2-1-1993

Assessment: Insights Into Teachers' Beliefs and Practices

Sally E. Lipa
SUNY at Geneseo

Rebecca Harlin
SUNY at Buffalo

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
Dorothy J. McGinnis
Reading Center and Clinic

Assessment: Insights Into Teachers' Beliefs and Practices

Sally E. Lipa
Rebecca Harlin

It is well established that instruction in process writing is important from the primary grades through the high school years. The work of Graves (1983) and Calkins (1986) provides teachers with a theoretical framework for implementing process writing instruction. However, wide variation in translating theory into practice is evident among teachers (Mangano and Allen, 1986; Bridge, Hiebert and Chesky, 1983). Research reveals that teachers seem to maintain their preset notions about writing conventions such as correct spelling, proper grammar and neatness while attempting to incorporate process writing into the curriculum (Ray, Lee and Stansell, 1986). Thus, teachers' conceptualizations seem to affect the way writing is taught (Bridge, Hiebert and Chesky, 1983).

Earlier studies examined teacher beliefs about writing. Three main points can be determined from these studies: 1) teacher reports regarding classroom practice can be depended on to be accurate (Bridge, Hiebert and Chesky, 1983); 2) there is a relationship between teacher beliefs, instructional practice and their impact on student perceptions (Fear, Anderson, Englert and Raphael, 1988); and 3) there is wide variation in teaching writing among teachers. These studies revealed baseline information about teacher

beliefs and instructional practices in writing as well as the need for further in-depth research. They also indicated that additional research is needed using larger samples. Mangano and Allen (1986) recommend that assessment instruments such as interviews be used for data gathering rather than a point scale technique.

Interviews have several advantages as assessment instruments. The interviewer brings expertise to the interview and reduces the likelihood of ambiguity in questions and responses. Individuals' perceptions, attitudes and opinions can be clarified. Festinger and Katz (1953) state "...if the focal data for a research project are the attitudes and perceptions of individuals, the most direct and often the most fruitful approach is to ask the individuals themselves." In the field of reading, interviews have long been recognized as assessment techniques regarding teachers' practices and beliefs (Harste and Burke, 1977; Duffy and Metheny, 1979; Fear, Anderson, Englert, and Raphael, 1988). Interview data have been instrumental in linking instructional practices with teacher beliefs (Swanson-Owens, 1986), teachers' knowledge structure and their organization of those structures (Johnson, 1986), and their philosophical beliefs (Harste and Burke, 1977). For these reasons it was decided to use an interview approach to data gathering.

The recent trend towards process writing has received attention in language arts, reading and English professional journals, professional educational conferences and workshops. Preservice and inservice teachers in some geographic areas have received instruction in the teaching of process writing. New York and California have adopted a process writing approach for school use. Other states such as Florida, Vermont, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Wisconsin and Michigan support process writing in

elementary and secondary classrooms. The effect of state support for instructional practices in process writing, including the effect on teachers' beliefs, is not known. This study was undertaken to investigate teachers' attitudes, beliefs and instructional decisions about process writing.

Method

A 19-item interview schedule, *Teachers' Concepts About Writing*, was developed by Lipa and Harlin (1988) to record and assess teachers' statements regarding their 1) beliefs and understandings of process writing; 2) their instructional decisions for teaching writing; and 3) the training and support within their school system. The interview form was administered by a trained group of graduate students from reading education courses to a sample of 66 teachers, grades K-7, teaching in urban, suburban and rural schools in western New York state. Responses to questions were analyzed based on the above three categories: A) teachers' beliefs and understanding; B) instructional decisions for writing; and C) training and support for teaching process writing. Category A responses were coded as *primarily process emphasis* or *skills emphasis* responses. Category B responses were coded primarily as *management emphasis, instructional emphasis* and/or *motivation emphasis* responses. Category C responses were coded as *yes/no*, and *much, some, little*.

Questions based on the three categories were developed for the interview instrument. Teacher responses to each of the questions were read by four evaluators and coded as Category A, process/skills emphasis; Category B, management/instructional/motivation emphasis; Category C, yes/no or much, some, none responses. Consensus of the four evaluators was needed before an answer was coded as belonging in one of the responses categories. For

example, Question 3A (*What does a good writer do?*) was analyzed based on process vs. skills emphasis responses. Answers that reflected the thinking, ideas and creativity of a writer were coded as process responses; answers that reflected the mechanics of writing such as punctuation and grammar were coded as skills based responses.

Responses to Category B, instructional decisions for writing, were coded as primarily management/instruction/motivation. For example, Question 1B (*What is the hardest part about teaching process writing?*) was analyzed based on management, instructional and motivation emphases. Answers that reflected time and organization problems were coded as management responses; answers that reflected direct instructional procedures were coded as instructional emphases responses. Skills vs. process responses in this category were based on the same characteristics for Category A.

Responses to Category C, training and support for the teaching of process writing, required direct responses of positive/negative; much/some/none and percent of respondents replying to specific choices. The answers to these questions clearly belonged in one of the designated response modes.

Results and discussion
Results were based on 19 questions; nine in Category A, seven in Category B, and three in Category C. Frequency tabulations were transformed to percentages for consistency in reporting. The appendix shows the percentage of responses to the questions in Category A, *Teachers' Understandings and Beliefs About Writing.*

Category A. What are teachers' beliefs and under-
standings about writing? The results shown in the Appendix
revealed that most of the teachers in this sample (94 per-
cent) understood that writing was a communication act, a
process, in which thoughts, ideas and feelings were ex-
pressed on paper. This viewpoint was supported by the
teacher responses to other questions in this category.
Questions which asked *What does a good writer do*; *What is
the hardest part about writing*; *What is the easiest part about
writing*; *What is a child's intent when he draws and labels a
picture* and whether teachers revise their writing were
answered as process based responses by more than 60
percent of the respondents.

A second major question in Category A included show-
ing teachers an emergent form of scribble writing, and ask-
ing them if this was writing. Primary and intermediate grade
teachers differed as a group in their response to this ques-
tion with 70 percent of the primary teachers indicating that
scribble was writing and did communicate an author's mes-
sage. Intermediate grade teachers were not as sure with 40
percent stating scribble was writing; 37 percent indicating it
wasn't writing. Clearly, there was a difference between pri-
mary and intermediate grade teachers' perceptions of what
constitutes writing. Training and experiences with process
writing may have helped broaden some views about scrib-
ble writing but many intermediate grade teachers view writ-
ing as legible letters with understandable content.

Another question within Category A was *How is pro-
cess writing different from traditional writing?* The answers
differed considerably with almost equal numbers reporting
about process writing in skill based terms, process based
terms and others stating that they didn't know how they dif-
fered. At first glance responses such as "process writing

has steps which *have* to be taught in sequential order" seemed like a process response. Responses such as "It is a series of steps which takes time and evaluation at each step" led to further analysis. Many respondents view process writing as *going through* and *completing steps* but miss the holistic nature of the process. These answers were considered skill based because the respondents appeared to have partitioned the concept of process writing into several discrete, linear steps, to be taught as separate steps out of the context of writing.

Another question/response of interest was *How do you (the teacher) know when a piece of writing is finished?* More than 50 percent of the teachers responded with a process based statement, e.g., *when the message is complete, when I can't make it any better.* However, these same teachers changed their responses when asked *How do your students know when a piece of writing that they are working on is finished?* Seventy-two percent of these teachers answered with a skills based response for their students. Some comments included the following: *if it's OK'd by the teacher; when the first draft is written; when you come to the end of the page; when the five steps are completed.* This suggests the need to examine whether teachers understand the concept of process writing or whether they are reifying the concept by teaching process writing as a skill.

In summary, most of the responses in this category reflected an understanding of writing to be a communication act. This was stated whether teachers responded to additional questions with a skills or process based emphases. Interesting shifts in responses to additional questions were noted suggesting that many teachers translate their beliefs and understanding about writing, viewing it as a procedural, skills based communication act.

Category B. The second major category addressed in this interview, *What are teachers' instructional decisions and practices in teaching writing* reflects the individual attitudes of teachers within their own classrooms.

Forty percent of the teachers responded that managing process writing was the hardest part of teaching writing, while 55 percent selected instruction, namely one of the steps — e.g., *conferencing*, as the hardest part. At the same time, instructional practices were also identified as the easiest parts of teaching process writing. Several stages/steps identified by some teachers as the hardest part of teaching writing were identified by others as the easiest. One item, *motivation*, stood out as the easiest part of teaching process writing. Individual differences were paramount in responses to this question. Broadly speaking, different aspects of instruction and management represented the diversity of teacher responses.

Teachers expressed their writing beliefs as well as their instructional decisions in their responses to the question, *If you were going to teach someone to write, what is the first thing you should do?* These answers, coded as skills/process, revealed that 67 percent of the teachers responded with a process response, e.g., *get them to talk*; *get ideas*; *think*; *read to them*; *model writing*. These responses seem to be consistent with the overall beliefs of this sample about writing.

Teachers reported that they included a scheduled writing time during the day. Fifty-seven percent of the teachers provided from one-half hour to an hour or more time for writing each day. Including writing time in the instructional plan suggests that instruction in process writing has influenced teachers' curricular decisions. Given that 67

percent of the teachers reported that their children spent the writing time doing process writing activities (e.g., journal writing, writing folders, personal writing, writing workshop) also suggests that teachers are engaging children in writing activities that are considered aspects of process writing.

A majority of the teachers (59 percent) reported that they also engage in personal writing or instruct children during writing time. Of concern is the 24 percent of the teachers who engage in routine clerical or reading group teaching during writing time. Customary practices are still followed by many teachers as they assign independent work time for children while they engage in clerical duties.

To summarize Category B, teachers' decisions and instructional practices reflect a strong tendency toward process writing activities. Approximately 25 percent of the teachers remain management or skills driven in their instructional practices. However, movement seems to be toward process writing strategies being implemented in the classroom. The information from the teachers interviewed in this sample suggests that teachers know what teaching strategies to use and understand the time needed for process instruction. As noted earlier, many of these concepts seem to be understood as skills or instructional formats developing out of a theoretical construct.

Category C. The final major question, *What is the extent of the training and support for teaching process writing within schools?* reveals that 92 percent of the respondents had received some form of training in process writing. The major learning came from 1) inservice workshops; 2) undergraduate classes; 3) graduate classes; 4) conferences; and 5) professional journals. Generally, teachers were positive about teaching process writing with 61

percent stating their enthusiasm for it. Negative responses represented some fears or relcutance by teachers to instruct in a process that they didn't fully understand. Many of the *don't know* responses revealed that they were not asked to teach process writing in their classrooms. This was a surprising answer, since New York state's syllabus presents the teacher with theory as well as instructional practices in process writing.

Fifty-two percent of the teachers reported a highly supportive school system (superintendent, principal, reading teacher or classroom teacher). This support was considered a very positive aspect of their training and, in part, responsible for their positive attitude. Note that 48 percent of the group reports *some/none* or just *doesn't know* if they are supported.

Summary and conclusions

Several conclusions can be drawn from these data. Most importantly, teachers seem to understand that writing is primarily a communication act. This was evident whether or not they had instruction in process writing or knew how process writing differed from traditional writing. The teachers in this sample were sophisticated in that most had received instruction in process writing and used strategies associated with process writing for instruction. Analysis of the responses suggested that teachers' instructional decisions often represented a skills translation of process writing. These teachers seem to confuse the concept of process writing with instructional sequences. Calkins (1986) described process writing as a "process of craft" (p. 16). This sample of teachers appeared to identify and label the processes involved in writing as if they were fixed and linear. Yet in practice writers can use all elements of the process at different moments, or at the same moment (Grasser, 1983).

Teachers in this sample may be confusing the concept of process writing with several instructional skill sequences.

Many responses seem to pattern textbook or popular statements about writing rather than the teachers' own thinking. The data suggests that teachers may be experiencing levels of depth in their understanding of process writing which, in turn, may affect their instructional practices. Apparently, understanding and teaching writing process develops over time. First, a knowledge base provides an awareness of theory, principle, etc. With time and practice a skill level of understanding and implementation develops; finally, there is a refinement, integration and/or translation between theory and instructional delivery. Johnson (1986) writes, "What influences teacher thought and action is the interplay between the context and the teachers' evolving organization of knowledge rather than their beliefs."

The teachers in this sample appear to be progressing toward a level of integration between theory and instructional delivery. Teachers' beliefs and understandings about process writing do appear to reflect their instructional decisions. Does instructional and school support help a teacher learn new concepts and translate theory into instruction practice? Apparently, yes.

References
Bridge, C., Hiebert, E., & Chesky, J. (1983). Classroom writing practices. In J. Niles & L. Harris (Eds.), *Searching for meaning in reading/language processing and instruction.* 32nd Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Rochester NY: National Reading Conference.
Calkins, L.M. (1986). *The art of teaching writing.* Portsmouth NH: Heinemann.
Duffy, G., & Metheny, W. (1979). *Measuring teachers' beliefs about reading (Research Series No. 41).* East Lansing MI: Michigan State University Institute for Research on Teaching.
Fear, K., Anderson, L., Englert, C., & Raphael, T. (1988). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and instruction and students' conceptions about the writing process. In J. Readance & S. Baldwin (Eds.), *Research in*

literacy: Merging perspectives. 36th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Rochester NY: National Reading Conference.

Festinger, L., & Katz, D. (1953). *Research methods in the behavioral sciences.* NY: Dryden.

Grasser, E. (1983). *Teaching writing: A process approach.* Dubuque IA: Kendall Hunt.

Graves, D. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work.* Portsmouth NH: Heinemann.

Harste, J., & Burke, C. (1977). A new hypothesis for reading teacher re-search: Both the teaching and learning of reading is theoretically based. In P.D. Pearson (Ed.), *Reading theory, research and practice,* 32-40. NY: Mason.

Johnson, J. (1986). The relationship between preservice teachers' instruc-tion of reading and their emerging conceptions of reading. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 20,* 159-165.

Lipa, S., & Harlin, R. (1988). *Teachers' concepts about writing.* Unpublished interview.

Mangano, N., & Allen, J. (1986). Teachers' beliefs about language arts and their effect on student beliefs and instruction. In J. Niles & R. Lalik (Eds.), *Solving problems in literacy: Learners, teachers and researchers.* 35th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Rochester NY: National Reading Conference.

Swanson-Owens, D. (1986). Identifying natural sources of resistance: A case study for implementing writing across the curriculum. *Research in the Teaching of English, 20,* 69-97.

Ray, K.L., Lee, S.C., & Stansell, J.C. (1986). New methods, old theories, and teacher education: Some observations of writing in a third grade class-room. In J.A. Niles & R.V. Lalik (Eds.), *Solving problems in literacy: Learners, teachers and researchers.* 35th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Rochester NY: National Reading Conference.

Sally E. Lipa is a faculty member in Reading Education at SUNY at Geneseo, Geneseo New York. Rebecca Harlin is a faculty member in the Department of Elementary Reading and Education at SUNY at Buffalo, Buffalo New York.

Further information about this research will be presented in a second article by Lipa and Harlin, "Assessment: Insights into children's beliefs and perceptions about process writing," which will appear in the next issue of *Reading Horizons.*

Appendix

Category A
Understandings and Beliefs About Writing

1A. What is writing?

Skills Based Response	Process Based Response	DK
6%	94%	0

Process response: Writing is for communication, e.g., putting ideas and thoughts on paper for someone to read.

2A. How is process writing different from traditional writing?

Skills Based Response	Process Based Response	DK
36%	34%	28%

Skills response: A new name for reworking compositions; process writing includes steps which are taught separately.

Process response: Process writing includes writing and editing rather than grammar; ideas to skills rather than skills to ideas; individual and developmental; emphasis is on "how to" rather than on product; child-centered rather than teacher-centered; more interesting.

3A. What does a good writer do?

Skills Based Response	Process Based Response	DK
9%	71%	18%

Skills response: Incorporates skills such as punctuation, grammar; uses the mechanics of writing; neat; uses a writing checklist; looks words up in the dictionary.

Process response: A good writer has good ideas, good vocabulary, polishes one's ideas; has a sense of audience; has clarity of thought and expression; is a risk taker; a good observer, good reader, good listener.

4A. (Show scribble writing) Is this writing? Why/why not?

Primary Teachers	Intermediate Teachers	
Yes 70%; No 8%; DK 22%	Yes 40%; No 37%; DK 23%	

Skills Based Response	Process Based Response	DK
24%	62%	14%

Skills response: Not decipherable; doesn't say anything; not writing.

Process response: It's an attempt to communicate; express ideas; communicate for a special audience.

5A. (Show drawn picture with labeling) What is this writer trying to do?

Skills Based Response	Process Based Response	DK
12%	72%	15%

Skills response: Get attention; identify objects, spell.

Process response: Describe the picture; illustrate feelings; express oneself visually and with words; clarify, tell a story.

6A. What is the hardest part about writing?

Skills Based Response	Process Based Response	DK
32%	56%	12%

Skills response: Rules and grammar; physical coordination; edit, final copy.
Process response: Organizing, getting the ideas, finding topics; communication/using the right words; creativity.

7A. What is the easiest part about writing?

Skills Based Response	Process Based Response	DK
18%	67%	15%

Skills response: Mechanics/penmanship; outlining ideas; editing; final copy.
Process response: Personal writing; getting ideas (pre-writing); maintaining the main ideas; expressing oneself; first draft; publishing and sharing.

8A. Do you ever revise your writing?

Teacher	Student
Yes 94%; No 4%	Yes 71%; No 24%

9A. How do you know when a piece of writing is finished?

Teacher Skills Response	Teacher Process Response
41%	59%
Child Skills Response	Child Process Response
72%	28%

Teacher skills response: The End, Sincerely, sign, tired of it; corrections made.
Teacher process response: Reread and it's acceptable; last section has closure; message is complete; can't make it any better; confident and pleased/satisfied.
Child skills response: It's ok'd by teacher, don't know, first draft is written; if it's written they're done; come to the end of the page; looks long enough; completed the five steps.
Child's process response: Message is complete; if writing makes sense.

Category B
Instructional Decisions

1B. What is the hardest part about *teaching* process writing?
Management 40%; Instruction 55%; DK 5%
Management response: Very time consuming activity; organizing the classroom; giving up control/being an observer; lessening student inhibitions about writing.
Instruction response: Conferencing; revision; organizing thoughts; first draft; teaching children to go through steps; phonic applications.

2B. What is the easiest part about teaching process writing?
Management 7%; Instruction 49%; Motivation 38%; DK 8%
Management response: Process writing is organized and sequential (easy to teach); less planning and more repetition; more individuality/less grouping.

Instruction response: Prewriting and brainstorming is the easiest part about teaching process writing; writing the first draft; the sharing experience.
Motivation: Motivating children is the easiest part of teaching process writing.

3B. If you were going to teach someone to write, what is the first thing you should do? Why?

Skills Based Response	Process Based Response	DK
27%	67%	6%

Skills response: Teach words and objects; teach letters of the alphabet; teach the basics; teach reading.
Process response: Help them get ideas/talk/brainstorm/think; read to them; saturate them with others' writing; teach them to observe; interest them; model/write for them to show them how.

4B. Do you revise your writing? Do your students revise their writing?

Teachers	Students
Yes 94%; No 6%	Yes 71%; No 24%

5B. How much time do your students spend writing during the day?
Less than 1/2 hour 14%; 1/2 - 1 hour 27%; + 1 hour 30%; DK 15%

6B. How do they spend their writing time?
Workbook/Skills 18%; Process Activities 67%; Content Subjects 9%; DK 6%

7B. What do you do during regularly scheduled writing time?
Conference 35%; Write 24%; Other (Attendance, etc.) 24%
Conference response: Circulate to see what children are doing; guide them; listen; help them get ideas.
Writing: Teacher writes himself/herself to model; responds to children's journals.
Other: Lunch money; attendance; reading groups; teach printing; give extra help; check workbooks; "We do whole language instead."

Category C
What training is available for the
teaching of process writing?

1C. How do you feel when your school district asks you to teach process writing?
Positive 61%; Negative 11%; DK28%

2C. How much support have you gotten for implementing process writing?
Much 52%; Some 20%; None 15%; DK 12%

3C. Where did you learn about process writing?
Ninety two (92) respondents answered that they had information on process writing: a) undergraduate classes 33%; b) graduate classes 33%; c) preservice workshops 3%; d) inservice workshops 36%; e) student teaching 3%; f) professional journal 24%; g) conference 20%; h) no information 8%.