachers to talk to each other, get to know and trust each other, learn to view each other as a source of knowledge, friendship, and collegiality. In addition to providing a consistent, integrated environment upon which to model a classroom program, faculty also modeled facilitation of learning rather than direct teaching. For example, one faculty member consistently brought in baskets and baskets of books from particular genre of children's literature to share with the teachers. She read aloud and provided time for teachers to read and discuss what they had read. Her enthusiasm, knowledge, and obvious love for literature was eagerly received and copied by the teachers. So too, was her method of motivating students to read. She did not lecture. She never said "the fun of learning to read is to be
able to experience these books." Teachers also copied this faculty member's method of presenting books in their own classrooms, i.e., they brought in baskets and baskets of books from the library, read aloud from them, gave students time to read, discuss, and extend their reading. Eventually, for eighteen of the nineteen teachers, literature became an integral part of the classroom environment. Even the arrangement of furniture changed to accommodate this emphasis on books, book extensions, and reading. A major strength of the Alternative MA program was, then, that it presented inservice material in a way which was congruent with the way the teacher educators wanted the teachers to teach children.

(2) Experiencing, or the Principle of Doing

Another feature of the Alternative MA program was that teachers were given the opportunity to try out ideas and activities in a supportive environment before they were asked to experiment with these ideas and activities in their own classrooms. Teachers were never asked or required to make changes in their classrooms, however. They were, instead, given the opportunity to experience alternatives, i.e., take a creek walk, make a cornhusk doll, bind a book with cloth, make a game based on a book, marbelize paper to use as endpapers, evaluate spelling errors according to invented spelling research, chart folk tale variations and/or extend and discuss books from various genre of Children's Literature. After an all-day workshop around a Christmas theme, for example, where teachers investigated Christmas customs by reading and/or interviewing each other, by researching and baking traditional holiday recipes, by gluing and molding tree ornaments, by shaping and tying
cornhusk dolls, and by weaving and filling Swedish hearts and hand-pulled taffy, they talked about, wrote about, displayed and presented their work for their colleagues and instructors to critique. Teachers learned how to mat, mount, write about, present, and extend the books, poems, clay ornaments, mobiles, etc., they created in Saturday workshops.

(3) **The Principle of Relevancy**

Part of the lecture-discussion class following each Saturday workshop was devoted to presentation, display, and discussion of the activities and ideas experienced the previous Saturday. The emphasis of these discussions was on making connections between activities and purposes, between theory and practice, and between the whole-language components of the Language Arts—speaking, reading, listening, writing. Just as the purpose of the workshop had been to give teachers a chance to experience and create in an authentic, whole-language environment, the purpose of the lecture-discussion class was to explore the research and theory behind activities. By tying theory to practice during lecture-discussion classes it was hoped that, ultimately, teachers would be able to see the relevance of these activities to theory and the relevance of theory to the practices they employed in their own classrooms. The aim was for teachers to be able to transfer more than an array of new activities to their classrooms. The intent was for teachers to be able to see the relevance of theory and research behind classroom practices and base their future practices on relevant theory. These intentions, however, were never stated to the teachers enrolled in the program. Although teachers were expected to try some of the activities they had experienced in workshops in their own classrooms, they were
never told which activities to try nor that they must change anything
in their on-going programs. However, eighteen of the nineteen teachers
did carry a variety of new activities back to their classrooms to try.
The majority of these teachers reported that they never would have
attempted these activities in their own classrooms had they not pre-
viously experienced them in the Saturday workshops. The "doing" of
the Saturday workshops seemed to give them the confidence and expertise
they felt they needed to try these new ideas with their own students.
By trying new practices in their own classrooms, often presenting them
in exactly the same way they had seen them presented in a Saturday work-
shop, and by working alongside their students, exactly as their instruc-
tors had worked alongside them, teachers began to see the relevance of
whole-language activities to their own classroom situations. Perhaps
because teachers were also given time in lecture-discussion to discuss
this relevance and explore underlying theory and research, they were
more able to make connections between theory and practice. Perhaps this
helps to explain the changes in belief and practice observed for eighteen
of the nineteen teachers during the two years in which they were studied.

(4) The Principle of Knowing the Learner

Another feature of the Alternative MA program which may have con-
tributed to teachers' change was that the program continued over two
quarters and all participants were able to get to know each other and
learn to use each other as resources. Not only does this feature
support the notion of peer-teaching and learning, it also represents the
principle of Knowing the Learner discussed by Katz (1977) and others as
important in helping learners to "improve, refine, develop, or in some
way modify their understanding of the concept, task, or skill to be learned" (p. 58). Katz cites Duckworth, 1972:

"...the teacher must uncover what the learner's understanding of the task or concept to be learned actually is...adequate uncovering of the learner's construction of relevant reality may help us make better informed decisions about what 'material' is most appropriate to 'cover' at a given time" (p. 59).

The faculty made a deliberate attempt to "get to know" the teachers as learners. Faculty and teachers were on a first name basis; they met at each others' homes to plan projects, present ideas and activities, and to discuss books and Children's Literature. Teachers and faculty both reported that the extended period of time (six months) plus the continuity of group members during this six months enabled them to get to know each other and to establish a strong support group where they could try new ideas, discuss these ideas with candor, and contribute to each others' learning. The extended period of time (two quarters) and continuity of the same faculty and students enabled the faculty to "know their learners"; it enabled teachers and faculty to get to know and trust each other as learners and teachers. Both teachers and faculty commented on the positive nature of this feature—a feature unique in a large university graduate education program.

(5) The Principle of Time

Closely related to the Principle of Knowing the Learner is the Principle of Time. As Katherine DeVaney said (1977)

"Genuine change takes time. Long-term growth comes from awareness of need which often emerges in the process of trying something out. As problems arise teachers begin to see better what they need to know or be able to do" (p. 26).
Not only was the inservice program set up to facilitate teachers' learning over an extended period of time (six months), but teachers were also provided time within the program to engage in and evaluate the kinds of activities their instructors hoped they would implement in their classrooms. Teachers had time to read books from Children's Literature; they had time to discuss books in informal and formal class meetings; they had time to extend books in Saturday workshops or during the week between class sessions. Teachers were given time to explore, extend, and explain their own learning. In addition, teachers were not expected to change overnight. It was expected that changes would be made slowly. The emphasis of the program was on making qualitative, interconnected changes rather than on accumulating a quantity of unrelated, superficial changes among teachers in their own classrooms. The instructors of the inservice program agreed with Katz (1977) who said:

"...it seems reasonable to hypothesize that understandings of teaching develop as experience accrues...(teacher educators) should understand (their) responsibility to be one of helping the learner develop rather than just change. Change is easy and can be achieved quickly...just point a gun at a teacher and you can make behavior change! But leave the room, and after 30 minutes, what endures? The focus of development implies attention to questions of timing over the longer course of modifying, refining, and differentiating understandings of phenomena which are important to the learner" (p. 63).

A strong component of the Alternative MA program was this principle of providing time for the learner to develop as she made changes in her classroom Language Arts, Reading, Literature program. Perhaps this feature helps to explain the change in beliefs and practices of the eighteen teachers who changed during the two years of the study.
Finally, one feature of the Alternative MA program which may have contributed to the changes found in the group of eighteen teachers was the expertise of the faculty members who presented the program. Both faculty members were experts in their respective fields of Language Arts, Reading and Children's Literature. Both were experienced elementary teachers and both had taught at the university level for many years. They had published widely and were involved in professional organizations to promote whole-language learning as well as Reading and Children's Literature. In addition, they both had developed and taught the Alternative undergraduate program for three years prior to the study. Thus, they were well qualified in terms of teaching experience and content-field expertise to teach the Alternative MA inservice program. Perhaps faculty expertise helps explain why eighteen of the nineteen teachers in the study carried expert ideas back to their classrooms and, a year later, were still using and expanding these ideas in their own programs.

The Teacher Who Did Not Change—A Puzzle

Mrs. Lewis, the teacher who did not change during the two years of the study, is a puzzle. Although she was not atypical of the other teachers at the beginning of the study in terms of years of teaching experience, hours of graduate study, or beliefs and practices of teaching Language Arts, she may have been atypical in areas not investigated in the study, i.e., personality, family life, self-concept, intelligence, etc. She did not seem to identify with the teaching situations of the other teachers in the study and several times expressed to the
investigator that her situation was different because she taught LBD/EMR middle-school-aged students. Although other teachers in the study also taught middle-school-aged LBD/EMR students, Mrs. Lewis perceived her situation to be different even from these teachers. She seldom carried Alternative MA activities into her classroom and was discouraged when the few activities she did try (creative writing, reading a poem aloud, asking students to make choices) were unsuccessful. Mrs. Lewis blamed her students, her fellow teacher, the school for her lack of success in adding new activities to her program. However, since she rarely attempted to add activities from the Alternative MA class, did not identify or mingle with the other teachers in the program, and rejected many ideas and activities because she could not see their relevance for her teaching situation, it is possible to speculate that Mrs. Lewis did not change beliefs or practices of teaching Language Arts or Reading or attempt to integrate these subject areas during the two years of the study because she did not fully participate in the program. She did not take advantage of the program's unique features of modeling, doing, relevance, or collegiality. She did not get to know her colleagues as learners. She did not take advantage of the unique expectation that learning takes time. She did not take advantage of the expertise of faculty. Mrs. Lewis may be the only negative case in the study because she did not really experience the Alternative MA program nor share that common experience with the teachers who did change.

The eighteen other teachers in the study did change, however. Their changes have been reported at length throughout this study. Although
they were at different "stages of development" at the beginning of the study and seemed to progress sequentially from lower to higher "stages of development" during the two years of the study, the Alternative MA program in which they participated was not designed to move them from one developmental stage to another. The intent of the MA program was to provide a time for regular classroom teachers to search out ways to make their Language Arts curriculum an integrated whole, see connections between reading, writing, speaking, listening, and to make decisions based on these interrelationships. The program attempted to achieve these goals by creating a whole-language environment where the interrelationship between reading, writing, listening, speaking, and Children's Literature was made explicit; by modeling learning and teaching in this environment and providing opportunities for teachers to experience and try out new ideas among their colleagues before taking them back to their classrooms; by helping teachers see the relevance of activities to their own situations and to theory and research in language development and learning; by giving teachers time to investigate, experiment, analyze, present, discuss, synthesize the experiences they were having; by expecting that changes would take time to become tied to theory and a change in belief; by giving teachers an opportunity to get to know each other as learners and as colleagues and to learn to trust and teach each other; and by providing expert leadership in both subject area and in whole-language teaching and learning. Because eighteen of the nineteen teachers who participated in the program changed in belief and practice of integrating Language Arts, Reading, and Literature while they were enrolled in this program during the following year, the
components or principle features of the inservice program in which they participated might be construed as being influential in promoting this change. Since this was an ethnographic, qualitative study, however, explanations for the changes found can only be hypothesized for further research.

The ethnographic research design was chosen for the study so that the kinds of changes teachers made in beliefs and practices about integrating Language Arts, Literature, and Reading over time could be discerned and described. The investigator was not interested in quantitative data obtainable by questionnaires to which teachers could respond "yes-no" or "moderately agree/disagree, strongly agree/disagree" or check off whether or not books were available in a reading corner or whether a reading corner existed in a particular classroom. The investigator was interested, instead, in the nuances of teachers' responses and the unique interpretations made by each teacher and found in each teacher's classroom. Although data from an experimental study would probably have been tidier, it would not have provided the in-depth look at teacher changes in beliefs and practices of integrating Language Arts, Reading, Literature with which the investigator was concerned. Therefore, untidy as data analyses threatened to be, the investigator deliberately chose methods of data collection already described. In-depth interviews were controlled to some extent by the order and wording of the questions. Videotapes were made at the same time of year for all teachers and at the same time of day for each teacher and used as a reference point for discussion about teacher perceptions of changes in 1980. All data was assembled, read, and analyzed for each teacher using the same systematic
procedure. Because the investigator's role as a participant observer was well-defined, the investigator was able to visit classrooms and discuss teachers' practices and beliefs with them in a non-threatening, non-evaluative way. Teachers were open and expansive in their responses.

Method of data collection, though cumbersome, seemed to result in reliable responses from teachers. For example, a teacher's response to the question "How do you teach reading?" in 1979 might have been:

"...I use the H-M basal series with three reading groups; students do the workbook assignments."

in 1980:

"...I use the H-M series for some instruction but this month we have been reading survival stories, discussing them in reading groups, and extending them with art activities, writing, and drama."

in 1981:

"...I used to teach three reading groups with the H-M series. Last year (1980) I started adding stories from different genre of literature and doing book extensions and some writing instead of workbook activities. This year (1981) I very rarely use the basal--only touch base with it occasionally to see if I've missed anything. The children read selections from children's literature and we discuss them in small groups, extend them as a class, or use them as the basis for writing our own stories."

Although the same questions were asked in the same order on three separate occasions, these occasions were separated in time by eight months and thirteen months respectively. Teachers spontaneously reported that they did not remember answering the questions before, yet their answers, though not the same every year, were internally consistent across time.

Similarly, the videotape interviews in 1980 reiterated teachers' respective responses on the 1980 questionnaire, though they were also
completed at different times in 1980 (the questionnaire interview in March, the videotape interview in April). Journal responses gave further examples and confirmation of changes teachers had reported they were struggling to make or had made on the 1980 indepth questionnaire. In addition, although videotapes were used as a basis for teacher discussion of her own perceptions of change, they also served as a visual reminder to the investigator of the teacher's classroom in 1979 and 1980. Videotapes for each teacher were reviewed by the investigator in 1981 before the final, indepth telephone interview with each teacher. Questions that occured to the investigator--such as "Do you still have that rolling cart with the Child Craft books on it?" not only elicited specific information about 1981 practices, but also lent a credibility to the investigator's purpose for the final interview.

Although all data collected was systematically analyzed in the same way for each teacher, the most productive data seemed to be from the three indepth questionnaires. Other data (teacher journals, videotapes, interviews from videotapes, field notes) confirmed, supplemented, and/or exemplified this interview data. However, by themselves, the three indepth questionnaires would probably not have revealed the richness nor complexity of response made possible by the total array of data collected for each teacher.

Future researchers interested in teacher changes over time might consider the unique use of videotape employed in this study. Although videotape has traditionally been used to evaluate teacher presentation of lessons, the ratio and content of teacher-student talk, etc., or to gather a reproducible visual and audio document of on-going classroom
activity for ethnographic analysis, videotapes have not been used for teachers to compare their own practices or provisioning over time to generate discussion about their beliefs and practices or the change in these beliefs and practices over time. The use of videotapes for this purpose enables the researcher and teacher to focus their discussion on observable, concrete events which the investigator can probe and the teacher can explain from her own point of view. The present researcher found this use of videotapes to be a valuable tool for generating and focusing discussion to reveal current, as well as former, teacher beliefs and practices of integrating Language Arts, Reading, Literature in their own classrooms.

Implications for Further Research

The present ethnographic study was able to discern and describe teacher change of beliefs and practice in a particular subject area before, during, and after the major change had taken place. The nature of the change seemed to be in the direction of the stages of development hypothesized in Teacher Growth and Development literature. In addition, teachers seemed to change, initially, by adding on new activities and practices to their already existing curricula. During the course of the two year study, however, half of the teachers continued to change by replacing (rather than merely adding on to) their former curricula. They replaced familiar curricula based on district guidelines and basal textbooks with activities similar, but not identical to, the whole-language activities they had experienced as students and had tried in their classrooms while they were participating in the Alternative MA inservice program. These teachers were neither asked
nor required to change, and the inservice program was not designed to move them from one stage of development to another. Yet these changes seemed to occur for eighteen of the nineteen teachers during the two years of the study. These findings, then, pose several questions for further research:

(1) Is the nature of change in beliefs and practices for experienced teachers one of first trying out new ideas and activities and adding them to existing curricula?

(2) Is this "adding on" process the ultimate change for some teachers or is "adding on" only the first step in the process of changing beliefs and practices for all teachers?

(3) Is the process of change one of trying out, adding on, refining and replacing the old with the new?

(4) Is the process of change related to or enhanced by the teacher's perception of herself as a learner?

(5) Do teachers' perceptions of their own change influence the kinds of changes they are willing or able to make in their own classrooms?

(6) Do the unique features or principles of modeling, doing, relevancy, collegiality, time, and expertise of faculty cause experienced teachers to change beliefs and practices of teaching in their own classrooms? Which features are most influential?

(7) Can inservice programs based on the principles of modeling, relevance, collegiality, time, and expertise of faculty cause experienced teachers to change beliefs and practices of teaching subject areas other than Elementary Language Arts, Literature, and Reading?
The answers to these questions can be addressed by further research of qualitative and quantitative nature. If the nature of change for all experienced teachers is indeed one of trying out, adding on, reflecting and refining, and replacing old with the new, and if it can be established that inservice programs built on principles of modeling, doing, relevancy, collegiality, time and presenter expertise, then using this knowledge and these principles, teacher educators will be able to design and implement inservice education programs which teachers will find relevant, challenging, and helpful as they search for ways to make long-lasting changes in their beliefs and practices in their classrooms. Teacher Inservice Education research has been limited in the past to describing inservice programs and delivery systems for these programs. Even the research on Teacher Growth and Development seems to be aimed at providing a rationale for those inservice programs which already exist. The findings and questions raised by the present research suggest that teacher educators might do well to investigate the nature of change among experienced teachers and the possible causes for this change as they can be reproduced in Inservice Education Programs. If long-lasting changes in beliefs and practices of experienced teachers is the aim of Inservice Education, and if programs such as the one experienced by the teachers in this study can be found to cause these long-lasting changes, then programs such as the one described as the Alternative MA program might serve as a useful model for future inservice and teacher education programs in other subject areas.
APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF ORAL PRESENTATION
SUMMARY OF ORAL PRESENTATION

I am investigating how teachers change in their beliefs and practices as they attempt to integrate Language Arts, Reading and Literature in their classrooms. I would like you to participate in the study. Whether or not you participate will have no bearing on your standing or evaluation in the Alternative Masters program. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to fill out two fairly lengthy open-ended questionnaires, one in October, the other in March. I will also videotape your classroom in October and March and interview you about the content of these video tapes. Each tape will be about 15 minutes. In May I will contact you by telephone for a final open-ended interview. Oral interviews will be audio recorded and transcribed for analysis. I will also ask you to keep a journal of your thoughts, frustrations, accomplishments during the year as you begin to integrate Language Arts, Reading, and Literature in your classrooms. All information and responses will be confidential. Your responses and videotapes will be identifiable only by a research number. Your name will not appear on any records nor in the final report. Audio and video tapes will be destroyed when the analysis of data is complete.
APPENDIX B

INDEPTH INTERVIEW

1979, 1980, 1981*

Grade level presently teaching: ______________
Age range of children: _______________
Hours of graduate work completed:
  Course Work in Reading:
    Language Arts: __________
    Literature: __________
    Other: ______________
Do you work with other adults in the classroom? ______________

1. What do you teach as part of Language Arts?
2. What are the goals or objectives of your Language Arts program?
4. How do you evaluate children's oral and written language?
5. How do you integrate Language Arts instruction with Reading and/or Literature?
6. How do you teach reading in your classroom?
7. How do you think children learn to read?
8. What kinds of activities do you feel are most important for reading instruction?
9. How much time do your students spend in classroom reading every day? Specify type.
10. How much time do you spend reading to your class everyday?
11. What have you read to your class this year?
12. How do you help children "get into" a book?
13. How do you help children extend or celebrate a book?
14. How do you use the school library or public library in your reading/literature/language arts program?
15. What kind of books do you have in your classroom book collection?
19. If you had the opportunity to take an extended period of time off for learning, what would you want to learn about? How would you go about it?

20. What advice would you give to the teacher who gets your class next year?

21. What excites you about teaching?

22. What kinds of outside pressures inhibit you from teaching the way you want to teach?

23. What kind of physical movement do your children engage in during regular class time?

24. How do you group children for instruction?

25. What kinds of talk do your children engage in during regular class time?


27. How do you find out about a student's abilities, aptitudes, achievements, failures? What gives you the most reliable information?

28. Have you made any changes in your teaching practices, thinking, attitudes since last year? To what do you attribute this change?

*The May, 1981 Indepth Interview added the tag question "Has this changed since last year? How? Why?" after each question.
APPENDIX C

EXAMPLE OF JOURNAL ENTRY

WITH INVESTIGATOR COMMENTS
SAMPLE JOURNAL ENTRY

October 29, 1979 Monday.

It is so amazing to see so many of these ideas taking off so well. Today, first thing, we went to the library. We took the card file along that the children are making on their own--several children used it to find books. I am surprised at the number of children that are now reading the same book as I am for SSR--I think many teachers do not realize the importance of their own model during SSR--if they sit and grade papers or don't seem interested in their book the children pick up on this.

November 9

Friday, November 9

Made tissue paper collages today.

Instead of writing we shared them--talked about the colors, the shapes, etc. Children were really sharing a lot of ideas with each other.
APPENDIX D

LETTER TO SUBJECTS, APRIL, 1981
Dear

Greetings from a long-silent Ph.D. Candidate from Charlotte and Sharon’s special MA Language Arts/Literature program 1979-1980. I’m happy to report that, after a year of classroom teaching (pre-school and kindergarten), I am once again in pursuit of my dissertation topic—Teacher Change and Development. Once again, I would like to ask a favor of you. Ready?

Remember the videotapes?
Remember the questionnaires?

Well, I’m trying to sift through them all and come up with something sensible. But I need more help. I need to talk to you again about your experiences this year—to see if they relate to your experiences last year. Can you help me?

I propose a phone call—which I will tape with a little recording device on my phone—and then transcribe (without your name). I think this will take about 45 minutes. Are you willing? If so, could you send back the enclosed post card with your phone number and the most convenient time to call. I’ll try to call you during that time. I’ve managed to get the month of May off from my teaching job—so I’ll call you within the next couple of weeks. Thanks.

One of these days this will all be over. Thanks again for your help.

Sincerely,

Leslie Mass
APPENDIX E

CHILDREN'S BOOKS MENTIONED IN THE STUDY
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