



1997

## Conversations with Evolving Whole Language Teachers: A Three-Year Follow-Up Case Study of a Whole Language Professional Development Program for Chapter 1 Teachers

Kristen Allen Ross  
*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_theses](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Ross, Kristen Allen, "Conversations with Evolving Whole Language Teachers: A Three-Year Follow-Up Case Study of a Whole Language Professional Development Program for Chapter 1 Teachers" (1997). *Master's Theses*. 4222.

[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_theses/4222](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/4222)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).  
Copyright © 1997 Kristen Allen Ross

## ABSTRACT

Kristen Allen Ross

Loyola University Chicago

CONVERSATIONS WITH EVOLVING WHOLE LANGUAGE TEACHERS:

A THREE-YEAR FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF A WHOLE LANGUAGE  
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR CHAPTER 1 TEACHERS

A year-long professional development training was provided for Chapter 1 teachers during the 1991-92 school year by an Illinois Educational Service Center. This training presented Whole Language research and beliefs, as well as instructional strategies. The training included experiential learning, professional reading, reflective planning, implementation of strategies, cognitive coaching, reflection journals and teacher collaboration.

Three years later, each participant that had remained in education was interviewed regarding the continued practice of Whole Language instruction, and what factors influenced the level of practice. If the participants believed that they had continued to use Whole Language instruction, triangulation was completed by comparing beliefs and strategies presented in 1991 with interview

responses and classroom observations which were made in 1995.

Fourteen participants were interviewed in 1995 and eight were observed. Of these, seven were substantiated practitioners. Their case studies provide insights as to what influences long term classroom transfer of educational innovations as complex as Whole Language.

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

CONVERSATIONS WITH EVOLVING WHOLE LANGUAGE TEACHERS:  
A THREE-YEAR FOLLOW-UP CASE STUDY OF A WHOLE LANGUAGE  
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR CHAPTER 1  
TEACHERS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES

BY  
KRISTEN ALLEN ROSS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JANUARY 1997

Copyright by Kristen Allen Ross, 1997  
All rights reserved

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study is a collection of conversations with educators who aspired to be Whole Language teachers. Their love of learning, desire to continually grow professionally, and willingness to experience the challenges that educational change provides was exemplified by their commitment to the professional development program that extended over an entire school year. In addition, three years later each participant was willing to be interviewed, and in several cases observed, in order to share what might be learned by her individual change process. The participants were excited to share their educational beliefs and practices with me, and interested in hearing the results of this study. I greatly appreciate the time, energy, and love of education that each one shared with me during this process.

I believe that I was drawn to study educators with these values because love of learning, desire to continually improve, and willingness to experience challenges have been an important part of my life. These values were taught to me by my parents, Ann and Alexander Kalnes. I have sought to teach them to my daughters, Julie and Jennifer. They are attributes that brought my husband, Jesse, and I together,

and they are qualities I share with my dear friend, Helene. In turn, my mother, my husband and my friend have been a source of support and encouragement as I worked to complete this study.

I have found many people in the course of this study, who have been willing to share ideas, titles of books, suggestions and advice because they, too, are members of the community of learners. Some of the many people who have been willing to help are: Bruce Fraser, Jack Barshinger, Don Morrison, Terry Shoemaker, James Gay, Roger Chesswas, Guy Todnem, Christine Hibbard, Mark McDonald, and Sherry Eagle. Each one of these educators provided me with a suggestion or direction that I was able to use and modify to fit my needs.

I also appreciated the help that Ellen Hathaway provided in the editing process. She accepted the challenge of this learning process and helped me with formatting and layout.

The most significant person in the process of completing this study has been Dr. Jane Davidson. She is herself, a Whole Language practitioner and a member of the community of learners known as the Fierce Eagles. She has been advisor to many doctoral candidates and is responsible for creating the professional development program that was studied here. Her involvement in the professional growth and development of educators is so extensive it is difficult

to document. She continually challenged me, as she has many others, to produce nothing less than the best that I was capable of. Her insights, revision suggestions, probing questions, and encouragement were invaluable. I feel proud to be a small part of her doctoral family tree.

In addition to support and encouragement, my husband provided me with technical support that was invaluable. His knowledge and skill with computers made it possible to complete this final document.

Lastly, I appreciate the work of my advisor and dissertation director, Dr. Max Bailey, and my committee member, Dr. Art Safer. I have worked with the Loyola University committee members for five years as I completed course work, comprehensive exams, and dissertation study. They have maintained the standards that traditionally have been a part of the Loyola doctoral program. I appreciate the contribution they have made to the completion of this doctoral study.



## VITA

The author, Kristen Allen Ross, was born in Chicago, Illinois.

Ms. Ross received the Bachelor of Science in Education degree from Western Illinois University in 1977. She completed a Master of Education in Reading at Northern Illinois University in 1983. During the summer of 1984, she was awarded a National Endowment of Humanities Grant to attend Bradley University. Studies were completed to earn a Secondary English Certificate in 1986.

While completing the K-12 Reading Specialist Certificate Program at Northern Illinois University, she was nominated and selected for membership in Kappa Delta Pi (International Honor Society in Education), Alpha Upsilon Alpha (Honor Society for the International Reading Association), and Phi Delta Kappa (Professional Fraternity in Education).

In 1993, as Chair of the Illinois Reading Association's Governmental Relations Committee, she was selected to participate in a Forum on the Reauthorization of Chapter 1 conducted by the International Reading Association in Washington D.C.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	iii
VITA .....	vi

## Chapter

1. CASE STUDY OF SUSAN ROBERTS, PARTICIPANT K ..	1
Observation Vignette .....	1
Background Information .....	5
1991-1992 Reflections .....	7
1995 Interview .....	13
2. OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY .....	21
Background .....	22
Purpose of the Study .....	25
Significance of the Study .....	26
Design and Method .....	29
Procedure .....	31
Definition of Terms .....	35
Assumptions and Limitations .....	37
3. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND INDIVIDUAL CASE STUDY OF SUBSTANTIATED WHOLE LANGUAGE PRACTITIONER .....	40
Whole Language Background .....	41
Chapter 1/Title 1 Historical Background .....	51
Case Study of Participant F .....	57
4. CBAM, EBCM, CHANGE PROCESS, AND AN UNSUBSTANTIATED PRACTITIONER AND NONPRACTITIONER .....	79
Concerns-Based Adoption Model: Concerns and Use .....	79
Efficacy-Based Change Model .....	85
Change Process .....	89
Case Study of Sandra Grant - Participant C .	106
Case Study of Mary Nichols - Participant I .	117
Summary of Participants C and I .....	129

5.	PEER COACHING, STAGES OF CAREER, AND THE NONPRACTITIONERS .....	131
	Peer Coaching .....	131
	Age and Stage of Career .....	140
	Case Study of Participant D .....	145
	Case Study of Participant L .....	157
6.	CROSS GROUP ANALYSIS .....	170
	Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) .....	170
	Efficacy-Based Change Model (EBCM) .....	177
	Change Process .....	181
	Peer/Cognitive Coaching .....	193
	Age and Stage of Career .....	199
	Summary .....	201
7.	A SEARCH FOR UNDERSTANDING .....	204
	Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) .....	204
	Efficacy-Based Change Model .....	207
	Change Process .....	209
	Peer/Cognitive Coaching .....	212
	Age and Stage of Career .....	213
	Format of the Training .....	215
	Questions for Further Research .....	217
	Summary .....	218
APPENDIX		
A.	PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT .....	226
B.	STRUCTURED INTERVIEW BACKGROUND QUESTIONS ..	227
C.	QUALITATIVE RESEARCH QUESTIONS FOR PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWS .....	228
D.	WHOLE LANGUAGE TEACHING CONTINUUM .....	230
E.	TRIANGULATION CHART .....	231
	REFERENCES .....	220

## CHAPTER 1

### CASE STUDY OF SUSAN ROBERTS, PARTICIPANT K

#### Observation Vignette

The small Chapter 1 classroom has a large Mrs. Wishy Washy book leaning in one corner. Bulletin boards have children's modeled stories of Mrs. Wishy Washy on display. A computer is on another table, and several racks of books are around the walls. A visual sweep around the room reveals print everywhere - big books, small books, student writing, student-generated charts, signs about checking out books - a print-rich environment.

Four third grade girls are sitting at a child-sized, kidney-shaped table. Their teacher, Mrs. Roberts, sits at a corner of the table rather than at the central focal point. One of the students had been absent yesterday when the writing project began, so Mrs. Roberts asks the others to explain to their returning classmate, Tanesha, what they are to do. After the explanation, Mrs. Roberts asks Tanesha to explain what she just heard, so Mrs. Roberts knows whether Tanesha understands the assignment. As Tanesha talks, Mrs. Roberts interjects comments, "Where the story is.... What's the big word for that? ... Setting, that's right."

After it is clear that Tanesha understands, the teacher asks if anyone wants to read what she has written so far. One of the girls who was in class yesterday responds, "Do you want me to read this? (She holds up the brainstorm list done for pre-writing.) Or this?" (She holds up the paper on which she has begun to write her story.) Her classmates respond, "The story." The girl proudly reads her story out loud.

"Where did you get that start?" Mrs. Roberts queries. The student goes to a book and shows the opening of the story that she modeled. It had a rhyming beginning with "1,2,3,...4,5,6." The rest of the group discusses her story, which involves an aunt receiving a marriage proposal and eventually marrying. The girls talk about getting married before having a baby. Mrs. Roberts reinforces that the best plan is to get engaged, get married, and then have a baby. As the students have been relating both the stories they read and the stories they write to their own lives, Mrs. Roberts has tried to reinforce choices that will allow them the best chance to succeed, both academically and in life. After the brief discussion on life choices, she asks if there are any questions before everyone begins work on their writing. As there are no questions, she offers to work with Tanesha to help her get started. Mrs. Roberts moves to a corner of the table with Tanesha. The other three girls reread their stories and continue the writing

process they began the day before.

Tanesha and Mrs. Roberts have a prewriting conference during which they discuss the need to have a problem and a solution in every story. The students have learned story elements from the books they have read. They have talked about setting, characters, plot and problems during other process writing experiences. The stories the girls are writing currently are modeled after an "auntie" story, so Mrs. Roberts asks where Tanesha would like auntie to go. The student responds, "Come here to school."

"Where would she go here at school?"

"Come into this class." By using this questioning strategy, Mrs. Roberts talks with Tanesha about character, setting, and problem. Tanesha decides auntie will have a peanut butter and hamburger sandwich. Mrs. Roberts asks who will like this sandwich that Tanesha describes as "nasty." Tanesha responds that auntie will. Mrs. Roberts asks what the solution to the problem will be. Tanesha doesn't know and wants Mrs. Roberts to come up with one. Mrs. Roberts turns to the rest of the group and asks, "What's the solution to Tanesha's problem?"

The rest of the group says in unison, "You figure it out, Tanesha."

This is stated as a matter of fact. Clearly the group knows that no one gives answers or solutions to others - that everyone has to figure things out on their own.

Tanesha is well on her way to catching up with the rest of the group, so Mrs. Roberts moves on to see how everyone else is doing.

Felicia is trying to figure out her story and is stumped. Mrs. Roberts says, "Play it in your mind like a movie. See if that helps you to decide what should happen next or what isn't working right."

Another girl reads her story out loud to Mrs. Roberts. Mrs. Roberts comments, "Hmm, that doesn't make sense. What can we do to fix it? Let's read it again." Mrs. Roberts points out a character who was never mentioned before. She asks if the character is important to the wedding, and if not, is it important to keep it in the story. They discuss the wedding proposal, and Mrs. Roberts asks if the student knows what "propose" means. The student says that it means getting flowers and a ring. Mrs. Roberts wonders if the character in the story would get a normal ring. The student decides the ring should be shaped like a fish or clam to go along with the character. This student asks how you spell engage.

Mrs. Roberts responds, "How do you think? What does it start with? "En" like ten. "Gage" is like "cage." "En" plus "gage" would be spelled...?"

It's time for the girls to put their writing papers in their folders and check out any books they want to take home that night to read. The Chapter 1 class with these four

*girls is over.*

### Background Information

The preceding ethnographic summary was an observation of Susan Roberts' Chapter 1 class completed in May 1995. The observation was conducted in order to verify whether Susan was using Whole Language strategies that she had learned in a professional development training held three years earlier, during the 1991-92 school year. Each of the participants of the professional development training was interviewed during the 1994-95 school year. Those participants who believed that they were still practicing the strategies they had learned three years earlier were also observed. Susan Roberts was one of the participants who was both interviewed and observed. For Susan, the Whole Language Professional Development Program wasn't the only contributing factor to her continued implementation of Whole Language strategies. Several other contributing factors related to events in 1991 and also in 1989, during final classes of Susan's Master's Degree program at Northern Illinois University.

Susan Roberts had completed her Master's Degree in Reading at Northern in 1989. At that time, the Reading faculty at Northern was exposing graduate students to Whole Language philosophy and literature-based reading instruction. In April 1991, the Educational Service Center



#1 (ESC #1) in Rockford offered a one-day Whole Language workshop for Chapter 1 teachers presented by Dr. Jane Davidson, Northern Illinois University. The presentation of Whole Language strategies for Chapter 1 teachers was part of a movement begun by federal and state agencies to shift Chapter 1 emphasis from isolated skill and drill study to a more holistic approach to the reading and writing process. Susan attended this workshop. At the end of the day, Dr. Davidson and the Language Arts Coordinator for ESC #1 asked participants to indicate if they were interested in further training. Susan was one of several workshop participants who expressed interest in the possibility of further training. Consequently, the Language Arts Coordinator for ESC #1 wrote a grant application to the Illinois State Board of Education for funding of a year-long professional development program in Whole Language strategies for Chapter 1 teachers. The grant was awarded and the professional development training began in fall 1991 for Susan and fifteen other workshop participants.

At that time, Susan was in her twentieth year as a professional educator. She was continuing the pursuit of information that she had begun during work on her Master's degree to further her career goals. She realized that the Whole Language philosophy appealed to her and was aligned with her personal values and goals. Common to teachers/educators at this stage of their career is their

emphasis on the quality of work and the values and goals that resonate with their personal moral and ethical beliefs. This emphasis is part of the self-awareness that is typical for this stage of career. Persons who have this self-awareness and a defined goal often direct their learning by choosing a learning experience or an expert person and then actively participating as a self-disciplined, committed learner. They are most able to self-evaluate and respond to questions like, "How did this learning change my beliefs and behavior?" (Arin-Krupp, 1981). From Susan's active participation in the professional development program and her reflections and responses to such questions, she demonstrated behavior identified with her age and stage of professional career.

#### 1991-92 Reflections

In December 1991, after four months of the professional development program, Susan wrote in a reflection to Dr. Davidson that one of the main reasons she wanted to be a part of this training program was to become a better Whole Language teacher. She believed in the theory and had done a tremendous amount of reading on the subject, but what she needed was help in implementation and suggestions on how to improve her teaching style.

Research has been done studying the implementation of new programs or innovations in schools (Hord, Rutherford,

Huling-Austin, & Hall, 1987). Several assumptions have been verified that form the basis for the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) that was an outcome of this research. Simply stated, the assumptions are that teachers move through stages of concern about new programs. They move from a "What is it?" concern to an "I need more information" level, to "How will this affect me", to "How will it affect my students?" Once these stages are completed and the educators have used the new program or innovation, they feel comfortable with the new idea and can begin to modify it, collaborating with others, and reworking it (Hord et al., 1987). Clearly, from the perspective of the CBAM, Susan was beyond the awareness and informational stage (What is it? I need more information). The awareness and informational stage had begun in graduate school and was extended by her reading and attending the workshop in April 1991. At the time of the December 1991 reflection, she was in the personal and management stages (How will this affect me?) and was expressing some elements of the concern for the consequences for students (How will this affect my students?). She needed help with implementation and suggestions on how to improve her teaching style for herself and her students.

In the same December reflection, she talked about how she had changed since the professional development program began in September. She stated that when she started the

program, she often led her students and talked too much because she felt she needed to "cram" so much into the thirty minutes that she had with them. Now she talked less and led them less. She believed she was becoming more of a facilitator of learning. She also saw more ownership of learning on the part of the children in her classroom.

She described her classroom walls as "jammed" with writing activities and projects. She even found it necessary to extend her displays into the halls and share things with the whole school. She reconfigured her small room to have centers for the students. She removed herself from the power position at the kidney-shaped table in her room and allowed students to take turns sitting there. The bulletin boards were decorated by students. All the lettering, art work, etc. was student generated. At times she wondered and worried about exactly how much learning was taking place in her classroom with so much commotion.

As a part of the professional development program, teachers were required to analyze lessons and videotape their teaching. After doing the analysis of lessons and videotapes, she realized that there was much more worth in her present activities than in the more orderly ones of the past.

Some of Susan's new activities included fun poems that became an important part of each day; students rewrote, changed, and chanted these poems. Susan began taking the

"I" out of her teaching strategies, which was difficult, but she was improving at it. Susan used the ideas from the monthly sessions and described these sessions as valuable and enjoyable. She stated that her personal goal has always been to fulfill the belief that children are not vessels to be filled but lamps to be lit. She believed that the changes she noted in this December reflection were helping her to achieve this goal.

The monthly sessions that Susan Roberts referred to included experiential learning, reading of theory, sharing teaching experiences and problems with other participants in the professional development program, and coaching each other via videotapes. Specifically, participants experienced lessons that consisted of hands-on activities. They worked with and wrote about such things as real birds' nests. They read books and articles on Whole Language philosophy and shared readings with others in small groups. They videotaped themselves teaching actual classes and then shared the tapes with the group in order to get focused feedback from their colleagues.

Dr. Davidson designed the program to provide a practicum experience in which each teacher would gain knowledge about Whole Language philosophy and practices in order to (a) design and implement a program consistent with Whole Language, (b) understand components of the literacy process, (c) implement use of grouping strategies, (d)

implement and infuse writing within and across the curriculum, and (e) plan and integrate thematic units and evaluate the results. The content and outcomes were Whole Language centered, and the process used in each session was Whole Language in practice.

By the end of the 1991-92 school year, after nine months of these kinds of meetings, Susan wrote another reflection on how she had changed and how she saw herself as a reflective/effective teacher. She stated that she used a Whole Language approach in her Chapter 1 classroom. She collected material for units and themes to enhance the curriculum presented in the regular classroom. Her students were given choices and had more control over their own learning. The word "I" had been deleted from her vocabulary when she spoke with her students. Students in her room asked their peers for assistance and approval. When they made mistakes, they discovered by themselves or with their peers what was incorrect. The more the students wrote, the better they read. Students were able to use all of their learning modalities to complete assignments. They were also able to write their stories on the computer. Students were asked to summarize and tell what they learned rather than having Susan re-cap the lesson. Children were given time to talk in class.

Susan took time to reflect and review what she had done and to write down her thoughts. Susan also indicated what

she had learned about her students. She said all of the students she had worked with during the 1991-92 school year had grown academically, even if their Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) scores didn't show it. On the ITBS, the second grade students all scored in the bottom quartile; however, on the Informal Reading Inventories that were administered as pre- and post-tests, the students began at prereading levels on the pre-test and ended the year at solid second grade levels. The classroom teacher's comments for two of the three children stated that they had made great improvement and demonstrated both confidence and competence in the area of reading. Writing samples showed growth in developmental writing skills and an increase in the length of writing for all three students. The students also demonstrated an awareness of story elements.

Susan observed that as a result of their first three years of schooling, her third graders hadn't been allowed to write as much as they should have. They had been "over-phonicated" (Susan's description for excessive phonics instruction that views mastery of phonics as an end rather than a tool to create meaning.) They believed there was only one correct answer, and they were not risk takers. Her first graders needed time to absorb, or plateau, after learning how to read and write. Susan believed they needed time to process, to practice the newly developed skills of reading and writing, rather than to be quickly pushed to the

next level. Susan also observed that authentic activities had greater carryover.

Susan's final reflection was about the year's professional development program. She said that when she started in the fall, she was often frustrated that Dr. Davidson wouldn't tell the participants exactly how to do something. Rather, the participants had to change or modify their teaching style to incorporate the theory of Whole Language. As a result, nine months later, Susan felt fairly comfortable with the principles of Whole Language and able to use them in her Chapter 1 classes. The way the professional development training was taught helped participants modify their style in their own classrooms. Susan loved the interaction with the other participants, who had different kinds of experiences and represented a variety of Chapter 1 programs.

#### 1995 Interview

In the fall of 1995, Susan Roberts was contacted by this researcher who wanted to interview her to determine whether she was still using the Whole Language practices that had been presented in the professional development program. Susan agreed to participate in the follow-up study and was interviewed for an hour and a half and observed during Chapter 1 classes.

In 1995, at the time of the three-year follow-up study,



Susan was a Chapter 1 teacher in Freeport, Illinois. She taught at one of the five elementary buildings that are part of the Freeport Unit District. This district serves the city of Freeport, which has a population of approximately 27,000, and the rural areas around Freeport including Ridot and Lily Lake. Because of the varied areas served, the school has had to deal with both urban and rural issues. A growing number of low socioeconomic students qualified for Chapter 1 services even though the 1990 census indicated a reduction in the number of students served in many school districts in the state of Illinois. Susan's elementary building had approximately three hundred students, with over twenty teachers on staff. This elementary building had several special programs, including life skills, transitional first grade (SMILE), Chapter 1, and two Behavioral Disorder classrooms. Susan was in the same school and same classroom that she had been in during 1991-92. Since that time she had completed Reading Recovery Training and Frameworks Training. She also had attended and led several Illinois Whole Language Summer Conferences at Northern Illinois University. In 1995 she used the Reading Recovery program with four students each morning and worked with sixteen other Chapter 1 students in pull-out groups in the afternoon. Susan began the interview by reflecting on the 1991-92 school year. She described that whole year as a journey with Dr. Davidson. She said that she was farther

along now than she had been then, but that she was still on the journey. Her metaphor is supported by Fullan, who conducted research on the change process, particularly in professional development in education. He says that change is a journey, not a blueprint (Fullan, 1993). Susan credited Dr. Davidson with the beginning of her journey. When Susan went to the week-long Frameworks Training a month before the interview, she connected many of the ideas that Dr. Davidson had presented in 1991. Susan said everything pulled together during the recent Frameworks Training. Each time she has experienced one of the classes on Whole Language, another piece made sense and fit. Susan observed that this is the same process used by her students to learn; they continually make connections in the same way that adult learners do.

During the interview, Susan talked about how her classroom works and the kinds of Whole Language activities she uses. She has used thematic units and learned along with her students. For example, in a unit on penguins, they learned how penguins breathe, swim, and move; they learned about eighteen different kinds of penguins and about their detailed appearance. They created a chart about penguin facts and decorated a large display case in the central hall of the school with their artifacts from the penguin unit.

In her Chapter 1 classroom, Susan allows the children to be children. They need the opportunity to talk and be

listened to. Many of them are taking care of siblings and being the parent in their families. They have little opportunity to be children outside of the school day. In a Whole Language classroom they don't have to hurry. They can sit and wonder and reflect, and they are not in a hurry to fill in workbook pages. They are allowed to be children.

According to Susan, the four components of Whole Language presented by Dr. Davidson during the professional development program were (1) student ownership, (2) authenticity, and (3) language-based and (4) child-centered instruction. All of these components have been applied in Susan's classroom. Students continue to learn from each other. The activities they do involve reading real books and writing real stories. All activities and interactions in the classroom are language-based, i.e., reading, writing, speaking, and listening, and child-centered.

Susan commented on the language that she acquired from Dr. Davidson during 1991-92 and that she still uses. She draws students into elaborating more and talking more by saying, "Talk about that" and "Tell me more." She affirms them by saying, "Wow, what a thought." She leads them to figure things out for themselves. Finally, she took the "I" out of her vocabulary.

Susan tells the story of asking students, "How do you feel when you get it yourself?" They responded, "I feel great." They know that they feel good when they work out

problems for themselves. They now put their fingers to her lips if Susan begins to offer them the answer, to remind her to let them "feel great."

Susan believes that she is a co-learner with her students, and supported her belief. For example, she learned many fascinating facts about penguins that she never knew until that unit of study. Susan also thinks that when teachers push students to learn on the teacher's timeline and schedule, the students shut down. Forced learning doesn't allow the students to fit the pieces together themselves. Whenever she began to lose sight of this belief and push her students on her own timetable, she noticed that the number of detentions she gave went up and the learning went down.

Susan includes reading and writing in every class. Students write notes to her about what they want and what is happening in their lives. They make all the charts and signs in the classroom. Each day they ask about when they can write. It has been Susan's goal to have students internalize the idea that writing is putting what they say into print.

When asked what helped her to continue on her journey of becoming a Whole Language teacher, Susan talked about powerful professional development experiences like the Illinois Whole Language Summer Conference. The week-long Frameworks Training was also a wonderful experience. At

Frameworks many of the ideas that she had heard over the years connected and became, as Susan puts it, new "ah ha's."

Susan has two other friends who teach in the district and who were participants in the professional development program in 1991-92. The three teachers have been able to encourage and support each other. In addition to these friendships and the support systems, Susan attributed her continuous growth to the connection with and friendship of Dr. Davidson, who also participated in the Illinois Whole Language Summer Conferences. She also continued to read professional journals and books that provided support and affirmation of her beliefs. Susan has ranked herself on a continuum of Whole Language instruction. In 1992 she placed herself at 7.5 on a scale of 9. When she was given that continuum to rank herself in 1995, she added another point at the end of the scale, making it 10, and placed herself at 9 out of 10. The metaphor of a journey seems to necessitate continual movement rather than reaching a destination - hence the need to extend the end point so that the evolution can continue.

In the current Chapter 1 program, half of Susan's day is assigned to a Reading Recovery program. Although she acknowledged that the Reading Recovery program was teacher-directed and structured and was not compatible with Whole Language philosophy, it does allow a rare look at the individual and unique journey each child makes as he or she

constructs meaning using letters and sounds, background knowledge, and semantic and syntactic cueing systems. Reading Recovery training also gave a coaching experience because of the two-way mirror that allowed instruction to be viewed and analyzed by more than one observer.

Susan also commented on the stumbling blocks on her journey. The biggest problem that she encountered was the time factor. The Chapter 1 program in the afternoon was a pull-out program, so the students were with her for only a small amount of time. Another obstacle was that teachers were "Madeline Hunterized" so much that every lesson was expected to have all of the Hunter steps present each and every time; it has been difficult for her to let go of those requirements.

Another stumbling block was that principals did not really understand what Whole Language was and did not know what they were looking for in a Whole Language classroom. Research supports the assumption that the principal plays a key role in professional development and change for teachers (Hord et al., 1987). In Susan's case, her principal did not seem to fully understand Whole Language; however, he did view the Chapter 1 teachers who completed the Whole Language Professional Development Program and the Reading Recovery training as leaders in Whole Language. He, as well as other principals in this district, seemed to be looking at these teachers as being change agents, or at the very least,

resources for the classroom teacher in the area of Whole Language instruction.

In addition to dealing with the time limitations, the Madeline Hunter factor, and the limited administrative understanding, Susan also has had to overcome the obstacle of limited space. The Chapter 1 classrooms have always been small and making a small room print-rich has been a challenge. A final block concerns substitute teachers. Often substitute teachers are not provided for Chapter 1 teachers; students simply do not receive services on a day that a Chapter 1 teacher is absent. If there are substitutes, they usually are not familiar with Whole Language lesson plans, and teachers have to reteach the lesson when they return.

Susan's final comments on being a reflective/effective teacher three years after her training focused on the process of Whole Language instruction. She stated that the more she reflected, the more effective she was as a teacher. She took time to think, question why, and share with colleagues. All of these activities helped her to coalesce her belief system. She realized that she was modeling the process she wanted her students to follow - to talk through their thinking and in the process internalize what they are learning, so it becomes a part of them.

## CHAPTER 2

### OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

Susan Roberts was one of 16 participants who completed a year-long professional development program, given in 1991-92, to implement Whole Language strategies in Chapter 1 classrooms. Her story, which includes her reflections during that year, student performance data from that year, subsequent interviews, and classroom observations three years later, describes her ongoing professional growth. She calls it a journey. The metaphor of journey is often applied to the evolution of Whole Language teachers. Whole Language is a unique professional development innovation because, unlike typical educational professional development programs, it is not an easily defined, step-by-step process. It differs from programs like Madeline Hunter's steps of lesson design, mentioned by Susan in that no list of steps or specific activities exists to guarantee that Whole Language instruction is taking place. Certain behaviors and strategies can be used in Whole Language classrooms, and certain interactions and instructional delivery can be described as Whole Language, but all of these are predicated on a belief system that the teacher must embrace and use to



drive the instructional decisions he or she makes.

Another challenge is designing professional development programs that help teachers implement this educational philosophy. Large amounts of money are spent each year by school districts, state boards of education, and through federal grants to provide teachers with professional development experiences that will enhance teacher performance and, subsequently, student achievement. Numerous research studies have been conducted (Krupp, 1981; Hord, 1989; Fullan, 1993; Joyce, 1988; Loucks, 1979) to determine what makes effective staff development that results in change in the classroom. The challenge of what makes an effective professional development program for Whole Language, combined with the complex dilemma of how to affect change in adult educators, transfer it to the classroom, and sustain it over time, motivated the study.

### Background

The case study focuses on 16 individuals who were Chapter 1 teachers in April 1991 and who attended a Whole Language workshop presented by Dr. Jane Davidson, Northern Illinois University, under the auspices of Educational Service Center #1 (ESC #1) in Rockford. At the end of that workshop, interested participants registered for a year-long Whole Language professional development program designed by Dr. Davidson. The Illinois State Board of Education awarded

ESC #1 a grant to fund the year-long program. The superintendent of each of the participants who expressed interest in the year-long program was contacted by letter and asked for administrative support for the program, since it would be necessary for teachers to attend monthly meetings and apply suggested activities in their classrooms. Money would be provided from the grant for substitute teachers so that Chapter 1 service for the students would not be interrupted while Chapter 1 teachers attended the monthly meetings. On the basis of teacher interest and district support, the final group of 16 participants was selected.

Dr. Davidson's program design, a nine month professional development program, began with three days of intensive training and continued with meetings once a month for an entire school year. Participants received professional development focused on Whole Language strategies during three days in early September and at monthly sessions during the year. They used these Whole Language strategies in their Chapter 1 classes and videotaped their lessons with the children. During the monthly sessions, they viewed and analyzed those tapes, reflecting on what went well and what didn't. They read professional materials about Whole Language, experienced hands-on activities and strategies, planned Whole Language lessons, and supported each other in the change process.

student artifacts, which included writing samples, and the usual Chapter 1 pre- and post-test results were collected.

In 1991 most Chapter 1 programs in the ESC #1 region, which included sixty-nine school districts, were pull-out programs. These programs usually involved 20-30 minutes of contact time and were skills-centered, with emphasis on supplementing, not supplanting, curriculum.

Whole Language was a philosophy not usually associated with Chapter 1 teaching at that time. The traditional format of Chapter 1 instruction was based on the view that reading is a system of discrete skills to be mastered. The twenty-minute pull-out sessions were usually used as supplementary sessions of small group practice of these skills.

With the view of reading changing to an interactive process for making meaning, and the knowledge of the connection between reading and writing, the Whole Language philosophy views reading and writing as holistic processes. In this philosophy, learning is best achieved through direct engagement and experience, not through isolated skills practice (K. S. Goodman, Bird, & Y. M. Goodman, 1991). In spite of the differences between traditional Chapter 1 instruction and the Whole Language philosophy, the April 1991 workshop sign-up sheet indicated several Chapter 1 teachers were interested in learning more about Whole Language and Whole Language strategies for their Chapter 1

programs.

The results of the year-long Professional Development Program were as individual as each of the participants. Some implemented many changes and innovations, and some experimented minimally. Students of teachers who were farther along in their evolution as Whole Language teachers had incredible gains. Other teachers' classes showed gains that were typical of other years.

A modified version of this Professional Development Program, supported by additional grants, was conducted for two additional years at ESC #1.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this dissertation is to present a case study of the participants of the 1991-92 Chapter 1 Professional Development Program, referred to as the Pilot Program, and to determine if and how the effects of that program evolved over the following three years. The research questions are as follows:

1. Was there continued use of the Whole Language instructional strategies and approaches learned at that time?
2. What were the factors, internal and external, during that year and during the following three years, that influenced this use?

### Significance of the Study

The Three-Year Follow-Up Case Study of a Whole Language Professional Development Program for Chapter 1 Teachers was a unique study for the following reasons: the structure of the Professional Development Program; the ex post facto approach at a three-year interim; participating teachers shared Chapter 1 instruction but were not necessarily from the same buildings or school district; and the lack of predetermined influencing factors. Previous studies had examined professional development programs of much shorter duration (Bennett, 1994), and the longest follow-up study took place nine months after the professional development (Schweiger, 1994). Other studies had examined instructional change implemented by groups of teachers in one building rather than teachers from several different districts and buildings (Wiggins, 1993). In another follow-up study, the participants were administered a survey or questionnaire that provided them with factors that they rated in terms of positive or negative influence (Cook, 1994). The study described here allowed participants to determine individual influencing factors themselves. Because of the broader spectrum of information and the relatively small number of participants in this study, it was impossible to make generalizations. Instead of generalizations, the results of this study offer assertions.

This case study, like any case study, provided a search

for understanding (Stake, 1995). First, there was a search for understanding of how the evolution of Whole Language teachers takes place by examining the changes of 14 individuals. (Two participants left education after the Professional Development Program was completed and were not included in the study.) Since Whole Language is a philosophy that influences instructional decisions and choice of curriculum, behaviors cannot be easily identified as clearly and unquestionably Whole Language. The interviews and observations that make up this case study offer an opportunity to probe the process and outcomes that are unique to the evolution of these Whole Language teachers.

In addition, this case study provided a search for understanding of the external factors that influenced the continuing, or in some cases, termination of the evolutionary process and the practice of Whole Language strategies. Although, these factors were unique to the participants, there were some surprising similarities. This case study provided an opportunity to make assertions about the influencing factors for these particular participants and, in that context, provided information that allowed an understanding of factors that may influence long-term change for others.

Another search for understanding was in the area of design and implementation of successful professional

development programs. Educators involved in this area can benefit from examining the assertions from these 14 participants. The participants identified components of the program that, looking back three years later, seemed to be important to continuing their change process. The study offered a view of a program structure and some follow-up activities that can be identified as positive influences for change.

Results of examination of data from these 14 participants provide a basis for generating some assertions about maintaining long-term instructional change in school communities. Educators concerned with maintaining instructional changes and innovations in their schools or districts can benefit from this information; however, some of the participants continued their change process without the school community supports that research has considered essential for the change process (Fullan, 1993). This study provided the opportunity to examine how some individuals succeeded in the change process in spite of, rather than because of, community or district supports.

This study also provided assertions about professional development programs specifically designed for Chapter 1 teachers. During the three years that this study covers, many changes in the structure of Chapter 1 occurred. This study allowed a snapshot view of Chapter 1 changes and Chapter 1 teacher development during the 1992-95 period of

time.

### Design and Method

A case study approach was used for a number of reasons. First, the number of participants in the Professional Development Program who were still working in the education field in 1995 was only 14. A quantitative research approach would be inappropriate for a sample group of that size. Second, the Professional Development Program focused on Whole Language, which is a philosophy or belief system that drives instructional decisions. The continued use of these beliefs would be difficult to verify on observable behavior alone. Finally, there was a wealth of data from the 1991-92 Professional Development Program, including personal reflections, student test performance, student writing samples, and videotapes of participants teaching lessons. Considering these conditions and the data available, the case study was the best approach to utilize. Through this approach, the examiner could question participants about which strategies taught in the Professional Development Program became part of their teaching repertoire, and why they believed that occurred. The examiner could also determine where participants were in the evolving process of becoming Whole Language teachers.

In the case study, open-ended interviews were conducted to explore the perceptions of the participants on the use of



the strategies learned and the factors that they believed influenced this use. The participants also described the practices that they considered Whole Language in nature. When participants believed that they were continuing to practice Whole Language instruction, observations were made and artifacts were collected to verify each participant's description of Whole Language instruction. The beliefs expressed and instructional activities that took place in the year-long training were compared with the responses given in the interviews. Triangulation was completed when the observations and artifacts were compared with the interview responses and the experiences of the 1991-92 program.

Through analysis of data collected during the interviews, the 1991-92 Professional Development Program, often referred to as the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, could be examined, as well as achievements in changes in classroom instructional strategies. The study also examined whether these changes were maintained as perceived by participating teachers during the 1994-95 school year. Participants were questioned about what elements of the Pilot Program supported this change process and what other experiences since that time also contributed to maintaining the change. Rather than selecting components that support the change process from current literature and questioning whether these components were present, the participants revealed

what they perceived as influencing factors for their own change process.

In qualitative research the most important objective is to understand the meaning of an experience. Qualitative research involves a rich, "thick" description in which the researcher strives to know the context of the event, the assumptions behind it, and the event's impact on the participants (Merriam, 1988). The study described in this document incorporated a historical component in reviewing reflections, artifacts, and test scores from 1991-92. It also utilized an ethnographic perspective with the interviews. In addition, observations of classroom instruction were conducted during the 1994-95 school year to verify interview statements. This type of verification is often used in qualitative research (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

#### Procedure

The specific methodology of the study was to interview all 14 members of the 1991-92 group who were still working in the educational field. They represented six school districts, from Rockford west to Elizabeth, Illinois. These interviews were conducted in person and an audiotape was made. The examiner began each interview by reviewing the reflections and perceptions that each participant wrote in 1992. The examiner then asked open-ended questions regarding influencing factors for the change process.

Questions also referred to specific components of the Professional Development Program and whether they were currently being used. Whenever participants identified themselves as working from a Whole Language philosophy, triangulation was accomplished by returning to participants' classrooms during school time and completing observations and collecting artifacts. The observation visits also involved some follow-up interview discussions for the purpose of clarification.

The interviews were scripted and analyzed in a number of ways. First, the data from the transcripts were compared with participants' written reflections from the end of the 1991-92 Chapter 1 Pilot Program. The participants were asked in 1995 to rank themselves on a continuum of Whole Language instruction development. Several participants had done this in 1992. Their self-evaluations were compared to understand their evolution as Whole Language teachers.

Next, the interview scripts were analyzed for common factors among participants. These common factors included ideas and methods from the Pilot Program that participants thought were particularly effective, as well as factors that influenced participants during the subsequent three years. The common factors were categorized and then compared with current literature on change process and staff development. This comparison was done to better understand effective staff development practices for the participants of the

pilot Program and what helped them to continue the change process.

During the three years following the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, many changes occurred in the structure and practices in school districts' Chapter 1 programs. The interview process and the observations revealed some shared experiences for many of the Chapter 1 teachers. In some cases, these experiences were unique to Chapter 1 teachers and revealed information specific to Chapter 1 Professional Development Programs.

In order to have dependability and confirmability, the examiner maintained a reflective portfolio and an audit trail for each participant. The audit trail included documentation of each decision in the research and the analysis of the data, and the reasoning upon which each decision was based. It included the categorizing of responses from the interviews and notes on data reduction and method procedure. The reflective portfolio became part of the audit trail. It included all raw data (audiotapes and field notes) and all documents used as sources, including artifacts, observation notes, and data from the 1991-92 program.

Analysis of the data was conducted in a case study format for each individual participant. The 1991-92 data and artifacts, along with the 1995 interviews, field notes and observations, were analyzed. Each participant was

reviewed in terms of evolution as a Whole Language teacher. The individuals' self-rankings on the Whole Language continuum were reviewed, as well as the participants' statements about beliefs and practices. All individuals were examined in regard to their stages of professional development and the external factors that influenced their personal change process. Using Miles and Huberman's (1994) suggested processes for qualitative data analysis, a chart was created for each participant that included the practices and beliefs that were taught in the 1991-92 Pilot Program, the practices and beliefs that were talked about in the 1995 interview, and the practices that were observed in the classroom observations. Those beliefs and practices that appeared in all three columns were considered as change that was maintained since the Pilot Program.

When an individual case study was completed for each participant, the cross-group analysis was done. This analysis allowed the clustering of responses from the 14 participants. Influencing factors included some that were unique to Chapter 1 teachers; some that related to stages of professional growth; some that were supported by literature on the change process; and some that were not. The clusters of influencing factors were used to determine assertions that are found in the conclusion of the study.

### Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined to aid the reader in clarity of meaning. These terms represent some of the concepts and strategies taught in the 1991-92 Professional Development Program.

Student ownership involves continuous decision making by the students regarding what they are supposed to do, what is important for them to learn, and how they are learning to learn. The importance of student ownership in Whole Language philosophy and instruction was an integral part of the professional development sessions. Everything from the wording of questions to the arrangement of desks in the room communicated subtly whether ownership of the lesson belonged to student or teacher.

Reflection involves teachers taking time to think about instructional decisions made before, during, and after actual teaching; analyzing them; and making additional plans for future lessons. Reflection also involves decisions about what is important to learn and how learning should proceed. Each teacher in the Professional Development Program was given a reflective planning book, and time was spent during every meeting reflecting on instructional decisions that had been made and those that were being planned.

Writing within and across the curriculum involves students using real, meaningful writing as part of every

unit or lesson. Student writing samples were collected during the entire year of the Professional Development Program. These samples were used to analyze how much could be learned about the student's literacy process. In addition, an early writing sample and another taken in May were compared and contrasted for growth in vocabulary, sentence length, and overall development of meaning.

Integrated, thematic units are units or themes that integrate concepts in math, science, and social studies wherever possible. Concepts are centered around themes or units, and the units are designed so that children have as many choices as possible. Units and themes involve authentic reading and writing experiences.

Hands on is a term to describe kinesthetic experiences and authentic activities that students do. These activities connect the concept being taught with real life experiences.

Authentic activities are activities centered around real life experiences and usually involve reading and writing. Students are expected to construct meaning from real pieces of fiction or nonfiction by using background knowledge and context clues and to apply this meaning to activities they are experiencing. The related writing activities do not involve filling in the blanks. Instead they are related to life activities that involve meaningful writing, such as letter writing.

Whole Language is a philosophy that has as its foundation the following:

1. Language is used to communicate meaning. Writing is a language process; oral and written language are very similar.
2. Language cueing systems interact in all four language arts areas. They should not be isolated.
3. Language usage occurs in authentic life situations. This context contributes to success or failure in reading and writing.
4. Life situations are of primary importance to the meaning inherent in language.
5. Risk taking, motivation, and predictability of text play important roles in learning to read and write (Goodman, 1986).

#### Assumptions and Limitations

The limitations of this study are those inherent in any case study. First, the number of samples in a case study is usually small. In this case, only 14 participants were still involved in education three years later. With a sample this small, it is impossible to draw generalizations. All that can be done is to make assertions about the experiences of the 14 participants regarding their evolution as Whole Language teachers and their individual change processes.



The second limitation of this study is that the study involves only one professional development program. It is not possible to make generalizations about other professional development programs. Instead, it is only possible to seek an understanding of the benefits and limitations of this particular professional development program.

When examining the factors that influenced continuing the change process, the open-ended interview questions provided a variety of responses. In some cases, follow-up activities or conditions that were specific to one school district ended up being strongly influencing factors. The variety of responses made it impossible to isolate what specific experiences were solely responsible for long-term transfer. One may only suggest factors that appeared to be influential for these participants.

Yet another limitation is that Whole Language is a philosophy that drives instructional decisions. Observable behavior can be used to support the belief system that a Whole Language teacher expresses, but it cannot be confused with the belief system. This limitation makes the measuring or quantifying of Whole Language instruction a challenge.

Lastly, this study is limited to Chapter 1 teachers, all but one of whom had attended a previous workshop on Whole Language and shared that knowledge base as well as a desire to learn more. These teachers represent different

schools and six different school districts. This diversity limited the inclusion of climate and culture into the commonly shared influencing factors.

Qualitative research always presents the dilemma of the researcher (the observer) becoming involved with, and potentially affecting, the members of the case study (the observed) (Merriam, 1988). The researcher is the gathering instrument at least part of the time. In the case of this study, the researcher also participated in the Professional Development Training during the 1991-92 school year. As an employee of ESC #1, the researcher was involved in the organizational aspects of the program. On one hand, this relationship provides the researcher with personal knowledge of the training that was provided. It also provides an additional area of personal involvement with and bias towards the Professional Development Training Program and interaction with the participants. One assumes that the researcher will be honest in interviewing and sufficiently skilled to properly interpret responses. It is also assumed that direct contact between investigator and respondent may influence the respondents' reactions and answers to the questions. Of course, it is assumed that respondents will be honest in their answers.

CHAPTER 3  
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND INDIVIDUAL CASE STUDY OF  
SUBSTANTIATED WHOLE LANGUAGE PRACTITIONER

This study is a collective case study of 14 participants in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. In addition, an individual case study was completed for each of the participants. In the subsequent chapters, case studies of individual participants will be presented. A chapter will also present data from the collective case study or cross-case analysis.

In reviewing the collective case study data, three years after the Professional Development Program, the participants were placed in three categories regarding use of Whole Language practices: substantiated classroom practitioners, non-classroom educators, and nonpractitioners. Substantiated practitioners were those participants who stated in the 1995 interview that they were still implementing Whole Language instruction in their classrooms and for whom the follow-up classroom observation substantiated that claim. The non-classroom educators included participants who no longer were Chapter 1 teachers. They were curriculum implementers, Chapter 1 coordinators,

and one participant who retired in 1994. The interview statements of the non-classroom educators were unable to be substantiated by classroom observation. Their involvement with Whole Language remained on a philosophical level since they were not classroom practitioners. The last group included Chapter 1 or classroom teachers who stated that they were not implementing Whole Language instruction in their classrooms.

Before presenting the individual case studies representing the classroom practitioners, it is important to define in greater depth the philosophy and practice of Whole Language and the historical context for Chapter 1 programs.

### Whole Language Background

Whole Language is based on research from a variety of sources. Language acquisition, emergent literacy, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, cognitive and developmental psychology, anthropology, and education are some of the areas on which Whole Language theory and research are based. These research areas have been used to develop a definition of language learning and strategies for teaching based on that definition. Whole Language is a socio-psycholinguistic process of language learning that involves a transaction between speaker and listener and between writer and reader (Weaver, 1988). During any transaction, the child is allowed to use his or her entire

language background, which includes past experiences of written and oral language and individual language cues, to produce guesses to arrive at meaning (K.S. Goodman, Bird, & y.M. Goodman, 1991). In essence language is learned from whole to part. This definition and the strategies developed to support it, provide the shared beliefs most commonly attributed to Whole Language philosophy. In addition, each practitioner has his/her own interpretation and application, providing a unique perspective. This unity within diversity makes Whole Language difficult to define quickly and simply. It is an evolving philosophy that changes as more research is completed, and practices are modified. Research and theory have stimulated practice, which in turn refines theory (Weaver, 1990).

Whole Language gets its name from the holistic concept of language rather than the fragmented concept that breaks language down into discrete skills. Whole, authentic literacy events are used as vehicles to develop literacy skills and strategies. Reading and writing experiences are used in all parts of the curriculum. Classroom learning is integrated with the whole life of the child (Weaver, 1990).

Kenneth Goodman believes Whole Language is a grass-roots revolution in education that has brought together the scientific study of learning, language, teaching, and curriculum with positive, people-centered, historical traditions. A Whole Language classroom is a democratic

community of learners, and its curriculum is embedded in the culture of social experiences of the larger community outside the school. For learners, Whole Language consists of rich, authentic, developmentally appropriate, school experiences that are real, relevant, and easy (K.S. Goodman, Bird, & Y.M. Goodman, 1991).

This philosophy sounds remarkably like Progressive Education, particularly in terms of the learner-focused curriculum, the concept of the student as an active learner and the classroom as a community of teachers who learn and learners who teach. Researchers like Carole Edelsky believe that in spite of these similarities, Whole Language is unique from Progressive Education because of its underlying beliefs and the current historical context. The basic beliefs about language and language acquisition are based on research and theory in linguistics, sociolinguistics and cognitive psychology done during the 1960's and early 1970's (Edelsky, Altwerger, & Flores, 1991).

One such belief is that reading and writing are learned through real reading and writing and not through exercises. Genuine texts, such as novels or newspaper or magazine articles, are used rather than materials written for instructional purposes. Another belief is that process, product, and content are all interrelated. A Whole Language classroom provides content-rich curricula where language and thinking can be about interesting content that can include

traditionally accepted knowledge, and also knowledge newly created by students (Edelsky et al., 1991). An important component of the Whole Language classroom is the critical analysis of this knowledge, figuring out how it came to be, what function it serves, and what other knowledge it had to displace. This component provides the learner not only with the knowledge gained from that particular experience, but also with the knowledge of how to replicate that experience and where that experience fits in the life-long learning process. Another Whole Language belief is that teachers and learners are to be respected and trusted. They are capable of directing their own educational lives. This is possible because they have more ownership of their learning process and are continually reflecting on how that process occurred.

Initially the Whole Language perspective developed out of research into the reading process done by Goodman in 1968-69 and Smith in 1971. Their research created a view of reading as the use of cues provided by print, and the use of the knowledge that the reader brings with him/her of the language subsystem to construct a unique interpretation. In this view, the reader creates meaning, and therefore there is no single correct meaning for a text, just plausible meanings (Edelsky et al., 1991).

According to the Whole Language philosophy, "language is a social semiotic system for creating meaning through socially shared conventions. It is a super-system of

interdependent subsystems including phonological (oral), graphophonic (written), syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic" (Edelsky et al., 1991). What began with Goodman's and Smith's views of reading as an interactive process for making meaning spread to all language: written, spoken, and read. What was once viewed as a system of skills to be mastered now became a process with subsystems that could employ skills. The notion of reading, writing, and speaking as being separate skills to be mastered was replaced with the notion of a super-system with subsystems that are integrated and interrelated. The super-system was best mastered by doing authentic communicating and looking at the subsystems that allowed meaning to be made.

Whole Language also views language development as occurring through actual use. This view is based on the natural language acquisition research which observed that within the first few years of life, children in all cultures, no matter what the language, learned to speak and communicate with adults. The children learned the language in natural, social ways. They acquired the phonological, semantic, and syntactic cueing systems by testing hypotheses about each of these subsystems. Children attempted to communicate orally and received feedback from the people around them as to how accurate their hypotheses were. The children attempted words, phrases, even sentences to communicate important information or needs, and the



experienced language users around them reinforced correct attempts or stated a more correct version. "The experienced language users knew the language rules and used them, but did not teach them directly; they simply communicated with the children" (Edelsky et al., 1991).

Whole Language is also based on learning as a social process. There is an acceptance of Piaget's suggestion that learning takes place through individual interactions with the environment, but the theory that may have greater influence concerns Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development, which is defined as naturally occurring points in children's development where they can learn easily if they get a little help. Each child's Zone of Proximal Development for learning the communication super-system and the subsystems is unique, so continual opportunities to interact and learn from others need to be available. This social view of learning stresses the importance of collaborations between students and teachers and between students and students (Edelsky et al., 1991).

Whole Language is based on the belief that learning is best achieved through direct engagement and experience. This belief has strong roots in Piagetian and Progressive perspectives. Everything is learned through a mixture of doing and reflecting. Learners are active participants in their own learning. Students should do science as scientists do, do history as historians do. Students need

to reflect on how they went about it, so they learn how to go about learning. This is often referred to as metacognition. There is another Whole Language belief that the learner's purposes and intentions drive learning. Just as the child's desire to eat a cookie drives his/her ability to communicate that desire, the learner's purpose or need to know drives his/her learning. Finally, there is the belief that learning involves hypothesis testing. Piaget says hypothesis forming and testing underlies all learning. This trial and error system is an essential part of natural language acquisition. In a Whole Language classroom, risk-taking attempts are essential to the learning process (Edelsky et al., 1991).

This view of learning as a social process, with the learner actively engaged in the external environment, has created a new model of education. Traditional instruction is often a Transmission model of education, with the teacher being the transmitter of knowledge and the student being the recipient. This is a passive, even failure-oriented model. The visual analogy for this model is the child's mind being a container and the teacher pouring the knowledge into it. Another commonly used phrase for the Transmission model is "sage on the stage." In the Whole Language classroom the active engagement of the learner makes it a Transactional model. This model involves interaction between teacher and learner and between learner and learner. It is experiential

learning. Changing from the Transmission model to the Transaction model affects instructional decisions (Weaver, 1990).

One of the instructional decisions relates to the level of development of students. There are common developmental patterns and trends, but each child develops uniquely with his/her own configuration of intellectual strengths, learning styles, and strategies. How can a textbook writer, or anyone else, predetermine ways and rates of development? Genuine learning can be facilitated but not forced. Students need to be immersed in learning in order to engage in learning tasks. People rarely engage or invest in learning tasks they consider boring or irrelevant to themselves personally. Unlike traditional assignments, Whole Language teachers offer children opportunities to choose from a variety of activities (Weaver, 1990).

People do not engage or invest themselves in learning tasks that they perceive as threatening to their self-esteem. A climate has to be created in which students can take risks without fear of failure. The natural language acquisition or learning process is based on trial, error, re-trial. It is essential for students to feel comfortable with this process and to know that attempts that are not successful bring them closer to attempts that will be successful. Students need to be allowed and encouraged to take significant responsibility for their own learning.

Much of learning is only indirectly stimulated and facilitated by the teacher (Weaver, 1990).

Because of this responsibility, direct instruction in a Whole Language classroom may consist of demonstrations in which the teacher is personally involved and in which students are invited to engage. In fact, children are able to learn complex processes by directly engaging in them. Direct instruction occurs in response to students' demonstrated needs or "teachable moments." It happens more or less incidentally within the context of authentic literacy events. It often appears as a mini-lesson with those students who demonstrate need (Weaver, 1990).

Traditional instruction is often referred to as a deficit model. What is focussed on and measured is what students do not know. In contrast, Whole Language classrooms treat children as capable and developing and build on what they do know. Children are given the opportunity to develop self-control rather than merely submit to teacher control. This type of classroom management typically produces fewer behavior problems (Weaver, 1990).

There is also a different view of literacy in a Whole Language classroom. Instead of practicing skills in order to read or write, children engage in reading and writing a variety of materials for various purposes by using thinking, discussing, creating, and any other of the behaviors that

characterize the literate adult. By doing this, children see themselves as literacy-competent, which creates a strong self-concept. They learn by doing and become more proficient as they do. This prepares students to participate actively in a democracy, rather than to submit passively to authority (Weaver, 1990).

As has been stated frequently, Whole Language is a philosophy, not a set of practices or strategies. Teachers who embrace this philosophy and accept its principles usually are eclectic in their instructional practices. Whole Language rooms are usually print rich with student-made print. They are learner-focused and problem-focused with multiple activities going on. Usually studies are thematic in nature and often there are literature groups. Journals are used frequently for reflection (Edelsky et al., 1991). Because of the social interaction belief, activities like dramatization, pantomime, role-playing, interpretive drama, and puppet plays are carried out. Shared reading is used, which can mean student participation when the teacher reads, or the teacher reading aloud and adding the thoughts that are going on in his/her mind as he/she reads and tries to comprehend. Often times big books with predictable stories are read, followed by pattern writing. Personal dictation is a form of Language Experience Approach in which the student dictates a story to a proficient writer who puts it in print form. Many activities can be done with this

story. Some other activities found in Whole Language classrooms include storytelling, Readers' Theater, book talks, individualized silent reading, and use of literature dialogue journals, novel studies, author studies, reading buddies, process writing, writing folders, written conversations, idea webbing, and word webbing (Heald-Taylor, 1989).

This narrative has been a brief summary of the development of the Whole Language philosophy, with a focus on some of the well-known contributors, the theory and research and some of the exemplary practices. Many of these ideas were presented during the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, and many of the contributors' readings were chosen by participants as professional development readings for the monthly meetings. Participants were encouraged to experiment with ideas as well as practices during the months between each meeting. The individual development and integration of these beliefs was allowed to occur with participants just as it would with students in a Whole Language classroom.

#### Chapter 1/Title 1 Historical Background

The initial one-day workshop for Chapter 1 teachers took place in April of 1991. The Chapter 1 Pilot Program was an idea conceived by Dr. Jane Davidson at that time, which was funded by a grant given to ESC #1 by the Illinois

state Board of Education. Both of these professional development experiences were the result of the initiative coming from the federal government due to the reauthorization of Chapter 1/Title 1. In order to better understand the factors that influenced the implementation of the Professional Development Program and the participation of the Chapter 1 teachers, a historic perspective of this federally funded program is necessary.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 began as part of Lyndon Johnson's vision of a "Great Society." Called Title 1 at that time, it was created to provide extra instruction in reading, writing, and mathematics for millions of disadvantaged children. The goals of Title 1 were to equalize educational opportunities for the neediest children, improve instruction in basic skills, improve the training of teachers, and increase parent involvement in students' education (LeTendre, 1991).

In preparation for the 1984 reauthorization of the Chapter 1 program, Congress mandated a study of the program, including a review of its effectiveness in improving the education of the students it served. The report of the study issued in 1986 revealed that Chapter 1 had been effective in raising the achievement of the disadvantaged students it served, but was not effective in closing the gap between Chapter 1 students, and their more advantaged peers. Students receiving Chapter 1 services increased their scores

on standardized tests more than students who were not receiving services, but they did not move substantially closer to the scores of the more advantaged students.

During the 1970's and 1980's, Chapter 1 provided a financial aid program that relied on compliance with two key statutory issues: comparability of services, i.e., receiving a fair share of state and local resources for the students served, and supplementing, not supplanting, curriculum and instruction in regular classes. The assumption was that if these two things were accomplished, the disadvantaged students would receive more services and would close the gap between themselves and the advantaged students. This was not, in fact, occurring (Fagan & Heid, 1991).

As a result of the studies and recommendations made by child advocacy groups, the Hawkins-Stafford School Improvement Amendments of 1988 were passed. These amendments dramatically changed the Title 1/Chapter 1 program. They focused on program improvement through accountability for student performance and allowed improvement to be determined in ways other than nationally standardized measurements. State and local agencies were allowed to determine other desired outcomes in terms of basic and advanced skills. There was a strong encouragement that these outcomes be consistent with those expected for all students (LeTendre, 1991).



The amendments stressed the use of higher-order thinking as opposed to drill and rote learning. The amendments also mandated coordination of the Chapter 1 program with the regular program, promoting the concept that the success of disadvantaged children is the responsibility of the entire school and that instruction in Chapter 1 classrooms must build on the same instructional strategies and materials used in the regular classrooms (LeTendre, 1991).

Another component of the amendments was the requirement that the Chapter 1 program be reviewed for its effectiveness on an annual basis. If programs were not effective, local districts were required to establish realistic program outcomes that could be measured and develop program improvement plans to reach these outcomes. The emphasis on outcomes in program improvement and on individual school-site plans differed substantially from the previous emphasis on compliance and on district-wide Chapter 1 programs.

In the 1991-92 school year, Chapter 1 provided \$5.4 billion to 14,000 school districts serving more than 5 million children. The basic purpose of this funding was to provide extra educational services to low-achieving children who lived in low-income neighborhoods (LeTendre, 1991).

Mary Jean LeTendre, the director of Compensatory Education Program in 1991, wrote that "we as a nation had an unfortunate record of viewing the disadvantaged as lacking

the knowledge, the intellectual facility, and the background experiences necessary for achievement in school settings." She suggested that Chapter 1 view students in light of what they have rather than what they lack, and that Chapter 1 programs work to bridge the cultures of school and community and to connect instruction to students' experiences (LeTendre, 1991).

Viewing students in light of what they lacked demonstrated the traditional deficit model of instruction. Drills and skill practices demonstrated the Transmission model of instruction, certainly not the Transactional model. Connecting the instruction to students' experiences and the cultures of the community is very similar to the idea of making learning experiences authentic and relevant to real life experiences.

Robert Slavin, the co-director of the Early and Elementary Education Program at the Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, Johns Hopkins University, wrote that it was critical that schools have a wide choice of methods that are known to be effective for Chapter 1 children. Some of these included Success for All program, James Comer's model, Theodore Sizer's Re:Learning approach, and Henry Levin's Accelerated Schools model. This demand for effective methods reinforced the importance of continued research and development, and effective professional development for teachers. He

proposed that 25% of Chapter 1 funds be set aside for staff development and the adoption of programs known to be effective. This money would be used for needed materials and supplies, extensive inservice training, in-class follow-up by trained technical advisors, and release time for teachers to observe one another's classes and to meet to compare notes. He believed that the achievement benefits of effective classroom instruction for the entire day would far outweigh the potential benefits of remedial service (Slavin, 1991).

The Hawkins-Stafford School Improvement Amendments had a powerful influence on change in the Chapter 1 programs. The new program was intent on increasing both the quantity and the quality of instructional services available to Chapter 1 students. Areas of change to increase the quantity of instructional services included encouraging innovation, restructuring services, realigning resources, and extending instructional time for Chapter 1 students. Areas of change to increase the quality of instructional services included setting expectations higher than the minimums specified in the regulations, promoting the process of program improvement for every Chapter 1 project based on student performance, looking at greater participation of Chapter 1 students in early intervention programs, and providing the very best instructors who are capable of stimulating and challenging disadvantaged young people by

trying new ideas and taking risks (LeTendre, 1991).

This was a time when professional development training for Chapter 1 teachers was very important. Individual states funded professional development programs with the requirement that the programs be replicable and that information for replication be disseminated to other school districts. In fact, the grant funding the Chapter 1 Pilot Program was just such a grant.

A basic understanding of the Whole Language philosophy and the historical context of the federal Chapter 1 program provides a greater understanding of the maintained belief system and continued practice of instructional strategies three years after the Professional Development Program. What follows is an individual case study of a classroom practitioner from the Chapter 1 Pilot Program who continued to successfully use the Whole Language beliefs and practices three years later.

#### Case Study of Participant F

Karen Jacobs, participant F, stated in her 1995 interview that she believed she had continued to use Whole Language practices in her Chapter 1 instruction. Observation data, interview data, and artifacts and information from the 1991 professional development training were analyzed. As a result, Karen Jacobs was determined to be a substantiated practitioner of Whole Language three

years after the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. What follows is a summary of the journey of this participant.

### Observation Vignette

Mrs. Karen Jacobs shares a regular-sized classroom with two other teachers. Each of the teachers in the room is involved in special programs that offer individual assistance to students. The room is divided by partial wall dividers, shelves, and filing cabinets, all of which serve to separate and absorb the noise from the teaching areas. This is an older building, with high ceilings, large wooden-framed windows, plaster walls, and dark wood trim. Mrs. Jacobs is the Chapter 1 teacher. Her section of the room is covered with books - in boxes, on shelves, and on display trays. The current reading topic is related to the study of other countries, so maps and pictures representing several different countries are on display. There are three small tables that could seat three or four elementary students. Colored plastic crates are filled with student folders. On one side is a portable blackboard and in a corner is a felt board. At first glance the room looks cluttered. A second, longer look causes an observer to wonder how all of the materials and books fit into this small area.

Mrs. Jacobs has been working on a rain forest thematic unit with Mrs. Johnson, a third grade teacher. The students have been reading articles, writing in their journals,

taking notes, viewing slides, working on vocabulary words, measuring trees and making murals. According to Mrs. Jacob's Chapter 1 schedule, she spends one hour each day in the third grade classroom. It is time for her to leave the Chapter 1 room and go to Mrs. Johnson's third grade room. As Mrs. Jacobs enters the classroom, Mrs. Johnson is reading a book to the students, who are sitting on the floor around her chair. Mrs. Jacobs quietly joins her in the center of the circle. She and Mrs. Johnson alternate reading nonfiction books about the rain forest out loud to the students. They stop periodically and repeat what they read or ask questions to clarify or make connections with the experiences the students have had during this unit. In one instance, Mrs. Jacobs tries to help the students get a sense of the size of the tree described in the article by comparing it to her height.

"If I'm five feet tall, how many of me would it take to get around this tree?"

"Seven," a student responds.

As Mrs. Jacobs continues reading, another student remembers something she read yesterday that connects with this article. She tells Mrs. Jacobs about it, and Mrs. Jacobs confirms that she has made a great connection. Mrs. Jacobs continues reading. She pauses again for more clarification.

"'It opens the forest floor to light.' What does that

mean?"

A student answers, "It allows light in."

"Great. Now, I'd like you to quietly walk back to your seats and get out your rain forest portfolios."

Everyone returns to their seats. They are directed to take out the sheets they received on the people of the rain forest and the card they began to work on yesterday.

"Yesterday we began talking about some of the people who lived in the rain forest. Today I'd like us to read about those people and share our information. Each group of students will do a choral reading of a portion of their article."

Yesterday the students read about three different tribes. These were articles from magazines like National Geographic and sections of books on the rain forest that had been copied for them. They did this as a small group activity and talked about what they read with each other. Today they are going to tell each other about their tribes and get another article. The first group of students does a choral reading of the last paragraph from their article.

Mrs. Jacobs asks, "Now that you've read that for us, give me one fact about your tribe."

One student says it was the largest tribe in the African rain forest. Mrs. Jacobs turns to another group of students, "What tribe did your group read about?"

A student answers and, for his fact, tells where that

tribe lived. This process continues for each group so that everyone has an opportunity to learn about all three tribes.

"Now that you have all shared your notes, please take out the sheet with the three tribes on it. Think about how the other people's tribes were similar to or different from yours. Using the article I gave you yesterday and the one we passed out today, decide which tribe you would like to live with for a week. On the back of the card, write the name of the tribe and a couple of reasons why you chose it. We want you to think. If you were moving to Africa or Malaysia, which tribe would you like to live with. Pick the tribe you'd like to be a part of for a week and tell us why. Then we'll collect the cards and tell you which tribe had the most members. We'll see which is the most popular tribe. Make sure you have your name some place on the card."

Mrs. Jacobs and Mrs. Johnson walk around the room and talk with students, helping them sort out their thoughts and choose the right describing words.

"I like the complete sentences I see."

Some students are rereading the article. Some are trying to make connections between things in the articles and things they already know. Some have selected a tribe but are still trying to decide why. The teachers are helping them find specific information and new facts. After a few minutes, the students are directed to finish their



cards and then put away the first article and keep out the second one.

Mrs. Johnson says, "I know some of you have already had the opportunity to read today's article. We're going to read it and look for something new. Each time you read something, you get something new out of it."

Mrs. Jacobs says, "We're going to read in groups. Most of you have already read it silently. Now stand up and read one paragraph of the article as a group."

A group that happens to be all girls stands up and reads out loud together - choral reading. "What does it mean to be 'fraught with danger'?" Mrs. Jacobs asks.

A student answers, "Danger is everywhere. You need to keep your eyes open."

"What would one kind of danger be?"

A voice calls out, "Jaguar."

"Animal danger. That's one kind. What about plants?" questions Mrs. Jacobs.

"Poisonous plants," another voice from the back answers.

"What else?" Mrs. Jacobs asks.

"People danger - cutting down trees."

Another student reads what she believes is an excerpt from the article that refers to danger. It has the word edible in it.

"What does edible mean?" Mrs. Jacobs asks. "Even when

we don't really know the meaning we can tell by looking at the rest of the passage."

Mrs. Jacobs and the students work at figuring out the meaning by looking at the words around it and connecting to other phrases and experiences they know. After determining the meaning of the excerpt, it becomes apparent that it doesn't really address the issue of danger.

Another group reads a paragraph from the article in choral reading. Mrs. Jacobs asks them questions about ways the tribal members use animals in order to assess their understanding of what they read.

Another group of students does a choral reading of a paragraph. Mrs. Jacobs says, "Yesterday Mrs. Johnson and I noticed they said in the article that less and less young people were staying in the rain forest. Why do you think that is?"

"Because their houses may be destroyed as they cut down trees."

"Another reason?"

One child responds, "Because there are too many of them."

Another says, "Because their food is being taken away."

Mrs. Jacobs asks, "What happens when young people leave? What makes you want to leave?"

"Sometimes other tribes might try to get them, or they might hear stories about the city and want to see for

themselves."

Mrs. Jacobs talks about when she was a young girl living in the country area around Rockford. She talked with cousins who lived in the city and she wanted to do what they were doing and see what they saw. "Young people everywhere are curious," she adds.

Mrs. Jacobs says that it's time to go to art. Students need to gather their materials and put them in their folders. While they are doing this she tells them the future plans. They will finish the articles. She will count the cards and they will get into groups according to the tribes they selected. Students from each group will read their cards explaining why they chose that tribe.

The students move on to art class, which has also been working on the rain forest theme. In art, they have drawn the three layers of the rain forest and displayed them in the hall outside the room; they have also done a mural. In addition, they created background and setting decorations for a video that they wrote, dramatized, and taped in the technology lab.

The preceding was an ethnographic summary of an observation of Karen Jacobs' in-class model of Chapter 1 instruction in May 1995. The observation was conducted to verify whether Karen was using Whole Language strategies that she had learned in the professional development training completed three years earlier.

In fact, she used many practices from that program. This was a thematic unit. The students used real-life activities in creating the mural that decorated the hall outside their classroom and in making their video. They also saw pictures from Brookfield Zoo, where they learned that a man-made rain forest had been created. They were reading real articles from magazines and journals about the rain forest, and they were given choices of ways to learn about it. As the students discussed the articles, it was clear that they had very different capabilities and background experiences, but all of them were building on what they knew.

An observation that is taking place when a unit of instruction is in progress does provoke questions particularly related to Whole Language instruction. Why were the students reading out loud? How had the groups been established? Have the students participated in planning any of the activities? Some elements of Whole Language instruction did not appear to be present. The activities observed were often examples of activities presented in the Chapter 1 Pilot; however they appeared to be teacher-directed. Since Whole Language instruction is an on-going process, it was not surprising to observe a combination of traditional and non-traditional instruction.

During the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, Dr. Davidson had urged different kinds of assessment and the integration of

writing. Karen Jacobs used portfolios, the videotape, and the mural as forms of assessment. The writing included journals, note taking, process writing, the script for the video, and summary paragraphs. Choral reading was recommended during the Pilot Program, along with using different kinds of student groupings. Both of these were observed during classroom observations. Dr. Davidson also recommended using a variety of different reading materials that are authentic. This was also observed.

#### Background Information

Karen Jacobs had attended the April 1991 workshop for Chapter 1 teachers. She was one of several educators attending that workshop who indicated interest in participating in a year long Chapter 1 Pilot Program. Karen had been a Chapter 1 teacher for twenty-two years in 1991. Eighteen of those years were spent in her current school. Like Susan Roberts, who was described in Chapter 1, Karen's journey began long before 1991. She had already completed a Master's Degree in Reading and had an additional forty hours of graduate work beyond. She took advantage of any conferences or training that the district Chapter 1 program offered.

Karen, like Susan Roberts, was in a stage of her career where the emphasis was on the quality of work and the values and goals that affirmed her personal, moral, and ethical

beliefs (Arin-Krupp, 1981). Karen described herself as an eclectic who chose the philosophies and strategies that best met the needs of her students from the wide variety available. She did not see herself as a follower or one who would embrace a single philosophy or practice exclusively. It was important to her that instructional decisions be made thoughtfully and individually. Like others of her age and stage of professional development, she was proud that she did not follow any one philosophy or program without reservation. She was a committed learner, who evaluated how and why learning changed her beliefs and behavior and whether the changes "fit" in her overall picture of teaching and learning (Arin-Krupp, 1981). Karen was not likely to choose an expert to follow as Susan did. Instead she was drawn to ideas that she could select from and discard as she chose. Karen's behavior, like Susan Roberts, was identifiable with her age and stage of professional career according to Krupp (1981).

Karen's district office was contacted about her interest in participating in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. She was a teacher at a Rockford, Illinois, elementary school. Since this was a large urban school district, there was a central administrative department for Chapter 1 and a district Chapter 1 director. The director approved her participation, and that of six other district Chapter 1 teachers, in the Pilot Program.

At the time of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, Rockford was the second largest school district in the state of Illinois. It served the city of Rockford, which was the second largest city in Illinois. Rockford was, at that time, in the midst of a class action court case which claimed that the school district did not serve minority students as effectively as non-minority students. Test scores from schools that were predominantly minority were used as the basis for this charge. As a result, during 1991 and subsequent years, several court-mandated programs were enacted. Some were student instruction programs, and some were teacher training programs.

Karen Jacobs' school served seven hundred students with a staff of fifty five teachers. During the 1991-92 school year it was decided that her school would become a K-6 gifted magnet school for multiple intelligences, specifically those dealing with communication, arts, and technology. Because of this, several of the court mandates were not applied to this school.

### 1991-92 Reflections

During the 1991-92 school year, Karen videotaped her teaching and brought the tapes in for discussion and feedback from the other members of the group. Each participant was allotted a small amount of the grant dollars to purchase student materials and teacher resource

materials. Karen was one of the first participants to use this budget. She purchased student books and also purchased professional materials for herself which she read and shared with other participants during the year.

In May, Karen talked about the components of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program that she liked best. She stated that sharing ideas and experiences with other Chapter 1 teachers, being able to purchase materials and resource books, and taking back ideas and using them between the monthly meetings were the most useful components of the program.

The fact that Karen was ready to "jump in" and order student materials and resource materials for herself indicated that she was in the implementation stage. She was focused on how Whole Language would affect her students and what materials would be best to use. Based on the CBAM, she could be placed well into the personal and management stages (Hord et al., 1987), supporting the idea that Karen had begun her journey as an evolving Whole Language teacher before the Chapter 1 Pilot Program ever began.

As Karen reflected on the impact that the year-long program had on her practices as a teacher, she said she learned to gear her lessons to include much more student choice, student coordination and cooperation, and student evaluation of their work. She had incorporated much more actual reading and related writing, instead of the teacher-



directed skill lessons that had once been 50% or more of her teaching techniques. These changes came about through listening and re-evaluating what she heard in the monthly meetings. She had often felt the need to do more reading and writing but always felt pressured by the need to teach skills, too, in the short teaching sessions she had with her Chapter 1 students.

Specific teaching changes included reading more novels and good literature selections with students, displaying and relating the books on display to classroom themes, and doing much more writing and sharing. These changes and the challenges that the new methods provided caused Karen to feel more excited about teaching.

These instructional changes provided insights about students as well. Karen found that more discussions with her students provided her with more knowledge of what they were thinking. The increased amount of writing provided a lot of guidance for personal word study and spelling. Because her students had choices, and therefore more ownership of their learning, they were more interested in and excited about their learning experiences. They began bringing in related articles, books, and materials from home.

Her plans for the future were to read more material on Whole Language and become more of a resource teacher in her building, helping to gather and implement classroom themes

and projects. She also planned to share the information she learned at staff meetings and building workshops during the following school year. Her final reflection noted that she had been exposed to many new ideas, theories, and methods during the 1991-92 school year. She thought seriously about how to apply them, so that they would work best for her students and herself. She practiced and repeated many new techniques and threw out some old ones. In the end, she felt confident enough to offer to be a coach for Chapter 1 Pilot Program participants the following year.

A summary of Karen's students' performance supported her perceptions of the school year. At the urging of Dr. Davidson, she used self assessments, writing samples, and lists of books read to supplement the test data information. The test data information included word attack skills and comprehension. In her final summary Karen stated that students' growth in comprehension, or making meaning of the words, was greater than their growth in word attack skills. She felt the students used word attack to achieve meaning. Each student's comprehension grade equivalent went up at least one year and two students' scores went from the end of first grade to third grade. Only one student was unable to reach third grade level in comprehension, and he/she had begun at the first grade level.

The students' self-assessment forms showed that the students had good self images and an awareness that reading

books and experiencing Chapter 1 had improved reading ability. The goals of life-long learner and improving reading were more likely to be achieved when students liked to read and did it both at home and school.

Students' writing samples showed growth in the length of the stories they wrote, but more than that, in their awareness of story grammar. The students were modeling stories they had read and including dialogue. There was an awareness of how stories were told that could only come from being immersed in reading them.

Lastly, there were lists of books that were read at home, in addition to the books read during class. The number of books read provided the immersion in reading that facilitates reading success.

### 1995 Interview

At the 1995 interview, Karen was still teaching Chapter 1 at the same school in Rockford, Illinois. The difference was that in 1991, the entire program was pulled out. Each child that she served saw her for 30 minutes on the days scheduled. In 1995, the lengths of time varied - 45 minutes, 60 minutes, or 30 minutes. Lower grade students were seen five times a week, while older students might be seen only four times a week. The 1995 program had early intervention in first and second grade, with Karen working with the third and fourth graders.

Karen worked with six teachers. Some she supported in the classroom; some involved both in-class and out-of-class instruction; some still liked the pull-out model. No two teachers used Chapter 1 services alike. How Chapter 1 services were used was very dependent on the teaching style of the regular classroom teacher. In addition to the uniqueness of each situation, several teachers had retired from Karen's school. This meant that there were new teachers to work with as long-time colleagues retired. Changeover of personnel makes it difficult to revise the Chapter 1 program from year to year since new teachers are unaware of how instruction was done the previous year.

Since the 1991-92 professional development training, Karen had participated in a district program that focused on the collaboration of Chapter 1 teachers with classroom teachers. The district provided one afternoon a month as meeting time to share ideas and plan instruction for the Chapter 1 teacher and the classroom teachers who wanted to collaborate.

Because of this district initiative, one of the major differences in Karen's instruction from the 1991-92 to the 1995 school year was the use of time, based on the increase of inclusion and collaboration. Sometimes Karen taught in the classroom for as long as an hour; sometimes she acted as a resource person for the Chapter 1 students in the classroom; at other times, she pulled students out for small

group work. Chapter 1 instruction in 1995 was linked to what the students were doing in their regular classrooms. Karen was connecting to the classroom themes either directly in the classroom or in her Chapter 1 room.

Karen attributed these changes to the general direction of education. The focus had been on integration and seeing how relationships worked. The reading/writing connection had been brought out in the thematic units. She had always been a lover of literature. When Chapter 1 was not allowed to use the same materials as those in the classroom, Karen sought out stories and poems that would connect to what they were learning in the classroom to make it more exciting for the students. She realized that the excitement over good literature would spill over into all learning.

She believed that a factor that encouraged the positive changes was the structure of time in her school. In the course of a school day, there were many interruptions for students to go to specialized areas or receive special services. Themes provided a great vehicle for instruction because the classroom instruction was focused on the same theme but in different ways and with different activities. Students could come and go and still be able to continue in their study of the theme. Subjects were not so separated. Portfolios were used. All of these practices supported the integrated, thematic study.

The hardest stumbling block for this change was the

lack of enough time to communicate with staff. Thematic units have always been created from multiple sources, with individuals' ideas pulling the sources together. There was no teacher's manual to follow. Time was required, and time for collaborating was a problem.

Another influencing factor was the effect of the court case. According to Karen, the teachers' perceptions were that they were found guilty of not doing things right. It struck at teacher self-esteem, causing teachers to second guess every action and decision in light of discrimination. People became more racially conscious than ever before. Staff development and instructional programs were mandated.

Karen's school was a magnet school and, therefore, did not fall under the mandates for those schools that had been identified as C-8 or C-9 schools by the court. A C-8 school had higher percentages of minority students. In the original court case, the issue was lower test scores of minority students, so schools with larger numbers of minority students needed more specific interventions to improve the education and therefore the test performance of minority students. A C-9 school had a lower percentage of minority students and therefore needed fewer interventions according to the court decision. Because Karen's school was neither C-8 nor C-9, it was not mandated to implement the Success for All program as most of the C-8 schools had been. This external factor allowed them the freedom to use

thematic units as a basis for instruction.

Karen believes that collaboration is really reflection, so she is practicing reflection all the time. She has used the ideas of choices of reading, literature circles, and real life activities like the bird's nest activity done during the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. She maintains an eclectic approach that takes the best from readings, classes, workshops, and other teachers, but never accepts any one approach as "the one and only."

Although she has not videotaped herself since the 1991-92 Pilot Program, she believes that coaching is very much a part of collaborative teaching. Ideas are shared; teachers watch each other teach and observe what works and what doesn't. Teachers imitate ideas and practices from each other.

Karen described Whole Language units she taught, including one on the solar system. Others were on hobbies, sports, and collections. She considered these to be Whole Language units because they integrated all subjects; students had choices; real life activities were used; and the units were carried into the technology labs, art rooms, and drama class. Karen made a list of skills the teachers wanted to cover, and as they were taught, the skills were marked off. Mini-lessons were taught on topics like contractions as they were reading materials with contractions in them. Students wrote letters to people and

organizations connected with the units of study. A variety of student groupings were used. Student writing played an important role in the Whole Language units and the Chapter 1 program, including: journals, process writing, essays in the IGAP format, structured overviews, and computer writing lab work.

Karen viewed herself as more of a resource person in 1995. This role forced her to keep looking for new ideas and sharing what she learned as well as what she saw in other teachers' classrooms. She saw herself as someone who "spread the word." She wanted to attend more workshops in order to share ideas with her staff and the teachers that she worked with. She wanted to connect what she had learned with what she experienced as she collaborated with other teachers. She viewed herself as a person who made connections - between practices in her school's classrooms and ideas presented at workshops and conferences. She also saw the thematic instruction as freedom from being "locked" into basal readers and as being able to order materials and use resources in the building to make lessons and learning more appealing to all students. This freedom has allowed reading to become more interesting and appealing, and therefore, more fun.

At the end of the interview, Karen was asked to place herself on a Whole Language continuum, first identifying where she was in 1991, and then where she saw herself in



1995. She identified herself as being at 4 out of 9 in 1991, and 7 out of 9 in 1995. Rating herself at 7 could be related to the concept of an evolving Whole Language teacher or the analogy of a journey, or it could be related to Karen's pride in being eclectic and never totally embracing any one philosophy.

### Summary

Susan Roberts and Karen Jacobs represent the seven participants who were substantiated practitioners three years later. The seven participants include three elementary teachers from Freeport, Illinois, two elementary teachers from Rockford, Illinois, one elementary teacher from Sycamore, Illinois, and one high school teacher from McHenry, Illinois. Susan Roberts and Karen Jacobs are from the two school districts that have five of the seven substantiated practitioners. Their individual case studies are representative of the other substantiated practitioners.

In the following chapter, educational change will be viewed from a concerns-based perspective, an efficacy-based perspective, and a change process perspective. These perspectives will be related to the individual case studies of Susan Roberts and Karen Jacobs, substantiated practitioners, and will be used as a context to review the representative case studies of the unsubstantiated educators.

## CHAPTER 4

### CBAM, EBCM, CHANGE PROCESS, AND AN UNSUBSTANTIATED PRACTITIONER AND NONPRACTITIONER

The examination of the journeys or stories of Susan Roberts and Karen Jacobs required some consideration as to where they were in their concerns about Whole Language as an appropriate belief system for instruction of at-risk students, where they were in the actual use of Whole Language practices, how confident they were in the use of Whole Language practices, and where they were in the change process. A brief review of literature related to each of these areas is presented in order to provide a better understanding of these teachers' journeys.

#### Concerns-Based Adoption Model: Concerns and Use

Both Susan Roberts and Karen Jacobs demonstrated a knowledge of and interest in Whole Language philosophy. They expressed their perceptions that they had begun using Whole Language practices before the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. Each quickly moved into concern for how the practices would affect their students and what materials would be appropriate to use with them. Their levels of concern and

use at the onset of the professional development training very likely influenced their acceptance and implementation of Whole Language strategies and the continued use of them three years later.

The concept of levels of use and levels of concern comes out of research done by Shirley M. Hord, William L. Rutherford, Leslie Huling-Austin, and Gene E. Hall (1987). These researchers worked at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin. They studied innovations being implemented at various school district's and verified several assumptions about change.

The first assumption was that change was a process, not an event. This process occurs over a period of several years. A second assumption was that change is accomplished by individuals. Change affects people, and their individual roles are of utmost importance when implementing new programs. Only when each individual in the school has implemented the new practice can it be said that the school, as a whole, has changed.

Focus on the individual, requires that change must be seen as a highly personal experience. Different responses and interventions are required for different individuals. Paying attention to the individual's process might enhance the total improvement process.

Another assumption was that change involves

developmental growth. As persons move along in the change process, they demonstrate different feelings and skills. Diagnosing and prescribing for these different feelings and skills can be a valuable tool for guiding and managing change.

Change can best be understood in operational terms. In the studies (Hord et al, 1987) at University of Texas, operational terms refer to classroom practices, changes in student behaviors, preparation time, and any concrete, practical activities that make up the configuration of the change or innovation.

The last assumption pulled all the others together. It restates that the focus of change should be on individuals, innovations and the context of the district and classroom. In other words, each innovation, combined with the individuals in a particular place, and put in the context of a particular classroom and district, creates a new and individual combination (Hord et al., 1987).

The CBAM model holds as a central premise that the most important factor in any change process is the people who will be most affected by the change. The individual is the critical unit of analysis. The CBAM focuses on two areas of the individual development in the change process: Stages of Concern and Levels of Use. Stages of Concern describes the feelings that individuals experience regarding the innovations, and Levels of use describe individuals'

behaviors as they experience the process of change. Finally, the model includes an operational definition of the innovation in order to view the use and interpret the concerns. This operational definition is called the Innovation Configuration (Hord et al., 1987).

The Stages of Concern about the Innovation describes seven kinds of concerns that individuals experience at various times during the change process. The first stage is awareness during which there is no concern about the innovation. The second stage is informational during which the teacher would like to know more about it. The third stage is personal during which the practitioner wants to know how it will affect him/her. The fourth stage is management, during which the teacher is concerned about how the changes will affect the organization of the day and preparation time. The fifth stage is consequence during which the concerns are focused on students in the classroom and how the change will affect them. The sixth stage is collaboration during which the concern is about relating what the practitioner is doing to what the other instructors are doing. The last stage is refocusing during which the innovation has become so much a part of the teaching repertoire that the practitioner begins to modify, revise and make new connections (Hord et al., 1987).

The Levels of Use describe performance changes as the individual becomes more familiar with an innovation and more

skillful in using it. The first level is nonuse which connects with the awareness stage. Without knowledge of the innovation there can be no use of it. The second level is orientation and the third level is preparation. These levels coincide with the informational and personal levels. During orientation users seek out information about the innovation. During preparation they begin to prepare to use it. Most often this is when the questions of "how will it affect me" come in. The next three levels of use have to do with actual practice of the innovation. They are mechanical use, routine use and refinement. During mechanical use, the organization and coordination of the innovation is disjointed. During routine use, experience and familiarity with the innovation increases. During refinement, changes are made based on the needs of the students. Refinement coincides with the consequence stage of concern - "how will it affect my students." The last two levels of use, integration and renewal, coincide with collaboration and refocusing. Integration is the practice of coordinating with others, which takes into consideration concerns about collaboration. Renewal has the teacher seeking more effective alternatives for the use of the innovation which reflects the concerns about developing better ideas (Hord et al., 1987).

The stages of concern and levels of use are not necessarily linear. Practitioners may move back and forth

through routine, refinement, integration and renewal. As new approaches are integrated, concerns about student impact may arise causing collaboration and more changes.

The operational definition of Innovation Configuration consists of a checklist that represents the patterns of innovation use that result when different teachers put innovations into operation in their classrooms. These can be broken down into critical components which have been determined to be essential to the innovation and use, and related components which are not considered essential to the innovation but are recommended by the developer or facilitator (Hord et al., 1987).

Of the participants in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program all but one had attended the April workshop. Thus, they had already been self-selected by interest in and knowledge of Whole Language. They were minimally at the personal or management stages of concerns, and the preparation or mechanical level of use. For Susan Roberts and Karen Jacobs, who rated themselves as middle level of the Whole Language continuum in 1991, it could be assumed that they were into the more fluid levels of use. Their concerns were on management and student consequence. By the end of the year, both were perceiving themselves as resources for other teachers which indicated that they had moved along to the stage of collaboration and the level of integration.

The Innovation Configuration would be more challenging

to define for the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. An operational definition has been difficult to establish for Whole Language since it is a philosophy that is constantly evolving. Dr. Davidson had established program goals to (1) design and implement a program consistent with Whole Language, (2) understand components of the literacy process, (3) implement use of grouping strategies, (4) implement and infuse writing within and across the curriculum, and (5) plan and integrate thematic units and evaluate the results. These outcomes and the components of student ownership, authenticity of activities, and language-base and student-centered instruction made up the operational definition of this innovation. The beliefs and activities that were identified in the interviews and the classroom observations in 1995 were compared with the program's outcomes and components or the innovation configuration. Long term change was confirmed when interview responses, classroom observations and innovation configuration were consistent.

#### Efficacy-Based Change Model

Three researchers at the University of Nevada combined the Concerns Based Model with some other factors that they identified, and developed the Efficacy-Based Change Model (EBCM) for viewing innovations. Ohlhausen, Meyerson and Sexton (1992) developed this model using concepts that help explain the success or failure of an educational innovation



as a function of specific psychological processes of the individual teacher. This is a view of change that is highly idiosyncratic since it is dependent on the individual change process and the factors that influence it. The change process is perceived as fluid and interactive. Four areas that influence the implementation and refinement of educational innovations are as follows: concerns, influencing factors, attributions and self-efficacy. The concerns are based on the Stages of Concern Model which cycles the concerns from the very personal, outward to class and students, and beyond the classroom to the larger school community. These concerns are individual for each teacher.

The influencing factors resulted from a study of teachers that identified the four most significant factors influencing their use of a reading innovation. The four factors were: professional controls, significant others, teacher uniqueness and professional development. Professional controls were district or building guidelines or policies that were determinants. Significant others were students, colleagues, or mentors. Teacher uniqueness refers to the teacher's personal philosophy of education. Professional development refers to professional reading, conferences, continued education and teaching experience (Ohlhausen, Meyerson, & Sexton, 1992).

Attributions are seen as causes of events. Internal attributions include the personal effort and ability that

influences the success. Internal attributions are within the control of the individual. External attributions are out of the control of the individual and are sometimes seen as task difficulty or sheer luck. Those individuals who attribute their success to their own ability or effort have a greater achievement motivation and are more likely to tackle new tasks in the future (Ohlhausen et al., 1992).

The last area that these researchers examined was self-efficacy. They define self-efficacy as the ability to generate the necessary level of motivation to use cognitive resources to accomplish the desired course of action. If people have the belief or confidence that they can succeed, they are more likely to try new tasks and persist in spite of difficulties. Teachers with higher levels of self-efficacy are found to be more receptive to change (Ohlhausen et al., 1992).

The Efficacy-Based Change Model combines these four elements. The process of change begins with the initiation of the innovation into the educational system. This stage involves planning and discussion of the proposed change, with teachers considering the impact on themselves (Ohlhausen et al., 1992).

During implementation, the innovation is attempted in the classrooms with the teacher concerns becoming task focused. The next stage is refinement during which the innovation has become a regular part of the practice and

teachers begin to adapt and change the innovation to fit their situations and meet the needs of their students. The focus shifts to student concerns and collaboration with other teachers. The process is fluid. Once refinement has been reached, new aspects and uses are developed and the process begins again (Ohlhausen et al., 1992).

At each stage a complex process of developing self-efficacy is occurring. Past and present factors influence the teacher. These influences depend on the meaning that the teacher gives the event. The meaning is dependent on the attribution process. If the teacher attributes the event to internal causes, self-efficacy is enhanced. If the teacher attributes the event to external causes, out of his/her control, self-efficacy is lost. This change process is an interaction of concerns, influencing factors, how both are interpreted, and the confidence that is lost or gained in the process. The resulting self-efficacy (or loss of) influences whether teachers will try innovations, how hard they will persist, and in part, how well they succeed (Ohlhausen et al., 1992).

EBCM integrates CBAM, influencing factors, attribution or giving meaning and self-efficacy. These are all useful areas aiding the interpretation of the interviews of participants of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. Susan Roberts and Karen Jacobs had rated themselves in the middle of the continuum of Whole Language practitioner. They may be

considered to be in the implementation stage when they began the year long Pilot Program. In terms of influencing factors, they were affected by professional development, professional controls, and philosophical beliefs. They both had completed their Master's degrees and continued studying new practices and ideas through workshops and classes. As Chapter 1 teachers, they were feeling the influence of the federal studies and the reauthorization guidelines pushing for more accountability and continuous program improvement. Since they both had attended the April workshop, they were part of a group who were already open to Whole Language philosophy.

Both Susan and Karen demonstrated high self-efficacy. No matter what changes occurred in their student demographics, their district structure due to the court case, or the top down pressure towards certain innovations, they believed in their professional judgement about what was best for their students. Self-efficacy or self-confidence can be related to age, career stage or ability to cope with change.

#### Change Process

All real change involves loss, anxiety and struggle. Even when teachers voluntarily participate in programs designed to implement a change in their teaching, they still experience feelings of loss, anxiety and struggle. New

experiences are related to known or familiar realities. This is not done in a resistive way, but in an effort to make sense of the new experiences and increase the chance of mastering them. Usually the meaning of change is unclear at the start of the process, and moves into ambivalence during the process. Unless this meaning is shared, the change cannot be assimilated (Marris, 1975).

Whether those involved in the change process desire it or not, real change is a significant personal and group experience that involves ambivalence and uncertainty. If the change is successful, the result is the satisfaction of mastery. The tension of the play between the anxieties of uncertainty and the joy of mastery are at the heart of the educational change process (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991).

In the world of the typical teacher, the challenge of change is just "one more thing" to deal with. The typical teacher has to cope with the documented "classroom press" (Huberman, 1983). This is a press put on them to perform several different kinds of tasks, including the following: the press for a) immediacy and concreteness in an estimated 200,000 interchanges a year, b) multidimensionality and simultaneity, carrying on a range of operations at the same time, c) adapting to ever-changing conditions or unpredictability as they deal with unstable input, and d) personal involvement with students (Huberman, 1983). This press causes teachers to focus on day-to-day effects, become

isolated from other adults, drained of their energy, and limited in their opportunities for sustained reflection (Crandall, 1982).

At the same time, reflection is considered one of the most important conditions for change. In addition, collaborative schools where teachers have a shared consensus about the vision and the goals of the school are the schools most likely to incorporate new ideas directed to student learning (Rosenholtz, 1989). Collaboration and shared views require time to reflect individually and collectively. Since time is consumed by the "classroom press" activities, it becomes a precious commodity, and deciding if and what change process to invest time in becomes an important decision.

Implementing change also involves change in the practice of teaching. This is multidimensional. There are at least three of these dimensions: (1) the use of new or revised materials (direct instruction materials), (2) the use of new teaching approaches (delivery of instruction), (3) the change or alteration of beliefs (personal educational philosophy) (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). It is possible to change one, two, or all three of these dimensions. Obviously, the most effective change would involve all three. Change in beliefs will sustain the change in content and delivery. During the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, all three of these dimensions were dealt with.

After studying several groups of teachers in the change process, Fullan & Stiegelbauer (1991) determined three lessons to be learned involving these three dimensions of change. The first lesson is that change is multidimensional and can vary accordingly for both individuals and groups. The second lesson is that in this multidimensional process some deep changes are at stake. Teachers in the change process risk losing their occupational identity, their sense of competence as a teacher, and in the process, their self concept. These are connected with feelings of anxiety and loss. Therefore, there is a great need to develop a sense of meaning about the change. Lastly, there is a dynamic interrelationship of the three dimensions of change. Teaching strategies and activities inform and guide beliefs. Use of materials and instructional approaches by the teachers depends on their beliefs and the manner in which they have articulated their instructional choices with these beliefs. Not only do teachers need to develop a sense of meaning about the change, but they also need to develop that meaning in relation to all three dimensions (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991).

Of the three dimensions of change, the most difficult to accomplish is the change in beliefs. Such a change challenges the core values held by individuals regarding their educational philosophy (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). During the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, changing beliefs was

addressed. In fact, this dimension of change produced some of the most challenging cognitive dissonance for the participants. Dr. Davidson facilitated the development of a clear belief system regarding Whole Language and the literacy process so that it could provide a framework for overall planning, and would support continued practice after the Pilot Program. The Chapter 1 Pilot Program also provided the opportunity for participants to try out materials and teaching approaches, and to return to the group meetings to discuss why something should or should not have been done and to what end. This opportunity also supported the reflection that is so necessary for the change process. In this way the Pilot Program addressed both the innovation or change, and the process needed to make that change a reality.

The change process is made up of three phases. Phase one is initiation. The initiation phase consists of the process and all of the experiences that lead up to and include the decision to adopt or proceed with change. The second phase is implementation which usually occurs during the first two or three years of use. The third phase is continuation, or making the change routine and/or institutionalized. After the innovation or change becomes an ongoing part of the system, there is usually an outcome of some kind. These outcomes could include improved student learning, new teacher attitudes or skills, satisfaction on



the part of teachers for the mastery of the innovation, or improved problem-solving skills of individuals or the organization. The phases, initiation, implementation, continuation/outcome, are not linear, so an innovation can move in and out of the phases depending on many variables (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991).

There are many variables that affect these stages and the direction of movement. First, numerous factors operate at each phase. The scope of the change or innovation can range from large-scale externally developed to locally produced depending on who initiates and/or develops the change (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). In the Chapter 1 Pilot Program study, some of the initiating was the result of the reauthorization of the Federal Chapter 1/Title 1 Program. The immediate initiation was the result of technical assistance provided by the Educational Service Center, a state-funded office whose purpose was to provide assistance and support for mandated changes. At a local level, the student performance, program accountability, and state Chapter 1 grants were all external influences for initiation.

Another influence on the phases of change and the movement in and out of them is time. Since change is not a linear process, it is not possible to determine absolute time frames. Initiation can be in the works for years. Implementation takes at least two years, and usually more.

The line between implementation and continuation is not clear, so it is difficult to determine a time frame. Evaluation of outcomes does not indicate the completion of implementation. In fact, the results of evaluating the outcomes can direct and inform revisions of the implementation (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). Because the teachers who participated in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program had attended the April workshop the year before, most were well into initiation and several were in early implementation.

The factors that influence initiation, according to Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991), can be linked closely to the format of the 1991 Professional Development Program known as the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. The first factor is existence and quality of the innovation. The value and quality of Whole Language as an innovation has been established in previous discussions. The philosophy and practice as it was presented in the Pilot Program had existed and had a body of research to support it since the 1960's. In addition, the use of Whole Language in Chapter 1 programs was suggested in the Hawkins-Stafford School Improvement Amendments of 1989 as well as the 1984 reauthorization studies. Technical assistance in the form of one day workshops presenting Whole Language strategies was being offered by the federal and state governments to support this use.

A second factor influencing initiation is access to information (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). In normal

situations, Chapter 1 teachers are even more isolated than regular classroom teachers. Depending on the size of the school and number of students needing services, there may be only one or two teachers in a building. For many Chapter 1 teachers, the only source of information on Chapter 1 strategies was provided by the one day workshops and Chapter 1 conferences that their school districts allowed them to attend. Other sources were college classes taken on their own. During the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, teachers had the opportunity to access information at each month's meeting during the school year.

Two other influencing factors are central administration advocacy and teacher advocacy (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). Central administrative advocacy was stimulated by the federal funding that came from Chapter 1/Title 1 and the Stafford-Hawkins Amendment that focused on program accountability. In addition, at the start of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, each superintendent received a letter informing them of the district obligations if they chose to participate in the program, and requested a written response for that commitment. The letter also informed the superintendent that the Pilot Program would pay for substitute teachers for the Chapter 1 teachers so that student services would not be interrupted by teacher participation in the program. The teacher advocacy as described by Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) included

frequent, continuous and increasingly concrete talk about the teaching practice, observations of the practices with feedback, and planning and designing materials and practices. The monthly meetings of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program involved all of these. The observations were done via videotape with discussions about the instructional decisions made occurring at the monthly meetings.

The last four factors influencing initiation all involve outside influences. According to Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) they are: external change agents, community pressure/support, new policy and funds, and bureaucratic orientation. Since the participants of the professional development represented six different school districts, these external conditions varied. All participants experienced Dr. Davidson as an external change agent. The community pressures and district policies and bureaucracy were unique to each district.

Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) have also developed key factors influencing the implementation phase. These are divided into three categories: characteristics of change, local characteristics, and external factors. The external factors are governmental and other agencies. As was stated in the initiation phase, the local characteristics were unique to each of the six districts involved. Some were supportive and some were not. The other two categories were experiences shared by everyone. All participants in the

Chapter 1 Pilot Program were influenced by the external factors of the federal Chapter 1/Title 1 changes, and the state implementation of these changes.

The category of characteristics of the change really dealt with the impact and content of the innovation itself. The four characteristics of an innovation are: need, clarity, complexity and quality/practicality (Fullan, 1991). The need in the case of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program participants was both external, program-directed, and personal, as in student improvement and performance.

The clarity refers to a clear definition of what the innovation is, the skills required and the extent of change of materials, teaching strategies and beliefs that are needed. This aspect was challenging for the Chapter 1 Pilot Program because Whole Language by definition is not a prescriptive program easily defined that can be subdivided into specific behaviors which make it up. By definition and integrity to practice, Whole Language strategies can provide choices and build on what the practitioners already know. Since participants were provided with materials, practices and challenges to their beliefs, each participant experienced many different combinations of these. Some participants in the follow-up interview denied embracing the Whole Language beliefs, but they did practice some of the strategies that were presented in the workshop. Others espouse the Whole Language beliefs, but due to district

policies, were unable to practice them.

Another characteristic of an innovation is complexity. It refers to the difficulty and extent of the change required. Whole Language is a very complex innovation. Consequently, there is a challenge of complexity, but, usually when this challenge is met, more changes occur.

The last characteristic of an innovation is quality/practicality, or determining whether the innovation meets the practitioner's real need. If the innovation is practical, it should address salient need, fit the teachers' situations, be focused, and include concrete "how to" possibilities (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). The Chapter 1 Pilot Program had as one of its goals to familiarize participants with the literacy process. This focus on how students develop reading and writing mastery was very practical for Chapter 1 teachers. Dr. Davidson included concrete and experiential activities several times during the year, so both quality and practicality were addressed in the content of the professional development program.

The key themes for the implementation process as developed by Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) are directed more to a district or building community. They include: vision-building, evolutionary planning, initiative-taking, staff development, monitoring/problem-coping, and restructuring (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). In the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, the vision-building was done in regard to

Chapter 1 programs and Whole Language. Time was spent discussing what an effective Chapter 1 program would look like in view of the literacy process children go through. Then discussions focused on what changes specific to each person's Chapter 1 program would move the program towards the ideal.

Because six districts were involved, the evolutionary planning needed to be individual for each district. After participants in the professional development program went back and tried strategies and activities, they discussed the results. Often, other participants would suggest modifications that would help to make the strategies and activities more successful the next time. The theme of monitoring/problem-coping connected with this. It also became a part of the feedback process for each participant's videotape.

The themes of empowerment, staff development, and restructuring were more directly related to a building innovation. Dr. Davidson did encourage participants to go back to their principals with their view of the ideal Chapter 1 program and solicit their principals' support for making their vision a reality. She also suggested initiating discussion on restructuring the Chapter 1 program to allow more than the usual twenty minutes with each small group. Again, restructuring efforts were specific to each of the six districts and were linked with the amount of the

Chapter 1/Title 1 grant, the district policies, and the concern for program improvement accountability.

The phase of continuation also has influencing factors. Huberman and Miles (1984) have found three of these influencing factors. An innovation will become an ongoing part of the school routine if the innovation gets embedded or built into the structure by policy, budget, or time; if there are a group of administrators and teachers who are knowledgeable, skilled and committed to it; and procedures are established for continuing support and training (Huberman & Miles, 1984). For the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, the cadre of skilled and committed people could be developed and provided with continued training that year and even the following year. What was not possible was to influence the policy and budget factors that guaranteed Whole Language a place in the school and the Chapter 1 program structure in each of the six districts.

Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) found four important insights that were not predictable, but turned out to be important to the change process. These were: active initiation and participation, pressure and support, changing beliefs and practices, and the problem of ownership. These four insights help identify some strengths and weaknesses in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program.

The active initiation and participation was evident in the April workshop participation and the year-long



commitment made by participants. The Chapter 1 Pilot Program was a program designed for the "learning by doing" approach.

The pressure and support was provided both by the facilitator, Dr. Davidson, and the participants. The sharing of videotapes of Chapter 1 classes taught using the new strategies provided participants with both support and pressure to make different instructional decisions the next time.

The insight of changing beliefs and practices was inherent in the Whole Language philosophy which supports the notion that behavior and belief change is a reciprocal and ongoing process. The final insight of the problem of ownership is the challenge for Chapter 1 staff development for multiple districts. The participants can change both beliefs and practices, but they need program structure and budget support in order to maintain continual progress and ownership.

After studying the improvement of teaching and student achievement relative to reading practices in secondary schools, Stallings (1989) identified conditions under which teachers are more likely to change their behavior and continue to use new ideas. Under these conditions teachers: (1) become aware of a need for improvement through their own analysis and observation; (2) make a written commitment to try new ideas in their classroom; (3) modify the workshop

ideas for the own classroom and school setting; (4) attempt the practices and evaluate the effect; (5) observe each other and analyze their own data; (6) are a part of a group that provides feedback for success and failures. This group also discusses problems and solutions related to individual students and subject matter. The teachers are provided a wide variety of approaches: modelling, simulations, observations, videotapes, and presentations at professional meetings. There is enough flexibility in the program for teachers to learn in their own way and to set their personal goals for professional growth (Stallings, 1989).

For participants in the 1991 Professional Development program, the need for improvement was stimulated not only by the program improvement initiative, but also by the desire to have individual students in their Chapter 1 classes improve and eventually leave the program. Unfortunately, many of the participants described students who were "terminally" Chapter 1.

In the Pilot Program, the teachers were given a reflective planning book that provided pages and suggestions for reflection to be done before and after lesson planning took place. Not all of the participants used it on a regular basis, but it did provide the type of reflective journal that is suggested in the second condition.

The cycle described in the third through the sixth conditions was an ongoing component of the Chapter 1 Pilot

Program. Each month teachers modified practices for their classroom, attempted them, and shared those attempts via video or verbal description. The group gave feedback and made suggestions to provide support and pressure. Anytime a group of teachers has time to talk about teaching, individual student problems are certain to surface. This is inherent in providing regular time for teachers to meet and develop respect and trust.

The variety of approaches that were suggested by Stallings were used by Dr. Davidson. She also added professional reading and time to share what was read. Since each session was presented in a manner that demonstrated Whole Language beliefs, each participant built on what they knew, grew in their individual understanding and set their individual professional goals. This was documented in the reflections that were written in May of 1992.

The cornerstones of Stallings' (1989) model of conditions for teacher change consist of: learning by doing, linking prior knowledge to new information, learning by reflecting and solving problems, and learning in a supportive environment. These four cornerstones are also often described in Whole Language practices. Dr. Davidson practiced the beliefs she holds regarding the learning process. For that reason, in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, teachers actually performed the activities, such as working with the birds nests, and used reciprocal reading strategies

on professional articles. They continually linked the new ideas with what they believed or practiced in the past. They reflected in group discussions, in writing and in journals, and they developed a trusted and supportive group environment over the nine months of the program.

Considering all the pressures that teachers have to cope with and all the demands of the stages of the change process, it becomes apparent that the problem of teacher commitment of time and energy to change and the change process is a serious one. Fullan's (1991) research suggests four main criteria that teachers use to determine whether they will put their efforts into a particular change. These are questions that they ask themselves and the innovation initiators. Does the change potentially address a need that will make a difference with students? How clear is the change in terms of what the teacher has to do? How will the change affect the teachers in terms of time, energy, sense of competence, and existing priorities? How positive will the change process be in terms of interaction with peers or others? (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991) These can be simplified into areas that keep occurring in studies and in the interview included here. They are need (practicality), clarity of understanding, personal costs or benefits (CBAM) and collaboration or professional interaction.

For Susan Roberts, Karen Jacobs, and the other substantiated practitioners, when they asked these

questions, the answers obviously supported continuation. For them, the need for change whether external, internal or both, was evident. They had a clear enough understanding of what Whole Language was that they could begin to implement strategies and modify them with feedback. In order to have maintained the change three years later, the personal costs/benefits must have been worth it. In addition, each participant who was a substantiated practitioner had at least the minimum district and building support to maintain the beliefs, practices and materials three years later. What follows are case studies of two participants, one unsubstantiated practitioner and one unsubstantiated nonpractitioner.

#### Case Study of Sandra Grant, Participant C

Sandra Grant, Participant C, stated in her 1995 interview that she still embraced Whole Language beliefs. In her position at that time, she worked with two Reading Recovery students each day, and the remainder of the day was spent as a full time curriculum implementer. Since Reading Recovery is a very structured program with specific steps to each lesson, there were no observational data to support Sandra's beliefs. As a curriculum implementer, Sandra is working with teachers in a consultant/coach role to help them implement curriculum changes determined by the school district. This position also does not provide a classroom

setting in which content or delivery of instruction can be observed. Therefore Sandra has been identified as an unsubstantiated practitioner. No observation could be completed to verify the statements made during the interview.

### Background Information

Sandra Grant attended the April 1991 workshop on Whole Language strategies that could be used in the Chapter 1 classroom. Mrs. Grant expressed interest in participating in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. She, like Karen Jacobs, was a teacher in the Rockford School District. Like Karen, Sandra's Chapter 1 coordinator supported her participation in the year-long professional development program. At that time she had 15 years experience as a Chapter 1 teacher. The school at which she was teaching was using the in-class Chapter 1 model. At the time of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, Sandra had completed a Bachelor's degree, a Master's degree, and forty hours beyond a Masters.

Sandra was in the stage of her career during which, according to Krupp (1982), she would be dealing with contrasting themes like stability/advancement, authority/mutuality and de-illusionment. At this stage, educators are striving for advancement on his/her own psychosocial ladder. Success is interwoven with achieving self-defined goals. At the same time there is a desire for

stability rather than constant change. Similarly, authority is connected with independence and power, while mutuality is connected with interdependence and cooperation. Finally, de-illusionment means to remove from one's dream those elements that are illusionary while holding on to the components that are reality-based. This is a time when the educator is open to change if it connects with their self-defined goals and supports their desire for advancement whether in the practice of teaching or in school or district goals. There is a desire to hone one's craft.

Modifications or accommodations are done if the goal is to meet students' needs and improve the practice of teaching (Krupp, 1982). Sandra appeared to be open to changes and innovations both at the time of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program and during the three years that followed. She was seeking changes that would support her advancement as a professional. She felt that her selection as a curriculum implementer identified her as a teacher leader who could coach and at times instruct peers in both curriculum and instructional delivery.

At the time of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, the Rockford school district was just beginning to receive direction from the court regarding the class action suit. In the interim, Sandra changed schools. The school at which she was teaching in 1995 served six hundred students with a staff of thirty teachers. The school served a bilingual

community, and the Chapter 1 program was an in-class model.

### 1991-92 Reflections

During the 1991-92 school year, Sandra videotaped herself and shared the video with the group of teachers. She immersed herself in all the components of the program. She purchased and read professional and philosophical books. She purchased student materials. She used the reflective planner. In December 1991, she wrote that there were many ways that she had changed. One was that she didn't immediately respond with "sound it out" whenever a student had difficulty with a word. She had stopped being the "teller." She was reading out loud to her students more, and in the process learning more children's literature, including poetry. Another consequence of this oral reading was that her students were seeing how she truly loved the books and loved reading them. She said she was asking "why?" more and "What will happen next?"

In February, Sandra and some of the other participants made a presentation at a Chapter 1 conference that was sponsored by the Rockford school district for Chapter 1 teachers. In the presentation, participants in the Pilot Program were to report about the progress of the Pilot Program to that time. Sandra talked about the new terms that she had encountered: Directed Reading and Thinking Activity (DRTA), Know-Want to know-Learned (KWL),



authenticity, running records, ownership, emergent readers, shared-book experience, and guided reading. She had also come to know and respect research names like: Don Holdaway, Andrea Butler, Kenneth Goodman, Marie Clay, Brian Cambourne, Frank Smith, Jerry Harste, and Dorothy Watson. She shared that her students had started taking more responsibility for their learning as she asked them, "How can you help yourself?" as they read. They were reading to make sense.

In May 1992, Sandra shared her end of the year impressions. She stated that during the Pilot Program, she had learned to be more trusting of her instincts as to what and how children learn to read. She learned to be more flexible and enjoy the wonderful literature that was available for children to read. She learned not to feel "guilty" when her students were reading real books and writing books during her teaching time. She learned to let the children discover more things and to lead her, rather than her being the dispenser of knowledge to them. She said, "It is an awesome burden, but an exhilarating feeling to have fun again while teaching." She learned to view herself as a process teacher: one who is in the process of changing and growing along with her students.

She believed that she learned these things when she was exposed to other teachers successfully teaching from a Whole Language philosophy in their classrooms. This learning process occurred when she was able to view their teaching on

the videotapes. She also learned through the exposure to and reading of various authors in the Whole Language field. In her words, the monthly meetings with fellow participants was like "meeting with an alter ego."

In Sandra's mind, her teaching took a more positive outlook as a result of the Pilot Program experience. She observed children wanting to learn to read real books, not just memorizing letter sounds and how to blend them together. She gave the children more opportunities to "fix up" their own reading. She now allowed the books and children to guide her to the next logical step in their development. Sandra said that she learned/relearned over and over again the power that stories had in the lives of the children she taught. She learned to glean much more about the language development of first graders from their journals than ever before. She saw the growth of children take place which is why she went into teaching.

In fact, Sandra shared some student results from her second grade, bilingual, Chapter 1 class. She had brought in videotapes of this group, and it was apparent that the students didn't speak much English. Sandra had decided that English standardized tests could not validly represent these students' growth. Instead she included self assessments, writing samples and lists of books read. In the self assessments, 13 of the 15 students saw themselves as better readers than they had been in August. The reason that most

of them said they were better readers was because they read - hard books - with Mom, with teachers, with Dad. All of the students said they were reading more than they ever had before. The reading lists supported the increased reading perception, and the writing samples at three different times in the year, supported growth in understanding story grammar and ability to communicate with letter symbols.

In 1992, at the end of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, Sandra drew her own Whole Language continuum. She identified herself below the first quarter in terms of practicing Whole Language in August 1991. By May 1992, she moved herself to above the top quarter in terms of practicing Whole Language strategies. Interestingly, she placed herself at almost the same point in 1995.

In May 1992, her professional goals included continuing to teach the in-class model of Chapter 1. She wanted to have more structured time with her colleagues to plan for their joint teaching time. She planned to attend an Early Literacy Inservice course. She also wanted to become an E.L.I.C. facilitator or a Reading Recovery teacher in the future.

### 1995 Interview

At the 1995 interview, Sandra was in a different school in Rockford, Illinois. She was teaching two Reading

Recovery students and serving as Curriculum Implementer in this school. She felt that both Reading Recovery and the strategic teaching practices that she was encouraging teachers to use, shared some elements with the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. Both were student-centered and both built on what students know and can do, rather than working from the deficit model. This was one of the ways that she felt she continued to use elements from the Chapter 1 Pilot Program.

On the other hand, many of the elements from the Chapter 1 Pilot Program were not possible to use. Sandra believed that one of the strongest influencing factors for continued use of the strategies and application of the beliefs was politics. The court order resulting from the class action suit mandated the implementation of Success for All in several identified schools. The Success for All program was structured and required sequential progress through the graphophonic cueing system before reading could begin. Whole Language instruction, Reading Recovery and Success for All were three very different instructional approaches to reading. If a building in the district accepted, by choice or mandate, one of these systems, it created a challenge in utilizing either of the other two programs. At the time of the interview, Sandra's school had not yet been mandated to use Success for All, but was being required to justify not accepting and implementing the program. The staff also had been requested to review test

data and justify continued use of Whole Language instruction.

Standardized tests were not necessarily reflecting the approach or content of some of the programs, including the Whole Language approach. Essentially, standardized tests did not assess what was taught. One such example was the amount of print found in Big Books and pattern story books that were used in Whole Language primary classes, compared to the amount of print experienced in a standardized reading test. Students were used to using other cueing systems including context clues, visual clues and syntactic clues. These clues were not present in the standardized tests and could not be used as cueing systems.

Although student instruction by Sandra was only done with 2 students in a Reading Recovery format, she still practiced other professional development components of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. She read a large amount of professional books including those like: Becoming Literate, The Assessment Book, Literacy Assessment Handbook, and Fundamentals of Language, and periodicals like: Bilingual Education, Kappan, Reading Teacher, Education Leadership and many more.

Professional reading was still very important; videotaping was not. However, in the Reading Recovery program, there was a peer coaching component, or observation/feedback piece when the teachers instructed in

front of the two-way mirrors and colleagues provided feedback.

Another component of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program was flexible student grouping. Of course, Sandra did not have a classroom in which to do this, but in her role as Curriculum Implementer, she helped other teachers utilize different grouping strategies.

When she was asked about student writing, which had been emphasized in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, she said that she used writing as a main focus when she was teaching. As Curriculum Implementer, she said that she encouraged writing also. She said that all the teachers in her school were trained in the Illinois Writing Project and process writing. This had become the center of language arts curriculum in their school.

When Sandra was asked about how she saw herself as a reflective/effective practitioner, she stated that she felt that she would always be in the process of trying something new and reflecting on it. She loved to learn and consequently continually took classes. In 1995, her interests were English as a Second Language (ESL), bilingual education and literacy, and she planned to study all of these.

#### Participant C Conclusion

Sandra was interviewed in her office which is where she

worked with the Reading Recovery students. The office was filled with books including teacher resource books and student books. When responding to the question about professional reading, she pulled books and periodicals from the shelves to identify titles. She also had student work on display in her office. Although it was not a classroom per se, it was a print-rich environment. The Reading Recovery program in which she instructed two students each day focused on making meaning and building on students strengths. She also used some of the same tools that were used in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, i.e. running records; however, the design of the program was much too teacher-directed to ever be considered Whole Language.

Several concepts that were key to the Chapter 1 Pilot Program were addressed in this interview. Sandra still expressed a belief in building on what students can do - focusing on their strengths. She defined reading as making meaning and used running records to collect data as to how effectively students were making meaning. She still valued and spent time reflecting on teaching, and doing extensive professional reading. She supported flexible groups in other teachers' classrooms, as well as writing across the curriculum. These beliefs were clear and practical to her and had been maintained three years later. In terms of CBAM, she was at a level of concern about the impact of Whole Language on students, and since she was collaborating

with other teachers, she had some concerns about collaboration. Her level of use was greater during the 1991-92 school year by virtue of the amount of time spent teaching. She clearly had confidence in her abilities and attributed any limitations to external factors, not internal. She stated that her beliefs had changed, but it was impossible to measure whether materials and instructional practices had changed when Reading Recovery was the only instruction done. When Sandra placed herself at the same point on the Whole Language continuum three years later, it would seem that she had not traveled on her journey during that time. She had moved in her career and in the mastering of Reading Recovery, but in the continuation of Whole Language innovations she did not describe movement.

Because she was no longer a Chapter 1 teacher, or functioning in an instructional situation that allowed her the freedom to practice her beliefs, there was no way to verify implementation of these beliefs and values. Sandra remained an unsubstantiated practitioner.

### Case Study of Mary Nichols, Participant I

#### Background Information

Mary Nichols had just been moved into a district level position in the Chapter 1 department of the Rockford School



District when she attended the April 1991 workshop. She expressed interest in participating in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program along with several teachers from Rockford. At that time she was a reading specialist for Chapter 1 and had been a teacher in the Rockford district since 1979. At the time of the workshop, Mary had 16 years of teaching experience with some in regular education classes and some in Chapter 1. She had a Bachelor's degree, a Master's degree in Learning Disabilities and seventy hours beyond. Although Mary was in her sixteenth year of educational career, she had a 14 year span during which she had not taught. In Mary's case, she did not reflect the life stage of a 55 year old person according to Krupp (1981). She also did not represent the career patterns of someone in the twelfth year of her career (Krupp, 1981).

Mary Nichols began this professional development program at the beginning levels of concern and use according to CBAM. She was not really aware of Whole Language and was seeking information about it. Her concern appeared to be based on learning more about an approach that some of her teachers might be using. As far as use was concerned, she was at the first level of nonuse. Mary had little awareness and no use of the Whole Language philosophy.

At the start of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, Mary Nichols had left the classroom for the Chapter 1 district position. It was her job to observe Chapter 1 teachers,

support them and coach them as they worked to better serve the students in the Chapter 1 Program. She also helped the schools write their Chapter 1 grants and develop their program improvement plans. In her new job, she was thrust into a new role, and as a participant in the professional development program she was challenged about her belief system. She said that she signed up for the Pilot Program because she felt that she needed to know and understand other approaches to instruction that her teachers might support and use. She expressed from the start of the school year that she did not embrace the Whole Language philosophy, and that she was trying very hard not to pre-judge Dr. Davidson as a Whole Language purist, even though many people had described her as such.

Mary was not associated with a single school. She and another reading specialist shared the buildings in the Rockford school system. Their position was not clinical supervision or evaluation; nor was it practitioner. They acted as consultants to schools in the district assisting them in writing program improvement plans and facilitating collaboration between regular education teachers and Chapter 1 teachers. Rockford is a large multicultural district with areas of great poverty. Several of the buildings have large numbers of students in the Chapter 1/Title 1 program.

1991-92 Reflections

Mary was a vocal participant in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. She asked many questions, and expressed frustration when Dr. Davidson would not give a clear definition of Whole Language that was satisfactory to her. She frequently challenged Dr. Davidson regarding Whole Language beliefs. The Pilot Program was focused on instructional strategies and included videotaping. All of the instructional activities were experiences Mary was unable to have due to her new position as reading specialist.

In her December 1991 reflection, Mary wrote that she had changed from September to December, but she wasn't certain whether that was due to her change in job or the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. She identified at this time that Dr. Davidson was a "purist" of Whole Language, and that she was very far right of Dr. Davidson's beliefs. She believed that she owed it to her teachers to be non-judgmental and to accept different teaching approaches. Because of this she had taken workshops on Marie Carbo's reading styles, Robert Slavin's Success for All Program, and how to develop a literature based reading program. These programs seemed to be more in line with her special education background.

She stated that she believed not every teacher can be a good Whole Language teacher, just as every teacher cannot be a good direct instructions, skill and sequence instructor.

She believed that she had observed excellent teaching and learning in both settings. She went on to state that she had a much clearer understanding of the Whole Language philosophy due to the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. In it the teacher becomes a facilitator; skill lessons may be taught as the need arises; choral reading aids fluency and round robin reading is frowned upon. A few open-ended questions are used to guide reading/thinking, and running records are critical to diagnosis. Her final statement in December was that she remained a learner and was open.

Because Mary was not a classroom practitioner, she had no student results to share. She participated in giving feedback to others as their videotape was observed, but she never received any herself. She purchased professional books and participated in the reading and sharing process that was a part of several of the monthly meetings. She experienced the learning activities with the other participants, including the bird's nest activity.

In the end of the year impressions, Mary stated that in September she felt confident, and now her ideas were muddled. She felt afraid and unsure of the rhythm - "trudging up the road, no longer skipping." She said she wished she was a product, not on a journey. She felt that she had learned she was "unfinished business" by taking this course, by the books she was exposed to and by attending the International Reading Association Conference. She described

herself as not completely letting go of her old beliefs, but more accepting of new ideas now.

She said she had changed professionally by having students articulate the reading strategies they used, doing more reflection, and using DRTA's. She planned to read, read, read; put her notes together from the International Reading Association Conference, and perhaps take the professional development course, Frameworks, or ELIC training. She planned to read, discuss, reflect and grow during the summer.

Mary commented that her vocabulary was changing. It now included words like: repeated readings, predictable books, running records, revising, editing, reflecting, trade books, DRTA's, making sense, authentic, child-directed, journals, and portfolios. Although all of these changes were described, Mary declined to place herself on a Whole Language continuum. She stated that since she wasn't teaching, she couldn't identify what kind of teacher she was. In addition, her belief system seemed to be relatively unchanged.

### 1995 Interview

Mary was interviewed in February of 1995. At that time she was still in the central office Chapter 1 Department in the Rockford school system. She was working with seven buildings in the Assured Readiness for Learning program

(ARL). This program included monthly parent meetings, regular teacher observations, full-day kindergartens and Reading Recovery. Mary also worked with school-wide programs, community academies (previously identified as C-8 schools that were under-performing schools which received tort money from the class-action suit), and C-9 schools (schools which received no tort money but still had a large population of Chapter 1 children). She worked with reading recovery, push-in programs, pull-out programs, and collaboration training. She still worked with grant writing and helping to write program improvement plans.

Mary stated that her background had been strongly connected with Madeline Hunter with whom she studied for three summers. She was also schooled in Project READ based on Orton Gillingham's work. For her, the Whole Language approach was foreign. She didn't feel it was for her children. She identified the children that she serviced as the bottom quartile. It was her belief that these children need the direct instruction and repeated learning and the oral reading. She saw Dr. Davidson's philosophy as very different from that of Slavin's model of Success for All. Mary believed that children do not absorb letter/sound relationships by osmosis. Some children need direct instruction and many of them are the Chapter 1 students. In the reading specialist role, Mary still believed that she needed to be accepting of different approaches. She stated

that she took the Project Read phonics class three times. She also said that the best component of Whole Language was the exposure to literature, but that Project READ also exposed students to literature. Mary said that she enjoyed Dr. Davidson, but did not believe in her philosophy.

Mary decided that she had changed since 1991 by mellowing, but she saw this as a result of her job, not any training. She said that instructional changes in Rockford were definitely influenced by the court case (external factors). Whole Language strategies were not easily blended with Slavin's Success for All, a court mandated program. Even blending Reading Recovery and Success for All was a challenge, since the strategies used in Reading Recovery were not taught or reinforced in Success for All. Mary felt that inservice was a key factor here. Teachers needed to be inserviced so that they could help students bridge these programs. Other inhibiting factors were: mobility of teachers in such a large district, site-based staff development that added to the mobility problem, over-emphasis on school improvement plans, and over-emphasis of test scores.

When Mary was asked what part reflection played in her teaching today, she stated that each week the Chapter 1 facilitators have a staff meeting in the central office and reflect on the previous week and how the teachers were doing. She tried to read professional materials one evening

a week. Mary did not participate in peer coaching. She did observe others and give them feedback, but it was in a non-evaluative setting.

One of the elements of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program was flexible grouping. Mary stated that Success for All uses different kinds of grouping that are predetermined. When Mary was asked about the part that writing plays in instruction in Chapter 1, she stated that students wrote their own sentences in Reading Recovery, kept journals, and wrote questions after reading. As far as using thematic units, these were individual to each building. In the role of reading specialist Mary's job was to support thematic units if they were taught.

When describing a professional development program that she really liked, Mary mentioned Assured Readiness for Learning (ARL). This was a good program because it made sense to her, was research based, came out of the context of a psychologist working with kids. Another good program, according to Mary, was one on Literature Circles, and for many of the same reasons.

Mary described herself as reflective. She had learned that professional development was a process and that people needed a climate in which they could feel comfortable taking risks. She believed that Dr. Davidson introduced her to taking risks, but that she was also at a period in her life when she was open to taking risks. Mary attributed her



openness to risk-taking to more inner contentment. Mary seems to be describing the self-efficacy mentioned in the Efficacy-Based Change Model. She was attributing the change and risk-taking to her inner contentment rather than external causes.

### Participant I Conclusion

In the process of reviewing the reflections from 1991-92 and the interview of 1995, some things become apparent about Mary Nichols. First, at the time of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program she was at the level of awareness and information seeking in terms of the Concerns Based Model. She was not using any Whole Language strategies because she was not a classroom teacher and even if she were a classroom practitioner, she had not developed the level of knowledge and use of Whole Language needed. Her reason for participating was to become aware of strategies her teachers might use and be able to understand and support them.

In terms of the Efficacy Based Change Model, Mary Nichols was at the beginning level of concerns, she had many external influencing factors, and her self-efficacy as a teacher was influenced by Madeline Hunter and Orton Gillingham, not by anyone known for their Whole Language beliefs. Mary stated during the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, that she was not able to practice the strategies and that this inability limited her. She also believed that the type

of student found in the Chapter 1 program was not a good match for Whole Language practices even though other participants felt there was a good match. The external factors of student demographics, non-classroom position, and mandated programs from the Court suit all made it impossible for her to implement any of the strategies learned in the Pilot Program. According to the EBCM, she was attributing the limitations to external factors which limited her self-efficacy in the area of this innovation. In addition, she had a strong philosophical foundation in the Madeline Hunter approach of nine steps of lesson design. The prescribed teaching approaches of both Hunter and Gillingham were not compatible with the Whole Language philosophy.

In terms of change process, the three dimensions of change according to Fullan and Stiegelbauer are: use of materials, use of teaching practices, and change in beliefs. Mary chose not to use materials and teaching practices because she was out of the classroom. According to Fullan and Stiegelbauer, these three dimensions interact and support each other in the change process. Fullan and Stiegelbauer also referred to the factors that influence initiation of change. One of these was teacher advocacy which involved teachers talking and reflecting about the innovation. Mary Nichols had the benefit of monthly meetings during which she heard other teacher practitioners talk about what they were doing and watched videotapes of

their lessons. These activities provided her with both information and teacher excitement about the innovation. In her 1991-92 reflections she acknowledged the excitement she had witnessed, and she expressed an openness to the belief system even if she wasn't ready to embrace it herself. She seemed to have had the support from the Chapter 1 Pilot Program to initiate a change towards Whole Language philosophy.

In the 1995 interview, it was clear that the distance from the Chapter 1 Pilot Program and the access to information and excitement, had lessened the openness to the Whole Language philosophy. She was unable to practice any of the strategies. Many of the schools in which she worked were mandated by the court to use programs like Success for All that is prescriptive with regard to both content and delivery. Therefore, she was unable to practice or experience the excitement of other practitioners. Her stage of initiating change in her belief system was ended because she had no access to information, no central administration support because of the court case, and no teacher advocacy because she was working with schools that had to use court mandated programs. The only other factor that influences maintaining initiation is the quality of the innovation. For Mary Nichols, she had felt that the open-endedness of Whole Language, the inability to have a clear definition, the fact that it was constantly evolving made it far less

appealing than the philosophies she embraced the most, Madeline Hunter's and Orton Gillingham's. These philosophies were the ones that she embraced when she began the Chapter 1 Pilot Program and they remained the beliefs that most influenced her educational decisions three years later.

Mary Nichols did not identify herself on a Whole Language continuum of beliefs either during the Chapter 1 Pilot Program or at the time of the 1995 interview. She resisted identifying herself anywhere on a continuum of Whole Language beliefs because she was not a classroom practitioner. In the final interview, she stated that the Chapter 1 Pilot Program had provided her with an opportunity to "mellow" to other people's beliefs. The only connection to the training that she believed she had was this openness to beliefs of all teachers.

#### Summary of Participants C and I

In summary, at the time of the 1995 interview neither Sandra Grant nor Mary Nichols were classroom practitioners. Sandra felt that she still embraced the Whole Language philosophy and utilized the belief system as she worked with other teachers. Mary Nichols believed that she had never been able to practice the Whole Language strategies, and due to external factors had not become a Whole Language teacher. She believed that she had an openness to the Whole Language

beliefs but had never implemented them. Neither Sandra Grant nor Mary Nichols could be substantiated in their statements because there were no classroom behaviors that could be observed to support either initiation or implementation and continuation of Whole Language philosophies.

In the following chapter, literature on peer support will be reviewed because peer support was an important component of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. The stages of career will also be examined in greater depth. Finally, the case studies of two participants who stated in the follow-up interview that they were not practicing the beliefs or strategies of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program will be reviewed.

CHAPTER 5  
PEER COACHING, STAGES OF CAREER,  
AND THE NONPRACTITIONERS

One of the significant components of the professional development program known as the Chapter 1 Pilot Program was teacher collaboration. It ranged from viewing videotapes of lessons and providing feedback to working together on professional readings, student activities and lesson designs. What follows is a brief summary of the development of peer coaching and cognitive coaching both of which were utilized in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program.

Peer Coaching

During the 1970's, as few as ten percent of participants in staff development that focused on teaching strategies and curriculum implemented what they learned. The rate of transfer remained low even when teachers volunteered for the staff development training, the staff development was well-funded, and it was approved by the public (Joyce & Showers, 1996). This low level of transfer stimulated research as to what would increase the implementation of an innovation in the classroom.

In the 1980's Joyce and Showers tested a hypothesis that regular (weekly) seminars would enable teachers to practice and implement the content they were learning. These seminars focused on classroom implementation and analysis of teaching, especially as it related to student outcomes. The seminars became coaching sessions on the implementation. The results were that implementation rates rose dramatically, sometimes to nearly 90 percent (Joyce & Showers, 1980).

As Joyce and Showers began their studies of successful staff development programs, they proposed a training structure that included theory presentations, modeling or demonstration, practice, and structured and open-ended feedback (Joyce & Showers, 1980). The structured and open-ended feedback became peer coaching. The results of early studies indicated that coaching relationships supported more frequent and appropriate practice of new skills and greater long-term retention (Baker and Showers, 1984). Coaching relationships were defined as teachers who shared aspects of teaching, planned together, and pooled their experiences (Joyce & Showers, 1996). Under this definition, the coaching relationship expanded from structured feedback, to include collaboration in the planning and teaching process as well.

The purpose of peer coaching was primarily to support the implementation of innovations, so that the effects on

student learning could be determined. This was Joyce and Showers' (1980) primary purpose, but they discovered that coaching had several other purposes as well. A second purpose was to build communities of teachers who continuously engaged in the study of their craft. A third purpose was to develop the shared language and common understandings necessary for the collegial study of new knowledge and skills. The fourth purpose was to provide a structure for the follow-up to training that is essential for acquiring new teaching skills and strategies (Joyce & Showers, 1988).

In Joyce and Showers' model of coaching, there were three important characteristics of coaching. First, coaching programs were attached to training programs. They continued and extended training into the classroom. Second, coaching was experimental in nature. This involved both experimenting with how to use the innovation and when it was most appropriate. The last characteristic, according to Joyce and Showers, was that coaching was completely separated from supervision and evaluation. Their belief was that any connection with evaluation would inhibit the experimental nature that was needed (Joyce & Showers, 1988).

The actual organization of peer coaching programs was basically simple. The coaches needed time to watch each other work and time to talk. According to Joyce and Showers' model, the coaches had already shared a common



training experience that provided both the new skills and strategies and the common language related to it. As the coaching process began, the focus was on increasing skill through practice, observation, and feedback. As the skill developed, the coaching relationship moved into a mutual examination of appropriate use of the innovation. This involved the cognitive aspects of transferring new behaviors into effective classroom practice. As the process shifted from skill development to integration for effective teaching, the coaching conferences would take on a collaborative, problem-solving character that moved into planning for future instruction (Joyce & Showers, 1988).

As Joyce and Showers struggled to create this coaching model, literature on supervisory practices and feedback influenced their thinking (Joyce & Showers, 1996). The pre-conference, observation, and post-conference format was based on the supervisory model.

The literature on supervisory practices and feedback also influenced the development of another type of coaching. At the same time that Joyce and Showers began to study why so little of what was taught in staff development ever made its way to the classroom, Art Costa and a group of California educators were charged with the task of developing a strategy for assisting school administrators in applying humanistic principles to teacher evaluation. This group applied the clinical supervision model of Cogan (1973)

and Goldhammer (1969), and outlined goals of trust, learning and autonomy (Costa & Garmston, 1994).

In Saudi Arabia at about the same time, Robert Garmston was working with computer-assisted individual instruction that placed teachers in the role of facilitator. He was also applying the clinical supervision model of Cogan, Goldhammer, and Anderson (1993). When Garmston and Costa joined the faculty of California State University, along with the clinical supervision work, they brought with them additional experiences in teaching communication courses, background work in cognitive development and problem-based inquiry learning, group dynamics strategies, and principles of counseling. In the early 1980's, the integration of these experiences and interests led to the joint development of cognitive coaching which could be used with teacher evaluation or with peer coaching (Costa & Garmston, 1994).

Cognitive coaching does not apply the analogy of athletic coaching. Instead the metaphor of coach is used as in a conveyance like a stagecoach. In this way, coaching means to convey a colleague from where he/she is to where he/she wants to be (Costa & Garmston, 1994). Cognitive coaching is not a judgmental process. Specific communication strategies are used to assist the person being coached to enhance his/her perceptions, decisions, and intellectual functions. When these thought processes are changed, then instructional behaviors change as well (Costa

& Garmston, 1994).

The primary goals of cognitive coaching are: establishing and maintaining trust, facilitating mutual learning, and enhancing growth toward autonomous interdependence (Costa & Garmston, 1994). In simplest terms, the model serves to improve existing conditions. This coaching model does not support a single innovation. The purpose of coaching is not long-term transfer of a new skill or practice. Instead, it suggests an on-going process of continual improvement that may include new practices or may simply refine and integrate current practices. The coaching can also be done by anyone - an administrator, fellow teacher, or department chair.

Cognitive and peer coaching are only two of the many forms coaching has taken. If the coach is the experienced teacher and the other the new teacher, a mentor/coach relationship is fostered. If the coaching team is focused on innovations in curriculum and instruction, the coaching falls into the categories of technical, team or peer coaching. If the aim is improving existing practices, the team may be collegial or cognitive (Joyce & Showers, 1996). All of these forms of coaching rely on verbal feedback, and most of them have the pre-conference, observation, post-conference cycle.

In Joyce and Showers (1996) most recent work, four principles for peer coaching were developed. These

principles evolved from their initial studies and reflect the results of the research completed since then. First, if Joyce and Showers work with entire faculties, all teachers must agree to be members of peer coaching study teams. These teams must agree to: practice or use the innovation the faculty has decided on; support one another in the change process; and collect data on the implementation process and the effects on students relative to school goals (Joyce & Showers, 1996).

Secondly, they omitted verbal feedback as a coaching component. Coaching teams work on planning and developing curriculum and instruction aligned to the shared goals. This collaboration is essential. Joyce and Showers found that when coaches provided feedback, they slipped into supervisory roles and the collaborative approach disintegrated (Joyce & Showers, 1996). Omitting feedback in the coaching process has not decreased the implementation of innovations or student growth (Joyce & Showers, 1995).

Thirdly, they redefined the meaning of coach. They identify the teacher who is watching as the coached, and the teacher teaching as the coach. The teachers doing the observing are doing so to learn. This eliminates the need for feedback (Joyce & Showers, 1996).

The last principle is that the collaboration of peer coaching is primarily done in the planning of instruction and developing of support materials. It can also be done

while watching one another work with students and talking about the impact of teaching behavior on students' learning, but this is not essential to the coaching process.

Joyce and Showers continue to have concerns about staff development training. Their focus is on how to help teachers provide the best learning experiences for students. These experiences would include the opportunity for students to build intellectual independence, reasoning and problem-solving capabilities, competence in handling the explosion of information and data, and the ability to navigate the information age (Joyce & Showers, 1996).

Cognitive coaching has many of the same goals. It is based on a cognitive perception of teaching. The processing of instructional experiences facilitates the construction of new meanings and insights for teachers. Cognitive coaching attempts to support this processing activity. During the pre-conference, planning of instruction, the teaching experience and the post conference reflection on the teaching process, there are several times when processing of instructional experiences is facilitated. Each time instructional experiences are processed an opportunity is provided to reflect on what was done and why that choice was made. The long-term goal of cognitive coaching is for these kinds of intellectual functions of effective teaching to occur without coaching. The goal is for the teacher to internalize these processes so that modifying and renewing

takes place without the presence of a coach (Costa & Garmston, 1994).

Cognitive and peer coaching have some specific differences. Peer coaching in the Joyce and Showers model is always connected with an innovation and never is connected to the evaluation process. Cognitive coaching does not have to be connected to a specific innovation. Instead, it is based on the individual teacher improving his/her effectiveness as a teacher. Except for non-tenured teachers, cognitive coaching is highly recommended as a component of the evaluation process. Peer coaching, then, is a tool for implementation of innovation, and cognitive coaching is part of a continual improvement process. Joyce and Showers express strong beliefs that peer coaching must be separated from the current teacher evaluation system. Costa and Garmston describe cognitive coaching as the direction that teacher evaluation should go.

In spite of the differences in style, both cognitive coaching and peer coaching have some elements in common. They both have as goals the improvement of student learning and thinking. They both support collaborative work by teachers. They both emphasize the importance of this collaborative work taking place during the planning and developing of instructional materials and activities. They both involve a change process for teachers. These commonalities are components of any of the forms of

educational coaching, and also are important components of professional development. For these reasons, some form of coaching is often found in professional development training programs. A form of peer coaching was used in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program when the teachers viewed videotapes of participants' classroom instruction and offered feedback. By the definitions given, in some cases, the participants who had begun the practice of Whole Language and were working on refining and improving effective instruction were experiencing cognitive coaching. The style of probing questioning, characteristic of cognitive coaching, was practiced by the facilitator. Participants were not evaluated on Whole Language practices as the videotapes were viewed. Rather they were questioned as to why they made a particular instructional decision. This type of question allowed them to determine whether they would make a different choice, and what that choice might be.

The collaborative planning work that is described in both peer and cognitive coaching was also done during monthly meetings. Peer coaching, cognitive coaching, and teacher collaboration were important components of the structure of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program described in this study.

#### Age and Stage of Career

As part of the vignettes of participants, the stages of

professional career were described. These stages are based on the research done by Judy Arin-Krupp (1981, 1983) who studied the stages of career development for educators. She related these stages to stages of adult learning and staff development considerations as well. Her work synthesizes studies and writings by Jung (1971), Levinson (1978), Erikson (1968), Hall and Rutherford (1976) and several studies specifically focused on women like that of Bardwick (1980) and Stewart (1977).

According to Arin-Krupp (1981), if an adult learner is in his/her twenties, he/she has a need for: a clear definition of what is expected, peer support, positive feedback, emphasis on self-awareness, mentoring, opportunities for creativity and a feeling of independence. At this age there is a struggle with independence versus dependence and self-awareness versus coping with responsibility (Arin-Krupp, 1981).

Educators in their late twenties need support in developing the teacher identity, encouragement to try new things, peer support, and staff development that models integration of past, present, and future. Key concerns of this age are the struggle of identity/intimacy, the struggle of loving/working, and the struggle of flexibility/stability. For each of these dichotomies, there is a struggle of determining what is the balance that is best for each individual. Marriage and choices about the



role of career and family are a part of the love/work struggle (Arin-Krupp, 1981).

The transition from the twenties to mid-thirties brings on another set of concerns. The major concern is individuation, or search for self, and the way that self penetrates the world. This is a time of struggle between the dream that each individual has had and the reality that is growing around him/her. Dreams need to be modified and career ladders climbed. The staff development implications are: a willingness to try new things particularly if they relate to an aspect of self, peer support, career counseling, opportunities to visit and see others, teacher involvement in planning, and opportunities to recommit to teaching (Arin-Krupp, 1981).

For the transition from the mid-thirties to the forties, there are other concerns. One struggle is stability versus advancement. The adult wants to feel a sense of accomplishment in the area of the dream each individual has. While trying to please others in order to advance, there is a need for stability. Constancy is sought in marriage and the family. Accommodations are made in order to maintain this stability. The tricky balance is to advance and maintain stability without too much accommodation (Arin-Krupp, 1983).

This is also the period of de-illusionment. This is the removal of illusionary elements from the dream without

losing reality-based components. It is moving from idealism to realism while holding onto as much of the dream as is possible. This is the time of "becoming one's own person" (Arin-Krupp, 1981). This involves knowing oneself and acting on that knowledge. The realization of the work needed to reach a goal, and the fact that the results of having reached it are not all that was anticipated makes this time de-illusionment. This time is also a struggle between independence and interdependence (Arin-Krupp, 1981).

The staff development implication is that for people of this age, time is very important. No time should be wasted with unorganized meetings or workshops. Staff development that supports advancement will be of highest interest. An environment that supports change, particularly change that will assist advancement is important. Workplace stability is needed as much as possible, so clearly established rules and guidelines are appreciated. This is a time when mentors are no longer appreciated. De-illusionment may cause stress or even crisis. Staff development at this age more than any must be worthwhile (Arin-Krupp, 1981).

The next stage moves from early forties to late forties. De-illusionment continues, and new concerns are added like individuation, generativity, time, and career. Individuation includes identity search, the question of immortality, the struggle between destructive and creative, male and female, separate and attached. At this stage, the

dream is seen as less absolute, its success is less essential, and its failure is less devastating. The fully de-illusioned adult is satisfied with what is, and considers ways to improve the current situation (Arin-Krupp, 1981).

Individuation looks at the gaps between where one is and where one wishes to be. Individuation goes on all through life, but there is an urgency at this time. The person who has been career oriented becomes focused on home and vice versa. The individuated adult is less willing to respond to "shoulds" and more interested in responding to their own "wants." An individuated person who has unified self and world is authentic. There is no interest in image, masks, status symbols and role playing (Arin-Krupp, 1981).

The dualities that people in their forties struggle with are young/old, destructive/creative, male/female, and separated/attached. The individuation mentioned earlier that focuses on filling the gaps, causes changes when people at this stage are dealing with these dualities. The male who has been aggressive and career oriented is now interested in home and family. The female who has been centered with home and family now wants to aggressively pursue her career. Individuated adults spend more time alone enjoying solitude which may be very different from the social activity pursued in earlier years (Arin-Krupp, 1981).

Staff development for this stage of life and career should include mentoring. This is the ideal age to mentor

younger staff members. This can be the time when people begin to say, "We tried that ten years ago and it didn't work." On the other hand, this is the time in life and career, when the right match of a task that fits the interest and value system of the teacher will be exciting (Arin-Krupp, 1981).

The last stage moves from late forties to retirement. During this time adults become more relaxed. An easy going staff member can be an asset or a liability. There may be more of a challenge to determine what will motivate a senior staff member. Often hobbies or avocations can be connected with instruction, allowing the enthusiasm and interest to be brought to the classroom. This is a time of greater concern about health and health problems. Retirement also becomes an overriding concern (Arin-Krupp, 1981).

The age and stage of professional career has been described in each case study. What follows are case studies of two participants who were not practicing Whole Language instruction in 1995.

### Case Study of Participant D

#### Background Information

Harriet Mills had been a Chapter 1 teacher in the Rockford School district for fourteen years at the time of the April workshop. She had completed a Bachelor's degree

in Elementary Education and a Master's degree in Reading at Northern Illinois University. She expressed interest at the April workshop in participating in the year-long professional development training.

Since Harriet Mills was in her fourteenth year of teaching, she fell into the same stage of career as Sandra Grant. According to Arin-Krupp (1981), she would be dealing with contrasting themes of stability/advancement, authority/mutuality and de-illusionment. Educators in this stage are striving for advancement on his/her own psychosocial ladder. Educators want to define their own goals, and they feel a sense of success when they have achieved them. This is a time when there is a desire for stability rather than constant change. In this stage, authority is connected with independence and power, and mutuality is connected with interdependence and cooperation. De-illusionment means holding on to the components of one's dream that are reality-based and letting go of the components that are illusion. This is a time when educators are open to change if the change connects with their self-defined goals and supports their desires for advancement whether it is in the practice of teaching or in the school or district goals (Arin-Krupp, 1982). Harriet reflected this openness to new ideas, but was more guarded about change than was Sandra Grant. This attitude was evidenced by both the quantity of strategies and activities

attempted and the enthusiasm and excitement expressed after using them. The difference seemed to reflect personality styles rather than stages of career.

Harriet Mills began the Chapter 1 Pilot Program at the informational and personal stages of concern on the CBAM model. She stated that she wanted to learn more about Whole Language, and wondered how she could implement it in a Chapter 1 program. In terms of levels of use on the CBAM model, Harriet was moving through the first three levels. Some strategies and concepts were familiar from her Master's of Reading program at Northern Illinois University. Other strategies and beliefs fell into the category of orientation; she needed more information about them before she could make a decision about using them. During the course of the year, she also moved into preparation (preparing to use them) and mechanical use (short term, day-to-day) of some of the strategies and beliefs. Harriet was interested in learning about Whole Language and solving the problems of implementation in the structure of a Chapter 1 program.

Harriet's school consisted of 350 children and a staff of 18 teachers plus itinerant teachers and special education teachers. The school was an elementary building with kindergarten to sixth grade situated in an integrated neighborhood. It was a C-8 school which means that a higher percentage of minority students were enrolled, and court

interventions were mandated.

### 1991-92 Reflections

Harriet Mills had known Dr. Davidson, the Chapter 1 Pilot facilitator, during Harriet's completion of her Master's degree at Northern Illinois University. This familiarity provided a comfort level and trust level based on past experience. Harriet also had a strong level of confidence in what she had learned in her Master's program which was reinforced by Dr. Davidson. Harriet was familiar with some of the strategies Dr. Davidson demonstrated and often served as a resource for information on the effectiveness of the strategies in the Chapter 1 setting. In spite of this knowledge base, Harriet saw herself as a beginning Whole Language teacher.

In the end of the year reflection, Harriet stated that she needed to give herself time for the completion of the transition to a Whole Language teacher. She described herself as willing and excited to experiment with new approaches to teaching, which would support the stages of career described earlier. She also said she saw herself as an effective reading model for her students, and she was working on improving herself as a writing model.

Harriet described the year-long process as one in which she tried to incorporate too many new ideas and approaches into too little time. She decided after reading some

professional literature that the process of becoming a Whole Language teacher takes many years. With this in mind, she was more forgiving of herself if a lesson wasn't successful on the first try.

Two significant changes in Harriet Mills' teaching style concerned student choice and modeling. She stated that she was gradually giving students more control and more choices so they could establish ownership for their learning. She also demonstrated and modeled more often about how she thought when she read a book or worked on a writing project. She would think out loud, cross out, and make revisions as she wrote. Her students felt frustration with writing which caused her to do more demonstrations.

In the course of the year-long professional development training, Harriet learned several things about her students. They were excited about reading novels. They learned quite a bit from each other in discussion groups. They didn't need her to clarify or explain. They still disliked journal writing, but had become very interested in letter writing because they received responses to their letters during the course of the year.

Harriet's professional goals for the coming school year included philosophical, instructional and curriculum changes. These changes represent the three dimensions of change that Fullan and Steigelbauer (1991) referred to when describing educational change. Harriet planned to do more



reading of the professional literature to deepen her understanding of the Whole Language philosophy, which would influence her beliefs. In addition, she planned to work collaboratively with a primary teacher so that the Chapter 1 students could be a part of the classroom for the whole day, which would be an instructional delivery change. She also planned on developing two or three new themes coordinated with the classroom curriculum which involved curricular change.

In order to achieve these goals, she had developed an action plan. She would continue reading books and journals throughout the summer months, and during the next school year she would discuss them with colleagues. She would work out an instructional plan for the colleague who had shown interest in working with her in the classroom. The second grade science curriculum would be the springboard for the first new thematic units.

In her final reflection of the 1991-92 school year, Harriet talked about the times she felt intimidated and frustrated, but also excited and joyous. The intimidation came from seeing other teachers in the Professional Development Program who were doing so much more than she and making better progress in adopting the Whole Language philosophy. The frustration came from the lack of teaching time which caused her to break up good discussions or inquiries almost in mid-sentence. She also felt frustration

because the quality of her students' writing was not what she had expected it to be and she didn't know how to improve it.

Exciting moments came for her when students became involved in reading novels. The students' comments and discussions indicated that they were able to identify with the main characters, see connections to their own lives, and enjoy the humor in the author's writing style. They asked for suggestions of additional titles by the same author. These kinds of moments affirmed that the Whole Language approach was the right direction to be going.

Another exciting moment was when Harriet read the response letter from Chris Van Allsburg, the students' favorite author. The students that were glued to every word in the letter did not appear to be the reluctant readers they were described as earlier in the year. They had a purpose; they had ownership; they felt important because a real writer had written to them. They immediately wanted to write another letter. Since Harriet's biggest frustrations during the year was with teaching the writing process, this experience provided a form of writing her students were interested in.

When Harriet addressed the experience of being videotaped, she described it as a little uncomfortable, but helpful in analyzing her own interaction with students. When she described developing themes for the fourth grade

group, she used the word challenge. Sometimes finding appropriate materials was very time consuming. At other times the topics provided such a wealth of fiction and non-fiction books that the challenge was narrowing down the topic to something her students could handle successfully. Some of the topics offered new information for Harriet so that she became a learner along with her students. Harriet viewed the units as "in progress," not completed. She felt that it would take many years to expand the units and develop new ones.

Her final statement of reflection in 1992 was that she had just started on her journey to becoming a Whole Language teacher, and that she was looking forward to the coming years which would help her see her own growth.

### 1995 Interview

Harriet Mills was interviewed in March of 1995. At that time she was teaching at the same school. She had completed the Reading Recovery training and was working with four students half of each day. The other half of the day was spent in three classrooms: first grade, second grade and fourth grade, supporting the Success for All program. She also had one pull-out group of fifth graders. In all, she served twenty-four students. Since this school had been identified as a C-8 school, student reading programs were mandated by the court. The teachers at this school were

required to teach Success for All as the reading program.

When Harriet was asked what the differences were in her instruction from 1991-92 until 1995, she stated that using running records was probably the only carry-over activity. Reading Recovery, a program to which she was assigned for half of her school day, was a structured, sequential, teacher directed program. Her in-class work had to support the Success for All program which was very structured and teacher directed. With the pull-out group supporting reading in social studies, she did use some Whole Language strategies.

Harriet felt that the structure of the Chapter 1 program could encourage the use of Whole Language if the classroom teachers had the freedom to practice it. The court-mandated reading curriculum for her school was structured and teacher-directed. As the Chapter 1 teacher in this school, she was required to support that program whether or not she believed in its premises.

When Harriet was asked about the role of reflection in her teaching today, she referred to the reflections done after each Reading Recovery lesson. Reflection was based on teacher notes, videotapes, and audio tapes of the reading recovery lessons. With Success for All there was not a lot of reflection. The prescribed lesson structure did not allow for teacher reflection and modification. She did reflect after teaching the content area pull-out group. She

also used running records with these students.

In spite of the limited freedom to practice Whole Language strategies, Harriet still read professional materials related to Whole Language on a weekly basis. She had read parts of Invitations, Dancing With the Pen, and articles from Reading Teacher and Reading Recovery newsletters.

The only peer coaching or collegial support she experienced came with the Reading Recovery work, and with the first grade teacher with whom she did some coaching and sharing. There were no thematic units taught because she was not free to develop or teach them. Flexible grouping was not possible either. The student grouping was prescribed in the Success for All program. The Reading Recovery work was individual. The group of fifth graders consisted of five children, so grouping was not possible with them. Sometimes in the Success for All classrooms, Harriet used partner reading. Overall, flexible grouping was not possible.

Writing was not a part of her Chapter 1 program. The fifth grade social studies group was supposed to work on writing the answers to questions with her. This was not student-generated writing. Success for All had some comprehension questions which required written responses, but again, she was not able to focus on process writing or generative writing skills.

Harriet's most effective professional development program since the Chapter 1 Pilot Program was the Reading Recovery training. The program helped her look at how first graders learn to read. She became a good observer of what children do and how they attack the reading task. She reflected daily since analyzing the student work and designing the next day's lesson was done after each session. The other powerful component was peer feedback which occurred after the Reading Recovery teachers observed each other.

Harriet believed she was a reflective practitioner. She reflected about her instruction with the Reading Recovery students and the social studies pull-out group. She tried to consider what she had learned, what went well and what had not gone well. She tried to think of alternatives and determine what would be the best choices, or what would be better choices than the one that had been made.

Harriet placed herself at 7 out of 9 on a Whole Language practitioner continuum in 1991. During the 1995 interview she rated herself as 5 out of 9 on the same continuum.

#### Participant D Conclusion

At the end of the interview Harriet stated that she really was not a Whole Language practitioner. The limits of

the structure of her Whole Language program and the Success for All Program, along with Reading Recovery really made it impossible for her to practice Whole Language instruction. In Fullan's (1991) description of the dimensions of implementation, he described the dimensions as beliefs, curriculum, and instructional activities. Due to external factors, Harriet was only able to maintain her beliefs. She still seemed to embrace Whole Language beliefs, but was unable to implement instruction and curriculum aligned with those beliefs. Overall, there was no writing, almost no student choice, no experiential learning and no use of thematic units. The structured programs could not be student centered nor could they involve authentic activities. Instead they utilized teacher-directed activities and materials created specifically for the program and program goals.

In the Efficacy-Based Change Model (Ohlhausen, Meyerson, Sexton, 1992), an important element in the implementation process was attribution, which was related to factors the educator considered limited or supported the change. If the educators believed that most of the factors that supported the change were internal factors, or based on their own effort and ability, they held a higher level of confidence and a greater resultant achievement motivation. If the educators believed that the most influencing factors were external events over which they have no effect, their

confidence was undermined and the motivation and persistence to change tended to decrease. Harriet described nearly all of the influencing factors as external. She also expressed that she no longer believed that she was a Whole Language practitioner. The teacher who described a confident start to her Whole Language journey in 1992 denied being a Whole Language practitioner in 1995 and attributed this change to external factors over which she had no control.

### Case Study of Participant L

#### Background

Sally Barnes was a first-year teacher at the time of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. She did not attend the April workshop since she was completing student teaching at that time. Her Chapter 1 counterpart did attend that workshop and was very interested in participating in the year-long program. When Sally was hired as the new Chapter 1 teacher, she was informed that she would be attending the Chapter 1 Pilot Program with her partner. She initially thought it was a one-day workshop. She was shocked when she found out that she would be making a once a month commitment, and that she would be videotaping herself and sharing that videotape with the experienced teachers in the program.

Sally was a teacher in a small rural community in western Illinois. The school district was a consolidated



district that served three communities and other villages in the area. The school had 209 students from second to fifth grade. In 1991, Sally taught Chapter 1 pull-out classes for students in second to fifth grade.

Since Sally Barnes was a recent college graduate and in her first year of teaching at the time she completed the Professional Development Program, she fell into Arin-Krupp's (1981) earliest stage of career. At this age and stage of career, educators are concerned about establishment of identity, creation of a dream and search for a mentor. On a personal level, this is the time for establishment of independence from parents. The independence/dependence contrast has to do with this separation from parents. The identity not only relates to "Who am I?" but also to "How do I fit into the world of adults?" By the end of this stage, key role choices have been made and a sense of identity comes. The dream referred to here is the goal toward which to strive, the achievement that is hoped for as an adult. The mentor that is sought helps the individual personality take shape.

Sally was overwhelmed by the group of experienced teachers that were her peer group in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. She struggled during the nine months to determine how she fit in this world of adults. She did turn to her experienced partner for advice and some mentoring, but this partnering was established by work assignment, not

necessarily individual choice. Sally was struggling to establish for herself what a full-time, practicing teacher was while she was reviewing with the group the role of the Chapter 1 teacher and that of a Whole Language teacher. She had not yet established her identity as a teacher or as a Chapter 1 teacher, and thus had no frame of reference. On occasion, during the course of the meetings she would refer to the additional challenge she had.

### 1991-92 Reflections

Sally Barnes did not attend the final meeting of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. The meeting took place in May during the final weeks of her school. Since it was a rural community, the school year ended earlier than the urban areas. She expressed concern at the April meeting about the end of the year testing and Chapter 1 paper work she would have to complete.

She did not send student test results or a final reflection to either the facilitator or ESC #1. Participants were asked to do this in order to complete a final evaluation for the grant funding from the State of Illinois. Since Sally had demonstrated a high level of professionalism throughout the Pilot Program, the lack of participation at the end was attributed to job-related stress. The non-participation at the end also seemed to indicate a lesser degree of value of the Pilot Program than

other participants demonstrated. By Fullan's (1991) description of dimensions of change, Sally seemed not to have had a change in beliefs or content during the program, and only small changes in strategies for delivery of instruction. The difficulty remained in the fact that change, by definition, indicates an initial state that is transformed. Sally had not yet established an initial state of teaching.

Another interpretation for Sally's reluctance to turn in any written documentation during the course of the Pilot Program could be her lack of confidence. The group of participants were veteran Chapter 1 teachers and most had been teaching for more than 15 years.

The only written reflection turned in by Sally during the entire nine months stated that her greatest difficulty was trying to do everything she wanted to get done. She said that as a first-year teacher, she was not good at balancing time. Many times her activities would either go beyond the time or come short of the time allotted. She was clearly struggling with one of the major areas of difficulty for first-year teachers. Without the experience of teaching and seeing how long activities take, and having a sense of the problem areas students will experience, timing is an on-going problem. Sally's reflection was on first-year teacher struggles, not on Whole Language implementation issues. Hearing her colleagues in the program discuss Whole Language

implementation issues, when she was struggling with first-year issues like timing and classroom management, is likely to have contributed to her not sharing written reflections or information.

### 1995 Interview

Sally Barnes was interviewed in March 1995. She was teaching in the same district, but at a different building. At this time she was no longer a Chapter 1 teacher. The Chapter 1 program in her district was focused on early intervention and consisted of Reading Recovery and services for first grade.

After her first year as a Chapter 1 teacher, Sally was moved into a transitional first grade classroom. She was then assigned a regular first grade class where she taught for the next two years. Teaching the regular first grade class the second year was the first time she had the opportunity to teach the same level twice.

Her school, located in Winslow, Illinois, consisted of 209 students, and was a kindergarten and first grade center. The other elementary school was a second to fifth grade school. In addition, the district had a junior high school and a high school.

Sally completed her Bachelor's degree in 1991, and since that time, her professional development consisted of workshops and conferences. She attended workshops on

authentic assessment and teaching science to first graders. Her future goal was to complete a master's degree in speech pathology.

When Sally responded to the question about differences in her instruction from 1991, she focused on her job assignment rather than philosophy or methodology. In 1995 she was teaching a full-size class rather than Chapter 1 groups. She was responsible for all content areas including science and social studies. As a Chapter 1 teacher, she had only been responsible for math and reading, and had functioned as a support for classroom teachers. As a regular classroom teacher she was responsible for learner outcomes in all areas and for preparing the students for second grade.

During the interview, Sally shared a philosophy that a respected professor had imparted to her during her undergraduate years. He believed that a new teacher should spend three years in a basal before changing their practices and moving into literature-based instruction. He had stated that new teachers need to have full understanding of what students need through basal readers before they change or develop new strategies and curriculum. Sally commented that she was completing her second year at the same level in a basal reader. According to this belief, she needed another year's experience before she could or should change or develop new strategies and curriculum.

During the interview, Sally was asked what she thought were factors that influenced her maintaining changes she learned in the Pilot Program. She identified two significant factors. One was the constant change of her assignment. She never had the opportunity to be comfortable enough with the assignment to attempt new strategies. The other was the fact that she did not choose the workshop. She started the teaching job in August and found out that the other Chapter 1 teacher had committed her to attend the workshop. Sally found out the morning of the first workshop that she was participating. She had no idea what she was getting into, and was unaware of the length and amount of time the Pilot Program would take. The first day of the training was not a positive experience as she learned about videotaping and monthly meetings.

In addition, she was married the week before the workshop began and had just moved into the area. She was a first-year teacher in a new locale with the personal role change of marriage. The number of changes in her life placed her at a high stress level.

Sally also observed the experienced teachers in the group being teased by Dr. Davidson. Because of her position as a new teacher, she interpreted the expressive style of Dr. Davidson with the experienced teachers as intimidating. In her words, she did not share in the group because of this intimidation and worried about the experienced teachers

criticizing her as well. Because she had not yet established her identity as a teacher, and being in the midst of the first-year struggle, she saw the group of experienced teachers as threatening rather than supportive. They reassured her and encouraged her on many occasions. This was always done from the perspective of remembering how they felt when they first started out. Sally heard their comments and interpreted them as criticism rather than support. In the Efficacy Based Change Model (1992), one of the key factors for high motivation for educational change is confidence. According to this research the higher the level of confidence a teacher has in him/herself as an educator and specifically connected to the innovation, the greater the success in changing and maintaining the change. Clearly, if Sally saw herself as a struggling first-year teacher intimidated by the experienced teachers and the facilitator, her level of confidence was low, and according to this research, her motivation to maintain change would also be low.

The factor that encouraged Sally to continue using any of the Whole Language strategies was related to experiences with the students when they got excited about what they were doing and enjoyed their work. Sally looked for positive experiences and tried to find more experiences like that.

Sally said that reflection was part of a weekly process for her. At the end of each week, she looked back on what

worked and what didn't. The things that didn't work would be pulled out, and she would know not to try them again. If an activity or learning experience was particularly good or bad, Sally would jot down notes on the spot. Otherwise, reflection was done at the end of the week as the new week was being planned.

Collaboration or coaching was not a strong part of Sally's teaching experience. The students videotaped themselves to be shared with a housebound student or other classes. Sally participated in team teaching in science and social studies with the teacher in the next room. They developed the units together and worked together on the delivery. They didn't give each other feedback on teaching; rather, they collaborated on the development.

Sally said that she spent about twenty minutes a week on professional reading. She read Instructor and Mailbox, as well as other professional periodicals. She said that the most effective professional development program she had attended since the Chapter 1 Pilot Program was one on authentic assessment training which included portfolios and how to use them. Sally had been interested in portfolios before she attended, and the workshop provided the opportunity to learn how to use them to assess growth, what should be included in a portfolio, and the needs that could be identified. The other workshop Sally felt was effective had been on teaching science. Sally talked about how the



instructor had the teachers experience what the students would do. She enjoyed seeing how the adults got into the student activities. The workshop also focused on how to get the students to think in a more critical, discovery-oriented way.

It was interesting to note that these were experiences in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program that other participants alluded to as positive experiences that made strong impressions on them. For Sally, they were not described as part of the Pilot Program experience, but were a part of the positive experience of the science workshop. According to the CBAM stages of concern, at the time of the Pilot Program, Sally seemed to be at the stage of awareness where she was unknowledgeable and uninterested in experiential learning. Whereas, at the time of the science workshop, three years later, she was at the informational stage where she was actively seeking more information about experiential learning and very excited about the workshop experience.

When asked if she taught a thematic unit, Sally responded that she taught three of them. The one completed most recently was on snow. It included poetry, experiments with temperature and graphing, outside experiences observing snowflakes with magnifying glasses, and art activities. She believed that this was a Whole Language unit because it tied in reading through poetry, and integrated math, science, oral language and art.

In terms of flexible grouping strategies, Sally mainly used a partners strategy. The selection of partners was based on compatibility and social interaction rather than ability considerations. Her belief was that one student couldn't teach or model skills for the other, if the personalities didn't work together.

For Sally, responses about the teaching strategies she used were related to the regular classroom setting rather than Chapter 1. When she responded to the question about what part writing plays, she related her answer to a regular first grade classroom setting in which students wrote daily in their journals. They also wrote stories and letters. They did writing to learn activities. They also did some process writing.

The final interview question had to do with how Sally saw herself as a reflective/effective teacher. She responded that she learned from her mistakes. She was not afraid to admit when lessons didn't go well. She was always looking at how to improve her teaching.

#### Participant L Conclusion

At the end of the 1995 interview, Sally Barnes rated herself on a continuum of Whole Language practice. She rated herself as 3 points out of a possible 9 both in 1991-92 and in 1995. In her opinion she had not changed in Whole Language practice in the three years following the year-long

program. She also placed herself in the bottom third of the continuum. From the interview, the only Whole Language strategies and activities she referenced were the three interdisciplinary units and the teaching of writing.

She seemed to be interested in the experiential learning that was demonstrated at the science workshop. From the interview responses, she planned on incorporating some of these activities during the next school year.

Sally stated that she was not ready to move to a more literature-based reading instruction until she had completed the third year of basal instruction. She never mentioned student ownership of learning, authentic activities or student-centered learning. She did express that she needed the structure of the basal for teaching. When she felt comfortable with the basal and had a sense of how children learn, she would begin to experiment with other ideas.

Sally's beliefs had not changed; however, she needed to develop them before she could change them. Her curriculum or content included the three identified interdisciplinary units. Other than that, she used a traditional first grade curriculum. In terms of delivery of instruction, Sally rated herself as fairly traditional. She was beginning to experiment with some identified experiential learning.

At the conclusion of the 1995 interview, Sally stated that she did not see herself as a Whole Language teacher. She was not sure that after her third year of teaching the

basal format whether she would change in the direction of Whole Language. Rather, she might incorporate some of the strategies into her traditional instruction. Sally identified herself as not being a Whole Language practitioner.

CHAPTER 6  
CROSS GROUP ANALYSIS

In a collective case study that includes 14 participants, the sample group is so small that cross-group analysis does not offer definitive data; however, clustering patterns are identified within the group. These clusterings have been related to the research topics used in the individual case studies and reviewed in the literature.

Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM)

In the CBAM (1987), as research was done on the change process, it became apparent that before one could measure how teachers were using an innovation it was necessary to develop an operational definition. The term given an operational definition was an innovation configuration. This represented the patterns of use that resulted when different teachers implemented the innovation in their classrooms. The major operational features of an innovation were called components (Hord et al., 1987).

For the purpose of this study, the components of a Whole Language Chapter 1 instructional program included the following:

- 1) student-centered instruction,
- 2) language-based instruction,
- 3) student ownership of the learning process,
- 4) authentic activities,
- 5) thematic units,
- 6) flexible grouping, and
- 7) writing across the curriculum.

These practices were based on Whole Language beliefs which included an understanding of the literacy process.

Those participants who were identified as substantiated practitioners demonstrated many of these components, or aspects of these components in the interview and the classroom observation. Those who were identified as unsubstantiated practitioners stated in the interview that they embraced and practiced Whole Language beliefs and strategies, but these beliefs were not substantiated in the observation. Those who were identified as nonpractitioners stated in the interview that they did not practice Whole Language strategies in their classrooms either by choice or by external controls.

Of the 14 participants, 7 were identified as substantiated practitioners, participants A, E, F, G, H, K, and N. The components of the innovation configuration had been a part of the year-long professional development training. These components were discussed during the interview that took place three years later. Finally these

components were identified during classroom observations. During observations of Chapter 1 lessons, it was not possible to identify all seven components; however, several were identified and supported the findings that Whole Language components were used whenever possible.

Two of the 14 interviewed participants, were unsubstantiated practitioners. One, participant B, had taught for two of the three years after the professional development program. The third year she accepted the early retirement incentive program offered by the State of Illinois. In the 1995 interview, she described herself as a Whole Language practitioner. She stated her Whole Language beliefs, and she professed practice of strategies and activities to the end of her teaching career. Since she was not teaching in 1995, it was not possible to complete an observation and substantiate these statements.

The second unsubstantiated practitioner, participant C, stated a strong belief in Whole Language philosophy during the interview. A classroom observation was not conducted because she had become a curriculum implementer for her school district. Her work consisted of Reading Recovery work during the morning and curriculum implementation work during the afternoons. She worked with teachers to design curriculum and instruction changes and then coached teachers as they worked on the implementation. The examiner's observation of the Reading Recovery lesson did not support

the use of components of the innovation configuration. As this was the only instructional observation that was possible to conduct, she also remained unsubstantiated.

The five remaining participants were nonpractitioners. Each one stated that they did not believe that they were Whole Language teachers. Since Whole Language instruction needs a philosophical foundation, if these teachers did not embrace Whole Language philosophy, or if they believed that they were not practicing Whole Language, then they were identified as nonpractitioners.

Of these five participants, two were administrators, participants J and I, who were not practicing classroom instruction. They also indicated that they did not believe that Whole Language was the best approach for Chapter 1 students. Of the three remaining classroom teachers, two thought that their school and community did not support the use of Whole Language instruction. One participant, D, stated that because her school had court mandated prescribed reading instruction, it was impossible to practice Whole Language. The other teacher, participant M, felt that because her rural community did not accept Whole Language, she could not implement Whole Language instruction. She experienced a community reaction to Whole Language, and therefore, decided against using this philosophy and practice.

The last nonpractitioner was participant L who was a



first-year teacher. She stated that she could not change her instruction to Whole Language because she had not had enough experience in teaching with a basal reader to make this change. She did not identify herself as a Whole Language teacher, and she did not describe herself as using most, or all of the innovation components.

In the CBAM, there are identified stages of concern and levels of use (Hord et al., 1987). The stages of concern are as follows:

- 1) awareness - not really concerned,
- 2) informational - would like to learn more,
- 3) personal - how will it affect me,
- 4) management - it is taking a lot of time,
- 5) consequence - how will it affect my students,
- 6) collaboration - concern with sharing with other teachers,
- 7) refocusing - concern with making it work even better.

Because all the participants except participant L, the first-year teacher, had attended the April workshop, the participants shared a readiness for use of the innovation. They also were able to choose to participate in the year-long program.

The seven substantiated practitioners identified themselves as being at the stage of personal concern and classroom management concern when they began. They placed

themselves at or just below mid-point on the Whole Language practitioner continuum. The CBAM model also has levels of use of the innovation that parallel the stages of concern and range from non-use to mechanical use, to refining and integrating the innovation. From the descriptions that the practitioners provided, they seemed to be at the level of use which indicated preparation to use or mechanical use of Whole Language at the time of the training.

When the 1995 interviews were conducted, these practitioners' responses showed them to be at the collaboration and refocusing levels of concern. They were being utilized by their principals and fellow teachers as resources for Whole Language strategies. In levels of use of Whole Language they were at the levels of routine use, refinement, and integration or renewal level.

The unsubstantiated practitioners were at the personal and management levels at the time of the training. Three years later, they talked about being comfortable with Whole Language and wanting to collaborate with others and refine the practices; however, one was no longer teaching, and the other was coaching other teachers as they implemented new practices in their classrooms.

The nonpractitioners fell into three groups. The administrators (participants I and J) were at the informational level when the training began. They appeared to be at the informational level three years later. They

felt they benefitted from being knowledgeable about Whole Language since some of their teachers might use some of the strategies, but they still believed that it was not an appropriate style of teaching for Chapter 1 students.

The two teachers (participants D and M) who felt that their school and community did not support their use of Whole Language appeared to be at the personal and management stages of concern during the training. They had moved to the consequence stages in terms of the impact on their students and thought the consequences would be negative for the students based on the school and community reactions. They remained interested in Whole Language, but they thought they were unable to practice.

The final nonpractitioner (participant L) was at the level of awareness at the start of the training. She was not concerned about the innovation. She was most concerned about coping with a new job, a new marriage, a new location, and the experienced teachers that made up her peer group in the training. Three years later she was indicating some interest in learning about experiential learning. She had moved to the informational level for some of the components of Whole Language. For the use of thematic units and writing across the curriculum, she seemed to be at the consequence and collaboration levels of concern.

### Efficacy-Based Change Model (EBCM)

The EBCM builds on CBAM and adds the element of confidence. The model identifies influencing factors and identifies how the teacher attributes the influences. If the influences are considered to be external and out of their control, the teachers are less likely to be motivated to maintain the change or innovation. If the influences are considered to be internal and under their control there is a greater likelihood of continual motivation to maintain the change.

Confidence or self-efficacy was also an influencing factor. The greater the confidence of the teacher in both their ability to teach and their ability to succeed with the new innovation, the greater the success rate (Olhausen, Meyerson, & Sexton, 1992).

The seven substantiated practitioners placed themselves just below or at the midpoint of the Whole Language continuum of use at the time the training began. At the 1995 interview, they identified themselves as well beyond the midpoint of the continuum. They seemed to demonstrate a beginning level of use when the training began; they grew during the course of the training, and they continued to grow during the next three years. With their increase in use came an increase in their confidence.

The substantiated practitioners identified several influencing factors which can be placed into four general

categories. The first category was the year-long professional development training. Some of the components of the training that positively influenced the participants were: experiencing the student activities, (i.e. the bird's nest activity); using the videotapes of classroom teaching; interacting with peers during the training; sharing the enthusiasm of the other participants; conversing with the others during the training; and reading research and professional books.

The second category that positively influenced the practitioners was follow-up activities. Some of the participants attended the International Reading Association Conference and heard speakers like Reggie Routman, a well-known advocate of Whole Language. Others attended week-long summer programs in Whole Language offered at Northern Illinois University. Some identified the experience of Reading Recovery training as a supportive follow-up activity because they were able to master the use of running records and study the individual journey of a child learning to make meaning of written language.

The third category that positively influenced the practitioners was philosophical and personal. The participants stated that the influencing factors were that they felt a need to make the changes, that their feelings of how education should be were affirmed, that curriculum moved towards integration, and they had always preferred the idea

of use of literature over basal texts. The most frequently stated personal belief was that the Whole Language philosophy "made sense" to them.

The last category that positively influenced the practitioners was the structure of their job. For some, district goals and expectations supported collaboration and Whole Language practices. For some, job assignments supported the change process. For others, the school structure supported thematic units and other Whole Language practices.

Attribution referred to attributing the power of these influencing factors to internal and external forces. Certainly, the personal and philosophical factors referred to internal influences. Several thought that their own growth as professionals contributed to their development as Whole Language teachers.

Participants of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program also experienced internal influences. Some participants thought that Dr. Davidson, the experiences she brought and the vocabulary she used were positive influences due to the personal interaction involved. Others thought that the professional readings were strong influencing factors. The choices of books and materials were individual and reflected the interests and concerns of each participant. The interactions with peers were identified as another strong influencing factor, individual in nature. Sometimes it was

the experiential learning activities, sometimes the knowledge enhanced by the readings, and sometimes the enthusiasm of the others that provided a positive influence for participants.

The follow-up activities were also a matter of personal control. Some of the participants attributed influence to conferences. Others attributed influence to classes. Still others attributed influence to significant people in their professional careers.

The structure of their jobs was the only influencing factor that was primarily external and out of the control of the participants. The structure of individual Chapter 1 programs involved program changes that included Reading Recovery and push-in classroom work. If the classroom teacher the participants were assigned to support was a Whole Language practitioner, this allowed opportunity to continue using Whole Language strategies. If the classroom teacher they were assigned to was a traditional teacher, implementing Whole Language strategies became more of a challenge. So for some participants, program structure was a very positive factor and supported their change process. For others, program structure was a limiting factor. In either case, the influencing factor could not be controlled by the teachers. Time, money and student load were other factors out of their control.

In terms of self-efficacy or confidence, the

practitioners all expressed high levels of confidence. They saw themselves as reflective/effective teachers. They often talked about starting their journey as Whole Language teachers before the year-long professional development training and making great strides during the course of that year. They tended to be the participants who needed to extend the line for the continuum so it was still beyond their reach because they saw becoming a Whole Language teacher as an ongoing, evolving process instead of end point. These were the participants who stated that one of the reasons Whole Language was so appealing was because it made sense to them. They readily accepted the philosophy and practices that affirmed their own beliefs and instructional intuition which demonstrated a high level of self-efficacy.

#### Change Process

Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) determined that there were three dimensions of educational change. These dimensions included change in teaching materials and content, change in methods or approaches of teaching and change in beliefs. Real educational change is a process that involves changing what teachers think and do (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991).

The format of the year-long professional development training, known as the Chapter 1 Pilot, addressed all three



of these dimensions. Teachers experienced both content and strategies that were student-centered, thematic and authentic. They attempted to implement some of these practices and then videotaped these attempts to share them for peer feedback. In addition, they were allowed a small budget from the grant to purchase both student materials and teacher professional readings that were aligned with Whole Language philosophy. This small amount (\$100-\$150 per person) allowed participants to select professional readings and instructional materials from a book supplier who specialized in Whole Language materials. The freedom to select materials for teaching, and texts to support philosophy and beliefs provided support for two of the dimensions Fullan and Stiegelbauer discussed. The videotapes provided an opportunity for support and feedback for the third dimension, instructional delivery.

Along with the three dimensions of change, there are three broad phases to the change process: initiation or mobilization, implementation or initial use, and continuation or routinization (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). The last phase refers to whether the change gets built in as an ongoing part of the educator's practice or if it disappears by way of decision or through attrition (Huberman & Miles, 1984).

Many factors affect these phases of change. Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) identify four sets of variables that

influence the phases of change. The first set is the interaction of numerous factors at each phase. The second set is that these phases are not linear; an event at one stage can feed back to alter decisions made at a previous stage. A third set concerns the scope of change and the question of who develops and initiates the change (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991).

There were multiple variables for the year-long Chapter 1 Pilot Program studied here. The initiation of change began at a personal level for each participant. In addition, there were district initiatives because program improvement was necessary to maintain the Chapter 1 grants which were an important funding source.

The initiation of change on a broader scope came from the federal Chapter 1 program and the Hawkins-Stafford Amendment. This amendment shifted the focus to program improvement, different types of student assessment, and measuring the success of the program on the basis of student performance related to regular education program and performance. This national initiative caused the state initiative which provided grants for programs like the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. At this time, the Education Service Centers were providing technical assistance and training for Chapter 1 teachers. It was one of these ESC's that provided the April workshop as well as the year-long professional development training as part of this technical

assistance support. The personal, district, state and federal influences demonstrated the extensive scope and range of external factors influencing the initiation and implementation of Whole Language in Chapter 1 programs.

The fourth set of variables involves time and the fact that the separation of phases of educational change can be very difficult to mark. The initiation can be in the works for years. Implementation takes two or more years. The line between implementation and continuation is hazy (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). For the participants in the Whole Language professional development training who were identified as substantiated practitioners, most talked about beginning their journey long before the year began. They identified themselves as practitioners in the middle of the Whole Language continuum during that year, and advanced themselves on the continuum three years later. They demonstrated that it was difficult for them to clearly identify beginnings and endings of each of the phases.

In Fullan and Stiegelbauer's work, variables were identified that influence the interaction of the three phases of the educational change process. In addition, influencing factors were identified for each individual phase. Eight factors were identified as affecting initiation: 1) existence and quality of the innovation, 2) access to information, 3) advocacy from central administration, 4) teacher advocacy, 5) external change

agents, 6) community pressure/support/opposition/apathy, 7) new policy and funds, and 8) problem-solving and bureaucratic orientation (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991).

Several of these influencing factors can be related to the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. The first one is existence and quality of the innovation. Whole Language as an innovation was in existence since the 1960's, and the quality of its educational value is supported by literature and research studies.

According to Fullan and Stiegelbauer, (1991) access to information refers to the importance of personal contact in the diffusing of the innovation. Continuous personal contact is needed to become aware of and follow up on innovations (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). The format of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program was a three-day workshop that continued with meetings once a month for nine months. These meetings involved activities, readings, videotapes and feedback, reflections and discussions. The format and organization of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program supported the continuous personal contact that Fullan and Stiegelbauer identified as an influencing factor.

The advocacy from central administration was also present for the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. The federal Chapter 1 initiative for change that began with the Hawkins-Stafford Amendment stimulated state and district initiative for change. For the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, each district

was asked to provide a letter of support from the superintendent after an explanation of the program and the district benefits had been given.

Fullan and Stiegelbauer's description of teacher advocacy included teachers engaging in frequent, continuous, and increasingly concrete talk about teaching practices. Teachers and administrators observe and provide feedback to each other, developing a shared language for teaching strategies and needs. Teachers and administrators plan, design and evaluate teaching materials and practices (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). Again, the design of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program included monthly sessions in which talking about teaching was an integral part. Observation and feedback took place when the participants viewed each other's videotapes of classroom instruction and discussed what they saw. Materials and practices were designed and selected by the teachers from an array of experiences, readings and shared ideas. At the heart of Whole Language instruction is the fact that instructional design is driven by student interests and needs and is unique to each group of students and their teacher. The only component of Fullan and Stiegelbauer's influencing factor that was missing was the administrative participation. Although the Rockford teachers did have two district coordinators who participated, all the other districts had no administrative participation.

Fullan and Stiegelbauer's influencing factor of external change agents was also found in the circumstances of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. The external change agents were the state and federal Chapter 1 programs and the ESC #1. Each of these had slightly different circles of influence. All were influenced by the reauthorization of Chapter 1 and the Hawkins-Stafford Amendment.

The influencing factor of community pressure, support, opposition, or apathy was experienced by some of the participants of this study. Participant M felt she was unable to practice what she had learned in the Pilot Program because her rural community did not accept Whole Language instruction. Participant D felt that the court case initiated by members of the community caused educational changes that made it impossible for her to practice Whole Language. All of the Rockford teachers made references to the influence of the court case in one form or another.

The influencing factor of new policy and funds was also addressed by the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. The program was completely funded by ESC #1 and a state grant, including the cost of substitute teachers. If the program was effective and student performance improved, state and federal funding would be positively affected.

In addition, the influence of new policy was studied in greater detail by Elmore (1980). This study pointed to a dilemma: policies that are left somewhat ambiguous and

general are easier for local districts to adopt while problems during implementation may arise due to this same ambiguity. Whole Language is a philosophy that is somewhat open-ended and ambiguous, and which provides opportunity for both the benefits and problems of ambiguous innovations. For many of the substantiated practitioners, the non-prescriptiveness of Whole Language was appealing. For others, like nonpractitioner L, the lack of prescriptive structure was unappealing.

In addition to influencing factors for initiation, Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) identified key factors in the implementation process: 1) characteristics of the change project, 2) local roles, and 3) external influences (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). The characteristics of the change project include need, clarity, complexity and quality/practicality (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). The Chapter 1 Pilot Program addressed a priority need, the maintaining of Chapter 1 funding and programs, and the improvement of student achievement. These were both priorities for Chapter 1 teachers.

The clarity issue was more challenging. Since Whole Language was not a prescriptive or formula program, describing what it meant in practice was challenging. In fact, participant I, who was at the informational level of concern, often asked for a definitive explanation of Whole Language, only to have the question put back to her.

Complexity refers to the difficulty and extent of change required of individuals responsible for implementation (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). The innovation can be viewed with regard to difficulty, skill needed, extent of changes of beliefs, teaching strategies and materials used (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). Whole Language qualifies as a complex innovation. Some of the participants of the training had already begun changing their beliefs and teaching strategies before the training began. These teachers were some of the substantiated participants who often described the training as making sense to them. For others, they began with the change of beliefs and practice at the start of the year-long training and were able to meet the challenge of the complexity of the innovation. For others, like participant L, the complexity was too difficult at an already stressful time of a first-year teacher.

The local roles that Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) referred to included district, community, principal and teachers. During implementation, district support was needed, as was community support. For some of the participants, either the district or the community did not support the change, so the change was not sustained.

The factor that Fullan and Stiegelbauer often refer to as very important, the role of the principal, was not as important for the participants in this study. Participant H



mentioned that because the principal did not allow her aide to participate in the training her practice of the innovation was made more difficult. The teacher and aide did not have the shared vocabulary and understanding of outcomes. The principal also did not give them planning time together which made it impossible for participant H to explain to her aide how she wanted things done. In this case the principal's influence on the implementation of the innovation was negative. For most of the participants, the principal's influence remained neutral.

The stronger influencing factor was the district structure of the Chapter 1 program. For the Rockford participants, the push-in work and collaboration limited the Chapter 1 teachers to the practices of the classroom teacher. For six of the teachers, the district commitment to Reading Recovery locked in half of their teaching day to this instruction. That program design limited the amount of time they had to practice Whole Language instruction.

Fullan and Stiegelbauer's final role of teacher was also unusual in regard to the Chapter 1 Pilot Program. The teacher participants had a peer group that met once each month and provided collegial support and continuous talk about Whole Language; however, only two of the participants returned to a building setting together. The remaining participants were alone in their buildings as far as collegial support and shared experiences were concerned.

The final category of external factors refers to government and other agencies. In this area, the federal Chapter 1 program was an influencing factor for implementation. The state agencies, including the ESC, were also influencing factors. In addition, in Rockford, governmental action related to the court case was also an influencing factor.

Huberman and Miles (1984) identified factors that influence continuation: policy, budget and time supports that assist in making the innovation a part of the school structure, a group of administrators and teachers who are skilled in and committed to the change, and established procedures for continuing the implementation of the change (Huberman and Miles, 1984).

Participant C, Sandra Grant, was a participant in this study who was unable to complete the continuation phase. Although she embraced the Whole Language philosophy, she was unable to build the Whole Language practices as an ongoing part of her instructional system because the only instruction she practiced was Reading Recovery. The remainder of her time was spent as a curriculum consultant. Policy, budget and time did not support her practice of Whole Language.

Participant D also was unable to complete the continuation phase. In addition to half her day assigned to Reading Recovery instruction, the Rockford court case

required specific classroom curriculum which she was required to teach. She could not practice Whole Language instruction with either Reading Recovery or the mandated curriculum. For both these participants, continuation was not possible.

In the study of the change process, the dimensions of change, the phases of change and the factors that support these phases have been related to the collective case study. The substantiated practitioners demonstrated changes in beliefs, materials used to teach and strategies used for instruction. The format of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program supported the change process in these three dimensions. The participants also moved through the initiation, implementation and continuation phases of educational change. Some of the factors that research has identified as supporting this change process were present for the substantiated practitioners. These included: the existence and quality of the innovation, access to information about the innovation, continuous personal contact throughout the change process, advocacy of central administration due to the Chapter 1 funding and program changes, teacher advocacy which was described as continuous teacher talk about teaching practices, external change agents in the form of the federal Chapter 1 changes, the state grant changes, and the ESC technical support to all of these changes, and finally, student needs.

At the same time others of these factors that support change were missing. These included: administrative support and the role of the principal as instructional leader and change agent, building level peer support, community support, and Chapter 1 program structure support.

### Peer/Cognitive Coaching

Peer/cognitive coaching was a component of the year-long Chapter 1 Pilot Program and was identified by participants as an influencing factor. Several of the characteristics of peer/cognitive coaching mentioned in the literature were practiced in the year-long training. The shared components of peer/cognitive coaching described by both Joyce and Showers and Costa and Garmston were collaborative work in developing materials and lessons, collaborative work in the teaching act, and collaborative reflection after teaching. Both kinds of coaching involved dialogue before teaching and observation of the teaching act. Both involved teacher change either related to a specific innovation or within the context of improving effective instruction. Both were concerned with the conversations and feedback being non-judgmental. In the course of the nine months of training, all of these practices were utilized in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program.

Peer coaching in particular has been described as being related to a specific innovation. It was to be used as a

follow up activity that would support and maintain the new practices. Participants in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program who described themselves as being at the early stages of Whole Language practice, identified this component as beneficial in supporting their efforts to attempt new behaviors. Those participants who described themselves as farther along in the practices of Whole Language, were not attempting new behaviors, but rather refining practices in order to be more effective Whole Language practitioners. The cognitive coaching aspects were beneficial for these participants. Participants who were farther along in the levels of use, found that the probing questions of the facilitator stimulated reflection and possible revision of practices. In this way, the Chapter 1 Pilot Program applied both peer coaching and cognitive coaching principles.

The participants who were attempting new behaviors found that the feedback from both facilitator and other participants regarding that new behavior, provided support for continued attempts. This process of experimenting and re-trying is one of the characteristics of peer coaching described by Joyce and Showers (1988). The natural learning process involves experimenting and experiencing failure, and revising and trying again. This natural learning process is also an important component of the Whole Language philosophy. The risk-taking and learn-by-doing that is the natural learning process is essential to Whole Language. In

this respect, coaching is an application of one of the elements of Whole Language.

Collaborative work and learning from each other is another characteristic of Whole Language. As was described in the literature, a Whole Language classroom is a community of learners. One of the goals of peer coaching is to develop a community of learners among the teaching staff, or in the case of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, the group of participants. In this respect, the practice of coaching modeled many aspects of Whole Language instruction.

The participants in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program expressed discomfort with the videotaping process during the course of the 1991-92 year. There was reluctance to view one's own teaching with the group of participants. Once the process began, however, the discussion was lively, questions were probing and thought-provoking, and participants were considerate of each others' fears of viewing their own teaching. The interviews completed three years later supported this observation. None of the participants expressed an enjoyment of the videotaping process, but nearly all of the participants talked about the excellent discussions that resulted from viewing the videotapes.

Several of the participants ranked talking with fellow participants as one of the strong influencing factors. Many liked the opportunity to do professional reading and talk

about what they had read. Others liked to share actual activities and instructional materials. The learning from each other, a key component of coaching, was mentioned by nearly all participants as one of the influencing factors for continuing the practice of Whole Language.

Joyce and Showers (1988) described five ways that coaching appeared to contribute to transfer of training. The first was that coached teachers generally practice new strategies more frequently and develop greater skill than un-coached teachers. In the case of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, a collective case study, there was no control group for comparison, and the number of participants limited the study to a relatively small group; however, it is worth noting that 7 of the 14 participants were substantiated practitioners three years later, and two more were unsubstantiated practitioners.

A second way that coaching contributes to transfer of training is that coached teachers used their newly learned strategies more appropriately than un-coached teachers (Joyce and Showers, 1988). There was no way to determine whether or not this was the case in this study. Nearly all the substantiated practitioners were involved in some form of push-in teaching. In this format, the Chapter 1 teacher is limited to the instructional practices of the regular classroom teacher.

During at least one observation, the Chapter 1 teacher

noted instructional decisions made by the classroom teacher, that the Chapter 1 teacher would not have made. In fact, the Chapter 1 teacher had asked the classroom teacher to allow students to discover language patterns on their own and not to write out the patterns on the board for them. The classroom teacher disregarded the request and wrote the pattern on the board, telling the students what the "right" answer was. Due to the structure of Chapter 1 programs, participants in the year-long professional development training program were not always free to implement the most appropriate uses of the Whole Language practices.

A third way that coaching contributes to transfer of training is through greater long-term retention of knowledge about and skill with strategies in which they had been coached. Joyce and Showers (1988) described long-term retention as six to nine months after training. It would be difficult to isolate new strategies and beliefs from those that were expanded upon by the participants in this group. In addition, the size of the group remains a limiting factor; however, the fact that the interviews and observations were completed three years after the training program would support the notion of long-term retention of new and/or revised strategies and beliefs.

The fourth way that coaching contributes to transfer is that coached teachers were more likely than un-coached to teach new models of teaching to their students. That is,



they would ensure that students understood the purpose of the strategy and behaviors (Joyce & Showers, 1988). During the observations of participants of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, student understanding was observed. In Participant K's (Susan Roberts) observation, students told each other that they had to "figure it out" on their own. They had been taught that solving their own problems was the practice, not asking the teacher or anyone else to do it for them. This demonstrated an understanding on the part of the students about how learning was taking place in the Chapter 1 class in addition to what was learned.

The last way that coaching contributed to transfer of training was that coached teachers exhibited a clearer cognition regarding the purposes and uses of the new strategies (Joyce & Showers, 1988). During the interviews and observations, participants discussed appropriate use, limiting factors, and collaboration with other teachers. Even the nonpractitioners were able to discuss what factors in the school and community prevented them from practicing Whole Language and why.

Whether through the formal structure of videotaping and providing feedback, or the informal structure of collaborating on planning instruction and teaching materials, the participants of the year-long professional development training used peer/cognitive coaching and coaching strategies.

### Age and Stage of Career

Reviewing the ages and stages of career of the participants of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program revealed an interesting clustering. Eight of the participants were in the 10-17 year range of their careers. According to Arin-Krupp (1981), this is a time when there is a willingness to try new things, particularly if they relate to an aspect of self or peer support or are perceived as beneficial for moving upward on the career ladder. This is a time when people are attempting to move towards self-defined goals in order to be successful. Success is individually defined. At this time, individuals seek affirmations from others as well as from self. Moving more towards one's own dream requires a willingness to change (Arin-Krupp, 1981). Several of the participants indicated that Whole Language made sense to them and affirmed their individual beliefs.

These qualities of willingness to change, concern with self-defined success, concern about professional advancement towards personal standards, and interest in peer support provide a readiness for professional development. In spite of the teacher "press" described by Huberman and the inherent resistance of the education system to change described by Fullan, teachers in this stage of life and career are the most open to change. They have established the professional identity that eluded them in their early twenties, and they have not yet started the focus on

individuation that occurs in the forties.

The qualities attributed to this age also seem to be a natural connection to the Whole Language philosophy. The student-centered instruction that involves teachers as co-learners would be a match for this stage which is concerned with self-defined standards of success and continual learning.

Four other participants fell in the 22-28 year career range. For these teachers, emphasis switches to the quality of work, its intrinsic value and meaning to the individual. If the person at this stage has become fully de-illusioned, he/she is satisfied with what is and attempts to devise ways to improve upon the present situation. The right match of task that fits the interest and value system of the teacher will be very exciting for that teacher (Arin-Krupp, 1981).

From observations and interviews, it did appear that the Chapter 1 teachers in the professional development training who chose to participate were very excited about the learning experience. They demonstrated the characteristics of their career stages. In addition, the seven substantiated practitioners and the two unsubstantiated practitioners all were found to be in these two career categories. It would be difficult to determine whether the age or stage of career influenced the interest in Whole Language philosophy or the participation in the year-long professional development training, or both.

It was clear that the participant who was a first-year teacher believed that her early stage of career made it impossible to incorporate into her teaching practices the new beliefs presented at the professional development training. Certainly the stress of being a first-year teacher influenced the change process, but again, it is impossible to identify the amount of influence. That teacher also was not participating on a volunteer basis. It is unknown how much of an influencing factor the forced choice provided.

Another clustering pattern was that all but 2 of the 14 interviewed participants were in the 10-28 year range of their careers. Of the 14 interviewed participants who chose to attend the year-long Chapter 1 Pilot Program, all but one were in the 10-28 year range of career. There is no way of identifying whether or how much the change process, the improvement of the Chapter 1 program, or the Whole Language philosophy influenced the participants' choice. Most likely it was a combination of these elements, but it clearly was more appealing to experienced teachers than those new to their profession.

#### Summary

The collective case study has been reviewed in regard to the Concerns-Based Adoption Model, the Efficacy-Based Change Model, the change process, peer coaching and stages

of career. When all of the interviews were analyzed, the changes in teaching that participants described can be summarized as follows.

### Program Changes

During the three years there were significant changes in the Chapter 1 program for many participants. Several school districts chose to move to early intervention focus, investing their Chapter 1 funding in Reading Recovery training. Six of the participants were trained in and teaching Reading Recovery.

Chapter 1 also moved towards push-in or inclusion. To accomplish this, special training was provided in Rockford to support collaborative work. As a result, several of the participants were working weekly in the regular education classrooms. In addition, many of the teachers interviewed, served in a resource role with classroom teachers.

At the time of the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, the teachers were frustrated with the short amount of time they were allotted for Chapter 1 instruction. Usually instruction took place for 20 minutes two or three times a week. In the 1995 interviews, the teachers indicated that Chapter 1 instruction time had increased.

### Instructional Changes

In addition to the Chapter 1 program changes,

participants talked about the changes that had occurred in the individual instruction. Some of the instructional changes described were more choral reading, more writing done by students, more awareness of involving all students, more decisions made by students, more group activities, more open-ended questions asked, more investigating done by students, and more student-centered instruction. The participants that were interviewed said that as teachers they modeled thinking, learned with students, used running records, used less structure and allowed children time to imagine and reflect.

As a whole, whether they considered themselves Whole Language teachers or not, the participants viewed themselves as effective/reflective teachers. They all talked about reflecting on what went well with the students and what did not. They modified and changed their instruction based on what they experienced with the students in the classroom. Fullan (1991) states that teachers do not learn by doing, they learn by reflecting on what they have done. Nearly every participant stated that the more she reflected on her teaching, the more effective she became.

## CHAPTER 7

### A SEARCH FOR UNDERSTANDING

This study was undertaken in order to develop a better understanding of how and why professional development training is implemented in classrooms, thereby having the potential to influence student achievement. Much has been written about the complexity of educational change and the application of that change to classroom practice particularly at this time of focus on continual school improvement and educational accountability. This chapter will search for understanding, provide hypotheses and recommendations, and pose additional questions regarding educational change.

Generalizations cannot be made when the study consists of fourteen individual case studies. Instead, insights, assertions or hypotheses are offered in relation to the influences discussed in each case study and reviewed in the literature. These assertions are applied to action research and school improvement.

#### Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM)

The CBAM (Hord, et al., 1987) described stages of

concern and levels of use. After reviewing documentation from 1991 and interviewing participants in 1995 with some follow-up observations, an analysis of stages of concern and use was conducted in retrospect. It was assumed that since participants had attended the April 1995 workshop, they had indicated a level beyond awareness. This awareness could indicate a minimum stage of concern at the information level, with some indicating that they were at the stage of personal concern.

By using the Whole Language continuum filled out by the participants, it was possible to discern a level of use for each. Since most rated themselves at or just below the midpoint of the continuum, it can be assumed that they were at least at the level of mechanical use.

Those participants who were identified as substantiated practitioners three years later had attended the April workshop, had chosen to participate in the Chapter 1 Pilot Program, and had rated themselves at or just below the midpoint on the Whole Language continuum of practice.

### Assertion

Higher stages of concern and levels of use of an innovation at the onset of professional development training



will ensure even higher stages of concern and levels of use at the completion of professional development training. This, in turn, can support continued use of the innovation.

### Recommendation

For future studies, administer the Stages of Concern Questionnaire (Hord, et al., 1987) at the start of a professional development training, and again as a post test. Participants could rate themselves in regard to stages of concern and levels of use. This would allow participants to identify where they began and where they are in the implementation of the innovation according to these stages of concern and levels of use. It would allow the participants the opportunity to map their change process according to these stages of concern and levels of use. This process would emphasize their personal control. Since collaboration and refocusing are final stages of concern and use, it would also provide them as future goals for teachers involved in the educational change process.

In relation to school improvement, the instructional leader could provide as much background information as possible to the staff regarding educational innovations. Providing this information could establish the stages of awareness or information for many staff members. As the innovation is being implemented, the instructional leader should continue to pay attention to the needs of staff as

they move through the other stages of concern and levels of use.

### Efficacy-Based Change Model (EBCM)

The EBCM addressed the stages of concern and levels of use. This model also added the components of influencing factors, attribution and levels of confidence. The basis of this model concerns the factors that influence teacher change. If these factors are within the teachers' internal control, the teachers will have a greater motivation for changing and greater confidence. Both increased motivation and increased confidence will support change (Meyers, Ohlhausen, Sexton, 1991). In this study, the influencing factors were identified three years later. At this time, participants identified the factors that influenced the practice of Whole Language instruction.

Among the participants who were substantiated practitioners, the influencing factors were predominantly positive and were influences under their control. For the participants who were nonpractitioners, the influences were predominantly negative and usually out of their control. In addition, the substantiated practitioners rated themselves at or just below the midpoint of the Whole Language continuum at the end of the year-long training. Three years later they all had moved themselves beyond the midpoint on the continuum.

### Assertion

In regard to classroom use of an innovation, the greater the teacher confidence, and the greater the number of influencing factors under the teacher's internal control, the more successful the implementation of the innovation will be.

### Recommendation

For future studies, teachers who are implementing the innovation should develop a concept web of influencing factors with a corresponding narrative that describes the influence at the start of the training (Meyerson, 1993). An analysis of these factors could be done to determine whether external influencing factors could be changed or modified to internal control instead. The factors indicated on the concept web could also be revisited at the completion of the training to determine their influence in retrospect. If the factors on the web are still strong influencing factors inhibiting change, then they would need to be addressed if long term change is the goal. They could also be revisited a year later along with an assessment of continued implementation. Again, this information could be used for future program design, as well as maintenance of the on-going program. This could be done in addition to a confidence indicator like the Whole Language continuum. Reviewing these data could provide additional insights into

the relationship of confidence and influencing factors to implementation and which components best support change.

At the school level, the instructional leader could use the web to identify factors that teachers on staff believe will influence their educational change. The principal could work to remove or modify as many external limiting factors as possible. This would allow the teachers a greater feeling of internal control over the change, and could enhance teacher confidence, thereby providing greater support for the change.

### Change Process

Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) delineated three categories of factors that influence change during the initiation, implementation and continuation phases of the educational change process. These categories are: external factors, local factors and characteristics of the change. An external factor in this study that influenced all three stages of the change process was the Chapter 1 reauthorization. Local factors such as the Rockford court case, also had a great influence on the implementation and continuation of the change. Lastly, the characteristics of the innovation seemed to be a significant factor in the change process studied.

According to Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991), the characteristics of the innovation or change are: need,

clarity, complexity, and quality/practicality. The need was established by the overall performance and success rate of Chapter 1 programs, as well as the reauthorization initiative. The quality and practicality were supported by the interest and response of the participants. One of the repeated influencing factors stated by participants was that Whole Language instruction affirmed their beliefs and made sense to them. For these participants, the experiences of the year-long training affirmed their instructional intuition and provided a philosophical base for the direction that their instruction had been taking. In regard to this study, the characteristics of clarity and complexity are more challenging.

Whole Language, as a change or innovation, has some unique characteristics related to clarity and complexity. First of all, it is not a strategy or set of activities; nor is it prescriptive. The history and description included in this study identified Whole Language as a complex philosophy that drives instructional decisions. Participants in this professional development training who wanted a clear definition with simple steps to follow were frustrated. They were provided a philosophical base and some examples of activities. They were questioned about instructional decisions and given time to reflect, but it was up to each individual to apply all of the experiences to her own teaching repertoire. The complexity of Whole Language makes

it more challenging to implement, but more likely to be continued since it is a philosophy that instructs educational decisions.

### Assertion

The more complex and integrated an innovation is, if it can be acquired by the teacher, it is more likely to be continued on a long-term basis.

### Recommendation

For future studies, test this hypothesis with other more complex and integrated innovations such as problem-based learning or teaching to multiple intelligences. Both of these are based on a belief system that drives instructional decisions.

At the school level, the instructional leader and the school improvement committee need to be aware of the external factors, the local factors and the characteristics of the change as they make school improvement decisions. This committee needs to be aware of the fact that although more complex and integrated innovations may take more time to complete the implementation stage, these innovations will be more likely to be sustained through the continuation stage.

### Peer/Cognitive Coaching

Coaching as it has been defined in this study, can be utilized to support a specific innovation or as a tool for continued professional improvement. Participants in this study identified coaching as a strong influencing factor. The time and opportunity to talk about teaching, to read and share ideas about teaching, to observe each other and hear the thoughts that determined instructional decisions, and to plan new or revised activities was appreciated by all the participants. For some participants coaching supported the new practice of Whole Language activities, and for others, it supported revising and improving current practices.

### Assertion

Peer and/or cognitive coaching is a positive influence in supporting educational change and professional improvement.

### Recommendation

For future studies, test this assertion with groups of teachers instructed in the coaching process. Collaboration, peer coaching, and cognitive coaching could be made a formal component of professional development programs.

At the school level, the instructional leader can create a collaborative school community by providing time for reflecting, talking about teaching and collaborating.

The principal can also provide support for peer coaching and model cognitive coaching during the evaluation process.

### Age and Stage of Career

The clustering of participants in the age and stage of career range of 10-25 years appeared significant. This seemed to be a time when professional identity including beliefs and values related to the education profession had been established. An individual definition of success was established and a professional dream existed with some reality-base. Innovations or philosophies that connected with these individual beliefs and values could be implemented more readily. According to Krupp (1981), there are two strong motivating factors in staff development for these career stages. They are the philosophies and practices that support the individual dream or goal, and those that support the external goal of career advancement as perceived by the teacher (Krupp, 1981).

The goal of career advancement was accomplished by participants in this study. Several of the substantiated practitioners described themselves as teacher leaders or building resources during the follow-up interview. Two participants had become active in professional organizations within the district and within the state.

In addition, many of the participants indicated that the Whole Language professional development training



affirmed their beliefs and made sense to them. This supports the concept of a developed professional identity with definite beliefs and values being drawn to staff development that affirms those beliefs. In contrast, the first-year teacher stated that she had not developed her professional identity and, in fact, needed at least three years of similar teaching experience in order to do so. She also identified herself as a nonpractitioner in the follow-up interview.

### Assertion

For more complex and philosophically based innovations, teachers in the 10-25 year career range should be targeted as core members of the innovation team, with the understanding that unless the innovation is compatible with their individual philosophies and beliefs, they may not be able to sustain a commitment to the training.

### Recommendation

Action research can be done within a district, targeting age and career stage groups of teachers. The research can be focused on the participants who choose to be involved with innovation training, or specific target groups who might like to participate.

At the school level, the instructional leader could select some mid-career staff members to participate in

school improvement committees and innovation teams, particularly if their educational philosophies are aligned with those of the innovation.

#### Format of the Training

Several of the participants identified the format of the professional development training as an influencing factor. Among these participants, specific components of the training were listed. These included: actually experiencing an activity that the students would experience, viewing the videotapes, talking about teaching, and reading and sharing professional materials. These components seem to reflect the differences in learning styles. McCarthy (1987) describes individuals as learning by four different styles: those who learn best with and from other people; those who learn best by reading and analyzing; those who learn best by experience or hands-on activities; those who learn best by trial and error and by making their own connections. Since all four types of experiences were identified as the "best" experience of the professional development training by different participants, use of a varied format is supported.

Joyce and Showers (1996) indicated that the most successful professional development training included: theory presentation, modeling or demonstration, practice, structured and open-ended feedback, and in-class assistance

with transfer. These also represent the different types of learning styles. Harrison and Killion (1988) also delineate three critical elements for professional development success. These include modeling, reflection, and application. All three of these elements were present in the professional development program in this study.

Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) emphasize the importance of reflection. They stated that the idea of learning by doing is not accurate. Real learning takes place when teachers reflect on what they have done. Reflection was a significant component of the professional development training studied here. The participants were provided with reflective lesson plan books that provided specific pages for reflection before lessons were developed. Reflection also took place as the videotapes were reviewed. Each session involved some form of reflection. The final self-assessment completed at the end of the year-long program included questions to stimulate reflection on the year's experiences.

### Assertion

For the greatest success, professional development training should include: theory presentation, experiencing student activities, modeling, peer or cognitive coaching, practice, and reflection.

### Recommendation

Action research could be done utilizing the above framework for professional development. Participants could identify the most significant component of that professional development program for them. A learning styles inventory could be administered to see if there is a relationship between the learning styles identified on the inventory and the program components participants identified as significant. Recognizing that learning is idiosyncratic, the purpose of this would not be to limit the participants to the learning styles identified on the inventory, but rather to use this information to support the need for a variety of activities and methods of presentation of information.

At the school and district level, when professional development is planned, it should contain a variety of activities and methods of presentation in order to address the differences in the way people learn.

### Questions for Further Research

1. With stages of career so diverse on any given school staff, how can they be accommodated with regard to staff development needs in order to move the staff along in the change process?
2. Joyce and Showers (1996) stated that peer coaching cannot be involved in the evaluation process or it will

inhibit the experimental climate needed for peer coaching. Garmston and Costa (1996) state that cognitive coaching needs to be the basis of tenured teacher evaluation. Can the evaluation process be changed to reflect the cognitive coach model? Will this affect the success of peer coaching efforts?

3. The element of choice and the stages of concern and use (CBAM) are important to implementation of innovations. How can individual stages of concern and use, and the element of personal choice be honored, and still accomplish building-wide change?

4. In this study, the role of the principal in the change process was almost non-existent. With site-based school improvement plans, how important is the role of the principal in the change process, and how important is it for the principal to experience the innovation training with the staff?

5. With multi-year school improvement plans, shouldn't follow-up studies of school improvement maintenance two, three and five years later be a part of the school improvement process?

#### Summary

This study has investigated the factors that influence long-term use of educational innovations. Although it has involved a relatively small number of individuals, the qualitative case study approach has provided a thorough

review of all the factors influencing educational change for each participant.

The study has provided information that can be used when designing and implementing educational change. In this time of focus on continual school improvement, information that can assist in maintaining long-term educational change is beneficial to educators and students.

An instructional leader or district personnel responsible for staff development can use the data related to the 14 personal stories about professional development to design effective programs to support school improvement. The information about levels of concern, use, and confidence, internal and external influencing factors, the complexity of the innovation, collaboration and coaching, reflection, training format and age of the participants, all affected the change process and the sustained use of Whole Language instruction. This information can be used to design more effective professional development that supports long-term change. This in turn, allows the most efficient use of limited educational dollars with the desired outcome of change in classroom instruction that increases student achievement.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, R. H. (1993). Clinical Supervision: Its History and Current Context. Clinical supervision: Coaching for higher performance. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- Arin-Krupp, J. (1981). Adult development implications for staff development. Colchester, CT: Project RISE.
- Arin-Krupp, J. A., (1983). How to spark an aging staff: Some suggestions. Illinois school research and development, 20, 38-46.
- Arrendando, D., Brody, J., Zimmerman, D., & Moffett, C. (1995, November). Pushing the envelope in supervision. Educational Leadership, 74-78
- Baker, R., & Showers, B. (1984). The effects of a coaching strategy on teachers' transfer of training to classroom practice: A six-month follow-up study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, La.
- Barth, R. S. (1990, March). A personal vision of a good school. Phi Delta Kappan, 512-516.
- Bennett, J. M. R. (1994). The relationship of mathematics staff development training to the mathematics instruction of elementary and middle school teachers. Houston, TX: University of Houston.
- Broyles, I., & Tillman, Murray. (1985). Relationships of inservice training components and changes in teacher concerns regarding innovations. Journal of Educational Research, 78(6), 364-371.
- Calhoun, E., & Joyce, B. (1995, April). School renewal: An inquiry, not a formula. Educational Leadership, 51-55.
- Cogan, M. (1973). Clinical supervision. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

- Cook, C. W. (1993). Factors affecting long-term implementation of integrated learning systems in elementary schools (staff development). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Costa, A., & Garmston, R. (1994). Cognitive coaching: A foundation for renaissance schools. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.
- Costa, A., & Kallick, B. (1993, October). Through the lens of a critical friend. Educational Leadership, 49-51.
- Crandall, D., et al. (1982). People, policies and practice: Examining the chain of school improvement (Vols. 1-10). Andover, MA: The Network.
- Denzin, N. (1989). The research act. a theoretical introduction to sociological methods. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Donovan, J. F., Sousa, D. A., & Walberg, H. J. (1987). The impact of staff development on implementation and student achievement. Journal of Educational Research, 80(6), 348-351.
- Edelsky, C., Altwerger, B., & Flores, B. (1991). Whole language, what's the difference? Portsmouth: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.
- Elmore, R.F. (1980). Complexity and control: What legislators and administrators can do about implementing public policy. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.
- Enz, B., & Searfoss, L. (1996, March). Can teacher evaluation reflect holistic instruction? Educational Leadership, 38-41.
- Fagan, T. W., & Heid, A. (1991). Chapter 1 program improvement: Opportunity and practice. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 582-585.
- Fine, C., & Riggs, E. (1994) Instructional conversations to promote reflection. Journal of Staff Development, 15(3), 28-31.
- Fullan, M. (1993). Change forces, probing the depths of educational reform. London: The Falmer Press.
- Fullan, M. (1993). Why teachers must become change agents. Educational Leadership, 50(6), 12-17.



- Fullan, M. (1992) Visions that blind. Educational Leadership, 49(5), 19-22.
- Fullan, M. (1983). Evaluating program implementation: What can be learned from follow through. Curriculum Inquiry, 13(2), 215-27.
- Fullan, M., & Bennet, B. (1990). Linking classroom and school improvement. Educational Leadership, 47(8), 13-15, 17-19.
- Fullan M., & Miles, M. (1992). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. Phi Delta Kappan, 73(10), 744-52.
- Fullan, M., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Garmston, R., & Wellman, B. (1996). The adaptive school. El Dorado Hills, CA: Four Hats Press.
- Genova, W. J. & Walberg, H. J. (1982). Staff, school, and workshop influences on knowledge use in educational improvement efforts. Journal of Educational Research, 76(2), 69-79.
- Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical supervision: Special method for the supervision of teachers. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Goodman, K. S. (1986). What's whole in whole language? Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Goodman, K. S., Bird, L. B., & Goodman, Y. M. (1991). The whole language catalog. U.S.A.: American School Publishers.
- Guskey, T. R. (1986, May) Staff development and the process of teacher change. Educational Researcher, 5-12.
- Harrison, C., & Killion, J. (1988). Evaluating training programs: Three critical elements for success. Journal of Staff Development, 9, 34 -38.
- Heald-Taylor, G. (1989). The administrator's guide to whole language. New York: Richard C. Owen.
- Hord, S. M., Rutherford, W. L., Huling-Austin, L., & Hall, G. E. (1989). Taking charge of change. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

- Hord, S., Rutherford, W., Huling-Austin, L., & Hall, G. (1987). Taking charge of change. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Huberman, M., & Miles, M. (1984). Innovation up close. New York: Plenum.
- Huberman, M. (1983). Recipes for busy kitchens. Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 4, 478-510.
- Joyce, B., Showers, B. (1980). Improving inservice training: The messages of research. Educational Leadership, 37, 379-385.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1995). Student achievement through staff development: Fundamentals of school renewal (2nd Ed.). White Plains, N.Y.: Longman.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1996, March). The evolution of peer coaching. Educational Leadership, 12-16.
- Killion, J. P. & Valencia, S. W. (1988). Overcoming obstacles to teacher change: Direction from school-based efforts, Journal of Staff Development, 9(2), 142-148.
- LeTendre, M. J. (1991). Improving Chapter 1 programs: We can do better. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 577-580.
- Lieberman, A. (1988). Teachers and principals: Turf, tensions, and new tasks. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 648-653.
- Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Loucks, S. F. & Hall, G. E. (1979). Implementing innovations in schools: A concerns-based approach. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 8-12).
- Loucks-Horsley, S. & Sparks, D. (1989). Five models of staff development for teachers. Journal of Staff Development, 10(4), 40-55.
- Marris, P. (1975). Loss and change. New York, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Mason, R. & Pahl, M. (1992). In search of whole language: Transforming curriculum and instruction. Journal of Reading, 35(7), 518-524.

- McCarthy, B., (1980). The 4mat system. Barrington, IL: Excel, Inc.
- McKinney, M., & Meyerson, M. (in press) Teachers' perspectives on the instruments used to measure educational change. To be published in the forty-fifth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Meyerson, M. (1993). Exploring reading instructional decisions through a reflective activity: A first step in the change process. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 4, 153-168
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ohlhausen, M., Meyerson, M., & Sexton, T. (1992). Viewing innovations through the Efficacy-Based Change Model: A whole language application. Journal of Reading, 35, 536-541.
- Rosenholtz, S. (1989). Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools. New York, NY: Longman.
- Sahakian, P., & Stockton, J. (1996, March). Opening doors: Teacher-guided observations. Educational Leadership, 50-53.
- Sarason, S. B., (1990). The predictable failure of educational reform. Can we change course before it's too late? San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schweiger, B. M. (1994). Impact of an intensive summer institute and follow-up practices (teacher beliefs, staff development). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska.
- Slavin, R. E. (1991). Chapter 1: A vision for the next quarter century. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 586-592.
- Stake, R. E., (1995). The art of case study research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Stallings, J. A. (1989). School achievement effects and staff development: What are some critical factors? Paper presented at American Educational Research Association annual meeting.

- Tyler, R. W. (1988, April). Making education reform work. Education Digest, 14-16.
- Weaver, C. (1988). Reading process and practice. Portsmouth: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.
- Weaver, C. (1990). Understanding whole language from principles to practice. Portsmouth: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.
- Wiggins, R. A. (1993). An alternate view of staff development: personal professional growth within a single school setting. Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois.

APPENDIX A  
PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT

I understand that the purpose of this study is to determine whether any of the philosophy and strategies learned in the 1991 Chapter 1 Pilot Program led by Jane Davidson are currently being used by participants. This study is attempting to reveal factors that might inhibit or support continued use of strategies that are learned in professional development. It is also an attempt to determine elements that are common to the change process in instruction.

I understand that my participation is completely voluntary. I may refuse to participate or may choose to withdraw at any time and there will be no consequences. Should I have any concerns about the questions at any later time, I understand that the researcher will be available for consultation.

1. I will participate in an interview that will take approximately one hour.
2. The interview will focus on the professional development program of 1991, the change process, my perceptions of what whole language is, and the experiences that have occurred since then that would support or inhibit the use of the information learned in 1991.
3. The interview will be tape-recorded. All information will be treated as confidential material. I understand my name will not be associated with the group.
4. The researcher may ask to observe me or for instructional artifacts which I may choose to share.
5. I will allow any of my statements to be quoted in the final study. No quoted material will identify me by name as being the source of information.

---

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Participant's signature

---

Researcher: Kristen Allen Ross

## APPENDIX B

## STRUCTURED INTERVIEW BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

## BIOGRAPHICAL DATA:

1. Experience and position at the time of training (1991-1992)?
2. Number of years in current position?
3. Total number of years teaching?
4. Subject and grade levels taught?
5. If you are currently a Chapter 1 teacher, how many students do you serve?
  - a. Are you involved in a pull-out program, a push-in program or reading recovery?
  - b. Any other type of program?
6. Educational training?
7. How do you keep up to date in the field?
8. Date and nature of last college class or workshop attended.
9. Future Goals?

## DEMOGRAPHIC DATA:

1. Size of school?
  - a. Number of teachers?
  - b. Number of students?
2. Describe the district community at large.
3. Describe the community your school serves.
4. Describe the Chapter 1 program.

## APPENDIX C

## QUALITATIVE RESEARCH QUESTIONS FOR PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWS

Each participant will be given their personal reflection of change and growth written in May of 1992.

1. Think about the way you instruct now and the way you did during the 1991-92 school year - what are the differences?
2. To what do you attribute these differences?
3. What has occurred during the interim that encouraged or inhibited these changes?
4. During the training, time was spent reflecting on what we teach and how and why we teach it. Describe the role that reflection plays in your teaching today.
5. How much time do you spend reading professional materials? Give some examples of the professional materials you read.
6. During the training, you videotaped yourself and viewed the tape with the group. Have you videotaped yourself since? If yes, describe how this has been used. If you have you done any other form of peer coaching, would you please describe it?
7. Please describe a unit or lesson that you teach that would be considered Whole Language.
8. What are the factors that make this a Whole Language lesson or unit?
9. What kinds of student grouping strategies do you use today? What are the situations in which you use them?
10. What part does student writing play in your Chapter 1 program?
11. Are you currently using any integrated thematic units? Please describe one.
12. Please describe any professional development program other than the pilot program, that you believe was very effective in changing your instructional strategies.
13. Why do you think it was effective?

14. How do you see yourself as a reflective/effective teacher?

Sources of data collection will be:

1. Structured subject interviews
2. Artifacts - lessons and student work
3. Pre and post test scores of students
4. Direct observations - using an observation guide based on components of the professional development training and generally accepted Whole Language practices



APPENDIX D

***Whole Language Teaching Continuum***

X \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_

***Traditional  
Instruction***

***Whole  
Language  
Purist***

***Name:*** \_\_\_\_\_

***Date:*** \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX E  
TRIANGULATION CHART



APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Kristen Allen Ross has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Max Bailey, Director  
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy  
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Art Safer  
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy  
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Jane Davidson  
Professor Emeritus  
Northern Illinois University DeKalb

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

December 2, 1996  
Date

Max Bailey  
Director's Signature